NEIL MacKINNON

The Changing Attitudes of the Nova Scotian Loyalists towards the United States, 1783-1791

All great passions are difficult to sustain, and even more so when one is removed from the object of that passion. The Loyalists came to Nova Scotia at the very flood of their anger. Although they had sometimes been generous and conciliatory towards the American people during the revolution, the year of the peace and the expulsion traumatized them, and they lashed out, like a grievously hurt child, with an intensity more fierce than during the war. It was in this state that they came to Nova Scotia bringing with them what seemed to be a strong and enduring hatred of those who had expelled them, an emotion which permeated the settlements during their first years in Nova Scotia. But there are few constants. In Nova Scotia the refugees could not reserve for the Americans that obsessive concentration upon which hatred can thrive. With time, new circumstances, and new enemies, the memory of the revolution receded, the Loyalist attitude mellowed, and the American as enemy was relegated to a far corner of the Loyalist mind.

Although they had lost much in the revolution, the early Loyalist attitude was based on more than loss. They had not only been beaten; they had been dismissed. They had forced upon them the role of contemptuous foil for the virtue and progress of the triumphant revolution, and, unable to accept this, they were driven to make of their fate a positive thing. As revolution polarized America, the Loyalists, denied the centre, found themselves where they did not necessarily wish to be, on the right. In a world with no centre, they accepted the polarity into which they were thrust by enemy and events, adopting and exaggerating the postures of their position. Losers of a civil war, they became unbowed defenders of a noble cause. Unable to remain, they made of their leaving a virtue, being "Voluntary exiles to this place, Chusing [sic] rather than to live under the Tyrannic power of a republican Government to quit the lands of our Nativity."[1] Treated with contempt, they reacted with utter

1 Memorial of the inhabitants of Digby, 1 August 1785, Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, MG17, B1/1, vol. 1, Public Archives of Canada.

disdain for all that the new nation symbolized. It was this need to make a virtue of their situation which gave their anti-Americanism in the first years much of its aggressive quality.

There were brave epithets cast over their shoulders about quitting "this damned country with pleasure."[2] It was now a cursed place, "a land of banditti,"[3] and a special resentment was often reserved for those Loyalists who chose to remain in such a land, under the domination of petty tyrants.[4] To one Loyalist, the country had become Satan's Kingdom, the collapse of which he anticipated with certainty and pleasure.[5] "Was I once clear of them, I should not Care, how soon they went to the devil."[6] The humiliation of their expulsion was alleviated somewhat by these assertions that they had been about to leave anyway.

The impact of the lost war, however, is seen in the dreams and the expectations they held concerning their place of exile. Nova Scotia was not only a refuge, but a place in which the Loyalists would still triumph. "By heaven," said Edward Winslow, "we shall be the envy of the American States."[7] Brook Watson saw Nova Scotia as growing affluent and populous within the British Empire, while "Their neighbours, like vinegar fretting on their lees will soon curse the day which made them independent."[8] To many, Nova Scotia was to be an extension of the war, where Loyalists and their principles would triumph, while the independent states would slide inevitably into decline and anarchy. In an exile's verse the province was hailed as that happy land where peace, love and harmony would reign, where liberty would be extended.

> Under a Sov'reign whose mild sway
> We shall flourish and be free,
> While the land from which we fled,
> Shall be oppress'd with Tyranny.[9]

As early as 1779 Jacob Bailey was describing his escape from the regions of tyranny and rebellion to a land of freedom, tranquillity and affluence.[10] Within a few years he was hedging sharply on Nova Scotian affluence, but still

2 C. Clopper to Chas. Whitworth, 18 April 1783, Gideon White Collection, Public Archives of Nova Scotia.

3 J. Alptharp to John Wentworth, 20 February 1788, Wentworth Papers, vol. 2, P.A.N.S.

4 Jacob Bailey to Capt. Benjamin Palmer, 2 August 1784, Bailey Collection, vol. 15, P.A.N.S.

5 N. Ford to Gideon White, 23 August 1786, Gideon White Collection, P.A.N.S.

6 *Ibid.*, 8 June 1786.

