Acadiensis

ACADIENSIS

Loyalist Historiography

Wallace Brown

Volume 4, numéro 1, autumn 1974

URI : https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/acad4_1rv02

Aller au sommaire du numéro

Éditeur(s)

The Department of History of the University of New Brunswick

ISSN

0044-5851 (imprimé)
1712-7432 (numérique)

Découvrir la revue

Citer ce compte rendu

Brown, W. (1974). Compte rendu de [Loyalist Historiography]. *Acadiensis*, *4*(1), 133–138.

the 1770's, was the key to control. His inability to come to terms with what was happening is shown in a pathetic vignette where Hutchinson, then in London, writes concerning the correct rank-ordering of mandamus councillors, almost all of whom had already been bullied into resigning their commissions. But above all, Hutchinson's failure is the failure of something larger, and time and again the reader is brought back to the insufficiency of logic, of reason, as an explanation for the events that led to Revolution and destroyed Hutchinson on the way.

The study tends very much to the depiction of the American Revolution as a passionate, irrational, illogical event. One might hazard a guess that Bailyn will take this up as his next theme. He has come almost full circle from the rational-compelling-logic train of thought by following through the career of one Loyalist. What happened to Hutchinson happened to many men less famous than he: the accusations, the threats, the absence of any opportunity to defend against charges based on wilful misrepresentation and personal jealousy, the failure of logic and reason to compete with passion and violence. If earlier writers on the Loyalists were not able to make these points with sufficient strength to impinge on the consciousness of the professional American historian, they can now count on powerful reinforcement from *The Ordeal of Thomas Hutchinson.* And this was the basic point of the study: not so much to look at one Loyalist but at Loyalism. The work is rounded off with an original historiography of Loyalism, tiresomely entitled "The Losers," which gives a final touch of sincerity to Bailyn's discovery that only the study of Loyalists "allows us to see the Revolutionary movement from the other side around, and to grasp the wholeness of the struggle."

Perhaps one day that consideration will lead Professor Bailyn to the wisdom of Reg Murphy: revolutionary games are not "the way you go about turning this country around."

L.F.S. UPTON

LOYALIST HISTORIOGRAPHY

"The history of our Revolution will be one continued lie from one end to another", declared John Adams. Although it is not what he had in mind, the failure to understand the Loyalists has been a major source of weakness in that history. It is true that complaints of historians' neglect of the Loyalists have often been exaggerated,[1] but it is a fact that only during the last decade have Loyalist studies have come into their own. Indeed the freshet threatens to become a large-scale flood, encouraged by the approach of the bicentennial of independence in the United States and the rather later bicentennial of the Loyal-

1 See my bibliographical essay: "The View at Two Hundred Years", *Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society*, 80, (1970), pp. 25-47.

ists arrival in what became Canada. American masochism allied with an intensified concern for minorities, past and present, added to Canadian nationalism should increase both public and scholarly interest. Perhaps even the sleeping giant, British scholarship, will be roused if we can judge from the growing transatlantic participation in the Programme for Loyalist Studies which is now collecting an impressive international bibliography, microfilming Loyalist sources, and publishing some of the most important material. A core of Loyalist scholars are already busy honing their sessional papers for various colloquia on both sides of the Atlantic that threaten to develop into an historical version of "the largest permanent floating crap game". Widening concern for the Loyalists is infallibly indicated by the recent unprecedented publication of more than half a dozen paperback collections of Tory writings and documents for use in undergraduate teaching. L.F.S. Upton's *Revolutionary versus Loyalist: The First American Civil War* (Waltham, Mass., 1968) can be warmly recommended partly because it illustrates both sides of the argument. Other useful items include G.N.D. Evans, *Allegiance in America* (Reading, Mass., 1969) which takes a refreshingly wide approach, Lawrence H. Leder's well-chosen selections from Loyalist historians (whose value remains insufficiently appreciated), *The Colonial Legacy* (New York, 1971), and for Nova Scotia and Quebec G.A. Rawlyk's rather too fragmented *Revolution Rejected* (Scarborough, 1968).

