

THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY
SCHREYER HONORS COLLEGE

DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY

NON-ENGLISH LOYALISTS IN THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION:
REASONS AND MOTIVATIONS FOR LOYALTY

JULE WALSH
SPRING 2016

A thesis
submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements
for baccalaureate degrees
in History, Anthropology, and Political Science
with honors in History

Reviewed and approved* by the following:

A. Gregg Roeber
Professor of Early Modern History and Religious Studies
Thesis Supervisor

Michael Milligan
Senior Lecturer in History
Honors Adviser

* Signatures are on file in the Schreyer Honors College.

ABSTRACT

This honors thesis examines non-English loyalists during the American Revolution, and their motivation for supporting the Crown. These loyalists do not fit the stereotypical image of a loyalist – a rich tory, who feared losing power. In fact, they were middling class people, who did not have large tracts of land to loose, and if their cultural background were taking into account, one would assume they would have ultimately aligned with the patriots. Their loyalty was not a result of strong feelings of attachment to the Crown, but an effect of the perceived radical nature of the Revolution. These populations give insight into the common perception of the American Revolution, and their motivations for allegiance supports the notion that the American Revolution was radical in nature.

With hindsight, the American Revolution appears tame, especially comparing it to future revolutions, like the French Revolution. However, to many who lived through the events, this rebellion was radical. Non-English loyalists considered many factors when choosing their allegiance, one of which was their country of origin's history with rebellion and warfare, and the consequences associated with them. Confrontation with the British could cause massive damage, to their property and the economy, facts with which these loyalists were quite familiar. These individuals also considered who aligned with the patriots, and given the hostile nature of some patriots, were hesitant to support such groups.

Through examination of non-English groups in three colonies – North Carolina, New York, and Pennsylvania – this thesis will introduce a perspective of the American Revolution not often covered, and demonstrate that the Revolution was far more radical than many believe.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS iii

Chapter 1 : Introduction: A Radical Revolution 1

Chapter 2 North Carolina: “Highlanders in the Backwoods” 11

Chapter 3 New York: “Merchants in a Port City” 32

Chapter 4 Pennsylvania: “The Undecided Population” 50

Chapter 5 Conclusion..... 75

BIBLIOGRAPHY..... 78

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This thesis in its final form would not have been possible without the help of friends, family, and my advisors. In particular I would like to thank my thesis supervisor Dr. A. Gregg Roeber for his guidance throughout this project. He was an invaluable resource who challenged me to dig deeper into this project than I believed he could. I appreciated all his help, especially in reading a new draft almost every week, for over twenty weeks. I would also like to thank my honors advisor Professor Milligan who has guided me through the honors process these last four years. I extend thanks to my parents, who have supported me throughout my entire career, including listening to me for hours as I described my thesis at far too great of lengths. I would also like to thank my roommates Ashley Lansdowne and Lauren Corliss, who allowed multiple corners of our apartment to be turned into my own personal library. I would also like to thank them for waking me up in the morning when I fell asleep on the couch after a late night of research. Finally, I would like to thank all the family, friends, and love ones who have supported me at Penn State.

Chapter 1 :

Introduction: A Radical Revolution

Most Americans recognize the American Revolution, or at least they think they do; the famous figures and events – George Washington, the Boston Tea Party, and Valley Forge – figure in the curriculum of schools around the country. In telling the story of the Revolution, the heroic Founding Fathers and the patriots bravely opposed tyranny, whereas the Tories conspired with the villainous British. In popular cinema about the Revolution, the central conflict revolves around the fighting between the patriots and British soldiers and their loyalist collaborators. The protagonist, a lowly, underdog, identifies as a patriot and displays his moral righteousness in his actions during the film. If the patriot protagonist comes from a more privileged social class he must see beyond social standings, and treat all men fairly.¹ The anti-aristocratic sentiments of the protagonist, differentiates him from the villainous British military officer or wealthy loyalists. The villain often holds rank in the British military, and comes from an aristocratic background. When civilians in films maintain loyalty to the Crown, “their political opinions and actions ultimately define them as villains, but *their goal of preserving their wealth and status offer an early clue.*”² These films neatly place revolutionary supporters and dissenters at opposite ends of the moral spectrum because they fit the common narrative about loyalists and patriots.

¹ Nancy L. Rhoden, "Patriots, Villains, and the Quest for Liberty: How American Film Has Depicted the American Revolution," *Canadian Review of American Studies* 37 (2007): 210, 213.

² Rhoden, "Patriots, Villains, and the Quest for Liberty," 217.

Yet, loyalists did not comprise exclusively of landowning, wealthy individuals who opposed the Revolution because they feared losing their wealth. Although some loyalists fit that criterion, many—in fact likely the majority—of loyalists remained in the middling class. These modestly well off to marginal artisans, farmers, shopkeepers, and laborers did not have titles and large tracks of land to lose, but they remained loyal to the Crown. The purpose of this thesis is to examine why these people remained loyal. Put simply, I argue that both personal experience and the memory of events in Britain and on the European Continent provided powerful economic and social evidence that revolution would endanger, if not destroy, the delicate hold on economic and social stability recently achieved by these middling people in the colonies. As well, the thesis also rejects some of the alternative explanations that have arisen in attempting to account for why so many British subjects in North America remained loyal, as these explanations are unconvincing for non-English loyalists. One of the most common explanations that one encounters has suggested that middling class loyalists maintained loyalty to the crown because a commitment to the Mother Country from which they, or their parents and grandparents, emigrated. In what follows, I suggest that this conclusion is incompatible with the background of these non-English loyalists. German-speakers, Scots, Native Americans, and many more non-English colonists identified as loyalists. The common, popular stereotype of wealthy loyalists is not appropriate for these groups, nor was their loyalty a reflection of an emotional, familial, or other tie to Britain.

In looking at the history of Scottish and German-speakers in the mid-eighteenth century, for example, one might expect that these populations would have sided with the revolutionaries. During the eighteenth century, Scottish forces arose twice in the British Empire. In 1715, a rebellion began that stemmed from the Scottish Jacobites' determination to place the Stuart

prince, James Stuart, the Old Pretender, on the English throne. The Jacobites made little headway militarily, and the rebellion eventually subsided.³ Another rebellion erupted in 1745, when the young Stuart Prince, Charles Edward Stuart, arrived on the western coast of Scotland, with a plan to gain Jacobite support in order to reclaim the British throne from King George II. This rebellion had a string of early military victories, including the Jacobite takeover of Edinburgh. When British troops forced the Jacobites into retreat, Charles Edward Stuart fled for France, and the rebellion failed.⁴

The educated citizens of the Holy Roman Empire generally showed little interest in America before the Revolution; many in the bourgeoisie saw the American colonies as a land of savages. When the Revolution began, German-speakers' interest in America soared, with the number of writings concerning America, and particularly the Revolution, almost tripled from prewar years.⁵ Those who followed the news on America, especially the bourgeoisie, felt that the colonists both philosophically and legally acted correctly.⁶ Yet, there were many German-speaking colonists who remained loyal during the war.

Understanding the nature of the Revolution, especially how colonists viewed the Revolution at the time is critical to set the broader context for answering the main question of this thesis, for that context helps explain why certain people stayed loyal. Gordon Wood has famously argued “the [American] Revolution was the most radical and most far-reaching event

³ Daniel Szechi, *1715: The Great Jacobite Rebellion* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2006) 2-5.

⁴ Geoffrey Gilbert Plank, *Rebellion and Savagery: The Jacobite Rising of 1745 and the British Empire* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006) 2-3.

⁵ Horst Dippel, *Germany and the American Revolution, 1770-1800: A Sociohistorical Investigation of Late Eighteenth-century Political Thinking* (Chapel Hill: Institute of Early American History and Culture by the University of North Carolina Press, 1977) 1, 14-15.

⁶ Dippel, *Germany and the American Revolution*, 89, 114-115.

in American history.”⁷ Others have disagreed arguing that the American Revolution does not appear radical; it looks nothing like the French or Bolshevik Revolutions. But why did ordinary people remain loyal to the empire if the Revolution was conservative and not radical?

Barbara Clark Smith observed that the Revolution was not radical because it granted equality to a group of men who were far from the most oppressed group at the time. Women and slaves gained no more freedom or rights in 1783, yet less than a decade later the French Revolution led to the abolition of slavery and discussion of increasing women’s rights.⁸ This arguments looks at the two revolutions that occurred close to each other, and compares the outcomes of these oppressed populations. By comparing these revolutions in that way, the American Revolution does seem, as Clark Smith puts it, adequate. But by looking at only the most oppressed peoples, this critique fails to recognize the significance of granting equality of all property-owning white men. Colonial society was rooted in hierarchy, even if the colonies lacked a landed aristocracy within their borders. Rank determined what jobs men took, their treatment in court, and seats in church. So, after the Revolution, when Americans found themselves no longer part of England’s hierarchical society and monarchy, granting all white men even a modest amount of social equality was, for those times and conditions, radical.⁹

Others like Eric Nelson argue misrepresentation plagues the patriots in the historical literature because the patriots held royalist ideology. According to Nelson, the patriots were rebelling against Parliament, who they believed had no control over the British colonies – instead they argued that the King directly controlled the colonies. Nelson claims that the patriots found

⁷ Gordon S. Wood, *The Radicalism of the American Revolution* (New York: A.A. Knopf, 1992) 8.

⁸ Barbara Clark Smith, "The Adequate Revolution," *The William and Mary Quarterly* 51 (1994): 684.

⁹ Gordon S. Wood, *The Radicalism of the American Revolution*, 15-21.

solace in the royalists cause of the seventeenth century, where royalists agreed with the Stuart Kings, Charles I and James I, that the monarchy held sole control of the colonies. The patriots finally broke with the Crown when King George refused to comply with the royalists' cause, choosing to instead rule as a parliamentary king.¹⁰ Nelson does concede that not all patriots were royalist, and some still maintained their Whig philosophy, but the "chief protagonists" of the Revolution held royalist ideology.¹¹ Wood has disagreed strongly arguing that the patriots using royalist tradition reveal a symptom: the need for an explanation to their actions, rather than an ideological alignment.

Previously, colonies had allowed external regulations from Parliament that they felt were necessary to enhance an entire empire. So, when the British and colonial governors argued that two legislatures – Parliament and the colonial legislatures – could not exist with equal power within a state, the colonists believed that this granted their legislatures independence from Parliament. In order to explain why they had allowed Parliament to have control over aspects of the colonies previously, they argued the dominion theory: the King had absolute power over the colonies, and Parliament's power ended at the shores of the United King. The patriots did not use royalist logic because they ideologically agreed with the sentiments; they used it to justify their actions.¹²

Furthermore, before the Revolution equality on that scale did not exist anywhere.¹³ One only has to look at English rights debates in the decade before the outbreak of the Revolution to understand why the issue of expanding the franchise, even only to white landowning men,

¹⁰ Eric Nelson, *The Royalist Revolution: Monarchy and the American Founding* (Cambridge: President and Fellows of Harvard College, 2014) 2-4.

¹¹ Nelson, *The Royalist Revolution*, 8-9.

¹² Gordon S. Wood, "The Problem of Sovereignty," *The William and Mary Quarterly* 68 (2011).

¹³ Gordon S. Wood, "Equality and Social Conflict in the American Revolution," *The William and Mary Quarterly* 51 (1994): 707.

constituted a monumental change. In the mid-eighteenth century, “Wilkes and Liberty” was a common cry heard in England. John Wilkes, a Member of Parliament who wrote pieces criticizing the King’s ministers, and even the King himself, became a symbol of liberty in a time when many Britons concluded that freedom was shrinking. Some have classified Wilkes’ election to the House of Commons, representing the Middlesex borough, as the beginning of the democratic movement.¹⁴ When Wilkes won the Middlesex election, cries of liberty rang throughout the borough and into London. Unlike many other members of Parliament, Wilkes won his seat with the votes of middling class, not through the votes of squires and clergy.¹⁵ Furthermore, the King later called for Wilkes’ arrest for “seditious libel” concerning issue number 45 in Wilkes’ satirical newspaper *The North Briton*. When the Secretary of State issued a warrant for arrest, he issued a general warrant, which did not name anyone specifically, but simply anyone involved with the printing of the newspaper. The broadness of general warrants provoked a great deal of controversy and outrage. Wilkes emerged as a hero of liberty in the eyes of many, including some among the American colonists. The Sons of Liberty, a society within the colonies that was active in many of the events before the Revolution, adopted Wilkes as a rallying symbol, because he fought against suppression of liberty by the Parliament and the King.¹⁶

American colonists were determined to defend this notion of “representation,” at a time when they already enjoyed a much wider franchise than their British counterparts. Colonial representation differed greatly from English representation; colonists expected more direct and equal representation. In England, voting did not follow a “one man one vote” ideology that

¹⁴ Arthur H. Cash, *John Wilkes: The Scandalous Father of Civil Liberty* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2006) 213.

¹⁵ Cash, *John Wilkes*, 211-213.

¹⁶ Jack Lynch, “Wilkes, Liberty, and Number 45,” *Colonial Williamsburg* (2003).

existed in the colonies – with restrictions on what constitute voting eligibility. Pocket boroughs, where a landlord would influence the few of his dependent tenants that could vote to elect his choice, did not cease existence until the mid-nineteenth century. Few men in England held eligibility to vote, resulting in a club-like Parliament. On the other hand, the colonies historically had more direct representation in their assemblies. Their voting ideology caused discontent on the eve of the Revolution, as representation became disproportionate to population size.¹⁷ British ministries seemed to be constricting the franchise at home, and in the colonies as well. The patriots' demand for extending liberty was radical, even for the society they in which they were living.

In his critique of Wood, Michael Zuckerman pointed out that inequality still exists in the United States, and it finds its roots in sexism, racism, and classism. He calls Wood's assertion that Americans in the 19th century felt freer because of the Revolution "Polyanna-ish." Wealth, Zuckerman stated, still conferred more rights to some.¹⁸ But as Wood argues, although oppression still survives, that oppression differs great from what existed during the Revolution.

Wood explains that

There existed in the premodern world another, more general sort of oppression that [he] believe[s] the Revolution eliminated, a comprehensive oppression that subsumed the oppression of both slaves and women and in which all ordinary people had a stake. This oppression involved all common ordinary Americans, including not only blacks and women but white males as well. This oppression was, of course, scarcely comparable to the particular degradation suffered by African-American slaves; nevertheless, its elimination had to precede the elimination of the oppression of blacks and women.¹⁹

Although not all oppressed people gained freedom from the American Revolution, even having liberties expanded to white property owning males was revolutionary.

¹⁷ Wood, *The Radicalism of the American Revolution*, 128-129.

¹⁸ Michael Zuckerman, "Rhetoric, Reality, and the Revolution: The Genteel Radicalism of Gordon Wood," *The William and Mary Quarterly* 51 (1994): 700.

¹⁹ Wood, "Equality and Social Conflict in the American Revolution," 706-707.

