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Abstract
Before the Revolution New Hampshire had one of the strongest, pro-British governing elites of the colonies. After 1775 however, the Loyalist faction in the state was one of the weakest and least effective. This dissertation seeks to examine the uniqueness of this experience by studying the general situation, the lives of many of the province's Loyalists, and by classifying the Loyalists through their connections with Great Britain.

Governor Benning Wentworth tightly controlled the colony through a network of family and business associations which came to dominate the politics and the economy of the province. However, when his nephew John Wentworth succeeded him in 1767, it was a different era, with a declining demand for the colony's products, unstable support in England, and revolutionary madness in America. The rebels soon took to extralegal methods of opposition, outmaneuvering the Loyalists, who were trapped into following constitutional avenues until they became only helpless observers.

Because the leading Loyalists followed Wentworth into exile, the movement was decapitated, and with no British occupation, there was no place for the Loyalists to band together. It was easy then for the rebels to identify and control the Loyalists. Yet not all Loyalists were helpless; many served England by facing death as spies, counterfeiters, and soldiers.

The end of the war found many Loyalists in permanent exile, mostly in Atlantic Canada. More important to the new nation were the hundreds of Loyalists who remained silent during the war and were allowed to live in comparative peace. These men formed a conservative force in the politics of the new state, and some Loyalists managed to rise to the heights of post-war politics.

By studying the New Hampshire Loyalists it is possible to categorize them according to their connections to Great Britain. However, whether influenced by governmental, mercantile, military, or intellectual connections, the decision to remain loyal was a deeply personal one, determined frequently by the inherent conservative nature of man. No matter what influenced their actual decision, they all sincerely believed in the British cause, and many risked their lives trying to defeat the Revolution.
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ABSTRACT

REVOLUTIONARY NEW HAMPshire AND THE LOYALIST EXPERIENCE;
"SURELY WE HAVE DESERVED A BETTER FATE."

by

ROBERT MUNRO BROWN

University of New Hampshire, May, 1983

Before the Revolution New Hampshire had one of the strongest, entrenched, pro-British governing elites of all the colonies. After 1775 the Loyalist faction in the state was one of the weakest and least effective. In this respect the Loyalist experience in New Hampshire is unique, and this dissertation seeks to examine that experience by studying the general New Hampshire situation and the lives of many of the province's Loyalists.

Benning Wentworth established a tightly controlled, rigidly maintained rule over the colony, through a network of family and business associations which came to dominate the politics and the economy of the province. He passed the government, intact, to his nephew, John Wentworth, in 1767. However, John came to power in a different era, with a declining demand for the colony's products, an unstable base of support in England, and a revolutionary madness in America. As the rebels took to extralegal methods of opposition, the Loyalists were trapped into following constitutional avenues and were outmaneuvered. As the crisis deepened, the Loyalists looked on as helpless observers, putting their faith in the British to set things right.
With the leading Loyalists following Wentworth into exile, the Loyalist movement in New Hampshire was decapitated, and with no British occupation, there was no place for the Loyalists to band together. It was easy for the rebels to identify the Loyalists through the Association Test and then to control them through harassment, confinement, disenfranchisement, banishment, and confiscation. Not all Loyalists were helpless, as many faced death as spies, counterfeiters, and soldiers; as the careers of men like Stephen Holland, John Sheperd, and Breed Batcheller demonstrate.

The Paris peace treaty did not end the suffering, as many men and women found themselves in permanent exile, mostly in Atlantic Canada. While Richard Holland, Hugh Henderson, and many others started over in Canada, some men, like Robert Luist Fowle, returned to New Hampshire after the emotions of the war cooled down. More important were the hundreds of Loyalists who had remained silent during the war and were allowed to live in comparative peace. These men formed a conservative force in the politics of the new state, and some Loyalists even managed to rise to the heights of post-war politics, like Joshua Atherton, the state’s future attorney general, and James Sheafe, future United States Senator.

By studying the lives of the New Hampshire Loyalists it is possible to categorize them on the basis of their connections to Great Britain. Colonial officials were dependent on the British government for their positions, many merchants relied on the British trade for their wealth, military men followed their oaths of allegiance, and some men followed their professional or intellectual leanings. In the end, however, the decision to remain loyal was a deeply personal choice that was
determined by the inherent conservative nature of man. No matter what influenced their actual decision, the Loyalists of New Hampshire believed in the cause of Great Britain, and many of them risked their lives trying to defeat the Revolution.
INTRODUCTION

THE LOYALIST PERSPECTIVE

In eighteenth-century colonial American politics, there existed a paradox on which rested the foundation for the revolutionary movement. On one hand there was a formal enlargement of the executive's legal authority, an enlargement which apparently went beyond the limits compatible with liberty. On the other hand there was a radical reduction of the real power of the executive as actually exercised. Conflict was inevitable between this presumptuous prerogative and this overgreat democracy. In this explosive milieu the political scene of New Hampshire provided a startling exception.

From Massachusetts to the Carolinas local circumstances gave particular coloration to the politics of each colony, but the underlying paradox, in every incident, led to immoderate politics and factionalism. In New York the confrontation began with Leisler's rebellion, but was modified and minimized by the creation of a dominant gubernatorial interest. This executive dominance was overturned by the DeLancey interests as they economically undercut the governor at home and found support in England. When the DeLancey's took over they found themselves battling yet another opposition party, the Livingstons, they never were popularly supported in New York as the Livingstons led the fight against prerogative, the only thing keeping the DeLancey's in power.

In Massachusetts the governor's party continuously fought an entrenched opposition by making concessions to local political interests
and by dispersing what patronage it had at its disposal. Meanwhile the executive was bound by royal instructions that seemed overburdened with excessive prerogative powers. In Pennsylvania the proprietor's party fought the Quaker party and then the royal party, while the governor became increasingly isolated from the population. In the Carolinas proprietary rule led to anarchy, into which the governor was forced to enter, using his prerogative power to maintain some semblance of order in the colonies while alienating the opposition. Proprietary power was at its most extreme and obnoxious in Maryland, where the almost feudal land policies and the arrogant use of privileges engendered a sharp reaction in the Assembly. Virginia, with its apparent harmony, actually typified the tumultuous factionalism of American politics. In Virginia, as in all the other colonies, there existed an incompatibility of a legally great but politically weak prerogative and a democracy that was capable of resisting executive influence and that was constantly stimulated to act by shifts in the economy.

New Hampshire was the only exception to the rule. Before the Revolution New Hampshire had, apparently, one of the strongest, entrenched pro-British governing elites of the colonies. After early fights with the Assembly, Benning Wentworth emerged with powers so great that he effectively obliterated the opposition. Not because of executive inertia or any characteristic of governmental organization, but rather because of a "fortuitous conjunction of economic and political forces," a single, tightly integrated hierarchy of authority emerged. Because of Wentworth's domination of the single industry economy, and his firm support of England, he could pack the Assembly, intervene in local elections, buy representatives, and fill local offices.
Yet despite the strength and the popularity of the Wentworth government, royal rule in the province was the first to suffer attack and the whole edifice of royal authority disappeared more quickly than in any other colony, and after 1775 the Loyalist faction in the state was one of the weakest and least effective. In this respect the Loyalist experience in New Hampshire is unique. The elaborately constructed governing elite completely dominated the colony, politically, economically, and socially; but at the same time they were isolated from the rest of the population, politically, socially, religiously, and geographically. The Wentworth oligarchy was a closed society, concentrated in the upper echelons of the government and the economy, and located primarily along the seacoast, with various representatives in the interior. The oligarchy was a marvellous target for the revolutionaries, men who resented the elite and were frustrated because they could not advance in government or society. The broader revolutionary movement provided the New Hampshire rebels with an ideology of opposition, popular support, and influential allies. While the revolutionists gathered popular support and increased their appeal, the Loyalists found themselves becoming more and more dependent on British support for their continuance in power. When the radicals finally made their move, in 1774 and 1775, the Loyalist elite in New Hampshire had no choice but to flee.

The very strength of the prewar Loyalist party was the major reason for their later weakness. With the exile of the Wentworth elite, the Loyalist movement was decapitated. The British never occupied any area of New Hampshire which could have been used as a Loyalist gathering point; instead, the New Hampshire Loyalists who fled found themselves outnumbered and dispersed in other areas of British-occupied America. The departure of the Loyalist elite also meant that there was no
east-west, seacoast-frontier division; the Loyalists found themselves dispersed and outnumbered everywhere in the state. Their cause was apparently hopeless, except for the belief in the ultimate success of British arms, a success to which many were willing to contribute.

Dispersed, with no focus and no leadership, the Loyalist experience of New Hampshire is, indeed, unique. Yet, the New Hampshire Loyalists shared a great deal with the Loyalists from other areas. More than the elite everywhere kept faith in the British empire, and more than direct connections with Great Britain determined men's stances. Pride in being part of the greatest empire on earth kept some men loyal; others cherished the liberal, balanced constitutional government of England; others feared the wrath of the British while doubting the revolutionists' chances of success; while still others did depend on the empire for power, wealth, and position. In the final analysis, however, the decision to remain loyal or to join the revolutionary cause was a deeply personal one, and in many cases the inherent conservative nature of man determined the outcome.

No matter what influenced their actual decision, the Loyalists, and not the British, were the real losers of the American Revolution. The Loyalists' lives were disrupted by persecution, violence, and exile; and their continued presence in the new United States after the war was intolerable. The Revolution was truly a civil war of tremendous magnitude, and it is easy to understand why the Loyalists were so harshly treated by their brethren, who were fighting for their own survival. After all, if the Loyalists were not traitors, then the patriots were, and the entire revolutionary cause was meaningless. The Loyalists were treated tyrannically, but it was a tyranny born of necessity, a despotism of revolution. Patriots zealously undertook the duty of purifying their
movement by terrorizing suspected Loyalists, tarring and feathering them, whipping them, and riding them on rails. Unpopular people were often denounced as Loyalists only because they were unpopular or because someone else was envious of their position or wealth. The prudent Loyalist, in order to save pain and humiliation, was well advised to remain silent, mouth revolutionary slogans, pay his taxes for the war effort, or else seek safety behind the British lines.

However, silent Loyalists were still Loyalists and therefore still to be feared as a force inimical to the revolution. Oaths of loyalty were rigorously imposed on all citizens, and those who refused to take the oaths were branded as traitors and deprived of all civil and political liberties. In late 1777 the Continental Congress recommended the confiscation and sale of all the property of prominent Loyalists so they would be made to suffer for their treason and also be forced to contribute to the patriot cause. Before the war was over, each state had confiscated some Loyalist property, in varying ways, and often accompanied the confiscations with acts of perpetual banishment. The war required harsh and savage measures to bring about ultimate success.

In New Hampshire the prominent Loyalists are easy to identify from an historical distance and were easy to identify during the revolution. The problem is, and was, the identification of those Loyalists who led quiet and unobtrusive lives. To resolve the problem, the New Hampshire Committee of Safety, in 1776, sent the Association Test to all males twenty-one and over to pledge their loyalty to the cause; naturally suspicion was immediately cast in the direction of the non-signers, and life necessarily became more difficult for them. The surviving returns indicate that approximately 6.3 percent of the population did not sign and were considered by their countrymen to be Loyalists in 1776.
6.3 percent, however, were not necessarily Loyalists, for many men had other reasons for not signing, and Loyalist strength would fluctuate with the progress of the war. Meanwhile, committees of safety and inspection were established throughout the state to weed out traitors and to purify the movement, with punishments ranging from warnings, posting of bond, confinement, imprisonment, to the ultimate punishment - exile.

The state of New Hampshire, following Congress' recommendation, confiscated the estates of the leading Loyalists after first taking the precaution of proscribing them. Nevertheless, a large number of Loyalists secretly stayed inside the enemy lines and provided great services to the British; tremendous contributions were made in the fields of espionage and counterfeiting. Of even greater service to the king were those men who bore arms with or alongside the British regulars in combat; Governor John Wentworth, for example, was the patron of a regiment of Loyalist volunteers who saw a fair amount of action in other states, if not in New Hampshire.

The Loyalist cause ultimately failed, and the men and women who had risked everything and lost were forced to begin new lives in unfamiliar places. Life was often a struggle, for many of the exiled Loyalists were ill-equipped by previous experience to survive in a wilderness. Some opted for life in Great Britain or Europe, some depended on royal appointments for survival, and some eventually returned to the United States. Most exiled Loyalists, however, struggled and survived in coastal Canada, giving that country their own imprint.

The story of the Loyalists of New Hampshire ends in Canada in the 1780s, but to understand the total experience one must go back to 1741 and the birth of the Wentworth oligarchy to comprehend the peculiar New Hampshire circumstances that eventually led to the birth of a
revolutionary party which toppled the Wentworth government overnight in 1775 and drove out the opposition by 1783. Who was right and who was wrong are impossible to determine; history has demonstrated the viability of the United States' form of government, but the Loyalists never got a chance, and they are now largely forgotten men of a doomed cause. The great historian of the Loyalists, Claude Halstead Van Tyne, summed up the Loyalist perspective masterfully when, in 1903, he wrote:

The cause of the Loyalists failed, but their stand was just and natural....The Loyalist obeyed his nature as truly as the Patriot, but, as events proved, chose the ill-fated cause, and, when the struggle ended, his prosperity had fled, and he was an outcast and an exile.
INTRODUCTION NOTES


4. Ibid., 277-279.

5. NHPP, vol. 7, 204-299; NHSP, vol. 8, 724-779. For a breakdown of the results of the Association Test, by town, refer to Appendix B, and for an analysis of the Association Test, consult Chapter Three.

6. NHSP, vol. 8, 810-814. Refer to Appendix C for a breakdown, by town, of the men who were proscribed and who had their property confiscated. Chapter Three contains an analysis of both the Proscription and the Confiscation Acts, as well as of many other acts passed by the legislature to control the Loyalists.

May it please your Excellency

I received your Excellency's Favor of yesterday & in obedience thereto I kept a strict Watch all Night & added two men to my usual Number being all I could get. Nothing material occur'd till this Day about one o'Clock, when I was inform'd there were a Number of People coming to take possession of the Fort, upon which having only five effective Men with me I prepared to make the best Defence I could & pointed some Guns to those places where I expected they would enter. About three o'Clock the Fort was beset on all sides by upwards of four hundred men. I told them at their Peril not to enter, they reply'd they would. I immediately ordered three four pounders to be fired on them & then the small Arms & before we could be ready to fire again we were storm'd on all Quarters, & they immediately secur'd both me & my men & kept us Prisoners about one hour & an half during which time they broke open the Powder house & took all the Powder away (except one Barrel) & having put it into Boats & sent it off, they released me from my Confinement. To which can only add that I did all in my Power to defend the Fort but all my Efforts could not avail against so great a Number.

I am with Respect Your Excellencys
most Obedient Servant
(signed) John Cochran

So wrote Captain Cochran, commander of the King's forces at Fort William and Mary, describing the events of December 14, 1774 on Newcastle Island, just outside Portsmouth. So too ended all effective royal rule in the colony of New Hampshire, although the government would limp along for another eight months. But what happened? How could a colony, previously noted for its calmness amid revolutionary times and its loyalty to the king and the governor, suddenly erupt into flames and initiate the first armed confrontation between His Majesty's troops and the American colonists? Why, in Bernard Bailyn's description of the
colonies before the revolution, did the "one striking exception" to executive inefficiency - New Hampshire, with its carefully constructed and tightly integrated hierarchy of authority disintegrate in one afternoon?^2

That royal government in New Hampshire collapsed so completely and so suddenly can not be blamed solely on the irrationality of Parliamentary acts, political blindness on the part of Governor John Wentworth, or the presence just south of the border of the inflammatory rebels in Boston. The forces behind the collapse of the Wentworth dynasty began as early as 1741, with the appointment of Benning Wentworth, the founder of the dynasty, as governor. To understand perhaps who "loyalism" was so weak in the colony, and to understand the subsequent experiences of New Hampshire's Loyalists, it is necessary to understand first the circumstances unique to New Hampshire under the oligarchic Wentworth rule.

The first Wentworth in America was William Wentworth, a follower of the Puritan minister, John Wheelwright. When the Bay Colony banished Wheelwright for his preachings, Wentworth followed him to Exeter, New Hampshire. In 1693 his grandson, John, wed the daughter of a prosperous sea captain, Mark Hunking. Rising quickly using family ties, fortunate mercantile adventures, and a shrewd political instinct, John became a member of the colony's council in 1712. By 1717 he was the lieutenant-governor of Massachusetts, a post that effectively made him the unofficial governor of New Hampshire. By living on a grand scale, becoming a member of the Church of England, and proving his abilities during Lovewell's War, John Wentworth pleased the king and the colonies for thirteen years and set the pace of social life in Portsmouth. But along the way he had managed to antagonize his superior the new governor...
of Massachusetts, John Belcher, who had assumed office in 1730. Belcher, in turn, ignored his lieutenant-governor, and within five months John died, but his son Benning was waiting in the wings to take up the case of New Hampshire and the Wentworths.  

Benning Wentworth was a merchant of good reputation in Portsmouth, and was respected and liked by the people. He had represented Portsmouth in the Assembly for several years, where he had led the opposition against Governor Belcher. Later he was appointed to the Council, where he continued his opposition, and "joined in the measures which were pursued for obtaining distinct governor, without any apprehension that himself would be the person." In 1741 the King in Parliament separated New Hampshire from Massachusetts and appointed Benning Wentworth the governor of the northern colony. John Thomlinson, Wentworth's patron, the agent for New Hampshire in London, and intimate friend of the Duke of Newcastle, obtained for the new governor the additional position of Surveyor-General of His Majesty's Woods, helping Wentworth to consolidate his political and economic power bases. The Thomlinson-Wentworth connection served both parties' interests in England and America for many years. Thus began an unparalleled twenty-five year long governorship in America.  

The only serious challenge to Benning's rule came in 1748, when he issued election precepts to several new towns to send representatives to the Assembly in Portsmouth. Richard Waldron, former associate of Governor Belcher, leader of the Massachusetts party, and Speaker of the House, declared the governor's actions to have been in violation of the House's prerogatives, and he obtained a majority vote against seating the new delegates. Wentworth responded by using his powers as governor to disallow Waldron as the House's choice as Speaker, and to refuse to
acknowledge the Assembly as a legally constituted body. The Assembly, in turn, petitioned the crown through its agent in England, but Thomlinson was so heavily connected with the Wentworths economically and politically that he was unwilling to do anything to jeopardize the arrangement. The governor had also expected such a challenge and had requested and obtained additional royal instructions specifically granting him the power to issue election precepts to new towns. Through adjournments and prorogations, Wentworth kept the Assembly in session, but inoperative, until 1752 when, according to the provincial triennial act, he had to call for new elections. But the election of 1752 showed that the political climate in New Hampshire had moderated as new, pro-Wentworth members were elected, and Meshech Weare was elected and allowed as Speaker. Benning Wentworth succeeded in taming the Assembly, whereas fifteen years later his nephew would fail under similar circumstances, but in a vastly different political environment.

As governor, Benning Wentworth had powers similar to all of the other royal governors in America, and yet he alone held power for twenty-five years. The obvious reason for his success was the unique way in which he used his powers in relationship to the available resources of the colony. New Hampshire had only one major industry, lumber. Through Thomlinson's connections with the government, the navy, and many mast contractors, along with his own position as Surveyor-General, Benning totally controlled the economic situation of the colony and basked in the reflected glow of prosperity. The problem would come when that prosperity came to an end, then the governor would have to take the blame. For now, six families came to dominate the economic life of the colony completely: the Atkinsons, Jaffreys, Peirces, Rindges, Warners, and Wentworths. Each family was tremendously wealthy, Anglican,
politically active, and intermarried with the other families. By the 1750s "a complex pattern of personal, social, economic, and constitutional relationships linked the family interests to the interests of others concerned with provincial government." Family ties existed at every level of the political and economic scales and helped to create an oligarchy that ruled New Hampshire from 1741 to 1775. Theodore Atkinson is perhaps the prime example of the family network. He married Hannah Wentworth, Benning's sister, in 1732; became colonial secretary in 1742, replacing the governor's old enemy, Richard Waldron; he also became a major-general in the colonial militia, a delegate to the Albany Conference in 1754, a councilor, and chief justice.

Plural office-holding and family ties secured the loyalty of the elite to the government, but they also isolated the elite from the people and prevented the lesser officials from advancing within the hierarchy. In 1750 six of the eight councilors were related to the governor; the other two were carry-overs from Governor Belcher's administration. The kinship pattern grew more extensive with time and intermarriage. George Jaffrey, junior, the Provincial Treasurer from 1749 to 1775 and councilor from 1766 to 1775, was a stepson of Sarah Wentworth, another one of Benning's sisters. Peter Gilman, a councilor from 1771 to 1775, married Dorothy Sherburne, whose mother was Lieutenant-Governor John Wentworth's sister; and Dorothy Sherburne's brother, John, became a councilor in 1774. David Warner, councilor from 1753 to 1775, fathered Jonathan Warner, councilor from 1766 to 1775, who wed Lieutenant-Governor John Wentworth's granddaughter in 1748. On a more oblique level, Leverett Hubbard, superior court judge from 1763 to 1784, married George Jaffrey's daughter in 1769. Finally, Benning Wentworth's nephew, John, was colonial agent and the last royal governor.
Sociological characteristics also added to the elite's cohesiveness. The majority were involved in commerce, particularly with the lumber trade, or else they were lawyers. Almost all of them had a residence in Portsmouth where they spent most of their time and established the social network of the city. Without exception they were all very wealthy, with economic connections that led directly to England. Most of them also tended to be Anglican, a very significant characteristic since the majority of New Hampshire colonists were Congregationalists. The ruling oligarchy was therefore geographically, sociologically, religiously, and economically removed from the majority of the people, a very dangerous situation should ever a breach of trust develop.

The governor used his vast appointive powers, from militia officers to provincial judges, to further the ties of dependency and loyalty to the lower levels of power. But it was primarily at the top that the bonds of loyalty were the strongest. With the Council, which the governor could appoint and suspend within certain limits, Wentworth could establish and maintain courts, act as the highest court of review and the highest probate court, and act as the upper house of the legislature. He had the power to control legal and military structures, use the direct veto, and adjourn, dismiss, or prorogue the Assembly. In addition, the nature of New Hampshire's economy, the domination of that economy by the elite, and the elite's own cohesiveness guaranteed Wentworth's long success. However, the very isolation of the elite, due to its cohesiveness, contained within itself the seeds of its destruction.

Wentworth was not just satisfied with consolidating his position in the upper echelons. After the confrontation with the Assembly in 1748, he also tried to tie the lower-level officials to his administration. In
that year he began granting townships, always deeding prime parcels of land in every town charter to members of the elite, while also reserving 500 acres to himself. After 1752 he began to grant land to favored house delegates, thus helping to develop a stratum of lesser officials who would look for their own personal advancement by seeking favor with the oligarchy. These grants were largely for speculation and profit, not settlement, and they built up the vast economic resources of the oligarchy and its new partners, while also tying them tighter together politically. Wentworth's goal was not the domination of the Assembly, for he truly expected them to assume independent responsibilities for many internal affairs, but he did expect the House to help in fulfilling the responsibilities of royal government.

Besides the elite and the co-opted lesser officials, the third leg of the tripod of domestic support of the Wentworth rule was the general populace of freeholders, farmers, artisans, and unskilled laborers, for without the support of the masses, any government is doomed. The majority of colonists were tied to the interests of the oligarchy by a combination of continual prosperity, generosity, and benign neglect. As long as the economy flourished, people were glad to support the ruling class. More personally, Wentworth was very generous in the form of easy and abundant land grants. Benign neglect made friends for the governor as he ignored his duty as Surveyor-General by not prosecuting offenders of the White Pine Act, by indulging his deputies, and by wasting the king's lumber on the common people. An excellent example of Wentworth's shrewd political sense took place during the Stamp Act crisis. Benning managed to keep New Hampshire out of the tumult by simply denying that the British ministry had even sent him a copy of the Act; so while Boston brewed, New Hampshire remained calm and
relatively unconcerned, not even bothering to send a representative to the Stamp Act Congress.¹⁵

Two other general circumstances helped Benning Wentworth prevent the Assembly from obstructing his authority. First, he held office during wartime in a province constantly threatened by the French and Indians. The House quickly complied with his requests for appropriations, since as individuals they benefited from the government contracts so created, and as representatives they were securing the protection of the frontiers. Secondly, the governor was independently wealthy. From 1749 to 1752, for example, he could afford to go without pay, and later he could pay Atkinson's salary as Chief Justice of the Superior Court, until the House assumed the responsibility.¹⁶

But the 1760s saw a new era come into existence. George III came to the throne determined to rule a tightly controlled empire. The Duke of Newcastle left office, and his replacements had little stake in the New Hampshire Wentworths. John Thomlinson retired in the early 1760s, taking his influence with him. At home, many people had had enough of the arbitrary rule of Benning Wentworth, and trouble over the New Hampshire Grants, west of the Connecticut River and in conflict with New York's claims, was coming under investigation by the Board of Trade. Complaints were lodged against Wentworth for demanding exorbitant fees for land patents, negligence in corresponding with the king's ministers, nepotism, informality and want of accuracy in his land grants, neglect of duty as Surveyor-General, and for passing acts of Assembly respecting private property without a suspending clause.¹⁷

Benning Wentworth was obviously on the way out. The only question was whether he would go with dignity, or would his ouster have to be brutal and destroy the elaborate oligarchy he had so carefully
established? Fortunately for himself and for the dynasty, Benning's nephew, John Wentworth, was in London at the time. John immediately went to work to save Benning's honor and, more importantly, the family's honor and power. Luckily he had some very important and influential friends. John had served as co-agent for New Hampshire with Thomlinson's replacement and associate, Barlow Trescothick, during the Stamp Act crisis. He was also very friendly with a distant relative, Charles Watson-Wentworth, the Marquis of Rockingham. Rockingham had been instrumental in repealing the Stamp Act, and John Wentworth had apparently been able to help convince him to take that course, making Wentworth very popular in America. In July 1765 Rockingham became Prime Minister, and to no one's surprise John Wentworth was appointed Governor of New Hampshire and Surveyor-General of His Majesty's Woods; Benning was allowed to retire with honor.  

John inherited a strong, secure, and formidable establishment, one that had operated successfully for twenty-five years, but now there was a rising undercurrent of opposition. The Stamp Act had begun the active debate on the role of the colonies within an imperial system, and the Townshend Duties continued and refined the arguments. Lesser officials were gaining experience on local, county, and assembly levels. Many of the officials, who were cut off from the upper levels of power because of oligarchic structure, were ready to take advantage of any situation to turn the tables on the elite. But all of that was under the surface, and in 1767, as Benning Wentworth resigned, the success of the Wentworths in maintaining their position gave New Hampshire both stable and effective government. Family control had inhibited the development of factionalism, which in many other provinces undermined royal authority. Additionally, family government pleased most of the
province's population, who shared with the oligarchy the benefits of the existing economic and political conditions. As Benning Wentworth resigned, the Assembly thanked him "for the steady Administration of Justice, the quiet enjoyment of Prosperity, the Civil and Religious Liberties and Privileges his Majesty's good subjects of the Province have experienced and Possess'd during this Period."

The last royal governor of New Hampshire was born in Portsmouth on August 9, 1737. Through his mother, Elizabeth Rindge, he was connected with the wealthy Rindge mercantile interests, and as Mark Hunking Wentworth's son he was a Hunking, a Wentworth, and a nephew of the governor. His father had made a substantial fortune in the very lucrative West Indies trade and in the mast trade. Mark Wentworth also became one of the Masonian Proprietors, who bought out John Tufton Mason's entire interest in the original New Hampshire grant, through which John would later become a major landowner along Lake Winnipesaukee.

As the son of a leading colonial figure and nephew of a governor, it was easy for John to enter Harvard. Graduating in 1755, he entered his father's house of business, became an associate of the Masonian investors, and in 1763 was sent to London by his father to be the company's representative. Once in England, John began to mingle with the most aristocratic and influential men, cultivating their friendship and esteem. Particularly important friendships were made with two relatives, Paul Wentworth, later involved in espionage during the Revolution, and the Marquis of Rockingham, who would come to John's aid several times. Because of his connections with Rockingham, his actions against the Stamp Act, and his unceasing work on behalf of New Hampshire, in 1766 Prime Minister Rockingham persuaded the king to appoint John Wentworth Governor of New Hampshire and Surveyor-General.
Returning to New Hampshire on June 13, 1767, the new governor was greeted by cheering crowds and supportive politicians, blissfully unaware of what his fate would be in seven and a half years. In the Assembly's official address, they congratulated the new governor on his "Benevolent Disposition," his "abilities and inclination to Discharge the Special Duties of [his] exalted Station," and on his "knowledge of the British Constitution and form of Government," and they thanked him for his previous service as their agent "at that critical conjuncture of affairs when it was threatened and in danger of irreparable Burthens." Then they addressed themselves to the future, with

The most pleasing hopes that the civil and Religious liberties of the People under your Government will always find Protection and safety thro' your whole administration; and more especially as they have hitherto preserved the character of quiet, loyal and dutifull subjects, firmly attached to his Majesty's person and government, and we flatter ourselves they will never forfeit that character; that they will be always disposed to demonstrate the truth of their profession by paying that honor and Duty to his Representative here which his character and station demand, and especially to your Excellency whose advancement is follow'd with the highest satisfaction and acquiescence: We therefore congradulate you, Sir, upon the Honor and trust his Majesty has confer'd on you and on the other propitious attending circumstances. 24

With high hopes for the future, John Wentworth began his administration, and in quieter times he might have succeeded. The period from 1767 to 1775 in New Hampshire has to be studied from two distinct angles, one from the viewpoint of events in the colony, and the other from the perspective of events outside, acting on the colony. In the first instance Governor Wentworth was remarkably successful, but in the second he soon found himself swept away in the revolutionary current.

In 1767 New Hampshire had 52,700 inhabitants, and Portsmouth was the leading city, with 4,466. 25 Wentworth took over this small, thriving, attractive, and still largely agrarian province with five major
constructive policies in mind: dividing the colony into counties, improving land transportation, surveying and recording the interior, improving the province's military preparedness, and establishing a major college in the west. The argument over whether or not to divide the colony into counties had been debated for years. The frontier settlers cried out for representation in the Assembly and for judicial systems in their areas so that they would not have to pursue all legal matters in Portsmouth. On the other hand, the Portsmouth oligarchy had no intention of giving up its favored position, nor its dominance of the provincial government. When John Wentworth became governor, the lower house voted to create four counties, a proposal that the Council immediately vetoed. Seizing the issue as a political opportunity to excercise royal power and to popularize himself with the people, the governor stepped in and proposed the creation of five counties, one more than the Assembly had dared ask for. To make the proposition more palatable to the Council, he proposed that of the five counties only three would be fully enfranchized immediately, while the other two would be delayed until some unspecified date. On April 27, 1769, Wentworth's plan was passed by both the House and the Council and sent to England for approval.26

With regard to improving land transportation, the governor was not quite so fortunate, as the Assembly absolutely refused to enact any taxes to support the construction of new roads, insisting that the proprietors and the merchants who benefited from the new roads should pay. Wentworth responded by beginning to enforce the collection of quitrents on all post-1741 grants, quitrents that had been uncollected by Benning Wentworth. All rents thus collected were then applied to public improvements, making them acceptable to the population. Needing maps to grant lant and to keep track of state lands, Wentworth appointed Captain
Samuel Holland to conduct a complete survey of the colony. Unable to persuade the Assembly to improve the military situation of the province's standing army of one officer and five men, or to repair Fort William and Mary, Governor Wentworth did what he could to make New Hampshire prepared militarily by improving the organization and increasing the numbers of the colonial militia, appointing John Stark as a colonel, an appointment Wentworth would later regret. Finally, the governor convinced the Reverend Eleazar Wheelock, of Lebanon, Connecticut, to relocate his missionary school in New Hampshire. Wheelock accepted Wentworth's offer of land and financial support, successfully resisted Wentworth's attempts to Anglicize the school, and moved his school to Hanover, establishing Dartmouth College.

Successful on all five objectives to varying degrees, John Wentworth seemed invincible from within New Hampshire, when he was suddenly assaulted politically and almost removed from office through the activities of Peter Livius in 1771. Livius was a well-to-do Briton who came to New Hampshire in 1762, and, as the husband of John Tufton Mason's daughter, Anna Elizabeth, had a substantial interest in the land of the colony. He quickly became one of Benning Wentworth's favorites, a councilor in 1765, a justice of the Inferior Court of Common Pleas, and a major landowner. When Benning died in 1770, it was assumed that his nephew, John, would be the chief beneficiary; instead, Benning's young widow, Martha Hilton, inherited everything. John Wentworth needed Benning's land so that he could sell it and not have to rely solely on the Assembly for support. He brought the case to the Council, declaring that Benning's grants to himself did not convey title, and thus the land reverted back to the crown at his death. The Council found in favor of the governor seven to one; the lone dissenter was Peter Livius. Adding
insult to injury, after the division of the province into counties in 1771 Wentworth did not renew Livius' judgeship. Bitter and angry, Livius created an opposition party to Wentworth, including such future rebels as John and Woodbury Langdon, Martha Hilton Wentworth, and her new husband Michael Wentworth. Governor Wentworth refused to buy off Livius and allowed him to submit formal charges to the Board of Trade, counting on his English power base to protect him.

The charges that Livius levelled at the governor stated that Wentworth and the Council had prematurely and without due process resumed and regranted lands, and that Wentworth had attempted to get Benning's lands for himself through the dispossession of the rightful owners. He charged that the Council had refused to provide an account of presumably public funds and had denied him (Livius) of the right of entering his dissent. He further charged that Wentworth had tried to influence a court case by juggling judges, that the Council was made up of so many of Wentworth's relatives as to be a conspiracy against justice, and that the Council journals never found their way to Whitehall as required by law. Livius also maintained that he had been the subject of personal abuse from the governor.

Not surprisingly, the Council supported their governor and submitted their own affidavits to the Board of Trade. Wentworth sent his personal secretary, Thomas Macdonogh, to join Trecothick in London to present his case, and to submit documents that refuted Livius' charges point by point. When the Board finally reached a decision in May 1773, Wentworth was stunned; he was found guilty on four counts, and the Board practically recommended his dismissal. Wentworth's friends were spurred on to greater activity, persuading the Board to submit the case to the full Privy Council Committee for Plantation Affairs for
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fresh consideration. On August 26 their efforts were rewarded as Governor Wentworth was acquitted on all counts; as consolation, Livius was appointed to head the judiciary in Quebec.\textsuperscript{30} Wentworth was saved, but the damage was done. An organized party of opposition was firmly entrenched in the Assembly, and his support in England had demonstrated that they could not always come to his aid. The towering monolith of oligarchic control bequeathed to him by his uncle had received its first blow, and it was not given a chance to recover.

John Wentworth might have been able to withstand the internal pressures that were building up in the early 1770s if it had not been for the external assaults, not only to his personal power base, but to the whole institution of royal government. Imperial reorganization and revolutionary ferment were totally beyond Wentworth's ability to control.

Governor Wentworth assumed office at a time of peace, prosperity, and good feelings between the mother country and the colonies following the repeal of the Stamp Act. But the Rockingham ministry lasted only shortly over a year and was replaced by a government headed by the great William Pitt, the Earl of Chatham. Unfortunately, Pitt was an old man and very ill, and his mediocre Chancellor of the Exchequer, Charles Townshend, was forced to provide the leadership for governmental politics. Townshend believed in two fundamental things: a balanced budget, and the need for America to bear her share of the tax burden. Taking Benjamin Franklin's testimony before Parliament as a fact of colonial opinion and wrongfully assuming that the colonies would accept customs measures, Townshend enacted a series of import duties, at very low rates so as not to anger the colonists, but all to be strictly enforced. At the same time he established an independent Board of Customs Commissioners to reside in America.
No one expected the reactions to the Townshend Duties that quickly spread throughout the colonies; it was obvious that the colonists did not make the distinction between external and internal taxes that Franklin had described in 1764. Massachusetts led the way and sent out a circular letter to all of the colonies, condemning Parliamentary oppression, calling for a non-importation association, and demanding the repeal of the offending acts. Wentworth managed to prevail upon the New Hampshire Assembly to decline Massachusetts' invitation to a colonial convention, while vaguely stating its support of Massachusetts' philosophical stand on the issues. Privately, Wentworth opposed the Townshend Acts, not on constitutional grounds, but in the manner of their execution, going to far as to warn London that in time America would become self-sufficient. But as governor he was ready to support any governmental action, writing to Dr. Belham on August 9, 1768 that "I am positively determined to suppress any open tumult in person at all risk, and by no means to suffer the laws to be violently broken or the King's authority condemned. I will first prevent by prudence, but if necessary I will suppress by all the power the law hath, if I am left singly to oppose thousands."31

The years 1768 and 1769 were difficult years in the colonies. Lord Hillsborough ordered Massachusetts to rescind its circular letter and, getting no response, sent troops to Boston. The Virginia Resolves arrived in New Hampshire condemning Parliamentary oppression and declaring that only Americans could tax Americans. They also maintained that only Americans could try Americans in courts of law, in response to a revived statute of Henry VIII that allowed the transportation of criminals back to England on charges of treason. In New Hampshire the Assembly concurred with the Virginia Resolves, but Governor Wentworth managed to keep the province cool until the Liberty was seized in
Boston in 1769. The New Hampshire Assembly was finally ready to take a firm stand, and it petitioned the king.

We do by no means Dispute the authority of the British Legislature. We have Ever been and still are obedient to all acts of Parliament Regulating the affairs of your Majestys Subjects in general and the Due Administration of Justice without complaint. But we cannot but be sensibly affected with the loss of that advantage without which we are no longer free men nor can have any claim to the peculiar Glory and Boast of the subjects of the British Empire, which is the absolute Disposal of their own property. But these Acts tax us without our own consent and deprive us so much of our property as in virtue thereof is taken from us without our voice and contrary to our Privileges as Englishmen; and we humbly apprehend our Complaint in this Respect cannot Justly be imputed to us as a fault or tending to Disloyalty or Disaffection to Government, for we humbly apprehend we should be unworthy the character of your Majety's subjects and Englishment if we had no Sensibility to perceive the happy Constitution of Government we live under and to Deprecate the loss of it.32

But the protest from New Hampshire did not reach the king until two years later, thanks to the delay in passing it on to the colony's agent by Speaker of the Assembly Peter Gilman, Wentworth's friend.33

Meanwhile, the Non-importation Association, formed in 1767, was proving to be generally unsuccessful, and particularly so in New Hampshire. Portsmouth as a whole refused to submit, largely because most of the merchants were royal officials, and also because they saw a chance to make a profit at Boston's expense. Throughout the colonies, support of the boycott was minimal, and, in fact, by early 1770 it appeared as if a peaceful solution to the whole problem was at hand, in favor of the Parliamentary position. Yet Governor Wentworth was fearful, writing that, "our province is yet quiet, and the only one, but will, I fear, soon enter. If they do, they'll exceed all the rest in zeal."34

The false tranquility was smashed on March 5, 1770 by the Boston Massacre. Wentworth watched in dismay as Portsmouth joined the Non-importation Association in response. A town meeting refused to allow
dissident Boston merchant James McMasters to open shop in Portsmouth, since he planned to operate in violation of the restrictions of the Association. With the boycott working efficiently, the British government was forced to listen to the complaints of its own merchants. Lord North, the new Prime Minister, responded and removed all of the offending duties, except for an inconsequential duty on tea.

The next two years were a time of tense peace in the colonies, and in New Hampshire good feelings returned. However, behind the scenes the balance of royal government was beginning to shift as Wentworth's opposition came to take its lead more and more from the Boston radicals. Yet on the surface all was well. The King in Council finally allowed Wentworth to divide the colony into five counties and to establish judicial systems for each. In December 1771 the Assembly saw fit to congratulate the governor "on the Peaceable State of the Province which must be in a great measure owing to the acquiescence & satisfaction of the People under your prudent administration of Government & which believe & doubt not will continue as long as the same means which procured it are Pursued." Then in January 1772 the Assembly formally thanked the governor for his services on behalf of the colony when he was their agent in England, and in appreciation they granted him £500 for his "extraordinary services."

Late in October 1771 an incident marred the tranquility when the brigantine Resolution docked in Portsmouth and entered its cargo at the customs house. The captain, however, refrained from notifying the authorities that a hundred hogsheads of molasses were on board. The collector of customs, George Meserve, was not easily fooled, and two days later revenue officers discovered the molasses and seized the
ship. At midnight on October 29, a group of men, disguised and armed with clubs, boarded the vessel, persuaded the customs officers to go ashore, and then locked them in a cabin while the mob proceeded to unload the molasses at their leisure. John Wentworth, rightfully indignant at such a challenge to royal authority, offered a reward of two hundred dollars for the capture of the perpetrators of the "illegal, & riotous Transaction." All of the governor's actions were in vain, a demonstration of the subtle change that was occurring in New Hampshire politics.38

In June 1772 the fabric of royal government in America tore a little more as the British customs ship, the Gaspee, ran aground on the Rhode Island coast and was seized and burned by the local population. Lord North immediately ordered an investigation, and it was assumed in the colonies that anyone found guilty would be tried in England. The cry of tyranny rang throughout the land, and on March 19, 1773 the Virginia House of Burgesses sent a letter to the other colonies calling for each province to establish its own Committees of Correspondence and Inquiry, to investigate the Rhode Island situation and to keep open the lines of revolutionary communication. To Governor Wentworth's dismay, the New Hampshire Assembly responded on May 28 by appointing John Sherburne, William Parker, John Giddings, Jacob Sheafe, Christopher Toppan, John Pickering, and John Wentworth (a very distant relative) as a standing Committee of Correspondence.39 In response, the governor prorogued the Assembly, but his power to control the colonial government was becoming more and more questionable now that extralegal institutions were being organized to bypass the established government.

While the situation rapidly reached a critical stage in America, Lord North pushed through Parliament an act certain to set the fuse of
revolution burning. In May 1773 the Tea Act became law, and the East India Company, with a surplus of seventeen million pounds of tea, was given a preferred position which amounted to a virtual monopoly in the American market. This naturally alarmed the commercial class but also the smugglers, since the East India Company could legally undersell what the smugglers brought in illegally. 40 Things might still have worked out, but the East India Company chose for its agents in America only those merchants who had not participated in the nonimportation association, thus alienating a majority of colonial merchants, who took up the cause of the smugglers and radicals, giving it respectability. The cry spread that the Tea Act was just another attempt to indirectly tax the colonies by forcing them economically to purchase designated tea. The real issue, commercial competition, was never mentioned, and the old arguments against the Stamp Act and the Townshend Duties were brought up again and polished - the rights of all Americans were being assaulted by a cabal of British governmental ministers. 41

Portsmouth did not take the Tea Act quietly, as it had the Townshend Duties. At a public meeting on December 16, 1773, eleven resolves were voted on and accepted. The first resolution stated that the recent measures to subject the colonies to taxation by the sole authority of Parliament were unjust, arbitrary, inconsistent with the principles of the British constitution, and were leading directly to the destruction of the empire. Among the other charges were that the Tea Act was a tax without the consent of the governed, that it was a direct attack by the ministry on the liberties of all Americans, and that the act subverted the New Hampshire constitution. Some of the other resolves called on the people to oppose the ministry's efforts to enslave Americans and to prevent the landing or the sale of tea. They also
called for a union of colonies to push for the repeal of the offending legislation. Finally, the town meeting called for the establishment of a local committee of correspondence, adding that all of those who supported the Tea Act were enemies of America.  

