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INTRODUCTION

In order to understand the causes of the American Revolution through the eyes of a New England Tory, an examination of the conditions which made a Tory is necessary. A Tory, or a Loyalist, was a person who remained loyal to the British government during the American Revolution. More generally, a Tory usually desired the maintenance of the established government, especially during the time of a revolution. Thus, persons who remained loyal to George III, supported the British government, and later went into exile for their beliefs were Tories. But many other people qualified who did not actively proclaim their beliefs, but rather took a very passive attitude. The formulation of a Tory possibly is summed up best by Lorenzo Sabine in his historical essay on Loyalists when he stated:

It has been said, also, that those who received the name of Tories were not at first, no indeed for some years, resisting a revolution, but striving to preserve order, and an observance of the rights of persons and property; that many who took sides at the outset as mere conservators of the peace, were denounced by those whose purposes they thwarted, and were
finally compelled, in pure self-defense, to accept of royal protection, and thus to become identified with the royal party ever-after.  

The New England Tories fit the above descriptions quite accurately. Occupations, family ties, and religion all contributed to the making of a New England Tory. Generally speaking they were representatives of the conservative element in society, and the major Tory strongholds were in the towns and cities of the provinces. In these locations the majority of royal officeholders, administrators, professional and commercial men resided. Men from these occupations comprised the majority of the active Tories in the New England region.

In studying Loyalist claims, a general pattern of support for the English system appeared among the commercial and merchant classes. Wallace Brown provided a chart based on claims after the war which placed the New England Tories into the following classifications:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Colony</th>
<th>New Hampshire</th>
<th>Massachusetts</th>
<th>Rhode Island</th>
<th>Connecticut</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Claims</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officeholders</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown by the chart, of the 559 claims reported, 317 were representatives of the commercial and professional classes, and 92 were royal officeholders within New England at the time. Each colony had representation from rural areas, but if the claims are an indication of royal support, only in Connecticut were rural dwellers even close to possessing a majority.²

The religious outlook of the New England Tory was against the established beliefs of the Congregational religion brought over by the colonial ancestors. The majority of the Tories were members of the Anglican church, which represented the established religion of the mother country. In New England, the Anglican church appealed to the more wealthy and conservative men of the provinces, and by nature the Anglicans taught allegiance to the Crown.

²Brown, King's Friends, pp. 257-258, 261-262.
Besides religious ties and occupations, which contributed to the desire to maintain the status quo, family ties and personal relationships encouraged some persons to remain loyal. For example, Ward Chipman, a young lawyer, raised by Jonathan Sewall, eventually adopted Tory beliefs. Chipman attributed his actions to the influence of his guardian. Also, James Murray of Massachusetts and George Rome of Rhode Island supported the royal cause due to their friendships with leading Anglicans and commercial men in the two provinces.  

Within New England, the Tory outlook was one of pessimism and fear of the "common people." How long the wealthy and affluent class could remain in power represented a major worry. Many Tories believed that the colonies could survive only as long as their class, the affluent, remained in control. The controversy between the mother country and the colonies only confirmed the Tory fear of a future of anarchy and

---

confusion. The period between 1763 and 1776, filled with repeated acts of violence, caused men of importance to doubt further the ability of the "common people" to govern. 4

Toryism developed along different lines within each New England colony. The Tories of Massachusetts appeared more vocal in defense of the British system due to the great amount of Patriot activity within the colony, starting with the violence over the Stamp Act in 1765. In Massachusetts, the largest classification of Tories were merchants, followed by the royal officeholders. The city of Boston served as the major Tory stronghold, and when General Howe evacuated the town in 1776 about 1100 Tories left with him. 5 Thomas Hutchinson, the last colonial governor of the colony,

---


5 These 1100 Tories included men, women and children. Of the men, however, 102 were councillors, commissioners, officers of customs and royal officials. There were 18 clergymen, 105 persons from country towns, 213 represented a combination of merchants and native Bostonians, and 302 were farmers, mechanics, and traders. Sabine, Historical Essay, p. 13.
represented the most important Tory leader in New England. Hutchinson, besides being an active participant in the controversy, was a noted historian of his time. Two members of the Oliver family, Peter and Andrew, held an important place in colonial Massachusetts. Both brothers held royal offices, Andrew being the stamp collector in 1765 and lieutenant governor from 1770 until his death. Peter served as chief justice from 1770 until the time of his departure from America. The marriage of Peter Oliver's son and Thomas Hutchinson's daughter united two of the most powerful and influential families of the colony. Daniel Leonard, a member of another important colonial family also turned to the Tory cause. He proved especially important to the Tory movement as the sparring partner of John Adams in the "Novanglus" and "Massachusettensis" debates during 1774 and 1775. Jonathan Sewall typified the person who could have joined either the Patriot or Tory side during the controversy. As a close personal friend of John Adams, it appeared Sewall would turn to the Patriot cause. He joined the government side, however, over a dispute regarding the settlement of his uncle's estate. His uncle, Samuel Sewell, was a former chief justice of the Massachusetts court. Jonathan Sewall took
an active part in the movement by writing in the Boston newspapers under the names of "Philantropos" and "Long J." Another prominent Tory within Massachusetts was General Timothy Ruggles who served in the colonial government for many years. He came under the suspicion of the Patriots for his failure to support the Continental Congress. After the battles of Lexington and Concord, Ruggles attempted to organize a Loyalist regiment to fight the Patriots. 6

In proportion to the population, Connecticut had the greatest number of Tories, ranging between 2000 to 2500 men. One of the major reasons for such a high number of active Tories was the strength of the Anglican church within the colony. There were over 2000 male heads of families who were Anglican and most of them became Tories. The Reverend Samuel Peters represented a typical Anglican minister in Connecticut. Peters actively promoted the idea of an American bishopry, which contributed to the religious split within the colony. Other factors besides religion influenced the

division within Connecticut. One major factor was the controversy over the settlement of western lands brought on by the Susquehannah Land Company. This venture tended to divide the colony further between the eastern and western sections. The most important Tory writer from Connecticut was Jared Ingersoll, the stamp collector. His defense of his actions as the stamp collector provided valuable information on the growth of the rebellion.  

Rhode Island, as one of the few colonies without a royal charter, remained extremely patriotic in its outlook toward the Revolution. The major Tory resistance centered in Newport and revolved around the Newport Junto, a group of pro-government men desiring a change in the colony's charter. Representative of this group were Martin Howard, Jr., George Rome, and Thomas Moffat. Shortly after the Stamp Act riots in August, 1765, both Howard and Moffat left Rhode Island and Rome retired to his farm. This practically ended

any vocal resistance against the Patriot movement within Rhode Island. 8

Of all the New England colonies, New Hampshire had the least amount of activity by Tories. Apparently the majority of New Hampshire Tories were wealthy and were royal officeholders. The urban center of Portsmouth represented the major area of Tory resistance within the colony as thirty-three of the seventy-six banished Tories resided there. The colony really produced only two prominent Tories, Benjamin Thompson, later Count Rumford, and Richard Rogers. Both these men switched to the Tory side only after several run-ins with the Patriot organizations within New Hampshire. 9

Most of the Tories in New England who actively opposed the Patriot movement were members of the wealthy, urban, conservative society. Their basic conservative outlook on life, and the desire to maintain the status quo, contributed to what the New England Tories recognized as causes of the Revolution. As the British governmental system had always served the Americans well, the Tories could not understand the Patriots.

---


9Brown, King's Friends, pp. 5, 12.
desire to question the system. The Tories, therefore, tended to place much of the blame on emotional issues rather than on constitutional ones. Their basic conservative attitude made the New England Tories defend the principles of British government long before their counterparts in other colonies. Perhaps the tradition of self-government within New England, which caused the Patriots to rebel, added to the necessity for a quick retort by the New England Tories. The conservative outlook on life plus the violence resorted to in the early period of the controversy started the debate between Tory and Patriot in New England. Altogether, Massachusetts took the lead in Tory resistance in New England, just as it did in the Patriot cause. Then only as the ideas of independence spread to the other colonies did the rest of the New England Tories feel called into action. Still, for the New England colonies, the battle was over long before the Southern and Middle colonies had started to fight.
CHAPTER I

CONSTITUTIONAL CAUSES

In advocating their loyalty to the government of Great Britain, the New England Tories were called upon to defend the British constitution. In defending the constitution, they searched for the underlying causes for the rebellion against the mother country. Jonathan Sewall summed up the dilemma of the Tories in discovering these causes in his play, "A Cure for the Spleen." Trim, the barber, stated:

And upon the word of an honest shaver or trimmer, or call me what you please, I'd shave or trim you all round for nothing, if I could but hear you settle intelligibly what is a whig, and what a tory—what is constitution, and what are charter rights and privileges—what is the obedience due from an American Englishmen, to the King and Parliament of Great Britain, and what are our grievances; . . .

Throughout the controversy between Great Britain and the colonies, the Tories acted on the defensive and attempted to answer the political grievances of the Patriots. The basic arguments centered around the

---

right of Parliament to raise a revenue by taxation, the idea of colonial representation in Parliament, the introduction of troops to the provinces, the removal of judicial salaries from colonial authority, and the new powers vested in the admiralty courts. The constitutional dispute between Great Britain and the colonies, Martin Howard Jr., observed, developed around two issues—the jurisdiction of Parliament and the exercise of its power.²

In defending the constitution, the Tories first of all attempted to show the success of the English system of government. Daniel Leonard explained that throughout the world three systems of government existed, monarchy, aristocracy and democracy. The British constitution combined the advantages of these three systems in the person of the monarch, lords and commons. Leonard believed that people throughout the western world recognized the British constitution as the most perfect system of government in existence. Shortly after the end of the Seven Years War in 1763 this system of government became the major source of concern between the colonists

²Martin Howard, Jr., A Letter from a Gentlemen at Halifax, to His Friend in Rhode-Island, Containing Remarks Upon a Pamphlet, Entitled, the Rights of Colonies Examined (Newport: Samuel Hall, 1765), p. 21 (hereafter cited as Letter from a Gentlemen).
and the mother country. Due to the heavy costs which accrued during the late war, the continuing defense costs, and the enlarged empire, Great Britain accumulated a debt of £140,000,000. The mother country, therefore, found it necessary to seek help from the American colonies who had benefited from the elimination of their French competitors.  