This radical social nature of the Revolution influenced many non-English loyalists decisions. Their fears explain why these middling class individuals chose to stay in a hierarchical society, instead of joining a cause that promised all white propertied owners more freedom and rights. The dangers of trying to alter a social structure were dangers of which the Scots had much knowledge. When the Jacobite rebellion ended, and the English captured Jacobite troops, the English executed over one hundred, with another eight hundred sent to the English's colonies as laborers.²⁰ The Scots knew well the consequence of failed rebellion when the American Revolution began.

German-speaking colonists were aware of the destruction that warfare could bring. During the Seven Years War, Hanover in particular suffered losses, due to the French invasion and destruction of the area. When France entered the American Revolution, educated readers in the German states, who had once supported the patriots' cause, withdrew their support. Many of them believed a possibility existed that the Revolutionary War would follow the path of the Seven Year's War, and the warfare across the ocean could eventually spill into their country.²¹ Furthermore, throughout Europe Lutherans opposed revolutions, as they feared revolutions would undermine the reforms already taking place across Europe. In North America, Lutherans refused to endorse other republican revolutions, like the Haitian Revolution, because they believed that only their society expressed civility. Even though they favored liberty and equality, German-speaking Lutherans in Europe, and a considerable number in British North America, preferred reformation to revolution, and if revolution, only a very conservative version of it.²²

²⁰ Plank, *Rebellion and Savagery: The Jacobite Rising of 1745 and the British Empire*, 2-3.

²¹ Dippel, *Germany and the American Revolution*, 114-115.

²² A. Gregg Roeber. "Lutheranism in the Atlantic World in the Age of Revolutions," in Hermann Wellenreuther, Thomas-Müller Bahlke and A.G. Roeber, eds, *The Transatlantic World of*

From this perspective, one can understand why the most recently-arrived middling and marginal immigrants sided with the Crown. Although they did not have titles to lose, the Revolution could lead to the destruction of their way of life, homes, and families, thus making revolution unsupportable.

To contribute to the literature already in existence concerning loyalists, and to bring a perspective not often discussed, that of non-English loyalists, this thesis will examine non-English loyalists in three different regions throughout the colonies. Each region is both geographically and socially distinct from each other. In the initial chapter, the diverse and politically volatile colony of North Carolina offers an initial perspective. Second, the urban setting of New York City demands attention, especially given the large number of loyalists who remained there; the very reason the Crown, in their attempt to suppress the rebellion, decided on New York City as the base of its North American operations. Finally, rural Pennsylvania, where German-speakers were divided as to their alignment, offers insight into neutral populations, many of which eventually were loyalists. All three of these areas held substantial non-English loyalists populations, thereby allowing examination of a great deal of material from these people. Furthermore, by looking at loyalists from diverse regions, it reduces the likelihood that the reasons for loyalty are situations specific to that one area.

Unfortunately, these loyalists themselves rarely left documentation, such as diaries, letterbooks, or even libraries whose content might reveal their political or theological reasons for remaining loyal to the Crown. Unlike many prominent, rich loyalists,²³ these individuals did not

Heinrich Melchior Mühlberg in the Eighteenth Century (Halle: Verlag der Franckeschen Stiftungen-Hassarowitz, 2013) 295, 301, 305.

²³ See Thomas, Hutchinson, *The Diary and Letters of His Excellency Thomas Hutchinson: Captain-General and Governor-in-Chief of Massachusetts Bay in North America* (London: S. Low Marston, Searle, and Rivington, 1883).

plan on publishing their accounts of the war; maintaining such accounts was not typical of individuals of their class. Furthermore, if they kept such records, it is possible that they were lost, as an effort to preserve such accounts following the war would have been unlikely. Therefore, this thesis will use contemporary writings and scholarship on the Revolution to reconstruct the environment that these loyalists were living in. For contemporary works, sources are primarily drawn from the *Early American Imprints, Series I: Evans and Documenting the American South: Colonial and State Records of North Carolina*. These two collections are invaluable as they allow access to a multitude of contemporary writing. But, there are limitations to the helpfulness of such databases. This thesis is looking at individuals who did not leave many records, and were not discussed at great lengths, thus skewing the number sources in favor of the wealthy individuals. Still, such documents are helpful, for their mentions of non-English loyalists help reconstruct the atmosphere within the colonies. It is difficult, but not impossible, to understand the pressure non-English loyalists may have felt, and why they chose to ultimately side with the Crown.

While examining loyalists in these regions, the thesis will highlight common themes and environments found throughout the colonies. Finally, the thesis will conclude with an examination into those common environments, and how they influenced non-English expressions of loyalty – in order to summarize the thesis’ main argument, that non-English loyalists allegiance was a result of their legitimate fear of the effects of failed rebellion on their economic and social standing, loss of trading, and their perception of the Revolution as a truly radical alteration.

Chapter 2

North Carolina: “Highlanders in the Backwoods”

At the eve of the Revolutionary War, tensions were high throughout the colonies as people began to declare their allegiances: loyalist or patriot. Within the colony of North Carolina, there were high levels of conflict, owing to the strong loyalists sentiments in the colony. Some estimate that North Carolina held the highest proportion of loyalists relative to the whole population.²⁴ The loyalists in North Carolina, with the guidance of Royal Governor Josiah Martin, raised battalions and engaged the patriots on multiple occasions, most notably at Moore’s Creek. Energetic, young, and not particularly tactful, Governor Martin planned to cease the rebellion by overtaking the middle of the colony, and begin driving his forces towards the coast, as the British moved inland. Much of those loyalist battalions comprised of middling Highlanders and Regulators from the rural, western region of North Carolina.²⁵ The Regulars were a population of farmers who held an insurrection against the colonial government in 1771. As was the case in all the colonies, there were rich loyalists, most of who lived in the coastal towns of North Carolina. Even some members of the Scottish population in North Carolina fit the image of wealthy loyalists. The wealthy Scottish merchants arrived from the Lowlands of Scotland and settled in the lower coastal region of the colony. These emigrants had technical skills, whereas Highland Scots, who Governor Martin recruited, were the middling class farmers that lived in the rural regions of the colony.

²⁴ Hugh Rankin, “The Moore’s Creek Bridge Campaign, 1776,” *North Carolina Historical Review* 30 (1953): 23.

²⁵ Rankin, “The Moore’s Creek Bridge Campaign,” 33.

In engaging with the patriots, Highland Scots were not defending their great amount of wealth or hoping to greatly improve their social standing. Furthermore, they did not have particular loyalty to the Hanover dynasty, as the Jacobites of 1745 were Highland populations. Yet, this population rallied enough support for the loyalist cause within their community that patriots deemed Highland Scots a problem. The North Carolina loyalists allow for an interesting case study into the motivations for loyalism of middling class individuals.

The Southern Campaign, in which the Scottish loyalist forces participated, ultimately was disastrous for the British. At the beginning of the war, British troops fought primarily in middle colonies, but in 1778, they significantly changed their strategy to focus their attention towards the southern colonies. The Southern Campaign commanded by General Cornwallis ultimately led to the British's defeat and American independence. Cornwallis' adherence to an "Enlightenment" military doctrine contributed to the botched strategy. During the eighteenth century, in order to develop military doctrine officers read prescribed treatise, with the goal to learn strategy and concepts of war. He successfully employed tactics suggested by the doctrine in Europe, but those same maneuvers were ill equipped to combat the patriots. Enlightenment battle plans, which "emphasized offensive action aimed at bringing enemy field armies to decisive battle, and used large networks of field fortifications to pacify territory," were ineffectual in combat against the patriots' Major General Nathanael Green.²⁶ Green refused to fight in the typical manner suggested by the Enlightenment military doctrine for two reasons. First, Green did not believe he was constrained to the European norms of battle. Thus, he used tactics like *petite guerre*, the contemporary term for guerrilla warfare, which Enlightenment writers

²⁶ Charles Heaton, "The Failure of Enlightenment Military Doctrine in Revolutionary America: The Piedmont Campaign and the Fate of the British Army in the Lower South," *North Carolina Historical Review* 87 (2010): 128.

disparaged. Second, the patriots were fighting a defensive war. Green commanded a smaller number of forces; at the beginning of engagement Cornwallis' forces consisted of 2,750 regulars and 400-500 loyalists, whereas Green personal roster listed 2,307 men, and only 1,428 were present for duty.²⁷ Enlightenment writers rarely mentioned defensive maneuvers, so even if Green sought to use Enlightenment maneuvers, he lacked such advice on how to use them in defensive warfare.²⁸ Green's strategy ultimately proved successful because although Cornwallis won many battles, those engagements resulted in large numbers of British casualties, with few casualties for Greens' forces.

The ineffective Southern Campaign initially began because Cornwallis argued for an adjustment to the British battle plans. He believed it was easier to overtake the southern colonies, as opposed to the middle colonies, because of the strong loyalist sentiment and scattered patriot forces in the South.²⁹ After implementing the Southern Campaign, Cornwallis discovered he miscalculated both the strength of loyalist forces and the ability of his enemy. Although there were strong loyalist sentiments in the region, the turnout from loyalist forces was not as great as he originally planned. Of the loyalist forces that did fight, many were Highlanders and the Regulators.

"Regulators" existed in both South Carolina and North Carolina in the mid 1760s, but the North Carolina forces are arguably the more well known. Individuals living in the western, rural regions of North Carolina joined together to address their grievances with the colonial government. The Royal Governor, William Tyron, blocked their measures, and eventually violence broke out. The insurrection continued until 1771, when the Regulators were ultimately

²⁷ Heaton, "The Failure of Enlightenment Military Doctrine in Revolutionary America," 132, 137.

²⁸ Heaton, "The Failure of Enlightenment Military Doctrine in Revolutionary America," 157.

²⁹ Edward G. Lengel, "Southern Showdown," *American History* 50 (2015): 36.

defeated. The Regulators were committed to reformation of the colonial government, which has led to some to comment that it was surprising that all the Regulators did not align with the patriots, especially as the Regulator movement happened so close to the Revolution. The apparent contradiction in their actions are reconcilable, as the Regulators actions during the 1760s were not anti-British *per se*; the insurrection against the colonial government was a reaction to the “corrupt local officials and an unsympathetic governor.”³⁰

One of the most important catalysts and source of corruption for the Regulator movement focused on property rights. Those who settled North Carolina backcountry did not have many means; thus, when they arrived in the colonies they could not purchase any land, and instead squatted on land owned by speculators. These farmers hoped that if they worked on the land, they would be able to garner enough of a profit from the land to buy it. When the farmers amassed the necessary money for the purchase, and approached the owner of the land, they would discover they were now unable to afford the land. When approached with an offer, speculators would survey the land, which the farmers had worked and cultivated, and increase the price, claiming that the improvements to the land – the farmers’ improvements – raised its value. Faced with two impractical and unattractive options, either buy the land at an inflated price or they leave and settle new land, the farmers directed their resentment towards the speculators. The resentment was further fuel because it was often the speculators’ participation in colonial government that afforded them the land. The argument over property rights, along with lack of any representation in the colonial assembly, in addition to excessive fees levied by sheriffs and clerks, ultimately led to the insurrection.³¹ Once one closely examines Revolution

³⁰ Sarah Sadlier, “Prelude to the American Revolution? The War of Regulation: A Revolutionary Reaction for Reform,” *History Teacher* 46 (2012): 98-99, 102.

³¹ Sarah Sadlier, “Prelude to the American Revolution?,” 98-99.

and Regulator movement, the differences between the two are clarified. Although the Regulators fought for more fair representation within the colonial assembly, an important part of their grievances derived from the abuse of their property rights. They were middling class individuals, who were struggling to maintain their property. The Revolution could have freed them from the corrupt Assemblies, but a failed rebellion could result in retribution. Already situated at the economic margin, any actions that could result in land loss or sanctions could send the Regulators into poverty. Although they did not leave explicit documentation of their motivations, many of the Regulators were mindful of the fear of the financial retribution in the case of a lost rebellion. The choice of a portion of the Regulators to side with the government that they rebelled against less than a decade before is reconcilable when the core motivation of the rebellion is examined.

Scottish Highlanders joined former Regulators in their loyalist sympathies. First arriving in the colony in 1739, Highlanders settled in the center of the colony, located near current day Fayetteville. This area, dubbed the “Argyll Colony” derived its name from the southwestern portion Highlands, bearing the same name, that many of the emigrants came from. A second wave of Highlanders arrived in the Argyll Colony around 1767, and upon their arrival received land grants from the Royal Governor William Tyron.³² Forces both pushed and pulled Highlanders towards the colonies, in particular the colony of North Carolina. In the Highland regions of Scotland during the 1760s, landlords substantially increased rents. The tenants, who previously found it difficult to live comfortably, determined it unlikely that they could continue to live on that land after the rent increase. At the same time that they were facing the financial dilemma, these Highlanders began receiving flattering accounts of the colonies from family who

³² Alexander Murdoch, “A Scottish Document Concerning Emigration to North Carolina in 1772,” *North Carolina Historical Review* 67 (1990): 438-442.

previously immigrated to North Carolina.³³ Advertisements and accounts from current inhabitants highlighted the availability and low cost of the land, as well as the high price of labor in North Carolina; some described North Carolina as the “best poor man’s country.”³⁴ As a result of the high price of rent in Scotland and flattering accounts of North Carolina, middling class Highlanders began immigrating to North Carolina, settling the Cape Fear Valley region.³⁵

It is noteworthy to mention that there was a belief during the American Revolution that the Presbyterians greatly influenced the Revolution. Some loyalists at the time, along with King George himself, felt that the Presbyterians were at the heart of the Revolution.³⁶ Hessian Captain Johann Heinrich wrote that “Call this war, dearest friend, by whatsoever name you may, only call it not an American Rebellion, it is nothing more nor less than an Irish-Scotch Presbyterian Rebellion.”³⁷ Many Scots were Presbyterian – the Church of Scotland is Presbyterian – and the Scots’ history, along with the history of Presbyterianism, which split from the Church of England, resulted in an English view of Presbyterians as dissenters. Therefore, it is unsurprising that the English characterized the Revolution as a Presbyterian Rebellion; Presbyterianism was rooted in dissent. When writing a dictionary of “Americanisms,” Johan Russell Bartlett wrote “Presbyterians, under which name all dissenters were often included.”³⁸ The association with Presbyterians and dissenters could explain the Crown’s accusation that the Revolution was a Presbyterians led event. That is not to say that there were not prominent Presbyterians with the

³³ Murdoch, “A Scottish Document,” 442.

³⁴ Murdoch, “A Scottish Document,” 445, 448.

³⁵ Matthew P. Dziennik, “Through an Imperial Prism: Land, Liberty, and Highland Loyalism in the War of American Independence,” *The Journal of British Studies* 50 (2011): 332.

³⁶ Richard Gardiner, “The Presbyterian Rebellion,” *Journal of American Revolution* (2013).