December 16, 1773 was more important for what happened in Boston, when a mob of ineffectively disguised townsmen threw the East India Company's tea into the harbor. Portsmouth's resolve was not tested until June 25, 1774, when the mast ship Grosvenor arrived in port with twenty-seven chests of tea, consigned to Edward Parry. Governor Wentworth was forewarned of the tea's arrival and took no open measures to protect the consignment, going so far as to leave town for Dover on a routine visit. The nonactivity of the governor lulled the citizens of Portsmouth into passivity, and the tea was easily landed and stored. Things did not remain calm for long, however. When the town learned that tea had actually been landed, a committee was immediately formed and went to see Parry. The merchant quickly assured the committee:

I am unwilling to irritate the Minds of the People, and should be glad of acting consistent with my Duty to my Employer who consigned the Tea to me, without my advice or knowledge, & I am confident he would not have ship'd it, unless he thought it would have been agreeable to this Country, by the unhappy Commotion in the Colonies - - having Subsided.

At a town meeting two days later, a committee of eleven was appointed to meet with the governor, and then, at his recommendation, it met with Mr. Parry again, as the town stood guard over the customs house and the tea. On June 28 Parry agreed to ship the tea to Halifax if the town paid his expenses. The duty was duly paid and the tea shipped to Nova Scotia. A standing committee of inspection was appointed to make sure that such an incident could not happen again.

The town was ready, therefore, on September 8, when Parry received another consignment of thirty chests of tea on the Fox, apparently
believing that the sentiment against the importation of tea had calmed. Far from calm, a mob of infuriated citizens proceeded to stone Parry's house. The governor summoned the Council and magistrates into emergency session; soon another compromise was engineered, and once again the tea was on its way to Halifax. New Hampshire, owing to Governor Wentworth's temperate administration, had managed to demonstrate orderly resistance without hysteria.

Unfortunately, Wentworth did not have any control over the situation in Great Britain or Massachusetts. In response to the Boston Tea Party, Parliament enacted the Intolerable Acts in an attempt to resolve the problem of imperial organization once and for all. The port of Boston was closed until the duty on the destroyed tea was paid, the government of Massachusetts was reorganized with more power given to the royal officials, soldiers were ordered quartered at the scene of any disorder, and royal officials who allegedly used undue force in suppressing riots were to be tried outside the colony concerned. Then, to demonstrate their resolve, Parliament installed General Gage as governor of Massachusetts, removing the civilian governor, Thomas Hutchinson.

Until the passage of the Boston Port Act, New Hampshire had remained calm. The northern colony was prospering: Britain had just funded the provincial bills of credit for the French and Indian War, taxes were light, and there was a £5,870 surplus in the treasury. With the closing of Boston, however, the Assembly took action in an official response to a series of resolves sent to it by Virginia, Rhode Island, Massachusetts, Connecticut, and Maryland. The Assembly established its standing Committee of Correspondence at this time, and on February 7, 1774 Speaker of the House John Wentworth wrote, in response to the Massachusetts resolves, that
By the best Intelligence we can obtain it appears that the British ministry are Resolved in a great Degree if not fully to Enslave the Inhabitants of the Colonies in America subject to the Crown of Great Britain, if by any means they can effect it, which much concerns the Americans to withstand and Prevent. 48

In response to the Connecticut resolves, the Speaker wrote that "the proposed method of union in all the Colonies hath ever appeared to us (since the first recommendation thereof) to be absolutely necessary." 49 Governor Wentworth was rapidly losing control.

On June 8 the governor's worst fears were realized as he learned that the Assembly had received letters urging it to send delegates to a general American congress to be held in Philadelphia. Finding the Assembly's activities "inconsistent with his Majesty's service & the good of this Government," Wentworth dissolved it, 50 hoping to end the activities of the Committee of Correspondence since it had no constitutional existance except during the session of the Assembly. 51

In response, the Committee of Correspondence summoned an extra-legal Assembly meeting to elect delegates to the Continental Congress. The Assembly duly met in the Assembly chambers, but shortly after commencing business the governor walked in, accompanied by Sheriff John Parker. He declared that since "some rash and ill-advised Person or Persons," had assumed the power of summoning together the representatives, in direct violation of the King's sole prerogative of calling together the Assembly, and because the representatives had responded by obeying the illegal summons, he had no choice but to order the Assembly to disperse or to suffer the consequences. 52 The members of the illegal Assembly respected the governor's prerogative and left the chamber, only to retire to a nearby tavern to plan for a provincial congress to be held in Exeter to elect delegates to the Continental Congress. Each parish in the colony sent a delegate to Exeter, on July 21, and the Congress
chose Colonel Nathaniel Folsom and Major John Sullivan to go to Philadelphi. Governor Wentworth was thus effectively presented with a rival New Hampshire government, and one that commanded an increasing amount of support from the populace, particularly outside Portsmouth. The Loyalist - Rebel distinction was beginning to form.

The situation cooled down in the absence of any overt actions by either side, and, by August 24, Wentworth felt comfortable enough to write to the Earl of Dartmouth that "I think the Province is much more moderate than any other to the southward, although the spirit of enthusiasm is spread, and requires the utmost vigilance and prudence to restrain it from violent excess." Then Wentworth ignored his own advice, and acting imprudently, made the worst mistake of his political career.

In October 1774, General Gage asked Governor Wentworth to furnish him with some carpenters to build barracks for his troops in Boston, since the Massachusetts' carpenters refused to work. The governor, dutifully heeding the call of another royal governor, contracted with Nicholas Austin, of Middletown, to supply the carpenters. Austin proceeded to hire his men in the Wolfesborough region, far from the tensions of Portsmouth and Exeter. Wentworth saw the move as a way to bolster royal government in the colonies, but acting surreptitiously was a big mistake, since he completely underestimated the depth and conviction of sentiment in New Hampshire. The Portsmouth Committee of Correspondence learned of Wentworth's activities on behalf of General Gage and declared him to be an enemy of the country and guilty of cruel and unmanly conduct. In one fell swoop, Wentworth had destroyed the people's faith in him, and he quickly lost control of the entire situation.
The carpenters immediately quit, and Austin was forced to appear before the Rochester Committee of Correspondence on his knees, and declare that

Before this company I confess I have been aiding and assisting in sending men to Boston to build Barracks for the soldiers to live in, at which you have reason justly to be offended, which I am sorry for, and humbly ask your forgiveness; and I do affirm, that for the future, I never will be aiding or assisting in any wise whatever in act or deed, contrary to the Constitution of the Country. It was just a sample of what would happen later to any person who ran afoul of the rebels.

The dramatic finale to effective royal government in New Hampshire was about to be played, and once again Governor Wentworth had no control over its development. On October 19, 1774 the King in Council prohibited the export of all powder and arms to America, and Lord Dartmouth wrote privately to all of the governors, instructing them to stop the importation of the same. Such an embargo scared the colonists; those on the frontier depended on British arms and munitions to defend their homes from the Indians and to hunt for food, and the rebel leaders naturally saw an embargo as the first step in imposing a military dictatorship by removing the means to oppose the British army. Throughout America, the uproar was tremendous once Lord Dartmouth's letter was made public by the Rhode Island Assembly.

The Boston Sons of Liberty directed their attention northward, saw the British arsenal at Fort William and Mary, and decided that the supplies stored there were imperative to their cause. Fearful that the military stores would be taken over by the British, Boston sent Paul Revere to Portsmouth on December 13, with a message of warning and encouragement to Samuel Cutts, the chairman of the local Committee of Ways.
and Means. Well aware of the dangerous situation, the governor sent a note to Captain Cochran to be alert.

At noon on December 14, a drum was beaten about the streets of Portsmouth, and a large mob began to assemble. Governor Wentworth sent Chief Justice Theodore Atkinson out to read the riot act to the crowd but to no avail. Led by Captain Thomas Pickering, a sea captain, and Major John Langdon, a local merchant, the crowd began marching to the fort. Reinforced by 400 men from Newcastle and Rye, it charged the fort at three o'clock in the afternoon. After token resistance, Captain Cochran and his five men were confined, the king's colors were hauled down, and 100 barrels of powder were carted off.

Finishing the job on the next day, another mob, led by Major John Sullivan of Durham, marched into Portsmouth, and Governor Wentworth courageously met it. Major Sullivan protested his innocence, and when he learned that the British were not coming as feared, he agreed to disperse his men. Wentworth hinted that the return of the stolen powder might alleviate the matter, and then the mob voted to disperse but did not. That night Sullivan's forces invaded the fort and took away sixteen cannon, sixty muskets, and various other military stores. The material remained on the outskirts of Portsmouth all of the next day, guarded by Colonel Nathaniel Folsom's Exeter party. On the evening of the 16th, with a good tide, the booty was taken upriver and distributed. Wentworth watched helplessly as all royal authority was defied; even the militia had refused to answer his call. Effective royal government had come to an end, even though Wentworth would hold on to the empty reins of power for another nine months.

What had actually gone wrong? Why had the imposing structure of oligarchic rule established by Benning Wentworth disappeared overnight?
In general, two broad, external processes helped to undermine the family-dominated oligarchy. First, John Wentworth lost influence in England as the Rockingham party lost control. This meant that Wentworth had fewer political favors with which to reward his friends or to bribe his enemies. It also meant that he then had to obey explicitly his instructions from London, or face the possibility of being removed. Secondly, the British government was coming to represent a system of political authority which the colonists increasingly distrusted, as first Townshend and then Lord North tried to enforce an imperial administration that had never before existed. Since Wentworth represented the king, he was easily identified with Parliamentary oppression, and his enemies were given a more sophisticated ideology of opposition.

Within New Hampshire there were also certain trends working against the maintenance of royal authority as represented by Wentworth. The lumbering industry was in decline because of fires, rapid cutting, competition, and a declining demand; the resulting economic decline was naturally blamed on the governor. Population growth accelerated in the 1760s, and although the governor tried to tie the colony together by roads, other centers of power began to challenge Portsmouth. Portsmouth lost its position of sole leadership as a direct result of Wentworth's division of the colony into counties. The act of creating counties and expanding the colonial judicial and administrative systems was a tremendously popular act, but it aggravated the overall situation. At first Wentworth had at his disposal a great many positions to fill, but the positions were not under the direct observation of the elite, and the positions were often filled by members of the non-elite. 58 In other words, Wentworth established a rival source of potential leadership.
Also within New Hampshire, a whole new class of lesser officials was growing up outside the elite. The new politicians were upwardly aspirant, highly motivated to take full advantage of their positions, and yet were prevented from attaining higher office because of the existence of the entrenched Wentworth oligarchy. The only way that these men could advance was to remove the Wentworth administration, and a way to do so was handed to them by the rebel leaders of America. Seizing the revolutionary ideology and the opportunity to act, men like John Sullivan and John Langdon moved to use the American Revolution as a way to expand their personal horizons.

General trends aside, part of the failure of royal government in New Hampshire was Governor John Wentworth's failure to perceive the depths of anti-British conviction sweeping America, and its non-local nature. Following December 14, 1774 he would try to reassert royal authority, but his failure was predetermined. The people, meanwhile, had to make up their minds. With the formal challenge to royal government at Fort William and Mary, the division between Loyalist and rebel became clearer, and the rebels had the initiative and the popular support. More than just powder and guns had been lost in the raid on Fort William and Mary that Captain Cochran had sadly informed the governor about on December 14, 1774; the whole marvelous facade of royal government had disappeared.
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CHAPTER TWO

THE LAST HOURS OF ROYAL RULE

I do, by Advice and Consent of his Majesty's Council, issue this Proclamation, ordering and requiring in his Majesty's Name, all Magistrates and other officers whether Civil or Military... to exert themselves in detecting and securing in some of his Majesty's Goals in this Province the said Offenders, in Order to their being brought to condign punishment...[and] I do in the most earnest and solemn Manner, exhort and enjoin you, his Majesty's leige Subjects of this Government, to beware of suffering yourselves to be seduced by the false Art of Menaces of abandoned Men, to abet, protect, or screen from Justice any of the said high handed Offenders, or to withhold or secrete his Majesty's Munitions forcible taken from his Castle. ¹

The revolution officially began in New Hampshire on December 26, 1774, with this proclamation of rebellion. Governor Wentworth had no other real alternative but to enforce the proclamation if he hoped to retain any authority. Outside Portsmouth, royal government was already a sham and if the governor intended to restore order, then he had to arrest the ringleaders of the attack. Although the ringleaders' identities were well known by everyone, and their whereabouts easily discoverable, the governor could not take any overt action since the militia refused to answer his call and because he also feared that any arrest would lead to a mass uprising. Wentworth had to be content with the empty threats of his proclamation of rebellion and hope for a miracle.

Having to do something in order to bolster the sagging royal authority that he represented, Governor Wentworth requested British warships from General Gage in Boston immediately after the events of December 14 and 15. On December 17 the Canceaux arrived, followed two
days later by the frigate Scarborough, commanded by Captain Barkley. The one hundred marines were kept on board ship because Wentworth and Barkley believed that the presence of redcoats on the streets of Portsmouth would be sure to cause rioting. The appearance of His Majesty's armed forces in the harbor was not to force obedience to royal rule; rather it was intended to intimidate the people of New Hampshire, force them to reassess their resistance, and thereby allow for the restoration of royal government. On a more practical level, the marines protected the customs house and the treasury. The proclamation of rebellion, following the arrival of the British by just over a week, was another attempt to bring the people to their senses.  

However, nothing that Wentworth did seemed to work; no information regarding the whereabouts of the stolen munitions was forthcoming; no ring-leaders were arrested; government officials loyal to the crown were harassed throughout the colony; and the presence of the British forces in the harbor only exacerbated the already strained atmosphere in the town. Determined to arrest and convict the rebel leaders, Wentworth asked General Gage on January 21, 1775 for the deployment of two regiments of regulars to Portsmouth. Gage went so far as to send an aide, Captain Gamble, to Portsmouth to survey the area for prospective barracks, but in the end Gage refused Wentworth's request because of the deteriorating situation in Boston.  

John Wentworth did what he could without the support of the British army. Since several of the leaders of the fort robbery held royal commissions, as soon as the governor found loyal citizens he could rely on, he replaced the offenders. In such a manner Majors Langdon and Sullivan and Colonel Folsom lost their militia commissions, and Colonel Josiah Bartlett, of Kingston, lost both his militia commission and his
position as a justice of the peace. As with everything that winter, the dismissals served only to arouse public opinion against the royal governor. On January 25 the second revolutionary convention was held in Exeter, and Sullivan and Langdon was rewarded for their revolutionary leadership by being chosen to represent New Hampshire in Philadelphia at the Second Continental Congress. Writing at the time to Thomas Westbrook Waldron, a friend, Wentworth viewed the situation pessimistically, "I wish the parties would leave ground for an amnesty; but they strive to augment the reverse. Peace, my dear friend, has by unwise men been driven out. They shut the door against its return, God forgive Them."  

The governor was not alone, however, in his beliefs or in his struggle. A group of concerned, prosperous, Portsmouth men joined together on January 17 to declare their support for their governor in the critical hours, and also to form a kind of mutual protection society. The "Tory Association" was the first and last example of Loyalists organizing themselves into an open force in New Hampshire, in an attempt to reverse the revolutionary tide. Until formation of the Association, the Loyalists had never taken the offensive or formed themselves into a political force. The Loyalists had never been able to relate to the masses and had been isolated in the upper levels of New Hampshire life. As a result, their allegiance to and support of the British position, as promulgated by Governor Wentworth, became stronger and further isolated them from the population. The New Hampshire situation mirrored the Loyalist problem throughout the colonies, Historians North Callahan and William H. Nelson have noted that the Loyalists failed for three basic reasons. First, the Loyalists lacked any kind of formal unity; in New Hampshire the Tory Association was an attempt to remedy the situation.
after the damage had been done. Second, the Loyalist party had a substan-
tial lack of leadership, and although Wentworth was the natural
candidate in New Hampshire he limited himself by taking purely legal
steps, rather than actively leading an opposition that would try to win
popular favor. Finally, the Loyalists failed to recognize early enough
the need for cooperation and defense, and here again the Tory Association
was an example of too little, too late.

As the first and only example of a combined effort by leading
Loyalists to combat the revolutionary impulse, the Tory Association
deserves some analysis. Fifty-nine men felt strong enough in their
support of the royal government and of Governor Wentworth to sign the
agreement:

We the Subscribers considering the disorderly State of the
Times, and being deeply impressed with a Sense of the inestible
Value of Constitutional Liberty, think Ourselves under an
absolute Necessity of associating together both for the Support
of the wholesome Laws of the Land, and also for the Protection
and Preservation of our Persons and Properties, Which we find
at least to many have been openly threatened of late. And we
do therefore solemnly engage to and with each other

First - That We will maintain the Laws of the Land to the
utmost of our Power. -
Secondly, That we will also defend and Protect Each other
from Mobs Riots or any unlawful attacks Whatever, and upon the
first Notice of any attempt upon either of the Subscribers,
each and everyone of us will immediately repair to the Person
so attacked and him defend to the utmost Extremity.7

Of the Association's members, fourteen were related in some way
to the governor: six were his uncles, five were cousins, one was his
brother-in-law, one was George Jaffrey, junior, whose father's second
wife was the governor's aunt, and the final relative was Mark H. Went-
worth, John's father. Twenty-seven were, or at one time had been,
officials of the government, from member of the Council to town lot layer.
Eight of them were sitting members of the Governor's Council, and one
other was a former member. Six had had some connection with either the
British army or the colonial militia, and sixteen were connected with commerce, as either merchants or shipowners.  

Relatives, officials, landowners, and merchants; men who feared change and revolution; men who, according to Claude H. Van Tyne, "were the prosperous and contented men, the men without a grievance;" such were the men who responded to the challenge in January 1775. As a reward for their loyalty, thirteen were later banished from the state, five of whom had their estates confiscated, and nine of whom later filed claims with the British government for compensation.  

The Tory Association was obviously a case of too little, too late. Events were fast outstripping the Loyalists' ability to react, especially as they found themselves limited by the constraints of legal action into acting through constitutional avenues, while the radicals were free to do as they pleased. On January 28, 1775 the governor issued election writs for the February 23 Assembly, adding three new towns to the list - Orford, Lyme, and Plymouth, all in Grafton County. Wentworth hoped to pack the Assembly with his supporters while he also appeased the frontier regions by granting them additional representation. Wentworth timed the elections to coincide with the expected arrival of the British troops from Boston, but with the failure of the British to arrive Wentworth's plans quickly went astray, and the radicals once again captured control of the Assembly.  

Arriving in Portsmouth for the new Assembly were Wentworth's three new representatives: Israel Morey of Orford, Jacob Greene of Lyme, and Colonel John Fenton of Plymouth. Things might possibly have worked smoothly if it had not been for Colonel Fenton. Unfortunately, Fenton was an outspoken supporter of royal government, a personal friend of John Wentworth, and a colonel of the 11th Regiment of Militia in Grafton
County. Representing Plymouth although he resided in Portsmouth, he also
served as judge of probate and clerk of the Inferior Court in Grafton
County. He was not the type of man whom the rebel leaders liked to see
in their Assembly.

When the results of the general election were known, it was
obvious to Governor Wentworth that too many agitators had been elected,
including the leaders of the attack on the fort. A potentially volatile
situation presented itself to the governor, and he chose to postpone the
Assembly session until May 5. It was his fervent hope that by May he
would have the rebel leaders in jail, and Parliament would have adopted
some sort of conciliatory platform.

But May turned out to be an ominous month to hold the next session
of the regular legislature. For one thing, the Second Continental
Congress was set to meet on May 10 in Philadelphia, and all eyes would be
focused on the events in that faraway city, where decisions on the future
of America would be made without any control being exerted from Ports­
mouth. Also, a great deal could happen between February and May. In
March the New England Restraining Act passed Parliament, restricting
New England's trade to the British Isles and the West Indies, and for­
bidding the use of the Grand Banks fisheries to the colonists; in April,
Parliament's conciliatory note of February became public knowledge.

On April 19, 1775 all hope for a peaceful settlement of the crisis went
up in smoke on the greens of Lexington and Concord. Immediately about
1,200 New Hampshire volunteers grabbed their muskets and marched south
to Cambridge, hoping to be involved in the expected full-scale battle
against General Gage around Boston. But Gage stayed in Boston and took
no overt actions against the rapidly growing army surrounding him.
With Gage's inaction, 1,000 New Hampshire men returned hungry for action, and for a time there was talk of seizing Governor Wentworth. Meanwhile, the situation of the Loyalists in the countryside was becoming more and more difficult. With open hostilities begun and General Gage and the British trapped in Boston, the rebels no longer had to fear reprisals. Throughout Massachusetts, leading Loyalists walked the road to Boston and to safety as the local rebel committees incessantly harassed them. North of the border, in New Hampshire, the situation of the Loyalists was no better. Persecutions mounted, and conservatives were tormented as nothing less than a full endorsement of the rebellion would satisfy the revolutionaries. The great future scientist, Benjamin Thompson, of Concord, New Hampshire, for example, had to flee to Massachusetts. His crime was inducing deserters from the British armed forces to return to duty by hiring them as farm hands for an indeterminate term of hard labor, thus increasing their willingness to return to the army or navy.

Circumstances were obviously not very conducive to rational action when the Assembly finally met on May 5 in Portsmouth. Governor Wentworth urged the members to use wisdom, candor, and moderation while considering Parliament's recently received conciliatory overture, but the Assembly was far more interested in considering the status of its three new members. In his opening address to the Council and Assembly, Wentworth pledged his support of "every measure that may be found conducive to the Public Good," called for the passage of a support bill to pay his salary, viewed with "inexpressible concern the alarming Pitch to which the unfortunate Dispute between Great Britain and her Colonies is daily advancing," proposed to lead the way to a "Restoration of the Public Tranquility," and found it "highly incumbent upon us in this Time of
General Disquietude to manifest our Loyalty and attachment to the best of Sovereigns, and our firm and unshaken Regard for the British Empire.  

The Assembly was in no mood for moderation, and the Speaker, Mr. Giddinge, and Mr. Langdon called upon the governor to ask for a short adjournment in which to consider their options. Wentworth recommended that in such uneasy times they should reconsider and immediately begin trying to clear a way for the resolution of the crisis; but he added that he was "always disposed to shew every indulgent regard in my Power to the wishes of the House." The Assembly wasted little time in replying:

We would observe That we think it is not only very necessary for our private Interest at this particular season of the year, but Especially for the Interest of the Province in General at this peculiarly alarming crisis that the House should be adjourned to some time early in June next, in order that we may in the mean time have an opportunity of fully consulting our Constituents respecting the several weighty matters necessary to be considered by the House the present Season.

Wentworth had no real alternative but to adjourn the Assembly, calling for it to reassemble on June 12.

The situation, however, did not stagnate while the Assembly members conferred amongst themselves and with their constituents. The British navy and marines were still out in the harbor where a very tenuous truce had taken effect. The British had tacitly agreed to let ships with supplies come and go, and to allow fishermen to leave the harbor. On their part, the townsmen had agreed to supply the British forces with fresh beef. But Captain Barkley, of HMS Scarborough, was becoming impatient; his men were itching for action, and the state of armed rebellion in Boston encouraged him to make a move.

On May 29 the Scarborough seized two provision vessels which were for the relief of Portsmouth. Captain Barkley sent both ships down to Boston, with the Canceaux, as prizes of war, despite the protests and
appeals coming from every facet of Portsmouth society, including a formal appeal directed to Governor Wentworth warning him of the "alarming Consequences" that Captain Barkley's actions might have on the overall situation. Wentworth pleaded with Barkley to return the ships, but the captain refused; the supplies, he declared, were contraband, and were also desperately needed in Boston. The next morning, 500 to 700 rebels marched to the Jerry's Point battery, took eight cannons, and brought them to town with the obvious intention of firing on the *Scarborough*. Meanwhile, thirty to forty marines from the British ship came to shore and dismantled some of Fort William and Mary to prevent the rebels from using it.

On May 31 men poured into Portsmouth, ransacking homes, looking for powder and arms, and were only barely prevented from marching on the governor's house. Captain Barkley escalated the tension by removing several fishermen from their fishing vessels, thereby threatening the town's food supply. The Committee of Safety, the Council, and the governor were for once united on the need to use every prudent method in their power to defuse the dangerous situation. Most of the town's citizens turned to their governor to solve the problem, while other more radical individuals set up an ambush of the *Scarborough*'s patrol boats. Wentworth met with Captain Barkley, who now realized that he had gone too far, and a compromise was reached whereby there would be no further sniping, the fishermen who had been seized would be freed, and the town would resupply the ship with fresh beef. The tense cease-fire was momentarily restored, while, at the same time, the Provincial Congress in Exeter voted to raise 2,000 men to enlist in three regiments for the rest of the year. In the event of future problems, New Hampshire would be ready.
The House reconvened on June 12, and the focus switched to the political maneuverings of the Assembly, out to strengthen its position, whereas the governor was trying to salvage what little there was left of royal authority in the colony. Ignoring Wentworth's appeal to consider Parliament's conciliatory note, the House concentrated instead on the seating of new delegates from Plymouth, Lyme, and Orford. The question, as the representatives saw it, was: Did the governor, by virtue of the King's writ, have the constitutional right to empower new towns to send representatives to the legislature without the concurrence of the Assembly itself? The report of the investigating committee recalled that in 1744 no new towns had been allowed to send representatives to Portsmouth without the consent of the House, and in such a way the first House of Assembly refused to seat five new representatives, citing executive encroachment of the legislative privilege as rationale. The crisis of 1748 involved another attempt by the governor to seat new towns, an attempt that was resisted, although the committee overlooked the fact that Benning Wentworth had received special instructions allowing him to issue election writs to new towns, and that the governor had eventually won the argument by constantly proroguing the Assembly. Since that time, the committee noted, some new members had been accepted without opposition, but there was no explicit clause in the governor's commission to allow him the right to issue new precepts, had not been done by the king in England for fifty years. They believed that the Assembly had never surrendered its right, embodied in the spirit of the English constitution, to prevent encroachments: "it is a settled Rule (as we apprehend) that every House of Assembly has a Right to regulate itself." The House, not surprisingly, voted to unseat the new representatives.
On June 13, the governor addressed the Assembly, in the guise
more of a supplicant than a mester. He decried the deplorable spirit of
jealousy and alarm in the colony and recommended to the Assembly's con­sideration the conciliatory resolution of the House of Commons on

February 27.

There appears in this solemn Resolution so great an
affection, tenderness of your liberties and Readiness to be
Reconciled upon Principles, consistent with the just Rights
and Dignity of the Parent State and the Priviledges of the
Colonies as precludes the necessity of particular observa­tions upon it, and I cannot but trust that it will meet with
the just and grateful Return from you that may be naturally
Expected from the wisdom which the hour of serious reflection
will call forth, and from the feelings which calm considera­tion will produce, and be finally Productive of those happy
Effects for which it lays so fair a foundation.21

Because the question that Wentworth presented to the Assembly was of such
a weighty nature, it was his duty, he believed, to allow its candid
consideration by the full citizenry of the colony. Accordingly, he
adjourned the Assembly until July 11.

By now the governor was beating a dead horse; too much had already
happened that had made Parliament's offer a token from another era.
America was going to war, New Hampshire was bound to follow, and the
governor was going to have the lesson forcibly driven home to him that
very night.

The unseating of the delegates from Plymouth, Lyme, and Orford had
been more a personal matter than a politically motivated action. It was
primarily directed against Colonel Fenton, whom the Assembly felt was an
unacceptable member. The colonel had been an officer in the Queen's
Royal Irish regiment during the Seven Years' War and married Elizabeth
Temple, a member of the Boston aristocracy; he was a personal friend of
William Pitt and Lord Grenville, the surveyor-general of His Majesty's
customs in the northern district, and also the lieutenant-governor of
New Hampshire, the last post being only a sinecure. He was everything that the radicals detested. After the Seven Years' War Fenton retired on half pay, until June 1775, when he was put in command of Fort William and Mary for twenty shillings a day. He moved to New Hampshire after the last French war with a grant of 3,000 acres, and he soon bought additional land in Plymouth. Wentworth knew a loyal man when he saw one, and he appointed Fenton a colonel in the militia, a clerk of the Court of Common Pleas, and a judge of probate for Grafton County. He quickly became an intimate friend of the governor and was one of the few individuals who rallied to the support of Wentworth in those awful winter months. An outspoken and courageous Loyalist, Fenton wrote an open letter to the people of Grafton County in which he advised them to stay on their farms and tend to their domestic business. Unfortunately, the letter appeared just one week after the battles at Lexington and Concord, and the Provincial Congress thought that it was dangerous propaganda.22

The colonel was called to account by the Exeter revolutionary congress and wrote an unsatisfactory explanation, saying that the note merely expressed his own sincere opinion. Colonel Fenton refused to appear before the congress in Exeter and instead sought refuge on board the Scarborough, where he lived from April on.

On June 13 Fenton was in Portsmouth as the Assembly unseated him and his two colleagues from Lyme and Orford. On his way back to the Scarborough he called on his friend, John Wentworth. Soon the house was surrounded, and the governor's bodyguard disappeared. The angry mob grew rapidly, and their threats increased, until finally they moved a cannon into place and aimed it at the governor's front door. With no alternative, and unwilling to place the governor in danger, Fenton surrendered himself to the mob. Treated ignominiously, he was dragged through the
streets of Portsmouth before he was eventually taken to Exeter, where he was kept in confinement until the next December.  

That very night, John Wentworth and his family and servants, including his brother-in-law, Benning Wentworth, fled rioting Portsmouth to find refuge at Fort William and Mary, where they joined Captain Cochran and his six man garrison. Writing to General Gage on June 15, Wentworth described in detail the attack on his residence, and more generally he described the situation in New Hampshire:

The ferment in the Province has become very general and the government has been very much agitated and disturbed since the affair of the 19th of April last. Two thousand men are already enlisted, two-thirds of whom I am informed are destined to join the insurgents in your province, and the remainder are to be stationed along the coast in different areas between Portsmouth and Newbury. Wentworth also requested and received another British warship, the Falcon, which arrived with orders to dismantle the Fort, although the governor managed to prevent the dismantling for a short period.

On July 11 the Assembly reconvened, but lacking a quorum they postponed the first session for two days. When they met, Governor Wentworth addressed them through his personal secretary, Thomas McDonough. He stated that the June 13 votes to expel the three new representatives from the Assembly deprived the electors of their privileges and deprived the entire county of Grafton of representation. Since the action infringed on his Majesty's prerogatives, the governor recommended that the Assembly rescind the votes. The Assembly responded by noting that, since the governor and the Council were both appointed by the king, it was an arbitrary and cruel stretch of executive power to appoint members of the Assembly.

Taking a closer and more analytical look at the problem, it is obvious that Wentworth had indeed been trying to pack the legislature
with people he could count on by picking and choosing the towns to be represented very carefully. Plymouth had a population of 382, Orford had 222, and Lyme had 252; while the governor ignored the larger towns of Grafton County, such as Hanover, with 434 people, Haverhill, with 365, and Lebanon, with 347. In other counties even larger towns were going unrepresented, such as Hopkinton, with 1,085 inhabitants, Concord, with 1,052, Brentwood, with 1,100, and Epping, with 1,569. Other inconsistencies demonstrate that the Assembly was gerrymandered in favor of the seacoast region, and therefore in favor of the commercial-Wentworth interests. For example, Hampton, with 862 inhabitants, had two representatives while Londonderry, the second largest town in the colony, with a population of 2,590, had only one representative. Not surprisingly, the Assembly refused to reverse its votes of June 13.26

Governor Wentworth's response to the legislative rebuff, dated July 15, 1775, but appearing in the records on July 18, outlined the history of representation, laying particular emphasis on King Charles II's reign.27 He maintained that it was part of the constitution that the governor and council had the power to issue writs to call for a General Assembly by using the king's writ. Since Grafton County had petitioned him for representation, he had granted it to them by choosing worthy towns to be represented. Because the Assembly refused to act reasonably, Wentworth felt that he had no other choice but to adjourn the Assembly until September 28.28

From his dismal and uncomfortable quarters in Fort William and Mary, John Wentworth watched as the last vestiges of royal authority disappeared during a series of confrontations between the town of Portsmouth and the British man-of-war Scarborough. The temporary agreement that Governor Wentworth and Captain Barkley had arranged after the
previous confrontation in May worked well until June 17. On that date the Scarborough seized the sloop King Fisher for violating the New England Restraining Act, an act that was truly harmful to the revolutionary mercantile and shipping class since it caused trade to drop and unemployment to rise, causing a very unstable situation to develop. Supposedly the sloop was arriving in Portsmouth from Rye with a cargo of dried fish. Captain Barkley claimed that in reality the King Fisher was coming from the Grand Banks, from which the Americans were forbidden according to the Restraining Act.

As if the seizure itself was not enough to infuriate the people of Portsmouth, soon afterwards a sailor deserted from the Scarborough and found refuge in the town. Captain Barkley retaliated by seizing a local fisherman. The populace declared that the tale of desertion was just a fabrication used by the British to give them cause to seal off the port, thereby breaking the May agreement. As a result the town stopped supplying the British forces until the situation was righted. Barkley did release his captive, but the unrest did not subside.

It was under the tense atmosphere of the seizures that the governor received word, on July 7, from his uncle and secretary of the province, Theodore Atkinson. Wentworth was informed that on July 4 a committee from the Provincial Congress in Exeter called on Atkinson and requested that he hand over the colony's records and files which were in his office. Atkinson refused, stating that it was against his honor and his oath to volunteer such delivery. On July 6 the committee returned, but Atkinson still refused to hand over the files voluntarily, although he "told them they well knew it was not in [his] power to defend the office by force of arms." They then took the files, except for the volumes which contained the land grant charters, which Wentworth still had in
his possession. It was shortly after this episode that the Assembly met and gave Wentworth its final rebuff before he adjourned them until September.

On July 21 the governor demonstrated that he still had the interests of his citizens at heart by forwarding a proposition to Atkinson from Captain Barkley. Under the terms of a new agreement, Barkley was willing to allow all fishing boats out with permits if the **Scarborough** was once again supplied with beef from the town. By July this peculiar arrangement between the rebels and the British was coming under the scrutiny of outside observers. From Watertown on August 7 "A. Traveller" wrote that "my last tour was to Portsmouth, where, to my astonishment, and I dare say to the astonishment of all America, I was informed that the Committee of that Town had voted to supply the Scarborough man-of-war, lying in their river, with from four to six hundred weight of fresh beef weekly." He found the report scarcely credible and due only to the "threats of a paltry sloop-of-war" to stop the town's fish supply. The anonymous author had hoped that "too great a soul...animated the breast of every American to submit to so insolent a demand." He could not understand how any patriotic American could give in to "those butchers of our countrymen," who daily pilfered and destroyed the land with their cruelty and imperious demands. The Watertown patriot felt that Portsmouth's conduct "at so important a crisis, cannot but wring tears from every well-wisher to America." It is not surprising that on that very day Hunking Wentworth, Chairman of the Committee of Safety, declared that the Committee had found it inconsistent with peace and order to keep communications open with the **Scarborough**. Therefore, no more boats were to be allowed...
between the town and the ship without a pass. In consequence, Captain Barkley stopped all shipping in and out of the harbor. On August 10, 1775 Captain Barkley dispatched a routine boat to shore to obtain provisions. The boat was fired upon from ashore, and the coxswain was captured as the British returned the fire. A town meeting immediately disavowed the actions of the rebels in opening fire, and they returned the coxswain. Barkley, however, was not satisfied and insisted that the governor investigate. Using his still existing contacts with the town, Wentworth launched his investigation through the Council and reported back that the town was truly repentant. Barkley was still not satisfied; he wanted the offenders punished, and he threatened to bombard the town if they were not. Wentworth’s patience was all but exhausted, but he was still determined to prevent bloodshed. Playing his cards very carefully, he persuaded Barkley not to approach the town by exaggerating the dangers of navigating the Piscataqua River.

On August 13 the Portsmouth Committee of Safety finally stopped all communications with the Scarborough and Fort William and Mary. For all intents and purposes, Governor Wentworth was exiled to Newcastle Island. On August 18 the town cut off all intercourse with the British except for mail. Captain Barkley had only two choices: starve or return to Boston. Once he had decided to return to the friendly town of Boston, Governor Wentworth had no other choice but to accompany him. It was a sad governor and official party that boarded the Scarborough on August 23. Boston would supply them with safety and security, but Wentworth hoped that they would all return to New Hampshire after picking up fresh supplies, and perhaps even bring with them a full naval squadron. Unfortunately the situation in Boston was growing worse daily, and, in comparison, the problems in Portsmouth seemed unimportant to General Gage.
Governor Wentworth made one final trip to the colony that he had loved and served for his entire life. Knowing that the Assembly was due to meet on September 28, and hoping to prevent the humiliation of the Assembly meeting without him, Wentworth boarded the *Hope* for a trip to Gosport, on the Isles of Shoals. On September 25 he sent a boat to the mainland with a proclamation adjourning the Assembly until April 24. He had had to make the proclamation from Gosport because he could not officially prorogue the legislature from outside the limits of the province, and Gosport was the only part of New Hampshire where he could safely land. After making his meaningless proclamation, Governor John Wentworth returned to Boston, and after that final, pathetic voyage, the last royal governor of New Hampshire never returned.  

With only the one striking exception of the attack on Fort William and Mary, the American Revolution in New Hampshire can hardly be described as a violent outbreak of the radical fever, but rather as a slow shifting of public opinion. Before 1774 there was no hint of what was to follow. True, the underlying tension was there, the opposition to Wentworth was active, and the general trends leading to the disintegration of royal authority were all present; but the majority of the people of New Hampshire were remarkably well pleased with the royal rule of Governor Wentworth. The problem evolved slowly; local grievances, Wentworth's actions, the furor over unfair representation, and the relationship with the *Scarborough* blended with the general atmosphere of discontent and criticism of British policy that was sweeping America to produce a highly volatile situation.

In 1765 feeling in the colonies against the Stamp Act was nearly unanimous, but most colonists failed to see the significance behind
their opposition to, or support of, a particular colonial policy. The problem was immediate and personal. All Americans reacted in self-defense and surprisingly won. The principle behind the Stamp Act, however, was vital to the new perception in Great Britain of imperial administration and the place of the colonies in that system. The same principle was re-embodied in the Townshend Acts and the Tea Act, and unfortunately each act struck some vital special interest in the colonies which reacted in self-defense, and without considering the broader principles involved until too late.35 The rebel leaders had things their own way from 1765 on. Had the Loyalists of New Hampshire been energetic prior to 1774, then perhaps things might have been different, particularly as the province bordered the British stronghold in Canada and was not surrounded by revolutionary colonies. But two general conditions were leading the the Loyalists defeat in New Hampshire: Lord North's high-handed policies, and the example of revolution in Massachusetts.

The government of New Hampshire, nevertheless, did not collapse with the removal of royal government. Even before Governor Wentworth fled, a network of local organizations had been established to guarantee peace and order in the colony, which included controlling the Loyalists who remained. As soon as the Provincial Congress had been organized in Exeter, the Assembly in Portsmouth lost all importance, especially because it was constantly being adjourned by the governor before it could conduct any business. Royal authority had never been deeply rooted at the local level, as the network of royal government had been concentrated in the hands of the commercially-oriented, Portsmouth-located, Wentworth family oligarchy. The dynasty never had any direct influence over the elected officials of the country, and the appointed
officials either resided in Portsmouth or were so isolated by their position on the frontier as to be completely useless when the crisis came. So, when royal authority collapsed, local authority remained intact; even the militia organization survived the removal of Loyalist officers and royal supplies. It was merely a matter of substituting rebel leaders for Loyalists, or of persuading the unsure of the righteousness or profitability of revolution.

The existing civil institutions of New England also proved useful in allowing a smooth transition from royal to rebel government. Town meetings had been a feature of New England life since the very beginning. In times of stress or chaos the people of the towns always had the institution of the general town meeting to fall back on. Special committees to handle unusual situations had always been a part of the town meetings' history, so that when the collapse of the Wentworth administration brought about new burdens, the obvious response was to form a local Committee of Safety or a Committee of Ways and Means to protect the colonists and to maintain revolutionary discipline. Portsmouth's relations with the Scarborough exemplify this practical attitude because, with Wentworth out of the picture on Newcastle Island and representing the enemy anyway, the stability and continuity of the local government made it possible to use new political organization or give new powers to old organizations to act in behalf of the interests of the general community.

In New Hampshire the collapse of royal authority became inevitable with the establishment, by the Assembly, of a standing Committee of Correspondence. The Committee formed the base of revolutionary government until it gave birth to the Provincial Congress in Exeter by a flagrantly illegal assumption of power. As the march to revolution...
accelerated, Governor Wentworth discovered that he could do nothing but watch. Placing all of his hopes on the conciliatory actions of Parliament in February 1775, he saw his hopes drowned in the blood at Lexington and Concord, and he was left with no alternative plan. The road to revolution was left wide open.

In 1775 John Wentworth was not making a choice between England or America in his actions. To him the two could not be separated, and he always tried his best to serve both his king and the people of his beloved New Hampshire. He was a Loyalist, the leading Loyalist of the colony, but he was first and foremost a conservative American.

Writing to historian Jeremy Belknap fifteen years after the Declaration of Independence, Wentworth stated that "I do verily believe had the true, wise, and open measures been embraced on both sides, that their union would have been many years established and their prosperity wonderfully increased." Belknap, in turn, summed up his feelings for the period and the governor. It is easy to conclude that John Wentworth always had the interests of New Hampshire foremost in his considerations. While the temper of the times permitted him to act according to his principles, his government was successful and popular. When matters finally reached a peak, he still strove mightily on behalf of the citizens of the colony and was as moderate as a representative of the crown could be.
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CHAPTER THREE

LOYALIST IDENTIFICATION AND CONTROL

I therefore desire that you will delay no time in causing the seizure of every officer of Government at Portsmouth, who have given pregnant proofs of their unfriendly disposition to the cause we are engaged in; and when you have seized them, take the opinion of the Provincial Congress or Committee of Safety in what manner to dispose of them in that Government. I do not mean that they should be kept in close confinement. If either of those bodies should incline to send them to any of the interior Towns, upon their parole not to leave them till released, it will meet with my concurrence.

For the present I shall avoid giving you the like order in respect to the tories in Portsmouth; but the day is not far off when they will meet with this or a worse fate, if there if not a considerable reformation in their conduct. Of this they may be assured.

Sir, your most obedient servant
(signed) George Washington

Close confinement, quarantine, parole, reformation of conduct, or an unknown worse fate were the options that George Washington gave, or alluded to, in his letter to John Sullivan on November 12, 1775. The options may have been varied, but the intent was obvious; the Loyalists were to be removed from all positions of responsibility, and their influence was to be completely destroyed if the cause of the revolution was to be successful.

Sullivan had originally written to General Washington from Portsmouth on October 29, 1775 to complain about the lack of defenses and of "that infernal crew of Tories, who...endeavoured to prevent fortifying this harbour, walk the streets here with impunity, and will, with a sneer, tell the people in the streets that all our liberty-poles will soon be converted into gallows." Washington's response gave the
patriots of New Hampshire the green light to crack down on the detested Tories. Eventually the Loyalists of the state would be denied of all their political and legal rights, and even their very citizenship. They would be unable to hold any office of trust or profit, serve as a juror, or become a lawyer. In some instances they would even be forbidden to engage in any profession at all. The rights of free speech and free press were not extended to the domestic enemies of the revolution. In time, many of them would flee from their fanatical neighbors or would publicly support the revolutionary cause in order to survive. But 1775 was only the beginning, and the mechanisms of control were not, as yet, institutionalized efficiently.