In seeking new ways to tax the American colonies, the question of the superiority of Parliament over the colonies became a major issue. Thomas Hutchinson, in March, 1766, wrote to former governor Thomas Pownall, that only two years earlier the colonies had supported parliamentary authority. At that time the public looked upon any opposition to the laws of Parliament as high treason. Hutchinson insisted that the oldest living person in the province of Massachusetts Bay could not remember a time when the people doubted the supremacy

---

3John Adams and Jonathan Sewall [Daniel Leonard], Novanglus and Massachusettensis (Boston: News and Goss, 1819), pp. 147, 169-170 (hereafter cited as Massachusettensis). At the time the book was published, Jonathan Sewall was recognized as "Massachusettensis." However, it has now been proven that Daniel Leonard actually wrote the work.
of Parliament as they did in the years after 1763. Also, "AZ" commented in a letter to the Massachusetts Gazette and Boston Newsletter that the people had always recognized the authority of Parliament prior to 1766. To have advocated a revolution against parliamentary authority before this time would have meant a crime against the State. Samuel Peters maintained the same conditions existed in Connecticut in that prior to 1766 the public did not question any acts of the British Parliament. But with the Stamp Act in 1765, the whole situation changed, and the people no longer believed Parliament acted in an intelligent manner.

The Tories attempted to prove that Parliament had always reigned supreme, and therefore, it should continue in this role. The major argument revolved


5 Massachusetts Gazette and Boston Newsletter, March 5, 1772 (hereafter cited as Massachusetts Gazette).

around the idea that within a dominion only one supreme authority existed, Parliament. "Chronus" in January, 1772, remarked that the colonies were a part of the British dominion, and the law of government allowed only one supreme authority capable of formulating laws for that dominion.\(^7\) When any nation obtained possession of another part of the world, Daniel Leonard explained, the new acquisition became an integral part of the original state. Leonard warned that the people of Great Britain would never admit the inability of Parliament to tax the colonies. Rather, the British believed the colonies were part of the empire, and therefore, subject to Parliament. If the Patriots insisted that they were never annexed to the Crown, Leonard believed they were conversely not entitled to any liberties and immunities accorded the average Englishmen. Leonard concluded that as a result of the union between the colonies and mother country, the supreme legislature created subordinate units for the colonies. These units, however, possessed power only over their internal affairs.\(^8\)

\(^7\)Massachusetts Gazette, January 9, 1772. The author of the articles signed by "Chronus" was the Reverend Henry Caner.

\(^8\)Adams, Massachusettsensis, pp. 143, 177.
Hutchinson, in his address to the Council and House in 1771, also confirmed the role of a supreme power when he stated:

such a power is essential in all governments, and that another power, with the name of subordinate, and with a right to withstand or control the supreme in particular cases, is an absurdity—for it so far ceases to be subordinate, and becomes itself supreme.

To Hutchinson, as to Leonard, the nature of government did not allow two supreme powers; therefore, the colonial legislatures must remain subordinate.9

The Tories generally attempted to gather proof of the subordination of the colonial legislatures by examining the original charters issued the provinces. According to Thomas Hutchinson, the grant issued the colonies by the King allowing the popular election of a House of Representatives which in turn chose a Council, did not free those colonies from parliamentary authority.10 The colonial legislatures, "Massachusettensis" explained, did not possess the same rights as the House of Commons; in fact, they had only limited powers specifically granted


10 Hutchinson, Additions, p. 40.
by their charters. The original charter issued by the King in 1629, binding his heirs and successors, established Massachusetts as part of the empire and subjected it to the authority of Parliament. Under this charter, Daniel Leonard claimed that both the parent country and the colonial recipients recognized and accepted parliamentary authority. Leonard related that under the new charter granted by William and Mary in 1692, the colonial legislatures were made more like Parliament in that the provincial government received additional legislative powers. However, these new powers were restricted by the words, "So as the same be not repugnant or contrary to the laws of this our Realm of England." He chastised the Patriots for ignoring these words and repeated that the colonial legislature could not hinder or reverse parliamentary legislation. Jonathan Sewall also traced the colonial development in relation to the superiority of Parliament. The original settlers, Sewall observed, upon departure from England and in the first charter of 1629, recognized parliamentary jurisdiction. Once again, within the charter of 1692 and four years after its issuance, the colonists upheld

---

11 Adams, Massachusetts, pp. 170-171, 179.
the jurisdiction of Parliament. These incidents, throughout the history of the colony, established precedents for the supremacy of Parliament and the subordination of the colonial legislature. Martin Howard presented the same argument to Rhode Islanders. The charter issued Rhode Island did not eliminate Parliament's jurisdiction, nor did any further grant received from the King lessen this power. In addition, Howard explained that the authority of Parliament rested on common law, which preceded all charters and grants. "Yeoman." in June, 1772, summarized the basic difference between the Tory and Patriot view of the constitution. The Patriots, according to "Yeoman," misrepresented the constitution when they maintained that the charter conferred upon the General Assembly the power to make laws governing the province. To him, compared to the Tory idea of colonial subordination, the Patriot argument lacked credibility.

On another issue regarding the charters, the Tories attempted to refute the argument that the charters represented compacts with the King. Thomas Hutchinson

13Lovejoy, Rhode Island, p. 77.
14Massachusetts Gazette, June 4, 1772.
believed that the Patriots formulated the idea of a compact between the King and his American subjects just for the sake of controversy.\(^\text{15}\) Daniel Leonard explained that the King granted charters only with parliamentary consent; therefore, the colonists could not owe allegiance just to the Crown.\(^\text{16}\) In an "Answer to the Farmer," "ZT" commented that the ancestors of the American people were British subjects, and upon arrival in America they retained their British citizenship according to common law. The colonists were thereby obligated to obey the King as long as he remained their protector. "ZT" further believed that every inhabitant owed obedience to the King as the executive and legislative head of the British government. As long as the King represented the head of the legislative branch, Parliament remained supreme over all British subjects. "ZT" maintained that when the Patriots denied the authority of Parliament they denied the authority of the King.\(^\text{17}\)

With this view of the relationship between Parliament and the colonies, the Tories attempted to prove that the colonists had recognized the parliamentary

\(^{15}\) Hutchinson, Additions, p. 53.

\(^{16}\) Adams, Massachusettsensis, p. 176.

\(^{17}\) Boston Evening Post, February 13, March 27, 1769.
right to raise a revenue long before the Stamp Act. Daniel Leonard maintained that previous to the Stamp Act not only had Parliament placed internal duties upon the colonies, but the colonists had willingly paid postage duties and duties imposed for the regulation of trade without questioning Parliament's right to levy such taxes. Leonard believed the colonists were quite happy to submit to these laws and would not have opposed Parliament except at this time, "under the influence of some malignant planet, the design was formed of opposing the stamp-act, by a denial of the right of parliament to make it." Both Daniel Leonard and Thomas Hutchinson referred to the year 1764 in their discussion of Parliament's right to tax the colonies. John Adams, writing as "Novanglus" and Leonard's sparring partner in written debates, attempted to prove that Governor Francis Bernard first asserted the right of Parliament to tax in a letter to the English ministry in 1764. Leonard and Hutchinson both observed that not only did Bernard assert the right of Parliament to tax the colonies, but the first-ranking Patriot of the time, James Otis, also admitted the right of Parliament to tax. Otis, in a pamphlet, published  

18Adams, Massachusettensis, pp. 147-148.
in 1764, recognized parliamentary authority, yet this failed to hinder his popularity with the public.\textsuperscript{19}

Leonard quoted Otis as saying:

\begin{quote}
\textit{it is certain that the parliament of Great Britain has a just, clear, equitable and constitutional right, power and authority to bind the colonies by all acts wherein they are named. Every lawyer, nay every Tyro, know this; no less certain is that the parliament of Great Britain has a just and equitable right, power and authority to impose taxes on the colonies internal and external on land as well as on trade.}\textsuperscript{20}
\end{quote}

Leonard concluded that recognition of parliamentary authority to raise a revenue did not presuppose an abusement of this authority.\textsuperscript{21}

After the repeal of the Stamp Act, some Patriots established the distinction between internal and external taxation. In letter nine of "Answer to the Farmer," the author wrote that the right to tax internally depended upon the interpretation of the British constitution. He believed it ridiculous to assume that only in the area of taxation could Parliament influence internal colonial activities.


\textsuperscript{20}Adams, \textit{Massachusettensis}, pp. 206-207.

The author maintained that any act specifically naming a colony altered the entire province, and therefore, represented an internal change similar to one of imposing taxes. In the same letter, the Tory writer stated that "the Farmer, when he came to distinguish between internal and external taxes, made the analysis with about as much skill as a quack surgeon would attempt to bleed a man with a chizzel or pickax." The "Farmer's" distinction between "impositions" which he said Parliament could lay, and "taxes," which it could not, remained an absurdity to the Tories.  

With the passage of the Declaratory Act, the Tories assured the colonists that Parliament had not surrendered its right to pass revenue legislation. Subsequently, when the Tea Act of 1773 expressly stated that its purpose was to raise a revenue, the colonists agitated against the measure. Jonathan Sewall pointed out that this act did not take money from the colonists without their consent. He reasoned that the colonists did not have to buy tea and only if they purchased such a luxury item did they lose money.  

---

22 Boston Evening Post, May 29, 1769.  
Thus, by buying tea the colonists accorded their consent to such legislation. A "tax is raised by compulsion," Sewall observed, "whether we will or no; but this is a regulation of trade, by which, though it may raise a revenue and is designed for this purpose, yet no man can be compell'd to pay any part of it. . . ." To Thomas Hutchinson, the Patriot arguments comparing trade regulations with revenue acts appeared absurd. He could not understand objections to an act which involved only a small amount of money just because the purpose stated was to raise a revenue. "Chronus," in January, 1772, echoed the absurdity of the argument to allow parliamentary legislation regulating trade but not legislation for raising a revenue. He questioned the Patriots' desire for equality with Englishmen, and he maintained that equality meant sharing the tax burden. To Daniel Leonard, the whole uproar over the revenue bill was difficult to understand. He asked:

Will not posterity be amazed, when they are told that the present distraction took its rise from a three penny duty

---

25 Hosmer, Thomas Hutchinson, p. 190.
26 Massachusetts Gazette, January 9, 1772.
on tea, and call it a more unaccountable frenzy and more disgraceful to the annals of America than that of the witchcraft.27

Since the colonists had always submitted to taxation in the manner of trade regulations, it appeared strange to a writer in the Boston Evening Post that suddenly they should become so upset over a tax on tea. He maintained that restraints placed on colonial trade worked the same as an actual tax, the difference being that in trade regulations the money never entered the public's pocket.28 To the Tories, it really made no difference whether regulations of trade or taxation deprived the public of their money.