³⁷ Johann Heinrichs, “Extracts from the Letter-book of Captain Johann Heinrichs of the Hessian Jäger Corps, 1778-1780,” *The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 22 (1898): 137.

³⁸ John Russell Bartlett, *Dictionary of Americanisms. A Glossary of words and phrases usually Regarded as Peculiar to the United States*, (New York: Bartlett and Welford, 1848): 38.

Revolution, John Witherspoon, the Scottish reverend is one such example. Furthermore, a substantial number of Presbyterians aligned themselves with the patriot cause.

On the eve of the Revolution, the Presbyterians engaged in a movement for religious toleration. The Presbyterians desired parity with the Church of England; speaking and writing about religious matters and holding estates were a few of their demands. The first bill to address such request arrived in the Virginia Assembly in 1772, but the Bill on Toleration ultimately failed to pass. By 1776, feelings toward religious toleration shifted, as the Declaration of Rights called for religious freedom.³⁹ With the patriots calling for religious toleration and the Crown's dislike of the Presbyterians, Presbyterian's allegiance with the patriot cause is not surprising. The Synod, the Presbyterian's official court, released a document supporting the patriots, and dispersed it throughout the colonial congregations. It is telling of the North Carolina Scots that Reverend Adam Boyd distributed two hundred copies of the document, as the Synod deemed the colony was not "correctly 'informed.'"⁴⁰ Although the Scots in North Carolina were Presbyterian, and likely had similar concerns to other Presbyterians throughout the colonies, their choice of loyalism indicates that there were multifaceted reasons for their loyalty, which is not rooted in their religious affiliations.

Contemporary writings from North Carolina refer to three loyalists populations: Tories (a term that most typically was meant to designate the more wealthy elites), Regulators, and Highlanders. In 1776, two years into open hostilities, a citizen commented that "Parties of Men are dispersed all over the colony, apprehending all suspected persons, and disarming all Highlanders and Regulators that were put to the rout [disorderly retreat] in the late battle [at

³⁹ Leonard J. Kramer, "Presbyterians Approach the American Revolution," *The Journal of Presbyterian Historical Society* 31 (1953): 77-80.

⁴⁰ Leonard J. Kramer, "Presbyterians Approach the American Revolution (Concluded)," *The Journal of Presbyterian Historical Society* 31 (1953): 178.

Moore's Creek Bridge]."⁴¹ The overall proportion of Scottish colonists within the colonies was low, but both British and the patriots were concerned with their allegiances. Reverend John Witherspoon, one of the Founding Fathers and himself a Scot, wrote, "Address to the Natives of Scotland Residing in America," in response to what he felt was a loyalist sentiment widespread among his fellow countrymen. At the time of writing, in 1776, some colonists had yet to cement their loyalty, but there was a trend already developed among the Scottish colonists to take up sides with the King, and within the same year, Highlanders and Regulators fought at Moore's Creek Bridge.⁴² In this environment Witherspoon wrote his "Address to the Natives of Scotland Residing in America," in an attempt to convince the Scottish colonists to align with the patriots.

The "Address" was a response to "Aristides," an essay written by a Scottish loyalist in Maryland.⁴³ L. Gordon Tait argues that an analysis of "Address" gives insight into the Scots' loyalty, or at least the reasons the Reverend Witherspoon believed were responsible.

Witherspoon begins his argument by outlining the reasons why the Scottish should take up arms with the patriots. First, he writes about John Wilkes, the British Parliamentarian and hero to Sons of Liberty. Witherspoon spends a page differentiating Wilkes' and the patriots' cause, stating, "I am far from supposing that this [Wilkes] was a good reason for any man's being cool to the American cause, which is as different from that of Wilk[e]s, as light is from darkness."⁴⁴

⁴¹ "Letter from an inhabitant of North Carolina [Extract]" 10 March 1776. Reprinted from *Jones' Defence of North Carolina*. P. 342. Documenting the American South. University Library, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 2004.

⁴² L. Gordon Tait, "John Witherspoon and the Scottish Loyalists," *Journal of Presbyterian History* 61 (1983): 300.

⁴³ Tait, "John Witherspoon and the Scottish Loyalists," 299.

⁴⁴ John Witherspoon, *The Dominion of Providence over the Passions of Men a Sermon Preached at Princeton, on the 17th of May, 1776. Being the General Fast Appointed by the Congress through the United Colonies: To Which Is Added, an Address to the Natives of Scotland Residing in America* (Philadelphia Printed: Sold by the Booksellers in Town and Country, 1777): 42.

Witherspoon's insistence that Wilkes and the patriots were not similar is not surprising. Many believed Wilkes held strong anti-Scottish sentiments. Wilkes wrote many pieces in his newspaper *The North Briton* about John Stuart, the Scottish Earl of Bute, who had been King George III's tutor, and briefly Prime Minister. Wilkes' work contributed to a hatred of Stuart among the British population, which eventually was strong enough to compel Stuart to resign as Prime Minister.⁴⁵ Witherspoon was aware of Wilkes' anti-Scottish prejudices, even commenting "That gentleman, and his associates, thought proper to found the whole of their opposition to the then ministry, upon a contempt and hatred of the Scots nation."⁴⁶ By commenting on Wilkes, and describing how the current cause was not related to Wilkes, Reverend Witherspoon indicates that Scottish colonists were opposed to the Revolution because the reverence had for Wilkes by patriot associations.

Witherspoon continued his argument, explaining that the colonies thrived because Britain allowed the colonies to govern themselves, with little regulations directly from the Crown. With regard to the current war, he argues three points: "1. That it [the Revolution] was necessary. 2. That it will be honourable and profitable. And, 3. That...it will be no injury, but a real advantage, to the Island of Great Britain."⁴⁷ Witherspoon was not the only person who thought that the Highlanders required an explanation of the Revolution, and once they understood the patriot argument, would join the cause. The Continental Congress recorded a motion on November 28, 1775 to send two Ministers of the Gospel to North Carolina. While in North Carolina, the ministers were "to go immediately amongst the Regulators and Highlanders in the Colony of North Carolina, for the purpose of informing them of the nature of the present dispute

⁴⁵ Jack Lynch, "Wilkes, Liberty, and Number 45." Colonial Williamsburg (2003).

⁴⁶ Witherspoon, "An Address to the Natives of Scotland Residing in America," 41.

⁴⁷ Witherspoon, "An Address to the Natives of Scotland Residing in America," 45.

between Great Britain and the Colonies.”⁴⁸ The effort put forth by both Witherspoon and the Continental Congress, indicate they believed it possible to convince the Highlanders to join their cause, thus the Highlanders’ allegiance was not perceived as fully cemented. The patriots also determined that Scottish allegiance was important enough to pay the two ministers forty dollars per month.⁴⁹

Around the time that the Continental Congress was deciding that they would send two ministers to speak to the Highlanders of North Carolina, Josiah Martin, governor of North Carolina wrote to William Legge, Earl of Dartmouth. In a series of letters, dating from March 23, 1775 to November 12, 1775, Martin explicitly mentioned the Highlanders and their loyalty to the Crown. Early in the letters, Martin hinted that the Highlanders could take up arms alongside the British, writing, “among which is a body of Highlanders whose principles have given me the fullest assurance of their loyalty and attachment to his Majesty and on which I am persuaded I could firmly rely.”⁵⁰ Legge responded by stating, “The King received in the most gracious manner your offer of raising a Battalion of Highlanders under your own Command.”⁵¹ Although Legge did not allow Martin command of the battalion, he was favorable towards the idea of the battalion itself, mentioning that this battalion might keep the King’s government in North Carolina, keeping Martin from “the disgraceful necessity of seeking protection on Board the

⁴⁸ United States Continental Congress, “Minutes of the Continental Congress [Extract],” Reprinted from the American Archives. Vol. 3. P. 1925. Documenting the American South. University Library, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 2004.

⁴⁹ United States Continental Congress, “Minutes of the Continental Congress.”

⁵⁰ Josiah Martin, “Letter from Josiah Martin to William Legge, Earl of Dartmouth [March 23, 1775],” Reprinted from B.P.R.O. Am. & W. Ind.: No. Carolina. Vol. 222. Documenting the American South. University Library, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 2004: 1174.

⁵¹ William Legge, “Letter from William Legge, Earl of Dartmouth to Josiah Martin.,” Reprinted from B.P.R.O. Am. & W. Ind.: No. Carolina. Vol. 222. Documenting the American South. University Library, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 2004: 90.

King's Ships.”⁵² Yet, by October 16, Martin worriedly wrote to Legge, as the patriot sentiments in North Carolina had increased, and the Highlanders declared neutrality. Martin attributed the Highlanders’ shift in allegiance to Mr. Farquhard Campbell, who Martin described as “an old Member of the Assembly and has imbibed all the American popular principles and prejudices.”⁵³ By November, the Highlanders’ allegiance shifted again; Martin wrote of Highlanders raising battalions for the Crown.⁵⁴

The shifting allegiance of the Highlanders during this tumultuous time requires some explanation. The Highlanders of whom Martin spoke did not leave records such as those left by Martin, which were documented and easily available; therefore, the Highlanders’ reasoning is less accessible. Yet, Martin’s letters give an insight into these people. First, Martin’s reference to a “body of Highlanders” alludes to a substantial population – enough to possibly raise a battalion– rather than simply a few individuals.⁵⁵ Although every individual could have their own personal reasons for loyalty, the community aligning with the Crown indicates an overarching reason why North Carolina Scots were loyal. For this community, it appears the intimidation of Committees of Safety and clan loyalty contributed to the community wide loyalty.

Martin indicates that the Highlanders chose neutrality because of a specific person:

⁵² Legge, “Letter from William Legge, Earl of Dartmouth to Josiah Martin,” 90.

⁵³ Josiah Martin, “Letter from Josiah Martin to William Legge, Earl of Dartmouth [October 16, 1775],” Reprinted from B.P.R.O. Am. & W. Ind.: No. Carolina. Vol. 222. Documenting the American South. University Library, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 2004: 266.

⁵⁴ Josiah Martin, “Letter from Josiah Martin to William Legge, Earl of Dartmouth [November 12, 1775],” Reprinted from B.P.R.O. Am. & W. Ind.: No. Carolina. Vol. 222. Documenting the American South. University Library, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 2004: 325.

⁵⁵ Josiah Martin, “Letter from Josiah Martin to William Legge, Earl of Dartmouth [March 23, 1775],” 1174.

Farquard Campbell. The Provincial Congress of North Carolina recorded Campbell as a delegate from Cumberland County.⁵⁶ Although the spelling of Campbell's name in the minutes differs slightly from Martin's, this is undoubtedly the same individual. On August 23, 1775 the Provincial Congress of North Carolina resolved that Mr. Farquard Campbell and ten other delegates would "be a Committee to confer with the Gentlemen who have lately arrived from the *highlands in Scotland* to settle in this Province, and to explain to them the Nature of our Unhappy Controversy with Great Britain, and to *advise and urge them to unite with the other Inhabitants of America* in defence of those rights which they derive from God and the Constitution."⁵⁷ The minutes do not detail why those specific individuals were selected for the task of informing Highlanders about the patriots' cause, but it is likely the Farquard Campbell sent by the Provincial Congress is the same as the one Governor Martin wrote about.

Sending Campbell was an interesting choice by the Provincial Congress, as the Campbell clan was a Highland clan. Campbell may have played a role similar to Witherspoon: a Scot sent to appeal to other Scots. The Campbell clan was powerful clan in the Highland region, who allied with the British during both Jacobite Rebellions.⁵⁸ Yet, it appears they were not particularly favorable towards King George III. In 1739, the Black Watch was created, a battalion of Highland Scots, a large amount of the forces were members of the clan Campbell. The Black Watch aroused excitement throughout the Highland, and eventually the King

⁵⁶ North Carolina Provincial Congress, "Minutes of the Provincial Congress of North Carolina [April 03, 1775 - April 07, 1775]," Reprinted from MS. Records in Office of Secretary of State. Documenting the American South. University Library, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 2004: 1178.

⁵⁷ North Carolina Provincial Congress, "Minutes of the Provincial Congress of North Carolina [August 20, 1775 - September 10, 1775]," Documenting the American South. University Library, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 2004: 173-174.

⁵⁸ Alastair Campbell of Airds, *A History of the Clan Campbell: From the Restoration to the Present Day* (Edinburg: Edinburgh University Press, 2004): 187-188.

requested to see members from the Black Watch. When the selected members arrived in England, they performed exercises for the King; the King was so impressed that he awarded a golden guinea, a golden coin, to each member. Immediately after leaving, the Black Watch members threw away the guinea, “saying that the King was clearly unaware of their standing in their own county.”⁵⁹ The Provincial Congress was aware of Campbell’s understanding of the Scots’ fears, as he came from the same region, which would have made Campbell a good envoy. The Campbell clan’s history was an illustrative case that siding with the Crown was more advantageous, yet Campbell was a patriot. It is probable that he could have gathered support from the Scots by explaining his own reasons for aligning with the patriots. Further, he could have argued that it was in the Highlanders’ own interest to not identify with the Crown. By declaring neutrality, the Scottish could stave off most retaliatory action from the British, citing inaction, while preventing hatred from the colonists, which could directly affect their livelihood. The Scots had no love for England, compelling them towards loyalty, so neutrality would seem a safe option for the Highlanders’ livelihood. Campbell eventually followed in the footsteps of his ancestors, ultimately becoming loyalist.⁶⁰ The Highlanders’ switch from neutrality to loyalism, on the other hand, was more likely a result of pressures from the Committee of Safety. To some more fervent patriots, neutrality and loyalty were similar, thus they harassed neutral individuals as well. Harassment from the committee could have led to the Scottish ultimately choosing a side, which they thought was the more stable choice.

The Committee of Safety that sent Campbell was one of the many Committees of Safety that existed at the time. After the Continental Congress met in 1774, Committees of Safety, also

⁵⁹ Campbell, *A History of the Clan Campbell*, 187.

⁶⁰ Campbell, who worked at a spy for Governor Martin shifted his allegiance on multiple occasions. The few letters he wrote do not explain his actions or loyalty, so his personal reasons for his actions cannot be determined.

known as Committees of Inspection and Observation, began to appear throughout the colonies; they emerged in many counties and townships. Hermann Wellenreuther has shown through a collection of documents from these committees, that their purpose was to ensure that colonists complied with the Continental Association.⁶¹ The Continental Association agreed upon by the Continental Congress in 1774, boycotted trade with England, with the goal to repeal the Intolerable Acts. After the creation of the Continental Association, separate Associations began to develop within the colonies, one of which was the North Carolina Provincial Congress. These Associations stated their members would uphold and defend the liberties of the Americas and the principles of the British Constitutions, as well as other constitutions.⁶² The Continental Congress suggested the creation of the Committees of Safety. The Continental Congress envisioned the Committees to function as regional enforcers of the Continental Association. The patriots favored the Committees, as evidence by their prevalence across the colonies; the only places lacking a strong number of Committees were in the loyalist-heavy backcountry areas of North and South Carolina, and New York.⁶³ Significantly, the Wilmington Committee of Safety recorded visiting members from other Committees; from Cumberland County the delegate listed is Farquier Campbell.⁶⁴ The person sent to persuade the Highlander of the error of their loyalist sympathies was an active member of the Cumberland County Committee of Safety.