In the beginning the control of the Loyalists was a haphazard affair and not entirely effective. As early as October 1774 Nicholas Austin had been forced to kneel before the Rochester Committee of Safety to apologize for hiring carpenters to go to Boston. Washington’s letter only formalized the already existing method of dealing with the Loyalists. Even while the royal governor was still in Portsmouth, the king’s friends had found it very difficult to hold their heads high, as Colonel John Fenton discovered after he had antagonized the rebels in the final hours of the Wentworth administration. His treatment by the mob had even forced the governor and his family to flee their house in the middle of the night. In May 1775, with Wentworth still not entirely out of the way, the Provincial Congress in Exeter decided to attack the matter of internal dissidence, and resolved

That Whereas many Persons, who through inadvertance, willfull malice or immoderat (Threat), have thrown out many opprobious expressions, respecting the several congresses & the methods of security they have though proper to adapt & thereby have made themselves obnoxious to the inhabitants of this Province an it is therefore recommended that the committees of the several Towns have a watchful eye over all such persons, &
that they only shall be the proper persons to take cognizance thereof & that their result shall be finall & that proper complaint being made to others of the committee, they make the most speedy & crutial enquiry thereof, in order to prevent riots & mobs & that they discountenance the same.³

In the same month the Provincial Congress took a more immediate and direct interest in the problem of Loyalists when they ordered John Akerman, Benjamin Hart, and John Peirce to be examined by the combined Committees of Safety of Portsmouth, Greenland, and Rye. They were under suspicion of "being Injurious to the Liberties and Privileges of this Country, suspected to be giving and receiving Intelligences from the British Troops."⁴ After a thorough investigation, the charge was dropped against Akerman, while Hart and Peirce were sent into the countryside.⁵

Usually, however, most of the work was done by the local Committees of Safety on their own initiative, based on complaints made by the local citizenry. On May 27 Ebenezer Loverin had to appear before the Kensington Committee of Safety to declare that "whereas I have offended the community...by refusing to equip myself with arms and ammunition, and by my opposition to military orders, for which I am sorry: I hereby engage to equip myself according to orders, and be ready to take up arms in defence of my Country."⁶ John Prentice, of Londonderry, had to account for his actions in signing the address of farewell to Governor Hutchinson of Massachusetts, a man "so universally and so justly deemed an enemy to American liberty and freedom." Prentice declared that he had intended his signing to be in the best interests of his country, but when he saw the effect that it had, he was glad to renounce it.⁷

Joseph Kimball, of Henniker, was accused of saying that he did not blame General Gage for coming to Boston and of speaking favorably
in defense of Governor Wentworth. Kimball did not deny the charges, but he explained that he did not approve of Gage's actions since his arrival, that he was in favor of keeping up the civil authority as represented by the Provincial Congress; and that he was sincerely sorry for having given any provocation of offense. After he promised to do all that he could to propagate the cause of liberty, the Committee of Safety declared Kimball to be a friend of the common cause.\footnote{8}

John Quigley had been arrested and jailed in Franeestown in July 1775 for his alleged Loyalist sympathies. On the 19th the New Hampshire Committee of Safety wrote to Colonel Bedel that since Quigley had been having difficulties with his neighbors, they believed that it was unsafe for him "to tarry at the place of his usual abode by reason of a Dissaefection in some persons against him," and recommended that Bedel take him into his company in the common service.\footnote{9} On July 26 Quigley petitioned the state Committee of Safety, declaring that

\textit{Whereas there has been wickedly and maliciously raised and propagated against me, the subscriber, certain scandalous falsehoods, with an intent, as must be supposed, to cause the publick to view me in the odious light of an enemy to my Country; Whereupon I declare that I never said or did anything with an intent to destroy the Liberties of America, or to hurt the publick good, and am now ready to risk my life and future in the defence of my Country's just rights.}\footnote{10}

The Committee was satisfied with Quigley's character, and since no one appeared to give evidence against him, the former Assistant Deputy-Surveyor of the King's Woods was released, only to flee from the state. In 1778 Quigley was formally banished.\footnote{11}

Knowing when to say the proper thing, or when to tell the right lie to save his life, Quigley showed a great deal more wisdom than did David Hills, a trader in New Ipswich. In February 1775 Hills had been called to account for illegally raising his prices; at that time he had
promised that in the future he would adhere to the non-importation association. Then in March he raised his prices again, was called to account, and declared that he did not understand the association. Once again it was explained to him, and he promised to abide by it, only to raise his prices in July. Stating that his actions were not in violation of the association, Hills refused to make satisfaction for a third time so the Committee of Inspection had no choice but to advise all good people to break off dealings with him. Discretion was not one of Hills' better characteristics.

The small fry, the Loverins, the Hills, the Kimballs, were easily handled by the local organizations as the cases were haphazardly brought before them. Sometimes the particular individual was found guilty and sometimes innocent, depending on the situation and either the presence or lack of evidence. On a few occasions the General Court would step in and release someone whom a local committee had jailed, such as James Gilmore of Durham, who had been arrested by the Nottingham Committee of Safety and released by the General Court on August 24, 1775.

When it came to the more substantial Loyalists, however, the Provincial Congress, or the state Committee of Safety, frequently did the dirty work. On November 15, 1775, for example, John Parker, former Tory Associator and high sheriff of Rockingham County, was declared a friend of the country and set at full liberty, while four other Associators, Isaac Rindge, William Torrey, William Hart, and George Jaffrey, were all confined to various locations in the state, as were Captain Nathaniel Rogers and Peter Gilman. The following week the Committee of Safety of New Hampshire was informed that George Meserve, former Collector of Customs and Stamp agent, and Associator, had left Portsmouth, apparently on his way to Boston. Since Meserve was such an
infamous enemy to the liberties of America, it was decided to try to stop him. Meserve still managed to escape, leaving behind his family and most of his estate, valued in 1788 at £15,040. He travelled first to New York and then to Boston, followed the troops to Halifax in 1776 after the evacuation of Massachusetts, went with the British to New York, and eventually arrived in England in 1778, where he died ten years later.15

Former Councilor George Boyd saw the trouble coming. Writing to his friends Lasham and Pussford on August 14, he said that "America is now Acting on the defensive, they seem determined to die sooner than to submit, God only - knowns what will be the event of all those movements I fear Great Brittain will Loose the Collonies if they are determined to drive matters."16 The very next day he confided to William Elliot of London, "Dont be surpris'd if you should see me in England this Winter."17 However, Boyd waited too long and was arrested, only to escape and travel 400 miles through the interior to New York and thence to England in 1776. He was included in the Proscription Act of 1778, but in 1787 he boarded ship for his native land, only to die at sea two days before the ship arrived in Portsmouth.18

It was not always easy to know if someone was or was not a Loyalist, and undoubtedly many mistakes were made. For instance, revolutionary leader John Langdon's brother, Woodbury, was suspected of being both a Loyalist and a rebel. The people of New Hampshire thought that he was a Loyalist because of his tradings in New York and Europe. This belief was natural because Woodbury was in England when the war broke out, and he stayed there, trying to collect some of his commercial debts. He went so far as to ask Lord George Germain to recommend him to Sir William Howe, whose displeasure he had incurred and by whom he had
been arrested in New York, a misfortune partially provoked by Wentworth's insinuations. Germain wanted to recommend Woodbury, but he was aware that John Langdon was a leading rebel and the principal contractor for building ships for Congress, and he knew that Woodbury had many connections in France, supposedly purely commercial but suspicious nonetheless. As far as Germain knew, Woodbury was loyal, but he still declined to give him a voucher for Lord Howe. Woodbury remained in London throughout most of 1777 collecting his debts, and it is not surprising that he was suspected of being a Loyalist by the people of New Hampshire. Yet later he was elected to replace Oliver Whipple, a former Tory Associator who had reformed, as one of the state's representatives to the Continental Congress. The move was engineered by John Langdon, but the Committee of Safety requested Whipple to remain in Philadelphia and Woodbury to remain in Portsmouth. Woodbury left anyway, and in a special town meeting Whipple was rechosen over Langdon; by 1780 Woodbury was out. Yet, by 1782, Woodbury was a justice on the state's superior court. Loyalist or rebel, it was a difficult determination to make with assurance at times, and mistakes were not uncommon.

Sometimes in trying to remedy a mistake it was discovered that no mistake had been made in the first place. Just such a case involved Hugh Tallant, of Pelham. In 1776 the local Committee of Inspection declared that he was an enemy to America. They confined him to his farm, and he willingly signed a document acknowledging the restriction. Later he insulted the Committee and appealed to the Provincial Congress for a new trial. The Executive Council voted that the Committee of the Town of Pelham be directed "forthwith to use their utmost Endeavours to protect the said Hugh Tallant from the Violence of any & Every Person,
on his Body or Estate until there can be an opportunity, for Some Civil Magistrate" to investigate. The second hearing of Tallant's case was before the combined committees of three towns, who also found him to be an enemy of America. They confirmed the first sentence, going so far as to force Tallant to give sureties to comply with the sentence and to pay the court costs. For one night he was entrusted to the care of Samuel Little, of Hampstead, but escaped. The Pelham Committee then denounced Little as a liberator of Loyalists and warned the populace to stop dealing with him. In trying to do their best to insure that Tallant got a fair hearing, the rebels had inadvertently given him the opportunity to escape.

In some cases, however, it was blatantly obvious that a man was a Loyalist. Major Breed Batcheller, of Packersfield, by all accounts was a vain, cantankerous, arrogant, stingy, profane, blustering man of many enemies, who always seemed to be in trouble with his neighbors. The outbreak of the war did nothing to change the major's personality. At the time of the Boston Tea Party and the explosion of public sentiment against the purchase of tea, Batcheller imported tea from Canada to use and to sell. He refused the command of the local militia, which had been offered to him because of his military experiences in the French and Indian War. He supposedly went to Keene to see if the rumor of Lexington was true, but instead he went to Cambridge to observe the British. In December 1775 the major was brought before the town's Committee of Safety, but he refused to answer their questions, denying their jurisdiction. According to the testimony of witnesses at the time, he had damned the committee, threatened to kill the first man to come for him, remarked that the committee could come to his house but not into it, refused to speak to it, and said that he would rather "be
tried by fire and brimstone before he would be judged by the committee." Then in 1776 he refused to sign the Association Test pledging allegiance to the revolution because everybody else had signed, and because he feared the effect that revolution might have on his property.  

By now the rebels had had enough of Major Breed Batcheller, and he was finally jailed in Keene. After being tried before the House of Representatives on March 20, 1777, he had to post £500 bond and remain confined to the area of Nelson and Marlborough. The townsmen complained that the sentence was too lenient for such a notorious Loyalist, and they filed a petition for a new trial, citing the discovery of new evidence as a reason. Placed in close confinement, he faced another trial, where witnesses quoted him as saying that if the mob came for him he would give the smallpox to them, even though he would not give it to a dog. He had allegedly damned Congress and the United States, had drunk the king's health, had declared that he would rather hang than be independent, a sentiment that the townspeople gladly would have put into action. The major was still not in prison but was hiding in a cave, known afterwards as "Batcheller's den." Realizing that his position had become impossible, Batcheller left New Hampshire for upstate New York, where he joined General Burgoyne's forces and was made a captain in the Queen's Loyal Rangers. He was with Colonel Baum at the Battle of Bennington, where he was severely wounded, and was sent to Canada with the wounded. He was then shipped to New York, finally settled in Digby, Nova Scotia, and died in 1785 in Annapolis. For his loyalty, or for his obnoxious personality, he was proscribed and had his property confiscated, losing an estimated £3,321.  

Loyalist or rebel? Rebel or Loyalist? Mistakes were easy to make, and the revolutionary atmosphere encouraged neighbors to turn
against neighbors for past offenses, for personality conflicts, or for greed. With no general method of control, identification, or coercion, some Loyalists were able to escape the state and even join the British forces. Londonderry’s Adam Stuart was discovered to be missing on January 15, 1776 and was presumed to be on his way to Boston since it was known that he had previously expressed a desire to fight for the king. On January 23 the Committee of Safety of Londonderry brought its complaint to the Congress in Exeter. The House investigating committee heard the evidence against Stuart and declared that he was an enemy to his country. As usual, the evidence was largely hearsay and stated that Stuart had approved of the British presence in Boston, had disparaged the fighting ability of the Americans, and had spoken in favor of the king on numerous occasions. But Stuart was already gone; obviously some method of centralized detection and control had to be developed in order to deal more effectively with the Loyalists.

The point was really driven home when The New Hampshire Gazette dared to print an attack against the revolution on January 9, 1776. In a very rational and conservative article, "Junius" lamented that "in quarrels between countries as between individuals, when they have arisen to a certain height, they no longer regard their interest or advantage, but the gratification of their wrath; when anger has arisen to this Pitch, the most inflammatory measures are esteemed the wisest; and moderation, prudence and virtue are degraded to the place of baseness and cowardice." Beginning the controversy with England over the principle of seeking a just redress of grievances, the colonial leaders had lost sight of their object and only desired complete independence, a step that Junius believed the public in general opposed. Already the representatives of the people were regulating the internal practices of
the colonies, considering a new form of government, and making and spending money - "the homely ugly features of that horrid Monster Independency." He urged all men to "oppose it...in the beginning; a little delay may be fatal; and like a neglected wound, it may mortify, and corrupt the whole body." He was ready to back up his opposition to independence by showing that it was impractical. First, the full might of the British Empire could easily crush the rebellion. Second, no support would be forthcoming from the British Whigs once the break was made. Finally, no support could be expected from any foreign nations. As if that were not enough, independence would not work because no one would buy America's products; there was no money; immigration would be cut off; taxes would have to increase; there would be no more bounties for America's struggling industries; and the entire Canadian border would have to be fortified and guarded. He closed by stating, "Was any man to see his neighbor's house in flames, would he fold his arms and silently sit at home: - it would be madness! - such is my case; and tho' I burn my fingers in the attempt I will try to extinguish it, lest the whole city be in flames."26 A very reasoned and rational statement of conservatism, Junius' letter was not what the rebels wanted the population to read. When the editor of the newspaper refused to divulge the author's name, the paper was closed down.27

In the confused and frustrating atmosphere of the early war period, someone had to take charge and direct the operations against the enemy within - the Loyalists. The general threat throughout the thirteen colonies was that the Loyalists would undermine the revolution through propaganda activity or, even worse, by taking up arms. These fears finally forced the Continental Congress to take action. On March 14, 1776 Congress "recommended to the Several Assemblies, Conventions, and
Councils, or Committees of Safety of the United Colonies, immediately to cause all Persons to be disarmed, within their Respective Colonies, who are notoriously disaffected to the cause of AMERICA, or who have not associated, and refuse to associate, to defend by ARMS, the United Colonies, against the Hostile attempts of the British Fleets and Armies."

The New Hampshire Committee of Safety then sent the message to all of the towns in the state, requiring all "Males above Twenty one years of age (Lunaticks, Idiots, and Negroes excepted)" to sign the oath that "we, the Subscribers, do hereby solemnly engage, and promise, that we will, to the utmost of our Power, at the Risque of our Lives and Fortunes, with Arms, oppose the Hostile Proceedings of the British Fleets and Armies against the United American Colonies." 28

The results of the Association Test, the name given to the oath, allowed the revolutionary leadership to identify those men who, in 1776, refused to support their cause. They also allow the historian to make certain conclusions about the strength of Loyalism and to identify individual Loyalists, recognizing that men who can be classified as Loyalists in 1776 could easily change their sympathies through time and with the changing fortunes of war. An analysis of the Association Test must be done carefully for several reasons. Most importantly, the results are limited; several towns are missing from the list, and the oath was only given to males twenty-one years old and over. To validate the figures of the Association, a comparison with the Census of 1775 was done, but the census only gives a breakdown of the population at the age of fifteen. The only age distribution analysis from a colony close to New Hampshire is the Connecticut chart of 1775, done by Robert V. Wells. 29 He was able to establish that 56.5 percent of the population was aged from zero to twenty, and the sex ratio was .98. Allowing for a
rough estimate of 3.5 percent of the population being between twenty and twenty-one, 60 percent of the census figures of all males were subtracted from the 1775 census in order to estimate how many men in each town presumably would have been offered the Association Test. What is indicated by the figures, as shown in Appendix II, is that in most cases, the figures are close enough to allow a reliable analysis of the date, acknowledging several rather glaring exceptions.

Another problem in the analysis of the Association Test is the equivocation of some of the non-signers and whether or not they should be considered Loyalists. The Kingstown Committee of Safety described James Caruth as "a Scotchman [who] Declines obliging himselfe to take up arms against his Native Country, but Declares he will never take up arms against America, & is willing to bear his Propurtion of the publick taxes with his Townsmen;" not really the proper attitude for a patriot. Colonel Jonathan Greely, of East Kingston, avoided signing the Association whenever it was offered to him until the Committee of Safety was obliged to add his name to the list of non-signers, stating that he "has several Times been desired to Sign the Declaration but has not."

Finally, ten out of twenty-six men who failed to sign the oath in Nottingham hedged their bets by advancing "money for to Hire Men to go to Crown Point." Since all of these men seem to have been philosophically opposed to the rebellion for reasons other than conscience, they can be considered as marginal Loyalists.

There are also those individuals on the other side of that hazy line dividing rebels and Loyalists. The Quakers of Hawke, Kensington, Rochester, and Weare, numbering eighty-two, are arbitrarily included in the rebel camp. Twenty-one men from Gilmantown refused to sign but stated that they "agree and Consent to the Declaration of Independence
on the British Crown and are willing to pay our proportion to the support of the United Colonies but as to Defend with arms it is against our Religious principles and pray we may be excused." Twelve men from Richmond refused to sign but explained that the reason for their refusal was because they did "not believe that it is the will of God to take away the Lives of our fellow creators, not that we came out against the Congress or the American Liberties, but when ever we are Convinct to the Contrary we are Redy to joine our American Brethren to defend by arms against the Hostile attempts of the British." Such groups are considered rebels because they seemed to agree with the principles of the revolution, but their religious scruples or conscience prevented them from taking up arms.

Eleazer Russell, of Portsmouth, went so far as to send a letter to President of the Provincial Congress Meshech Weare explaining his reasons for not signing the Association Test. He wrote that

it was, and is meerly to secure the morality of my mind, that I was reluctant to put my name to it. Solemly to bind myself to the performance of what nature & necessity rendered impossible, I started at the tho't of, and tho' my health is mended, so wreck'd are my nerves, that I cou'd not do one hour military duty to save my life....From the first Injuries done America by Great Britain, my tho'ts took fire on the subject, and have been conceiv'd & uttered in one unvaried strain...without hesitation or reserve: So that I can challenge all mankind to impeach me to my country. Russell was a devout patriot but felt that, because of his physical and nervous state, it would be inappropriate for him to sign the Association, since it was impossible for him personally to take up arms.

While it is obvious that some of the men who did not sign the Association Test were rebels at heart, it is also true that some of those who did sign were actually Loyalists. Some men were forced to sign out of fear for their lives and the safety of their families and property.
Many men could not just pick up and leave, as did Wentworth, Boyd, Quigley, and others; many had everything they owned invested in a small plot of land or in a small business, and practical decisions of survival took priority over matters of some ephemeral notion of loyalty. Since it was common for mobs to attack and destroy homes and businesses of suspected Loyalists, what better way to protect oneself than by signing the Association? The signer would then be considered a rebel and afforded the protection of the local Committee of Safety, the very body that he feared in the first place. Three men who did sign the oath were later discovered to be staunch Loyalists, and in 1778 they were banished from the state: Hugh Henderson, a Portsmouth merchant, John Morrisson, a clerk from Peterborough, and Jacob Brown, a trader from Newmarket.33 Perhaps between 1776 and 1778 these men changed their minds, or perhaps they had just chosen the path of discretion in 1776. The obvious question, to which there can be no certain answer, is: How many Loyalists signed the oath and then led quiet, unobtrusive lives in their own communities?

Recognizing all of the limitations, an analysis of the Association Test is still an excellent way to gauge the extent of Loyalism in New Hampshire in 1776. Any extrapolation from the conclusions is impossible because in the following years situations changed and so did men's minds. Looking at the Association, the records for eighty-four towns remain, but unfortunately among the missing towns are two of the major seacoast towns, Exeter and Dover. Exeter, the center of revolutionary activity in the state, probably did not have a large number of Loyalists who were willing to stand up and be counted. Dover, on the other hand, with its trade connections with Portsmouth and Atlantic community, probably had its fair share of Loyalists. Calculations by the author, based upon the
returns of the Association Test, show that 9,047 men were offered the oath, and 8,477 men pledged their lives and their fortunes to support the rebel cause, including seventy-eight Quakers, thirty-three men with religious scruples, and sixteen men already in arms. Only 570 men refused to sign, giving New Hampshire a 6.3 percent Loyalist population, according to this formula.

Breaking down the results by town, thirty-four of the eighty-four towns reporting had no non-signers out of a combined population of 2,444. Only one town, Henniker, in the center of the state, in what is now Merrimack County, reported over 30 percent non-signers; out of an eligible population of seventy-three, twenty-two did not sign. Five other towns reported over 19 percent Loyalists: Stratham had 24.3 percent, Claremont 23.7 percent, Hinsdale 22.2 percent, Sandwich 19.6 percent, and Nottingham 19.4 percent. Seventeen towns reported between 8.0 and 18.8 percent of their populations refusing to sign the oath, including Portsmouth, where forty-seven out of 556 men did not sign. Twenty towns reported from 2.4 to 6.6 percent Loyalists, and the remaining seven towns had between 0.6 and 1.6 percent non-signers. See map on following page. (A complete breakdown of the Loyalist population, by town, is included in Appendix B.)

In general, several areas of concentration appear in the state, one in the central area around Henniker, another along the Connecticut River just north of the Massachusetts border centering around Hinsdale, and a third zone located around Nottingham in the east. Rockingham County had by far the greatest number of Loyalists, with high percentages in Nottingham, Stratham, Portsmouth, Deerfield, Salem, Hampstead, Kingston, Newmarket, and Brentwood. But, after all, Rockingham was the most heavily populated, most commercialized, and the longest established
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county in the state, as well as the location of the royal government before 1775.

The analysis of the Association Test shows that Loyalism was not located specifically in one area of the state, and, very importantly, that there was no urban-frontier division as existed in many other states, particularly in the south; instead, concentration existed on the seacoast, on the frontier, and in the center of the state. It is also obvious that, while Loyalist sentiment was dispersed, nowhere was it a numerical threat to the revolution. It must be re-emphasized, however, that the Association can only be used as a barometer for 1776. In later years, as the rebels became successful and particularly after the rebel victory at Saratoga, it can be assumed that Loyalist sympathies lessened. Also, through time many Loyalists chose to leave the state rather than to suffer the abuse heaped upon them by the rebels, while many more simply chose to lead quiet lives on their farms and let the war pass them by.

The year 1776 was the decisive year in the American Revolution because with the signing of the Declaration of Independence the rebels destroyed all hopes for reconciliation. The war then officially became a war for outright independence, and the failure of the war effort would have meant the gallows for the revolutionary leaders. It became a situation of all or nothing, and in that type of struggle no internal dissidence could be tolerated. If the Declaration did not make many more people radical revolutionaries, it did make more people neutral, at least until they learned what direction the war would take. Lukewarm Loyalists learned to keep quiet in order to avoid persecution and harassment, while still keeping their faith in the British alive. Lukewarm
patriots remained lukewarm, or neutral, rather than going over immediately to the radicals' side in case the war was lost, and they would have to face the unhealthy consequences.

With 6.3 percent of the men of New Hampshire known to be Loyalists, and with an unknown number, but undoubtedly a large number, neutral but potentially Loyalist, the Congress in Exeter had to take official action to insure the victory of the cause they were risking their lives for. One of the major problems that the rebels faced was with their currency, and the ease with which it was counterfeited. On July 3, 1776, the General Court passed "as Act to prevent the forging & altering Bills of publick Credit, and for preventing the Depreciation thereof; and for making the Bills of Credit of the United Colonies, and the Bills of this Colony a Tender in all Payments." The act was aimed at those "wicked persons, intending to Defraud the Inhabitants of the Colonies," and the punishment, if convicted, was to be "set on the Gallows for the Space of one hour, with a Rope round the Neck & pay a fine for the use of this Colony not Exceeding Fifty pounds and Suffer Six Months Imprisonment, and be publickly whipped not Exceeding thirty Nine Stripes and be Incapable of holding any Office." The reward for turning someone in for forging or altering notes was ten pounds; the penalty for receiving or using bills for less than the denominated value was fifty pounds and the inability to hold any office; and the penalty for selling goods for less when bought with gold and not paper was again fifty pounds. The next year the Congress passes an amendment, or addition, to the counterfeiting act which expanded the coverage to lottery tickets and loan certificates.

Counterfeiting was one thing, but treason was something far more serious, and on January 17, 1777, the General Court passed "An Act
against Treason and Misprison of Treason, and for regulating Trials in such cases, and for directing the mode of executing Judgments against persons convicted of those Crimes." The act stated that all such persons...who shall, either within, or without the limits of this state, levy war, or conspire to levy war against the same, or against any other of the United States of America or shall in any way whatsoever aid the Enemies of either, or all the said united states in carrying on war against them or either of them, and thereof be convicted, such persons shall be deemed and adjudged guilty of Treason against this State, and shall suffer Death without benefit of Clergy.\textsuperscript{37}

The concealment of adjudged treasonous actions was labelled misprison of treason and carried with it the loss of the convicted's property and a five year prison term. Flight or outlawry was penalized by confiscation of the guilty's estate, and all of the treasonous activities had a two year statute of limitations. For those acts that did not quite amount to treason or misprison of treason, such as discouragement of enlistment, speaking against the common cause, endeavoring to change other people's minds, or spreading false news, the Congress passed an act that levied a forty shilling fine for each subsequent offense.\textsuperscript{38}

While the government cracked down on internal dissidence by enacting restrictive legislation, the press of New Hampshire continued to keep the public aroused. On January 14, 1777 "An Enemy to Tories" wrote in the New Hampshire Gazette:

To the Public. Is it not amazing, astonishing to every thinking mind at this Period, when nothing but Rapine and Murder can Satiate the Lust of those Infernal Devils sent among us by the Infamous Tyrant of Britain, that there can still be found a single Person who yet retains that odious name of a Tory, when they see (notwithstanding their much boasted loyalty) their wives and Daughters are not exempt from the Ravaging Cruelties of those Wretches.

The author continued his tirade and concluded that all Loyalists should be put on boats and shipped away, and if they returned, they should be shot.\textsuperscript{39}
The New Hampshire government was not quite ready to go that far yet, but on April 11, 1777 "An Act to prevent the Desertion of Soldiers, during the present war with Great Britain, the concealment of deserters, and also the Embezzlement of Cloaths, Arms & c. belonging to the United States of America" was passed that carried with it punishments of arrest, courtmartial, and fines. The year 1777 also witnessed acts passed to prevent the transfer of property of those apprehended for counterfeiting or on suspicion of treason. The act entitled "an act for taking up and imprisoning or otherwise restraining persons dangerous to this State" was in danger of expiring, and since it had set the foundations for all that had followed, Congress re-enacted it. On January 2, 1778 "An Act to Encourage Fair Dealing and to Restrain and Punish Sharpers and Oppressors" was adopted to prevent the hoarding of goods necessary to the war effort. Once started, the Provincial Congress used all the power that it had to meet the challenge that the war had brought. Piece by piece, a code of laws evolved that outlawed the actions of any group opposed to the revolution.

But by late 1778 the situation in America had changed greatly compared to the summer of 1776. General Burgoyne had surrendered a large British army at Saratoga. The British army had failed to pin down and destroy Washington's army in the middle colonies and had even been forced to evacuate Philadelphia, for all intents and purposes ending all major military actions in the North. The Articles of Confederation had been adopted by the Continental Congress, although they would not be ratified until 1781; and most importantly, the French had signed a commercial treaty and a military alliance with the new nation. But the war was not yet over; the British were still in Canada and in New York, disaster loomed in the southern colonies, and England was still
the greatest power on earth. It was obvious that the war was going to be a long and very expensive one. The problem was that the states lacked the necessary funds to continue a war effort for very long. There was a remedy close at hand, however, in the property of the Loyalists who had fled. The concept of the confiscation of Loyalists' estates to provide for the sinews of war quickly gained acceptance; not only had the states discovered a way to punish the Loyalists, they had also found a source of untapped wealth.

Some states began to use confiscation in 1777, but the real impetus came late in that year when the Continental Congress adopted a resolution recommending that the state confiscate and sell the personal and real estates of all those persons who had forfeited the right to protection because of their inimical disposition to the revolutionary cause, and then to invest the money coming from those sales in Continental loan certificates. Congressional approval of confiscation gave the idea widespread popularity, and in New Hampshire the process was completed in November 1778.

New Hampshire proceeded to accomplish the goal in two steps. First, the General Assembly passed an act of proscription on November 11, 1778, clearing the way for an act of confiscation two weeks later. The initial act of proscription desired "to prevent the return to this state of certain persons therein named, and of others who have left or shall leave this State, or either of the United States of America and have joined or shall join the Enemies thereof." Seventy-six men from twenty-two towns were banished, Portsmouth, with thirty-three, having the largest concentration, while the others were largely dispersed throughout the state. Thirty of those banished, including ex-governor John Wentworth, were either Esquires or Gentlemen, denoting high social
status and wealth; eighteen were listed as simple yeomen; thirteen were either merchants or traders; four were doctors; one, Major Robert Fagers, was engaged solely in military matters and was then serving as a British officer on half-pay; and there was one printer, one ropemaker, one post-rider, and one clerk. No apparent pattern emerges from a study of those men who were proscribed; the only thing that can be said with any certainty is that the Portsmouth - Loyalist relationship was still strong, and that over half were wealthy or of high status. All of the men were considered dangerous, and most of them were absent from the state. The act formally accused them of

not only basely deserting the Cause of Liberty and depriving these States of their personal services at a time when they ought to have afforded their utmost assistance in defending the same against the Invasions of a cruel Enemy; but abetting the Cause of Tyranny, and manifesting an inemical disposition to said States and a design to aid the Enemies thereof in their wicked purposes.43

The act further required officials in each county to arrest anyone listed in the act who still lived in the area. Provisions were also made to transport those arrested either to jail or to the British lines. Adding a note of finality, it was stated that anyone who returned would suffer the "pains of Death."

The drastic death penalty never had to be carried out. Only one of the men proscribed ever returned to the state during the war, William Baxter of Alstead. In 1776 he had been too young to have been offered the Association Test, but his father, Simeon, had refused to sign. According to Simeon's claim with the British government after the war, he had suffered "much persecution from the Whigs & Malecontents," before leaving his wife and children to join General Burgoyne in August 1777. He was captured with the rest of the army and sent to jail in Boston to await exchange.44 William left Alstead in March 1778 to find
his father, and once in Boston his father told him that he had to accompany him to New York. William reluctantly obeyed. Travelling first to Rhode Island, they eventually arrived in New York where Simeon told his son to look out for himself. Doctor Josiah Pomeroy, an absentee Loyalist from Keene who would later also be proscribed, helped William to find a place to live and work on a farm on Long Island. In New York Simeon was informed that he would not be exchanged unless he agreed to join the regulars, a course he was reluctant to take. With his rations cut off, Simeon and his son returned to Boston to await further developments. Once in Boston, William told his father that he would not go back to New York but instead would go home. Simeon replied that such a course was just as well, because it was costing him more than he had expected to take care of them both. Simeon also gave William a large sum of counterfeit money which he was hesitant to accept but nonetheless did, eventually exchanging the bogus money for hard currency on his way home. William returned to Alstead and was immediately arrested under the provisions of the Proscription Act, the very day the act was passed. His case went before the General Assembly in Exeter, where rebel captain Lemuel Holmes testified that when he had been a prisoner on Long Island, William had been living with and working for a farmer and had not joined in the British service or taken any provisions or money from the British. The farmer seemed, according to Holmes, to be a friend to America, and he also knew, for a fact, that William's father had ordered William away. 

Despite Holmes' testimony, according to the Proscription Act the House of Representatives had no other choice but to sentence William to jail, to the British, or to the gallows. They therefore ordered William to be delivered to the sheriff in order to be returned to New York by
the first truce ship. However, William never left but was instead admitted to bail, the bond requiring him to restrict himself to Exeter. By May he was issued a pass to travel to Alstead, and in July he was made a messenger for the Congress, carrying the General Court’s printing business between Portsmouth and Exeter. In April 1780 he was so trusted that he was employed by the New Hampshire Committee of Safety to carry letters to Cheshire County calling together the General Court, for which he was paid one hundred dollars. Apparently William had first been influenced or forced by his father to be a Loyalist, only to regain his senses and join the winning side.

The other men who were banished from New Hampshire wisely stayed away from the state during the war. With the detested Loyalists legally forbidden to be in New Hampshire, the stage was set for the confiscation of their estates. On November 27, 1778 the Assembly confiscated the property of twenty-five men previously proscribed, and of three men from out of state. Nine of those confiscated came from Portsmouth, once again demonstrating the strength of Loyalism in the state’s former royal capital. Why the property of all of the men proscribed was not confiscated is a matter for conjecture. Some of the men had only personal estates which they took with them, and some were just businessmen whose business was taken over by the rebels. Some had already divested themselves of their property before fleeing, and is probable that the property of some Loyalist fathers passed into the hands of rebel sons. Committees were appointed in each county to seize all of the real and personal property of the individuals named in the act. They were also directed to sell, at public auction, the personal estates that they had seized, and to account for the same to the General Court.
After the two major acts directed against the prominent Loyalists, it was just a matter of refining and updating the other acts in order to keep the Loyalists in line. On December 26, 1779 an addition to the act of confiscation was passed that appointed trustees over the confiscated estates and provided means by which the money from the sales of the estates could get into the state treasury. On March 18, 1780 the act was repealed and in its place another act was passed that made all of the sales by the trustees valid. On the same day, a bill was enacted for disposing of prisoners by turning them over to the Commissary General of Prisoners for exchange. On June 9, 1780 another addition to the confiscation act was passed that allowed Captain Samuel Gilman, trustee of John Wentworth's estate, to put the entire Wolfesborough property up for sale. On April 6, 1781 the House revised its treason and misprison of treason act by declaring that anyone who said that the king had authority over the states or who engaged in any propaganda was to be jailed for the duration of the war, and that anyone who joined the enemy and was later captured would not be considered a prisoner of war, but a traitor. On July 3, 1781 the House authorized judges of probate to allow more time for receiving and examining claims against the estates of absentee owners. An act was passed to prevent any inhabitants of Great Britain and other enemies of America from purchasing territory in the state, and also to prevent the same from prosecuting actions in court, serving as jurors, or holding town offices. This act was further strengthened in June 1782. On March 25, 1782 the General Court confiscated the estates of all of those who had left the state and gone to the enemy since the war began, and also of those subjects of England who owned land in the state. As late as June 27, 1782, the House was still running a war since it passed an act encouraging the
capture of deserters and calling for a twenty-four pound fine for harboring or secreting them. 48

Throughout the war years the government of New Hampshire attempted various methods of accomplishing what George Washington had alluded to in 1775. However, within the established formal framework of the law that evolved through trial and error, there was a great deal of room for variations in the treatment of individual Loyalists. The war was a civil war, a fight to the finish, and as such, those individuals who opposed the revolutionary cause had to be eliminated or silenced. Ultimately the job fell to the local organizations that developed in the early years of the conflict. Arising out of the special committees chosen at town meetings to handle the extraordinary situation, these Committees of Inspection or Committees of Safety tended to be made up of the more politically active members of the community. These men were wealthier, on the average, than the rest of the population, but less wealthy than the large body of Loyalists. They were the men whose careers had been stymied by the presence of the Wentworth-dominated oligarchy, and once they had an opportunity to reverse the tables, they applied themselves with vigor to the task.

As the front line of defense, the local Committees of Safety and Inspection handled the great bulk of the war effort against the Loyalists, although frequently the New Hampshire Committee of Safety or even the General Court took an active part in the campaign, as they had in the cases of Isaac Rindge, William Torrey, and the others in November 1775. From 1774 to 1783 the crusade to eliminate the domestic opposition to the revolution proceeded mercilessly. The early years saw the most activity because the war and the cause were new, and the outcome
was very uncertain. After 1777 and the Battle of Saratoga, the Loyalists who stayed in the state usually remained quiet and were left alone.

The first three years of the war meant everything. The war could not have been won, but it certainly could have been lost, and that fact accounts for the rash of actions initiated against the Loyalists. In the beginning the focus of attention was on the prewar royal leadership identified with ex-governor Wentworth. Those men who did not flee, like Boyd or Quigley, faced an uneasy future, as Rindge, Hart, and many others learned. It did not always take an overt act to draw the wrath of the Committee of Safety; Sheriff Benjamin Whiting, a Wentworth appointee, was arrested in July 1775 just because he had called the rebel leader John Sullivan a "damn'd perjured villain" and a "damn'd rebel," who deserved to hang. Whiting was jailed and eventually released by the General Court in June 1776 when the court heard the petition of himself, Leonard Whiting, Samuel Whiting, Samuel Cummings, and Thomas Cummings. Citing insufficient evidence, all except Samuel Whiting were discharged. Apparently the General Court made a mistake because in 1778 Benjamin Whiting and both Cummings were proscribed.

In many of the cases, all types of evidence were allowed before the investigating committee including hearsay, gossip, and irrelevant and prejudicial details. In January 1777 Timothy Walker wrote an impassioned letter to the General Court about his fear that the Loyalists in the Concord area were trying to communicate with General Howe and give away valuable information through the exchange of prisoners. Zacheus Clough of Poplin declared himself to have been injured in character by designing persons with false insinuations, at which the New Hampshire Committee of Safety launched an investigation and cleared him. Lieutenant John Clark of Londonderry was arrested on June 10,
1777 because, in referring to the Association Test, he "Said it was a God Damned oath Several times and Swore Profanly He Never would Take that oath. He Likewise Swore He would Die First," going on to say that he would like to see Hancock and Adams in hell.\(^{53}\)

At a special session of the Cheshire County Committee of Safety in Keene, in June 1777, Seth Walker gave evidence that Elijah King had said that he looked on the country as embarked on a wrong course and that if he were to take up arms, he would do so for the British. Lieutenant Johnson declared that King said he did not like the idea of independence, certainly damning evidence. At the same session Samuel Smith was accused of saying that he was on the king's side, of uttering discouraging words about the revolution, of approving of General Howe's proclamation, of believing that very shortly everyone would be glad to be a Tory, and of never speaking well of the American cause. As John Butrick quoted Smith, he "Damn'd the Blue Skins (meaning the Liberty People) said Hell was gaping for them now - and the Congress not a Damning Better."\(^{54}\)

At the same meeting in Keene, Simeon Baxter, Elijah Willard, Josiah Butler, Abner Sanger, and Prentice Willard were all accused of various dastardly crimes, such as discouraging enlistment, speaking in favor of General Howe, saying that the British would win, refusing to sign the Association Test, resisting active service, passing counterfeit money, drinking toasts to the king, desiring to fight on the British side, invoking the spectre of Indian attacks, and preferring to be governed by a tyrant who was farther away than Philadelphia. Some of the crimes obviously could hurt the revolution, such as discouraging enlistment, passing counterfeit money, and alarming the population, but in a war for independence even drinking an innocent toast to the former
monarch could be considered a crime. For these real or imagined crimes, Smith, Baxter, Elijah Willard, and Sanger were all closely confined. King and Prentice Willard were confined within certain limits in Cheshire County after posting bond.\(^5\)

In 1777 most of the prewar Loyalists of stature were already in jail, in confinement, or in exile. But the outcome of the war was still in doubt, and there were still very many individuals who refused to support the cause. Those men had to be weeded out and neutralized. Peter Green, John Stevens, Jeremiah Clough, and Richard Allison were arrested in June for suspicion of conspiring against the state. William Pottle was declared an enemy to the liberties of the state, and Breed Batcheller and Robert Gilmore were confined to close quarters. Jeremiah Bowen and William Rogers were examined for treason, and Rogers was released. Robert Fulton and his son were jailed in Exeter because they had tried to join the British and had cursed the rebels at the Battle of Concord.\(^5\) There was plenty of work for the various state and local Committees to do in 1777, and the end of the war was a long way off.

In fact, the war was very near at hand in 1777 as the British marched down the Champlain Valley and occasionally sent parties into Vermont. It is not surprising that rumors abounded concerning various plots and expeditions supposedly aimed at western New Hampshire. Apparently not all of the rumors of invasion or subversion were untrue, if the letter to Captain Benjamin Brooks of Claremont is to be believed. According to the intercepted letter to the leading Loyalist of the area, supplies were being readied for transport to Claremont to arm the Loyalists so that they could launch a counter-revolution.\(^5\) Whether or not this was a genuine letter has never been ascertained, but it does
indicate the underlying fears that the rebels had of what the Loyalists could do if they had the supplies, the leadership, and the courage.

Although by 1778 the war in the north was won and the actions of the various committees slowed down, they did not stop. As late as June 9, 1781, a warrant was issued for the arrest of John Waldron Smith of Raymond for being inimical towards his country and for making sundry expressions discouraging people and injuring the common cause. Two months later, and one month before Yorktown, the New Hampshire Committee of Safety ordered the sheriff of Rockingham County to seize Robert Young of Salem and bring him to Exeter for a formal examination. But after 1777 the documents show an ever increasing number of petitions from the jailed or confined Loyalists asking, and frequently obtaining, a new hearing or a modification of their sentence.

Petitions were submitted almost as soon as the first Loyalist was arrested and continued throughout the war. In August 1775, the General Court released James Gilmore of Durham from the Exeter jail because of insufficient evidence after reviewing his petition. On December 5, 1775 William Hart, who had been apprehended on the orders of John Stark and committed to the Exeter jail for what he claimed was no reason at all, petitioned the Court to reconsider the matter because he felt that he had never done anything inimical to the interests of America. The Court was unmoved. In June 1776 Oliver Parker was confined to his land, but in a petition he demanded anybody to prove that he was a Loyalist. In September of that year, Strafford's George March requested that he be liberated from his confinement because half of his children were sick, and it was a hardship for his wife. In October Peter Mitchell, of Dover, asked for an enlargement of his confinement because he had previously fallen in with the wrong crowd but had since mended his ways.
The Court was not convinced. On December 19 James Ryan, languishing in the Exeter jail, declared that he was willing to go into the army to prove his patriotism. It was a busy year for the General Court, and in most cases they denied the petitions; 1776 was still too early to begin easing up on the Loyalists.

The next year saw even more petitions submitted to the General Court, not surprisingly since there were more Loyalists than ever in jail or under confinement. Robert Luist Powle, a newspaper editor before the war, pleaded innocent to his conviction for counterfeiting and declared that since his confinement he had become very ill and was willing to post bond if only he were released. Asa Porter asked for relief twice because his estate was failing, his family was reduced to dire straits, and because he did not know why he had been arrested in the first place. On June 4 Isaac Rindge, William Torrey, William Hart, Peter Pearse, John Peirce, and James Sheafe declared that they were willing to post bond guaranteeing their future conduct because close confinement in the Portsmouth jail was proving detrimental to both person and property. In June Leonard Whiting, Joshua Atherton, and John Holland protested their innocence of counterfeiting charges, to no avail. On June 24 Philip McCarrigain of Concord desired the liberty of the Exeter jail yard because of his ill health. Also in June Nathaniel Rogers and John Marsters tried a different tactic by protesting their arrests as contrary to law and the general principles of personal liberty. On June 30 Peter Pearse volunteered to take an oath to support the United States while Isaac Rindge, William Torrey, William Hart, John Peirce, and James Sheafe declared that since they were inhabitants of the state, they automatically owed it their
allegiance and therefore did not have to take an oath to prove their patriotism. The Court was not impressed by legal maneuverings.