7 Cited in W. H. Nelson, *The American Tory* (London, 1961), p. 169.

8 B. Watson to E. Winslow, 26 August 1785, in W. O. Raymond, ed., *The Winslow Papers* (St. John, 1901), p. 312.

9 Halifax *Nova Scotia Gazette and Weekly Chronicle,* 18 October 1785.

10 Jacob Bailey to Moses Badger, 1 July 1779, Bailey Collection, vol. 13, P.A.N.S.

preferred "the gloomy retreats of the wilderness" to the land of mobs and committees.[11] This note was struck again by George Deblois who described the new settlers as breathing "a much greater share of *Free Air* than those renowned Sons of Freedom."[12]

Despite their own difficulties, the Nova Scotian Loyalists clung tenaciously to the belief that the troubles in the new states were worse, and their future bleak. They still talked of the promise of their situation and the comparative collapse of their enemy. One Nova Scotia refugee, in 1785, described the Americans — poor, tax-ridden and oppressed — as regretting their independence. "They now look back with regret to those happy times, when, under the wings of Great Britain, they enjoyed peace, plenty and real freedom."[13] Similarly, a friend wrote to Gideon White describing the imminent collapse of the United States. With exorbitant taxes, cramped trade, political and social uncertainty, the country was on the brink of total dissolution and inevitable revolution.[14] White, visiting New Hampshire in 1787, felt that, in comparison, Shelburne was a veritable paradise, and an object of great envy by the unfortunate people of that state.[15] Benjamin Marston in the same year was permitting himself the luxury of sympathy for the revolted states. Although they richly deserved what had already befallen them, Marston expressed some pity for them in the calamities yet to come.[16]

The extent of this early obsession with the United States is seen in a New Year's verse found in the Shelburne *Packet.* The occasion appears to have been a traditional attempt by the printer's man to sum up the year's events and to wish the customers a happy new year, in light but laboured verse. This particular example began with references to local places and events, but the lightheartedness was abruptly dropped as the writer moved swiftly into a paean to the King and his province of Nova Scotia. The bulk of the verse was then concentrated upon the new nation, the many conflicts within it, and the ugly fighting over the spoils of victory.

> Our trade protected shall each year increase
> And in its train bring freedom, plenty, peace;
> Whilst independence sons shall curse the hour
> That first gave birth to Independence pow'r.[17]

11 Jacob Bailey to Charles Inglis, 22 August 1783, Lawrence Collection, vol. 72, p. 110, P.A.C.

12 George Deblois to _____, May 1785, Lawrence Collection, vol. 20, p. 12, P.A.C.

13 *London Chronicle* (London, England), 25-27 August 1785.

14 N. Ford to Gideon White, 23 August 1786, White Collection, P.A.N.S.

15 Gideon White to Charles _____, 22 June 1787, *ibid.*

16 Benjamin Marston to Edward Winslow, 8 September 1787, in Raymond, *The Winslow Papers,* p. 347.

17 *Nova Scotia Packet,* 1 January 1787, in the White Collection, P.A.N.S.

Even in doggerel, intended for local amusement, this theme of Nova Scotia's rise and the States' failure was struck and was dominant. While the American experience faced imminent collapse, the Loyalists were "laying the foundations of a New Empire," and establishing "a *place* chosen by the Lords elect."[18]

The Loyalist newspapers played an important role in reflecting and extending this attitude, offering the refugees a steady flow of stories from and about the United States. In the summer and fall of 1786, the *Packet* was very busy with stories of discord and discontent within the United States, and particularly with the troubles in New Hampshire where, according to the *Packet,* a Cromwell had lately risen.[19] It also ran detailed stories on uprisings in Massachusetts, Rhode Island and Philadelphia, noting that with the continuing anarchy and confusion throughout the States, "many of the better thinking among them, are totally quitting them, and mean to seek an asylum from such distractions in this settlement."[20]