Another major constitutional issue connected with the authority of Parliament was representation. Americans believed themselves entitled to the rights of Englishmen, especially to legislative representation. The Patriots rationalized that because they lacked representation they did not need to submit to parliamentary authority. Martin Howard maintained that the Patriots first denied the right of Parliament to tax

27Adams, Massachusettensis, pp. 145-146.
28Boston Evening Post, February 13, 1769.
by opposing the Stamp Act. In his mind, the "humour" spread and the Patriots then argued that Parliament had no right to pass any legislation binding the colonies because it lacked colonial membership. Howard observed that Americans had their rights confused, that they had mixed the political and personal rights. The personal rights of "life, liberty and estate" were secured to every Englishman by common law. The political rights, however, were defined and limited by the separate charters issued the various colonies.²⁹ In letter ten of the "Answer to the Farmer," the writer maintained that the colonies could not refuse to obey Parliament due to lack of representation because of the activities of their colonial ancestors. These ancestors moved away from England and therefore deprived their heirs of the right of representation in Parliament because of the great distance between the colonies and the mother country.³⁰ "Massachusettensis" argued along the same lines, that is, that the fore-


³⁰Boston Evening Post, June 5, 1769.
fathers realized the distance made representation impractical. Therefore, the Patriots could not consider lack of representation a violation of an essential right. Daniel Leonard maintained that distance hindered representation and that a grievance existed only if Parliament turned down colonial petitions for representation. Daniel Leonard maintained that distance hindered representation and that a grievance existed only if Parliament turned down colonial petitions for representation. 31

Another of the arguments or grievances failed to deal strictly with constitutional issues, rather it involved the emotional aspects of quartering troops. Most Tory writers paid attention to the problems surrounding the troops within Boston. Because the town refused to provide troop shelter, the governor had to find lodgings. He did this by taking over public buildings, one of which was Faneuil Hall, honored by the Patriots as a sacred meeting place, a "cradle of liberty." Peter Oliver believed this action by the governor gave added impetus to the townspeople in their plan to cause trouble for the soldiers when they arrived from Halifax. 32

The Tories looked upon the troops as security for the maintenance of order in the province. Ann

31Adams, Massachusetts, p. 172.
32Oliver, Origin and Progress, p. 88.
Hulton declared that without troops governmental authority would disappear. Peter Oliver agreed that the troops helped restrain the outrages of the "rabble," but this restraint caused the Patriots to abuse the soldiers in hope of some retaliation. This came, but nevertheless, Ann Hulton believed that the acquittal of the soldiers and Captain Preston for the so-called "Massacre" actually helped calm the troubles of Massachusetts. Thomas Hutchinson also referred to the relative period of calm after the acquittal of the soldiers on murder charges. Still this calm failed to last and soon the provincial newspapers placed the soldiers on trial once again. Hutchinson, in his history, claimed that the newspapers helped convince the people that the trials were unjust and the soldiers were guilty of murder. To Hutchinson, the acquittals did not "discourage the friends of liberty, but they deprived them of the great advantage which convictions would have given them for promoting the cause."

---


34 Thomas Hutchinson, Diary and Letters of His Excellency Thomas Hutchinson, ed. Peter Orlando Hutchinson (Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1884), pp. 24-25 (hereafter cited as Diary and Letters).
later celebrations of the "Massacre" proved him quite wrong. Peter Oliver apparently saw the trial of the soldiers in the correct light. He maintained that the sparks from this trial helped to fan the flames of the rebellion.

The establishment of customs officials and admiralty courts within America also contributed to the constitutional disagreement. According to Thomas Hutchinson, the establishment of these courts created more efficient government and economized on the time needed to bring a case to trial because it no longer meant a trip to England. He further stated that the admiralty courts did not encroach on the rights of the colonies. Parliament had always reserved the privileges of admiralty and the collection of customs. The custom officials were not new, Hutchinson observed, but this represented the first time that Parliament had instituted them within the colonies.35 The Tories defended the actions of the British government in establishing admiralty courts and custom offices in the colonies by tracing the problem to the smuggling activities within New England. Hutchinson believed the illicit trade in the colonies forced Great Britain to provide a closer

regulation of trade. Martin Howard also related that the colonists brought on the harsher measures by themselves because of their practice of smuggling. The British government tried mild measures, but when these failed to halt the activities, the only step left open to the government was stricter enforcement of the laws.

Daniel Leonard observed that the British held laws governing trade in high esteem, and they looked upon the smuggler as injurious to the trade of the country. Because the colonial officials failed to take action on their own to curtail the illicit trade, the British government found it necessary to formulate new and stricter rules.

The final argument in which the Tories defended the British government concerned the removal of the judicial salaries from the general assemblies. The Patriots viewed the salaries provided by the King as a violation of their charters. Peter Oliver stated that the King decided to pay the salaries of the judges because of the poor financial status accorded by the assemblies. Among the officials the judges were the lowest paid, in fact, even the doorkeeper of the Massachusetts assembly

36 Hutchinson, History of Massachusetts Bay, III, 130.
38 Adams, Massachusettensis, p. 160.
received more money. Thomas Hutchinson hoped to strengthen the royal government by placing the salaries under the Crown and therefore no longer requiring the judges to depend upon the assemblies for their existence.

The Tories generally argued that if the King had the power to appoint the judges he had the power to control their salaries in order to maintain a King's ministry, not a colonial one.

Many of the so-called grievances of the Patriots came from the tightening control of the British government during the period 1760-1776. This change in attitude caused the breakdown of communications between the mother country and her American colonies. The Tories, as did many of the English ministers, failed to admit that the major troubles were due to a need for constitutional changes. Rather than putting forth methods to gain the colonial support, they generally worked at justifying the British activities. They defended Great Britain through the original grants issued the colonies, and strove most of all to prove that the actions taken by Parliament in matters of taxation, salaries, and customs

39 Oliver, Origin and Progress, p. 107.

40 Hutchinson, History of Massachusetts Bay, III, 279; Boston Evening Post, April 10, 1769.
were not new at this time. Through a study of the early charters, the New England Tories hoped to prove colonial subordination to Parliament. The grievances contributed not only to a controversy of a constitutional slant, but also as major contributors to the rising tide of emotion within the colonies.
CHAPTER II

BRITISH INEFFICIENCY AND THE
BREAKDOWN OF AMERICAN GOVERNMENT

Inevitably in the search for causes of the Revolution, the New England Tories placed much of the blame on the negligence of the British government. The Patriots tended to see this negligence as leniency on the part of the mother country, while the Tories saw it as a major weakness of the British system. This weakness, according to the Tories, led to future problems, the worse being the deterioration of royal government and the take-over by the Patriot organizations within America.¹

The Tories firmly believed that the inability of the British government to handle colonial affairs aided the Patriots in their quest for independence. Thomas Hutchinson, for example, attributed the present colonial disorders to British neglect of the affairs within the colonies, and the forcing of British

supremacy on the American people. Hutchinson explained the Tories, particularly the Crown officials, did not agree with British policy and laws. Yet, even though this was true, their job called for enforcement of these laws, no matter how poorly conceived.² Peter Oliver related that Great Britain failed to benefit from passage of the Stamp Act because the need for a repeal showed the British inability to maintain colonial policy. Oliver believed that Great Britain failed to grasp the mood of the colonies and therefore formulated poor policies.³ While Governor, Francis Bernard also disagreed with the British plan to tax the colonies by a Stamp Act. He maintained that the provincial governments needed reform before Parliament enacted any new policies.⁴ "Massachusettensis," in his discussion of the Bernard and Hutchinson administrations, commented that if Great Britain had followed the governors' suggestions for controlling colonial policies, the present situation would not exist. The British failure to implement these

²Hutchinson, History of Massachusetts Bay, III, 160; Hutchinson, Diary and Letters, p. 15.
³Oliver, Origin and Progress, p. 50.
⁴Nelson, The American Tory, p. 27.
suggestions caused conditions to deteriorate within the colonies to the point where rebellion could occur.  

In addition to bad policy, in general, American Tories believed the failure of Parliament to take decisive action in the controversy encouraged the growth of independence. Each time Parliament refused to punish the colonists, the Patriots took this as an indication of timidity within the government. George Rome, in a letter dated December, 1768, disagreed with the British policy of not punishing the colonists, and he criticized Britain's attempts to soothe the persons causing dissension. The people were too sure of themselves and their power, Rome observed, to allow a lenient policy on the part of Great Britain change their minds. This basic weakness, the failure to punish, Francis Bernard explained, allowed the Americans freedom to continue and to expand their seditious activities. Peter Oliver also alluded to the idea of timidity in the British government when he discussed the arrival of General Gage as the new

---

5Adams, Massachusetts, p. 155.

6Boston Evening Post, June 28, 1773.

7W. W. B. Barrington and Francis Bernard, The Barrington-Bernard Correspondence, 1760-1770, eds. E. Channing and A. Coolidge (Cambridge: Oxford University Press, 1912), pp. 112-113 (hereafter cited as Correspondence).
governor of Massachusetts Bay in 1774. Instead of punishing the colonists as Oliver and the "friends to England" had hoped, Gage ignored the Patriot activities and allowed them to continue.\(^8\)

The lack of initiative shown by Great Britain in dealing with the rebellious Americans caused those loyal to the Crown much suffering, and some former supporters of Crown government began to turn toward the Whig movement. The Tories often compared the treatment accorded the Loyalists and Patriots by Great Britain.\(^9\) According to George Rome, the people loyal to the Crown were afraid to petition Parliament for relief. Great Britain offered no satisfactory solution to retaliation from mobs in America.\(^10\) Joshua Wingate Weeks, in his journal, recorded the case of a captain serving with Colonel Wanton during the war. This captain failed to receive financial aid from Great Britain, and he barely subsisted on revenues from rental lands. Weeks remarked that incidents of this nature relayed to the world the negative attitude of the British empire toward

\(^{8}\) Oliver, *Origin and Progress*, p. 115.