In order to ensure the compliance of Association members, as well as to decrease the

⁶¹ Hermann Wellenreuther, ed. *The Revolution of The People: Thoughts and Documents on the Revolutionary Process in North America 1774-1776* (Göttingen: University of Göttingen, 2006): 8.

⁶² Hermann Wellenreuther, ed. *The Revolution of The People*, 12, 19.

⁶³ Hermann Wellenreuther, ed. *The Revolution of The People*, 26.

⁶⁴ Wilmington Committee of Safety, "Minutes of the Wilmington Committee of Safety [July 20, 1775 - July 21, 1775]," Reprinted from MS. Records in Office of Secretary of State. Documenting the American South. University Library, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 2004: 112.

number of loyalists in the areas, Committees of Safety employed various methods. When individuals refused to sign the Continental Association, the Committees and colonial associations would resolve to brand the individual an enemy. After the Committee passed the resolutions, the resolutions were printed in local newspapers or in broadsides ensuring the information were distributed to the surrounding area. Wellenreuther noted that the North Carolina Committees “pursued a much harsher and energetic course against those whom they suspected of Tory principles,” relative to other colonies’ committees.⁶⁵ The mass distribution of the names of suspected loyalists was an important intimidation method. If an individual’s name was in the paper as a loyalist, they could face retribution from neighbors, or suffer from the economic effect of a boycott. In Virginia, from October 1774 to July 1775, a significant number of merchants recanted their loyalist sympathies.⁶⁶ The high incidence of merchant recants was likely a result of the negative economic effects for merchants branded a loyalist, because people stopped trading with them. The Rowan County Committee of Safety in North Carolina urged its own members and members of surrounding counties to boycott goods sold by Rowan residents who lacked a signed certificate from the Committee.⁶⁷ Rowan County was located in the most western portion of the colony, and also near Cumberland County where the Scots lived. The Highlanders likely would have heard about the economic sanctions imposed by the Rowan Committee of Safety, and further, similar measures were employed in the Cape Fear Valley restricting salt selling, albeit very temporarily. Some even suggest this ban of commerce explains the Scots’ brief neutrality.⁶⁸

⁶⁵ Hermann Wellenreuther, ed. *The Revolution of The People*, 30.

⁶⁶ Hermann Wellenreuther, ed. *The Revolution of The People*, 30.

⁶⁷ Alan D. Watson, “The Committees of Safety and the Coming of the American Revolution in North Carolina, 1774-1776,” *The North Carolina Historical Review* 73 (1996): 138-139.

⁶⁸ Rank, “The Moore’s Creek Bridge Campaign,” 31.

The printing of non-signers and loyalists' names was not the only tactic used by the Committees. At times, groups resorted to physical violence to coerce members into signing associations. Once such incidence occurred in Georgia to Thomas Brown. Brown's situation differed from the North Carolina Highlanders, as he emigrated from England shortly before the war with 74 indentured servants. Although Brown differs economically from the Highlanders, his case is nonetheless illustrative, and furthermore, insightful as Mr. Brown recorded the incident in his diary. Brown refused to sign an association, instead signing a loyalist's counterassociation. The Association no longer invited him to join, but instead employed harassment. Eventually, Brown was beaten, scalped, and tarred and feathered. This incident eventually caused him to sign the association, an act that he recanted once he fled to South Carolina. Brown, who was at first fairly neutral to the Revolution, eventually become an active combatant against the Revolution, starting his own loyalists' militia, the King's Rangers.⁶⁹ Brown was not the only loyalist to receive such treatment. Cullon Pollock the grandson of the colony's former governor faced a similar situation. After making a remark about the patriots, Pollock was brought before the Edenton District Committee of Safety. He eventually promised to uphold liberty, but that did not stop a group of patriots from breaking into his house and attacking him.⁷⁰ They threatened to tar and feather him, and brought him to the courthouse. Pollock was eventually able to stop the mob, by allowing the patriots to burn his coach, raid his cellars, and paid a sum of money.⁷¹ Alan Watson suggests that the attack on Pollock was a mixture of anti-loyalist sentiments, redressing of personal grievances, and prejudice towards the

⁶⁹ Maya Jasanoff, *Liberty's Exiles: American Loyalists in the Revolutionary World* (New York, New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2011. PDF e-book): 69-73.

⁷⁰ Watson, "The Committees of Safety," 146-147.

⁷¹ Anne Pollock, "Letter from Ann Pollock to Joseph Hewes," *Documenting the American South*. University Library, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 2004: 1030-1031.

Scots, as Pollock was Scottish. Physical intimidation was a persuasive tactic that some loyalist faced.⁷²

Some, like Mary Beth Norton, in her assessment of harassment incidents asserts, “their use of tarring and feathering...has been greatly exaggerated. A few men were tarred and feathered.”⁷³ Norton believed that rather than actual violence, the committees used the fear of violence to get more signers of associations.⁷⁴ If the violence actually occurred, or if it was exaggerated, as Norton believes, threat of violence was a persuasive tactic. Potentially the Committees of Safety employed such tactics on the Scottish in order to change their stance neutrality to endorsement of the patriots.

The fear of patriot retribution may explain a letter Colonel William Purviance wrote to the North Carolina Provincial Council, which detailed the aftermath of a battle between the patriots and Highlanders. Colonel Purviance recounts Colonel Moore’s description of a recent battle; the patriots succeeded, and the loyalists company, consisted of Highlanders and Regulators, disbanded. Colonel Moore was confident that the Highlanders would not raise arms against the patriots again, commenting, “I have no doubt but many of the poor [H]ighlanders will be pleased to get home, being, as they confessed forced and persuaded, contrary to their inclinations into the Service.”⁷⁵ In Governor Martin’s account, the Highlanders were willing and proactive to create their own battalion; Martin’s letters indicated the Highlanders were loyalists, and loyalists by choice. Although there is possibility that Martin’s letters were misleading, more

⁷² Watson, “The Committees of Safety,” 147.

⁷³ Mary Beth Norton, *The British-Americans: The Loyalist Exiles in England, 1774-1789* (Boston, Massachusetts: Little, Brown, 1972): 28.

⁷⁴ Norton, *The British-Americans*, 28.

⁷⁵ William Purviance, “Letter from William Purviance to the North Carolina Provincial Council [February 29, 1776],” *Documenting the American South*. University Library, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 2004: 280.

likely that when captured by the patriots, Highlanders feared punishment from the patriots, so they stated they were forced into their current position. Colonel Purviance's account also suggests that he viewed the Regulators as the leaders of the loyalists uprising. In commenting that it is unlikely another uprising will occur he states: "Indeed we are assured that the few Regulars they had among them have left them..."⁷⁶ Furthermore, Colonel Purviance was incorrect in his assertion that it was unlikely the Highlanders would fight more, as the Highlanders maintained a battalion throughout the war.

Fighting for the British Empire was not a novelty in Scottish history, recruitment officers did not struggle to meet requirements in the Scottish Highlands.⁷⁷ During the Seven Years' War, King George, under the King's Proclamation of October 7, 1763, granted soldiers land for their service.⁷⁸ In Scotland, land was of great importance, as owning such property strengthen an individual's economic stability. With the King's Proclamation of October 7, 1763, Matthew Dziennick argues that "By 1775, a link had been forged between imperial political ends and preestablished ideas among Highland males of how to achieve economic security through military service in the army."⁷⁹ Early in the start of the war, some of England's recruiting officers implied that the war would not consist of a long engagement, and further they place a restriction on the length of time individuals would have to serve for land entitlements.⁸⁰ Loyalists, especially those whose economic security was not guaranteed, may have seen military service as an opportunity for economic security. Although such land grants were not promised, there was a precedent set by the Seven Years' War.

⁷⁶ Purviance, "Letter from William Purviance to the North Carolina Provincial Council," 280.

⁷⁷ Dziennick, "Through an Imperial Prism," 346.

⁷⁸ George the Third of the United Kingdom, "The Royal Proclamation - October 7, 1763." The Avalon Project, Yale Law School.

⁷⁹ Dziennick, "Through an Imperial Prism," 346.

⁸⁰ Dziennick, "Through an Imperial Prism," 349.

Josiah Martin, the Royal Governor of North Carolina, also spoke of property as a technique to increase Highlanders' loyalty. In October 1775, a boat arrived from Scotland, bringing 172 Highlanders. They asked Governor Martin for the ability to settle vacant land owned by the government, located near their relatives. Martin conceded to their request, reasoning that

the Highlanders would settle on the land, regardless of his verdict, thus it was more advisable to attach these people to Government by granting as matter of favor and courtesy to them...without owing or acknowledging any obligation for them, as it was not only the means of securing these People against the seditions of the Rebels, but gaining so much strength to Government that is equally important at this time, without making any concessions injurious to the rights and interests of the Crown...⁸¹

Although Martin notes he is giving this land without any obligation attached, he also mentions that when asking for the right to settle on the land, the emigrant gave the "most solemn assurances of their firm and unalterable loyalty and attachment to the King, and of their readiness to lay down their lives in the support and defence of his Majesty's Government..."⁸² Martin does not require a formal contract, honoring the Highlanders' assertion that they will lay their lives for the cause, but an informal obligation still remains. This exchange also gives insight to the incoming Highlanders' mindset; in order to gain land, they offer military service. They do not merely pledge loyalty to the Crown, but also express a willingness to fight in the Revolution, an offer that they believe is one of value. The lack of formal signing for military service makes it difficult to determine if they were simply making such offers without the intent to follow through or if they truly meant to fight for the Crown. Regardless of the Highlanders' true intent, their offering shows a link in their mind between military service and land grants, likely a result from

⁸¹ Martin, "Letter from Josiah Martin to William Legge, Earl of Dartmouth [November 12, 1775], " 324.

⁸² Martin, "Letter from Josiah Martin to William Legge, Earl of Dartmouth [November 12, 1775], " 324.

the Royal Proclamation. Governor Martin concludes this paragraph by suggesting that "...that the expediency of making some rule of favour and indulgence in granting lands to these emigrants not extending to the encouragement of future emigrations may be worthy his Majesty's Royal consideration."⁸³ Martin suggests that the King should offer land to those already emigrated to the colonies, as a method of increasing loyalty in these populations. He does not intend to extend this offer to new emigrants, but sees offering land to those already in the colony as a potential solution. Although the Highlanders never received land in North Carolina for fighting for the Crown, during the war such an outcome would seem likely. If the Highlanders thought the England would eventually succeed, as many of the times though probable, with the precedent of land distribution for service, then alignment with the Crown seemed an opportunity for gaining land, and thus economic stability.

After the Revolutionary War, some Highlanders began to migrate out of North Carolina. Individuals began migrating north, to remain in the provinces of British North America, and settled in Canada. Other moved westward to the frontier lands, inhabiting present-day Kentucky, while some stayed within the state of North Carolina.⁸⁴ The Highlanders' fear of financial ruin as a result of a failed rebellion was never realized, but it is important to note that at the time of the Revolution, that was a likely outcome. This fear, alongside intimidation tactics, and the Highlanders' belief that military service could result in land grants were all reasons the Highlanders sided with the Crown. But, the Highlanders' loyalty did not happen within bubble, middling class individuals throughout the colonies were faced similar circumstances, fears, and motivations. Committees of Safety existed throughout the colonies, and used similar intimidation

⁸³ Martin, "Letter from Josiah Martin to William Legge, Earl of Dartmouth [November 12, 1775], " 324.

⁸⁴ Ned C. Landsman, "Nations, Migration, and the Province of the First British Empire: Scotland and the Americas, 1600-1800," *The American Historical Review* 104 (1999): 475.

tactics to encourage loyalty to the patriot cause. Living on the edge of poverty, and knowledge that such disaster could quickly occur after a failed rebellion was an issue facing many middling class populations. The Highlanders of North Carolina were certainly not the only population to align with the Crown, but their actions in actively raising a battalion and fighting the patriots certainly allows for an interesting case study in non-English loyalism.

Chapter 3

New York: “Merchants in a Port City”

During the war, New York City became a loyalist haven, and the base from which the British ran their military operations. Loyalists naturally flocked to the city, where they could escape prosecution from the Assemblies and other patriot groups. But, the post-occupation migration into the city does not illustrate the complete experience of loyalism in New York City, a city that held a sizable loyalist population before the British occupied it militarily. The answer to why so many supported the Crown in the city, when as support for the British was more variable throughout the rest of the colony, is not a straightforward one. It cannot be reduced to the issue of economic advantage. As a port city, New York City inevitably had an economic impact on loyalist sentiments, especially considering the large number of merchants who ultimately declared loyalty. Yet, loyalists did not arrive at their decision by only considering the economic impact. Just as the loyalists of North Carolina had done, they made other considerations when ultimately making their political decisions. Those in New York considered what type of government would emerge if the patriots succeeded; many New Yorkers feared this outcome. The colony's history was riddled with strife, unlawful actions, and disorder. The events that occurred in the years preceding the war indicated that if the system of government would change, the colony would face mob rule. This was not a fear held exclusively by those who already held power; many middling individuals were uneasy with this prospect, as well. This apprehension about the Revolution helps explain why non-English loyalists like Scots, Dutch,

and German-speakers, who history suggest they would have had reason to support a movement to oust the British from power, instead ultimately supported the Crown.

Despite the first confrontation between the British army and armed rebels at Lexington and Concord, British officials' tasked with suppressing the rebellion quickly concluded on the basis of their assessment of New York City's population, that the royal governor's seat of power recommended itself as the strategic stronghold from which to prosecute the crushing of the American rebellion. They assumed that the city boasted solid loyalist sympathy. It was not in General William Howe's initial strategy, however, to occupy New York City alone. Howe envisioned quelling the rebellion by occupying "New York, the Hudson River Valley, and Rhode Island in order to divide the colonies and destroy the rebellion piecemeal."⁸⁵ This remained his plan until August of 1776, when he altered his strategy, choosing to base his operation in New York City. Howe's change is certainly striking, as there was no indication his initial strategy would fail. It appears most likely that this change in strategy came about as a result of his desire to reunite the colonies and Britain. He reasoned that employing steady military pressure from New York and Canada would achieve that desire.⁸⁶ Moreover, by putting all his forces in New York, Howe's actions indicate he was confident in the loyalist majorities in that area. At the time of his invasion, General George Washington shared his opponents' opinion about the importance of New York. In order to attain success in New York, so that it could become England's base of operations, Howe had to have confidence that his forces could push the remaining patriots out of the city, and that the royal forces would have enough support within the city to maintain his hold there. Howe was correct in assuming that he would find a strong loyalist force in New York City.

⁸⁵ Ira D. Gruber, *The Howe Brothers and the American Revolution* (New York: Institute of Early American History and Culture, 1972): 104.