The fact that Bernard Bailyn, the doyen of American intellectual historians of the Revolution, has turned his attention to Loyalist matters is a sign of the times. Another is the publication, by Robert Calhoon, of the book under review, *The Loyalists in Revolutionary America 1760-1781* (Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, New York, 1973). It is the third volume to appear in a new, slightly odd, series entitled "The Founding of the American Republic" which was planned and initiated by the late, lamented Clinton Rossitter. Odd in the sense that so far it is not clear what its scope or purpose is. But it is indicative of shifting American historical perspectives that a whole book rather than a footnote should be thought necessary to explain the Loyalist part in the founding of the Republic, although Calhoon deals with that precise aspect only obliquely, if at all. It is fitting that the admirable Rossitter, a leading conservative historian, should have had a hand in the birth of Calhoon's important discussion of the Tories, though his own writings give them fairly short shrift. For various reasons American conservatives have never much utilized them. But as the American dream continues to crumble and with it, its eighteenth-century, enlightened, liberal base, they should come increasingly into their own, although, I doubt if they will ever be "well-liked". Even Calhoon seems slightly to share an antipathy towards them that has infected to some degree the majority of Loyalist scholars.

Calhoon has produced a big book of more than 500 pages of text, with a useful bibliographical essay. He divides his forty-eight chapters into six parts,

but fundamentally the book has two halves. The first half deals with Loyalist reaction to the great pre-war crises, 1760-1776. Calhoon's technique is reminiscent of that of William H. Nelson and even, in a different context, Vernon L. Parrington; for he proceeds largely through analysis of the careers and writings of individuals. Thus there are chapters on Thomas Hutchinson, William Smith Jr., Daniel Dulany and so on. The second half discusses the period of hostilities, 1774 to 1781. Here the Whig treatment of the Loyalists, military matters and much else is covered following an orthodox division of America into New England, the Middle States and the South. A tantalizingly brief epilogue mentions the peace treaty, Loyalist compensation, the diaspora and offers some wise reflections on the Revolution in general.

The historian of the Loyalists faces a minor and a major problem, each of exceptional difficulty. The minor one is finding a title for his book that has not already been used or almost used. The major one involves several questions of organization. To begin with what time span should be covered? Not as simple as it sounds. Mary Beth Norton in *The British Americans* (Boston, 1972) has argued intelligently, but unconvincingly, that the logical beginning is 1774. Calhoon rightly, I think, starts in 1760 with occasional flashbacks to earlier years to deal, for example, with the Great Awakening. However, he does accept the legitimate aspects of the Norton view by splitting his book at the 1774-1776 point when hostilities made the Loyalist position "more elemental". This is sound, although I would have put more specific stress than he does on the transforming effect of the Declaration of Independence. The terminal point of Loyalist studies is more contentious. American historians naturally tend to be more "strict constructionists" than Canadians. Calhoon ends his study in 1781, a date which may well have been dictated by his publishers and by the wealth of material at his command. Thus the book is not concerned with the totality of the Loyalists' story, particularly their post-war experiences in, and effect on, the United States, Canada, the Bahamas, the West Indies, Great Britain, and Sierra Leone. (Calhoon must give us a second volume! If he does the sources available will, I fancy, dictate a very different sort of book.) Even within its time-span the book deals only briefly with the American colonies that did not rebel: ranging from Newfoundland to the Leeward Islands they comprised a numerical majority!

A further problem facing the Loyalist historian is how far do you discuss the Revolution and general history of the times. Obviously you cannot put the Loyalists in a vacuum: a balance has to be struck and Calhoon has struck it nicely. Thus, well-versed in the findings of modern scholarship, he deals in Chapter Nine with "The Political Culture of the American Colonies". Similarly Chapter Two summarizes what is known of "The Sources and Disposition of Power in the British Empire". But the firm focus and strength of the book is, as the title puts it, the Loyalists *in Revolutionary America*. The time is fast approaching when, even concerning the Loyalists, historians of the

Revolution can take Rossitter's advice tendered in the first volume of this series to "shift their gaze away from the preliminaries and the main event ... toward the aftermath". [*The American Quest, 1790-1860* (N.Y., 1971), p. 263] Here there is great scope for Canadian historians and students of comparative culture. This is not to deny that for local Loyalist studies during the Revolution the surface has only just been scratched, including the vexed topic of confiscated property which Calhoon, perhaps wisely, leaves alone.