\(^{10}\) *Boston Evening Post*, June 28, 1773.
its loyal subjects. This neglect caused persons to turn their backs on the Crown and to move to the Patriot side. Weeks maintained that throughout the controversy the British government had never shown the slightest inclination to punish the enemies of government nor to reward their loyal subjects. He believed that the British despised the Tories when they turned to Great Britain for help or to offer services. Weeks, in comparing the actions of the American Congress to that of the English Parliament, observed that Congress used every art in the world to bring over the disaffected to espouse their cause. They hang the turbulent, imprison the dangerous, fine the wealthy. They allure the ambitious with the hopes of preferment and distribute [sic] estates to those who have lost their property for the sake of joining them. And by such means as these, they have strengthened their cause amazingly. Whereas on the part of the King nothing had ever been done of this kind. ll

Likewise to George Erving, Great Britain failed to take advantage of the tense situation by helping those loyal to the cause. In his memorandum of June 26, 1776, Erving stated that the Boston Port Bill really punished innocent persons and not the guilty ones who dumped the tea. In a

later memorial to the parliamentary commission for settling Loyalist claims, Erving reiterated that the British had furthered the American cause by not punishing the rebels and by not supporting those loyal to the Crown. In his opinion, the British treatment of the rebels contributed to the rebellion and the eventual independence of the colonies.\textsuperscript{12}

Smuggling represented a specific area where British neglect contributed to the Revolution. The British government failed to control the extensive smuggling, and the Tories attempted to find reasons for this failure. Samuel Peters observed that "smuggling is rivetted in the constitution and practice of the inhabitants of Connecticut" just as much as their religion. According to Peters, the smugglers reasoned that God never intended the duties to go to the King; therefore, it was no crime to smuggle.\textsuperscript{13} Jared Ingersoll, in a letter to "TW" observed that prevention of smuggling proved difficult within the colonies because of the


\textsuperscript{13}Peters, History of Connecticut, p. 221.
extensive coast line, the distance between custom
officials, and the good harbors. Daniel Leonard
also discussed the reasons for the illicit trade.
Besides the extensive coast, harbors and numerous
islands, Leonard emphasized the unwillingness of
custom officials to halt this traffic. Peter
Oliver also attributed many of the causes of rebellion
to the illicit trade within the colonies. He stated
that all merchants in Massachusetts were smugglers
who had pledged to protect one another. Martin
Howard believed that the English used more rigourous
measures to control the smuggling in the mother country
than they did in the colonies. He elaborated on
smuggling and called it "a crime against the law
of nature." Howard related that custom officials
ignored the acts of Parliament for controlling the
illicit trade and that the courts of admiralty had
fallen into the hands of the colonial merchants.
The Tories urged the British government to rectify
this situation, but the British resisted the call
for many years. Great Britain waited too many years

14 Jared Ingersoll, Mr. Ingersoll's Letters Relating to the Stamp Act (New Haven: Samuel Green, 1766), p. 6 (hereafter cited as Letters).
15 Adams, Massachusettensis, p. 160.
16 Oliver, Origin and Progress, pp. 46, 163.
according to the Tories, because when attempts to revise the system occurred in the 1760's, trouble started in the colonies. By the 1760's, American merchants were too used to smuggling and too accustomed to resisting governmental authority.

Support by certain Englishmen provided an added impetus to the Patriot movement as far as the Tories were concerned. Peter Oliver believed that the rebellion would never have reached the stage of independence if the Patriots had not received encouragement in Great Britain from the opposition to Parliament. He lamented that minority groups in Great Britain used the American difficulties to further party issues. In Great Britain, Oliver maintained, merchants supported the Americans in order to gain shipping rights, the clergy for the republican ideas expressed, and the orators so they could remain popular and cause distress to the English administration. This support only contributed, in Oliver's eyes, to the Patriot feeling of importance. Thomas Hutchinson also attributed much of the dissention within the colonies to party splits in Great Britain. The frequent changes in the English administrations did little to halt the rebellious Patriots, and the protests either accelerated or regressed

---

18 Oliver, *Origin and Progress*, pp. 58, 149.
according to the support shown by the mother country. Hutchinson further believed that the persons opposed to the ministry in Great Britain contributed to the Revolution by actually encouraging the colonists to move against the authority of Parliament. British support made it easier for the colonists to continue their firm opposition to the Crown. In fact, the Patriots received extra encouragement from the actions of the ministry. In a letter to Robert Wilson in May, 1770, Hutchinson stated that Englishmen had only themselves to blame for the disorders occurring in America. He reminded Wilson of the needless parliamentary debates and stated that splits within the ministry were not just internal affairs, because soon word of dissatisfaction within Great Britain made its way to the colonies where the Patriots revived the discontent and carried it to extreme.

In particular, the Tories attacked William Pitt for his statements in Parliament favoring the activities of the colonies. Pitt's statement, "I rejoice that America has resisted," quickly made its way to the colonies. With such popular support from Parliament, Peter Oliver noted that the colonists could

---

19 Hutchinson, Additions, p. 42; Hutchinson, History of Massachusetts Bay, III, 276; Hosmer, Thomas Hutchinson, p. 190.
not help but continue their opposition to British authority because the Patriots quickly reprinted any parliamentary speech supporting the American cause. Thomas Hutchinson agreed with Oliver that the words of Pitt hindered the movement to maintain peace in America. With this encouragement from various members of Parliament, Hutchinson related that the colonies found it extremely easy to move from advocating no taxation to denying all parliamentary authority.

In addition to support from members of Parliament, the colonists received letters from individuals in England who supported the actions of the Americans. These Englishmen believed the Patriot actions represented the true spirit of liberty and patriotism. The letters indicated that Great Britain anticipated waving punishment of the leaders of the "faction" and repealing all oppressive legislation. Due to this support, the "friends to independence in America" were overjoyed and the "friends to government" were disappointed. Throughout the years of

---

20 Oliver, Origin and Progress, pp. 58-59.
22 The term "faction" refers to the name given to the Patriots by the Tories during their debates. The Tories used the term in reference to the Patriot leaders, their organization and their followers.
the controversy, Thomas Hutchinson lamented, the people learned not to fear any taxation or enforcement of parliamentary laws. With support from the men within Parliament and from the newspapers and pamphlets published in England, the Americans concluded that they had nothing to fear from their subversive activities.23

According to the Tories, the breakdown of the colonial governmental system in America accompanied the lack of support from the British government during the controversy. Beginning with the Stamp Act riots, the failure of the government became evident. In Connecticut, even before Governor Thomas Fitch repeated the oath upholding the Stamp Act, he had great difficulty keeping the radicals under control. After the stamp collector, Jared Ingersoll, resigned, the general assembly attempted to maintain law and order by having Fitch issue a proclamation requiring all local officials to suppress riots and unruly assemblies. Fitch issued the proclamation, but no one attempted to enforce the law. Ingersoll reported that "no one dares and few in power are disposed to punish any violences that are offered to the Authority of the Act; in short all the Springs of Government are

broken and nothing but Anarchy and Confusion appear in prosepect."  \(^{24}\) Francis Bernard, in November, 1765, wrote that since the Stamp Act riots, the American government had weakened and allowed the people to gain superiority.\(^{25}\) In Rhode Island in 1773 with the burning of the Gaspee, an English schooner, it appeared that the government within that colony had lost its control. Peter Oliver commented on this affair in relation to the spread of the independence spirit from Massachusetts to the other colonies. He observed that the people of Rhode Island were against any British legislation to begin with, and therefore the colonial government believed any investigation useless. This incident gave added impetus to the Patriot attack on royal government. In Rhode Island at the time of this and succeeding riots, the government proved powerless to find and punish the leaders of the outbursts.\(^{26}\) To the Tories the weakness of the colonial government gave added encouragement to the Patriot efforts and soon convinced the "faction" that they could take control.

\(^{24}\) Quoted in Zeichner, Connecticut, pp. 61-62.

\(^{25}\) Bernard, Correspondence, p. 95.

\(^{26}\) Oliver, Origin and Progress, p. 93; Lovejoy, Rhode Island, p. 47.
This inability of civil magistrates to handle colonial problems brought out the failure of civil authority in the colonies. Hutchinson commented that the popular element was determined to resist the laws of Parliament and that within the colonies there existed no authority able to check this resistance. George Rome commented on the condition of the court system in Rhode Island in 1767. He observed that the colony needed wise and honest men to run the government. Within Rhode Island, however, men of such ability lacked encouragement to serve the public. Peter Oliver brought out once again the futility of finding a magistrate to handle the Gaspee affair. Rhode Island, to Oliver, represented a republican government, more republican than the other colonies. Within this system any magistrate going against the popular will faced severe retaliation. In January, 1774, Ann Hulton informed a Mrs. Lightbody, that within Boston no magistrate dared halt the outrages against the government, and because of this sad situation, no one person remained safe from the mob and its violence. Daniel Leonard elaborated on the

27Hutchinson, History of Massachusetts Bay, III, 189.
28Boston Evening Post, June 28, 1773.
29Oliver, Origin and Progress, p. 99.
30Hulton, Loyalist Lady, p. 72.
idea that within the court system no individual dared attempt to stop the riots. Writing on December 26, 1774, he stated:

disaffection to Great Britain being infused into the body of the people, the subtle poison stole through all the veins and arteries, contaminated the blood and destroyed the very stamina of the constitution. Had not the courts of justice been tainted in the early stages, our government might have expelled the virus, purged off the peccant humors, and recovered its former vigour by its own strength.

Leonard concluded that since the judges depended upon the people for their subsistence, the magistrates were afraid to move against the majority will.  

The local assemblies fell victim to the wiles of the Patriots and their propaganda. The Tories generally attributed the switch within the assemblies to the annual elections provided for in the charters. Thomas Hutchinson related that through the annual election, the Patriots eliminated representatives who disagreed with Patriot political philosophy, and they replaced the loyal representatives with men who advocated disavowing parliamentary supremacy.  