⁸⁶ Ira D. Gruber, *The Howe Brothers*, 106.

He was met with many supporters within the city limits, and as the war progressed, deserters from the Continental Army arrived in New York, and many other loyalists fled from their colonies to the safety of a loyalist bastion.⁸⁷

When British troops docked at New York City, a skyline of churches and other meeting places of worship greeted them, with the spire of the Anglican Trinity Church as one of the largest buildings in the skyline.⁸⁸ Certainly, Howe and other British officials counted on for the religious loyalty of the city. In most of the middle and northern colonies, Anglicanism – the Church of England – was not the majority version of Protestant Christianity. In certain colonies, Anglicanism held the same amount of influence and members as another denomination, and in others it was the minority faith.⁸⁹ Even in the royal colony of New York the Anglican Church's numerical strength and influence varied by county and region. In some counties, like Queens and Richmond, the Anglican Church enjoyed support and power, but it derived that strength from the simple fact that there were more English settlers who counted themselves as Anglicans in that region. In the lower four counties in New York, Anglicanism did find a genuine power base, as a result of the efforts of some Royal Governors. Garnering the support of the residents of New York City for the Church, however, had not been an easy task. The government deployed missionaries to areas throughout the colony to increase support for the Anglican Church. The missionaries were not successful in creating a constant source of power, as they were still employed sixty years after the creation of the initial post.⁹⁰

⁸⁷ Ruma Chopra, *Unnatural Rebellion: Loyalists in New York City during the Revolution* (Virginia: University of Virginia, 2013).

⁸⁸ Patricia Bonomi, *Under the Cope of Heaven: Religion, Society, and Politics in Colonial America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003): 2-3.

⁸⁹ Bonomi, *Under the Cope of Heaven*, 54.

⁹⁰ Bonomi, *Under the Cope of Heaven*, 53-54.

At the time that the Howe brothers were creating their plan, it is likely they would have considered the religious makeup of New York as well as the surrounding areas. The perceived strong Anglican support would have indicated that the British would find support in that area; especially considering some thought this rebellion was the work of Presbyterians.⁹¹ Yet, such a view failed to take into account the ethnic and religious diversity of the colony; it was far from the homogenous population the British believed it to be.

Howe was correct in his assessment that New York's lower counties held many loyalists. In areas such as Staten Island, loyalty to the Crown was strong – according to some estimates ninety-nine percent of the inhabitants of Staten Island were loyalists; in other parts of the colony, loyalty was not a clear.⁹² The reason that some had for remaining loyal varied, and no evidence survives to suggest that wealth and power accounted for a choice in favor of the Crown. Colonists' allegiance does not seem to appear to follow economic lines. The Livingston and the De Lancey families, two prominent New York clans, were famous for their rivalry both before the war,⁹³ and during the war, the families differed on their allegiance.⁹⁴ Yet it was not just the wealthy that ended up choosing rebellion or loyalty as these examples attest. A surviving published oath of loyalty reveals that only two percent of the signers held government office. Many of the signers came from the middling class – “farmers, shopkeepers, artisans.”⁹⁵

British officials may have relied on the loyalty of an Anglican population in New York, yet they were quite aware that New York – both the city and the entire colony – had boasted a heterogeneous population since the seventeenth century. There were individuals from many

⁹¹ Richard Gardiner, “Presbyterian Rebellion,” *Journal of the American Revolution* (2013).

⁹² Phillip Papas, *That Ever Loyal Island: Staten Island and the American Revolution* (New York: New York University Press, 2009): 1.

⁹³ Chopra, *Unnatural Rebellion*, 16.

⁹⁴ Gordon L. Wood, *The American Revolution: A History* (New York: Modern Library, 2003).

⁹⁵ Ruma Chopra, *Unnatural Rebellion*, 67.

European, African, and American areas, both recent immigrants and those with established lineages. Many did not belong to the Anglican Church; they were Presbyterians, Dutch Reformed, and Long Island Congregationalists. New York held significant populations of Scots, Scots-Irish, French Huguenots, and some German-speaking Palatines. Within the colony, the Scottish population comprised of a substantial amount of the immigrant population; the Scottish had stronger ties to this colony partly due to the actions of the first Royal Governor, Richard Nicolls, who descended from a Scottish lineage. Nicolls attempted to bring Scots into the colony, but it was not until the eighteenth century that this population began immigrating in large numbers. Their immigration was discontinuous, with many coming after the failed Jacobite Rebellions of 1715 and 1745 and on the eve of the Revolution.⁹⁶

Even though the non-English middling class was not the population the British officials expected would support the Crown, many did. I argue it was the fear of mob rule that could result from patriot success, along with the acknowledgement that war would bring economic prosperity to who were involved with trade occupation that caused these groups' loyalty.

To understand why there was a fear of a government under the patriots – or, as many believed, no government – it is important to know the seventeenth and eighteenth century history of New York. English authorities had always regarded the colony as rambunctious, and one that could not be ruled. Throughout the colony's history, factions emerged consistently, resulting in rebellion and political discourse. As Patricia Bonomi concluded: “And if one were to select the single most persistent theme running through the commentary of colonial politicians themselves, it would be the emphasis they put on the factiousness and volatility of their politics. Nothing

⁹⁶ Michael Kammen, *Colonial New York* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1975): 178-179

about it was ever ‘controlled’ for very long, by an aristocracy or anyone else.”⁹⁷ The assignment to any British official to the position of Royal Governor of New York included not just a title, but a very impressive salary as well, but both advantages came with a set of challenges. Reflecting on his own time as Royal Governor of New York, George Clinton wrote, “The public affairs of this Province committed to my care are not reduced to such a State, the violent opposition of an insolent faction, that his Majesty’s Authority is openly despised...” and that “It is well known that for some years before my arrival in this Government the public affairs had been distracted by parties and oppositions.”⁹⁸

The opposition to the government, in combination with the heterogeneous population of New York, contributed to an anxiety within the population.⁹⁹ The anxiety arose, in part, from the high level of crime. In the city, Michael Kammen notes, from “1731-1737 and 1756-1771, crime rates rose even faster than population growth.”¹⁰⁰ This high level of crime, combined with the lackadaisical and ill-equipped law enforcement resulted in increased numbers of unsolved case, longer times before restitution, and heightened uneasiness.¹⁰¹ Fear of slave revolts was a continual worry within the colony, especially in New York City. In 1712, recently arrived slaves allegedly set fire to houses in the city, killing nine white citizens. New Yorkers were aware that arson could cause great damage and loss of life, the city comprised of wooden houses stacked closely together. The harsh punishment of five of the slaves who started the 1712 fires indicates

⁹⁷ Patricia Bonomi, *A Factious People: Politics and Society in Colonial New York* (New York: Cornell University Press, 1971): 11.

⁹⁸ John Romeyn Brodhead, *Documents Relative to the Colonial History of the State of New-York*, “Governor Clinton to the Lords of Trade, 22 June 1747” (Albany: Weeds, Parson, 1853): 352.

⁹⁹ Douglas Greenberg, *Crime and Law Enforcement in the Colony of New York: 1691-1776* (New York: Cornell University Press): 32.

¹⁰⁰ Kammen, *Colonial New York*, 283.

¹⁰¹ Kammen, *Colonial New York*, 283.

that the citizens feared a repeat event, and attempted to make clear that they would not tolerate future revolts.¹⁰² Further, many believed that the perceived lewd and promiscuous behavior of slaves resulted in laborers acting in a similar manner.¹⁰³

The punishments of 1712 were not successful enough to ward off another similar incidence in 1741. Known as the “Negro Conspiracy,” a series of theft and fires resulted in widespread hysteria. Officials offered a one hundred pound reward for information on the arsonist, and an indentured servant, Mary Burton came forward claiming knowledge on a “Negro Plot.” Burton’s testimony conflicted with the accounts of the slaves’ masters, who said the slaves were at their homes during the fire. Still, her testimony resulted in a yearlong trial, and the accompanying fear and hysteria. Eventually, “18 slaves, and 4 whites were eventually hanged, 13 slaves were burned at the stake, over 150 slaves and 25 whites were imprisoned.”¹⁰⁴ The only way the accused escaped punishment was by admitting guilt; those who did were exiled to the West Indies.¹⁰⁵ With a considerable slave population within the city limits – approximately one-sixth of the population – the possibility of slave revolts posed a continuous source of fear for property-holders, and not merely the well to do.¹⁰⁶

To add more anxieties in the colony, on top of the fear of slaves, New Yorkers worried that convicts were flooding their colony. In 1717, an act regularized convict transportation, and many of who first landed in the New York port, and then was shuttled to other colonies. The inhabitants of the colony overestimated the number of convicts who actually stayed in the colony, and believed these people were going to influence the behavior of the residents. New

¹⁰² Serena R. Zabin, *The New York Conspiracy Trials of 1741* (Boston: Bedford/St. Martin, 2004): 19.

¹⁰³ Greenberg, *Crime and Law Enforcement*, 30.

¹⁰⁴ Kammen, *Colonial New York*, 285.

¹⁰⁵ Kammen, *Colonial New York*, 285.

¹⁰⁶ Kammen, *Colonial New York*, 284.

York Englishmen considered these individuals, along with other non-English and non-Protestant who contributed to the heterogeneous population of New York threats to the moral character. Pluralism, where diversity is recognized and accepted, within the colony was not accepted or well liked. There was a real fear of diverse population, and the perceived havoc or turmoil that a pluralistic society could experience. For that reason, royal officials struggled to maintain patterns of British social hierarchy, to prevent the distress and criminal behavior they believed would accompany a heterogenic society.¹⁰⁷

The reputation that New York had acquired for being hard to govern was not without foundation. Officials found it difficult to put down riots or disorderly conduct of any sort because there simply were not enough constables. Individuals who worked in law enforcement could receive fines if they failed to arrest criminals, but the arresting of criminals came with many risks, and the officials found themselves lacking the necessary resources to employ a successful arrest. Because of the difficulty associated with the position, many people in the colony chose to pay requisite fines rather than serve in law enforcement. Individuals who did serve often were those who could not pay the fines, and thus were either questionable in character, negligent at their duties, or a combination of the two. Surviving evidence even suggests that the office of constable was a form of punishment to those in the community who were disliked.¹⁰⁸

In the decade preceding the Revolution, New York City experienced another riot, this one in response to the Stamp Act. The British Parliament passed the Stamp Act in 1765, so any paper item that was bought or sold or used in the colonies had to be printed on stamped paper. The stamped paper was made in England, and was more costly, as the act was a tax to raise revenue, to offset the cost of the recently concluded Seven Years' War. As a result, the colonists

¹⁰⁷ Greenberg, *Crime and Law Enforcement*, 30-32.

¹⁰⁸ Greenberg, *Crime and Law Enforcement*, 162-165.

experienced an increase in cost of many items. The Act was met with vocal hatred from the colonists of every social rank and in every colony. A Stamp Act Congress was called, with delegates sent from throughout colonies. After convening in New York City, the Congress created a “Declaration of Rights and Grievances,” which put forth – the now famous principle – no taxation without representation.¹⁰⁹ The Act was also passed in a time of economic crisis for New York City. Farmers faced a poor harvest that increased the price of grain, causing merchants to suffer as well; many feared they could not pay their debts.¹¹⁰ New York’s Lieutenant Governor Cadwalladar Colden declared he would enforce the act. Colden dismissed threats from the Liberty Boys, New York’s branch of the Sons of Liberty. As tensions increased, a leaflet was distributed to public offices within New York.¹¹¹ Signed by *Vox Populi* – the voice of the people – it threatened, “The First man that either distributes, or makes use of stamped paper, let him take care of his house and effects.”¹¹²

Colden did not give credence to the threat, and resolved to enforce the Stamp Act on October 31, 1765 the same day that merchants were pledging to boycott British goods. The merchants met at Burns Tavern, and slowly a group began to form, making reference to newspaper articles written a month prior about public demonstrations and liberty. The crowd was disappointed when evening fell and nothing happened, but soon a group of wandering men began marking houses for devastation. The next night, November 1, 1765 rioting began throughout the city. British officials, who could not control the violence, did not stop the destruction nor did they later prosecute the ringleaders of the riot. The lack of response by the government troubled

¹⁰⁹ Joseph S. Tiedmann, *Reluctant Revolutionaries: New York City and the Road to Independence, 1763-1776* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1997): 70.

¹¹⁰ Tiedmann, *Reluctant Revolutionaries*, 67.

¹¹¹ Tiedmann, *Reluctant Revolutionaries*, 73.

¹¹² Charles Lloyd, *The Conduct Of The Late Administration Examined, With An Appendix, Containing Original And Authentic Documents* (Boston: Edes and Gill, 1767): 44.

the propertied residents of the city, but the mob's actions also created fear. The mob began destruction that was not sanctioned by their elite leaders; although many of the elites were critical of the Stamp Act, they did not approve of the violence exhibited by the mob. This chain of events, including the uncontrollable nature of the mob, remained in the popular consciousness of New Yorkers on the eve of the Revolution.¹¹³

The old tensions and resulting anxiety did not dissipate during the Revolution; instead, they were amplified. This was in part due to the actions of the Liberty Boys, who used mobs and uprisings to show their displeasure with the policies of the British government. On April 23, 1775, the Liberty Boys broke into City Hall, took substantial numbers of muskets and gunpowder, and for almost a week disrupted the city's routine. Paul A. Gilje has argued that the Liberty Boys used mobs as a method to further their goals, but eventually the mob got out of hand, resulting in more destruction and fear than its leaders intended. Gilje uses the cases of two merchants who used stamped paper as a case of the mob "tak[ing] action that exceeded the bounds set by the Sons of Liberty."¹¹⁴ Some leaders of the Liberty Boys punished the merchants by burning the stamp paper in front of thousands onlookers. The mob, using the rhetoric of the Liberty Boys, argued that the merchants were corrupted, and the burning of the stamped paper was not enough of a punishment for their crimes. They proceeded to break into the house of one of the merchants, destroying furniture, which was viewed as symbols of the wealth the merchant gained from his corruption. The leaders of the Liberty Boys, fearing what more the mob might do, attempted to calm the situation by promising that the merchants would appear in the Fields to confess for their sins. Even after the merchants performed in this act of public humiliation, the

¹¹³ Tiedmann, *Reluctant Revolutionaries*, 75.