Where the American difficulties were reported with satisfaction, the American position in the commercial empire of Britain was debated with concern and fear, comments on the issue appearing repeatedly in the refugee newspapers. Its very prominence prodded the memories of revolution and provoked renewed comments on the past sins and possible future treachery of the independent states, on further rewarding rebellion, and on British credulity in the deceptions and designs of a desperate people.[21] *The Royal American Gazette* even reprinted fierce diatribes from American newspapers. One such letter from the *Boston Gazette,* having dredged up past British atrocities, described the Loyalists as pelf-hunting parasites and double faced tools of British intrigue.[22] Shortly after another Boston article was printed which, while commenting on the opposition of the Nova Scotian Loyalists to American involvement in British Trade, labelled the refugees as "nefarious outlaws" who were not only intent upon hurting American trade, but were also *"sucking the very vitals of our political existance* by means of their agents and emissaries."[23] The Shelburne newspapers were very sensitive to any American slighting of their communities, and answered in kind any derogatory comments they found. One column of a 1786 *Packet* contained a biting verse on affairs in the United States, and below it an attack on American distortion of Loyalist affairs in Nova Scotia. Commenting on the progress of shipbuilding in the province, the *Packet* stated that American newspapers deliberately exaggerated the difficulties of the refugees in order to stop the constant emigration of their citizens

18 Wm. Parker to Chas. Whitworth, 8 June 1784, White Collection, P.A.N.S.

19 *Nova Scotia Packet,* 13 July 1786.

20 *Ibid.,* 5 October 1786.

21 *Royal American Gazette,* 7 February 1785.

22 *Ibid.,* 1 August 1785.

23 *Ibid.,* 18 April 1785.

to Shelburne.[24] The shipbuilding controversy was continued by the *Packet* with the launching of the brig *Governor Parr* at Shelburne. "Be hush'd ye inhabitants of Shelburne nor with your skyrending acclamations on these occasions, *disturb* the *quiet tranquility* of the *peaceable people of Massachusetts.*"[25]

By their constant attention to the United States, by their comparisons and contumely, the Shelburne newspapers helped to sustain the intensity of Loyalist hostility, for with three such newspapers in Shelburne, dragging the past in all its rancour before them, the Loyalists were given little respite from the war. The Shelburne papers, however, like their community, were short-lived, their demise coinciding with a shift in the Loyalist attitude towards the United States.[26] By the time of their passing, Loyalist antipathy was receding, the response to their former home less automatic and less harsh. Other comments on the United States can be found, but after 1787 the references, both in newspapers and private correspondence, were less frequent and less bitter.

The *Nova Scotian Magazine*, for example, produced in the last years of the decade to encourage both economic and cultural improvement within the province, contrasted sharply with the Shelburne newspapers in its attitude towards the United States. Originally published by William Cochrane, an Anglican minister who had come from New York after the Revolution, and later by John Howe, a Sandemanian Loyalist, it was dependent upon the support of Loyalist readers throughout the province, yet showed none of the blatant hostility of the Shelburne papers. It shamelessly borrowed many of its articles from American journals and sources, most of them on agricultural methods, but others on topics ranging from school systems to the fate of the free negro. There was one fierce Loyalist reaction in the magazine to a biased history of the Revolution.[27] There was also a plan for education in Nova Scotia which made much of the weakness of the American system of education and the threat of American democratic institutions.[28] But these seem isolated incidents in a journal otherwise void of derogatory comments on the Americans.

After 1786 there appeared an increase in, and easing of communication between Americans and Loyalists. Co-operation between the ethnic and fraternal societies on both sides of the border was more marked. The North British Society of Halifax, although studded with Loyalist members, thought it fitting to have representatives of the New York and Philadelphia societies in

24 *Nova Scotia Packet,* 9 November 1786.

25 *Ibid.,* 14 December 1786.

26 *The Royal American Gazette* and *The Port Roseway Gazeteer* had both ceased publication in Shelburne by September, 1787, while *The Nova Scotia Packet* existed as late as February, 1789. See Marie Tremaine, *A Bibliography of Canadian Imprints* (Toronto, 1952), pp. 612-617.

27 Halifax *Nova Scotia Magazine,* vol. 1, p. 204.

28 *Ibid.,* vol. 1, p. 105 ff., p. 199 ff., p. 364 ff.

attendance for its celebration of 1787.[29] Ties with relatives and friends, although frayed by division, emotion, and the wayward post, had not been sundered. With time, letters to and from the United States became more frequent and the circle of acquaintances broadened. As these ties were renewed and strengthened, visits to and from Americans increased.