Daniel Leonard agreed with Hutchinson on the Patriot take-over. In times of moderation he believed that anyone opposing a

31Adams, Massachusettensis, p. 156.
32Hutchinson, Additions, p. 37.
popular measure or voting against one did not need to fear the loss of his seat at the next election. During the controversy with Great Britain, however, the Patriots employed a new voting method. They began to take votes on a yes and no basis, and then on the following day in the Boston Gazette, they published the votes followed by the representative's name. With the record of their vote published, little time elapsed before the men lost their seats to those favoring the popular philosophy. 33

The Massachusetts House of Representatives began its move away from royal authority by appointing its own colonial agent. According to Thomas Hutchinson, the Council and House had always chosen agents jointly, with the consent of the governor. The House, however, at the time of the Sugar Act, decided to employ its own agent in London. Hutchinson saw this as the first attempt by the House to challenge traditional authority within the province. At this time the Council ignored the action, which only contributed to the representatives' activities. Hutchinson, however, believed the sending of an agent by the House "unconstitutional and unwarrantable," and with the House and Council both maintaining agents in London, the governor lost control over the affairs of the colony. 34

33 Adams, Massachusetts, p. 153.
34 Hutchinson, History of Massachusetts Bay, III, 79-80, 229.
"Massachusettensis" also commented on the appointment of a colonial agent by the House. Daniel Leonard explained that the Patriots in order to gain the services they desired, transferred the affairs between the colony and mother country to its own agent. This action gave the colony two representatives at twice the cost. In addition, the House regarded its agent as the representative for the entire province, which he was not. To Leonard, the agent appointed by the House served only the Patriot "faction" and he threatened to sacrifice the whole province to fulfill the desires of the Whig party system.35

The movement away from an assembly favoring royal authority was not confined to Massachusetts. George Rome described the session of November, 1767, in the Rhode Island assembly where the governor offered his resignation because of party feuds. Rome attributed the governor's resignation to the bribery and corruption currently running rampant within the colony. He observed that the action of the governor, whether needed or not, provided evidence of "their [Rhode Island's] decrepid state, the prostitution of government, and melancholy situation of every good subject."36

35Adams, Massachusettensis, p. 154.
36Boston Evening Post, June 28, 1773.
The Tory writers cited numerous other examples to demonstrate the loss of civil authority by the government. Daniel Leonard recorded two incidents showing this breakdown. One involved an outbreak of smallpox, which the public attributed to attempts by the local government to inoculate at Marblehead. The aroused townspeople of Marblehead burned buildings and threatened the houses of the authorities, who petitioned the assembly for relief. The second incident involved the failure of civil authority to help an individual desiring protection. A mob pulled a loyal subject, named Malcom, from his house, tarred and feathered him, and during the severe winter weather carried him across town. Malcom was in serious condition for several days, but he recovered and then petitioned the assembly for redress. The government, however, failed to act on either of these petitions. Leonard saw this failure as an impetus to the people to move to the Patriots for protection. After the Boston Massacre, Peter Oliver commented on the mob's control of the local assembly. The failure of the assembly to renew the Riot Act, which it had done for many years, provided another example of the Patriot takeover of government. This act made rioting a felony, and in Oliver's eyes, the

---

failure of the assembly to renew the act moved the colonial government a step closer to destruction. Oliver also commented on the shifting of the general assembly from Boston to Cambridge in 1771, which caused a great controversy between Governor Hutchinson and the assembly. While located in Boston, Oliver related, the Patriots had wined and dined the members of the assembly, but after the move to Cambridge the "faction" lost this opportunity to exert influence. With the return of the assembly to Boston, Oliver lamented the opportunity afforded the Patriots to influence governmental affairs once again.

Throughout the controversy with the mother country, the royal government also gradually lost the support of the Council. During earlier administrations, Thomas Hutchinson related, the Council had upheld the authority of the Crown, and between 1728 and 1766, it never failed to support the governor in his actions. After 1766, however, changes occurred within the Council and it soon equalled the House in repudiating the royal administration. Hutchinson attributed the change to the elimination by the House of those men who opposed Patriot measures. By the use of annual elections, the opposition gained strength just as it had within the House, and the

38 Oliver, Origin and Progress, pp. 95, 97, 99-100.
Council refused to pass any legislation to strengthen the authority of the executive. Besides this, Hutchinson believed that the average councillor did not remain firm against the public pressure of the colonists. Francis Bernard commented in 1768 that the Council, which the public had previously considered all powerful, had lost its effectiveness as a voice of control. Particularly at the time of the annual elections the councillors were ineffective. Bernard concluded that the governor no longer could count on the Council for support of the royal authority, and the governor stood alone in the fight against the House and Council. Thus, the Tories believed that the councillors were unable to continue their support of the royal government. Any councillor who attempted to go against the popular view only asked for trouble, and even risked his life. Because the councillors depended upon public support and the local assemblies for their political existence, they needed to follow the lead of the House or lose their positions. The


40Bernard, Correspondence, p. 169; Francis Bernard and et al, Letters to the Ministry from Governor Bernard, General Gage, and Commodore Hood. And also Memorials to the Treasury, from the Commissioners of Customs. With Sundry Letters and Papers Annexed to the said Memorials (Boston: Edes and Gill, 1769), p. 11 (hereafter cited as Letters to the Ministry).
Council in Massachusetts originally consisted of twenty-eight members, who were from the best families. These men were attached to their native country, and yet they were gradually replaced by the Patriots.\(^1\) As a result, the Council lost its effectiveness as a moderating power between popular and royal government. This decline meant the end of the political balance within the colony.

Thomas Hutchinson concluded that the assembly in Massachusetts no longer existed as a royal government. He observed that no legislation could possibly correct the horrid conditions within the colonies.\(^2\) Peter Oliver attributed the end of civil government to Gage's attempt to dissolve the assembly in 1774. The secretary of the assembly was unable to carry out Gage's orders to dismiss the assembly until after it had passed seditious resolves and stopped the civil government within Massachusetts.\(^3\)

The Tories observed that once the shift away from royal government started with the assemblies, the "popular spirit" enabled the Patriots to move to illegal or extra-legal government. Jonathan Sewall believed that


\(^2\) Hosmer, *Thomas Hutchinson*, p. 207.

\(^3\) Oliver, *Origin and Progress*, p. 115.
all the measures formulated by the Americans, rather than mending the controversy between the mother country and the colonies, made the situation worse. The Continental Congress eliminated the legal government, which every man in the province counted on for protection. Thomas Hutchinson agreed that by the time of the second non-importation agreement, the illegal associations had triumphed over the established governments in every colony. These associations, initiated by the Sons of Liberty, were to Hutchinson the "greatest tyrants which were ever known." Daniel Leonard found it unbelievable that people who opposed Great Britain because their liberties were violated could establish such arbitrary power among themselves. The destruction of government occurred even when "lovers of liberty" were in control. Leonard saw the committees as being quite adept at locating supposed grievances, and he called these committees the "foulest, subtlest, and most venomous serpent that ever issued from the eggs of sedition." Besides this, these "vicious" committees

45 Hutchinson, History of Massachusetts Bay, III, 85-86; Hutchinson, Additions, p. 15; Hosmer, Thomas Hutchinson, pp. 166-167.
46 Nelson, The American Tory, pp. 70-71; Adams, Massachusetts, pp. 165-166.
were the cause of many Tory problems. Due to fears of persecution, the men loyal to the Crown were forced to abandon their homes and families and move behind the British lines for protection.

In relation to the rise of popular and extra-legal government, both Thomas Hutchinson and Daniel Leonard criticized the activities occurring at the public meetings. Leonard believed that the Patriots used the public meetings to the fullest, and that they never failed to apply their propaganda wisely when discussing the meeting's activities.\(^{47}\) Hutchinson lamented that due to the success of these meetings, the Patriots were convinced that outside authorities could not halt the gatherings. In April, 1771, Hutchinson commented on the fact that persons of good taste and wealth seldom attended these public meetings called by the Patriots. In May, 1771, the Governor wrote Francis Bernard that these meetings actually constituted a mob due to the fact that they consisted of the same lower class persons. Aside from the makeup of the public meetings, Hutchinson also complained about the qualifications for voting within this group. The Massachusetts charter required only £40 sterling for voting, and the Patriots accepted this amount in clothing, furniture, or any other property. Besides this, the Patriots failed to check to see if the partic-

Hutchinson presented his version of the public meetings to John Pownal, secretary to Lord Hillsborough, in a letter where he discussed a meeting of the inferior people and related:

at a late meeting the inhabitants of other towns who happened to be in town, mixed with them, and made, they say themselves, near 3000,—their newspaper says 4000, when it is not likely there are 1500 legal voters in the town.

Hutchinson believed such meetings represented "government of the mob," and they made the lower classes feel important.

The Tories believed the public meetings and the committee system led to the ultimate of extra-legal government within the colonies, the Continental Congress. Jonathan Sewall believed the Patriots had deceived the public by calling the Congress. He had hoped that the Congress intended to adopt measures to bring about a reconciliation between the mother country and the colonies. Instead of this, the Congress "have blown up a spark, which was but kindling, into a raging conflagration." He considered, as did other Tories, the Resolves passed to

---


49 Quoted in Hosmer, Thomas Hutchinson, p. 189; Hutchinson, History of Massachusetts Bay, III, 149.
represent treason on the part of the colonies, and the associations formed meant an actual declaration of hostilities. 50 "Massachusettensis" maintained that the Congress advocated the destruction of royal government. The Suffolk Resolves, which Congress approved meant that the colonies actually sanctioned opposing Parliament and halted any attempts at reconciliation. The Congress through its activities had "dismembered the colonies from the parent country." 51 As Oliver related upon learning of the actions at Lexington and Concord, the battles were immaterial since the "civil Government had been Resolved by the Suffolk Resolves, the military Power had a right to suppress all hostile Appearances."