This is not entirely, or even mainly a work of original research. It could not be; there is too much for one man. It is a mixture of original research and interpretation (e.g. the treatments of Joseph Galloway and Egerton Leigh) and succinct, able summaries of published and unpublished scholarship (e.g. the chapter on the Iroquios is largely derived from Barbara Graymont's good new book. *The Iroquois in the American Revolution* (Syracuse, 1972), while the discussion of Myles Cooper owes much to a fairly recent Ph. D. dissertation on King's College by David C. Humphrey, "Kings College in the City of New York, 1754-1776" (Northwestern University, 1968). Throughout Calhoon is certainly in command of secondary sources and his originality lies in his synthesis and integration of disparate material. This is probably most striking in the first half of the book where he divides the Loyalist stand down to 1776, somewhat artificially but nonetheless rewardingly, into three categories under the headings: "The Enunciation of Principle", by which he means the "legal, constitutional, and historical rules [that] governed the Empire" (p.x) such as Jonathan Sewall followed; "The Search for Accomocation", by which he means "practical ways of reconciling colonial liberty with the maintenance of British authority" (p. 175) such as were essayed by the Reverend William Smith of Philadelphia; "The Appeal to Doctrine", by which he means a real, often Anglican, Tory "Philosophy of order and obediance and . . . profound alienation from the ideology of the Revolution" (p.x) such as was espoused by the Reverend Samuel Peters. Calhoon gives many examples of each category and in so doing highlights a rich, variegated tapestry and shows better than anyone else the complexity of Loyalist thought. In fact, throughout the book there is the most subtle attempt yet made to understand Loyalist motivation, "the compelling reasons, influences, predispositions, and dictates of self-interest, temperament, conscience, intellect, fear and plain confusion . . . that made the Loyalists act as they did", (p.xl) to which is added "an examination of the Loyalists' *perception* of their roles in society". (p.xi) I confess a personal uneasiness about this kind of intellectual-political history, but at his best Calhoon joins the company of its leading modern practitioners.

The book is not susceptible to easy summary and indeed the author does not try, though I wish he had. In fact for me (and it's probably my fault) the merits of the parts of this book far exceed those of the whole. Brilliant vignette (I particularly liked, to give just one example, the chapter on Jona-

than Boucher), but sometimes the thread and thrust of the whole argument is obscure, and occasionally even the chapter sequence seems arbitrary. Treatment of blacks and Cherokees and the rank and file of "inarticulate" Tories is thin, while that of women is nonexistent. But the coverage of such neutralists as Quakers is excellent. I think any broad book on the Loyalists must discuss equivocal groups even if most Quakers were not really Loyalists. However, I also think Calhoon shares a widespread failure to acknowledge sufficiently the degree of apathy and opportunism exhibited by much of the American population — "insipids" and "mongrels" to use John Adams' words. But full marks for not underemphasizing the South. How refreshing to read a book on the Revolution that begins in Georgia!

I am not clear at whom this book is aimed. The abundance of explanatory phrases attached to well-known people, institutions and events suggest that (largely illusory?) publisher's dream, the lay audience. Only the most dedicated general reader will be likely to plough through this sprawling book. It will be demanding, if rewarding, reading for bright undergraduates, but I think that Calhoon has written mainly for fellow-historians who, hard pressed for time, will welcome his summary of recent scholarship and his fresh organization. Those who want wide-ranging *haute vulgarisation* will still have to make do with my own attempt, *The Good Americans* (New York, 1969). The neophyte should then turn to Van Tyne, Nelson, and for military matters Paul H. Smith and Piers Mackesy, before scaling the Calhoon peak.