One result of these visits, and perhaps also a cause, was the growing number of marriages between Americans and Loyalists. "I hear by accounts from Boston," wrote Mrs. Hutchinson, "that one of your youths has thought fit to detain one of our pretty girls by marrying her."[30] Andrew Belcher, another Loyalist, expressed delight at the engagement of his sister to a doctor from Cambridge.[31] The only derogatory comments were humorous ones by a friend who reminded Miss Belcher of her former opinion of doctors, and threatened to visit Boston to tease the prospective groom.[32] Those who had not long before severed their ties forever from Satan's Kingdom, now seemed happy to witness and encourage marriages with Americans. The scarcity of suitable matches in Nova Scotia would have overcome most obstacles, but what one notices is the lack of any comment on nationality as an obstacle.

Comments made by Loyalists visiting the United States after 1787 lacked the antagonism and bitterness found earlier. Although Gideon White painted a doleful picture of the state of New Hampshire upon his visit, he also stressed how impressed he had been by the kindness he had received, and by the many people he had call on him, all "very polite, friendly and social."[33] Frederick Geyer, writing of his visit to Boston in 1787, omitted any comment on public matters, "having long since determined to leave those matters to whom they are interested."[34] Gregory Townsend of Halifax had very much wanted to visit his friends in Boston.[35] Finally arriving in the spring of 1788, he had a delightful, if too brief, stay among "all our Boston Friends." Circumstances at home forcing him to cut short his visit, he "reluctantly left that best of Countries."[36] The family of Mather Byles, the Anglican clergyman, were also visiting the United States. An uncle had sailed in 1787, and in the following year Mather Byles III planned to visit relatives and childhood haunts.[37] In 1790 the elder Mather Byles journeyed to Boston to settle his father's estate. It was a sentimental journey, one of embracing sisters not seen for a decade, of prayers at

29 James S. Macdonald, *Annals of the North British Society of Halifax, N. S.* (Halifax, 1894), p. 55.

30 M. Hutchinson to M. Mascarene, 6 September 1783, Mascarene Papers, P.A.N.S.

31 Andrew Belcher to his sister, Betty, n.d. (c. 1790), Byles Papers, vol. 1, f. 3, P.A.N.S.

32 R. Altman to Miss Byles, 19 June 1790, *ibid.*

33 Gideon White to Chas._____, 22 June 1787, White Collection, P.A.N.S.

34 F. W. Geyer to Ward Chipman, 12 June 1786, Lawrence Collection, vol. 2, P.A.C.

35 G. Townsend to Ward Chipman, 19 November 1787, Chipman Papers, P.A.C.

36 *Ibid.*, 10 May 1788.

37 Mather Byles III to his aunts, 26 August 1788, Byles Papers, vol. 1, f. 2, P.A.N.S.

the family tomb, of visiting relatives, of entertaining and being entertained by a host of friends and acquaintances. He preached at Trinity Church, and was astonished to receive an invitation from a Mr. West to preach to his father's congregation at the new meeting house. It was a very happy trip, and the journal kept by this acerbic gentleman is noteworthy for the expressions of warmth, gratitude and generosity towards his American hosts. From the moment of his arrival, with his comments upon the politeness and courtesy of the customs official, until his return, there were no unkind comments on the Americans, no stirring of the Revolution's residue.[38]

Nor did it take a visit to express the altered views. One reads of the gradual softening in the letters of Margaret Hutchinson, from sharp hostility towards the new order to a casual acceptance. At the war's conclusion she would not entertain the idea of returning to the new Massachusetts. "The ideas I have of what it once was, and what it is now, has sufficiently wean'd me from it."[39] As the years passed she still did not return, but the altered America was no longer a factor. The reasons she later stressed were the difficulties of age and of leaving husband and family for any period of time.[40]