The second half of 1777 was just as hectic. In July William Vance requested leave to attend his farm, Jeremiah Clough desired the liberty of the jail yard so that he could exercise, and John Marsters complained that his wife was not allowed to visit him any longer. In September Jeremiah Clough once more asked leave to return home on bond, recognizing that he had said some things inadvertently in the past, but hoping that his former painful services in the common cause would not be forgotten and that his future services would help enlarge his sphere of confinement. Jonathan Gove, John Malony, Robert Fulton, and Philip McCarrigain also wanted to retrieve their good characters through good deeds if they would be released or even sent to another area. The pleas for readjustment of sentence, in almost every case, appealed to humanity, cited innocence or inadvertance of deed, and promised restitution in the future through good deeds. Frequently the ill health of the petitioner or of his family was thrown in to soften the judges. Still, the General Court and Committee of Safety tended to remain unconvincing.

The year 1778 saw nearly as many petitions as 1777. The difference was that more of the petitions were granted, although the majority were still turned down. Even though Warren Bragden was devoured by lice and "Truely to be pittyed," and "much abashed of his late behavior," and willing to join the army, or Jane Holland was in a state of "Beggary and Want," or John Sheperd had been in "very irksome confinement in variousGoals & Dungeons ever since November 1776," the General Court still had a war to win and could remain unmoved in regards to the domestic opponents of the war.
Sometimes the petition was aimed at relatively minor matters, such as when Matthew Thornton, John Robertson, and John Sheperd requested firewood in the winter of 1777 because they had used up all of their money buying firewood earlier, and "the cold is Still in Creesing and if your honors Doth not grant us sum Releaf we will Suffer with the cold." More frequently a petition took the form of the kind that Theophilus Smith, Seth Cook, Jeremiah Knowles, Joseph Hoit, Daniel Hoit, and William Rogers submitted on May 10, 1777:

I do Solemnly Swear by the Great name of the everliving God that I will do my Duty as a Good Subject of the State of New Hampshire, That I will to the utmost of my Power and Ability Disclose, & make known to some officer, or Magistrate Acting for and under the Authority of the United States, or some one of them, all Plots, & Conspiracies which I know, or may come to my Knowledge, against this State, or the united States of america, or anyone of them as Independent of, and in opposition to the King of Great Britain.

And that I will not Directly, or Indirectly, aid assist, advise or give Intelligence to any Person, or Persons, acting under the Authority of the said King of Great Britain relative to his, or their endeavouring to bring the united States, or any one of them under the Dominion of the said King. And that I voluntarily take & subscribe this Oath without any Mental Reservation or Equivocation whatsoever - and mean, Honestly & Faithfully to perform the same - so help me God.

By late 1779 the rate of petitions coming to the General Court and the state Committee of Safety began to slow down but by no means to stop. Many of the new petitions came from wives of Loyalists who had fled and left them destitute. The petitions usually asked for compensation, support, or requested leave to join husbands overseas, such as in the cases of Esther Meserve, Sarah Little, Mary Traill, and Jane Hart. By 1779 the war in the north had been won, and it was becoming obvious that the British were not going to make another major offensive in the area, so many of the petitions were granted, and many Loyalists were released on bond with sureties. This type of qualified release had been
used effectively since the very beginning on a limited basis. For example, in February 1777 John Peirce, William Hart, James Sheafe, Hugh Henderson, John Stavers, Robert Robertson, Peter Peirce, William Torrey, Oliver Whipple, Stephen Little, and Isaac Rindge were released on £500 bond, with two sureties each to guarantee their future behavior. In 1777 such a release was remarkable, but comprehensible when it is realized that the state saw in it an easy way to make money. By late 1778 and early 1779 a bond release was more common and cheaper, making it easier for a less affluent man to afford.

With the war in the north over and with the war in the south winding down towards victory, the rebels in Exeter could afford to be a little more generous. But sentiment still ran high. As late as February 12, 1783, Oliver Parker of Stoddard submitted a petition requesting that his confinement to the town be lifted so that he could travel on business without forfeiting his bond. It had been a long war for Parker: he had been in jail for eleven weeks and then confined to Stoddard for three years and still, even with the war over, he was not trusted.

What the Loyalists suffered because of their loyalty can never really be appreciated, and what they lost can never be comprehended. They believed in a cause just as fervently as did the rebels, risked everything they had, and in the process of losing they were harassed, persecuted, banished, broken in health and spirit, jailed under horrible conditions, confined, and confiscated, all because of the exigencies of fighting a civil war. On the other hand, the revolutionaries were fighting for their very lives; not only were they fighting a civil war, but a total war, and as such, they could not let anything or anyone threaten their efforts. From the haphazard beginnings, to the
Association Test, to the acts of proscription and confiscation, the rebels were doing all that they could to insure that the domestic opposition to the cause never undermined the war effort. Even General Washington had warned the Loyalists that they could expect a very harsh fate if there was "not a considerable reformation in their conduct."
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CHAPTER FOUR

CATEGORIES OF LOYALISTS

...our persons have been seized & searched, and this has been followed by Committing us to close goal, previous to any Legal examination, or at best, but one which the Examiners themselves Esteemed as partial - and these things have been transacted with much more tumult and uproar than usually marks the pathway of the proceedings of Law -- Complaints and informations have been taken behind our backs - depositions and Relations of pretended Crimes have been taken Exparti against us - Our Characters have been Maligned & Reprobated....All the good, even every alleviating Circumstance in our favour have been buried in unfathomable oblivion, while Enthusiasm & Suspicion have gone hand in hand, in Stirring up and propagating with Unrelenting malice, every species of infamous falsehood that could be the offspring of the Conjunction, of such giddy headed & envenomed monsters, whose breath is sufficient to poison & blast with Ruine, not a few individuals only, but whole empires.¹

With these words Joshua Atherton, Stephen Holland, Jonathan Gove, Leonard Whiting, William Vance, Richard Cutts Shannon, Robert Fulton, John Malony, and Jeremiah Clough petitioned the Council and House of Representatives of New Hampshire on July 19, 1777. After bemoaning the manner in which they had been treated, arrested, and confined because of their loyalism, they went on to describe some of the suffering they had to endure. Taken from the quiet enjoyment of their farms or businesses, they were confined in "the Ragged & Solitary walls of a Goal." They had been deprived of all personal liberty, and their health had been endangered by the "poisonous & intolerable stench," the "want of proper food," and the exclusion "from the benefit of fresh air." Suffering from various "bodily disorders," and "Excluded from Council permitted to
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all, the Greatest Criminals not Excepted," they even had to suffer the
agony of seeing their children fatherless and wives "O'erwhelmed with
Sorrow and Bedewed with Tears." "Degraded from every right of human
nature," without remedy or redress, these unfortunate men discovered
at one stroke their personal liberty & Security gone, their
prosperity perishing, their health in perpetual danger, Robed
of every Social enjoyments, their Character torn with more
than a Viper's fury, their wives widows and their Children
Fatherless. Surely we have deserved a better fate."

"Surely we have deserved a better fate." These are words that
every Loyalist must have uttered at one time or another. Suffering for
their loyalty to the king, to whom all colonists had owed their
allegiance, most Loyalists suffered more for their innate conservatism
than from doing anything overtly to help the British. The revolution
took everybody by surprise. The conflict initially began as an American
cause within the British system to redress grievances within the system,
a cause which the Loyalists largely supported. However, the Loyalists
were left behind as events swept moderation away and as the radicals
forced independence and war onto the population. Many people felt the
same reluctance to rebel; probably over half of the population did not
immediately favor independence, but as the war continued, many of the
 neutrals joined the radicals. For the Loyalists there had to be some
spark of deeply felt loyalty to mobilize them to declare their support
of the king and to suffer all that lay ahead.

The actual motivating factors determining an individual's loyalty
were varied, but a rough categorization of the elements of the Loyalist
party, using different connections to the British Empire, reveals some
broad motivations. It is always difficult to categorize on the basis of
motivation; therefore two types of criteria, one functional and one
attitudinal, have been used to establish six basic categories.
Functionally, what a Loyalist did for a living often tied him to the British cause, and five basic distinctions of connection can be identified. A final, overriding category includes all of the Loyalists on the basis of their attitudes or psychology. While the first five categories can be arbitrarily established according to connections, the final category is a more fluid one that included each Loyalist. This category often overlaps with the first five, based on function, but it is much more than just a catch-all classification as it ties all Loyalists attitudinally and psychologically to the British Empire. Also, while many individuals fit in more than one category, they have been arbitrarily assigned to one particular division because of what can be assessed as an overriding characteristic or connection.

Taking Governor Wentworth as the ultimate Loyalist, a series of concentric rings of Loyalism span outward describing ever-lessening direct connections with England. The first group beyond the governor was the entire class of governmental officials appointed by Wentworth or sent from England, who depended on royal support and the existing regime to maintain their position, status, and wealth; they had no alternative except to remain loyal. The third ring contained those men whose loyalty was determined by their military connections, whether as an active or an ex-British officer, or as a militia officer who took his oath seriously. Next came the professional men, doctors, lawyers, and clergymen, men whose connections to England were educational and intellectual but nevertheless strong. The commercial class followed, connected to Great Britain on a materialistic level through trade patterns. The sixth and final category included the natural conservatives, a much harder category to assess because the connection with the British cause was not always obvious. This last group would include
what Van Tyne categorized as the "dynastic Tory, the king-worshipper," the "legality Tories," who were convinced that Parliament had the right to tax the colonies, and the "religious Tory," who followed the Biblical command to "fear God and honor the King."\(^3\) It also included all of those men to whom change, any change, was abhorrent, those conservatives of all eras who are uncomfortable with new and different approaches to problems. Beyond the attitudinal, or psychological, Loyalists were the very large class of neutralists, men who tried not to make a decision on the war. The only difference between the neutral class and the psychologically-determined Loyalists was that the latter made a commitment to Great Britain because of some character trait deep within their psyche.

Moving inward from the neutral classification is a constantly increasing degree of connection to the king or to the British Empire. This does not mean that the degree of commitment necessarily increases with the connection; any man from any category could become a strongly committed Loyalist. For example, Benjamin Hart, a ropemaker from Portsmouth, with no visible direct connection to the British cause, could be so committed to the British war effort that he was banished in 1778, whereas Mark H. Wentworth, the governor's father and a member of the provincial Council, with obvious connections to the royal side, could become a patriot and die a wealthy man in Portsmouth in 1785.\(^4\) To understand better the determining motivations of a Loyalist, it is best to take a closer look at each category, acknowledging that a man could have had more than one connection to England, but that one connection would always have been the strongest, and that every Loyalist belonged to the larger, final category of psychological Loyalist.
The Royal Governor

John Wentworth deserves to be in a category by himself because he was New Hampshire's arch-Loyalist, and because he was the leading representative of each category. As royal governor he could be no less than New Hampshire's premier Loyalist, but he was still an American, striving, even in the darkest hours from his cramped quarters in Fort William and Mary, to serve his subjects in their best interests. However, he saw their interests as always within the larger sphere of the British imperial system. As much American as Loyalist, Wentworth was like every other Loyalist who hoped that the problems before 1775 could have been resolved without war or independence. Popular with the people of his colony until he tried to procure workmen for General Gage in Boston, he served them long and well, until his sad departure. Lorenzo Sabine has described Wentworth as "an excellent public man in almost every particular. In business few surpassed him in promptness, intelligence, and efficiency. His talents were of a high order, his judgment was sound, and his views were broad and liberal."

Sabine goes so far in his admiration of New Hampshire's last royal governor as to say that "had Bernard, Hutchinson, Tryon, Franklin, Dunmore, Martin, and the other Loyalist Governors been like him, the Revolution might have been delayed." An interesting incident took place in Paris in 1778 when Wentworth chanced upon United States Minister to France, John Adams, as they were leaving their separate theater boxes. Adams was understandably shocked when Wentworth introduced himself, since although they had been friends and classmates at Harvard, in 1778 they were on opposite sides. Later, the Loyalist and the Revel met in friendship and discussed mutual friends, Franklin's health, and other innocuous subjects. Adams never
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learned what Wentworth was doing in France, but in his memoirs he concluded that "not an indelicate expression to Us or our Country or our Ally escaped him. His whole behavior was that of an accomplished Gentleman." It is quite possible that Wentworth was testing the water to see if he might be able to return to New Hampshire because life in England was very expensive, and his patron, Rockingham, was out of power. But Wentworth was forever barred from returning by the state's act of proscription, and his entire estate was confiscated; in both acts he was enemy number one.

Wentworth's career took a turn for the better after the battle of Yorktown, when Rockingham became Prime Minister again. The ex-governor was appointed Surveyor General of His Majesty's Woods in America, and he returned to Halifax, Nova Scotia. He was an efficient and busy administrator who took his job seriously and was looked upon favorably from London. In 1791 he and his wife, Frances, visited England to see their son, Charles-Mary, and it was very fortunate for them that they did. In that year John Parr, Governor of Nova Scotia, died, and since Wentworth was highly visible around the Court of St. James, he was appointed to fill the vacancy.

As he had in New Hampshire, Governor Wentworth focused on the improvement of roads, education, and military preparedness in his new colony. He ruled Nova Scotia just as he had New Hampshire, with a family dominated government: his brother-in-law Benning became the secretary of the province, member of the Council, and register in chancery, while his son also served as a Councilor. In the diversified colony of English, Scotch, American, French-Canadian, Indian, Black, and German settlers, he ruled for sixteen years. He held no resentment towards New Hampshire, and he even helped Jeremy Belknap to write the
history of the state by forwarding correspondence of the period to him. In return, Belknap aided Wentworth in becoming a baronet in 1795 by tracing his genealogy. In 1800 Wentworth's son visited the United States and met President Adams, who expressed his great respect for John Wentworth by wishing that the governor could visit him.

In 1808 Wentworth was replaced as governor by a military man, Sir George Prevost, because of the Napoleonic threat. The Nova Scotia Assembly voted its appreciation for his services and gave him a £500 pension, to which Parliament added another £600. In 1810 he returned to England, where his wife died three years later. Wentworth then returned to his beloved America, and died in Nova Scotia in 1820 at age eighty-three.

Whether in New Hampshire or Nova Scotia, John Wentworth was an American Loyalist, loyal to the rights of Americans as he saw them. He believed in the king, in Parliament's right to tax, and in the entire British system of government. He also loved America and loved serving its citizens, whether from Portsmouth or Halifax. He had to be a Loyalist, it was part of his job and it was part of his character, but he was always a citizen of America. The career of John Wentworth demonstrates the problem of motivation faced by all Loyalists. For Wentworth it was a clear decision to remain loyal but no less painful for being clear.

Governmental Loyalists

The second category is really just a continuation of the first, since Governor Wentworth can be considered the leading governmental Loyalist. The men of this group held positions of responsibility under the old regime, and in each instance they owed their position, their status, and usually their wealth to the support of the governor and the British government. Many of these men had begun their careers as
lawyers or merchants, but with time their connections to the royal cause grew stronger, and they, in turn, grew more valuable as allies of the British imperial system. Likewise, many men who were merchants or lawyers in 1775 were actually destined eventually to become members of the governmental class, but unfortunately for them the war disrupted their careers. The reward for their continued support was usually an appointment to a position of authority, a minor position at first, such as sheriff or justice of the peace. In time the positions became more important and more lucrative, such as a justice of the Superior Court or collector of customs, until the final reward, an appointment to the Council, was reached for long-standing loyalty and service in the interests of the king. Not surprisingly, twenty-two, or perhaps twenty-three, of them came from Portsmouth, the royal capital.

Of the twenty-eight men who can be definitely identified as governmental Loyalists, fourteen were, or at one time had been, members of the Council. Among the other offices that these men held were Chief Justice of the Superior Court, under-sheriff, sheriff, surveyor of the port of New Hampshire, collector of customs, gauger of the port of the Piscataqua, comptroller of customs, secretary of the Council, and deputy secretary of the province. There were many instances of multiple office holding, but Thomas McDonough was an extreme example. Beginning his service in America as a customs agent in 1767, in 1770 he became the Deputy Collector of Customs in Charleston, South Carolina. In 1771 McDonough resigned to go to New Hampshire as the private secretary to Governor Wentworth, and he soon held six positions at once: deputy auditor of the province, private secretary to the governor, deputy collector of customs, deputy surveyor of the woods, deputy receiver general of quitrents, and deputy secretary of the province. McDonough
was the man who accompanied Governor Wentworth to Fort William and Mary, acted as the governor's messenger to Portsmouth, and fled with him to Boston. His total income per year was £400, and he owned 5,000 acres of land in the colony, all of which he lost because of his loyalty when he was proscribed and had his estate confiscated in 1778. McDonough stayed with the British forces until 1780, when he went to Great Britain. Filing a claim for £2,060 after the war with the British Exchequer, he was allowed only £100 and given a pension of £100 per year. Unlike Wentworth, McDonough did eventually return to America but not as an American; he served as the British Consul for New England, dying in Boston in 1805 at the age of sixty-five.9

McDonough was not alone in being proscribed and in having his property confiscated; these men were, after all, the leading Loyalists of the state. Ten others were proscribed: George Boyd, Thomas Cummings, John Fisher, Samuel Hale, Peter Livius, George Meserve, John Quigley, Robert Traill, Benning Wentworth, and Benjamin Whiting. In addition, Meserve, Quigley, and Benning Wentworth suffered the confiscation of their estates. Thirteen men from this group submitted claims to the British Treasury after the war seeking compensation for their loyalty. The claims varied from Boyd's £34,012 to Hubbard's request for a pension of £45 per year. Leon Hubbard, recorded by the British Exchequer, is apparently Leverett Hubbard, Wentworth's cousin, who was a Tory Associator, and a Superior Court justice before the war. He never took an active part in the war effort and even submitted to the rebel government, retiring to the countryside for the duration. The rebels found Hubbard's character to be so irreproachable that he was allowed to continue as a judge of the Superior Court, at £25 per year. The records of the British Treasury do not indicate that any action
was taken on his claim, but it is doubtful that they would have granted a pension to a man who eventually became a judge under the new government. 10

Exactly half of the men who can be identified as governmental Loyalists fled the country, while the other fourteen stayed in the state. Some of the latter group, like Hubbard, rose to positions of trust and suffered very little at the hands of the rebels. Twelve of the individuals who signed the Tory Association in January 1775 are in this group, including three of the governor's uncles: Daniel Peirce, Daniel Rindge, and Daniel Rogers; two of the governor's cousins: Daniel Warner and Jonathan Warner; and the governor's father. While Mark H. Wentworth stayed in New Hampshire, dying a wealthy man in 1785, he did attempt to help the Loyalist John Fisher family upon the request of his son, the ex-governor. Through Mark Wentworth's efforts, giving parole for himself, for his family, and for Mrs. Fisher and her children, Fisher's family was permitted to join him in New York on a flag of truce in 1777. 11 John Parker, high sheriff for Rockingham County, was also allowed to stay in the state, and, although arrested in 1775, he was adjudged a friend of America and set at full liberty. 12 Councilor Peter Gilman, former Speaker of the Assembly, who in 1769 managed to prevent the delivery of a note of protest from the Assembly to the province's agent in London, was confined to Exeter during the war but died in 1788 a trusted citizen. 13 Daniel Rindge, Councilor before the war, fled to England in 1776, arrived in New York in 1777, and returned to Portsmouth in 1778 where, according to his claim in 1790, he suffered no confiscation, but uncountable insults. The Treasury decided that nothing in the circumstances warranted giving Rindge an allowance since he had apparently mended his bridges with the rebels. 14
The two most notable Loyalists who stayed in New Hampshire were George Jaffrey, treasurer of the province, and old Theodore Atkinson, secretary of the colony. Born in 1697 Atkinson graduated from Harvard in 1718 and was appointed the lieutenant in charge of Fort William and Mary. In 1722 he was elected to the House of Representatives, where he and Benning Wentworth led the opposition to the Massachusetts party. Governor Belcher, of the Bay Colony, attempted to destroy Atkinson, but Atkinson had formed a very strong and familial alliance with Wentworth, marrying Benning's sister in 1732. Together they led the movement for a separate New Hampshire administration, and when Benning was made governor and surveyor general, Atkinson was rewarded for his support by being made deputy-surveyor of the king's woods, clerk of the Council, provincial secretary, and colonel of the militia. Surviving Benning's death, Atkinson went on to become John Wentworth's most trusted councilor and Chief Justice of the Superior Court, in which capacity he vainly tried to disperse the Portsmouth mob on December 14, 1774. In July 1775 he was visited by a committee from the Exeter revolutionary congress, to whom he reluctantly turned over the provincial records. In August 1776 he refused to sign the Association Test but was not listed as one of those disaffected to the common cause. On September 22, 1779 he passed away, still a most respected and honored man.

Jaffrey was equally fortunate with regard to his treatment at the hands of the rebels, although he gave them a great deal more provocation. Born in 1717 he graduated from Harvard in 1736, was one of the purchasers of the Mason Grant, became clerk of the Superior Court in 1744, and soon became the treasurer of the province and a member of the Council in 1766. An uncompromising Loyalist, he was several times roughly treated by the mobs, but he always refused to escape from the state. The
rebels were reluctant to go further because of his fearlessness and his reputation for correctness, punctuality, and integrity. The new government did not know how to force him to hand over the provincial funds and accounts, until his refusal to follow the legislature to Exeter gave them the opportunity to demand that he surrender the accounts. In June 1775 he turned over £1,500 to the Committee of Safety, but refused to turn over the rest, or to lay the accounts before the congress, because he had since moved to North Hampton for safety and could not easily lay his hands on the records. This, of course, was just an excuse; actually he questioned the authority of the Exeter congress to act as the representative body of the province and would only respond to a call by the official General Assembly which no longer existed. In November 1775 Congress removed him to ten miles from Portsmouth with instructions not to leave the town where he settled. At this point General John Sullivan came to his aid, requesting that Jaffrey be allowed his freedom because of his assistance in constructing the military works of the harbor. In December the Congress let him have a fifteen day travel pass, and before the time was up they granted him total liberty, despite the fact that he refused to sign the Association Test and had remarked that "we never ought to have come off" from England. The problem of the state's finances was finally resolved in January 1777 when the new House of Representatives requested the Treasury accounts. Jaffrey complied, regarding the new House as the legal government of the state, and turned over £963. Only in 1785 did the House and Senate call on him for the official weights and measures of the province. Not one to accept defeat easily, Jaffrey demanded and obtained compensation from the state for the damage that had been done to his Newcastle land when a fort was built there in 1775, and for the damages to his house done by the troops
in 1775 - 1776. Although a pain in the neck for the rebels, Jaffrey was, nonetheless, tolerated and even respected. He died in Portsmouth in 1802.  

Only four Tory Associators followed their governor into exile: Thomas McDonough, George Meserve, William Torrey, and Robert Traill. Only three Councilors quit the state never to return, and one of those was Peter Livius, who had given John Wentworth such a challenge in the early 1770s. When Wentworth had been cleared of all charges, Livius was appointed Chief Justice of New Hampshire, only to trade it in for a more lucrative position in Quebec. In 1776 Mrs. Livius desired to join her husband, who was then a favorite of General Carlton, and her petition was presented to the state's Committee of Safety, where the evidence of Major Meigs and Captain Dearborn was admitted in her defense. According to their testimony, Livius had "interested himself with General Carleton to obtain leave for them to revisit their Families, & that in return for his kindness they promised him to use their utmost Endeavors to have his Family sent him."  

The petition was granted on July 23, 1776. In 1785 the state repealed its act preventing the transfer or conveyance of estates and property of all those people who had been apprehended on suspicion of treason, thus enabling Peter Livius' agent in New Hampshire, Woodbury Langdon, to sell his land. Livius died in England a wealthy man in 1795.  

Paul Wentworth, another councilor, never spent time in New Hampshire but served for a time before the war as one of the province's agents. During the war his major occupation was espionage on the British side. The third councilor was George Boyd, who was banished by the Proscription Act of 1778. He later filed a claim for £34,012 which was disallowed because, according to other depositions, Boyd was a man of
bad character, probably a rebel at heart, and a most unworthy Loyalist. In November 1784 the New Hampshire House of Representatives and Senate granted his petition to return to the state in order to settle his affairs. He died two days before arriving in Portsmouth. 20

Besides Paul Wentworth, a distant cousin of the governor, only two other relatives, both brothers-in-law, followed John Wentworth into exile. Benning Wentworth, the governor's secretary, accompanied Wentworth to Fort William and Mary, to Boston, and to Halifax. In 1778 he went to New York with the Volunteers and then to England. He served as a captain-lieutenant in the 89th Regiment, and he filed a claim for £7,307, of which £413 was allowed since his prospects in Nova Scotia were excellent. In fact, Benning did very well in his new home, where he became a councilor, the treasurer of the province, Master of the Rolls, and Registrar in Chancery. 21 John Fisher, who married Anna Wentworth, was the naval officer of Portsmouth and the collector of customs at Salem. He left New Hampshire at the outbreak of hostilities, and through the intercession of John Wentworth with his father, and Mark H. Wentworth's intercession with the Committee of Safety, Fisher's family was eventually allowed to join him in exile. Banishment was not much of a struggle for Fisher because he found employment as Under-Secretary of State to Lord Sackville and the Honorable Welbone Ellis in 1781, and his son, John, junior, became the private secretary to Lord Grenville when he was Secretary of State. 22 Robert Traill also fared extremely well after he was banished from the state. The former comptroller of customs for New Hampshire and relative of William Whipple, a signer of the Declaration of Independence, he eventually became the collector of customs for Bermuda, where his wife joined him in June 1781 after her petition was granted by the House of Representatives. 23
Not everyone escaped New Hampshire as easily as Fisher, Wentworth, and Traill. John Quigley, assistant-deputy surveyor of His Majesty's Woods, had troubles with his neighbors as easily as 1772, when a mob chased him and nearly overcame him. Quigley fled to a nearby house and shut himself into a chamber, but this did not deter the angry mob. They took off the ceiling and beat him with long poles from the attic until he surrendered. In 1775 he was seized and confined in Amherst before he managed to escape and leave the state. William Torrey, gauger of the Port of the Piscataqua, had been a Tory Associator, refused to sign the Association Test and was later kept in close confinement in the Portsmouth jail where he was released on bonds in 1777. He was imprisoned again for three years before he was compelled to leave the state in 1780. For his pains he sought £2,277 in compensation but received only £150 because he was well off in Nova Scotia, where he owned 1,600 acres.

Samuel Hale, the last councilor to leave the state, was forced to quit his law practice in 1775. He was first confined by the rebels and then compelled to leave, stopping at his uncle's house in Connecticut where he briefly renewed his acquaintance with his cousin, Nathan Hale, before journeying to New York. While in New York, according to the Essex Journal of Newburyport, Massachusetts on February 13, 1777 Samuel Hale was instrumental in the capture and conviction of his cousin. In fact, if it had not been for Samuel Hale, Nathan Hale would have escaped from the British, or at very worst have been acquitted of the crime of espionage. In actuality, Samuel Hale had nothing to do with Nathan Hale's capture or execution, but in the temper of the times all matters of rumor were believed. Samuel wrote to his wife that "I fear the resentment of the people against me may have injured you but I hope...
not I am sorry such a prejudice has arisen depend upon is there never was the least truth in that infamous newspaper publication charging me with Ingratitude & c." Lydia replied, "I can with pleasure inform you that I have not been sensible of any disadvantage from it by the grief that arose at seeing your character so cruelly treated Some of your Friends were so kind as to inquire into the matter & found the author to be a Person that had a Family & Personal prejudice against you. There was very few that I could hear of that gave any credit to it only some of the lower sort who Love Scandal your Friends all knew it to be a Malicious lie." Banished from America, Hale was offered a judgeship in South Carolina which he turned down because of his poor health. He applied for the job of Solicitor General of Quebec but was turned down because he could not speak French very well. Not everything went wrong, however, because by 1784 he was an under-secretary in the State Department.

Two of the fourteen exiled governmental Loyalists actively fought on the side of the British. George Sprowle had been a captain in His Majesty's 16th Regiment of Foot for twenty-one years, seventeen of which were spent in America, before his retirement in 1774. In that year he was appointed Surveyor-General of New Hampshire. However, the commotion in America at the time forced him to postpone his retirement, and when actual hostilities broke out he joined the British army in Boston with twenty-four New York recruits. He was appointed an assistant field engineer under General Carleton, and in 1781 he purchased an officership in the 16th Regiment of Foot. He later estimated that his loyalty cost him £2,328.14, of which only £70 was allowed. Yeoman Thomas Cummings, under-sheriff for Hillsborough County, a promising new member of the elite, also saw active armed service during the war. At
the onset of the troubles between Great Britain and her colonies, Cummings fled because he found "both his Person and Property insecure, on Account of his Loyalty to his Sovereign and Attachment to the British Government." In September 1776 he joined the British in New York where he was appointed captain in Major William Stark's New Hampshire Regiment; he served there for six months before joining Governor Wentworth's Volunteers as a private without pay. In 1778 he was proscribed and in the process lost an estimated £288 in real and personal property and £1,125 in estimated salary loss for ten years. In 1786 Cummings died in Paddington, Nova Scotia, and his wife was granted an allowance of £40 per year.

Perhaps the most famous member of the ultimately exiled governmental Loyalist category was George Meserve. His father had been a ship-carpenter by trade and had served as a lieutenant-colonel with the New Hampshire troops at the seige of Louisbourg in 1745, and again in 1758. In 1764 George went to England and received a grant of 5,000 acres as a reward for his father's services; he was also appointed to the newly created office of Distributor of Stamps of New Hampshire. Before landing in Boston he learned of the colonial opposition to the Stamp Act and wisely chose to resign his office. Before his resignation was known in New Hampshire, an angry mob burned him in effigy, and on his arrival in Portsmouth, Meserve was forced to resign again and to swear an oath that he would not try to perform his duty. He returned to England and obtained the position of Comptroller of Customs in Boston, a position he exchanged with Robert Hallowell, the Collector of Customs in Portsmouth, worth £600 a year. When the insurrection began, Meserve tried his best to stop it, and he called upon the British in Boston to send ships. In the summer of 1775 his job took him to Boston,
with Portsmouth's approval, but on his return he found his personal safety endangered. He was confined for a short spell, but in November he escaped, joined the British in Boston, followed them to Halifax and then to New York before finally arriving in England in 1778 where he received an allowance of £100 per year, plus his salary of £200 per year as Customs Collector. He filed a claim for £15,040 compensation, of which he received only £400. He died in 1788.\footnote{33}

All twenty-eight men were Loyalists; their connections with the British government and policies, and their forced reliance on the British to maintain their position made no other choice possible. That is not to say that each man was heavily committed to the cause. Obviously Mark H. Wentworth was not nearly as committed to the cause as Robert Traill, but each man truly believed in the British government. Although not everyone was willing to risk his life like Thomas Cummings or Samuel Hale, they did have to put up with threats and persecution. In some instances age perhaps played an important determining role in establishing the degree of commitment: perhaps if Atkinson had not been seventy-eight when the troubles began, he too might have been a more active Loyalist, but this does not mean that Atkinson was any less of a Loyalist than Cummings. Each of the twenty-eight men responded in the only way that his character would allow. Each, whether one of the fourteen who stayed, or one of the fourteen who left, was truly a Loyalist.

**Military Loyalists**

The third classification, if Governor Wentworth is considered to be in a class by himself, is the one containing those men who were bound to the British government by military considerations. Somewhat similar to governmental Loyalists in that they also hold office by appointment,
the military mind is trained to accept authority without reservation. Whereas a civilian government official may be inclined to question orders and even to bend the rules occasionally because he doubts the wisdom of a particular command as far as it concerns the particular circumstance, the military man is inclined to obey without question the orders of his superior. The civilian official has to contend with popular opinion to remain in office and to be effective; the military officer knows that the force of arms is always ready to come to his aid and put down any dissidence. It was therefore natural that many military men, British officers, ex-British officers, and militia officers closely connected to Wentworth, remained loyal. They were obeying the dictates of their character by remaining loyal to their ultimate superior, the king. Furthermore, as officers they knew the fighting capabilities of the regular army and were sure of victory in the end.

Not all military men were stalwart Loyalists, but there are always exceptions. The most glaring exception in New Hampshire was Michael Wentworth, a retired British colonel and John Wentworth's cousin. These connections should have given Michael a high degree of Loyalism, but further investigation shows that Michael Wentworth had plenty of reason to become a rebel, or at least to accept the new government. In 1770, two months after the death of former governor Benning Wentworth, Michael married the widow Martha Hilton Wentworth. At the time, John Wentworth assumed that he would be the chief beneficiary of Benning's will and was counting on the land he thought he would get as a way of rewarding friends and punishing enemies through grants. Unfortunately for John, Benning left the bulk of his estate to his widow, and suddenly Michael was a very wealthy landowner. Then John took the case to the Council, which ruled that Benning’s grants to
himself were not legal and therefore reverted back to the colony upon
his death. Opposed to this ruling was Peter Livius, a rich landowner
and intimate of Benning, who took the case to the Board of Trade and
nearly had John removed from the governor's chair. Supporting Livius
in his action were, naturally, Michael and Martha Wentworth for personal
reasons, and the Langdon brothers, John and Woodbury, for political
reasons. Within the new opposition party, Michael made further connec-
tions with the eventual rebel leadership of the colony. With
personal motives of revenge against John Wentworth for stealing what he
considered to be his land, Michael Wentworth drifted into the rebel
camp. The switch to rebel did not come easily to Michael, who as an
ex-British colonel, wealthy landowner, and the governor's cousin, had
signed the Tory Association in 1775. Because he was in Europe only on
business at the beginning of the war, the Assembly permitted him to
return on November 27, 1778, without facing any forfeiture of property,
and he lived in peace for the rest of his life.

Including Michael Wentworth as a military Loyalist, (because he
signed the Tory Association and was therefore a Loyalist at that particu-
lar moment), there are twelve men who can be positively identified as
Loyalists because of their military connections. Exactly half of these
men were proscribed in 1778, and three of them saw their estates con-
fiscated. Five claims were filed with the British government after the
war, from the £515 claimed by Colonel William Stark's family to the
£9,640.9 filed by Colonel John Fenton's heirs. Eight men definitely
left the state, never to return, and a ninth one apparently followed
suit. Three men chose to remain in New Hampshire, including Michael
Wentworth. Captain George March of Stratham was examined by the General
Assembly in 1776, confined to his farm, and disarmed. Ipswich's
Charles Barrett was a wealthy, propertied individual and commander of a militia company; he was frequently in trouble with the local population because of his very vocal Loyalism, and the town Committee of Safety eventually confined him to his farm. After the war Barrett gave his oath of allegiance to the new government and became such an ardent democrat that as a delegate to ratify the United States Constitution in New Hampshire, he was opposed on the grounds that the Presidency was too strong and would lead to the establishment of a monarchy.  

On the other hand, Major Breed Batcheller was such an obnoxious and bothersome Loyalist that he was hounded by the local townspeople for years, facing several trials and other proceedings for his Loyalism before he joined General Burgoyne in upstate New York. Edward Goldstone Lutwyche acted more timely and did not wait as long as Major Batcheller to escape persecution. Early in 1776 the former militia commander of Hillsborough County made his way to Boston and safety. He followed the British army to Halifax, was proscribed and had his estate confiscated in 1778. He left New York in 1783, at the end of the war, to settle in Nova Scotia with a government grant of land and £1,000 compensation for his Loyalism.  

The "infamous John Sheperd" had a very rough time during the revolution, making the careers of Batcheller and Lutwyche seem less impressive. Sheperd first joined the rebel army, but in October 1776 he deserted to the British. Shortly after joining the British he was captured, and orders from General Howe to enlist men were found sewn inside his pants. He was imprisoned in Connecticut but managed to escape and make his way to New Hampshire. On March 1, 1777 the Committee of Safety offered a one hundred dollar reward for the capture of the "infamous John Sheperd," deserter and escapee. He was captured
again and jailed in Exeter, only to escape a second time; captured a third time, he was bound to the floor by chains on his hands and feet. In February 1778 he and his son, also a prisoner, petitioned the General Court for the restoration of their natural rights of personal liberty. Not surprisingly, the Court was unmoved, but on August 17, 1778 Sheperd petitioned the court again, citing his "very irksome confinement in various Goals & Dungeons ever since November 1776." Suffering with the fetters and manacles, he begged the Court to allow him the liberty to go behind the British lines. The very next month the General Court allowed him to do just that, and thus they removed one notorious Loyalist from the state.\(^40\) Colonel John Sheperd may have suffered more than most, but in varying degrees all Loyalists suffered.

Captain John Cochran was one of the very first men in New Hampshire to feel the physical displeasure of the crowd, when they stormed his command on December 14, 1774. As commander of Fort William and Mary, he held out until August 1775, when he accompanied Governor Wentworth to Boston. He served with the regulars in Nova Scotia, Rhode Island, and New York for ten shillings a day. He was proscribed, and his estate was confiscated, but his family was allowed to join him on Long Island in May 1778. For his loyalty Captain Cochran lost 1,320 acres in the colony, for which he was reimbursed by the British government £469. He tried to claim £1,290, but his claims for improving the fort, building a lighthouse, and supporting the garrison were disallowed because they were parts of the job. After the war, he settled in St. John, New Brunswick and lived there as a gentleman until his death at the age of fifty-five.\(^41\)

Governor Wentworth was equally well served by John Fenton, a captain in the British army before he retired and settled in New
Hampshire. Fenton quickly became one of the governor's intimate friends and was made a colonel in the militia in Grafton County, a clerk in the Court of Common Pleas, and a judge of probate. Unfortunately, Wentworth tried to use him in his attempt to control the Assembly in 1775, by choosing Fenton to represent Plymouth in the new Assembly. The resultant clash of wills between the governor and the legislature resulted in Wentworth escaping to Fort William and Mary, the Assembly losing power to the Provincial Congress in Exeter, and Fenton being imprisoned in Exeter, although he was treated like a gentleman at the expense of the state. Later the Congress voted that he be turned over to the British on parole, and on September 19, 1775 the Continental Congress ordered General Washington to release him to the British, so that he could go to Great Britain on his promise never to bear arms against the American nation. Proscribed and his estate confiscated, Colonel Fenton lost an estimated £9,640 and died in great distress. The British government granted £40 a year to his wife, and an additional £30 a year to each of his two daughters.42

Colonel William Stark had other reasons besides duty that determined his Loyalism. As an officer in the French and Indian War, he had served at Fort Ticonderoga and Crown Point and then had commanded an independent company of Rangers at Louisbourg and Quebec. Before the revolution he had been a lieutenant-colonel of the militia, and when the war broke out he applied for the command of a regiment in the rebel army - hardly the act of an ardent Loyalist. But the Assembly turned him down, and in spite he joined the royal army in New York, where he was appointed a Major Commandant of a Provincial Corps, raised 250 men to fight, and was promoted to colonel. He tried to persuade his brother, General John Stark, one of the leaders of the attack on Fort William and
Mary and the victor at the Battle of Bennington, to join the British forces, but John was unmoved. Banished from New Hampshire in 1778, he died before the war was over, killed on Long Island after a fall from a horse. Stephen Holland and William's oldest son, John, acted as trustees for his younger children and filed a claim after the war, obtaining £515 in compensation. Acting from personal motives of anger and revenge, William Stark nevertheless served the British faithfully from the moment of his decision.

Like Colonel Stark, one other New Hampshire Loyalist of distinction acted from questionable motives, although this man's career contains more mystery and romance. The man is none other than the famous Major Robert Rogers, probably the best known New Hampshire Loyalist, although known more for his actions during the French and Indian War than as a Loyalist. Born in Methuen, Massachusetts in 1731, he went north in 1739 with his family. In 1746 Rogers volunteered to serve in King George's War, but it was in the next French war that he made his reputation.

On April 24, 1755 a New Hampshire regiment was activated, and Rogers brought fifty men to join with him. He was made a captain of Company One, and his lieutenant was John Stark. From 1755 to 1760 aggressiveness and uncanny woodsmanship typified his scouting expeditions and raids until, in May 1760, he was given the command of an independent company of Rangers, known to history as Rogers' Rangers. At first his fame was disproportionate to his achievements, but by 1758 he was indispensable to the British, as he showed during his raid against the St. Francis Indians, immortalized in Kenneth Roberts' novel, Northwest Passage. After five years of war he emerged with no permanent rank, no retirement pay, and deeply in debt. Catching western fever, he served
briefly but bravely in the Indian war of 1763. His next stop was England, where he tried, unsuccessfully, to obtain money that he thought was owed to him because of his services. While in London he published two books on America that were widely acclaimed and which gave him some money. With royal approval he was made the governor of Michilimackinac in 1766, a position from which he treated the Indians fairly and tried to reorganize the trading network in the west. Unfortunately he ran afoul of Sir William Johnson, Indian agent and self-styled ruler of the frontier. Accused of "treasonous machinations," "horrid villany," and of a "traiterous plot" to plunder his own fort and join the French, Rogers was arrested. Taken to Montreal in chains, he was put on court-martial by another of his personal enemies, General Gage, who disliked and distrusted all provincials, but especially famous ones. Rogers was found not guilty in 1768, but Gage did not release him until June of 1769. By September Rogers was back in London where he was presented to the king. Very soon afterwards he found himself in debtors' prison, where he remained, off and on, until August 1774.

In the spring of 1775 Rogers was finally granted the retirement pay of a major and given funds to return to America so he could tend to his affairs. He arrived in Maryland a broken man, and a man who knew nothing of recent American developments. On September 22, 1775 he was arrested by the Philadelphia Committee of Safety on suspicion, whereupon the Continental Congress indicated that if his half-pay status in the British army was the only charge, then he should be released on his word. After giving his oath of parole, he proceeded to New Hampshire, preoccupied as always with money. In November he stopped at Dartmouth College and spoke with President Wheelock. He told the president that he had come from Philadelphia where he had been offered a commission but
had turned it down because he was still on half-pay in the British army. He also told Wheelock that he had fought two battles for the Dey of Algiers, that he was in the area to take care of some large land grants, and that he was on his way to visit his sister and his wife, the former Elizabeth Browne, daughter of the Reverend Arthur Browne of the Anglican Church in Portsmouth. He also spoke of the high reputation Dartmouth had in England and offered to do what he could to help the institution obtain more land. But the Reverend Mr. Wheelock did not believe the Major entirely, and in a letter to General Washington on December 2, 1775 he told of Rogers' visit and closed by repeating a rumor:

yesterday two soldiers...on their return from Montreal, informed me that our officers were assured by a Frenchman, a Captain of the Artillery, whom they had taken captive, that Major Rogers was second in Command under General Carleton, and that he had lately been in Indian habit through our encampments at St. John's, and had given a plan of them to the General; and suppose that he made his escape with the Indians which were at St. Johns.44

Washington was unsure about Rogers' intentions, and when the Major presented his credentials to the General in Medford, Washington had General John Sullivan examine him. Sullivan found everything in order, and Rogers was allowed to travel to New York on personal business. In the city Rogers boarded the ship in the harbor where Governor Tryon was temporarily established in an attempt to confirm some land grants. While he was there, General Clinton recommended him to the British government and tempted Rogers with a large cash bounty; but Rogers took his parole seriously and refused.