With these battles, however, the known system of royal government was completely eliminated within New England. This breakdown of the royal colonial government had taken shape over the years of the controversy and had received an added impetus by the handling of colonial affairs on the part of Great Britain. The British allowed the Patriots to go unpunished, which

51 Adams, Massachusetts, pp. 220.
52 Oliver, Origin and Progress, p. 118.
most Tories believed, encouraged the Patriots to continue their opposition. Through this encouragement, the Patriots gained control of local government and moved toward setting up their own illegal systems of government.
CHAPTER III

AMBITION AND PASSION

The New England Tories maintained that another cause for the Revolution was that the individuals striving for an overthrow of the existing government were those whose abilities were not rewarded by Great Britain or the local government. Peter Oliver regarded the desire of the demagogues to gratify their own ambitions and to fulfill their personal resentments as a major cause of the rebellion. Particularly he believed this true for the two Adamses, Otis, and the rebel clergy.¹ In an "Answer to the Farmer," a series of letters published in the Boston Evening Post, the writer discussed the various reasons for men becoming leaders in the rebellion. He observed that some hoped to gain in a monetary manner by the cancellation of debts; others were just ambitious and desired to become the protectors of the country's rights.² Thomas Hutchinson agreed that the ambitions of frustrated

¹Oliver, Origin and Progress, pp. 145-146.
²Boston Evening Post, February 20, 1769.

57
individuals contributed to the outbreak of hostilities and that envy and greed were major contributions to the desire for a change in government. Hutchinson believed, for example, that the ambition of John Adams tended to warp the rebel's good judgment. Adams' "ambition was without bounds," Hutchinson stated, "and he has acknowledged to his acquaintances that he could not look with complacency upon any man who was in possession of more wealth, more honours, or more knowledge than himself."³

As noted, the ambition of James Otis, for both himself and his father, played a major role in the beginning of the Revolution. To Peter Oliver, the Hutchinson-Otis feud was the first of the immediate causes of the American Revolution. The death of the Massachusetts chief-justice, Samuel Sewell, in 1760, and the appointment of Thomas Hutchinson, then lieutenant governor, as the new chief-justice set off the trouble. During the previous administration of Governor William Shirley, James Otis, Sr., had received assurances that he was to fill the next vacancy on the court. Otis, therefore, petitioned Governor Francis Bernard for the vacant position, and Otis, Jr., also petitioned in behalf

of his father. Thomas Hutchinson maintained that the younger Otis vowed revenge if the petitions failed to meet with success. He supposedly remarked "that if his Father was not appointed a Justice of the superior Court; he would set the Province in a Flame if he died in the Attempt." With the appointment of Hutchinson as chief-justice a switch appeared in the allegiance of the two Otises. Prior to this occasion both men had supported the royal government. Hutchinson and Oliver related that from this time on, the two men opposed the local government in every possible way. Oliver explained that young Otis, after being elected a representative from Boston to the House, ranted and raved continually against the royal government. He never failed to take advantage of his position, and with the joint effort of his father and Joseph Hawley, he caused trouble for many years. As Hutchinson lamented many times, "from so small a spark a great fire seems to have been kindled." A writer in the June 3, 1771,

4 Oliver, *Origin and Progress*, pp. 27-28; *Boston Evening Post*, June 9, 1766. The two men believed that one of the older judges would move up to be chief-justice, and that Otis, Sr. would then replace the judge who moved.

5 Quoted in Hutchinson, *History of Massachusetts Bay*, III, 63.

issue of the *Boston Evening Post* also referred to the Hutchinson-Otis feud, to which he attributed the start of the Revolution. This writer blamed the Revolution on the son of a man who "fancied to himself much honour and ease from a seat upon a certain bench," namely Otis.  

Thomas Hutchinson dealt with another Patriot leader, Samuel Adams, his chief opponent in Massachusetts affairs. To Hutchinson, Sam Adams represented the greatest incendiary in the British dominions. The Massachusetts governor believed Adams cared for nothing but the destruction of government and all the friends of the King.  

The New England Tories attempted to warn the people of the deception of the ambitious leaders of the rebellion. Jonathan Sewall believed that the leaders of the movement toward independence first sought freedom from Great Britain in order to establish themselves as "tyrants." They then meant to trample the rights of others in the colonies. The Reverend Mather Byles, one of the few Congregational ministers in New England remaining loyal to the Crown, asked the people "which is better--

---

7 *Boston Evening Post*, June 3, 1771.  
to be ruled by one tyrant three thousand miles away, or by three thousand tyrants not a mile away?" 10

"Massachusettsenis" explained also that any man who incited a rebellion would eventually become a tyrant and wield the "iron rod of oppression" over the people. 11

Samuel Peters in Connecticut often prayed to the Lord for deliverance from the anarchy of the mob, and "Honestus" lamented:

Bad as our present Ministers are universally represented to be by the Newspapers, they still allow us some degree of Freedom, they suffer us to think, talk, and write as we please, but the Patriots allow us no indulgence: Unless we think, talk, and write as they would have us, we are Traitors to the State, we are infamous Hirelings to the Government. 12

In an article to the Boston Evening Post of June 9, 1766, "Cato" attempted to warn the people of the desires of Otis. "Cato" informed the public that deceptions had occurred and that the time was now right to rid themselves of this deceitful man. In his attempt to warn the country, "Cato" pointed to Otis as a man with an intemperate mind who desired to

10 Brown, King's Friends, pp. 36-37.


establish himself as a dictator over the colonies. "Philo Patria," in the New London Gazette commented that these false Patriots were aiming to ruin the reputation of the governmental leaders, and were attempting to end the present government and replace it with anarchy. "Chronus" also warned his countrymen of the "false Patriots" who were out to ruin the happiness of the people and who were damaging the country by their activities.

Tied in with ambition of the Patriot leaders was the easily aroused passion of the average colonist. The Tories attributed many of the problems during the period 1763 to 1770 to the Patriot leaders who attempted to arouse passion against the existing government. According to "Massachusettsensis," the public did not endorse independence or share in the revolutionary spirit. In fact, they really desired and believed in the natural order of things, loyalty to the King. Yet, Daniel Leonard explained how each individual desired importance. The leaders of the Revolution took advantage of the public's desire for importance and informed them

---

13 Boston Evening Post, June 9, 1766.
14 New London Gazette, April 3, 1767.
15 Massachusetts Gazette, February 13, 1772.
of their high place as men within the universe. The Patriots presented the idea that all men are equal by nature and that kings, as ministers of the people, are subjected to removal by the people. These remarks all contributed to the acquisition of the support of the masses in actions against the government.\textsuperscript{16}

Party politics also contributed greatly to the rise of passion within New England. "Massachusettsensis" traced the source of trouble to the popular party and its measures throughout the years, actions which he believed went against the public welfare.\textsuperscript{17} According to Thomas Hutchinson, the majority of the people in Massachusetts held political beliefs similar to those of the Whig party in England. Suddenly those persons supporting royal government found themselves branded Tories, a term long held in reproach, and the opposers of royal government now assumed the name of Whigs. Hutchinson explained that just the name of the parties led to advantages for winning the support of the public. The "common people" associated the term Whig with good policies, and therefore, the Tories were looked upon as being in the wrong.\textsuperscript{18} This

\textsuperscript{16}Adams, \textit{Massachusettsensis}, p. 152.

\textsuperscript{17}Ibid., p. 146.

\textsuperscript{18}Hutchinson, \textit{History of Massachusetts Bay}, III, 75.
division of parties by the name of Whig and Tory also confused an "old Whig," who wrote a letter to the Massachusetts Gazette. He could not understand why he suddenly became a Tory when for years his political philosophy had represented that of a Whig. This "old Whig" still believed in preserving the constitution, and he still opposed any branch of government seeking to become all powerful, and therefore, it remained a complete mystery to him how he suddenly became a Tory. 19

Daniel Leonard stated that the whole conflict boiled down to a popularity contest between the two groups and caused great bitterness among the men of the province. The Whigs accused the Tories of seeking patronage from the King to protect their self-interests, while the Tories believed the Whigs attempted to further their interests by gaining popularity among the masses. During the controversy between Great Britain and the colonies, the two parties took separate routes. The Tories advocated ending the troubles with Great Britain and restoring government to its former position. The Whigs, however, continued in opposition to these policies and resisted any attempt at reconciliation with the

19Massachusetts Gazette, October 1, 1772.
mother country. Leonard pointed out that the Whigs were more successful because their ideas tended to flatter the public. Visions of oppression caused the masses to believe that they were in a high position in life. The Tory plan, Leonard concluded, stressed subordination to a higher rank and proved humiliating to the "common people."\textsuperscript{20}

In May, 1771, "PD" warned the readers of the \textit{Boston Evening Post} that a certain party was attempting to control the popular vote in the upcoming elections. "PD" referred to an article published by the "Elector," which encouraged persons to vote for so-called "veterans" to represent them in the House. "PD" disapproved of these men because of their repeated opposition to the local government and to Parliament. Their lack of integrity, generosity, and public spirit meant these "veterans" were less qualified to represent the colony. "PD" further believed that these "veterans" had allowed party spirit and dissatisfaction to combine with their desire for popularity, and this encouraged discord among the people. Therefore, these men, rather than the friends of government, were unfit for election.\textsuperscript{21}

\textsuperscript{20}Adams, \textit{Massachusettsensis}, p. 149.

\textsuperscript{21}\textit{Boston Evening Post}, May 20, 1771.
Another method which the Patriots used to sway the masses, was the use of the clergy or "black regiment." Peter Oliver believed the leaders of the Revolution won the clergy over to their side, and the clergy in turn helped to sway the public. Oliver, in particular, looked to the clergy as the major source of difficulties. Boston, as the major city of Patriot discontent, had an active clergy that helped to spread the seditious materials. The Boston clergy at various conventions worked to show the public the wrongs of royal government. Oliver commented on the work of the "dissenters" in relation to the "Boston Massacre," when the clergy cried for the blood of the soldiers and when after the acquitals they issued the cry of revenge against the system of government and justice. He again criticized the clergy when after the Tea Party they urged that "it was no Sin to kill the Tories." Actions like these helped to inflame the passions of the public.

Oliver was not the only one who criticized the clergy. "Massachusettensis" warned that once religion

---

22 The "black regiment" consisted of a group of ministers, mostly Congregational, which Oliver held responsible for arousing the passions of the public. The leading members were Samuel Cooper, Charles Chauncy, Jonathan Mayhew, Jonas Clark, Andrew Eliot, John Lathrop, and Samuel Cooke.

23 Oliver, Origin and Progress, pp. 42, 43, 91, 93, 105, 145-146.
entered politics it could cause the support or the overthrow of a government. He stated that the people were taught over the years to believe and respect the words of their ministers. Therefore, when these men preached seditious material Sunday after Sunday, it took very little time for the Patriots to gain public support. The clergy needed only to call a person a traitor and the masses were ready to move in anger.  