Even Jacob Bailey was softening. Few in Nova Scotia had written as much on the Loyalist fate in the Revolution, nor as violently against Britain and the rebels alike, as this Anglican minister in the Annapolis Valley. Towards the revolting states, the ambitious leaders, and their foolish supporters, he had been merciless in his ridicule.[41] With time, however, he turned more to Britain as the chief cause of Loyalist woes, and the Americans as villain receded somewhat into the background. In December of 1787 he wrote to the Rev. John Gardiner on his appointment to Bailey's former church at Pawnalborough, wishing the new minister well, and expressing his own continued affection for the parishioners. He had hoped to return after the war, he explained in most diplomatic terms, but the spirit of revolution had prevailed and gallic perfidy has led to a separation from Britain. "My long absence has not in the least diminished my tender regard for the happiness of those dear friends, which stubborn faction had compelled me to forsake."[42]

William Clark, an Anglican minister in Digby, by the end of the decade, also expressed new views on the revolted states, finding the Americans much changed from the earlier years. Having travelled to Boston in 1789, he commented on the immense difference he found in the people since the Revolution. "In times of Rebellion or public Commotion, the Body politic resembles a man under the Dilirium of a Fever, who when he gets well and returns to

38 Journal of Mather Byles, July-September 1790, Byles Papers, vol. 1, f. 2, pp. 29c-29i, P.A.N.S.

39 M. Hutchinson to M. Mascarene, 20 October 1783, Mascarene Papers, P.A.N.S.

40 *Ibid.*, 3 October 1786.

41 See, for example, Bailey's journal of the flight from New England, Bailey Papers, vol, 5, P.A.N.S.

42 Jacob Bailey to Rev. John Gardiner, 8 December 1787, Bailey Collection, vol. 15, P.A.N.S.

his natural Temper, is quite a different man."[43] Clark, far from condemning, now appeared to be rationalizing earlier American actions, and drawing a sharp distinction between revolutionary America and the moderation of the post-Revolution period.

The altered attitudes of such individuals as Clark and Bailey, White, Mrs. Hutchinson and the others, reflected the changing attitude of the Loyalists in general. The rank and file left few letters, but they did express themselves graphically by their actions, for they were now leaving Nova Scotia and returning to the United States. Although there had been an exodus of the uncommitted soon after the founding of the settlements, the majority had settled in and begun to build again. After the cessation of the King's allowance, however, another rush began to the United States. In the fall of 1787 an Anglican minister wrote of "the great Emigration from this Province to the States."[44] Governor Parr also described the great number leaving with the ending of provisions.[45]

A concurrent factor in encouraging many to return was the British decision which allowed half-pay officers to receive their pensions while residing outside the empire. The effect this had on emigration was so extensive that Jacob Bailey felt it would depopulate the province.[46] In 1790 William Clark wrote: "This Place is nearly desolated by emigrations, or more properly, re-emigrations."[47] The portable pensions had given many the opportunity of living where they wished and they apparently wished to live in the United States. Their return testified to the changing feelings of the refugees to their birthplace, a change in which the old rhetoric, the old cries of loyalty and treason, did not necessarily reflect the attitudes of the rank and file. It is difficult to return to a people you profess to hate. Since so many were returning with so little remorse, it might perhaps be assumed that the professions of hatred were no longer very extensive or very intense.

Hatred of the United States had been a dominant characteristic of the early Loyalist communities, for the first years had been too close to the Revolution to allow the abatement of harsh memories. The scars were still raw. Moreover, reality had not caught up with the Loyalists, and it was still imaginable to create

43 William Clark to Samuel Peters, 12 May 1790, Peters Papers, vol. 4, P.A.N.S.

44 Roger Viets to Samuel Peters, 12 October 1787, Peters Papers, vol. 3, P.A.N.S.

45 John Parr to Grenville, 25 May 1791, C.O. 217/63, P.A.C. Judith Fingard estimates that by 1790 Shelburne had lost 4/5 of its population, and Digby about one half. See Fingard, *The Anglican Design in Loyalist Nova Scotia* (London, 1972), pp. 43, 204.