Back in Philadelphia Rogers tried to obtain a rebel commission, and, when unsuccessful, permission to return to London. In his hand was a letter from John Langdon to Josiah Bartlett, New Hampshire's delegate to Congress, in which Langdon said that
I've had frequent Interviews with him and opportunity of Convincing fully on Matters, find him well inclined and ready to Serve this Country in this grand Struggle - and as I wish his Military abilities might be employed for us, shall be much pleased if you'll speake to him on the Subject, and if any thing should turn up for his advantage, and the real Service of the United Colonies, I've no doubt you'll do every thing in your power to Serve him and the Country.45

Congress, however, was suspicious of former British officers, although they had already accepted General Charles Lee, so Rogers returned to New Hampshire to obtain more recommendations. In Portsmouth Rogers' marriage was in trouble, but that was the least of the Major's problems. A recent rumor tied Rogers to a plot in New York led by Governor Tryon, a proposed Loyalist coup d'état. The New Hampshire House voted to seize him just as General Washington ordered his arrest. Captured in New Jersey, Rogers was sent in custody to Philadelphia, and on July 4, 1776 Congress voted to return him to New Hampshire for disposition. Hurt and bitter, with the choice of imprisonment or escape, Rogers chose the latter. On July 19 he boarded the British flagship in New York harbor.

Rogers, however, was still viewed under a cloud of suspicion by the British because of his courtmartial, his relations with General Gage, and the fact that it appeared that the British side had been his second choice. But he was still a valuable man to have because his reputation alone increased rebel apprehension, and on August 6 he was empowered to raise a battalion of Rangers under General Howe's orders. Our of raw recruits Rogers made the Queen's American Rangers the most respected Loyalist force in America. The Rangers played a minor role in the capture of Fort Washington and in the pursuit of the Continental Army into New Jersey, fighting and barely losing an action at Marmaroneck on October 21. By January 1777 Rogers had stepped aside as commander
because the new Inspector-General disapproved of having provincials as officers and frowned on the use of blacks, Indians, and prisoners. Without Rogers, the Queen's Rangers continued to see action under Major James Wemyss and then under Captain John Graves Simcoe. General Clinton still had faith in Rogers' ability to recruit men, and he ordered Rogers to raise two battalions of King's Rangers, a commission he failed miserably at and which eventually saw him in a debtors' prison in Halifax. In the meantime, Elizabeth had filed a petition, in March 1778, to have the bonds of matrimony dissolved by the New Hampshire General Assembly, the only way to get a divorce. According to her petition, they had been married for seventeen years, and "for the greater part of which time he had absented himself & totally neglected to support and maintain her - and had, in the most flagrant manner, in a variety of ways, violated the marriage contract - but especially by Infidelity to her Bed." The petition was granted, adding another ignoble chapter to Rogers' life. Succumbing to heavy drinking, he died in a poor lodging house in London on May 18, 1795.

In his heyday Rogers had been a tactical genius, but the turning point of his career came at Michilimackinac and was not due entirely to his own errors. He was treated very badly by Gage and Johnson, who refused to utilize his talents and his experience. Disobedience, quarrels, inglorious arrest, and courtmartial destroyed the Major Rogers of the French and Indian War. Heavy drinking and debtors' prison further destroyed the man, and his career during the American Revolution was typified by physical and mental deterioration. To both sides he appeared to be a dissembler, while in actuality he did not understand the situation and was concerned only with his own monetary problems. The success of the Queen's Rangers came after he left, and his attempt
to raise the King's Rangers was a shameful failure; however, up until the very end the mention of his name was enough to cause consternation in the rebel camp.

In every instance, from Michael Wentworth's signing of the Tory Association, to Major Rogers joining the British, each man followed his own sense of duty, a sense of duty heightened by his connection to the British military establishment. Not all men responded equally or for exactly the same motives: Wentworth gave up his loyalty for position and wealth in revolutionary New Hampshire; Barrett adjusted to the new government over time and served at the ratification convention for the United States Constitution; Batcheller stayed and suffered much abuse before joining Burgoyne and being wounded; Stark felt personally cheated by the rebels; and in confusion and self-preservation, Rogers joined the British. Regardless of the direct motivation and degree of commitment, the twelve military Loyalists of New Hampshire all had in common a very strong connection with the British Empire primarily through their military careers.

Professional Loyalists

The fourth category of Loyalists, defined by their connections with the British system, is made up of those professional men whose ties were primarily more intellectual than materialistic. The group is made up of those doctors, lawyers, and clergymen who can be definitely identified as Loyalists at some point in time, although in some instances the identification can only be brief. The ultimate example of a temporary Loyalist was Oliver Whipple, who so strongly favored Governor Wentworth that he signed the Tory Association in 1775, but who quickly reformed enough to be one of New Hampshire's delegates to the Continental Congress.
Including Whipple, nineteen men can be described as professional Loyalists: six ministers, five doctors, four lawyers, two printers, one scientist, and one teacher. Of the nineteen, six stayed in the state where they met with varying degrees of success, twelve eventually left the state, either forcibly or voluntarily, while one, the Reverend Arthur Browne, died in 1773. Browne was the first minister of the Anglican Church in Portsmouth, Queen's Chapel, which served as the center of religious life for the Wentworth oligarchy. He was also a missionary for the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, an organization feared by the colonists because of the suspicion that it wanted to remove all other churches from toleration and because of its desire to have an American bishop. Although Browne died before the revolution actually began, his posture before his death clearly indicates his Loyalism; it was his daughter, Elizabeth, who married Major Rogers.48

All of these men were intellectually conditioned to respond favorably to the British cause, although by no means did all professional men become Loyalists. It is just that these men responded quickly to the call, for reasons of their training, position, and ambition. Six were Harvard graduates, a high proportion than for any other group; but it is also interesting to note that five of the six stayed in the United States, while the sixth, Doctor Jesse Rice, was proscribed.

One of the five to remain in the country was Governor Wentworth's personal friend, Doctor Ammi Ruhammah Cutter. Cutter served with Rogers' Rangers for a short time and served as a surgeon on the Crown Point and Louisbourg expeditions during the French and Indian War. After the war, Rogers tried to persuade him to remain in the service, but Cutter preferred civilian life. At Wentworth's suggestion he
opened his practice in Portsmouth, where he soon became the leading
doctor and almost wealthy enough to be considered a member of the
aristocracy. As the governor's friend, Cutter was granted large patents
of land, especially around the Wolfeborough area. He was appointed
Overseer of the Poor, and in 1774 he turned down an appointment to the
Council because he was not comfortable in politics. In 1775 he joined
the Tory Association, and when Wentworth was on board the *Scarborough*,
Cutter was the last visitor from New Hampshire that he saw. In 1776 he
signed the Association Test, thereby declaring himself in favor of the
revolution, but in 1777 he was suspected of hoarding rum. An investiga-
tion by the Committee of Safety disproved the charge, and on April 11,
1777 Cutter was put in charge of the medical department of the Northern
Army. He resigned his post in 1778, had an interest in privateering,
served on the Constitutional Convention of 1781, and served twice as a
special justice on the Superior Court. Politics and the law did not
really appeal to Doctor Cutter and he prided himself, instead, in
activities such as incorporating the first bank in the state, piping
water to the city, and establishing a public bath house. In 1792
Harvard awarded him an honorary M.D., and he died peacefully in 1820.

Of the other Harvard graduates to remain, Joshua Atherton had the
most success, although he also had the most difficulty in the beginning.
He graduated from Harvard in 1762 and became an attorney, and by 1771
he was a justice of the peace and a register of probate. He was quite
adamant in his opposition to all change not sanctioned by the due
process of law, and the revolution was certainly not legal. In Septem-
ber 1774 a committee of five, followed by a crowd of Amherst citizens,
visited his home to press their charges aimed against his efforts to
prevent the town from choosing delegates for the Provincial Congress.
Atherton was taken to a nearby tavern where he was forced to sign a document acknowledging his guilt, to read it before the crowd, and to buy a drink for everyone. It was not long before the ritual of recantation and a round of alcohol for the crowd became a cherished tradition in Amherst. In January 1776 he was dropped as a justice, and later that year he refused to sign the Association Test, even though it meant that he was disarmed of his favorite fowling piece. He was suspected of being involved with the Stephen Holland counterfeiting gang because some bogus currency was found in his house. He was arrested and sent to the Exeter jail. In July 1777 he was adapting to life in prison, as he wrote his wife, Laurea,

> When I parted with you last I had very little expectation of being detained so long from my Family and my Interest; but while I flattered myself that I should get out of the Hands of Scoundrels and dirty Committee Men, and be brought before men of Candour and understanding, where I doubted not I should meet with the Justice I was intitled to; I was greatly disappointed to find myself before a Number of fellow Prisoners, who owed their situation to the same Injustice.... We dance, sing, play cards, tell the Tales of Friendship to each other, and despise our oppressors. In a Word, the Company has turned a Goal into a Palace, and we would not exchange our situation for that of many a Gentleman's out Doors.50

But exchange it he did, as first he was granted lodgings in Exeter and then later confined in the Amherst jail during the day while being allowed to stay home at night. In October 1778 he took the oath of allegiance to the state and was liberated by the Superior Court. Perhaps the news from Saratoga swayed him. He was soon practicing law again, was instrumental in the incorporation of a library and an academy in the town, and led the fight in New Hampshire against the United States Constitution because of its tolerance of slavery. In 1792 he was elected to the House of Representatives of New Hampshire and was quickly promoted to the Senate, and in 1793 he was elected
the state's attorney general. A Hamiltonian Federalist, he supported the Jay Treaty with England. He passed away in 1809.  

Ebenezer Champney, another Harvard lawyer to remain in the state, was so respected and admired in his town of New Ipswich that, despite his professed loyalty to the crown, when the town heard that a mob from Rindge was on its war to tar and feather their judge, they turned the mob away and assured Champney of their future protection. During the war he was stripped of his political offices, but in 1785 he was elected to the Assembly; in 1786 he was again a justice of the peace; in 1789 he was made solicitor for Hillsborough County; and in 1793 he was reappointed judge of probate for Hillsborough. After burying three wives, Champney passed away in 1810 at the age of sixty-six.  

The other two Harvard graduates to stay were ministers: Jonathan Livermore, the first minister of the First Congregational Church in Wilton, and Joseph Stacy Hastings, the second minister of the First Congregational Church in North Hampton. Hastings was a very eccentric minister in a very explosive situation, since North Hampton had very large Loyalist and Baptist minorities. He was a very pious individual and loved by his congregation, which reluctantly accepted his request for dismissal from his pulpit because of his conversion to Sandemanian principles. In 1776 he refused to sign the Association Test, and in 1777 the Committee of Safety voted that he and his family could go to Halifax on board a flag-of-truce vessel. Hastings eventually returned to America and settled in Boston after the war, where he lived in obscurity and poverty as a grocer until his death in 1807 on a trip to Vermont.  

Jonathan Livermore was not nearly as eccentric as his Congregational brother, but he was a much more outspoken Loyalist. On
January 5, 1775, in a sermon upon the raising of a new meeting house, he said "God is now threatening to deprive us of our liberty and privileges, or to reduce us to the dreadful extremity of engaging in a civil war, and entering a war with a foreign adversary. And this is undoubtedly for daring and presumptuous wickedness of the land." In 1776 he did not sign the Association Test, but his remarks were inimical to the liberties of America, and in February 1778 he was dismissed from his station. His dismissal was more for his religious beliefs than for his political differences, and after the war he was employed by the state to preach in frontier parishes.

The Reverend John Morrison, of Peterborough, was the only minister to be proscribed. He had been ordained in 1766, but the connection was severed when he visited South Carolina in 1772. In 1775 he joined the rebel army outside Boston, but immediately after the Battle of Bunker Hill he joined the British, where he obtained a position in the Commissary Department. He gave several sermons in the new Brattle Street Church in Boston, in which he spelled out the fatal consequences of sewing sedition and conspiracy, but he was never formally called again. He died in Charleston, South Carolina in 1782.

The Reverend John Houston of Bedford, was not proscribed, but his treatment at the hands of the mob was far worse than anything that happened to Morrison. Because he was an outspoken supporter of Great Britain, the town voted in 1775 to close his church. Houston insisted on occupying the pulpit until the townspeople boarded up the doors and windows. The townsmen were still not satisfied, mounted him on a rail with a pair of kitchen-tongs attached to his neck, and rode him for about six miles. Unrepentant, Houston refused to sign the Association
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Test the next year. Later he preached temporarily in Vermont before moving to Shelburne, Nova Scotia.⁵⁸

The other Loyalist minister was the Reverend Ranna Cosset of Claremont. He was suspected of helping Loyalists hide in the famous "Tory Hole" near Claremont and of helping them on their way to Canada, as well as of supplying the British with information. After the war, on March 4, 1784, the Claremont Episcopalians petitioned the government of Upper Canada for a grant of land because they could not tolerate or be tolerated in New Hampshire. Cosset stayed in Claremont until 1785, when he went to Cape Breton Island as a missionary, dying there in 1815.⁵⁹

Four of the five physicians also left New Hampshire for good; in fact, all four were banished by the state's Proscription Act for "abetting the Cause of Tyranny and manifesting an inemical disposition to said States and a design to aid the Enemies thereof in their wicked purposes."⁶⁰ Keene's Doctor Josiah Pomeroy fled from the rebels early in the war, first to Connecticut and then to New York, where his wife and three children joined him. In 1782 he went to London to recover from a nervous fever, and in May 1783, with a pension of £80 per annum, he and his family settled in Annapolis, Nova Scotia.⁶¹ Doctor Jesse Rice, of Rindge, a Harvard graduate, was proscribed in 1778 and followed Pomeroy to Nova Scotia.⁶² Charlestown's physician, Phineas Stevens, was also proscribed.⁶³ However, it was Stephen Little, physician, surgeon, and apothecary from Portsmouth, who stands out as the Loyalist physician who made the biggest contribution to the British cause.

Doctor Little made his initial stand on the revolution known in January 1775 when he signed the Tory Association, and he reconfirmed his stance in 1776 when he refused to sign the Association Test.
Believing strongly in the British cause, he entered New York as a volunteer in Governor Wentworth's Volunteers and served until February 1778 when he was captured. In 1778 he was sent to England, and once there he requested that he be allowed to return to his wife and family in New York, and to look after his financial affairs. He had earlier invested in a privateer, which had been successful at first but had later failed to provide for his needs. The British government decided to employ him on a man-of-war, with a £60 allowance. For his loyalty, at the end of the war the British Department of the Exchequer allowed him £200 for his lost income, granted him £250 of his total £1,660 claim, and gave him a pension of £100.64

Like Little, Keene's Elijah Williams, an attorney, went to New York in June 1777, where he joined Governor Wentworth's corps, and then served in the King's American Dragoons with no commission. At the end of the war Sir Guy Carleton appointed him a lieutenant in the Maryland Loyalists at half pay to compensate for his proscription from New Hampshire, and for the confiscation of his estate. As further compensation, the British government allowed him £147 on his claim, plus £110 for his loss of income during the war, and a £55 pension.65

Printer Robert Luist Fowle belongs in the class of professional Loyalists because the nature of his business tended to tie him to the interests of the authorities, who were generally his biggest customers. Fowle was the nephew of Daniel Fowle of Portsmouth and became his partner in the publication of The New Hampshire Gazette, a connection terminated in 1774 when Robert moved his business to Exeter. He was chosen to print some of the state's new paper money, and, since the money was counterfeited almost immediately, he was naturally suspected, and his flight to New York seemed to confirm his guilt. After the war, and
after the lifting of the provisions of the Proscription Act, Fowle returned to New Hampshire, married his brother's widow, and lived in the state until his death.\footnote{66}

Another man suspected of counterfeiting was teacher Benjamin Snow of Plymouth. On February 26, 1777 the state Committee of Safety received a letter from Francis Worcester, stating that

> Upon reading and considering a number of intercepted Letters signed by Benjamin Snow late an Ensign in the Continental Army, which are directed to several persons in Amherst supposed to be Enimical to their country, & as reported some of them in Jale: Therefore agreed by said Committee that it appears by said Letters, that said Snow much favors the cause of the Enemies to our country and is a dangerous person to the Community, and therefore ought to be taken care of.\footnote{67}

The letters that Worcester mentioned were apparently directed to Colonel Stephen Holland and his gang of counterfeiters. Snow managed to escape and eventually settled in Annapolis, Nova Scotia, where he worked as a teacher for £10 a week.\footnote{68}

The most famous member of this category, who tried his best to help the British from within New Hampshire, fought with the Loyalist troops, was proscribed, and achieved fame throughout the world as a scientist, was Benjamin Thompson, Count Rumford. Thompson was born in Woburn, Massachusetts on March 26, 1753. He received only the usual grammar school education, and by the age of thirteen he was apprenticed to a tradesman. He showed very little aptitude for business, but his diary shows a great deal of interest in scientific experiments in the field of physics; for example, he celebrated the repeal of the Stamp Act with a display of homemade fireworks and badly burned himself. Later, as an apprentice to Doctor Hay, of Woburn, he continued his experiments, trying to duplicate Benjamin Franklin's kite experiment and nearly electrocuting himself, trying to manufacture a perpetual motion machine,
and attempting to build an electric generator. He also managed to attend several lectures at Harvard, although he was never enrolled as a student. Soon his boyhood days were over, and he took employment as a teacher for six weeks in Bradford, on the Merrimack River.

While in Bradford, the Reverend Timothy Walker invited him to teach in Concord. Always looking for means of personal advancement, Thompson took the job. Within months he married Sarah Walker Rolfe, eleven years his senior, whose husband had been a friend of John Wentworth. In later years Thompson always maintained that Sarah had married him, rather than he her; but nevertheless, Thompson immediately became a very wealthy man. He impressed Governor Wentworth by proposing a scientific expedition and White Mountains survey, and by experimenting on his farm, much as Wentworth was doing on his estate in Wolfeborough. The governor recognized a promising young man when he saw one, and he knew that he could tie Thompson to the administration. Wentworth needed loyal men at the time, and Thompson had everything to gain by being useful. Within six months the young squire was made a major in the provincial militia, by-passing other, more deserving men, and creating a potent source of opposition.

As the British-American tension increased, Thompson turned informer in return for his social position. As a large landowner and employer, he hired British deserters, worked them hard to convince them to return to the army, and used a disguised British soldier to keep tabs on them. In December 1774 he was summoned before the local Committee of Safety but was released for want of proof. One week before Christmas he learned that the people were about to march on his house to tar and feather him and ride him on a rail through the town. Thompson was not one to submit to such a humiliating experience, so he fled, alone, to
Boston. Writing to his father-in-law on December 14, he explained that "when I learnt from Persons of undoubted veracity, & those whose friendship I could not suspect, that my situation was reduced to the dreadful extremity; I thought it absolutely necessary to abscond for a while, & seek a friendly Asylum in some distant part." Blaming "the determined Villany of my inveterate enemies," and fearing that "another trial at the bar of the Populace would doubtless have been attended with unhappy consequences," Thompson found "My Persecution was determined on. - Any my flight unavoidable." 70

Writing again to the Reverend Mr. Walker on August 14, 1775, he further explained his motives, declaring that upon the "advice of many whom I really thought my friends: & among the rest you will give me leave to name your Son as the chief - who not only gave it as his opinion that it was for the best, - but also furnished me with a Horse to make my escape, & money to the amount of 20 Dollars to bear my expenses; & promised to take care of my affairs in my absence."

Further, that "when I was brought to trial, my friends...advised me to plead not guilty. - I did so; but found instead of quieting the disturbances, it only serv'd to heighten the clamours against me: 'till at length I found it absolutely necessary that something should be done for my personal security." Turning the argument of liberty against the rebels, Thompson stated that "these men act, who under pretence of 'defending their Liberties & priviledges, & asserting the rights of mankind,' are depriving individuals of every idea of freedom; & are excersicing a Tyranny which an Eastern Despot would blush to be Guilty of." Because "mine enemies are indefatigable in their endeavours to distress me...I am determined to seek for...Peace & Protection in foreign lands, & among Strangers, which is deny'd me in my native
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Country." He closed his letter with his "constant and devout wish" that "the happy time may soon come when I may return to my family in peace & Safety - and when every individual in America may set down under his own Vine, & under his own Fig-tree and have none to make him afraid." 71

Thompson reported to General Gage in Boston and supplied the eager general with information before going to Woburn. He offered to serve as a major under George Washington but was turned down when the news of New Hampshire's suspicions of his conduct arrived. To all outward appearances, Thompson then lived the life of an idle gentleman, although in reality he acted as a British spy after the outbreak of hostilities, by sending notes to Boston with invisible ink. 72 An extremely clever and well-informed spy, he was never caught, but he was called before the Massachusetts' Committee of Safety because of suspicion, due to his close connections with Governor Wentworth. With no proof of any wrongdoing, Thompson was released but kept under constant surveillance. Early in 1775 Thompson's wife and daughter joined him in Woburn, but in October he left them behind, never to see his wife again, as he went behind the British lines in Boston.

In March 1776 Thompson was sent to London with the official news of the British evacuation of Boston. Once in London, he exaggerated his own importance and ingratiated himself to Lord George Germain, the Secretary of State for the Colonies. Recognizing a man he could use and trust, Germain made him his private secretary, and in 1779 the Secretary of the Province of Georgia, a purely nominal title, since Georgia had declared its independence. In 1780 Thompson was promoted to a position of power, as he was appointed Under-Secretary of State for the Northern Department and was made responsible for recruiting, equipping, and transporting the British forces. As Under-Secretary, he also became
the primary London contact between the American Loyalists and the British government. A very busy man, he still found time to experiment with gunpowder and naval signalling, and to speculate by selling clothes to the army. The floor dropped out when the French spy, LaMotte, was arrested with secret British naval plans, and suspicion of passing the plans to LaMotte was focused on the young Under-Secretary. Thompson immediately resigned and went to America to take active command of his Loyalist regiment. 73

When Thompson had been in Woburn, he had begun to recruit and organize a company of Loyalists. Later, in England, the plans for the King's American Dragoons crystallized as he persuaded Major David Murray to go to New York while he stayed in London and reaped the rewards of his commission. According to the rules of the day, in raising a regiment an individual had to recruit 366 men by offering them bounties; the officers received no pay until the regiment was half full, and then they received half pay until the regiment was complete. It was to the Dragoons that Lieutenant-Colonel Thompson came in early 1782, stopping first in Charleston, South Carolina, where he led several raids and foraging expeditions before he went on to New York. The plight of occupied towns is never enviable, but according to the inhabitants of Huntington, Long Island, Colonel Thompson was the devil incarnate. He razed the church to the ground and used the timber to build fortifications. He ordered all of the apple trees to be cut down for firewood, even though there were many other types of trees available. He also used the church cemetery's gravestones to build baking ovens and sold the bread to the citizens, with the reversed epitaphs baked into the crust. 74
Carleton disbanded the Loyalist regiments on August 17, 1783, but
Thompson was already in England, where he tried to get his regiment
assigned to the East Indies, or the Dragoons transferred to the regular
army. All that he accomplished was to get a promotion to full colonel
before retiring on half pay. But London was inhospitable to his aims
and aspirations; there were too many other Loyalists looking for employ­
ment, so Thompson set his sights on the Continent. In the coming years
he ingratiated himself with the Elector of Bavaria, Karl Theodor, was
knighted by George III, giving him a higher status in Germany, and was
finally made a count of the Holy Roman Empire, taking the title of
Count Rumford, after the original name for Concord. Scientifically, he
was a pioneer in the field of thermodynamics and the relationship of
heat to energy, as he studied thermal conductivity and demonstrated that
heat can be transmitted without the aid of material substances. He
became a social reformer, developed exhibits for the British Royal
Institution, developed Munich's Academy of Arts and Sciences, and was
an active member of the French Academy of Sciences. He was also a very
successful military leader for the Bavarians, was a personal friend of
Napoleon, and married the widow of the French chemist, LaVoisier. He
tried to return to the United States and proposed the creation of a
military academy at West Point. President Adams was sympathetic, and
for a while Thompson was under consideration for the job of first
superintendent of West Point, until his earlier career was remembered.
He never saw America after 1783, and he died in France in August 1814,
leaving the bulk of his estate to Harvard. 75

A truly great scientist, second in his day only to Benjamin
Franklin, Count Rumford is comparatively unknown, except to scientists.
He was undeniably a brilliant mathematician, a painstaking investigator,
a pioneer in the field of light and heat, and an excellent organizer; but he was utterly devoid of humor, integrity, and humanity, and he possessed absolutely no personal warmth. He was always the courtier, always seeking self-aggrandizement, but he had no interest in human problems; his attitude towards people was only to use them. His attributes as a soldier clearly demonstrate his basic character. He performed his duties with efficiency, zeal, and cold detachment; killing fellow Americans never troubled him at all. Later, his social reforms were only attempts to utilize human labor more efficiently. His connections with the British Empire were of self-interest and ambition. All he ever wanted was his own personal advancement, and when England was used up, he had no qualms about setting his course in a different direction, just as he had done with America earlier.

Count Rumford and Major Rogers were not dissimilar. To each of them, the British cause was the one that best served his own personal interests, but in the final analysis that is what determined everyone's affiliation. The difference between Thompson and Rogers was in how they were connected with Great Britain originally: Rogers was tied to England through his military career and a sense of duty; Thompson was involved in a more intellectual exercise in ambition, hitching his horse to the wagon that could supply him with what he desired. Thompson may not be as typical of professional Loyalists as Stephen Little or Josiah Pomeroy were, but they were all cut from the same fabric of intellectual identification with the British Empire.

Commercial Loyalists

Thirty-six men were connected to Britain because of commercial interests. These merchants, traders, mariners, and innkeepers were all, in one way or another, dependent on Great Britain for their continued
success, station, and wealth. Not surprisingly, twenty-eight of them came from Portsmouth, while another four were from the seacoast region. Only Josiah Butler, a tavern keeper in Hinsdale, Zaccheus Cutler, an Amherst merchant, Jonathan Dix, a trader from Pembroke, and Soloman Willard, a gentleman merchant from Winchester, were from the interior of the state. Of the latter four, three were so obnoxious in their Loyalism that they were proscribed. Josiah Butler, however, seems not to have alienated the citizens by refusing to sign the Association Test as he held several town positions, including the office of highway surveyor, almost continually from 1778 to 1789.\textsuperscript{76}

It is also not surprising that nineteen of the men belonged to the Tory Association, although at least one, Thomas Achincloss, was forced to recant in a published letter and to declare his sorrow that his conduct had made the friends of America uneasy.\textsuperscript{77} Portsmouth trader Philip Bayley also had to publish a recantation that was forced from him through extortion. While it appears that Achincloss may have seriously repented, as there is nothing later to identify him as a Loyalist, Bayley's recantation was not meant as anything more than a way to escape the wrath of the crowd because, by 1782, he was a captain-lieutenant in the Royal Fencible Americans.\textsuperscript{78} Another commercial Loyalist to fight for the British was one of the McMasters brothers, Patrick. After narrowly escaping being tarred and feathered in Boston, he joined the British army in 1775.\textsuperscript{79} Most merchants were not the type to fight; they either cut their losses and removed themselves or adopted a revolutionary appearance. For some, like John Peirce, the change to rebel was successful, as he served as loan officer for New Hampshire under President Adams, even though during the war he was confined to the countryside.\textsuperscript{80}
One of the first men actually to suffer the abuse of a revolutionary mob was merchant and mast agent Edward Parry, the man who unwisely acted as the East India Company's agent in Portsmouth. For his attempt to sell the hated tea, not once but twice, Parry's place of business and his house were stoned, he was forced to apologize for his actions before the town, and he had to trans-ship the cargoes of tea to Halifax. In May 1775 he was in irons in prison, and in August the Massachusetts' General Court ordered him to be sent to Sturbridge. Still a prisoner in June 1776, his petition to receive parole to go to Portsmouth to settle his affairs was granted, and in 1778 he was banished from the state. 81

Parry was not the only merchant to feel the anger of the rebels before the actual outbreak of hostilities. Wealthy James McMasters suffered even before Parry, although he was not physically assaulted. McMasters came from Scotland in 1765 and settled in Boston, accompanied by his two brothers, John and Patrick. They opened their business in Boston, but since they opposed the colonial non-importation agreement of 1768, they moved to the more congenial atmosphere of Portsmouth and opened a warehouse. After the Boston Massacre, the rebel leaders of Massachusetts demanded that Portsmouth adhere to the non-importation association and refuse to accept any ex-British merchants, or face the prospect of being embargoed. On April 11 a town meeting declared that they would no longer have anything to do with outsiders, and that from thenceforth they would uphold the association. After the repeal of the Townshend Acts in 1770, the American boycott collapsed, and business went on as usual until the final confrontation. The McMasters left Boston with the British in 1776 and opened business in Halifax, making a fortune by supplying the army. In their claim after the war, James,
John, and Patrick estimated that the war kept them from collecting their debts, nearly £9,000 in Boston, and £16,000 in Portsmouth. Proscribed and confiscated, the brothers were allowed £405 in compensation, but for some reason John's name was crossed off the claim.82

While the McMasters fared relatively well after their escape, their clerk in the Dover store did not do as well. On July 9, 1776 the key to Peter Mitchell's store was taken from him by the Committee of Safety, and the goods were confiscated. James McMasters petitioned the Assembly to have his property restored, but the petition was denied because of his inimical disposition to the revolutionary cause, while Peter Mitchell was confined to within twelve miles of Dover. On September 19, 1776 James McMasters petitioned the General Court to apprehend Mitchell and confine him to the Exeter jail on the charge of claiming that McMasters' goods were his own. On October 29 Mitchell asked for an enlargement of his confinement, saying that his previous unpatriotic actions were due to falling in with a bad crowd, particularly his employer, and that since his confinement he had been the model of good behavior.83

In December 1776 Mitchell gave evidence before the General Court of McMasters' evil nature. According to Mitchell, "James McMaster is a Deep Rooted Enemy to America," who has "shown himself a most inveterate Enemy to this Country" through his "Spiteful, abusive, Contemptible language." McMasters had "hoped to see one half of all Americans hanged to be an example to the other half," he had damned "the Continental Congress for a Sett of Damned Mercenary Villians," had "hoped to God the Kings Troops would soon Conquer this Country," had called "the Comitee a Sett of Damnd Villians," and had referred to the American army as "a Sett of poor Lousy good for nothing Devils."84 For such obvious reasons,
McMasters' goods were confiscated and sold by the Assembly's agent, Nathaniel Cooper, who paid the proceeds of the sale into the treasury after deducting a five percent commission. 85

John Stavers was another man who suffered for his adherence to the crown. Since 1756 he had operated a hotel called the "Earl of Halifax" in Portsmouth, and in 1766 a new "Earl of Halifax" was completed on Atkinson Street, which also served as St. John's Masonic lodge. Stavers was a well known friend of England, and his hotel and tavern was a favorite resort of government officials. By 1775 the people were growing suspicious of Stavers' loyalty and the secret, back-room transactions being conducted in his establishment. The action began when Captain Hopley Yeaton walked by and declared that if anyone dared to look out, all of the windows would be smashed; no one looked out and the incident passed. A few days later, however, Stavers heard an axe cutting down his sign and he sent his slave out to stop the destruction. The slave gave the axe-wielder, Mark Noble, a hit on the head with an axe that left Nobel insane for the rest of his life. The crowd forced the slave to retreat, the sign was pulled down, and a general assault was launched on the inn. Meanwhile, Stavers took a supply of gold and ran, finally finding refuge at brewer William Pottle's house in Stratham. John Langdon managed to calm the crowd, prevented the destruction of the hotel, and persuaded Stavers to return. Once back in Portsmouth, Stavers was seized by the Committee of Safety and taken to the Exeter jail. Stavers willingly took an oath of allegiance to the provincial government, although he refused to bear arms on grounds of conscience, and before long he had removed all suspicion from himself and enjoyed the support and confidence of the people. Eventually,
Stavers reopened his tavern, but with a name that was more acceptable to the rebels, the "William Pitt Tavern."\footnote{86}

Most loyal merchants suffered at some time for their loyalty, but they usually found success again later, either in exile in Canada, like Gillam Butler, Hugh Henderson, John Smith, and Soloman Willard, or in New Hampshire, like John Peirce and Governor Wentworth's cousin, Joshua Wentworth. The case of Asa Porter is somewhat typical of the entire category. Porter had been born in Haverhill, Massachusetts in 1742, and settled in Newburyport as a merchant, where he married in 1764. He followed his wife's family to the Coos region in 1770, and in 1772 he established a ferry across the Connecticut River. In 1773 Wentworth appointed him a justice of the Inferior Court of Grafton County, and because of his closeness to the governor Porter received thousands of acres of land in many new towns that Wentworth granted. Because of his well advertised Loyalist leanings, he was not very popular; one story has it that before going on a trip to Boston he had to paint over the royal coat of arms on the back of his carriage in order not to attract any missiles, and once he returned home, his wife immediately cleaned the coat of arms off. Reflecting their dislike of Porter, the populace never elected him to any town office, except that of town meeting moderator.

Porter was appointed a lieutenant-colonel in the militia, but on January 28, 1775 the towns of Haverhill, and Newbury, Vermont boycotted Porter and his superior, Colonel John Hurd, for discrimination against a Congregational minister and for extravagence in building a new county courthouse. The Provincial Congress distinguished between Hurd and Porter, and while Porter was removed from the bench, Hurd was promoted. The threat of a British or Indian invasion in 1776 drew Porter further
into the Loyalist fold, and he preached non-resistance and fought against the building of a fort. In July and August he advocated sending a delegation of citizens under a flag of truce to St. John to invite General Burgoyne to come and protect them, the so-called "Dartmouth Plot." Chairman of the Haverhill Committee of Safety, John Hurd, arrested Porter and brought him to trial. Porter's friends blocked his transfer to Exeter for trial for two weeks while he collected evidence in his defense, affidavits impugning the reliability of the prosecution's star witness, and explanations of his own alleged remarks. The trial opened on August 19, 1776, and the central line of Porter's defense was his assertion that the New Hampshire legislature did not have the jurisdiction to punish him for his alleged offenses, and that his appeal to Burgoyne had been made inadvertently, in a moment of crisis. All of his arguments were fruitless, but very vexing to the General Court, and very time consuming. Because of his many wealthy and powerful friends, Porter was given repeated paroles, which he repeatedly violated until finally his persecution was ended, and he was allowed total liberty.

After the war, on Wentworth's recommendation, Porter was given 200 acres in Digby, Nova Scotia, for his political sufferings, and the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel appointed him a trustee of their lands, thereby giving him a right in every new township it turned over to the Protestant Episcopal Church in New Hampshire. Porter stayed in his home state, and by 1790 he had nineteen people in his household, including three slaves. He owned 100,000 acres of land, including all of Woodstock, Vermont. He also owned a bridge across the Connecticut River, and he was a director of the Coos Bank. Porter
died a very wealthy man in 1818, none the worse off for his Loyalism during the war.

In conclusion, of the twenty-four merchants, four traders, three inn-keepers, three mariners or shipowners, and two shopkeepers, eighteen were proscribed and never returned to America. Of all of the classifications, the commercial Loyalists fared the best. The men who fled maintained their English contacts and continued to make money in a new location, while those who remained changed their suppliers and sold to the same customers, or else professed revolutionary zeal while waiting for the war to end so they could reopen their old trade patterns with Great Britain. This group also contained the fewest members who actively took up arms against the revolution, much fewer than the following group of psychological Loyalists; but, after all, the commercial Loyalists were more interested in making money than in causes.

**Psychological Loyalists**

All Loyalists, in the final analysis, were psychologically determined, but in all of the previous cases the connections to the British crown and government went much farther, as office, status, duty, or wealth provided a concrete connection with the empire. For the remainder of the New Hampshire Loyalists no such definite connection existed, or can be seen to have existed. Their connection to the British cause was purely psychological, since some part of their character moved them into the Loyalist camp. The men of this category are those men for whom no obvious connection existed with the British government. They are the men that Leonard Labaree described, in *Conservatism in Early American History*, as those who have a natural predisposition to certain conservative attitudes. For a variety of reasons that can only be surmised, these men detested change and were inclined to become
Loyalists because revolution meant change. Not all conservatives became outright Loyalists because many of them just kept silent, waiting for the outcome of the war, unwilling to challenge the majority. Peer group pressure also would have come into play in this category, as many natural conservatives found themselves surrounded by rebels and in turn supported the revolution, whereas some conservatives, associated socially or commercially with the Wentworth oligarchy, naturally assumed Loyalist roles. Peer group pressure is an amorphous thing to determine because what is meant by peer - family, friends, business associates, or other connection. Some men are naturally cantankerous and go against peer pressure just for spite, and flourish in the midst of hostile environments, such as Breed Batcheller.

In describing the Loyalist party before the arrival of the British troops, Claude Halstead Van Tyne described what he saw as "the elements of the active Tory party." After mentioning the office-holding Tories, their friends, and the Anglican clergy, he came to the conclusion that "with these men drifted the conservative people of all classes, who glided easily into the old channels." Going further, Van Tyne listed other types who were bound to Great Britain through character traits: the "king-worshipper," who listened to metaphysical considerations rather than to concrete facts; the "legality Tories," who were convinced that Parliament could tax the colonies; the "religious Tories," who followed the Biblical injunction to honor the king; and the "factionsal Tories," who were determined by political and family bonds. Underlying the reaction of the conservatives was a steadfast belief in the old faith and contentment with the existing order of things. These basically conservative men, who remained loyal even after the outbreak of hostilities, became what can be broadly described as psychological...
Loyalists, while those conservatives who did not continue to actively support the crown fell into the much larger class of neutralists.

The vast majority of those who refused to sign the Association Test were psychological Loyalists in 1776, but by 1778 only nineteen men from this class were believed to be so inimical to the American cause that they were proscribed, and only five had their estates confiscated. Six men from the Tory Association were not bound to Great Britain through office or commerce but joined it because of their unshakeable belief in the cause. After the war seventeen of these men filed claims against the British Exchequer, from Stephen Holland's claim for £7,609, to weaver Levi Warner's claim for £70. Warner had joined General Burgoyne's forces in 1777 after he had been released on a £500 bond. On June 4, 1778 he was in the Exeter jail, where he petitioned the General Court to let him go home to his sick wife. He promised that his future behavior would convince his countrymen of his attachment to the revolutionary cause. For his loyalty, Warner forfeited his house, furniture, weaving tools, a cow, a heifer, and three swine, for which the British government gave him £25 of his £70 claim. Holland was the leader of a counterfeiting gang in the state, and he also served as a captain in the Prince of Wales Volunteers before filing his claim, which was reduced by the Treasury to £2,558. These men held what Loyalist Samuel Mallows described as "a firm attachment to the British Constitution." Why else would a man like Mallows give up a comfortable and secure life in Portsmouth to serve as a waggoner to General Howe's baggage in the Quarter Master General's Department, and then fight in the army, only to lose his home and a secure future? Some deeply held belief in the empire or the king caused William Pottle to be accused of manifold sins against the American cause in 1774 and to suffer being
shouted at, mobbed, chased, and dragged from his horse, and then to be declared an enemy to the liberties of the state by the Assembly. Some deep conviction kept George Glen from signing the Association Test and let him hire a substitute so that he would not have to serve in the army. Glen finally fled to Rhode Island in 1778, leaving behind an estate that he valued at £1,558.15. Bartholomew Stavers, the first regular stage driver north of Boston and a thirty-five year inhabitant of America, held meetings of the friends of the royal government in his house, even though it meant his house was plundered in 1774. This stout Loyalist, whose opinion it was that the rebels would all swing, was forced to leave his adopted country and, with his pregnant wife, dare a very dangerous crossing to England, before being proscribed forever in 1778.

The individual futures of the psychological Loyalists varied as much as for any other category. Not all suffered the way Stavers or Pottle did; Jacob Green and Israel Morey, the representatives elected to the Assembly in 1775 from Lyme and Orford, respectively, and who were colleagues of John Fenton in the debacle that sent Fenton to jail and Governor Wentworth to Fort William and Mary, were only expelled from the Assembly and left alone. Thomas Butler of Hinsdale did not suffer at all for he was elected town constable, selectman, and surveyor of highways in 1776; in 1781 he took the Freeman's Oath; and by 1788 he was a selectman again. By 1797 Butler was the second richest man in the town, according to the tax records. William Hart, Nathaniel Rogers, and Isaac Rindge were all confined to specific areas outside Portsmouth in 1775, then temporarily allowed to go about their businesses, and in February 1777, after spending several months in jail, Hart and Rindge were allowed to post bond of £500 with two sureties and were given their
freedom. Rogers was kept confined, but in July 1777 he was given permission to visit his sick wife at home. 100 John Clark, of Orford, also had his problems after the Committee of Safety of New Milford, Connecticut, proclaimed him to be an enemy of American liberties. He was first limited to his farm for six months, except for Sunday worship, then jailed, and finally liberated in June 1777 on £500 bond. 101

Hugh Tallant was also confined to his farm in 1776, but he later insulted the Pelham Committee of Safety and asked for and got a new trial, only to have his confinement reconfirmed. But Tallant was not one to willingly accept the dictates of a mob, and the one night that he was entrusted to the care of Samuel Little, he managed to escape, causing Little no little trouble. 102 Reuben Kidder, of New Ipswich, was a very prominent person and helped to promote the growth and prosperity of the province as a land agent for Governor Wentworth. During the war he refused to acknowledge the rebel government but remained inactive, paid his taxes, and was allowed to remain in the state until his death in 1793 without any molestation. 103 James Sheafe had refused to sign the Association Test in 1776, but that is the only sign that he ever gave of his Loyalist tendencies. Apparently this small display of Loyalism did not deter the state government from choosing him as a United States Senator in 1802, but perhaps enough of the population remembered in 1816 to defeat him when he ran for governor. 104

Persecuted or respected, exiled or overlooked, these men all followed their instincts to preserve the status quo. Interestingly, it is from this group of psychological Loyalists, the group with the least visible connection to Great Britain, that most of the fighters came. Of course, this group is larger than the others and in effect contains all of New Hampshire’s Loyalists; but the classification does include men
like Simeon Baxter, John Davidson, Johathan Blanchard, James Fulton, Stephen Holland, John Stinson, junior and senior, and Leonard Whiting, who do not fit exactly in any other category. These men put their lives on the line as counterfeiters, spies, and soldiers. All of them were motivated by an innate conservatism and loyalty to Great Britain. They believed in the king, in the empire, and in Parliament; they were satisfied with the way things were and were so resistant to the winds of change that they were willing to put their lives on the line to keep America in the British Empire. These men can not be blamed, only admired for standing up and being counted as friends of the king.

Conclusion

All these men were originally supporters of Great Britain. At the end of the French and Indian War, England was the greatest power on earth, and every American was proud to belong to the British Empire. But from 1763 to 1774 the conception of imperial administration changed, and British and American interpretations began to diverge until an unbreachable chasm was formed. Most men were unaware of the reasons for the change and only learned of it through revolutionary propaganda, while the supporters of Great Britain remained silent, afraid to tempt the rising tide of rebellion and trusting the system to find a solution.