Jonathan Sewall also rebuked the rebel clergy for their movement away from the peaceful ideals of the gospel to actively encouraging sedition and maliciousness among the public element.  

Thus, the preceding opinions demonstrated the Tory belief that passion played a large part in the success of the Revolution. Daniel Leonard believed that the Whigs succeeded at the time of the Stamp Act in gaining the trust and confidence of the masses. After the repeal of the Stamp Act, it remained for the Whigs to keep the spirit of discontent alive. This the leaders did with increasing vigor. Leonard applauded the Whigs for their ability to work on the feelings of the masses. The use of effigies, the celebration of dates such as the

24 Adams, Massachusettensis, p. 151.  
fourteenth of August and the fifth of March, the publishing of grievances, and orations from the pulpits all helped to further the dissatisfaction of the colonists with the royal government.\textsuperscript{26} A writer in the *New London Gazette* believed that the Patriots had the advantage because they were not afraid to falsely accuse persons, particularly friends of the government.\textsuperscript{27} Peter Oliver told of the boast of the leaders of the "faction" that they could eliminate any governor from the province of Massachusetts just by presenting allegations against him. If no real grievances existed, the "faction" easily formulated false information. Oliver believed that no better persons existed "for the dirty jobs--to rake into Kennels is the proper Business of such political Scavengers."\textsuperscript{28} Thomas Hutchinson summarized how the opposition leaders used many different means to inflame the passions of the masses. They succeeded mostly through the use of inflammatory speeches and false accusations against those sworn to uphold the authority of the King and Parliament. He felt the leaders of the

\textsuperscript{26}Adams, *Massachusettensis*, pp. 149-150. The fourteenth of August represented the burning of a public building in opposition to the Stamp Act, and the fifth of March marked the anniversary of the Boston Massacre.

\textsuperscript{27}*New London Gazette*, March 20, 1767.

\textsuperscript{28}Oliver, *Origin and Progress*, p. 50.
Revolution deliberately poisoned the minds of the ignorant by feeding them lies and falsehoods. The leaders further helped to spread dissent by ridiculing the rulers and by turning the mob loose on respectable individuals. Hutchinson divided these promoters of "liberty" into three classes. His first class consisted of individuals from the Council, House of Representatives, and the clergy. The second division combined the merchants and former sea-captains with shopkeepers and tradesmen. This group generally encouraged the mob in their actions. The final classification consisted of the mob made up of the inferior craftsmen and common people.29

The first major use of mobs as an outlet for the passion of the public and for the benefit of the Patriot leaders occurred in reaction to the Stamp Act. In Boston the Patriots hanged in effigy, the stamp master, Andrew Oliver, burned his new building, and ransacked his house. Oliver, after the riot, resolved to resign his office and immediately notified the public of this decision.30


30Hutchinson, History of Massachusetts Bay, III, 87-88.
In Connecticut Jared Ingersoll received much the same treatment. In a letter to Richard Jackson, the colonial agent, Ingersoll related that upon his return from England matters in Connecticut appeared quiet. Not until after the printing of the Virginia Resolves and news of the Boston riots did conditions change in Connecticut. Ingersoll stated that the same fury exhibited in Massachusetts against the stamp collectors now spread to other colonies, and the typical activities of hanging effigies and placing slanderous material in newspapers started. Ingersoll expressed shock that the Patriots called him a "Traitor and Parricide," and became particularly upset when the newspapers observed that his initials were the same as those of Judas Iscariot. In a letter to the Commissioner of Stamps in London, Ingersoll told of the plan formulated by the opposition to government. The populace was to force a resignation from the stamp collector by the use of a mob, and then they planned to proceed with business as usual without the stamps. Ingersoll explained to the Commissioner that the colonists had treated him and the parliamentary act with great indignity, with the "rabble" threatening his house, business, and person. On September 19, 1765, a group of men met Ingersoll and forced him to resign as distributor of stamps, and on
September 27, the Connecticut newspapers published his disavowal of the stamp office. 31

In Rhode Island the Patriots directed most of their opposition to the Stamp Act against the stamp distributor and the Newport Junto, a strongly pro-government group. The Junto, particularly Martin Howard, Jr., and Thomas Moffat received much the same treatment as Oliver and Ingersoll. In August, 1765, at Newport, the Patriots hanged effigies of three prominent citizens, Howard, Moffat, and stamp distributor, Augustus Johnston. These effigies were later taken through town and burned. The next day a mob ransacked the houses of the three men. Johnston, the former Attorney General of Rhode Island, announced his resignation and stated that he would not distribute the stamps against the will of the people of Rhode Island. Because the government did not provide any protection, both Howard and Moffat sailed for Bristol, England, on August 31. 32

Thus, passion exhibited by the masses proved advantageous to the leaders of the opposition to govern-


ment. According to Jonathan Sewall, if one of the "demagogues" hinted that an individual had turned against America, even though that person was born in the province, resided and held property there, the masses attacked with great savagery. The mob attack on Thomas Hutchinson's house during the Stamp Act riots provided proof of this belief. The people upon hearing that Hutchinson favored the Stamp Act, which he did not, turned against their former friend. Ann Hulton, in a letter, described an American mob in action during a riot which occurred at a neighbor's house in June, 1768. In England, Miss Hulton maintained, a mob dispersed with a few lights placed in a window or with the appearance of a magistrate. She noted, however, that in the colonies the mobs act "from principle and under Countenance, no person daring or willing to suppress their Outrages, or to punish the most notorious Offenders for any Crimes whatever." She further expounded on the violence, the breaking of windows and the beating of victims, which accompanied these riots in America. "Massachusettensis" in February, 1775, commented on the frequency of mobs and

---

34 Hutchinson, History of Massachusetts Bay, III, 88-89.
35 Hulton, Loyalist Lady, p. 11.
riots within the province of Massachusetts. He attempted to make the public understand that those who suffered from the mobs were loyal Americans. Daniel Leonard explained that many of the persecutions occurred only because the men were connected with the Crown and not for any offense against the colonies. These actions, Leonard concluded, were not accidental or just spontaneous uprisings among the populace, but resulted from planning on the part of the Patriot leaders.  

The New England Tories believed that the Patriot leaders were successful only because of the immense credulity of the masses. It followed that the Tories, therefore, were uncomplimentary in their comments about the average colonist. Samuel Peters of Connecticut was typical when he denounced the "drunken barbarious People" and raged against the "Empty hypocritical Governor and his Seditious . . . pulpit imposters." Peter Oliver had little faith in the common people whom he felt represented machines ruled by the opposition leaders, and he maintained that the people of New England were ignorant of the real problems of the Revolution. According to

37Quoted in Zeichner, Connecticut, p. 117.
38Oliver, Origin and Progress, pp. 162-163.
Jonathan Sewall, the colonists were easily convinced that they had grievances. They accepted as truth the ideas of Parliament fearing the American Congress, of the New England militia defeating the trained troops of the King, and of the colony surviving when its seaports were destroyed. He found it incredulous that the people could accept these ideas in addition to the belief that a duty of a three pence proved more burdensome than a duty of a shilling. The Tories believed the rebels give rise to profaneness, intemperance, thefts, murders, and treason, cursing, swearing, drunkenness, gluttony, lewdness, trespassing, mains, are necessarily involved in them. Besides they render the populace, the rabble, the scum of the earth, insolent and disorderly, impudent and abusive. They give rise to lying, hypocrisy, chicanery, and even perjury among the people, who are drawn to such artifices and crime to conceal themselves and their companions from prosecution in consequence of them.

According to the New England Tories, the spirit of independence would not have spread without the help of the newspapers. Daniel Leonard pointed out that from the outset of the controversy the Patriots, or "partizans


of liberty" were favored in the Boston press. He attempted to show what effect this type of partizanship had on the public. With the Patriot press reiterating the ideas of liberty, oppression, and tyranny to the public throughout their waking and sleeping hours, naturally they learned to despise the Crown officials. Leonard urged the public to acquaint itself with both sides of the situation and to call a halt to the Patriot power. 41 Peter Oliver related how the men who were supposedly guarding the colonial liberties so highly had deprived others of the "liberty of the press." The "faction" discouraged the printers favorable to the Crown, and this meant the general public read only one side of the controversy, the side filled with seditious material. 42 Francis Bernard also commented on the success of the newspapers and maintained that "the Press again teamed with Publications of the most daring nature, denying the Authority of the Supreme Legislature and tending to excite the people in Opposition to its Law." 43 To "ZT" the most seditious material was the Patriot

41 Adams, Massachusettensis, pp. 141-142.
42 Oliver, Origin and Progress, p. 105.
43 Bernard, Correspondence, p. 266.
reprinting of articles in the *Journal of the Times* or *Journal of Occurrences*. This journal, he maintained, made the people aware of only the Patriot side. In a letter in the *Massachusetts Gazette*, a report appeared on the discussion between a Tory and a "substantial farmer" outside of Boston. The farmer had supported the "idea of liberty," but he soon decided that the activities had moved too far from peaceful demonstrations. Most persons in the province, the farmer believed, were ashamed of their activities against the government and would have remained quiet if the Boston newspapers had not spread their seditious material throughout the province. This same writer commented that in the presses of New York and Philadelphia, the seditious material had stopped two years before, in 1769. He compared this with the activities in Boston. There the *Boston Gazette* and the *Massachusetts Spy* continually filled their columns with material aimed at the destruction of royal government. In February, 1772, in a letter addressed to the printer, a Tory lamented that a person who supported the cause of government remained obligated to provide reasons for his

---

44 *Boston Evening Post*, July 3, 1769. The *Journal of the Times* was not a daily newspaper, but represented a series of articles which were reprinted throughout the colonies at various times to help stir up excitement among the colonists.

45 *Massachusetts Gazette*, December 5, 1771.
actions. This was in comparison to the freedom the press and general public allowed the Patriots to stress passion and to formulate opinions without any real proof. This situation caused a great amount of stress among the "gentlemen of the province." This writer commented that only at a great risk could a person still remain in favor of the royal government against the Patriot cause, because soon a "true Patriot will break your head, or run you through the body, and then you must be convinced."  