46 Jacob Bailey to _____, 12 November 1787, Bailey Collection, vol. 15, P.A.N.S.

47 William Clark to Samuel Peters, 26 July 1790, Peters Papers, vol. 4, P.A.N.S. See also Jacob Bailey to _____, 12 November 1787, Bailey Collection, vol. 15, P.A.N.S., and Bailey to Morice, 12 November 1787, *ibid.* In a list of Shelburne residents who registered to leave the province in 1786-1787 approximately 74% stated they were returning to the United States. See White Collection, vol. 5, P.A.N.S.

in Nova Scotia what had been lost in the former colonies. The strength of this hope, spurring the many comparisons with the Americans, helped to keep alive the hostility. But the very intensity of their reaction was too much to sustain. The passage of time and the reality of Nova Scotia were bound to produce a mellowing patina for their views, and to elicit a more generous and friendly attitude to the United States. The revolutionary experience was, in effect, being supplanted by the Nova Scotian, the immediacy and the dominance of which overwhelmed the earlier trauma. If the hostility towards the United States was to be sustained, that country had to remain the principal focus of envy and hatred. In Nova Scotia, however, these hostile emotions were loosed upon Britain, local officials, Nova Scotians and one's fellow Loyalists.[48]

Twenty thousand Loyalists had descended upon Nova Scotia seeking retribution and opportunity from a province too poor to support them. The natural result was a fierce scramble among the Loyalists for the prizes. Moreover, the refugees were often placed in large, uncultivated areas, isolated somewhat from the rest of Nova Scotia. The discord and conflict inevitable in such a large task of transplanting was between and among Loyalists. The pent-up hostility and resentment of Loyalist grievances, instead of being channelled to the outside world, turned inward, Loyalist bickering with Loyalist over fundamental questions of property and place. Noting this on a tour of Shelburne, Andrew Brown wrote: ". . . all the bitterness seemed now to be shed between the different knots of Loyalists in Shelburne which they had lately directed undivided against the members of Congress and the independence of the United States."[49]

An even deeper resentment was soon expressed towards the officials of Nova Scotia. From the very beginning there had been harsh complaints of Governor Parr, of the treatment received and the obstacles placed in the way of settlement, and accusations of corruption, incompetence, and favouritism. To Charles Morris there were "unmeritted ungenerous complaints which have been made against all the officers of Government without exception."[50] These complaints and hostilities did not ease with time, for the Loyalists had come to a province ruled tightly by a small circle in Halifax, and their attempts to share in and to limit this power exacerbated feelings on both sides, deflecting much of the Loyalist venom onto the ruling body of Nova Scotia. Jacob Bailey declared that many of the respectable people returning to the United States had been in effect driven out by affairs in the province, where only the wicked prospered.[51] A returning Loyalist expressed his sympathy for the many remain-

48 Roger Viets to Samuel Peters, 12 October 1787, Peters Papers, vol. 3, P.A.N.S.

49 Prof. Andrew Brown, "History of North America" (unpublished MS), Andrew Brown Papers, p. 103, Edinburgh University.

50 Charles Morris to Maj. Studholm, 12 November 1784, Charles Morris Letterbook, P.A.N.S.

51 Jacob Bailey to_____, 12 November 1787, Bailey Collection, vol. 15, P.A.N.S.

ing Loyalists "who are obliged to live under the arbitrary, cruel & unjust Govern mt as at present administer'd in Nova Scotia."[52] The comments of the returning Loyalists represented a common attitude among the refugees towards official Nova Scotia, for complaints had been both widespread and harsh. "This is an ungrateful place, . . .", said one who had seen his son return in 1788.[53] They spoke as if they had fled a land under mob rule only to find themselves in Nova Scotia under a rule which seemed almost as arbitrary and exclusive. The bitterness once felt towards the revolted states was being shouldered aside by the growing anger and resentment felt towards the establishment in Nova Scotia.

Britain also shared in the deflecting of Loyalist anger. Their early attitude towards the mother country was somewhat disguised by the situation in which they found themselves. Because of the circumstances of their defeat their expressed enmity was focussed upon the revolting states. The corollary of this attitude was the rite of loyalty in which they indulged so zealously. As antagonists of the rebel forces, they sought both to glorify and to symbolize the antithesis of rebellion, the quality of loyalty.[54]

But what was of importance in their strenuous displays of devotion to the crown was not the object of that loyalty but rather the virtue of loyalty itself. They were to be distinguished from the rebels, and from other mortals, by the possession of this selfless quality. Moreover, in the realm of Nova Scotia, since they were uncomfortably dependent upon British largesse, and since their one claim upon Britain was their loyalty, the ritualistic celebration of every imaginable royal event and birthday was as much a tactical as an affectionate reponse, to keep alive in Britain a remembrance of the Loyalist sacrifices.