In 1763 everyone was pro-British, but by 1774 most people were neutralists, not really understanding the situation and hoping that all of the problems could be solved rationally and peacefully. With the outbreak of hostilities on December 14, 1774 men found themselves taking sides. Many neutralists tried to remain neutral, but many immediately sided with the rebels for various political and personal motives. Many others sided with the British and thus became Loyalists, at least in the beginning when it seemed obvious that the British would win.
Whether governor of the province or a frontier weaver, men responded the only way their natures allowed them. All Loyalists were, first and last, psychological Loyalists, bound to the British cause through conservatism and other undiscernable character traits. The connections between the individual and the movement did not stop with psychological consideration. Many men found themselves bound to Great Britain commercially and were dependent on British trade for their wealth; many were bound intellectually and were dependent on England for intellectual leadership and career advancement; many others were bound to Great Britain through military training and a professional assessment of America's chances in a war against the regular army; and many were tied to the British imperial administration officially and were therefore dependent on the system for position, advancement, status, and wealth. In every way the greatest New Hampshire Loyalist of them all, Governor John Wentworth, was the most typical of each category.
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...the good people of these parts are greatly Alarmed at the Numbers of Torys and Suspected Persons that frequently Resort to the Houses of said Absentees & Hold Nightly & Private Meetings their; which serves to Intimidate and Weaken the Hands of the Friends to American Liberty. Your Honours are well Apprised that Villains & Spys from said Absentees in the British Murdering Army to there Friends here with Counterfeit Money, have been detected Several Times - And We have the Greatest Reason to think that many Persons of the same Stamp with Counterfeit Money and other things have come in Safety to the Aforesaid Families and Return'd to the British Army without being Discover'd.

That while our Bretheren are Spilling their Blood for the Glorious Cause of Liberty, these Miscreants are Sapping the foundation of Publick Credit and are doing their Worst to Involve us in Certain Ruin.

That as Long as the Wives & Families of said Absentees are Suffered to dwell Amongst us, we shall ever be in Danger of Receiving Counterfeit Money and every Evil Attending Spys Lurking Villains & Cut Throats & Murderers.¹

Counterfeiteurs, spies, lurking villains, cut-throats, and murderers - quite an impressive indictment by seventy-four inhabitants of Dunbarton against what was really an inconsequential threat to the American Revolution in New Hampshire. Those Loyalists committed enough to the British cause that they sought actively to involve themselves in the war had several different activities to choose from, and the subscribers of the Dunbarton memorial listed most of them. Counterfeiting, spying, and enlisting in the army were the major ways in which the Loyalists actively helped the British. Dunbarton's petition to the Council and the House of Representatives in October 1779 was directed, in a roundabout way, against the three kinds of Loyalist services. The memorialists were particularly uncomfortable having the families of
William Stark, John Stinson, and the "Infamous Stephen Holland" still residing in the area, because their very presence invited mischief. William Stark was a colonel in the British forces; John Stinson served in the Queen's Rangers, and his son served in Governor Wentworth's Volunteers and acted as a spy for the British in New York on several occasions. Stephen Holland, probably the most detested Loyalist in New Hampshire, who, according to John Langdon, did more damage than 10,000 men could have done, was the leader of a counterfeiting band and later commanded a company in the Prince of Wales Regiment. In response to Dunbarton's petition, the House and Council voted, on November 11, 1779, to empower the town's committee of safety to send the undesirable families to the British army. As far as Dunbarton was concerned, the problem was solved.

However, the problem was not so easily solved everywhere. From the very beginning of the war until the final refugee ship left New York in 1783, the Loyalists were a constant thorn in the side of the rebels. The revolutionary government could identify, harass, arrest, confiscate, and expel many of the hated Loyalists, but they could not stop all those dedicated men who were determined to actively support the king. As far as the state of New Hampshire was concerned, the most pressing problem was the counterfeiting of the state's currency, because that problem was direct and immediate. But New Hampshire's Loyalists also saw action as spies, messengers, and soldiers. The history of the Loyalists' service in behalf of the British Empire is one of outstanding courage and heartbreaking failure.

Counterfeiting

To run a state or a nation efficiently, it is first necessary to have a dependable and trusted currency. The new government of the
combined thirteen colonies was having a difficult time making people accept Continental currency, a problem compounded by the existence of thirteen additional state currencies. The proliferation of paper made hard currency - British sterling and Spanish gold - the favored exchange for products or services, but the government could not allow such a situation to exist because it caused gross inflation and drained the country of its already inadequate supply of hard money. In response to the problem, the several governments made it a crime to accept more paper money than gold for a commodity, and hoarding became illegal in an effort to forcibly rationalize the economy.

With the economy already in a precarious state, it was natural for the agents of the British to turn to counterfeiting. There were no real safeguards for the manufacture of paper currency, and anyone with a printing press and an eye for reproducing acceptable designs could easily duplicate or alter the denominations of the bills. In this way the already deflated value of the real bills would be cheapened by the sudden appearance of thousands of bogus dollars. The obvious aim of such an enterprise was to force the collapse of the entire economic system. While counterfeiting operations existed on a national level, most of the efforts of the counterfeiters took place at the state level because the central government was still just an amalgamation of thirteen semi-independent nations, each one dependent on its own currency for survival. The counterfeiters in New Hampshire took a back seat to no one in their endeavors.

In an attempt to prevent the duplication or alteration of the state's currency, the General Assembly passed an act, on July 3, 1776, to "prevent the forging & altering Bills of publick Credit, and for preventing the Depreciation thereof; and for making the Bills of Credit
of the United Colonies, and the Bills of this Colony a Tender in all Payments." Part of the penalty, if convicted, was to stand on the public gallows with a rope around the neck for an hour, be fined not more than fifty pounds, suffer six months imprisonment, and be whipped no more than thirty-nine times. 4 Simeon Baxter was one individual to suffer such treatment. Baxter was indicted for passing counterfeit money and was forced to stand for an hour on the gallows with a rope around his neck. Deciding that he had had enough after that experience, he left his wife and children to join General Burgoyne in August 1777. Unfortunately his trials were not over, for he was captured with the rest of the British army at Saratoga, taken to a Boston jail from which he escaped; eventually he settled in New Brunswick. 5 Not, however, before he had involved his son in the counterfeiting game by giving him 600 dollars of fake money, which William passed in Massachusetts, after he had decided to leave his father and return to New Hampshire. 6

Most of the counterfeiting seemed to be haphazard and the work of individuals who, for their own reasons, attempted to forge the state's currency. Joseph Skinner, arrested by the Committee of Safety of Hanover in May 1776, admitted that "I made it myself, and I have altered a good many bills from three shillings to forty shilling and I have known many more altered both here and at Cambridge, and a person may make his fortune by it in a little time." 7 Apparently Skinner was more interested in making his own fortune than in endangering the state's economy, and probably most of the haphazard, smaller, individual counterfeiting operations were similarly geared to personal enrichment.

While the activities of men like Skinner, Bezaleel Phelps, and James Ryan were annoying, 8 the organized efforts of a professional gang, like Stephen Holland's, was a much greater danger. Stephen Holland, a
veteran of the French and Indian War and a member of the New Hampshire General Assembly from Hillsborough County, was persuaded by Governor Wentworth to stay in the province and organize the dissemination of counterfeit money, a job he excelled at until his discovery in 1777. The network of the Holland gang is at times complicated, which indicates the efforts that these British allies expended. Robert Luist Fowle, the printer from Exeter who was chosen to print a new release of the state's currency in 1777, was accused of counterfeiting and arrested by the Exeter Committee of Safety on April 18, 1777. Fowle pleaded innocent to the charges and implicated Doctor Silas Hedges of Dunbarton, who was already in jail in Cambridge; according to Fowle, he had delivered the currency plates to Hedges, who did the actual counterfeiting. Hedges then gave evidence that implicated John Holland, a relative of Stephen's, who was already in the Exeter jail under suspicion of counterfeiting.

Robert Smith, a neighbor of Stephen Holland's in Londonderry, wrote on August 10, 1779 that a gang of counterfeiters was still operating in the area, almost two years after Holland's capture. The remainder of Holland's family and his confederates, Smith believed, were responsible for the sudden appearance of large sums of money in the area. As members of the Holland "Junto," Smith named Abel Sawyer of Newburyport, Ezekell Greely, Joseph Kelley, Leonard Whiting, Jotham Blanchard, and others. Not surprisingly, Smith was one of those to sign the petition against Holland's family and friends on October 20, 1779.

As far as Stephen Holland himself was concerned, suspicions about his loyalty arose as early as April 1775, when he was called before a town meeting in Londonderry, where he protested his innocence of any designs against the new government. In 1775 the town believed him, but
on March 11, 1777 the General Court believed firmly enough in his leadership of a counterfeiting ring that they ordered his arrest. Holland was captured and jailed in Boston before he was taken to Exeter by Colonel Enoch Poor, who also had to pick up an accomplice, John Moore, of Peterborough. On May 2 Holland escaped, and the Londonderry Committee of Safety procured evidence against William Vance of having aided in his escape. Vance was thereupon apprehended in Haverhill, confined to his farm at first and then sent to the Exeter jail. On May 3 the General Court announced a one hundred dollar reward for the capture of Stephen Holland; he was soon recaptured in Boston and returned to Exeter.

On June 25, 1777 three more members of the Holland gang were given sixty days in the Exeter jail, kept in close confinement, refused all visitors, and deprived of all of their legal rights. Conditions were such that Leonard Whiting, Joshua Atherton, and John Holland complained bitterly to the General Court with many different petitions throughout the year 1778. They consistently denied their guilt, complained of distressing conditions, desired new trials, and cited the conditions of their families and estates as reasons for their liberation.

In September 1777 Stephen Holland was brought before the Superior Court, and Judges Meshech Weare, Matthew Thornton, Leverett Hubbard, and John Wentworth found him guilty on three counts of counterfeiting and plotting against the state; remanded him to the Exeter jail for three months from November 28; and fined him $2,000 for the use of the government and for court costs. In September it was suggested that Holland be exchanged for Woodbury Langdon, who was in jail in New York, but the Committee of Safety turned down the proposal.13
As a very dangerous prisoner, Holland’s treatment was much harsher than others. According to William Vance later, in his deposition to the British government in support of Holland’s claim, “Stephen Holland was brought Prisoner to the same Goal loaded with Irons, that he appeared very unwell and the Irons were so heavy that he could not move forward without the Assistance of two Men to support him.” Fellow prisoner Doctor Gove, who came to treat Holland, “said he had never suffered so much before as he did while he was in the Dungeon with the said Stephen Holland, on account of the Stench, that the said Stephen Holland had begged him to go out of it, as it would be no service to him to stay and die with him.” On December 30, 1777 Holland learned that his estate was to be sold for his debts, and he petitioned the General Court that the mode of the sale was not beneficial to the state or to his family, and he requested that they reconsider. On January 9, 1778 he complained to the Court that the last time he had been brought to jail Sheriff Greenleaf had taken his watch pistols and his money, and now he was in dire need of them in order to buy firewood.

Whether or not Holland escaped again is a matter of historical debate, but in any case by March 1778 he was with the British in Rhode Island. He became a Town Major in Rhode Island, was instrumental in procuring information for the British, and was eventually commissioned a captain in the Prince of Wales Volunteers. Not surprisingly, he was proscribed, and his estate was confiscated; interestingly, the trustee appointed by the state to look after his land was Robert Smith. After the war Holland asked for £7,609 from the British government, and he was allowed £2,558. Supporting the claim was Stephen Little, George Boyd, General Prevost, William Vance, Major General Archibald Campbell, and
Governor John Wentworth, an impressive list of supporters. Retiring on half pay, Holland died in Ireland soon after the peace.\textsuperscript{18}

Obviously New Hampshire had a very remarkable counterfeiting operation, and significantly the only two New Hampshire Loyalists to be executed were counterfeiters. On October 7, 1778 David Farnsworth and John Blair were arrested in Connecticut and were charged with being spies. According to the testimony at their courtmartial, they brought $10,007 of counterfeit money from New York into New Hampshire, after being encouraged to do so by Colonel Holland. For their activities both Farnsworth and Blair were hanged in Hartford on November 10. The statements that they made during their trials led directly to the arrest of Samuel Abbot, Oliver Stoddard, and Richard Peck. As an indirect outgrowth of those arrests, John Clark, John Moore, and William Cox, all of Londonderry, were arrested on charges of aiding and assisting in the concealment of counterfeiters.\textsuperscript{19}

The infamous Stephen Holland gang had operated a very successful organization until its exposure in 1777 and the mass arrests that followed. Atherton, Blanchard, Fowle, Gove, John Holland, Moore, Vance, and Whiting were all involved, along with many others from Massachusetts. Only the two Hollands and Robert Luist Fowle were proscribed for their activity, and Fowle was allowed to return after the war. Atherton went on to become a popular member of the state government after the war and was even the state's attorney general. The impact of Holland's activity was tremendous, and as late as 1779 the fear of Holland's influence still manifested itself, as may be seen in the Dunbarton petition.

**Secret Services**

While the New Hampshire counterfeiters operated within the state, the Loyalists who were engaged in secret services on behalf of the king...
operated on a much larger scale. For their part they caused much con-
cern among the rebel leaders with their espionage, bribery, midnight
messages, and other secret services. Of all of the Loyalists who engaged
in undercover work for the British, the most famous were Benedict Arnold
of Connecticut and Benjamin Church of Massachusetts. No less important,
if less well known, were two of New Hampshire's leading Loyalists -
Benjamin Thompson and Paul Wentworth. Ironically, Thompson may have had
a role, albeit minor, in the famous Doctor Church affair.

Benjamin Church was a leading patriotic figure from Massachusetts,
who passed military and political secrets to General Gage in Boston.
For several months he operated as Gage's best spy until an incriminating
letter of his to his brother-in-law, a Boston Loyalist, was intercepted.
Church was immediately arrested, and Washington sent agents to the
Doctor's quarters to search for his correspondence. It appeared, how-
ever, that a confidant of Church's had been through his papers, and
nothing was found. Historians Allen French and Carl Van Doren believe
that the secret confidant was Benjamin Thompson. Thompson was already
suspected of disloyalty to America, and he left Woburn for Boston just
one week after Church's arrest.  

The future Count Rumford had earlier acted as a British agent in
New Hampshire, where he hired British deserters and worked them so hard
that they preferred to return to the army. After his hurried exit from
New Hampshire, he first spoke to General Gage, then offered his services
to General Washington, was turned down, and retired to Woburn where he
acted as General Gage's spy. Using secret ink, he passed on information
about the patriots' plans, strengths, and weaknesses before he openly
joined the British.  
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While Thompson may be almost as well known as Arnold and Church, probably the most important Loyalist spy, from the viewpoint of the British, was Paul Wentworth, former New Hampshire councilor and colonial agent in England. When Lord North decided to try conciliation in 1775, he first decided to send a spy to Paris to test Benjamin Franklin, Arthur Lee, and Silas Deane, the American representatives to France. The British Secret Service on the Continent was managed by William Eden, who believed, as North did, that America could never be independent from Europe, and that it was better than the dependency be on Britain than on France. North and Eden were willing to listen to any American proposals short of independence, and they chose Paul Wentworth to carry this message to Paris.

Wentworth became a double-dealer by agreement with Lord North. He was an American, but he considered himself a cosmopolitan, as he spent most of his life in England. He was a stock-jobber in London and Europe, and he was willing to be a spy in return for an established position in English society as a member of Parliament and a baronet. Also, as a Loyalist he had a great deal of land in New Hampshire that he would forfeit if the revolution were successful. Wentworth believed that the rebel leaders were, as he was, motivated by envy, ambition, and self-interest, and that for the right price they would change allegiance. In the British political world of the eighteenth century, bribery and corruption were openly practised, and Wentworth felt that if it worked on him, it could work on the Americans in Paris.²²

Using twenty different names and as many addresses, Wentworth directed an intricate organization of espionage on the Continent. He was an unscrupulous spy and, although he lived in style, he never received anything but his stipulated salary. Connected personally to
Lord Rockingham and the Whig party, he was unpopular with the Tory government, and as a stock-jobber, the king questioned his information, suspecting that any bad news was just an attempt to manipulate the stock market. A further reason for the king's distrust was that the spy continually sent bad news which later proved to be accurate; unfortunately, the king never wanted to believe the worst. Therefore, the best spy the British had in France was ill-used and seldom believed.

Nevertheless, Wentworth began to test the three American commissioners. Franklin refused to meet Wentworth without first extracting a promise that there would be no mention of rewards. On January 6, 1778 they finally met and the Loyalist showed the rebel a letter indicating the British willingness to fight for ten years, to which Franklin responded that the Americans would fight for fifty if necessary. Wentworth gave up on Franklin and likewise failed to entice the very upright Lee, but with Silas Deane he finally met with success.

Wentworth first made contact with Deane through fellow American spy Doctor Edward Bancroft. Deane was offered high honors and emoluments as well as a position in post-war America, and it was also known that Deane played the market, so it was suggested that he might trade political information for economic tips. Bancroft did what he could to tempt Deane, but Lord North finally insisted that Wentworth go to Paris himself in November 1777 to take over the negotiations. In February 1778 North wrote to the king about certain goods to be bought by Wentworth in London and sent to New York for the profit of a "Mr. D."

Wentworth had his man. Arthur Lee suspected that Deane had been seduced by the British, and it was very nearly true. Deane had his own personal reasons for selling out; Congress, ignoring his great services in behalf of the revolution, had recalled him in December 1777 and replaced him
with John Adams. In disgust Deane resigned, at which time Wentworth stepped in with his proposals of personal advantages. Deane afterwards became what he had been suspected of earlier - a traitor.

Meanwhile, the Comte de Vergennes was using the presence of Paul Wentworth in Paris to pressure the king to come out formally in favor of the Americans. Vergennes played up Wentworth's role to Louis XVI and suggested that if the king did not act soon, the war would be over and America reunited with Great Britain. Wentworth believed that the Declaration of Independence was an opportune move because it could be used as a bargaining chip at any negotiations, but he knew that a French alliance with America would be a disaster for England. He recommended that Lord North send a Peace Commission to America immediately to negotiate a reconciliation and to avoid a French alliance; North took his advice, but it was too late. In a sense Wentworth was directly responsible for both the French alliance and the ill-fated British Peace Commission.

Wentworth also had ideas on how to treat the American provinces during and after the war. He believed that America was actually three nations: New England, the area from the Hudson River to the Potomac River, and the South, and that each should be treated differently. He also felt that there was only one true American, Benjamin Franklin, although he did believe that the influence of George Washington was becoming more general. He thought that some of the leaders of Congress could be subverted, particularly James Lovell of Massachusetts, the most active member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs; John Rutledge of South Carolina, who was ambitious and could be servicable; the Reverend John Witherspoon, president of the College of New Jersey, who loved
power and money; and even Thomas Paine, who, according to Wentworth, was naturally indolent and led by his passions.

Obviously, Paul Wentworth was an indispensable member of Great Britain's secret services. In return for his efforts he got none of the rewards that he expected, except for a seat in Parliament for six weeks in 1780. In 1790 he retired to his plantation in Surinam, where he died three years later.24

But Thompson and Wentworth were not the only secret agents that England had from New Hampshire. Both Peter Livius and Stephen Holland attempted to turn General John Sullivan into a traitor. Livius, the chief justice of Quebec, believed that he could influence the Major General because in 1777, when Sullivan was a prisoner on Long Island, he was given parole to go to Philadelphia with an oral message from General Howe to Congress. The message was oral because Howe refused officially to recognize the existence of the revolutionary body. Sullivan's apparent willingness to serve as Howe's messenger and General Burgoyne's impending invasion of New York encouraged Livius to try and win over the northern general who, he incorrectly believed was in command of Fort Ticonderoga.

Livius sent his letter to Sullivan on June 2, 1777, proposing that, in the face of a British invasion, Sullivan become a turncoat by keeping the good men in New Hampshire while getting the difficult men out. As a reward, Sullivan could rely on getting a pardon, escaping from any confiscation, and receiving amply pecuniary rewards. Unfortunately for Livius, General Schuyler intercepted the letter, responded as Sullivan, and used the correspondence to gain information about the British plans. When Schuyler was finished, he allowed Sullivan to publicly expose Livius by publishing the original letter.25
The British were not done with Sullivan however, and next it was Stephen Holland's turn to tempt the general. Sullivan's health had never been good after his capture, and in November 1779 he resigned his commission, though in 1780 he was healthy enough to be elected to Congress. The British had intercepted some of his private correspondence and knew that he was in need of money. Captain Holland hit upon a scheme to use Sullivan's captured brother, Captain Daniel Sullivan, to swing Sullivan into the British camp. According to the plan, Daniel was sent to Philadelphia to apply for an exchange; Holland knew there was a reasonable chance that General Sullivan would hesitate to send his brother back to prison. Holland sent a letter with Captain Sullivan reminding the general of their past friendship and hoping for a reconciliation, not just a personal one but also one between the former colonies and Great Britain. Holland also knew that Sullivan was not in sympathy with the recent extreme measures taken against the Loyalists, and he promised to keep all future communications secret. Sullivan was to send a reply asking for more specifics if he was interested.

Captain Sullivan went to Philadelphia and returned to Captain Holland on May 17. According to Daniel, General Sullivan had read the letter thirty times, wept, wished he had received it sooner, hoped for a reconciliation, but would not send a letter for fear of his brother's safety. Actually, Sullivan later claimed that he had thrown the letter into a fire and kept silent about it in order to save his brother. Sullivan proposed to use Holland just as Schuyler had used Livius, while also hoping to make life easier for his brother. In spite of his poverty and his concern for his brother, General Sullivan did not turn traitor, and three months later, when his brother died, the general wrote to Captain Holland thanking him for his assistance in caring for
his brother but making no mention of any past treacherous proposals. Interestingly, on November 16, 1782 General Sullivan submitted a petition to the General Assembly asking them to grant Mrs. Stephen Holland permission to visit her children in the state; General Sullivan paid his debts, even to a Loyalist.  

Not all of the Loyalists' contributions aimed as high as subverting a leading rebel general or a prominent diplomat. That is not to say that the contributions, though minor, of the others were unimportant. John Sheperd, for example, deserted to the British in October 1776, and soon afterwards he was captured with orders sewn into his pants. The orders were to enlist men for General Howe, and Sheperd was committed to jail in Connecticut for acting as a secret messenger.  

Leonard Whiting of Hollis also tried his best, in his minor capacity, to help the British. In 1775 he was carrying dispatches from Canada to Boston when he was arrested in Groton, Massachusetts by Mrs. David Wright, Mrs. Job Shattuck, and some neighboring women. The women, dressed in their husbands' clothes and armed with muskets and pitchforks, were protecting Jewett's Bridge over the Nashua, their menfolk having gone with Colonel Prescott's minutemen. Mrs. Wright had been elected the commander of the little group, and they were all determined not to let any foe of freedom cross the bridge since rumors abounded of the approach of British regulars. Suddenly, Whiting appeared, and since he was already suspected of being treasonably engaged in carrying information to the British, Sergeant Wright ordered him seized, taken from his horse, searched, and detained. Inside of his boots they discovered secret dispatches, and he was committed into the custody of Oliver Prescott. In 1776 Whiting was acquitted by the General Assembly and
liberated, he later became involved with counterfeiting and still later joined a Loyalist regiment.28

Whether living luxuriously in Paris, writing letters from the safety of Quebec, or riding swiftly and silently through the night, the Loyalists who chose to aid the British by stealth and deception served just as vital a role as those who took arms or printed counterfeit money. Danger of exposure was always possible: Whiting and Sheperd were caught, Thompson narrowly avoided capture, and Wentworth travelled around Paris under the constant shadow of assassination. While these men's stories are known, what other stories of espionage are lost forever? While it is known that John Stinson, junior, of Dunbarton fled to New York to join a Loyalist corps and also served twenty-eight times as a spy without pay, the details of his activity are unknown, and an undoubtedly fascinating story is lost because the very nature of the secret service is secrecy.29

Military Services

Espionage and counterfeiting may be important wartime activities, but the very nature of war is, after all, combat. Spying and undermining a nation's economy may help to win a war, but ultimately the decision is made on the field of battle. In the American Revolution the Loyalists did their fair share of the fighting, and their contributions can not be overlooked just because they were largely ill-used by the British, in a cause which was eventually lost.

According to Paul H. Smith, a leading historian on the military contributions of the Loyalists, the British used the Loyalists too late and then relied on them too much. At first the war was expected to be very short, and the regular army was supposed to destroy the rebel forces easily and quickly. With such expectations, the use of the
Loyalists under arms was considered wasteful because it would take them months to be trained and equipped, by which time the war was expected to be over. When it became obvious that the war was going to last for a long time, the British reconsidered using the Loyalists, but the British generals and the entire establishment had a bias against using provincials. The Loyalists were Americans, and therefore they were inferior at best, and at worst they were rebels at heart. While the British did begin to use the Loyalists, they used them primarily as auxiliaries, for foraging expeditions and for policing occupied territory. The authorities preferred that the Loyalists join the regular army, but the Americans were unwilling to surrender their personal liberties for the well known abuses of serving in the regulars. As a result, corps of Loyalist volunteers were established, but the official prejudice carried over into the arrangement: Loyalist soldiers were not usually respected as fighters, American officers were not entitled to retirement on half-pay until much later in the war, and provincial officers were always considered junior to any comparable British officer.

By 1777, General Howe began to use the Loyalists more, and they did serve vital but supportive roles in the Pennsylvania campaign. It was not really until the Southern campaign that the Loyalist corps were used primarily as fighting forces. The Loyalists were instrumental in conquering and holding Georgia, and throughout the South, in 1780 and 1781, they served bravely and effectively under officers like "Bloody" Tarleton. The major difficulty was that the Loyalists in the South were mostly Northerners, and fighting a civil war always brings out the most violent passions, so the Loyalist battles were often very brutal and bloody. The Loyalist corps failed to win over the population and suffered defeat at several major battles. After Yorktown they were
allowed to return to New York since Washington refused to guarantee their safety. The problem that the British had in their use of the Loyalists in the Southern campaign was an overestimation of their potential, which had been based on leading Loyalists' opinions and advice, Northern experience (which had been wasted and then lost entirely after Saratoga), and forlorn hope.  

The Loyalists themselves never gave up; from the siege of Boston to the evacuation of New York, they did their best to serve the cause in which they believed. The first attempt to form a Loyalist corps was in 1774 in Freetown, Massachusetts, an effort that terminated with the capture of Colonel Thomas Gilbert's entire company. The first successful organization was Brigadier General Timothy Ruggles' Loyal Associated Volunteers, formed in Boston to defend and patrol the city. As early as April 19, 1775, New Hampshire's Josiah Stephens fled to Boston where he joined one of the three companies of the Volunteers. Eventually, the Third Company had for its first lieutenant Edward Goldstone Lutwyche, former commander of Hillsborough County's militia. Also serving in Boston, but in the Loyal North British Volunteers, the third Loyalist corps formed, were Patrick and James McMasters. New Hampshire men were responding to the call but only haphazardly in the beginning, largely because they were dispersed or isolated within the state.  

In 1777 Governor John Wentworth took an interest in the problem of his fellow New Hampshire exiles and lent his support to the formation of Wentworth's Volunteers, a corps of Loyalists made up mostly of New Hampshire men, giving them an organization of their own. Wentworth's Volunteers first mustered at Flushing, Long Island on October 16, 1777, and its officers were Captain Daniel Murray of Brookfield, Massachusetts, commanding, First Lieutenant Benjamin Whiting, the former Hillsborough
 sheriff, and Second Lieutenant Elijah Williams, a lawyer from Keene. Wentworth's Volunteers served largely in an auxiliary capacity by going on foraging expeditions and pulling guard duty. The New Hampshire contingent of the Volunteers was never a large group, and the Volunteers also consisted of many individuals from other New England states, but the New Hampshire soldiers did earn the hatred of the state government in Exeter, which proscribed fifteen of them: Under Jacob Brown from Newmarket; Thomas Cummings the under-sheriff for Hillsborough County; Thomas Cutler from Keene; John Davidson, James Fulton, and Richard Holland from Londonderry; Daniel Farnsworth of New Ipswich; printer and counterfeiter Robert Luist Fowle; Simon Jones from Hinsdale; Doctor Stephen Little of Portsmouth; Charlestown's Enos Stevens; John Stinson, junior, of Dunbarton, and Winchester merchant Solomon Willard. These men did not all serve at the same time or for the entire duration with Wentworth's Volunteers. Elijah Williams, for example, also served as a lieutenant in the Maryland Loyalists.

For most of their existence, Wentworth's Volunteers stayed in New York, and from what remains of Lieutenant Enos Stevens' diary, it appears that the British did not care to have the Loyalists fight, but rather, under a polite fiction of exercising them in arms, virtually kept them as prisoners. But the Volunteers did see some action. In September 1779 they were sent, with other Loyalist corps, to Martha's Vineyard to end the contraband trade between the island and the mainland. Once installed on the island they threatened the inhabitants with vengeance if they did not co-operate, and they compelled the islanders to send a representative to Boston to request the island's release from taxation because the taxes went to fund the revolution. The petition was temporarily granted. In March 1779 the Loyal Associated Refugees,
along with Wentworth's Volunteers, were sent to attack Bedford, Long Island. Because of bad winds they never saw Bedford but instead bombarded Falmouth. A second attempt on Bedford in May also failed. On June 19 the corps withdrew from their camp in Rhode Island and established themselves in Huntington, Long Island. The corps began to dwindle in numbers until at a muster at Jerusalem on May 24, 1780 only forty-one men were serving. Other Loyalist regiments were also suffering the same losses, mostly due to non-re-enlistments and resignations. In 1781 Wentworth's Volunteers was just one of several provincial corps to be incorporated in Colonel Benjamin Thompson's new corps, the King's American Dragoons - the very group that terrorized Huntington until the end of the war, when they left for Nova Scotia. Among those former members of Wentworth's Volunteers who made the transition were Captain James Fulton, Lieutenant John Davidson, and Lieutenant Elijah Williams.\(^{36}\)

The most famous Loyalist corps of the war was the Queen's Rangers, raised in August 1776 by Lieutenant Colonel Robert Rogers of New Hampshire. They were drawn largely from The Queen's Own Loyal Virginia Regiment, and from Connecticut and New York, but included Captain John Stinson from Dunbarton, Colonel William Stark temporarily, and the notorious Captain Breed Batcheller of Packersfield.\(^{37}\) The first major military engagement of the Rangers was a hectic affair, when they were surprised and mauled by a rebel night attack at Mamaroneck, New York on October 22, 1776. Nonetheless, under Rogers' experienced leadership and the ability of his successors, the Rangers were molded into an efficient and disciplined corps of light infantry.

In June 1777 the Queen's Rangers fought at Brunswick, New Jersey, and later that year they were commended for their efforts at the battle of Brandywine Creek, where they lost seventy-two men. They also saw
action at the battle of Germantown in October before Major - later Lieutenant Colonel - John Graves Simcoe took over from Major James Wemyss. Under Simcoe the Rangers achieved their greatest successes, fighting at Quintain's Bridge, Hancock's Bridge, Monmouth Court House, and Kingsbridge in 1778, as they covered the British withdrawal from Philadelphia. Throughout 1779 they raided in the New York area, and on May 2 they were designated the First American Regiment. The next year the Rangers formed part of the expedition to South Carolina and took part in the siege of Charleston. From late 1780 until the battle of Yorktown, the Rangers campaigned in Virginia, first under Benedict Arnold and then under Simcoe again. They engaged in numerous skirmishes and battles with the rebels before they suffered the humiliation of Cornwallis' surrender. Returning to New York with the surrender news, and with the war virtually over, the Queen's Rangers were placed on the British establishment as a regular unit on Christmas Day 1782. They were finally disbanded in October 1783, and most of them, with their families, numbering 361 in all, settled in New Brunswick.  

Wentworth's Volunteers, the King's American Dragoons, and the Queen's Rangers were not the only provincial corps to which New Hampshire Loyalists belonged. Philip Bayley, a Portsmouth trader, was a captain-lieutenant in the Royal Fencible Americans, and, as noted earlier, counterfeiter and spy Stephen Holland commanded a company in the Prince of Wales Regiment. George Dymond chose to fight on the ocean rather than the land, and he commanded the armed schooner Sophia. Samuel Mallows joined the British regular army where, in the service of the Quarter Master General's Department, he lost four horses and all of his gear. Mallows also served as the waggoner to General Howe's own
baggage, and then under Major Ward he helped to defend the blockhouse at Slouggum, New Jersey. 40

Whether in a provincial corps, the regular army, or at sea, the Loyalists of New Hampshire made their contribution to the military efforts of the British forces. But this was not always easy, as the experiences of Simeon Baxter of Alstead demonstrate. According to Baxter's memorial to the British government after the war, he "endured much persecution from the Whigs or Malecontents because he would not join in their Measures against the King and Parliament of Great Britain from 1774 til August 1777, when he left his Wife Children and Property and joined the Royal Army under General Burgoyne and was made a Prisoner by the Rebels in Saratoga." 41 He was taken to Boston where he suffered many "hardships and abuses," then was indicted for high treason and for passing counterfeit money and carried to the gallows, where he was kept standing with a rope around his neck for an hour. He was confined until August 1779, when he was discharged on £1,000 security with two sureties of £500 each. He was sent to the barracks in Rutland, Vermont, where he was later given a fourteen day parole to visit his family in Alstead. As soon as he entered New Hampshire, he was set upon and beaten by a mob and thrown into the Keene jail. After his release he was recaptured on his way back to Rutland, and he was ordered to Worcester for the duration of the war. However, Baxter managed to escape on the way to Penobscot, and in September 1781 he was with his family in Maine, along the Kennebekacias. In December 1781 his exchange was finally negotiated. He returned to Alstead to get his family, and for the rest of the war he commanded a company of volunteers. Finally, in 1783, he managed to settle down along the St. Johns River, in New Brunswick. For his loyalty and his suffering he was given £358, after filing a claim for £1,257. 42
According to Robert McCluer Calhoon, in summarizing the Loyalists' military contributions to the war, the Loyalists in arms never enjoyed or earned the support of a sizeable civilian constituency capable of supplying, financing, or supporting their military activity. They had no great leaders, they were not partisans or monarchists, they were not fighting to retain colonial government control or to preserve British policies; they were only doing what they believed in, and found themselves, Calhoon maintains, enmeshed in a tragedy of an ill-conceived exertion of national power. Ill-conceived, misused, and ultimately defeated are words that adequately describe the total Loyalist military experience.

Conclusion

The good patriots of Dunbarton had much to fear from counterfeiters, spies, lurking villains, cut-throats, and murderers. From their point of view, the Loyalist efforts on behalf of the king were the acts of traitors and scoundrels. But from the point of view of the Loyalists, they were doing all that they could to insure the victory of the cause in which they believed. Stephen Holland and his band of counterfeiters tempted the hangman, as did Benjamin Thompson and John Stinson, junior. Paul Wentworth risked assassination, and each and every one of the brave men to take up arms risked death in battle. All of them risked, and most of them lost, their homes, businesses, and friends in New Hampshire.

Not every Loyalist felt as strongly as did Simeon Baxter and Robert Luist Fowle. The vast majority of Loyalists were not as committed to the British Empire, and they either stayed in New Hampshire and kept quiet, or fled the country to avoid persecution. While the quiet Loyalists made their stand known in various ways, and in many instances...
suffered terribly for it, the efforts of the active Loyalists are
deserving of special notice. For their sacrifices they lost everything,
but that was not always the worst of it. Forsaking their safe, comfort­
able lives, they threw their total weight behind the British, and in
return the British often held them in contempt. Paul Wentworth's
activities were never fully appreciated, and the king never did trust
the very efficient spy. Robert Rogers was used and discarded when his
services were no longer needed. Counterfeiters were left to their own
devices to pass bogus money, and, if caught, the British refused to
raise a hand to help. The Loyalist soldiers were held in total contempt
as poor fighters and provincials who were only good for doing minor jobs.

Yet men like Stephen Holland, Benjamin Whiting, and Breed
Batcheller persevered because they believed completely in what they were
doing. They believed as fully in the British form of government as John
Adams and Thomas Jefferson believed in the revolution. For following
their own sense of values, neither side can be faulted or blamed.
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We have intelligence of the arrival of some of the Tory fleet at Halifax...that they are much distressed for want of houses, obliged to give six dollars per month for one room, provisions scarce and dear. Some of them with six or eight children round them sitting upon the rocks crying, not knowing where to lay their heads. Just Heaven has given them to taste of the same cup of affliction which they one year ago administered with such callous hearts to thousands of their fellow citizens, but with this difference that they fly from their injured and enraged country, whilst pity and commiseration received the sufferers whom they inhumanely drove from their dwellings.¹

In this letter to her husband John, on April 21, 1776, Abigail Adams described the ordeals faced by the Loyalists after they had been forced to abandon Boston with General Howe and the British. It was her opinion, and undoubtedly the opinion of all rebels, that the suffering of the Loyalists was inflicted on them by a just and vengeful God. The group of Loyalists that Abigail Adams described belonged to the fleet that left Boston in March in 170 sailing vessels, and consisted of 1,000 refugees. After six torturous days at sea they arrived in Nova Scotia, where they found very much what Abigail depicted, so it is not surprising that most of the Loyalists chose to accompany Howe to New York City in June 1776. As long as there was an alternative place to stay, and as long as the Loyalists believed in an ultimate return to their homes, Canada did not attract many permanent settlers. From 1776 to 1782 occasional small bands of sad Loyalists made their way to Halifax, but up until the very end, very few Loyalists were willing to invest their
time, effort, and wealth in starting over in a rugged, new environment, when each and every Loyalist hoped to return to his or her own comfortable home in the colonies. It was not until the final evacuation of Savannah, Charleston, and lastly New York by the British at the conclusion of the war that the full flood of Loyalists swamped Atlantic Canada.  

The preliminary peace treaty was signed by both sides on November 30, 1782, to go into effect two months later when England made peace with France and Spain. Congressional ratification occurred on April 19, 1783, exactly eight years after the shots were fired at Lexington and Concord. The first authentic news of the peace treaty was published in New York on March 26, 1783, and the Loyalists were stunned. Only two articles in the entire treaty concerned their interests. The fifth article, which provided for the restitution of the confiscated property of British subjects, also stipulated that the Loyalists could go anywhere in the United States, for one year, unmolested, to obtain restitution for their confiscated property. Congress further promised to recommend to the states that they revise their laws and restore the confiscated estates to the original owners, once the concerned Loyalist had refunded the price paid by the current owner. The sixth article was supposed to guard the Loyalists against any future persecutions or confiscations, and to allow for their release from confinement after the treaty was ratified; but once again Congress only promised to recommend such actions to the states.

The solution reached in Paris ended the war but did not end the Loyalists' suffering; now they could never return, and the future looked bleak. While Congress could recommend, the states were free to ignore all recommendations, harass any Loyalists still inside their boundaries,
and forbid other Loyalists from entering the state. The Loyalists indignantly declared that the peace treaty was an abandonment of their cause by the British. Some even believed that the British, who had earlier used them for all kinds of different purposes, now treated them worse than the detested rebels.³

Fair or not, the Loyalists were faced with permanent exile, and they were forced to find another place to begin over. Having to leave America was one thing, affording the move and finding another location were far different matters. Nova Scotia, which included New Brunswick at the time, was the obvious region for settlement; it was climatically similar to the northern colonies, it was largely unsettled, and it offered abundant trade, lumbering, fishing, and farming opportunities.

In 1782 the Reverend Samuel Seabury, sensing the future, launched an association aimed at helping those who wished to go north. Sir Guy Carleton, the British commander in New York, approved the plan, and it was arranged that 500 exiles would leave in the autumn, under the leadership of three agents, including Samuel Cummings of New Hampshire.

The three agents and their party sailed on October 19, 1782 and were soon at the village of Annapolis Royal on the western coast of peninsular Nova Scotia. The agents travelled across to Halifax, inspected the lush Annapolis Valley, and sent glowing reports back to New York. General Carleton was soon swamped with requests for migration, and he gave orders that each migrating family was to be provided with enough royal supplies to last them for one year, and that the provisions were to include clothing, medicines, tools, arms, and ammunitions. On April 26, 1783 7,000 exiles left New York, half of them destined for the mouth of the St. John River in New Brunswick, while the other half sailed for Shelburne, Nova Scotia.⁴
By the end of 1783 about 80,000 Loyalists had fanned out into Canada, the Bahamas, the West Indies, Sierra Leone, Bermuda, Great Britain, and Europe. The largest group, more than 34,000 emigrants, found permanent refuge in the Atlantic provinces of Canada. Newfoundland, inhospitable as it was, attracted perhaps 300; Cape Breton Island received about 500; Prince Edward Island almost 600; New Brunswick about 14,000; and over 20,000 settled on peninsular Nova Scotia.

The immigrants to Nova Scotia were mainly soldiers, farmers, merchants, and artisans. Halifax was already an established city and the major North American station for the British army and navy. As the major social center of Nova Scotia, Halifax attracted the wealthier exiles, men like John and Benning Wentworth, Portsmouth merchants Robert Robertson and Gillam Butler, former Collector of Customs George Meserve, and Wentworth's close friend, John Fisher. But Halifax was not a kind city for the normal, poor Loyalist, who was just trying to put his life back together again.

Most of the Loyalists destined for Nova Scotia settled first at Shelburne, originally called Port Roseway. The influx of refugees quickly swelled the population to over 12,000 and temporarily made Shelburne the fourth largest population center in North America, after New York, Philadelphia, and Boston. They came to Shelburne primarily because of Gideon White's recommendations. White was a Massachusetts mariner who found Port Roseway to be a fine, safe harbor with great fishing and trading potentials. A group of 120 Port Roseway Associates was formed in New York, conferred with the government of Nova Scotia, and, with the blessings of Governor Parr and the aid of Carleton, they shipped out on April 27, 1783 on board thirteen vessels with 3,000 settlers. The site was quickly chosen: the first street, King Street,
was laid out, and the people started to clear the land. In July
Governor Parr renamed the town Shelburne, in honor of his patron, Lord
Shelburne, the British Secretary of State for the Colonies. Late in
October, 1,600 disbanded soldiers and their families arrived, only to
find little available land, and most of them spent the winter aboard the
transports. Survival was difficult, but the Loyalists worked hard and
made it through the first, most important winter.

In May 1784 John Wentworth, the Surveyor of the King's Woods,
arrived from Halifax to see the bustling new city. The Loyalists had
found a new place to live and thrive. By the end of the summer 1,427
houses had been built, two saw mills had been erected, and about fifty
ships were employed in the cod and whale fishery, as well as with the
West Indies' trade. In addition, 2,400 house lots, 837 store and wharf
lots, and 800 country lots had been assigned to the settlers, although
many lots had been granted to wealthy, absentee landowners in Halifax
and St. John. Two newspapers were established, and in 1784 the Friendly
Fire Club was formed. The city of Shelburne had promise initially, but
as the years went by there were also problems. There were too many
people and not enough land, too many different cultures, difficult
communications with the outside world, a harsh climate, smallpox epi-
demics, fires, and the jealousy of Halifax. Internal dissension further
retarded the growth of Shelburne and, in many instances, the retardation
was accelerated by inefficiency and stupidity, as drawn lots were not
always suited to the business or aptitude of the owner. Further, there
was a shortage of skilled labor and building supplies, and there was a
general dissatisfaction with the provincial government. Soon families
began to leave Shelburne, and by the early nineteenth century the popu-
lation had dropped from 10,000 to just 300; never again would Shelburne
see a large, bustling population. Shelburne's success was the success of a way-station: it provided a valuable learning experience for the Loyalists on their way to ultimate success elsewhere.