This leads to a final consideration. Where does the book stand in the historiography of the Loyalists? It joins a select group of general treatments. Leaving aside such early exotica (often useful, but still exotica) as the works by Lorenzo Sabine (a kind of pioneer oral history), Egerton Ryerson, and James H. Stark, the only comparable books are: C.H. Van Tyne. *The Loyalists of the American Revolution* (New York, 1902), necessarily outdated but still well-worth reading: W.H. Nelson, *The American Tory* (New York, 1969), a highly rated, well-written effort with some brilliant insights, not nearly so encompassing as the title suggests, which for me weakens with successive readings; North Callahan's two volumes, *Royal Raiders* (Indianapolis, 1963), and *Flight from the Republic* (Indianapolis, 1967), broad in scope but fatally flawed by incredibly sloppy scholarship; my own survey already mentioned, of uneven quality but which attempts to present the general reader with the basic facts and themes of Loyalist history and which will be followed by a similar second volume dealing with the period after 1783. Amongst articles the following should be mentioned: Leonard W. Labaree's rather overrated "The Nature of American Loyalism", *Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society*, LIV (1944), pp. 15-58, and Moses C. Tyler's fine pioneering "The Party of the Loyalists and their Literature", *American Historical Review*, I (1895), pp. 24-65. Within his scope Calhoon supersedes all of these as well as William A. Benton's rickety but interesting *Whig-Loyalism* (Ruther-

ford, N.J., 1969). His book has to be added to the list of recent "essential reading" that includes Norton's book, already mentioned, a work of greater and at times lesser significance than its topic, the exiles in England, might suggest; L.F.S. Upton's *William Smith* (Toronto, 1969) — there's room for lots more biographies; Scot Symons, *Heritage: A Romantic Look at Early Canadian Furniture* (Toronto, 1971), an indication of the possibilities of an unorthodox approach; Charles R. McKirdy, "A Bar Divided: The Lawyers of the American Revolution", *The American Journal of Legal History*, 17 (1972), pp. 205-214 and Anne A. Allan, "Patriots and Loyalists: The Choice of Political Allegiance by members of Maryland's Elite", *Journal of Southern History*, 38 (1972), pp. 283-292, both of which have the over-riding virtue of a broad approach. The future of Loyalist studies looks bright and complicated and exciting.

WALLACE BROWN

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN PRAIRIE HISTORIOGRAPHY

Plains historiography is at least a century old. A recent article by T.D. Regehr surveys over one hundred key books, articles and papers published since 1870 which have shaped our conception of the historical development of the Canadian prairie west.[1] Nevertheless, even with this long and honorable tradition, the study of plains history has not often been marked by significant academic dissent, reinterpretation or even widespread controversy. The historiography of the prairies has been keyed to harmony, tradition and academic conservatism, and though many recent works have expanded the scope and depth of prairie history,[2] few have offered challenge to ideas and beliefs which have prevailed for at least a generation. As the popular song once reminded us, however, "the times, they are changing." In the last half decade or so a number of books and articles have appeared which are important not so much for the new ground they cover as for the old terrain they attempt to re-map. Though it would be an obvious over-dramatization (not to mention exaggeration) to assert that a whole new era is upon us, it does appear that a handful of scholars are finally beginning to offer some significant, even radical, reinterpretation of the history of the Canadian prairies. Some of these works will, perhaps, finally spark the beginning of

1 T.D. Regehr, "Historiography of the Canadian Plains after 1870," in R. Allen, (ed.), *A Region of the Mind* (Regina, Canadian Plains Studies Centre, 1973).

2 See, for example, R. Allen, *The Social Passion: Religion and Social Reform in Canada, 1914-1928* (Toronto, University of Toronto Press, 1971); P. Berton, *The National Dream* (Toronto, McLelland and Stewart, 1970) and *The Last Spike* (Toronto, McLelland and Stewart, 1971); J. Gray, *The Winter Years* (Toronto, Macmillan, 1966), *The Boy From Winnipeg* (Toronto: Macmillan, 1969) and *Red Lights on the Prairies* (Toronto, Macmillan, 1971).