¹¹⁴ Paul A. Gilje, *The Road to Mobocracy: Popular Disorder in New York City* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1987): 50.

mob was not satisfied; they followed the merchants home and demanded they confess in front of their homes.¹¹⁵

The mobs and their actions had many worried, including Gouverneur Morris. Morris would later become known as one of the revolutionary “Founding Fathers,” but at the time of the Revolution, he had only recently been admitted to the bar and served as a member of New York Assembly. He expressed his fear of the mob in a letter to John Penn when he stated “The mob begin to think and to reason...I see, and I see it with fear and trembling, that if the disputes with Great Britain continue, we shall be under the worst of all possible dominions; *we shall be under the domination of a riotous mob.*”¹¹⁶

Ruma Chopra has argued that it was fear of mob rule that caused many New Yorkers, especially of the middling class to declare themselves loyalists. Chopra points out that like the patriots, loyalists believed the colonies were entitled to an “enhanced status within the empire.”¹¹⁷ Both sides felt that the colonies’ contributions to the Seven Years War and their overall maturity as a colony merited the enhanced status, which would allow them to exercise more control over their own government, while still enjoying the privileges of being members of the British Empire. What separated the two sides was how they believed the colonies should reach these ends: loyalists felt this could be accomplished through legal and constitutional means, not through rebellion. Further, loyalists feared what would happen to their colony if it fell

¹¹⁵ Gilje, *The Road to Mobocracy*, 50-51.

¹¹⁶ Gouverneur Morris, “Gouverneur Morris to John Penn” *American Archives*. Edited by M. St. Clair Clarke and Peter Force. 4th ser., 6 vols. (Washington, D.C., 1837): 46. Quoted in Chopra, *Unnatural Rebellion*, 36.

¹¹⁷ Chopra, *Unnatural Rebellion*, 58.

into the hands of the patriots; they feared anarchy and chaos that would result from a mob rule whose potential for anarchy and destruction had already been demonstrated in recent events.¹¹⁸

Fear of mob rule appears to have been a primary motivating factor that explains why non-elite New Yorkers maintained their loyalty to the Crown. More marginal middling colonists regarded loyalty as a better option than the rule of an uncontrollable mob, and reasoned that if they maintained loyalty, they would then be able to work with Britain to give New York its increased rights – through constitutional means. Yet, fear of mob rule was not the only consideration that prompted loyalists' decisions. Loyalists considered other factors as well when they decided their allegiance. Although fear of the mobs, and disagreement with the tactics of the Liberty Boys was important, the years preceding the Revolution, when the Liberty Boys rose up against the Stamp and Townshend Acts, many future loyalists supported their guiding argument, even if they did not agree with the Liberty Boys' tactics.

Both the Stamp Act and the Townshend Acts were economic sanctions imposed on the colonies. The Townshend Acts in particular were a series of acts created to punish the colony of New York. The Suspension Act, one of the acts falling under the Townshend Act, prohibited the New York Assembly from meeting until the complied with the Quartering Act of 1765. New York refused to house soldiers, as the Quartering Act stipulated. The Townshend Duties, which also fell under the Townshend Act, imposed a direct tax on revenues, which was intended to raise revenue for the Crown. This was different from many other taxes, which were set to regulate the economy, because it was strictly employed to raise revenue.¹¹⁹ Although many future loyalists were fearful of the mobs, to switch their support in a relatively short time frame,

¹¹⁸ Chopra, *Unnatural Rebellion*, 58.

¹¹⁹ Encyclopædia Britannica Online, s. v. "Townshend Acts,"
<http://www.britannica.com/event/Townshend-Acts>.

there are likely other considerations they made. Many middling class individuals in New York City worked in a trade occupation, and likely considered the impact of a revolution.

New York City's location had already in the seventeenth century enabled it to emerge under the Dutch as a leading successful port city. As with any thriving port city, New York had long boasted a large merchant class. Overall, those who worked in trading, although they were considered the middling class were able to exert great influence in the city. These individuals held a variety of jobs that revolved around trade, participating in both skilled work and enterprise, with reasonable expectation that their labor would result in increased financial security. Many Scots had immigrated into the colony in the 15 years before the Revolution, and quickly began participating in the trading enterprise.¹²⁰ The Seven Years War had helped propel some of these individuals to even greater levels of influence, and helped many achieve an increased level of economic success. In order to accommodate the British Army during the prosecution of the Seven Years' War, merchants began importing vast quantities of food, alcohol, and dry goods, which allowed some to achieve impressive levels of economic success.¹²¹ Occupations in trade-related work all enjoyed an overall increase in profitability, and Chopra further explained that "the demand for shipbuilding craftsmen drove wages up to a level not exceeded in any of the port towns before the American rebellion."¹²² From middling class merchants' perspective, the Seven Years War allowed for a profitable relationship between themselves and England; the British Army's presence in the colony after the Seven Years War was symbolic of the continuing economic relationship. Even though there were famous names in New York merchant industry, analysis of major port cities trading between England and the

¹²⁰ Chopra, *Unnatural Rebellion*, 15.

¹²¹ Chopra, *Unnatural Rebellion*, 17-18.

¹²² Chopra, *Unnatural Rebellion*, 17-18.

colonies shows that “New York was more accessible to well-connected merchants” than most markets.¹²³ Furthermore, the Navigation Acts appeared to have little negative effect on the New York trade market, with those merchants trading in restricted areas.¹²⁴

Yet, not all merchants received large economic benefits from the Seven Years War; many middling merchants “tended to rise more modestly and fall harder during the war.”¹²⁵ The economic downturn some merchants faced was a result of financial difficulties others integral in the line of trade, like farmers and shopkeepers, faced, in combinations with the difficulties associated with the high cost of living in New York City. As they were struggling to survive in the city, the farmers and shopkeepers raised their prices, hurting the middling merchants who could not financially compensate the increased cost.¹²⁶

Although there were some merchants who failed to gain any economic success during the Seven Years War, those who did found even greater success immediately following the war. This boom was a result of carefully promotion within the colony by merchants to increase overall consumption and supply the growing demand through domestic trade. Merchants within the city, especially those living in the North and East Wards, lived near the open-air markets that they supplied. After the Seven Years War, the merchants noticed that production centers, like breweries, tanneries, and distilleries, were emerging near the markets. They promoted consumption of these products, and some, sensing that this new system was an avenue for future successes, began pondering an economic future where the interior of the colonies and New York

¹²³ Emily Buchnea, “Transatlantic Transformations: Visualizing Change Over Time in the Liverpool–New York Trade Network, 1763–1833,” *Enterprise and Society* 15 (2014): 697.

¹²⁴ Buchnea, “Transatlantic Transformations,” 397-398.

¹²⁵ Cathy Matson, *Merchants and Empire: Trading in Colonial New York* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998): 274.

¹²⁶ Matson, *Merchants and Empire*, 274.

City could work more close and create intercolonial trade network.¹²⁷ It is important to note, although merchants started increasing their level of trade with domestic producers, a considerable amount of trade – approximately half – was maintained through international producers and intermediaries.¹²⁸ This relationship was important, as the colonies were still connected to an international market, and thus experience economic downturn that was tied to the international market. In 1761, as fortunes seemed high due to the post-war boom, an economic recession occurred. This recession was particularly devastating as Dutch firms, who borrowed credit from Germans, were unable to pay back their credit. The Dutch had extended credit to colonists, but when a post-war slump occurred, the Dutch were no longer able to meet their payments. The British bought these faulty credits at reduced prices, which resulted in strain on the British's reserve. The British government, to compensate, began sending large amount of manufactured products to New York, hoping to find a buyer, but as New York was facing a similar economic downturn, the goods remained unsold. The imported goods severely damaged the now struggling middling merchants, who faced both economic downturn, and a market flooded by imported goods.¹²⁹

The difference in response from the middling class merchants during the Stamp Act Crisis, where it was mostly uniform, to the Revolution, where there was a great amount of division, gives insight into the motivation of loyalists merchants. During the Stamp Act, almost all participated in non-importation – where merchants refused to import goods from England – which is particularly surprising because a merchant who still imported goods could have

¹²⁷ Matson, *Merchants and Empire*, 278.

¹²⁸ Matson, *Merchants and Empire*, 278. “Documents Relative to the Colonial History of the State of New York” (Albany: Weed, Parsons and Company, 1857) 446-448.

¹²⁹ Matson, *Merchants and Empire*, 283.

increased their fortunes greatly.¹³⁰ But, merchants participated in nonimportation, in part, because it was a way to reduce the glut of goods from England, which had caused economic hardship for many.¹³¹ These merchants supported the same general philosophy as the Liberty Boys, but not for the same reasons – theirs was a purely economic strategy. This helps explain why there was a general consensus between classes of merchants to continue with nonimportation.

On the other hand, no economic incentive existed for these merchants to support the Revolution; in fact there were economic reasons why they would not want to support it. Multiple times groups of merchants tried to recreate the success of the first nonimportation movement, but failed to garner such support. There were such movements in response to others acts passed by the British in the years leading up to the Revolutionary War. This group of radical merchants even went so far in 1774 they attempted to hold a city-wide nonimportation and nonconsumption acts in response to the Coercive Acts, another series of economic sanctions. But, many merchants did not join this movement because many still were struggling economically, due to some financial hardships that hit the city in 1769 and 1771. Now, nonimportation was no longer seen as a way to right economy's wrongs, but a potential financial disaster in which the costs outweighed the benefits. Moreover, an increasing number of merchants flooded both New York City and other port cities, trying to take over the few available markets for trade.¹³² With uncertain markets and economic hardships supporting the Revolution and the economic sanctions that went along with it would not have seemed as feasible.

¹³⁰ Edmund S. Morgan and Helen M. Morgan, *The Stamp Act Crisis: Prologue to Revolution* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1962): 306.

¹³¹ Matson, *Merchants and Empire*, 295.

¹³² Matson, *Merchants and Empire*, 304-305.

For the middling class in New York City, loyalty was not the necessarily the obvious choice. Many who later would declare their allegiance to the Crown initially supported measures that combatted British economic sanctions. Yet, this previous alignment did not necessarily predict future allegiances. These middling class merchants were on the fringes of their economic class – they knew true poverty could occur, and some had even experienced it in the years leading up to the Revolutionary War. Thus, their support of an economic measure in a postwar boom – even if they did not necessarily receive great financial success in that period – is reasonable with a people whose financial prospects overall look promising. Yet, by the Revolutionary War, these merchants experienced years of difficulty, and likely did not want to risk losing any business, even that which came from importation. Further, they had to consider who was supporting these measures: the Liberty Boys and their mobs. These non-English merchants lived in New York long enough to know its history of disorder, and the Liberty Boys, who were using the popular mobs to help support their cause. Yet, there were instances that indicated the Liberty Boys could fully not control the mob. There was potential that life under the patriots would be a life under mob rule; a terrifying prospect. These merchants' loyalty was not a result of a love of England, or an overarching belief in what the monarchy stood for, but a better option in place of mob rule and economic ruin.

Unlike the Scots in North Carolina, New York City loyalists were not a homogenous group that lived in relatively isolated areas; they interacted with a variety of individuals during the war. But, in both examples, these non-English loyalists lived in drastically different environment, whereas German-speakers Pennsylvania lived in an area that is a “middle ground.” It is these loyalists that will conclude the examination of non-English loyalists sentiments in the colonies. German-speakers in Pennsylvania lived in a more rural area than loyalists in New York

City, but different than the rural, backwoods of North Carolina. And, although they all were German-speaking, their religious affiliation separated these groups in their way of life, allowing for consideration of diverse views. Although they spoke a different language and had a different collective history than the non-English loyalists already examined, the German-speakers in Pennsylvania still retained similar motivations to the non-English loyalists already assessed. In the commonality of reasons, the German-speakers' experiences support the conclusion reached in the study of New York and North Carolina: these loyalists perceived the Revolution as a radical event that they approached with caution.

Chapter 4

Pennsylvania: “The Undecided Population”

Pennsylvania German-speakers played a unique role in the Revolutionary War. Unlike non-English speakers in the colonies of North Carolina and New York, this group of transplanted Europeans lacked a consensus with regard to the question of loyalty. Their divide in loyalty was even more complex since it also included a preference for neutrality, thus making this population a good one to study, since it allows for examination of why certain people chose loyalty, others struggled to remain neutral, when others around them supported the Revolution. This divide was not regional or by religious group, but instead happened within towns and even families.

Although German-speaking loyalists came from a variety of backgrounds, there were some commonalities in their rationale for opting for loyalty. The first of these, allegiance to a particular version of Christianity, played a major role in coaxing the German-speakers to loyalty, or neutrality and that decision was also influenced by a long-standing satisfaction with the Pennsylvania’s colonial government. The Proprietary government’s stance on religious freedom, taxation, and conscription had served immigrants from the Holy Roman Empire well and commanded the loyalty of German-speakers. They had little incentive to change the original Charter secured by William Penn from the Crown in the late seventeenth century into one that, in the opinion of many, had the potential to be less favorable to them. Finally, age played a role in an individual’s choice, as older German-speakers appeared more cautious about embracing the Revolution, as did those who had most recently arrived in the colony.

Within German-speaking population, there was a tendency towards conservatism that was rooted in their religious convictions. They were hesitant to embrace political change, and thus during the Revolution, many decided to not align with either side, but instead remain

neutral. The true feelings of these middling German-speakers about the Revolution are hard to determine, as they left very few sources that detailed their convictions about events. Yet, in their actions and declared stances many were neutral. In writings concerning the American Revolution, scholars identify loyalists as those who actively supported the British, while patriots actively supported the rebellion. This dichotomy fails to account for those many in Pennsylvania's immigrant population who were neutral towards the issue, choosing not to align with either side. This dichotomy of patriots and loyalists is likely an artifact of how patriots perceived the Revolution. For many revolutionaries in the Revolution, neutral groups were suspect. If a person failed to support the Revolution, patriots concluded they were against it because an ambivalent attitude could mask loyalism, or at least suggested insufficient support for independence. Patriots in Pennsylvania faced special difficulties because of this colony's religious history that had created neutral populations who refused to support the patriot cause.

Before the Revolution, approximately 80,969 German-speakers immigrated to the colonies through Philadelphia's port. Once they immigrated into Philadelphia, many remained in Pennsylvania. There were distinct waves of immigration, and a majority of the German-speakers arrived before 1755, with many coming during the War of Austrian Succession (1740-1748). An unbalanced age ratio within the initial population – the expected number of middle-aged men was lower than the actual – stabilized eventually. The uneven age distribution in the early periods is especially interesting, as it gives insight into the groups attracted to Pennsylvania. The literature has long stated that some of the first German-speakers to immigrate to the colonies were members of Protestant groups unhappy with the Lutheran or Reformed established churches of the Holy Roman Empire. Demographic data confirms that description. These groups, beginning with the famous Germantown settlement north of Philadelphia lived in small villages

so they maintained groups of large, extended families, and the leaders were middle-aged men.¹³³ These dissenters who in many instances were pacifists in their views, flocked to Pennsylvania more than any other colony because the original Charter of William Penn eventually created a Quaker-dominated government that allowed for freedom of conscience and the Quaker belief in pacifism. The Pennsylvania government was founded to defend the Quakers and in support of freedom of conscience that allowed the dissenting German-speakers to create their own communities. Pennsylvania was also the only colony that did not create a militia for defense, again on the basis of religious conviction.¹³⁴ For these reasons, Pennsylvania proved to be the ideal colony for these early German-speaking settlers, who for the as most part were adherents of what are commonly called the Peace Churches.¹³⁵

Understanding the German-speaking groups that inhabited Pennsylvania is important for comprehending why some German-speakers pledged loyalty to the Crown, and why some did not. There were two general classifications of German-speakers in colonial Pennsylvania, Church Germans (Lutherans and Reformed) were distinct from the Peace Churches (Mennonites, Amish, Moravians, Dunkers). During the Revolution, many of the German-speakers who belonged to the Peace Churches declared neutrality, citing their religious objection to warfare. Their neutrality has been discussed at length in scholarship, but I will still briefly address it. The Church Germans on the other hand, are not discussed as frequently. This difference in research is important because although the Peace Churches have received extensive scholarly attention, they

¹³³ Marianne S. Wokeck, *Trade in Strangers: The Beginnings of Mass Migration to North America*, (University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2003): 1-37.