Among those Loyalists who settled or owned land in Shelburne were five individuals from New Hampshire. Daniel Jessup, David Brown, and John Houston lived in the city. Donald McAlpin was granted fifty acres in Port Roseway Harbor in 1784. James McMasters shared a grant for 25,000 acres in Shelburne with several other investors, a grant issued in 1784.8

There was no particular pattern of settlement for the Loyalists of New Hampshire because, unlike those from other states, they never formed a cohesive group. There had been no town or city occupied by the British in New Hampshire where the Loyalists could congregate, and although many of them eventually made it to Boston and New York, they made it singly or in small groups. Even the creation of Wentworth's Volunteers did not lend itself to forming a corps of New Hampshire Loyalists because not enough of them joined, and in the end they were all dispersed throughout the larger King's American Dragoons. As a result, New Hampshire Loyalists spread out, isolated from their fellow New Hampshire countrymen in Nova Scotia and Canada, much as they had lived isolated from each other in New Hampshire. Patrick McMasters was granted 2,000 acres on Passamaquoddy Bay; Doctor Jesse Rice, of Rindge, found land in Yarmouth; Annapolis attracted Benjamin Snow, Robert Robinson, Doctor Josiah Pomeroy, Thomas Cutler, and Elijah Williams, the latter two having been comrades in Wentworth's Volunteers. Williams also co-owned 65,600 acres in Digby with several others, including Enos Stevens of Wentworth's Volunteers. John Holland, Robert Gilmore, Phineas Stevens, Josiah Jones, and Thomas Cummings also chose Digby.9
While Nova Scotia was a difficult place to live, earning for its nickname "Nova Scarcity," success was possible. The most obvious examples of success stories are John Wentworth, who eventually became the Lieutenant-Governor of Nova Scotia, and his brother-in-law, Benning Wentworth, who became Councilor, Treasurer, Master of the Rolls, and Registrar in Chancery. Success was also possible at a lower level, be it Jotham Blanchard's lumber business, or Thomas Cutler's positions of notary public, justice of the peace, and judge of probate. Most refugees were just happy to find a place to live and to call their own in peace and security, especially after suffering for the previous ten years.

Because of the great number of Loyalists who were pouring into Nova Scotia, and who were settling to the west of the Bay of Fundy far from the administrative center in Halifax, on June 18, 1784 the king divided the province into two separate units. The western colony was then designated as "New Brunswick," in honor of King George's German principality. Lieutenant-Governors were appointed to govern each colony - John Parr for Nova Scotia, and Colonel Thomas Carleton, Sir Guy's brother, for New Brunswick. The annual budget for New Brunswick was set at £3,100, including £1,000 for the governor, £500 for the chief justice, and £500 for unforeseen contingencies.

The first 7,000 settlers bound for New Brunswick left New York on April 26, 1783 and landed at the mouth of the St. John River twelve days later, where Governor Parr provided them with food and shelter. The land where the city of St. John was built was then just a forest, and the new town was made up entirely of tents and huts originally. Because of the navigability of the river many Loyalists moved to the flat, fertile region 100 miles inland, where they built the future capital,
Fredericton. Life was rugged, and many of the Loyalists were unused to hard work and were totally unprepared for the rigors of the wilderness. Devoid of everything that had made their lives tolerable before, they set about just trying to survive. The recollections of survivor Mary Fisher indicate exactly how terrible the first winter actually was:

The season was wet and cold, and we were much discouraged at the gloomy prospect before us. Those who had arrived a little earlier had made better preparations for the winter; some had built small log huts. Snow fell on the 2nd day of November to the depth of six inches. We pitched our tents in the shelter of the woods and tried to cover them with spruce boughs. We used stones for fireplaces. Our tent had no floor but the ground. The winter was very cold, with deep snow, which we tried to keep from drifting in by putting a large rug at the door. There were mothers, that had been reared in a pleasant country enjoying all the comforts of life, with helpless children in their arms. They clasped their infants to their bosoms and tried by the warmth of their own bodies to protect them from the bitter cold. Sometimes a part of the family had to remain up during the night to keep the fires burning, so as to keep the rest from freezing. Some destitute people made use of boards, which the older ones kept heating before the fire and applied by turns to the smaller children to keep them warm.

Many women and children, and some of the men, died from cold and exposure. Graves were dug with axes and shovels near the spot where our party landed, and there in stormy weather our loved ones were buried. We had no minister, so we had to bury them without any religious service, besides our own prayers.13

Some settlers were discouraged enough to leave the country and to try their luck in Europe, the West Indies, or even back in the United States. But most of the Loyalists were in the prime of their lives with young families, and once the first winter was survived the prospects for success grew. From 1785 the province slowly improved in agriculture, shipbuilding, and the exportation of masts and spars to England and of fish, staves, shingles, and lumber to the West Indies. A variety of grains and roots were successfully cultivated, and considerable progress was made in clearing the wilderness. Barren times occurred
occasionally but were remedied by the exertions of the governor and the British government. Success was in the offing in New Brunswick just as it was in Nova Scotia.

The biggest grant of land in New Brunswick was the grant for Parrtown, later renamed St. John, presented by John Parr to a group of men called the Parrtown associates. The grant was dated August 14, 1784 and gave the land to the associates and their heirs and assigns forever:

Yielding and Paying by the said Grantees & each & every of them, their Heirs & Assigns, which by the acceptation hereof they bind & Oblige themselves their Heirs Executors & Assigns to pay his Majesty his Heirs & Successors or to any person lawfully authorized to receive the same a fee yearly Quit Rent of one Farthing for each & every Lot hereby Granted the first payment of the Quit Rent to commence & become payable at the expiration of Ten years from the Date hereof & so to continue payable yearly thereafter for ever on default thereof this Grant shall be null & void.

Among the grantees of Parrtown were ten men from New Hampshire. Captain John Cochran, former commander of Fort William and Mary, obtained lot 113 on Germain Street. Wentworth's brother-in-law, John Fisher, King's American Dragoon Captain James Fulton, and Portsmouth merchant Hugh Henderson were also grantees. Richard Holland was granted lot 197 on Pitt Street, John Stinson had a lot on King's Square, and Winchester merchant Solomon Willard was Cochran's neighbor on Germain Street. Hugh Quinton, John Smith, and Thomas Smith were the other three New Hampshire men with original grants. Four other New Hampshire Loyalists eventually settled in Parrtown: James Cochran, John's father, Samuel Mallows of Portsmouth, Tory Associator John Marsh, and James Rogers.

Of the other ex-New Hampshire, now New Brunswick, colonists, four were settlers of St. Georges: Portsmouth shipowner and Tory Associator James Hickey, John Wentworth's wife's brother-in-law Gillam Butler,
Portsmouth hatter John Beck, and Tory Associator Philip Bailey. Bailey later went on to become a justice of the peace in Sunbury County.\textsuperscript{18} St. Andrews attracted John Fisher, Hugh Henderson, John Stinson, and William Morre.\textsuperscript{19} Captain John Cochran and counterfeiters William Vance and Jonathan Gove were grantees of Wentworth's Plantation.\textsuperscript{20} James Fulton had an interest in 20,500 acres on the Stewiacke River; Simeon Baxter owned land along the St. John River in Norton; Richard Holland had 1,120 acres in Conway; Solomon Stevens owned land in Musquash; George King and John Parker had land in Bellevue, Charlotte County; and John Parker and Eleazer Sanger owned land in Beaver Harbor.\textsuperscript{21} The New Hampshire group was not overwhelmingly large or powerful, but it did contribute to the eventual success of the New Brunswick experiment.

There was also a large stream of exiles to Upper Canada, made up mostly of New Yorkers but containing some from many other colonies. The Loyalists were instrumental in settling Kingston, York (Toronto), and Niagara under the directorship of General Frederick Haldimand, the able governor of Quebec. He established a place for them to gather at Machiche, had militiamen build barracks for them, and obtained provisions for them from the nearby Three Rivers' merchants before the Loyalists were finally moved to permanent locations.\textsuperscript{22} Four of the New Hampshire Loyalists who owned land in St. John also owned land in, or near, Kingston. Solomon Willard shared 4,509 acres with other investors; James Rogers and Samuel Mallows had interests in 21,892 acres in Kingston; and Parrtown grantee John Smith moved to Upper Canada after first settling in New Brunswick.\textsuperscript{23} Eight other New Hampshire men can be traced directly to Upper Canada: John Brooks from Claremont, Portsmouth mariner Patrick Burn, Hillsborough under-sheriff and Wentworth Volunteer Thomas Cummings, fellow Wentworth Volunteer John Davidson of...
Londonderry, Tory Associates John Elliot and Daniel Rogers, spy and volunteer John Stinson, junior, and Gentleman Levi Willard of Charlestown. While most of the Loyalists settled in Canada, the more affluent preferred to go to Great Britain. The exodus to England began very early in the war, and the Loyalists in London acted as a type of closed society. They lived together, they ate together, and over drinks they talked about the war and of eventually returning to the colonies. All except the most socially acceptable were treated with contempt by British society as provincials, and their advice was constantly ignored. They were a group with no unity of experience, provincially oriented, and with a restricted view of the future. Saratoga, however, altered their expectations; they still hoped to return to America, but they knew it was impossible in the foreseeable future. They had been living from day to day, with few long-term commitments, and suddenly they had to change their entire approach to survival. They began to live more frugally, and they began to look for employment. The government was the natural place to start, and they tried to obtain positions in England, Florida, the West Indies, Canada, and Europe. Like Peter Livius before the war, they relied on the government to provide for their needs. Unfortunately, very few were as lucky as John Wentworth, Paul Wentworth, or Benjamin Thompson. Major Robert Rogers was successful, but his success turned sour, and he died in poverty in London. Robert Traill, the former comptroller in Bermuda, and Thomas McDonough, Governor Wentworth's private secretary, became the British Consul to New England.

Most men did not have as much luck as McDonough or Traill: Robert Luist Fowle gave up and returned to New Hampshire, George Boyd died.
trying to come home, and the "infamous" Stephen Holland died shortly after the war, in Ireland. Even success, however, could be sour, as the case of Samuel Hale of Portsmouth demonstrates. Hounded out of New Hampshire and proscribed by the rebels, the former councilor drifted to Boston and then to England. He was offered a judgeship in South Carolina, which was occupied by the British at the time, but he declined, citing his poor health. He later applied for the position of Solicitor General of Quebec but was turned down because he could not speak French very well. Eventually, after failing to be appointed a British consul to the United States, he found employment as an undersecretary in the State Department. While he finally succeeded in his public life, his private life was utterly destroyed by the war.

To read Hale's private correspondence to his wife back in New Hampshire is to read the story of two broken hearts. He and his wife, Lydia, wrote continually to one another, as Lydia remained in America to care for their son. Their letters contain few mentions of politics, but mostly consist of tender expressions of love and regret. In 1777 Samuel wrote of his heartsickness at being "absent from the tenderest Connections & most endearing Ties of my Life." Two years later he wrote that "these things Sometimes unman me & I fear I shall not continue to do what my conscience dictates to be my Duty." In 1780 he stated that "altho the distance is great that divides our persons sure I am nothing can destroy our Affections,...time and distance had only increase them." Writing about his son in 1781, he said that "I have wrote a letter to Jack but the Struggle in effecting it has overwhelmed me with tenderness & affection." "I wish my dear as much & as ardently as you can that the way was open for our meeting," was his lament in 1782, but in 1783 he wrote that "I cannot think of coming to NH to be a beggar," and "my
conscience tells me I have been invariably right in my attachments &
reasonings upon this unfortunate subject that separated the Two
Countries." In 1784 he wrote "but my Love I cannot come back to America
before a better...humour prevails between the two Countris;" and in 1786
he bitterly wrote that "America made a foolish bargain for her indepen-
dence." To many men the war meant much more than just a political
separation from their former homes and physical suffering; surely the
psychological and mental anguish of men like Samuel Hale hurt much
deeper.

While the British government could not ease the psychological
pains of their allies, they did not, despite what some Loyalists thought,
desert them. The British knew full well that the Loyalist clauses in
the Paris peace treaty were unenforceable and meaningless, but the
government had realized by 1782 that they had to cut their losses and
end the war, or face possible disaster. The Shelburne administration
regretted sacrificing the Loyalists, but the national interest had to
take precedence. In order to help the exiles start fresh, the govern-
ment elected to shoulder the responsibility for compensating them for
the losses that they suffered in the war. To win a claim, the
particular Loyalist had to prove his loyalty, wealth, and status, and
demonstrate his need. Compensation was not allowed for estates bought
after the war, uncultivated lands, rents, incomes of office received
during the revolution, mortgaged property, anticipated professional
profits, losses through depreciated currency, captures at sea, losses
in trade or labor, losses caused by the British army, runaway slaves, or
debts. In July 1783 a five member commission was established to classi-
fy losses and services into six categories: those who rendered service
to Great Britain, those who bore arms against the revolution, uniform
Loyalists, Loyalist residents in Great Britain, those who took oaths of allegiance to the American states and later joined the British, and those who took up arms with the Americans and later joined the British army or navy. The investigations involved a personal examination, written and sworn statements, and the testimony of witnesses. When the first compensation act expired in 1785, it was quickly replaced. The new act reflected experience, and it called for the commissioners to go to Quebec and Nova Scotia to hear cases. The deadline for filing a claim was extended to May 1, 1786 because many Loyalists could not possibly go to London to file or to defend their claims. Eventually 3,225 claims were filed, and 2,291 Loyalists received compensation to the sum of £3,033,091. Included in the 3,225 claims were forty-nine from New Hampshire.

The basic problem in any analysis of the American Loyalists' Claims for New Hampshire is the fact that the sample of New Hampshire claimants is much too small for making anything more than just superficial generalizations. While it seems that the Loyalists who filed claims were, on the whole, a wealthier group than the rebels, so many poor Loyalists did not file claims that even this conclusion is not certain. Further complicating any analysis of the London Claims' figures is the possibility of fraud and overestimation of losses, undoubtedly commonplace occurrences, such as in the case of George Boyd. Councilor Boyd filed the second largest New Hampshire claim, for £34,012. Despite Governor Wentworth's support, Boyd's claim was disallowed because the commission had doubts about his loyalty, particularly after Peter Livius testified that Boyd was an unworthy Loyalist, probably a rebel, and a man of bad character. Because the problems of analysis are so great, it is much more interesting to treat the Loyalist claimants as
individuals who gambled on the wrong side and lost, but who tried to
recover some of their losses from the British government.

Of the forty-nine claimants, it is possible to estimate the
wealth of thirty-nine, with the claims totalling £185,787. The estima­
tions are taken directly from the British records as the amounts claimed
by the Loyalist in question, ranging from Governor Wentworth's claim for
£47,116, to the £70 claimed by weaver Levi Warner. Samuel Mallows, who
held a "firm attachment to the British Constitution," filed a claim for
the loss of 100 acres and four horses; later he withdrew his claim for
the land, and the rest was disallowed because he had been advantageously
employed in the Quarter Master General's Department when the loss
occurred. George Sprowle, Surveyor General of the Lands under Governor
Wentworth, claimed £2,328. John Stinson, junior, the spy, lost 150
acres, which he valued at £550. Captain John Cochran tried to claim
£1,290, including as losses what he had spent in improving and supplying
Fort William and Mary and a lighthouse; the British government allowed
him only £468.

Undoubtedly John Wentworth lost the most, including 4,387 acres
of land in Wolfeborough, 15 acres in Portsmouth, 72 in Barrington, 350
in Lyman, 900 in Thornton, 911 in Gore, 12,000 in Cheshire, 2,200 in
Dartmouth, 2,020 in Cockermouth, and an additional 3,200 acres in
Dorchester, all of which he valued at £44,116. Added to his claim was
the value of lost personal property and lost income. The last royal
governor of New Hampshire produced letters from the Secretary of State
approving his actions as governor during the turbulent days before he
had been forced to leave the colony. The investigating committee
declared that "the claimant is a meritorious Loyalist & rendered Serv-
ices to Great Britain." However, Wentworth was already employed as the
Surveyor General of Nova Scotia at £800 per year, with a good chance for advancement. The commission decided to allow Wentworth only £7,927, which they later revised to £8,827.33

John Stinson of Dunbarton filed a claim for £450 for the loss of 200 improved acres. He had been a lieutenant and a captain, had been captured and jailed in Boston and Rutland, and was proscribed and confiscated. Supporting his claim was Major Robert Rogers. The commission ruled that he was loyal and had borne arms, but they valued his land at £190, a sum which they approved. Counterfeiter, spy, and officer, Stephen Holland, claimed £7,609, which was greatly reduced to support his wife and two children in Nova Scotia. The government gave him £2,558 and then deducted his pension from it. Councilor Samuel Hale was granted £150 of his £500 claim and was also given an allowance of £100 per year. Post-rider Bartholomew Stavers was given only an allowance of £40 because he could not satisfactorily demonstrate his property losses. George Glen filed a claim for £1,558 but did not file any certificates to prove his loss and as a result the commission gave him only £20 per year because they could not be sure if he really had had property.34

While the British government tried to make life easier for the Loyalists, and while the Loyalists tried to start over in new lands, back in New Hampshire, with the war over and independence won, it might be assumed that the temper of the revolutionary leaders had begun to cool down. John Stinson did not find that to be the case, however, as he was apprehended and arrested in June 1783 for trying to enjoy the fruits of liberty which he had tried to destroy, according to the General Court; he was shipped back to New Brunswick.35 In 1784 Elijah Williams of Keene tried to return home but was arrested and forced to
leave again. On March 4, 1784 the Claremont Episcopalians petitioned the governor of Quebec for a grant of land because they could no longer live in the United States because of harassment. As late as April 25, 1783, Jesse Christey was still confined in Exeter because he had earlier gone over to the enemy and had then returned to the state without permission during the war. The General Court also forbade Mrs. Stephen Holland and her children to return to the state, even temporarily, despite the request of Major General John Sullivan.

Yet times were slowly changing, and sentiments were cooling down. In 1784 the General Assembly repealed the act disenfranchising those suspected of disloyalty and the act prohibiting suspected Loyalists from holding public office. In 1786 the Proscription Act was repealed, and all of the other anti-Loyalist laws were removed from the books by 1792. Of course, most of the Loyalists had firmly established themselves elsewhere by that time, and even though the laws were repealed, the people of the state were still reluctant to accept back into the fold their former enemies. A few Loyalists did manage to return, such as Daniel Nelson, who was given permission to return to New Hampshire by the General Court on August 29, 1783, to take care of his widowed mother.

The most famous Loyalist to return to the state was Robert Luist Fowle, who had fled the colony after being suspected of counterfeiting, later served in Wentworth's Volunteers, had been proscribed, and had his estate confiscated. Fowle filed a claim for £925 with the British government and was allowed £100. Regardless of his past Loyalism, he returned to the United States when it became legal, married his brother's widow, and lived in New Hampshire until his death. Perhaps his return was tolerated because of his family's prominence; his uncle published
the New Hampshire Gazette, and his father was a silent partner in Rogers and Fowle of Boston and was later an Episcopalian clergyman in Connecticut. Robert Luist Fowle's own activities in the state had also not only been directed at supporting Great Britain: as editor of the newspaper, the State Journal, before his counterfeiting career, he had published many pro-revolutionary tracts. Here was a man who could, and did, play both sides and win. 40

Other men, like Joshua Atherton, John Peirce, and James Sheafe, managed to rise from their Loyalist identifications to reach the heights of post-war government. While Oliver Whipple and Woodbury Langdon put their shaded pasts behind them and succeeded very early by being chosen as delegates to the Continental Congress, it took longer for these three men to outlive their pasts. Atherton had been implicated in the counterfeiting activities of the Stephen Holland gang and had served a year in the Exeter jail, yet he overcame his past to be elected the state's attorney general in 1793. 41 John Peirce, a Portsmouth merchant, had been, like Whipple, a member of the Tory Association in 1775. It took him longer to outgrow his identification with the Loyalist party, but he eventually became the loan officer for New Hampshire under President John Adams. 42 The only reason to classify James Sheafe as a Loyalist is because he refused to sign the Association Test in 1776; nevertheless, that qualifies him as a Loyalist at that particular time in history, something that General Sullivan never let him forget. Sheafe managed to triumph over his past to be chosen United States senator in 1802, and in 1816 he just missed being elected governor by 2,000 votes; perhaps enough people did remember and had not forgiven. 43

More former Loyalists managed to live out the war and persecutions in silence and afterwards lived lives of modest success. Charles Barrett
of Ipswich had once been confined to his town but was later a delegate to the ratification convention of the United States Constitution, where he was an ardent democrat. Ebenezer Champney, "a moderate Tory," became a judge of probate for Hillsborough County. Doctor Ammi Ruhammah Cutter, one of John Wentworth's closest friends before the war, served at the Constitutional Convention in 1781. Asa Porter, the wealthy Haverhill merchant, survived vilification and jail to become one of the wealthiest landowners in the state. John Stavers continued to run the William Pitt Tavern in Portsmouth; Reuben Kidder refused to acknowledge the new government, but he paid his taxes and went unmolested; Peter Gilman survived confinement to die at home in 1788, and former councilor George Jaffrey likewise survived confinement to die in Portsmouth in 1802. 

In the case of New Hampshire's two most prominent Loyalists, Benjamin Thompson and John Wentworth, the fact that they had been vivified, humiliated, proscribed, and confiscated did not mean that they lost interest in the well-being of the state, particularly with regards to their favorite institution - Dartmouth College. Thompson, Count Rumford, wrote to President Wheelock of Dartmouth in 1800 of the:

sincere desire of the Managers of the Royal Institution of Great Britain to cultivate a friendly Correspondence with them, and to cooperate with them in all things that may contribute to the advancement of Science, and the general Diffusion of Knowledge of such new and useful Discoveries, and mechanical Improvements, as may tend to increase the enjoyments, and promote the Industry, Happiness, and Prosperity of Mankind.

Thompson went on to supply Dartmouth with many valuable documents and instruments.

Former governor John Wentworth also took an interest in Dartmouth College and corresponded frequently with the Reverend Mr. Wheelock.
Among other things, Wentworth expedited the donation of books by Paul Wentworth and the donation of John Phillips' mathematical and philosophical apparatus and helped to exchange the instruments for much needed books. \(^{46}\) All of Wentworth's activities on behalf of Dartmouth caused Wheelock to write that they "recalled to our minds those former days when we were honored by your cultivated connection and care....the plaintive muses drop a tear," and he also wrote, although he later crossed it out, "you don't think how numerous your friends are in this country." \(^{47}\) Wentworth also helped Jeremy Belknap write the history of New Hampshire by supplying him with some of the private correspondence of the time and by criticizing Belknap's early rough drafts. \(^{48}\)

While some Loyalists could return, and some managed to overcome their past, all was not forgiven nor forgotten by the rebels. When it came to such a British institution as the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, the rebels could still hold a grudge. In July 1783 two of their agents wrote to their London office about the distressing situation of the Society's lands in New Hampshire:

Since the commencing of the War between great Britain and America, the care that has been taken of those Lands has for the most part failed of the desired effect. For that licentious principle which has been the distinguishing Badge of People in general in this Country has been as obvious in this as in any other respeck. And in many places, where the situation and quality of those Lands render them valuable, Persons have presumed to improve them without paying any acknowledgment therefor, and are determined to hold them without any other title than that of Possession, and tho, at present it will avail them but little yet in time it will amount to a title. And tho the Revd. Ranna Cosset who is the only Person that is authorized to take care of them has not been wanting in his endeavours to prevent such proceedings, yet in many cases he has not been able to restrain them as he could have no assistance from the Laws of great Britain. \(^{49}\)

While times were changing, it was obvious that they were changing very slowly, and that the men who had been especially hated for their
Loyalism - men like John Wentworth, Stephen Holland, and Breed Batcheller - could never return. The American Revolution was a civil war, and in New Hampshire it also took the form of a factional political dispute between the Wentworth oligarchy and men on the outside, like John Sullivan and John Langdon. If the verdict of the revolution was to succeed, then the men who had challenged it from the beginning could never again be allowed to exert their influence in the state. If the positions of government were to remain open, the oligarchys' return could not be tolerated. The war was over, independence was won, but the future was still shaky. What New Hampshire lost by banishing the countless others of breeding, culture, and intelligence, can never be truly determined. Yet the sacrifice was justified and necessary in the eyes of the rebels, and the verdict of history has seconded them.
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CONCLUSION

THE LOYALISTS' LEGACY

The Loyalists of New Hampshire chose an ill-fated course, but their positions in society, their commercial and professional connections, and their conservative nature allowed them no other alternative. Once they had made their choice, however, many of them risked their property, their futures, their families, and even their lives in a losing effort to keep America part of the British Empire. As spies, couriers, counterfeiters, and soldiers, they stood up for what they believed in and fought against their former neighbors and sometimes even against the biases of their British allies. Having made their decision, many of them suffered proscription, physical and psychological harassment, and property confiscation. When the war ended, their problems were only half over as they were forced to start their lives over in strange, new lands. At the same time, the new nation lost the services of some of the finest men of pre-revolutionary America.

In general, the American experience led inexorably to 1776. Transplanted Britons carried with them ideas of parliamentarianism and constitutionalism and learned individualism and equality in the harsh wilderness. As the colonies matured, they grew farther away from the mainstream of purely British experience. Gradually a very unstable aristocracy rose to the top of colonial society, without which there could have been no successful movement against England. The American aristocracy never came close to approximating the English aristocracy.
in strength because it lacked the legal, built-in supports that buttressed the English aristocracy's position in society. The American aristocracy was more an aristocracy of wealth and merit, and in the free-wheeling colonial economy, and with no legal definitions or restrictions, the colonial aristocracy was very open and mobile, therefore providing America with a very volatile situation. The members of the aristocracy knew each other, trusted each other, and shared experiences and concerns which were peculiarly American. The leading Loyalists were part of the prewar colonial aristocracy since they were usually wealthy and held high government posts, and from 1763 to 1774 there was no division in the American ranks. The idea of Parliamentary supremacy was new, and the new imperial controls were challenging an arrangement that had existed for decades and under which the colonists had prospered.

Where the Loyalists began to disagree with the rebels was over the means to uphold American liberty while maintaining their positions, and they also disputed the attitude to be taken towards British law. John Wentworth is a perfect example of the pull between British and American sentiment. He opposed the Stamp Act and may have been instrumental in its repeal by persuading his distant cousin, Lord Rockingham, of its faults; he regretted the Townshend Duties and questioned the wisdom of the Tea Act, but as an officer of the government he was forced to uphold them. When the New Hampshire radicals took to extra-legal methods of opposition by establishing a Committee of Correspondence, a Committee of Safety, and a Provincial Congress, Wentworth was still trapped into following the prescribed legal motions and therefore lost all of his effectiveness. When it came time for the final showdown, Wentworth could rely on no one except a small band of supporters.
who, like him, were dependent on Great Britain for their position and wealth.

In New Hampshire the Wentworths had built up an elaborate system of control that tied everyone's interests to the interests of the oligarchy. As a one product colony, the Wentworths dominated the product and controlled the land through their positions as governor and Surveyor-General, and they could often buy their opponents. With firm support in Great Britain, from John Thomlinson and Lord Rochingham, they controlled the government in the colony and could reward their supporters with positions of high status. But John Wentworth came to power without firm support in England and during a declining period of demand for lumber.

The New Hampshire opposition party, led by John Langdon and John Sullivan, saw an opportunity to unseat the Wentworth oligarchy and to remove the obstacles from advancement in government and society by accepting the revolutionary doctrines and by making Massachusetts' fight their own.

The rebels first drove out the prominent and dangerous Loyalists, and took over the formal mantle of government by forcing Loyalist officers, like George Jaffrey and Theodore Atkinson, to turn over the records and finances of the colony. Then the rebels concentrated on keeping the less prominent Loyalists quiet through a series of laws that eventually robbed them of every human political right for which the rebels were fighting. But the Loyalists could not all be kept silent, and men from every economic and social class came forward to support the king. The motivations of the Loyalists will always remain unclear, although certain obvious connections of position, status, commerce, and profession with the British empire can be determined. Men who were afraid of change, men who loved the king, men who obeyed the laws, and men who held firmly
conservative beliefs, these were the men whom the rebels learned to fear and to control.

There was very good reason to fear the Loyalists, as the very dedicated ones served Great Britain as best they could, as spies, counterfeiters, and soldiers. Men like Robert Luist Fowle, and Stephen Holland and his gang did their best to undermine the economy of the state through their counterfeiting operations. Solomon Willard, Leonard Whiting, and Breed Batcheller risked their lives in battle, trying to uphold the king's authority. Benjamin Thompson, Paul Wentworth, John Sheperd, and John Stinson, junior, used devious but efficient means to try and destroy the new government. Many Loyalists believed devoutly in the British cause and were willing to die in support of it. Yet most conservative-minded individuals kept quiet until they knew which way the war was going, or else they bent under the pressure of their rebel neighbors; but not the hard-core Loyalists, not a Simeon Baxter or a Stephen Holland. To the hard-core supporters of the king anything was preferable to a rebel victory, and in the process of trying to prevent that victory they lost everything.

R. R. Palmer, in The Age of the Democratic Revolution, maintains that very few Loyalists returned to the United States, and while it is obvious that several did return to New Hampshire, what is important is that not every Loyalist left in the first place. For every William Baxter, Robert Luist Fowle, or Daniel Nelson who fled and was allowed to return, hundreds of Loyalists had remained in the state for the duration of the war, silently, or not so silently accepting their fate. The men who refused to sign the Association Test in 1776 have to be classified as Loyalists in that year, with the exceptions of those who refused to sign because of their religious or conscientious beliefs. Most of
them never contributed to the British cause, but in 1776 they declared themselves for the king by not signing the oath, even though after Saratoga they wisely remained mute. These were men who chose pragmatism over principle. Yet here, also, was a group of conservative-minded men who stayed in the state and who would have a voice in the post-war years. Sometimes their impact could be great, as in the cases of Leverett Hubbard, who served on the Superior Court, and James Sheafe, who became a United States Senator; but mostly it was just the great potential impact that they represented that was important. Even a Loyalist who remained in the state during the war and did not remain silent or inactive, but who instead actively worked against the new government, could overcome his past and attain a high office in the post-war period. Such was Joshua Atherton, the counterfeiter who went on to become the state's attorney general.

Palmer believes that:

it is clear that the Revolution involved a contest between men committed either to a more popular or a more aristocratic trend in government and society. Had the Loyalists returned, received back their property, and resumed the positions of prestige and public influence which many of them had once enjoyed, it seems unlikely that the subsequent history of the United States would have been like the history that we know.²

In New Hampshire, however, it is obvious that most of the Loyalists remained in the first place. While most of the leading Loyalists, and almost all of the old Wentworth elite left, and relatively few Loyalists rose to post-war heights of trust and influence, a large mass of former Loyalists continued to live in the State. Perhaps if the Loyalist leadership had returned the history of America would have been different, but the Loyalists, as a conservative force, remained and influenced America's subsequent history.
While many Loyalists stayed in the state, most of the leading Loyalists of the pre-war years left. What New Hampshire lost because they expelled men like John Wentworth, Benjamin Thompson, Stephen Holland, and others is difficult to ascertain. Wentworth was one of the most popular governors in New Hampshire history, at least until he hired the carpenters for General Gage. The interests of New Hampshire and of the colony's citizens were always vitally important to him, and his actions in their behalf were commendable. Trapped as he was by position and temperament to the British side of the war, he still maintained a fondness and an interest in the state.

Although Benjamin Thompson had a thoroughly unlikeable personality, a great deal was sacrificed when he was lost to Great Britain. Surely his scientific and social experiments could have benefited the new nation. Paul Wentworth could have proven to be invaluable in the diplomacy of the United States. The loss of the McMasters brothers and all of the other commercial Loyalists undoubtedly robbed the new economy of trade connections and great profits. The loss of experienced military men, like the sober Robert Rogers, or Breed Batcheller, or Stephen Holland hurt because the United States could have benefited from their experiences in the future on the frontier and in the War of 1812.

However, the rebels could not take a chance by allowing their former superiors to return. While they had to consider the conservative class in their decisions, they could dispose of the most obvious threats to the success of the revolution as they saw it. Too much conservatism might have resulted in a backsliding into the British Empire or perhaps defeat in the War of 1812. With the Loyalist leadership gone, the rebel leadership was the only one available. In New Hampshire that had been part of the reason behind riding the revolution to success, and men like
Meshech Weare, John Langdon, and John Sullivan were unlikely to allow their former superiors to return once they had triumphed. While the rebel leadership could and did chart the course of American history, part of the Loyalist legacy was to act as a brake on the revolutionary process after the war.

James J. Talman states it very clearly when he writes that "the exodus of the conservative and moderate elements left the thirteen colonies poorer in knowledge of finance, diplomacy, and politics, but hastened the development of democracy." Only it was a democracy that had to include thousands of ex-Loyalists still residing in the country.

The legacy of the Loyalists is two-fold, however, as their departure from the United States meant their impact elsewhere. America's loss of anywhere from 60,000 to 100,000 Loyalists was the rest of the British Empire's gain. They strengthened the British hold on the West Indies, the Bahamas, and Bermuda and made them economic gems in the British Empire. They settled the Atlantic provinces of Canada and created New Brunswick. They settled in Upper and Lower Canada, in fact forcing an administrative division of Canada into upper and lower provinces. They Anglicized Canada, turning it from a basically French colony into a predominantly British colony. As part of their cultural baggage from the thirteen colonies, the Loyalists brought with them the traditions of freehold tenure of land, English laws, and representative legislative institutions. In many cases, their hatred of the United States colored the diplomatic relationships between Great Britain and America for years.

The most significant impact that the Loyalists had after 1783 was in the political, cultural, and economic life of Nova Scotia and New...
Brunswick. In the beginning the few prominent and articulate Loyalists, like John and Benning Wentworth, Robert Traill, and Thomas McDonough, managed, by using friendships and patronage, to secure most of the political offices in the colonies. As political and social leaders, whether as lieutenant-governor or sheriff, as councilor or justice of the peace, these men tried to impose their vision of society and politics onto the masses. They established schools, churches, newspapers, and even a bishopric. The influence of Lieutenant-Governor Wentworth was perhaps the strongest, having once again the support of his British superiors. As he had done in New Hampshire, Governor Wentworth worked tirelessly in behalf of the people of Nova Scotia and the British Empire. Education, improvement of transportation, commerce, and strengthening of the colonial militia were all important items on his agenda again.

That the Loyalists could establish a center of activity, political and social, far away from and independent of Halifax, is just another example of their impact. New Brunswick is rightly called the "Loyalist Province," and dozens of New Hampshire Loyalists did their part to help it succeed. While struggling to start over in the wilderness, the emigrants managed to maintain both their American and British heritages. Despite having been expelled from the United States, men like John Stinson, magistrate James Fulton, and sheriff Richard Holland hung on to their democratic, individualistic backgrounds. Their ties to the British Empire were even stronger following the revolution and, while the impetus for political change was always strong, the liberal, democratic elements were always kept within the bounds of British constitutional legality.
Economically, the potential for prosperity in Atlantic Canada was tremendous, and the Loyalists were not about to waste it. Canada was particularly important to Great Britain once the United States was excluded from trading within the empire. Once the old American colonies were no longer protected by the Navigation Acts, or encouraged by bounties, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick were expected to pick up the slack, especially with regards to the very lucrative West Indies' trade. The Loyalists also felt that they would become a valuable partner within the trading network of the second British Empire, and also in the highly profitable trade with New England. Atlantic Canada abounded in lumber, fish, beef, pork, and horses; shipbuilding expanded dramatically, and lumber was in demand both locally and abroad, particularly by the Royal Navy which had just lost the United States' stands of white pine. Once established, it was not long before the Loyalists thrived once again, like the McMasters brothers, Jotham Blanchard, and Hugh Henderson.⁵

By the end of John Wentworth's tenure as Lieutenant-Governor of Nova Scotia in the early 1800s, the direct influence of the leading Loyalists had begun to level off. Nevertheless, as Robert S. Allen, Deputy Chief of the Treaties and Historical Research Centre in Ottawa, has written, "they had achieved a fair measure of success in instilling the Loyalist ideals, particularly conservative principles, anti-republicanism, an abhorrence of revolution, and the preservation of the British constitution."⁶ Such was the beginning of the Loyalist legacy in Canada.⁷

The New Hampshire Loyalist experience was unique in America. Before 1774 the colony was one of the quietest and seemed to be firmly controlled by the pro-British Wentworth elite. After 1774, and
particularly after John Wentworth's flight in 1775, the Loyalist movement in the state was dispersed and largely ineffective. The Wentworth oligarchy, a formidable structure on the outside, was hollow and had few roots in the population or the colony at large. As a closed society the oligarchy was isolated and provided a marvellous target for the rebels, who were anxious to supplant the entrenched elite. The oligarchy was so powerful and contained relatively so few individuals that it naturally engendered a reaction against itself. Meanwhile, as the lower positions of power were gradually opened, the elite built up an articulate opposition party, fueled by jealousy and dislike.

John Wentworth also came to power without the firm backing in England which his uncle had enjoyed. When John became governor John Thomlinson had recently resigned as the colony's agent, Lord Rockingham was once again out of power, and George III had recently ascended to the throne determined to rule a tightly organized and controlled empire. While John Wentworth may have been a very popular governor, one must distinguish between his personality and what he stood for. Personally he was extremely popular, and everyone knew that he was dedicated to the interests of the colony and its citizens. On the other hand, he increasingly stood for a less and less popular form of imperial government. For a while Wentworth managed to keep the two images separate and rule effectively, but after his attempt to supply General Gage with carpenters, in 1774, the people only saw him as the figurehead of a repressive regime.

The combination of these internal and external forces was irresistible. When the rebels finally forced Wentworth and his followers out of the colony, the Loyalist movement was decapitated. The evacuation of the seacoast area by the elite also meant that the Loyalists
were dispersed throughout the state, with no east-west, seacoast-
frontier division. The fact that the British never occupied any part
of New Hampshire meant that the Loyalists had nowhere to congregate
except outside the state, in Boston, New York, Halifax, or London, where
they were again dispersed. Leaderless and with no focus, the New Hamp-
shire Loyalist movement struggled haphazardly along, trusting in the
king and the British army to correct the situation. The old regime had
fallen, a victim of its own success.

While the New Hampshire Loyalist leadership left, the less influ-
ential and the less public Loyalists tended to remain in the state.
Even some of the lesser officials of the oligarchy stayed in the state,
and while some, like John Wentworth's father, changed their stripes;
others, like Asa Porter, continued their opposition to the revolutionary
government for as long as they could. Depending on their actions, or
inactions, they suffered persecution, vilification, quarantine, confine-
ment, fines, and physical and psychological abuse. Some of them took it
and disappeared into history as Loyalists no longer after the Association
Test, and others fled to the security of the British lines where they
waited patiently for the end or served under the king's standard. Some
very brave Loyalists, like Stephen Holland, Joshua Atherton, and John
Sheperd, chose to remain in the state and work quietly to undermine the
state by counterfeiting the currency and by carrying secret messages.

Yet the vast majority of New Hampshire Loyalists, who can only be
identified as Loyalists because they refused to sign the Association
Test, kept quiet and did nothing to arouse the anger of their neighbors.
When the battle of Saratoga was over, most of these Loyalists stopped
being active or open Loyalists and began to support the revolution, at
least publicly, as their private thoughts can never be divined. These
were the conservative men who the leaders of the new country had to contend with at the ballot box later.

The major problem in dealing with the Loyalists of the American Revolution is that a man who can be categorized as a Loyalist in 1775 because he joined the Tory Association, could become a leading radical and serve as one of New Hampshire's representatives to the Continental Congress only a few years later, as was the case with Oliver Whipple. Hundreds of non-signers of the Association Test, and thus Loyalists in 1776, never made another sign of their loyalty and are lost forever. Even someone who was proscribed in 1777 could return and be accepted into the rebel ranks and become a messenger for the General Court, as was William Baxter. "Loyalism" fluctuated with time and events, so there was never a steady corps of Loyalists, except at any one given time.

In general, however, New Hampshire Loyalists were spread throughout the state and were nowhere in great concentration. The leading Loyalists were, not surprisingly, members of the Wentworth elite and came from Portsmouth. The majority of Loyalists, after making their initial choice in favor of the king by not signing the Association Test, lived quiet, unobtrusive lives and did not suffer at the hands of their neighbors. Ardent and outspoken Loyalists were hounded with persecution, legal and extralegal, culminating in banishment and confiscation. Many dedicated Loyalists did all that they could to help Great Britain win the war, through counterfeiting, espionage, and soldiering, but ultimately the Loyalists lost. They had to accept defeat, and many of them went on to become instrumental in shaping the future of Canada. In the final analysis, however, the Loyalists had followed their own nature as truly as had the rebels, and perhaps they did deserve a better fate.
CONCLUSION NOTES


6. Ibid., 6.

7. Later in the nineteenth century, the Loyalists actually became a repressive force in Canadian history, with their involvement in the Tory Compact and the revolts of the 1830s, as they fought separatist demands. As a political force, they were conservative, but they are largely maligned for exerting a reactionary influence over the development of Canada in the mid-nineteenth century, an influence which is debateable that they really had.
APPENDICES
APPENDIX A

LOYALIST HISTORIOGRAPHY

History tends to be written by the victors, and thus victory always colors the view of the past. It is true that the losers do write explanations, excuses, and apologies, but in time even they come to accept the verdict of the victors. The historiography of the American Revolution reflects this general pattern. Obviously the winners of the Revolution were the rebels, or patriots, and their valuation of the causes, circumstances, and outcome of the war have come to be accepted as fact. Even the British, the obvious losers, quickly came to accept the rebel victory as a natural conclusion, learned from their mistakes and improved upon their imperial administration for their second empire, and then forgot the unpleasantness of the entire period. The verdict of history states that the Revolution was inevitable, just, liberal, and righteous, with results beneficial to all.

However, it is impossible to treat the American War for Independence as a simple movement for national liberation, and more than just two groups were involved in the development and progress of the problem. The Revolution was just as much a civil war as it was a revolution, and yet the Americans who remained loyal to Great Britain, and thus shared in the ultimate defeat of British arms, are largely forgotten. Historian Lawrence H. Leder refers to the American Loyalists as "outcasts" and "a lost generation," descriptions that adequately reflect the role of the Loyalists that history has since assigned them.¹
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No clear-cut, all encompassing definition of "Loyalist" has been, and probably never will be established because being a Loyalist in 1775 was not necessarily the same as being a Loyalist in 1779, since situations changed and men adjusted to the new circumstances differently. Only the most general definition of Loyalist is possible and that is to say that any man who, after the outbreak of hostilities, continued to show support for the king or Great Britain, by act, word, or discernable thought was, at the particular time of the deed, a Loyalist.

The Loyalists were under the handicap of being not only losers but also traitors in the eyes of the victorious rebels, and as such they were an element to be purged from the historical accounts, or else their fate had to be dramatized as a moral for all future American generations; an attitude that still prevails today in most schools throughout the country. Ask most children, and adults as well, to name a prominent Loyalist and, after the term is explained, the person will respond - Benedict Arnold, the arch foe of American liberty and patriotism. The names of Joseph Galloway, Thomas Hutchinson, William Franklin, and John Wentworth; all moderate, well-meaning men equally attached to liberty and as full of American patriotism as John Adams, Thomas Jefferson, and Benjamin Franklin; are unknown. Loyalists are the men and women that history chose to ignore, while the whole nature of "loyalism" has undergone a constant debate.

The Loyalists themselves were not totally silent, however, and many spoke directly to history in their own accounts of the causes and progress of the revolution. Likewise, not all historians have ignored the Loyalists, and at the present time the study of Loyalists is undergoing a resurgence. In American history those times when the question of loyalty has arisen have been few and generally have come during
wartime. In such times of questioning, the nature of loyalty and the
study of the Loyalists of the revolution have usually attracted atten-
tion because during the War for Independence there was as large a number
of people who were genuinely perplexed as to where their political
loyalty lay than at any other time, with the possible exception of the
American Civil War, and at no other time in American history has such an
exodus of citizens taken place. The first crisis of loyalty came almost
immediately after the revolution with the division between nation and
state, with the nationalists having a great deal of difficulty making
the citizens give up their local jealousies. Next, during the crisis
with France, President John Adams' administration panicked, imposed
standards, and arrested Republican newspaper editors under the provisions
of the Alien and Sedition Acts. During the War of 1812, loyalism was
discussed in an international context, between British and American con-
cepts of naturalization and citizenship.² In these early instances
however, the study of Loyalists played little role, the memory of their
treachery was still fresh in the minds of Americans and the Loyalists
themselves, as British citizens and Canadian neighbors, continued to be
in opposition to American interests.