Overall, the Tories saw the desires of the men whose ambitions were not rewarded by Great Britain as playing a major role in the Revolution. These men, frustrated in their ambitions, turned to the overthrow of the royal government. The Tories believed these men in turn played upon the feelings of the uneducated "common people." By stressing the importance of all men, the Patriots won the support of the masses against the Crown government. This support, New England Tories maintained, was easily changed to passion and the full fury of the public turned on the Tories. The Tories saw the Patriots as controlling the colonial press and the Congregational clergy. With full control of these two organizations,

the Patriots had ample voices for their seditious material. This need for power among the Patriot leaders eventually led to the need for independence from Great Britain, and therefore, the necessity of a Revolution for the colonies.
CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY AND CONSPIRACY

Overall, the New England Tories faced difficulties with the Patriots from the time of the Stamp Act to the outbreak of the Revolution. These Tories, especially in Massachusetts, were called upon to defend their ideals and those of the British governmental system. In evaluating the causes of the rebellion, the New England Tories divided the problems into two classes, long-range and immediate.

Within the long-range causes, the Tories placed the early settlements and charters issued by the King. Coupled with these charters was the fact that between 1629 and 1692, and to a substantial degree after that, the King and Parliament neglected the colonies and allowed almost virtual self-control. The lack of knowledge on the part of the British about the colonies contributed to the difficulties in the 1760's and 1770's. Another major long-range cause was the religious difficulties. The old Puritan tradition of dislike for the established Anglican church was carried over from generation to generation by the rebel clergy. The
old religious prejudices helped to stir the emotions of the mobs.

In discussing the long-range causes, the Tories often went back to the actual settling of the colonies in the early 1600's. Jonathan Sewall, in a letter to General Haldimand, in May, 1775, expressed the view that the actual rebellion started with "the ancient republican spirit brought by the first emigrants, which the form of government in New England has cherished and kept alive." ¹ The spirit of independence, as exemplified by the Puritans through their activities between 1629 and 1689, contributed to the new Massachusetts Charter of 1692. Peter Oliver referred to this new charter which granted more powers to the colonial legislatures, as the date the rebellion started, because here the colonial interests first clashed with those of the mother country. He observed that the original settlers left their native land to avoid religious difficulties with the Church of England. Within New England, Oliver reported, religious aspects of life influenced the political and social conditions. The settlers, therefore, carried over their

¹Quoted in Jones, Loyalists of Massachusetts, p. 259. John Adams agreed with Sewall on the beginning of the Revolution. Adams declared: the Revolution "began as early as the first plantation of the country," and that "independence of church and state was the fundamental principle of the first colonization, has been its principle for two hundred years, and now I hope is past dispute. Who was the author, inventor, discover of independence? The only true answer must be, the first emigrants." Quoted in Stark, Loyalists, p. 7.
fear of the Church of England to the royal government. To Thomas Hutchinson, the men who left England to avoid tyranny established their own oppressive system in the new land. They forgot the English law that went with them in their charters, and this forgetfulness contributed to the easy manner in which they later denied the authority of Parliament.

In the eyes of the Tories, the immediate causes of the rebellion grew out of the long-range ones. Of particular importance was the inability of Great Britain to handle affairs within the colonies. For years, the British had ignored the colonies, and only after the Seven Years War did the mother country attempt to establish control. The British ministers were unsuccessful in their attempts, and the failure of the British government to crack down on the American colonists contributed to the breakdown of royal authority within the colonies. The British neglect encouraged the Patriots to take over the colonial governments, and in this way the royal officials lost complete control.

Under these circumstances, the New England Tories,

\[\text{\sloppy citation}^{2}\text{Stark, Loyalists, pp. 8-10; Oliver, Origin and Progress, pp. 19, 145; Peck, The Loyalists of Connecticut, pp. 4-5.}\]

\[\text{\sloppy citation}^{3}\text{Hutchinson, Diary and Letters, pp. 2-3.}\]
in general, failed to provide any substantial solutions to the constitutional problems, rather they acted on the defensive and only answered the Patriot protests. The Tories attempted to justify the British actions in answer to the Patriot complaints on representation, admiralty courts, taxation and judicial salaries.

To most of the New England Tories, however, the major cause of the rebellion was the ambition of the demagogues within the colonies. The Tories throughout New England saw the controversy as a contest between the royal government and dissatisfied individuals. This contest moved more and more toward violence which the Tories feared. The more the violence went unpunished, the further the colonies moved away from the mother country.

One final related topic concerning the causes of the Revolution was whether or not it was planned. Some New England Tories generally believed that sooner or later the American colonies would declare independence from Great Britain. Hutchinson, for example, in a letter observed that the colonies would not remain under British control for another hundred years. He, along with James Murray, a Boston merchant, accepted the inevitability of the growth of the colonies due to the availability of fertile lands and a booming population.
Nevertheless, Hutchinson explained, although it appeared inevitable that the colonies would become independent, the time had not yet arrived in the 1770's.

Most New England Tories during the 1760's did not believe the Patriots had a plan for securing independence. Rather, the Tories felt the movement was a natural one with the Patriots moving one step at a time. Thomas Hutchinson, for one, disagreed with persons who believed the Patriots had a specific plan. He felt, rather, the Patriots after gaining success at one level simply proceeded to the next step. In his official correspondence and letters during the 1760's, Hutchinson persisted in this belief. In both March and October, 1768, he commented that the spirit of independence had progressed from the colony of Massachusetts Bay to neighboring ones, but he believed that no person actually advocated open revolution. He explained in a letter to Richard Jackson, a colonial agent, that the "advocates for sedition" had moved one step at a time, but he did allow that independence might represent the next plateau. Daniel Leonard


5 Hutchinson, Diary and Letters, p. 115; Hosmer, Thomas Hutchinson, pp. 134-135.
agreed that the Patriots moved one step at a time toward independence without any real plan or design. After denying the authority of Parliament to tax internally, it was just a short move to the denial of parliamentary authority to raise a revenue. From this belief, Leonard saw the Patriots progressing to the adoption of the philosophy of removing parliamentary control completely. Still, to Leonard, this represented a natural outgrowth of all previous actions, and not a specific plan formulated in advance by the Patriots.⁶

By the 1780's, however, many Tories, now living in exile, tended to change their views on the idea of a set plan of rebellion. In looking back, Hutchinson admitted that as early as the 1760's he recognized a plot, but had refused to accept its existence. After the riots in March, 1766, in a letter meant for Pownall, but never sent, Hutchinson stated he might have made a mistake about the move for independence.⁷ By the time of the writing of his third volume of his history, in the early 1780's, Hutchinson called the Boston Tea Party the "boldest stroke" taken in America by the Patriots. He related at this time his belief that:

⁶Adams, Massachusetts, p. 173.
⁷Hosmer, Thomas Hutchinson, p. 102.
to engage the people in some desperate measure had long been their [Patriot's] plan. They never discovered more concern than when the people were quiet upon the repeal of an act of parliament, or upon concessions made, or assurances given, and never more satisfaction than when government had taken any new measures, or appeared to be inclined to them, tending, or which might be improved, to irritate and disturb the people.

Samuel Peters noted in his history of Connecticut that the events leading to the rebellion began with the Peace Treaty of 1763. He maintained after the French were eliminated from North America the colonists began to show ingratitude and to agitate for independence.

Thus, looking back as losers in the revolutionary struggles, many Tories searched for a planned movement and found such a conspiracy among the Patriot leaders. They also observed that the Patriot leaders needed to keep the plan of independence a secret from the average colonist. Peter Oliver saw the immediate cause of the Revolution starting in 1768 with Sam Adams and his "crew," even though independence was not formally declared until 1776. In 1768, the Patriot

---

8Hutchinson, History of Massachusetts Bay, III, 315.
leaders of Massachusetts first attempted to form a revolutionary government by calling the Massachusetts Convention. Oliver repeated a discussion he had with a gentlemen whom the Patriots desired to have on their side at this time. Joseph Warren, an early Patriot leader, had, as early as 1768, informed the above gentlemen that the Patriots' major objective was independence. This, Warren commented, must remain a secret in order to keep the English from retaliating. Warren also explained that the Patriots had already estimated the value of Loyalist estates, and had formulated a policy of compensation for those adhering to the Patriot cause. Even though this gentlemen refused to join the Patriots, Warren assured him that the drive for independence would continue. Another major reason for secrecy was to keep the average colonist ignorant of the movement because the Patriots felt the shock of such an idea might halt the activities. Oliver believed that by the 1770's, the Patriots had exposed the public to enough propaganda so that the idea of independence no longer shocked them. 10 Thomas Danforth, in his memorial to the parliamentary committee for Loyalist claims, discussed the "design of a set of desperate

people in Boston" in attempting to start a rebellion. This man, as did many others, recognized a conspiracy on the part of the Patriots to overthrow the government.  

Thomas Hutchinson further expounded upon the idea of a Patriot conspiracy. By 1771, Hutchinson believed that the Patriots attempted to make the English and American public believe they only wanted redress of their grievances. By stressing their desire for obtaining only redress, the Patriots withheld their true ambitions from the royal administration and the men loyal to the Crown. Hutchinson further believed that the Patriots kept their plan a secret in order to prevent the English from halting their plans. The Patriots misrepresented any person who happened to uncover their seditious plot, and the British failure to acknowledge any possibilities of trouble provided the Patriots with the needed time to win the favor of the colonists.  

The Tories throughout the controversy failed to see a set conspiracy by the Patriots. In fact, they tended to believe that sooner or later the English would halt the rebellious activities, and that conditions

---

11Jones, Loyalists of Massachusetts, p. lll.
12Hutchinson, History of Massachusetts Bay, III, 266; Hutchinson, Additions, pp. 29-30.
would revert to their former positions. This inability on the part of the Tories to organize and counteract the movement early, actually contributed to the Revolution. Once in exile, the Tories searched for a reason for this inaction on their part, and saw a conspiracy by the Patriots as the major cause. The Tories were able to use the set plan of rebellion as an explanation for the whole movement.

As New England was one of the major centers of Patriot activities, the Revolution as seen by the Tories of that section provides an insight into the reasons for the success of the Patriots. The Tories of New England actually saw the causes of the Revolution as the same ones used by the Patriots—taxation, representation and ambition on the part of individuals within the provinces. The causes, however, were viewed in reaction to the Patriot complaints. The Tories of New England appeared unable to originate actions against the Patriots on their own, and their basic conservative nature contributed to the lack of initiative in halting the rebellious activities around them.
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