¹³⁴ J. William Frost, *A Perfect Freedom, Religious Liberty in Pennsylvania*, (University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1990): 5.

¹³⁵ For more on the topic of early German-speaking settlers, see Stephanie Grauman Wolf, *Urban Village: Population, Community, and Family Structure in Germantown, Pennsylvania, 1683-1800* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1976).

constituted a minority of German-speakers. Most German-speakers in Pennsylvania, overwhelmingly shopkeepers, artisans, or small farmers by occupation, identified as Church Germans, and their loyalty will be the topic of investigation for this chapter.

First, it is important to understand how the religious teaching differed between Peace Churches and Lutherans and Reformed German-speakers, as it influenced the reasons for neutrality and loyalty. The Peace Churches held a long history of avoidance of warfare. Each church differed in how strictly it adhered to pacifism; some even forbade violence in the case of self-defense. This tradition, that found its origin in the emergence of the radical Reformation Anabaptist movement eventually included the Renewed Unity of the Brethren (sometimes referred to as the Moravians) that in the early eighteenth century also adopted the pacifistic teachings that had arisen during the Reformation. The Church Germans, on the other hand, did not adhere to this doctrine, the result of the differing interpretations of Luther's theology that sharply criticized the radical Anabaptists. The Anabaptists who insisted on the conscious, adult choice to be baptized into a community that was not connected directly to any ruler, Christian or not, and Martin Luther thus differed sharply on their teachings about warfare and the involvement of Christians in political life in general. Both agreed that warfare and law enforcement belonged to the affairs of this world. Luther developed the well-known "Two Kingdoms" doctrine, which held that God had established two separate areas of work for the Church and the state. The state's role was to provide discipline to man. Luther believed that Adam's desire for liberty caused his failure in the Garden of Eden; thus, humans needed law in order to keep from such rebellions. The state was tasked with the proper enforcement of law, as it was God's will to have discipline and order. Luther also postulated that the law existed because humans were tragic and fallen by nature. Humans know what actions they should

undertake, as it was those that they wished to have done to them, but they would fail to act accordingly. In Luther's doctrine, law was necessary because humans would always fail to act, as they should. For the Peace Churches, the connection between church and state amounted to a betrayal of the Gospel. Rejecting political and military violence as demonic, these Christians insisted that the law derived from the New Testament should be a model for their simple congregations and it provided guidance for redemption.¹³⁶ Luther's criticism of the Roman Catholic Church's acceptance of prince-bishops insisted on a separate sphere of authority for civil leaders and for preachers of the Gospel. He also did not believe the New Testament should serve as a model for building church and state relations. Instead, he focused on the importance of Romans 13—that Christians were bound to obedience to whatever civil authority was over them since all authority came from God.

Regarding war, Anabaptists argued that if God had given away control of such tasks to the state and its leaders, it was because warfare clashed with the ideals of the kingdom of God. As a result, Anabaptists rejected the whole idea of a "Christendom" in which Christians could legitimately take oaths, take up arms, and engage in behavior they regarded as Satanic.¹³⁷ Lutherans and the Peace Churches differed completely on the legitimacy of pacifism, the latter being a position both Lutherans and the German Reformed denounced as unethical since it would require disobedience to the lawful commands of a Christian Prince.

To understand the impact of this tradition of pacifism among the Peace Churches in Pennsylvania and its effect on the Revolution, it is helpful to look at a few Peace Churches and

¹³⁶ A. Gregg Roeber, *Palatines, Liberty, and Property*, (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1998): 73.

¹³⁷ Jared S. Burkholder, "Neither 'Kriegerisch' nor 'Quäkerisch': Moravians and the Question of Violence in Eighteenth-Century Pennsylvania," *Journal of Moravian History* 12 (2012): 146-147.

their reaction to the Revolution. Throughout the German-speaking population, observers encountered patriots, loyalists, and neutrals—the latter in particular many considered to be implicitly loyalists. It is important to tease out the different German-speaking communities that were divided by religious affiliation, to understand how this population could vary in its loyalty. Through examination of these different groups, we can sharpen our picture of German-speaking motivation for loyalty to the Crown, as well as understand some common reasons why some of these non-English loyalists aligned with the British.

The Unity of the Brethren, or “Moravians” of Bethlehem, Pennsylvania are a notable example of German-speakers whose neutrality frustrated patriots in the surrounding areas. Beginning in Lusatia and southeastern Saxony in Europe, the “Renewed Brethren” led by Nicholas Count von Zinzendorf first aspired to provide an umbrella movement under which all Protestants could cooperate. Rejected by Lutherans and Reformed alike, however, Zinzendorf and his followers opted to create separate communities to carry out their vision of the ideal Christian community. Moravians established Bethlehem in 1741 as a self-sufficient town; this places them at a later date in comparison to other Peace Churches settlements, but their actions and motivations serve as a case study into non-Church German groups. Although Bethlehem was a Moravian town, with primarily Moravian inhabitants, many notable figures, like Benjamin Franklin, John Dickinson, and a few other leaders of the Revolution resided or visited for extended periods of time. Most visits were conducted as the visitor wanted to “escape from the disorderly disease-ridden cities” such as Philadelphia.¹³⁸ Although they were not Anglicans the Crown had granted a unique status to the Moravians. Through a Parliamentary statute of 1749, Britain declared the Moravians to be an “Ancient Protestant Episcopal Church,” judging its

¹³⁸ Daniel R. Gilbert, “Bethlehem and the American Revolution,” *Transaction of the Moravian Historical Society* 23 (1977): 19.

history and doctrines to be similar to those of the Anglican Church.¹³⁹ Through this act, the Moravians now saw themselves as a legitimate Church in the eyes of the government, even if Lutherans and Reformed German-speakers disagreed. The Moravians had not gained this distinction in the Holy Roman Empire. Through this statute, the Moravians received complete control of their congregations, were exempt from taking the oath of allegiance, and did not have to participate in active military duty. The exemption from military service was a right that was guaranteed in perpetuity. Moravian doctrine lacked an absolute ban on taking up arms, but often many Moravians, adverse to violence, hired individuals to take their place in military engagements, citing a religious objection against war. Bethlehem, at the time of the Revolutionary, appears to have adopted the viewpoint of their past leader Augustus Spangenberg “that defensive war was acceptable if ‘princes and governors,’ charged with the duty of protecting their subject, had failed to do so.”¹⁴⁰ Spangenberg, who was a leader in Bethlehem at the time of the French and Indian War, had turned the town into a fortress. Yet, even though his influence remained strong at the time of the Revolution, Spangenberg’s theology ultimately did not prevail in the Revolution, as a provincial conference declared that Bethlehem would maintain a non-combatant position during the rebellion. As a result of this action, some patriots believed that the Moravians were not neutral non-combatants as they claimed, but actually secret Tories.¹⁴¹

The Moravians’ actions in Bethlehem were not an anomaly, but instead typified the response of many of the Peace Churches to the American Revolution. To understand their actions, one must first examine the motivations at Bethlehem. John Ettwein, who held a

¹³⁹ Gilbert, “Bethlehem and the American Revolution,” 27-28.

¹⁴⁰ Gilbert, “Bethlehem and the American Revolution,” 29.

¹⁴¹ Gilbert, “Bethlehem and the American Revolution,” 29-30, 32.

leadership position within Bethlehem at the start of the Revolution, wanted to remain apart from the Revolution. He reasoned that in order to “foster a lifestyle of impartiality that would remain free from ‘worldly’ entanglements” the Moravian must remain neutral.¹⁴² The Moravians, when pressed with the Test Act, had objected both to taking an oath, which they believed was wrong, and also because it required “abjuration.” Within the oath, there was wording that essentially nullified their previous loyalties to the Crown, which they believed constituted rebelling against the Crown, thus effectively defying against God’s established authority.¹⁴³

As for the Anabaptists, who subscribed to a pacifistic doctrine as well, they adopted a “theology of martyrdom” in the decades leading up to the Revolution.¹⁴⁴ In Pennsylvania, “Mennonites, Amish, Dunker, Moravians, Schwenckfelder, and various smaller pacifist groups.” continued their witness to pacifism.¹⁴⁵ This frustrated colonists not in these communities, such as the Church Germans because Indian attacks beginning with the outbreak of the Seven Years’ War had now become a serious and real threat, yet these groups refused to participate in, or support the creation of a militia. As an attempt to ensure that the populations remained pacifistic, the printer Christopher Sauer wrote in his paper that the German-speakers should favor death as a martyr over any act of violence, even if it was in self-defense. His Peace Church readers would not have had any qualms with that argument, and it is only one of many pieces of literature arguing similar ideas of martyrdom, that drew the justification for that line of thought from older Anabaptist writings. Even though inaction at times might result in death, the Peace Church

¹⁴² Burkholder, “Neither ‘Kriegerisch’ nor ‘Quäkerisch,’” :163.

¹⁴³ Burkholder, “Neither ‘Kriegerisch’ nor ‘Quäkerisch,’” 168.

¹⁴⁴ Jan Stievermann, “A ‘Plain, Rejected Little Flock’: The Politics of Martyrological Self-Fashioning among Pennsylvania’s German Peace Churches, 1739-65,” *The William and Mary Quarterly* 66 (2009): 297.

¹⁴⁵ Stievermann, “A ‘Plain, Rejected Little Flock,’” 288.

writers justified such a fate, as they drew a connection between personal suffering and those endured by Christ.¹⁴⁶

Concerned to identify and potentially pressure pacifists into support, the Pennsylvania General Assembly passed a series of mandated loyalty oaths, known as the Test Acts. The first act, passed in the summer of 1777, required all men over the age of eighteen to renounce the former oaths they had made to King George III, and instead swore fidelity to the new Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Oath-takers also pledged, “to do nothing prejudicial to the freedom and independence of the commonwealth.”¹⁴⁷ If an adult male refused to take the oath he faced exclusion from a variety of civic rights: bearing arms, electing or being elected to offices, suing for debt, buying or selling land, and serving on juries. Although the acts aimed at exposing and intimidating loyalists, they were not particularly effective in changing the loyalties of their targets. After the British took over the patriot city of Philadelphia, resentment towards both loyalists and those declaring neutrality notably increased, which led to the passing of the Test of April 1778. This act set a deadline of June 1, 1778 by which time individuals had to declare their loyalty to the Revolution. If individuals refused to swear the oath, not only did they face the same punishments from the original Test Act, but they also had to pay a doubled tax and faced being barred from the courts, which restricted the ability to create wills or deal with debt and property issues. Those who refused to take the oath were barred from certain occupations –

¹⁴⁶ Stievermann, “A ‘Plain, Rejected Little Flock,’” 287-290.

¹⁴⁷ Owen S. Ireland, “The Ethnic-Religious Dimension of Pennsylvania Politics, 1778-1779,” *The William and Mary Quarterly* 30 (1973): 429. For full text of the Test Act 1777 see *Hazard’s Register of Pennsylvania: Devote to the Preservation of Facts & Knowledge*, (1829) volume 4, 11

“merchant, trader, lawyer, physician, druggist, and school or college teacher or administrator.”¹⁴⁸

Under the Test Act of April 1778, these punishments would extend for an individual’s life.

With regard to the Test Acts, people from both Church Germans as well as the Peace Churches refused to pledge the oath, for various reasons. Heinrich Melchior Mühlberg, for example, the “patriarch” of the Lutheran Church in North America and a loyal supporter of the original charter of the colony of Pennsylvania, wrote that the “so-called Moravian Brethren and Schwenckfelder have presented to the provincial *Assembly* a petition in which they request that on their behalf that part be omitted from the oath of allegiance which reads: ‘The members of the free states shall renounce their loyalty to the king of Great Britain and his successors.’”¹⁴⁹

A letter, published in the patriot *Pennsylvania Packet* referenced statements its publisher John Dunlap wrote, where he observed, “that on a late visit to several parts of three counties of this State, you [Dunlap] found great complaints made by the Mennonites and Quakers, of the oath of allegiance.”¹⁵⁰ Throughout south-central Pennsylvania there was resistance to the Test Act, as the German-speaking Peace Church populations objected to the required oath.

Revolutionaries speculated why these groups refused to swear the oath. In the *Pennsylvania Packet*, the letter mentions that Dunlap believed the Mennonites and Quakers objected to the oath, as it required a pledge to fight, which violated the Mennonites’ and Quakers’ pacifist beliefs.¹⁵¹ But, as the author of the letter attested “no obligation to bear arms and fight is deductible from the latter form [the oath].”¹⁵² Interestingly, the patriots, on multiple accounts,

¹⁴⁸ Ireland, “Pennsylvania Politics, 1778-1779,” 429-430.

¹⁴⁹ Henry Melchior Muhlenberg, *The Journals of Henry Melchior Muhlenberg*, (Philadelphia: Evangelical Lutheran Ministerium of Pennsylvania and Adjacent States Journal, 1958): 159.

¹⁵⁰ *Pennsylvania Packet*, June 17, 1778, 1.

¹⁵¹ *Pennsylvania Packet*, June 17, 1778, 1.

¹⁵² *Pennsylvania Packet*, June 17, 1778, 1.

argued that German-speakers should be more in support of such oaths. In Muhlenberg's personal account, he described the response Pennsylvania Assembly to petitions requesting an exception for the required oath by both Moravians and Schwenckfelders:

Because the Germans in Particular, have the less reason to object to the Oath of Allegiance as directed by law, as they heretofore generally renounce Allegiance to a Royal Family, which had forfeited its pretensions to the British Throne, by Acts not less outrageous and insulting on the Rights of the Subject, than those which the present King is guilty towards the people of America.¹⁵³

The author of the letter in the *Pennsylvania Packet* employed similar language, stating “As to the Menonists [sic], it may be observed, that the Germans (and these people are, I believe, generally such) at their first arrival, and on naturalization, have conformed to the declaration fi[r]st mentioned...on pretence that it obliges them to fight, refuse the present form of attesting allegiance and abjuration.”¹⁵⁴

Notably, both writers mention Germans, but that terminology is misleading. The tendency of English-speakers to categorize all German-speakers as “Germans” resulted from the large number of Peace Church members (with exception of the Quakers) who spoke German. Many of the specific religious groups were founded in regions of the Holy Roman Empire – Mennonites in Friesland, Moravians in Moravia and Saxony, Schwenckfelder in lower Silesia, Lutheranism in Saxony and other principalities of the Holy Roman Empire. The reasoning stated in the petitions against the Test Act oath, does not reflect the convictions of the majority religious groups among German-speakers. German-speaking Lutherans or Reformed did not reject the Test Act, nor declare neutrality because of an overall objection to warfare. The German Peace Churches' bid for neutrality in the American Revolution makes perfect sense given their theology and their history both in Europe and in early Pennsylvania, but it would be wrong to

¹⁵³ Muhlenberg, *The Journals of Henry Melchior Muhlenberg*, 159.