With the Mexican War came Henry David Thoreau's classic on the
nature of a citizen's duty in his essay on civil disobedience. Shortly
thereafter, the Civil War era began the actual process of historical
investigation into the nature of the Loyalists, because of the similarity
between the Civil War and the War for Independence. In the South, the
people attempted to win a war of national liberation, while in the
North, the Unionists tried to save the constitutional union. The
parallels between 1861 and 1776 were obvious and during the War Between
the States, both areas contained pockets of opposition to the avowed
purposes of the war — the Southern Unionists and the Northern Copperheads, both legitimate domestic opponents of their region's aims. For the first time, people began to see the American Revolution as a civil war, during which there had been legitimate opposition.

The Populist and Progressive eras, though not wars, divided the nation ideologically and philosophically, calling into question once again citizens' loyalties. The World Wars brought into focus ethnic and ideological opposition to American involvement. More recently the American presence in Vietnam saw the nation more divided in loyalty than at any other time since the Civil War, and added an intellectual and social tint to the picture of loyalism.³

Loyalist historiography has thus gone through over two centuries of growth and development, beginning with the Loyalists' own works and culminating with the more recent, specialized approaches taken by today's historians. From the 1770s to the 1980s, the nature and role of loyalism have been examined by many different men from many varied, and sometimes antagonistic, perspectives.

Beginning in the pre-Revolution period, future Loyalists, like Samuel Seabury, Joseph Galloway, and George Chalmers tried to make their voices heard above the roar of the radicals. The Reverend Samuel Seabury, of New York, writing pamphlets as "A Westchester Farmer," took up the British cause within three weeks of the announcement by the First Continental Congress of nonimportation and nonconsumption. He castigated Congress with old prejudices, rusty jokes, and colorful, lively language that appealed to the average man. He wrote of the farmers' need for law and peace, of the rights of government and the obligations of the citizens. Seabury destroyed the "heresy" that the colonists' loyalty was due only to the King and not to Parliament, by demonstrating that
the king was king only because of an act of Parliament. He made the case that if one person had the right to disregard lawful authority, then everyone had the same right and government would cease to exist. The magic of Seabury's writing was in the grandeur of its simplicity and the readability of his arguments. However, his persuasiveness was dangerous to the rebels' cause and he was seized as an undesirable citizen in November 1775, and then fled to the British lines in New York City in 1776.

Joseph Galloway, a political ally of Benjamin Franklin and Speaker of the Pennsylvania Assembly from 1766 to 1775, was opposed to the Stamp Act and the other imperial regulations following the French and Indian War. In fact, few Americans, whether future patriot or future Loyalist, supported the Stamp Act; but Galloway realized the necessity of British taxation and found it impossible to reject the basic premise of Parliamentary supremacy. Galloway emphasized citizens' rights, the necessity of exercising all power institutionally, and the need to explore all constitutional avenues before doing anything drastic. He was one of the few future Loyalists to attend the First Continental Congress and there he attempted to settle the differences between Great Britain and America by proposing of a written constitution, with an American congress and a king-appointed president. Galloway failed to cultivate the members of a possible third party at the Congress, made up of moderates like John Dickenson, and, by failing to encourage them, Galloway's plan met easy defeat and independence became inevitable. The decisions of the First Continental Congress and the very establishment of the Congress itself as a nucleus of an American government were mortal blows to Galloway and to the Loyalist cause in general. Galloway's moderate views and desire to compromise reflected the attitude of many
politically active Loyalists throughout the colonies who soon found themselves behind the British lines.\footnote{6}

George Chalmers, a lawyer from Maryland, attacked the rebel cause from a different angle and represented the more conservative approach. Like most lawyers, Chalmers opposed the Stamp Act but, unlike the rebel lawyers, he never challenged Parliament's fundamental right to lay any tax on the colonies. He went on to deny the concept of natural law, the foundation of the rebels' arguments, by stating that the colonies had never been in a state of nature, but had always been subject to English laws.\footnote{7}

The Loyalists soon found themselves outshouted by the rebel propagandists, like Sam Adams and Patrick Henry, and outmaneuvered by master politicians, like John Adams and Thomas Jefferson. With the actual outbreak of hostilities, most of the outspoken Loyalists were persecuted and driven to find safety behind the British lines. Pinning their hope of eventual return to the colonies they loved to British force of arms, these unfortunate men and women found themselves in permanent exile at the end of the war. In many cases banished by the Americans and apparently abandoned by the British after the peace, some of the Loyalists began to write histories of the war to justify and to explain their viewpoint.

Many Loyalist historians blamed the revolution on the improper management of the empire by the king and Parliament. Alexander Hewat, of South Carolina, blamed the war on changed political and social conditions in the colonies which the British never understood. Jonathan Boucher, writing that government by its nature was irresistible and concluding that the assumption by the revolutionaries that government prescriptions could be legally denied was absurd, nonetheless believed
that even though the Americans had strayed from moral duty, the British had erred in judgment. George Chalmers felt that Parliament had failed to play its proper role in imperial administration until too late, and that both sides had failed to fulfill their commitments. Daniel Leonard, "Massachusettensis" before the war, believed that the colonists had been misled by their demogoguic leaders, and Joseph Galloway also believed that the Americans had been deluded by ambitious men. Going further than most, Galloway stated that the actual revolution had been the result of a conspiracy by a few of those ambitious men.8

The two greatest Loyalist historians were friends and leaders of Massachusetts' pre-war political and social scene - Thomas Hutchinson, governor, and Peter Oliver, chief justice. In 1776, Hutchinson wrote a point by point refutation of the Declaration of Independence's indictment of the king, using legal and constitutional documentation of the facts to show the rebels were guilty of exaggerations, lies, and precipitate action.9 In volume three of his monumental history of Massachusetts Bay, Hutchinson wrote of becoming governor and finding himself "bound by a solemn oath, as well as by the nature of his office, to support an authority to which the body of the people refused to submit, and he had no aid from any of the executive powers of government under him."10 He found John Adams to be a man whose "ambition was without bounds, and he has acknowledged to his acquaintance that he could not look with complacency upon any man who was in possession of more wealth, more honours, or more knowledge than himself." He found John Hancock to be a man whose "ruling passion was a fondness for popular applause."11 Hutchinson admitted that Great Britain had made mistakes, citing his own opposition to the Stamp Act as one example, but the blame for the revolution belonged to the radicals who had heated up
"the dregs of the people" with fears of evils, disorders, and confusion. Moses Coit Tyler, describing Hutchinson's ability as an historian, found him to be a man who loved truth, a man of justice and diligence who could master details and narrate accurately, but who lacked breadth of vision, sympathy, historic imagination, and style. While Hutchinson was thus personally involved, as a historian he can be trusted fairly well.

Peter Oliver states, in his *The Origins and Progress of the American Rebellion*, that "Independence, it is true, was declared in Congress in 1776, but it was settled in Boston, in 1768, by Adams & his Junto." The work itself is the usual Loyalist search for an explanation of the rebellion that had been so unexpected and so successful. Oliver, like Galloway, blamed everything on the radical colonists and their overreactions to legitimate British legislation. To Oliver, Otis broke down the barriers of government to let in the "Hydra of Rebellion," during the crisis over the writs of assistance. Sam Adams was a shrewd Machiavellian with no principles but who understood and could manipulate human nature. Franklin was an unprincipled, hypocritical genius who was ruled by pride, and John Adams was a loyal, sensible lawyer until the governor refused to grant him a Commission for the Peace, whereupon he was filled with resentment for the whole imperial system. The merchants of New England, Oliver stated, preferred smuggling to legal business even after the British made legal business more profitable, and the clergy of New England sanctified treason while Congress constantly lied to the people. During all of this, Oliver believed that Great Britain acted constitutionally and usually wisely, even if the acts sometimes suffered in their execution. Oliver concluded that the colonists had been blessed and favored with liberty and a charter grant of an extended
country, prosperity, and happiness, but had been betrayed by the base
ingratitude, pride, ambition, and resentment "of a few abandoned Dema-
gogues, who were lost to all Sense of Shame & of Humanity." Galloway's
earlier judgement was perpetuated in the historical writings of both
Oliver and Hutchinson.

The early works of the Loyalists were aimed toward the justifica-
tion of their lost cause and as a psychological support to uphold their
own faith after their unexpected defeat. On the other hand, the early
American treatment of the Loyalists, or the Tories as they derogatorially
referred to them, was to condemn them and their beliefs as treasonous in
order to shore up support for the new nation, an insecure republic in a
world of monarchies. Benjamin Franklin, an early friend of Galloway and
a man who had a general feeling for the moderates, alluded to the Loyal-
ists as hired murderers. He also made the hazy distinction between
loyalists and royalists; royalists supported the king while the loyalists
were the American people against whom the crown acted. Writing a parable
about a lion and some dogs, Franklin referred to the royalists as a
mongrel race, a mixture of wolves and foxes, corrupted by royal promises
of great rewards, who had deserted the honest dogs to join the enemy.
George Washington felt that Loyalism was basically a military problem,
but he did refer to Loyalists as "infamous betrayers of their country;"
and as "abominable pests of society." But Thomas Paine, the master
propagandist, spoke most vehemently of all as he asked

...And what is a Tory? Good God! what is he?... Every Tory is
a coward; for servile, slavish, self-interested fear is the
foundation of Toryism; and a man under such influence, though
he may be cruel, never can be brave....
or when he stated that,

He that is not a supporter of the independent States of
America in the same degree that his religious and political
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principles would suffer him to support the government of any other country, of which he called himself a subject, is, in the American sense of the word, A TORY; and the instant that he endeavors to bring his toryism into practice, he becomes A TRAITOR.

and finally,

There is not such a being in America as a Tory from conscience; some secret defect or other is interwoven in the character of all those, be they men or women, who can look with patience on the brutality, luxury and debauchery of the British court, and the violations of their army here.¹⁹

The patriotic writers and leaders of revolutionary America had to treat the Loyalists tyrannically because they were fighting for their very lives, for they would have been the traitors had the British won. It was a tyranny born out of necessity, and any opposition was intolerable, but especially the opposition of fellow Americans who could sway some of the undecided, who could furnish the British with supplies and information, or who could even launch a counter-revolution from behind the lines. Once the war was over, the exiled American could not be allowed to return to undermine the new republican experiment in government. The Loyalists were undesirable elements to be kept away and their arguments had to be discredited and kept away from the people of the new United States. The work by Mercy Otis Warren, History of the Rise, Progress and Termination of the American Revolution, is the epitome of this type of approach because the Loyalists are almost totally ignored.

Warren ignores the Loyalists in general but saves her sharpest barbs, in the first volume of her three volume work, for Governor Thomas Hutchinson. After the recall of Governor Bernard, she describes Hutchinson, from a perspective colored by later events, as

...dark, intriguing, insinuating, haughty and ambitious, while the extreme of avarice marked each feature of his character.
His abilities were little elevated above the line of mediocrity; yet by dint of industry, exact temperance, and indefatigable labor, he became master of the accomplishments necessary to acquire popular fame.\(^{20}\)

According to Warren, this "public delinquent" then gained the confidence of the administration but lost the esteem of his countrymen as he "seized the opportunity to undermine the happiness of the people, while he had their fullest confidence, and to barter the liberties of his country by the most shameless duplicity."\(^{21}\) Hutchinson, Warren concludes, soon justly felt the full might of popular resentment.

The picture of Governor Hutchinson that Mrs. Warren paints, differs dramatically from other historians' portraits. Mercy Otis Warren was, after all, related to both the Otis and Warren families who had suffered personally under the Hutchinson administration. Hutchinson's own account of the pre-Revolution era portrayed himself as a supporter of American liberties, an opponent of the Stamp Act, and bound by oath and duty to uphold an authority that the public had deserted.\(^{22}\) Hutchinson's opinion is biased, but so was Warren's. Peter Oliver referred to the governor as "a Gentleman on whom Nature had conferred, what she is very sparing of, an Acumen of Genius united with a Solicarity of Judgment & great Regularity of Manners."\(^{23}\) Of course Oliver was as prejudiced as Hutchinson and Warren; only later were impartial assessments possible. Moses Coit Tyler, in the late nineteenth century, found Hutchinson to be a man of justice, truth, diligence, and accuracy.\(^{24}\) More recently, Bernard Bailyn, in his masterful work, *The Ordeal of Thomas Hutchinson*, described the governor as "besides being honorable to a fault, sincere, industrious, and profoundly loyal to the community of his birth, he was also more tolerant and more reasonable than those who attacked him and drove him into exile." In his
analysis of Hutchinson's dialogue between Europe and America, Bailyn has added another facet to Hutchinson's reputation. Not only was the governor a decent historian, he was a very good, conservative political philosopher as, in the dialogue, he discusses the nature of government, the relationship between the individual and the government, civil disobedience, and when one should sever the bonds of government. Hutchinson has thus emerged from the early mist of historical villany to assume his rightful place as a moderate American doing what he thought was right in very trying times.

Warren launched an attack on another Loyalist in volume two, this time attacking the arch-American traitor — Benedict Arnold. General Arnold, she wrote, "was a man without principle from the beginning; and before his defection was discovered, he had sunk a character raised by impetuous valor, and some occasional strokes of bravery, attended with success, without being the possessor of any intrinsic merit." Arnold was portrayed as an aggressive, ambitious, and vain man who had plundered Montreal, where his actions were "remarkable reprehensible," and then took off to Philadelphia, "where his rapacity had no bounds." These were some of the charges that were commonly raised against Arnold during and after the war, but are believed to be inaccurate; Arnold himself is now regarded as a man supported by General Washington, stabbed in the back by jealous subordinates, wronged by Congress, and disillusioned with the American cause after the French alliance was concluded.

It was only in the third volume that Warren referred to the Loyalists as a general body of men, and she wasted no pity on them. Quoting Governor Livingston of New York on the conduct of the Loyalists from the beginning of the hostilities, she wrote that they "were responsible for all the additional blood that had been spilt by the addition of their
weight to the scale of the enemy," had "chosen bondage before freedom," and had "waged an infernal war against their nearest connections." She concluded her assessment of the Loyalists by describing them as men "who had set their faces against the liberties of mankind and the exertions of their countrymen. This class had hazarded their own fortune and liberty, which were staked against the independence of America, and the freedom of future generations." Warren's History... is obviously not an impartial assessment of Loyalism, but she was writing in an era when the hatreds born of war had not yet subsided.

It was not until the 1840s that Loyalist historiography really began. That decade witnessed the publication of G. A. Ward's Journal and Letters...of...Samuel Curwen (London, 1842), Henry Van Schaack's The Life of Peter Van Schaack (New York, 1844), and John Graves Simcoe's Simcoe's Military Journal (New York, 1844). The climax of the decade came in 1847 with Lorenzo Sabine's Historical Essay, expanded in 1864. At the time Sabine was charged with a lack of patriotism but Civil War experiences led Northerners to see loyalty more kindly and by 1879, loyalty, even to a lost cause, was held to be a virtue. In the introduction to his two volume work of Loyalist biographies, Sabine states the reason for the dearth of Loyalist literature, and by implication the need for it.

Men who, like the Loyalists, separate themselves from their friends and kindred, who are driven from their homes, who surrender the hopes and expectations of life, and who become outlaws, wanderers, and exiles, - such ones leave few memorials behind them. Their papers are scattered and lost, and their very names pass from human recollection. Sabine's essay was the first survey of the Revolutionary period from the perspective of the Loyalists. He found that the trials over taxation only accelerated the dismemberment of the empire, while the
long-range causes of dislocation involved the acts of Parliament and their renewed enforcement after 1763. However, Sabine was still not ready to disown the patriots because he truly believed that the merchants were right in opposing Britain's "barbarous" commercial laws. The Loyalists though, according to Sabine, were also early supporters of the Whig opposition to English acts, but when the protests became violent, they recoiled to a position favoring the preservation of order and of the rights of persons and property. Eventually, in self-defense, they had to turn to royal protection of their interests. Sabine pointed out that John Adams nearly was a Loyalist because for a long time he was willing to remain a colonist if colonial rights were protected. Sabine proudly points out that even the greatest American of the day, Benjamin Franklin, did not want independence, and George Washington believed that the radical Fairfax County Resolves were malevolent falsehoods. But violence begat violence, the Loyalists were persecuted and hounded out of America, surviving only because of the compensation payments given to them by the British government. Sabine concluded his essay by declaring that "virtuous men, whatever their errors and mistakes, are to be respected." The Loyalists had found their first friend and were rescued from oblivion.

Lorenzo Sabine's work was not rapidly followed by similar attempts to handle the Loyalists favorably, or even impartially; in fact, his essay was not totally accepted when he wrote it. The Belfast Republican, in 1847, stated in a review of his first edition, that "Mr. Sabine is a good Whig of these days, but he would evidently have been a Tory had he lived in the Revolution; but be he what he may, as an American citizen we are sorry to see him engaged in the endeavor to rescue these quite
forgotten worthies from a happy obscurity, which preserves them from the
particular scorn of all patriotic men."  

George Bancroft, leader of the nationalist school, wrote of the
Loyalists much as Warren had done eighty years earlier. Hutchinson
once again became an agent of the devil. According to Bancroft, Hutchin­
son's "advancement to administrative power was fatal to Britain and to
himself; for the love of money, which was his ruling passion in youth,
had grown with his years." Bancroft continued that "to corrupt pure
and good and free political institutions of a happy country and infuse
into its veins the slow poison of tyranny, is the highest crime against
humanity," and as for Hutchinson, the agent of that tyranny, "how
terribly was he punished." Of other prominent Loyalists, Bancroft
rated Galloway of mischievous importance, while Arnold continued to be
an avaricious, ambitious traitor.

Times, however, were changing near the end of the nineteenth
century as the United States and England became friends, and eventually
allies. This rapprochement was stimulated by the Spanish-American War,
the resolution of the Venezuela and Panama crises, and because of Eng­
land's need for a friend while facing a hostile Europe. Because of the
Anglo-American friendship, the Loyalists were not as uniformly written
off as traitors. Moses Coit Tyler led the way for future historians in
his article in the first edition of The American Historical Review (1895).
According to Tyler, for eight to ten years before 1774, the problem
between the colonies and Great Britain had been regarded as just a
family struggle that would eventually have a natural outcome, and because
of that belief, Loyalist writers played little part in the arguments
before 1774. After 1773 and 1774 there was a change in the situation,
accompanied by a rapid crystallization of partisan divisions. The
Loyalist party was only formed at the time of Congress, in 1774, and Loyalist literature was characterized by emotional appeal, exultant oratory, and derisive denunciations; there was not enough time left for argumentative discussion by the time the Loyalists realized that the situation was rapidly escaping from their power to control it.

Tyler estimated that probably one-third of all Americans were loyal, with the majority located in the Middle Colonies. He was also the first historian to attempt to categorize the Loyalists, the late nineteenth century being the time of professionalism and scientific research. He divided the Loyalists into five basic categories: the official class with their family and friends, the colonial politicians who betted on British success and reward, the commercial interests, the professional class, and the naturally conservative men. The Loyalists, as a group, Tyler found to be thoughtful, conscientious, and well educated men, who truly believed in the British imperial system, its constitutionality, and its balance of government. They argued that taxation was legal and that opposition to the British acts was not only illegal but inexpedient. The Whigs themselves, Tyler noted, were not for independence until 1776, and when secession became a fact, many previously moderate men became Loyalists. The greatest contribution that Tyler made to Loyalist historiography was his characterization of the Loyalists as not a party of mere negation and obstruction, but one of positive ideals and measures, often in favor of basic reforms within the imperial system, but with London always the center of any relationship.

The greatest historian of the Loyalists followed Tyler by a few years, and Claude Halstead Van Tyne's *The Loyalists in the American Revolution* is still the best general treatment of Loyalism. Van Tyne revolutionized the historical perspective on the Loyalists when he wrote
that loyalty was the normal condition, the state that had existed, and did exist; and it was the Whigs, - the Patriots, as they called themselves, - who must do the converting, the changing of men's opinions to suit a new order of things which the revolutionists believed necessary for their own and their country's welfare.  

Previously it had always been considered by historians that patriotism was the normal condition and that loyalism involved a change of allegiance. Van Tyne reversed the perception and raised the study of Loyalists out of the mire forever. Van Tyne granted that the British government had monumental claims on the loyalty of many colonists, appealing to hopes, fears, honor, glory, wealth, and power while threatening disgrace, ruin, poverty, contempt, and death. He found that "the aristocracy of culture, of dignified professions and callings, of official rank and hereditary wealth was in a large measure found in the Tory party." He, like Tyler, categorized the Loyalist party and came up with a similar but a more complex list: office-holders and their families and friends head both lists, but then Van Tyne continues with the Anglican clergy; natural conservatives; dynastic-Tories or king-worshippers, who listened and yielded to metaphysical considerations and not to facts; legality-Tories, who believed in Parliament's rights to rule the colonies; religious-Tories, who followed the Biblical command to fear God and honor the king; and factional-Tories, or those determined by family feuds and old political animosities.  

But the Loyalists were Americans first, most had opposed the Stamp Act and other Parliamentary incursions, but their policy had been largely negative, withdrawing from colonial politics at the critical stage to look on with disapproval while the rebellion gained momentum. Vigilante violence forced many to remain silent and when the war actually
began, many more were forced to seek the protection of the British lines. Van Tyne treated the Loyalists experience from the formation of the factional division in America, through life behind the British lines, Loyalist military actions, punishments meted out to them in America, banishment and exile, to permanent settlement in Canada, with British aid. The best general statement of the Loyalist experience remains Van Tyne's closing paragraph.

The cause of the Loyalists failed, but their stand was just and natural. They were the prosperous and contented men, the men without a grievance. Conservatism was the only polity that one could expect of them. Men do not rebel to rid themselves of prosperity. Prosperous men seek to conserve prosperity. The Loyalist obeyed his nature as truly as the Patriot, but, as events proved, chose the ill-fated course, and, when the struggle ended, his prosperity had fled, and he was an outcast and an exile.  

The works by Sabine, Tyler, and Van Tyne stand out because they are devoted entirely to the Loyalists, but following Van Tyne the Loyalists became a respectable and vital topic to be dealt with by historians of the broader Revolutionary age. Part of the reappearance of the Loyalists in general history books was also due to the attitude of the imperialist school of the American Revolution, which took a basically Loyalist view of their age. They believed that the British had acted lawfully but frequently unwisely, and that the colonists were right to protect their rights but wrong to use violence - much the same arguments as those by Seabury and Galloway. The greatest imperialist historian was Charles M. Andrews, and in *The Colonial Background of the American Revolution* can be seen the basic argument of the day. For over a century the colonies and the mother country had been moving in opposite directions in obedience to their own historical tendencies. The colonies, self-absorbed and preoccupied with domestic problems, slowly outgrew their status as dependencies, while Great Britain moved, without any
clear comprehension, to territorial expansion and the establishment of imperial policy and system. After 1763 England endeavored to meet the rising demands of defense, finance, and administration without adequate resources by imposing burdens on the colonies. The British government failed to evolve politically domestically in the critical years, while the British system in America had evolved into democratic forms that were alien to the English at home. British ignorance, stubbornness, and prejudice led them to eventually see no other remedy for radicalism except coercion; and every new coercive act further radicalized the patriots who saw the government destroying what the conceived to be British rights. Andrews maintained that, without a doubt, the vast majority of Americans did not want a revolution, only reform, and that it was not a revolution against the king and his ministers but against a system and a state of mind. 43

Also writing general histories in the 1920s was James Truslow Adams. He too believed that the imperial reorganization after 1763 had led directly to the revolution, a reorganization that had long been planned but delayed and made necessary after 1763 because of the financial effects of the French wars. The American colonists were united in opposition to what they considered to be unconstitutional acts, but what separated the future Loyalists from the future patriots was the Loyalists' belief in legal redress. As Adams wrote, "great numbers, who condemned the Acts of Parliament as heartily as did the patriots, could not bring themselves to raise the standard of open revolt without having exhausted every effort at peaceful remonstrance." 44 The coercive measures adopted after 1775 finally forced men to take a stand on one side of the issue or the other; a line drawn more firmly on July 4, 1776. The revolutionists, Adams maintained, were a minority, and as such had
to be harsh and cruel; opposition had to be silenced, disarmed, disfranchised, confiscated, and banished if the cause was to succeed. This feeling of hatred of the domestic opposition never died down and the American Loyalists were never permitted to return and had to find compensation from the government in which they had vainly put their faith.

Writing of the Revolution in New York, Alexander Clarence Glick masterfully stated the significance of the Loyalists to the study of the Revolution in the 1920s.

On its political side Loyalism stood for the recognition of law as against rebellion in any form, for the unity of the empire as against a separate, independent existence of the colonies, and for monarchy instead of republicanism. It clung to the established order of things; in its conservatism it avoided dangerous "revolutionary principles" and shunned association with those "that are given to change." This did not mean that the Loyalists upheld England's colonial system in all its features, or that they sanctioned her unwise policy in dealing with the colonists. If anything, in the days before the revolution, they were more active than the whigs in seeking to modify that system and to correct the known abuses. Their method was to operate through legally organized bodies in ways provided by the constitution. They had positive remedies to suggest which, they constantly insisted, would have secured in time every demand of the whigs except independence.

Twenty years later, Leonard Labaree was the first historian to focus on the Stamp Act and the year 1763 for the beginning of the rise of conservative Loyalism. As early as the Stamp Act, Labaree discovered men already opposed to radical extremism, and those men became the backbone of the future Loyalist party as more and more conservative and moderate men became disenchanted with the seditious mutterings of men like Sam Adams. The study of Loyalism owes a great deal to Labaree for bringing to the forefront the notion of a class of men who were psychologically prone to conservatism and loyalty, men who were satisfied with the status quo and less impetuous in forcing change. Labaree divided conservative Americans, from which the Loyalists eventually emerged,
into five categories. The office-holders were the most obvious future Loyalists, and they headed Labaree's list just as they had for Tyler and Van Tyne. Labaree unequivocally stated that "the colonial ruling class was unquestionably one of the most important forces of conservatism in the colonies." These men were the wealthy and the powerful, and their wealth and power depended upon British jobs and patronage. It was basically a closed class maintained by family ties, nepotism, and inter-marriage, the greatest example being the Wentworth dynasty in New Hampshire. Anglican clergymen made up Labaree's second category, and their ties to Great Britain mimic the office-holders' ties because they too were dependent on English privilege and support. He placed Quakers and pacifists in the third category because they followed the scriptural message: "My son, fear thou the Lord and the king: and meddle not with them that are given to change." Large landowners were naturally conservative men who feared any change in the status quo that might upset their position. Lastly, the merchants filled out Labaree's typology; as a group merchants were men of substantial means, with overseas ties and British connections on which depended their continued prosperity. Business, and businessmen in general, he pointed out, always tend to demand stability and resist change. Loyalism, Labaree maintained, was dependent on a deep attachment to England, an admiration of the British constitution, a human tendency toward caution and conservatism, and a pessimistic dread of unknown consequences. Or, as he wrote:

They saw more clearly than did some of their opponents the values inherent in their colonial past, in the tradition of government by law which was theirs under the British constitution, and in the strength and external security afforded by the British connection. They recognized the dangers threatening a future state founded in violence and disorder by a group of leaders many of whom were quite inexperienced in the art of government.
In recent writings, those within the last twenty years or so, historical opinion of the Loyalist experience has not been greatly altered, only added to. The study has gone the way of most research, into the narrow confines of specialist concentration, with several notable exceptions. North Callahan, in *Royal Raiders*, sounds very much like Labaree, one of his sources, as he writes that "the Tories saw more clearly than did their opponents the inherent values of their colonial past; they clung to the security of union with the Empire and feared the uncertainty of a new government founded by inexperienced leaders." Callahan attributes Loyalist failure to three reasons: lack of unity, lack of leadership, and failure to recognize early enough the need for arms and their effective use. The success of the patriots, on the other hand, depended on their positive program, inspired leadership, frontier methods, and the effective use of propaganda. In *The American Tory*, William H. Nelson makes much the same argument, but he attributes to the Loyalists more of a psychological dependence on the British because the Loyalists "held social or political opinions which could prevail in America only with British assistance." The Loyalists could not relate to the masses, and with time they became increasingly isolated from their fellow Americans; as a result, their allegiance to and support of the British position became stronger. Nelson writes that the Loyalists never organized themselves as a political force or took the offensive, and by allowing the colonists to form the Continental Congress they lost their chance to make any imput, trapped by their insistence on pursuing legal redress for British wrongs. He does maintain that the Loyalists all had one thing in common, they all represented conscious minorities in the colonies and therefore felt weak and threatened by the "patriotic" masses.
Nelson and Callahan treat the Loyalists as a theoretical problem deserving analysis rather than as a total experience, though they both do take up, in very general terms, Loyalist military activity and the treatment of the Loyalists by the states. Of greater impact are the works by Paul H. Smith and Robert McCluer Calhoon, *Loyalists and Redcoats* and *The Loyalists in Revolutionary America*, respectively.\(^{53}\)

Calhoon's work is far overshadowed by Smith's book, but nonetheless is important for its focus on specific areas and leading Loyalists. He traces the success of leading Loyalists in power during the 1760s, and their rapid loss of control and ultimate defeat. Men like William Smith, junior of New York, William Bull of South Carolina, William Franklin of New Jersey, and John Wentworth of New Hampshire figure prominently in the book. Political cohesion in New England, Calhoon believes, accounted for the low level of Loyalism in the area, while cultural pluralism in the Middle Colonies was translated into a high Loyalist population, and territorial control in the South determined the level of Loyalism there. Calhoon places the blame for the revolution and the victory of the rebels at the feet of the British government. Much like Lewis Namier, Calhoon finds that the centrifugal forces in British politics threw men of talent and imagination to the periphery of power and influence. The role of the king had been solved in Great Britain in 1689, but had never been resolved in the colonies, setting the stage for the eventual collision of opposing viewpoints about imperialism.\(^{54}\) In the final analysis, the Loyalists were enmeshed in the tragedy of an ill-conceived exertion of national power by Great Britain.\(^{55}\)

Paul Smith's 1968 masterpiece about the development of the Loyalist party and their military participation in the war complements the
more theoretical works by Nelson and Callahan. Smith describes the 
decline of the imperial equilibrium after 1763, the British efforts to 
impose order and organization on the colonists who were unused to such 
attention, and the rise of extralegal bodies which strengthened the 
most vociferous, undermined the moderates, and outmaneuvered the con­
servatives. "Handicapped by their loyalty to traditional authority, 
they lost all prospect of controlling the protest movement once the 
assemblies proved unable to cope with Parliamentary oppression and the 
initiative passed to the provincial committees and congresses." With 
the destruction of tea, the middle ground of reform evaporated and the 
Loyalists found themselves "unwilling to exchange the security of 
imperial government for the unrestrained rule of the people."56

In Smith's analysis the Loyalists played an integral part in 
British military planning after the first year of the war. Implicit in 
every British decision was the belief that the war was a product of 
the efforts of a dissident minority, and that the masses could be aroused 
to support the king; this belief was, in part, strengthened by the 
intelligence reports of men like Galloway and Boucher, who were more 
optimistic than realistic. Once it was obvious that the war was to be 
a long one, the British began to use the Loyalists as a military, sabo­
tage, and propaganda force; the Southern campaign of 1780 - 1781 was 
made up primarily of Loyalists. The problem, as Smith sees it, was 
that the Britis... made two errors in regards to the Loyalists: they 
turned to them too late for assistance and then relied on them too 
heavily. The fact that England had to fight a limited war among a 
hostile population against an elusive army meant that at no time was the 
government at liberty to conduct the war on purely military grounds; the 
same problem that faced the United States in Vietnam when Smith wrote
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his book. But the basic reason for British failure was their ignorance of colonial conditions, combined with sheer incompetence.\(^{58}\)

Nelson, Callahan, Calhoon, and Smith all wrote general works on the Loyalist experience, but it can be easily seen that none of them have the wide focus that Van Tyne had. Nelson and Callahan handle Loyalism as a theoretical problem, Calhoon treats it by focusing on areas and individuals, while Smith, though adequately conveying the general picture before 1775, treats the period 1775 to 1783 from a military perspective. The move to more and more specific studies of Loyalists and Loyalism is becoming common.

One of the more interesting areas of specialization in recent years has been on the plight of the Loyalists as exiles. The best general handling of the topic in North Callahan's *Flight from the Republic*,\(^ {59}\) He treats the British attitude toward the Loyalists, ranging from pity to contempt; the Loyalist attitude to the British, from relief to disappointment and cultural shock; and the difficulties that the Loyalists had in adapting to permanent exile. While early exile provided security, protection, and camaraderie, it was only supposed to be temporary. With peace, and the apparent abandonment of the British of the Loyalists' interests at Paris, life became simply a struggle for survival for many. England was a strange and foreign land, with social and political institutions that were unfamiliar to the former colonists; only the wealthy and those with English patrons could afford or wanted to stay in England. The vast majority of Loyalists had to begin life anew, and not surprisingly they chose areas similar to those they had left. Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and Upper Canada appealed to northern Loyalists, while the southern Loyalists favored Jamaica, the Bahamas, and Grenada. Life anywhere was harsh and in the end some of the Loyalists
did return to the United States, but most of them stayed where they had settled and, with the help of British compensation for their earlier losses, made Canada or the Caribbean their home.

Going further, James J. Talman, editor of *Loyalist Narratives from Upper Canada*, assesses the impact of the Loyalist flight to Canada and the effect their departure had on the United States. For the United States, he believes, the flight of the conservatives left the thirteen states poorer in financial, political, and diplomatic knowledge, but hastened the development of democratic institutions and thought. For Canada, the Loyalist influx created New Brunswick, divested Quebec of its French heritage, divided Quebec into Upper and Lower Canada, and brought to the country the traditions of freehold tenure of land, English common law, and representative legislative institutions.60

*The British-Americans*, by Mary Beth Norton, supplements the work by Callahan by concentrating on the Loyalist experience in England.61 She describes, very briefly, the causes of the Revolution and the development of the Loyalist party, where again the dislike of violent protest played an important role. She outlines the Loyalist attempts to effect reconciliation and advise on military policies and the British disregard of their suggestions. After Saratoga the Loyalists altered their expectations she finds, although they still believed in an eventual return to the colonies, but not in the near future. Having, until that time, been living day-to-day and making no long-term commitments, the Loyalists began to live more frugally and to seek jobs wherever they were available. The Loyalists finally persuaded the British that the Americans could be mobilized for military support, and this belief led to the ill-fated Southern campaign, Yorktown, and to permanent exile.
The peace treaty in 1783 was an English sell-out as far as the Loyalists were concerned, because the pertinent clauses were meaningless and unenforceable. The Loyalists finally organized as an interest group and brought pressure to bear on Parliament, and compensation was given to those who had lost income and property due to their loyalty. Norton agrees with Callahan that life anywhere was tough for the Loyalists, since many of them were unprepared and ill-trained to begin life again, but they persevered and eventually most of them did succeed in establishing new lives for themselves.

More common than periodic specialization in Loyalist studies are those studies of a particular area. James H. Stark's study of The Loyalists of Massachusetts, done in 1910, was one of the earlier works. Stark found that the principle cause of the Revolution was the question of what was legal under the British constitution and what was expedient under colonial circumstances. He described the Loyalists as "generally people of substance; [whose] stake in the country was greater, even, than that of their opponents; their patriotism, no doubt, fully as fervent." But Stark's major emphasis is on producing biographical sketches of Massachusetts' Loyalists and primary documents relating to their plight. Another early work, and an equally disappointing one, is Otis G. Hammond's 1917 study of the Loyalists of New Hampshire. Given originally as a speech to the New Hampshire Historical Society, Hammond's work is a good example of factual gathering with no analysis, but he did raise the issue of the other colonies. A little later, Wilbur Henry Siebert published a study of the Loyalists of East Florida, concentrating on the sanctuary that the colony provided for southern exiles, the military involvement of its Loyalists, and their final evacuation and resettlement.
In recent years the Loyalist experience in Delaware has been ably evaluated by Harold B. Hancock. He finds that Delaware was a state with a proportionally high percentage of Loyalism and attributes it to the proximity of Philadelphia and eastern Maryland, local grievances, and commercial connections with Great Britain. He also finds that there was a basic religious division, as Anglicans favored Loyalism and Presbyterians favored rebellion. He finds the treatment of the Loyalists was relatively lenient and most of them were not proscribed, causing the continued division of opinion in Delaware which plagued her politics well into the 1790s.

The most popular state for studying Loyalists is New York, probably because of the strength of Loyalism and the presence of the British from 1776 to 1783. Harold Swiggett, in an early work, emphasized the military aspects of Loyalist participation on the frontier. Hazel C. Mathews also concentrated on the military exploits of the Loyalists, but followed them from the formation of the Loyalist faction to their ultimate exile in Upper Canada and Nova Scotia. L. F. S. Upton handles the problem of Loyalism by concentrating on only one Loyalist—William Smith, Jr., a politician with an eye on the main chance, following his own interests, remaining neutral for as long as possible, and finally paying heed to his conservative nature by remaining loyal. From Whig lawyer opposing the Stamp Act to Canadian official, Upton's biography of Smith tries to investigate what influences came to bear on one particular individual.

The best work on New York is the very recent Loyal Whigs and Revolutionaries, by Leopold S. Launitz-Schürer, Jr. The author finds that the Loyalist-Patriot division was born in the factional atmosphere of New York's politics between the Delanceys and the Livingstons.
research shows that the DeLanceys opposed the Stamp Act and used it to mobilize the people against the Livingstons, but both sides quickly learned to use and to manipulate the masses until they both lost control. The DeLanceys found themselves forced to support the British actions to remain in power, while the Livingstons became more radical in opposition. Finally, the DeLanceys put their total support behind reconciliation, met defeat at the hands of a general election, and found themselves forced to seek British protection.

Another one of the better case studies of Loyalism is Robert O. DeMond's *The Loyalists in North Carolina during the Revolution*. He focuses on the particular North Carolina situation and the politics between the tidewater and the backcountry areas in the development of the revolutionary factions. Thereafter he focuses almost exclusively on the military aspects of Loyalist involvement in the state, from the early battle at Moore's Creek Bridge to Cornwallis' final campaign. He does touch on the suffering that the Loyalists endured and the truly civil war nature of the fighting, but the emphasis is too much on the military.

One final book of importance is the compilation of case studies for each colony, by Wallace Brown, entitled *The King's Friends*. From New Hampshire to Georgia, Brown describes and analyzes the Loyalist strengths and characteristics, using state and colonial records and records from the British Public Records Office. Unfortunately, the time spent on each colony is too short, but the information that is contained in the book provides an excellent starting point for any future investigations.

Any look at the current production of dissertations will show that the trend to specialization, be it by area, person, or time span,
is continuing and probably will continue into the foreseeable future. But this concentration of effort is not entirely new nor is it unwelcome. In-depth research will help to expand the historians’ knowledge of the general phenomenon, provide new insights into problems that are too small for a general treatment, unearth new and important facts about the Loyalist experience, and provide enormous amounts of sources for some future great historian who will be able to analyze and synthesize the information. Until that time, Claude Van Tyne’s work will undoubtedly continue to be unchallenged as the best general work on the American Loyalists.
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APPENDIX B

RETURNS OF THE ASSOCIATION TEST,*
1776, BY TOWN

1775 Census** Males Offered the Association

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town</th>
<th>All Males</th>
<th>Males 0-21***</th>
<th>Total Signers</th>
<th>Non-Signers</th>
<th>Loyal %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Henniker</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Stratham</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Claremont</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Hinsdale</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Sandwich</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Nottingham</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Newmarket</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Hampstead</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Salem</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Deerfield</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Dunbarton</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Winchester</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Croydon</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Brentwood</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Gilmanton</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Marlboro</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Rochester</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Lee</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Keene</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Chesterfield</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Portsmouth</td>
<td>2027</td>
<td>811</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Hopkinton</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. New Castle</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Pembroke</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Sandown</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Alstead</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Barrington</td>
<td>781</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Deering</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Epping</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Allenstown</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. South Hampton</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Westmoreland</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Londonderry</td>
<td>1179</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. East Kingston</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Kensingtown</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Temple</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1775 Census**  Males Offered the Association

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town</th>
<th>All Males</th>
<th>0-21***</th>
<th>Total Signers</th>
<th>Non-Signers</th>
<th>% Loyal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38. Wyndham</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Amherst</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Epsom</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Hillsborough</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Packersfield</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Salisbury</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Northwood</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Wilton</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Sanbornown</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Bedford</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Boscowaen</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Nottingham West</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Hampton</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The remaining 34 towns, for which records exist, reported that all of the 2,444 men, to whom the Association Test was offered, actually signed the oath, and there were no non-signers.

Total Signers........ 8,477
Total Non-Signers..... 570
Percentage of Loyalists in New Hampshire... 6.3

*Source: The above information is derived from the "Returns of the Association Test;" NHSP, vol. 8, 204-296.

**Source: The above figures are drawn from the "Census of New Hampshire, 1775;" NHPP, vol. 7, 724-779.

***Note: This computation was done to determine approximately how many men were above the age of 21 in 1775. The 1775 census divides the state's population at the age of 15, but by using the Connecticut age distribution chart for 1775, as found in Robert V. Wells' book, The Population of the British Colonies in America before 1776 (Princeton, N.J.; Princeton University Press, 1975), 92, it is possible to estimate that 40 percent of the population was over 21. The exact figures, for Wells, are 56.5 percent aged 0 to 20, and the sex ratio is .98. It was arbitrarily decided to subtract 60 percent from the census totals because the Connecticut figures do not include those aged 20 to 21. This enables one to estimate how many men in each town presumably would have been offered the Association Test. Recognizing it as a broad estimation, no claims are made for its complete accuracy. What does seem to be indicated is that in most cases the discrepancy between the adjusted census figures and the number offered the Association Test is small enough to assume that the Association is a reliable tool for defining loyalty in 1776, acknowledging several rather glaring exceptions.
LOYALISTS ACCORDING TO THE ACTS OF NEW HAMPSHIRE AND BY THE CLAIMS FILED WITH THE BRITISH AUDIT DEPARTMENT, BY TOWN.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town</th>
<th>Proscription Act*</th>
<th>Confiscation Act**</th>
<th>London Claims***</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portsmouth</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunbarton</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Londonderry</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keane</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlestown</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollis</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alstead</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinsdale</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newmarket</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claremont</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concord</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exeter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francestown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merrimack</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Ipswich</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Packersfield</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peterborough</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pembroke</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rindge</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winchester</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolfborough</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of State</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: The above figures are derived from the "Proscription Act" of November 11, 1778; NHSP, vol. 8, 810-812. This act forbid the return to the state of those individuals named in the act. If any man therein named was still in the state, he was to be arrested. If anyone returned to the state, he would be arrested and could face execution.

**Source: The figures in this column are derived from the "Confiscation Act" of November 27, 1778; NHSP, vol. 8, 813-814. Under the terms of this act, all the real and personal property of those listed was to be seized by community committees and sold at public auctions.

***Source: These figures represent the number of men applying to the British government for reimbursement for losses suffered by them for...
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