This combination of circumstances, however, obscured a festering resentment towards Britain. They had not accepted a peace which they felt betrayed them to appease the rebels, and where ". . . such a number of the best of human beings were deserted by the government they have sacrificed their all for?"[55] To a degree judgment was withheld on Britain until it was seen how far she would go to compensate the Loyalists for their losses. By 1788 they knew, for by this date Britain had met her basic obligations. The land had been distributed, half-pay and pensions granted, provisions ended, and for many refugees, too little given to too few. With their fate in Nova Scotia crystallizing, the Loyalists tended to weigh less generously Britain's part in their fortunes, and to place at her doorstep much of the blame once monopolized by the independent states. In 1790 William Clark wrote that "The People of New

52 Quoted by Clark in William Clark to Samuel Peters, 23 June 1789, Peters Papers, vol. 4, P.A.N.S.

53 J. Peters to Samuel Peters, 17 November 1788, Peters Papers, vol. 3, P.A.N.S.

54 See Neil MacKinnon, "Nova Scotia Loyalists, 1783-1785," *Histoire sociale/Social History* (November, 1969), pp. 23-24.

55 Sarah Winslow to Benjamin Marston, 10 April 1783, in Raymond, *The Winslow Papers,* p. 87.

England never treated me with that Barbarity the Government of Old England has, all things considered."[56]

In contrast with the chill from Britain and Nova Scotia was the increasing warmth of the American response to the Loyalists. With time American anger subsided, and the returning Loyalists found a cordial welcome from the Americans. Settling in New York in 1790, a Dr. Huggeford wrote of how pleased he was with his reception, and only wished he had gone sooner.[57] Another found that the most friendly treatment was being paid to all the Loyalists returning to America.[58] Dr. Walter's return from Shelburne was well reported in an American newspaper of 1791:

> He has been invited to officiate in several of our Meeting-Houses, and met with universal approbation — the places of Worship have been crowded with the most respectable audiences on those occasions.[59]

Such examples of American generosity and cordiality would have done much by themselves to curb the Loyalist attitude, for the ebbing of American hostility weakened the foundations upon which Loyalist antipathy rested. No longer treated as an enemy, the Loyalist found it more difficult to act as one.

It would have been impossible in any case to sustain the intensity of the earlier attitude. Even hostility must have priorities, and the attention once focussed in splendid concentration upon the revolted states had been diverted in Nova Scotia to other, more immediate and more dominant objects of anger. With the Loyalist difficulties in the new land, the ugly conflicts with pre-Loyalists and fellow Loyalists, with the growing resentment of both the British and Nova Scotian governments, the American as enemy was relegated to a minor, somewhat distant role.

Republican institutions would remain alien to the Loyalists, for they had not shared that desperate American experience which had given birth to their political system. The influence of the French Revolution and its excesses would harden their attitude towards republicanism. Such events of the 1790's as Jay's Treaty and the American flirtation with the French, combined with the conservative regime of John Wentworth in Nova Scotia, with its emphasis upon the virtue of loyalty to the status quo, would rekindle some of the old rhetoric.[60] But it is easy to exaggerate the anti-Americanism of this later period in Nova Scotia,

56 William Clark to Samuel Peters, 12 May 1790, Peters Papers, vol. 4, P.A.N.S.

57 *Ibid.*, 4 September 1790.

58 Quoted in William Clark to Samuel Peters, 23 June 1789, *ibid.*

59 *Nova Scotia Gazette*, 20 December 1791.

60 Some Loyalists who entered the establishment in Nova Scotia retained a rhetoric of contempt and hostility. What is interesting in Nova Scotia is that the establishment, chiefly non-Loyalist under Parr, managed to usurp the image of loyalty and to brand some of the Loyalist reformers as suspect.

and misleading to see this later period, shaped by its own events, as a simple continuation of the 1780's. Between the bitterness of the exodus and the conservatism of the Wentworth years there was a marked pause in which the attitude of the Loyalists towards the American people, those detested rebels of the past, had mellowed remarkably.