¹⁵⁴ *Pennsylvania Packet*, June 17, 1778, 1.

focus on those churches as if they presented patriots with the only troublesome possibility that neutrality actually disguised loyalism. German-speakers as a whole comprised a substantial percentage of colonial Pennsylvania's people; estimates place the German-speaker as between one-third to three-fifths of the total population.¹⁵⁵ The majority of that German-speaking population did not belong to the Peace Churches, but were members of the Lutheran and Reformed confessions of faith. Therefore most German-speaking Pennsylvanians did not have a religious tenet that would have led them to advocate complete pacifism, yet there still were loyalists among the Lutherans and Reformed.

Mühlenberg himself refused to take the oath until pressured to do so by his own, patriot-inclined sons Peter and Friedrich.¹⁵⁶ Mühlenberg's own reluctance to accept the oath is an interesting as it allows insight into the Church Germans' view of the oath – although Mühlenberg as a University-educated cleric cannot be thought to reflect the ordinary artisan or shopkeeper or small farmer among German-speakers. Nevertheless, many Lutherans understood and related their own feelings to those expressed by Mühlenberg in his writings.¹⁵⁷ When approached by supporters of the Revolution who requested his help for their cause, Mühlenberg explained that he could not support their desire to change the government. He argued on the basis of Luther's own theology that a distinction existed between immediate and ultimate authority. For Mühlenberg the protection of rights by the government was only a portion of its role. The government in the colony was the immediate authority over the inhabitants of Pennsylvania, but

¹⁵⁵ John B. Frantz, "Franklin and the Pennsylvania German," *Pennsylvania History: A Journal of Mid-Atlantic Studies* 65 (1998): 21.

¹⁵⁶ Ireland, "Pennsylvania Politics, 1778-1779," 431.

¹⁵⁷ A. Gregg Roeber, "Lutheranism in the Atlantic World in the Age of Revolutions," in Hermann Wellenreuther, Thomas-Müller Bahlke and A.G. Roeber, eds. *The Transatlantic World of Heinrich Melchior Mühlenberg in the Eighteenth Century* (Halle: Verlag der Franckeschen Stiftungen-Hassarowitz. 2013) : 304.

King was the ultimate authority. As such, it was necessary for “loyalty to the ultimate authority of a monarch who was both protector of the Empire and religious rights.”¹⁵⁸ As A.G. Roeber has argued, this distinction held great importance to Mühlenberg, and explains his loyalty until 1777, when the King deployed the Hessian mercenaries.¹⁵⁹

It is also important to note that Mühlenberg’s wished to maintain his non-involvement in political matters, and did so until absolutely forced to commit to one side or the other in the revolutionary crisis.¹⁶⁰ Mühlenberg believed – as did the clergy in the Lutheran churches in the Holy Roman Empire where he had been educated and trained – that as a leader in the church, it was inappropriate for someone holding the clerical office to participate in political conflicts. The political and religious spheres should not overlap in conflict, as in the religious one God was the only judge. Although Mühlenberg espoused these beliefs during the Revolutionary War, he had not always followed his own teachings with complete consistency. During the Stamp Act Crisis, on multiple occasions he acted in a way that made his feeling about the act known; thus causing the two kingdoms to overlap. In subscribing to the two-kingdom doctrine, Mühlenberg conceded that the Christian princes should be obeyed because they exercised the authority of God through the law, where as pastors like himself exercised the authority of the Gospel. Mühlenberg believed these two authorities should remain separate, but by making clear his own views on the Stamp Act Crisis, he was not commenting or teaching on the Gospel, but on an issue of the law.¹⁶¹

¹⁵⁸ A. Gregg Roeber, “Lutheranism in the Atlantic World,” 306.

¹⁵⁹ See A. Gregg Roeber, “Lutheranism in the Atlantic World in the Age of Revolutions,” in *The Transatlantic World of Heinrich Melchior Mühlenberg in the Eighteenth Century* and A.G. Roeber, “Palatines, liberty, and property: German Lutherans in colonial British America”

¹⁶⁰ A. Gregg Roeber, “Lutheranism in the Atlantic World,” 306.

¹⁶¹ Lisa Minardi, “Pastors & Patriots: the Mühlenberg Family and the War for American Independence,” in Hermann Wellenreuther, Thomas-Müller Bahlke and A.G. Roeber,

Adherence to a specific understanding of Protestantism certainly played a role in shaping the actions of German-speakers in the Revolution. Such examples however were not limited to the neutrality of Peace Churches. Heinrich Melchior Mühlenberg provided insight into the way Lutheran German-speakers regarded their role in the Revolution. During the Stamp Act Crisis, Mühlenberg had already counseled churches to avoid the boycott of British goods, by citing Romans 13.¹⁶² This verse commands that “Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but from God; the powers that be are ordained by God. 2. Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God, and those who resist shall receive for themselves damnation.”¹⁶³ Before the Revolution, Mühlenberg had to explain if he would be *obdientia active or passive* (passively or actively obedient), to which he replied Romans 13 asserted that all men are subject to higher powers.¹⁶⁴

His devotion to this teaching stemmed from his training as a cleric in Europe. An established teaching in Protestant Europe, the interpretation of Romans 13 taught that a Christian monarch was God’s chosen authority, and thus obedience to the King was demanded of all faithful Christians as such obedience was, by extension, obedience to God. European-trained clerics, like Mühlenberg were thus faced with an almost impossible dilemma of conscience when confronted with the requirement to support and pledge oath to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania mandated by the Test Acts.

The younger generation of German-speaking Lutheran, who lived in exclusively in North America did not place the same level of weight on Romans 13. Instead, they often agreed with

eds. *The Transatlantic World of Heinrich Melchior Mühlenberg in the Eighteenth Century* (Halle: Verlag der Franckeschen Stiftungen-Hassarowitz, 2013) : 358.

¹⁶² Faith E. Rohbough, “The Political Maturation of Henry Melchior Mühlenberg,” *Lutheran Quarterly* 10 (1996): 400.

¹⁶³ Romans 13:1-2 21st Century King James Version.

¹⁶⁴ Rohbough, “The Political Maturation of Henry Melchior Mühlenberg,” 400.

the revolutionaries' cause – two of Muhlenberg's sons ultimately became patriots. For the younger generations, they placed more emphasis on the securing of their property, and they felt the British government could not protect that property.¹⁶⁵ Peter Mühlenberg, a pastor at the start of the war, ended that career soon after the outbreak of violence, taking up arms as a soldier for the Continental Army. Before enlisting, Peter allegedly preached a sermon about Ecclesiastes 3:1-8, arguing that the time arrived for fighting.¹⁶⁶ Unlike his father, Peter did not worry about keeping the religious and political spheres separate, and instead used one to influence a stance in another. Muhlenberg's other son Frederick, also before the war a cleric, ultimately changed his career during the war, and became a politician, the first Speaker of the later House of Representatives under the Federal Constitution and first signer of the Bill of Rights. This career change was particularly stressful for the elder Mühlenberg, because both he and his son were ministers, and thus, in his eyes should not involve themselves in politics. He lamented when he learned Frederick's new role, convinced that it would result in Frederick's downfall.¹⁶⁷

During the Revolution, Mühlenberg refused to commit to either side, arousing suspicion of the patriots. Mühlenberg openly stated that the British government had the God appointed right to rule, and those statement only further increased suspicion about his loyalty. Mühlenberg refused, when asked by the Pennsylvania Congress, to publish a work aimed at warning German-speakers “to be watchful because their privileges and liberties are in danger”.¹⁶⁸ He replied “Sir as far as I know, all the intelligent members of our Lutheran congregations are loyal subjects of His Royal Majesty, our sovereign.”¹⁶⁹ Muhlenberg's response indicates that there was support

¹⁶⁵ A. Gregg Roeber, “Lutheranism in the Atlantic World,” 310-311.

¹⁶⁶ Minardi, “Pastors & Patriots,” 359.

¹⁶⁷ Minardi, “Pastors & Patriots,” 362-363.

¹⁶⁸ Muhlenberg, *The Journals of Henry Melchior Muhlenberg*, 124.

¹⁶⁹ Muhlenberg, *The Journals of Henry Melchior Muhlenberg*, 124.

for the King within the Lutheran population, and it implied that they aligned in such a manner because of the teaching in Romans 13. If all Lutherans had followed the teaching of Mühlberg, their loyalty would have been overwhelmingly obvious; their pastoral leader remained loyal to the Crown due to his Lutheran understanding of scripture that explained that God appointed kings and princes. Under that logic, to overthrow a King amounted to an attack on God himself and his plan for keeping order through the “Two Kingdoms.”

For their part, the patriot leaders believed that the German-speakers in Pennsylvania were a population that should, for what the patriots thought were good reasons, ultimately declare their loyalty to the revolutionaries’ cause. The similar arguments prepared by the General Assembly and the author in the *Pennsylvania Packet* indicates a general line of reasoning developed to garner German-speakers’ support. But, it was not only the patriots who tried to garner German-speakers’ support. The British also participated in a war of propaganda with the patriots to generate German-speakers’ support. For the British, King George III’s Hanoverian lineage was thought to be one reason German-speakers could conceivably support their cause. Andreas Emmerich, a German officer in the British Army, wrote in a broadside that he was surprised that the German-speakers in the colonies had yet to come in support of the King, appealing to their “patriotism and support of monarchism.”¹⁷⁰ Other British arguments focused on the failure of a republican constitution in history, particularly in the case of Oliver Cromwell, when England had ultimately descended into a military tyranny. This argument also focused on asserting that England was not trying to subject the colonies to enslavement, and if the rebellion ended,

¹⁷⁰ Hermann Wellenreuther, *Citizens in a Strange Land: A Study of German-American Broad­sides and Their Meaning for Germans in North America, 1730-1830*, (University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2013): 228. See also. Andreas Emmerich, “An die Deutschen in Amerika, 1777.

England would continue to assume its role as protectorate of the colonies.¹⁷¹ Patriot writings, on the other hand, focused on the unfair fate of the Hessian soldiers, who they described as sold by German princes solely for monetary gains. The revolutionaries were cautious and never declared the Hessians to be their enemies, and Pennsylvania was described as a land where German-speaking immigrants experienced liberty and security.¹⁷²

These German language pamphlets regarding the affairs of the colonies and the Empire did not lack precedent; in the decade before the war, both sides of the debate over royalization of Pennsylvania used imagery and history familiar to German-speakers in a printed series of pamphlets. Within this debate existed two opposing printing presses, one run by Christopher Sauer, Jr. and the other by Heinrich Miller. Both Sauer and Miller used language and imagery with the intention to invoke support from these German-speakers groups. After the passage of the Stamp Act, Miller, who supported royalization, wrote that in the German-speaking areas in Europe, printers were unable to pry into political affairs. Further, Miller reminded his readers that in German-speaking areas of Europe printed works were heavily taxed. In response to Miller's attempt to win support from German-speaking colonists, Sauer pleaded for peace. He warned that if Pennsylvania did not focus on restoring peace, Pennsylvanians could lose their liberty. To ensure German-speakers understood the dangers of continued fighting, he invoked the incredibly culturally negative image that royalization supporters were misfits. Sauer employed these images as a method to resist royalization, and the potential for more violence, with success.¹⁷³ Given the pre-Revolutionary history and cultural images conveyed in pamphlets,

¹⁷¹ Wellenreuther, *Citizens in a Strange Land*, 228.

¹⁷² Wellenreuther, *Citizens in a Strange Land*, 226, 228.

¹⁷³ A. Gregg Roeber, "Henry Miller's *Staatsbote*: A Revolutionary Journalist's Use of the Swiss Past," *Yearbook of German-American Studies* 25 (1990): 64.

broad­sides, and newspapers, it is clear why both sides employed pamphlets during the Revolution to win the allegiance of German-speakers.

On both sides, the pamphlets targeted two audiences: German-speaking colonists in Pennsylvania and Hessian mercenaries. Significantly, no German-speaking colonist authored these pamphlets. English-speakers wrote the pamphlets, which were later translated to German with one exception: the pamphlet by Andreas Emmerich a Hessian general.¹⁷⁴ Although German-speakers did not directly contribute to these pamphlets, the writings themselves indicate what both sides believed could possibly influence the German-speakers' loyalty. The appeal to the need for security and protection appear as common themes in pamphlets on both sides. The memory of the Seven Years War, and the destruction it wrought in German-speaking areas, especially in Hanover, was in the consciousness of many. Those German-speakers in Europe, who initially supported American Revolution, withdrew support once the French became involved, as it was the French who had caused the destruction.¹⁷⁵ If German-speakers in Europe still remembered that destruction, German-speaking colonists, at least those who were the most recent arrivals in North America after 1763, carried such memories and thus would search for the side that provided the greatest chance of stability.

Although both sides attempted to win the support of German-speakers, they ensured that the German-speakers did not undergo great disruption. Lancaster, which held a diverse population of colonists, including a sizable German-speaking population, provides yet another helpful case study of the difference in treatment between German-speakers and English-speakers.

¹⁷⁴ Wellenreuther, *Citizens in a Strange Land*, 225.

¹⁷⁵ Horst Dippel, *Germany and the American Revolution, 1770-1800: A Sociohistorical Investigation of Late Eighteenth-century Political Thinking* (Chapel Hill, North Carolina: Institute of Early American History and Culture by the University of North Carolina Press, 1977): 114-115.

For those who attending Anglican churches, the actions of the ministers determined if services faced interruption. The Pennsylvania Assembly passed a law forcing those who had not sworn allegiance to leave their counties, against which the Anglican Church petitioned with no success. For German-speaking congregations there is little indication that services were disrupted. This included the Moravian church, whose members would not have sworn allegiance. Pastors from a variety of German-speaking churches were granted the ability to visit captured Hessian mercenaries. The German-speaking churches did not overtly claim loyalty to one cause or another; although each pastor had leanings of which side he supported, strict declarations of loyalty did not surface.¹⁷⁶ The lack of great pressure on the German-speaking churches is an interesting phenomenon that may have been a result of the patriots' and British's' understanding that the German-speakers lacked an overall consensus, and thus punitive measures could affect their potential loyalty negatively.

How Lutheran and Reformed German-speakers saw their own status within the colony is critical in determining the reasons for their loyalty. Shortly after the end of the Seven Years' War in 1764 Benjamin Franklin and a number of other opponents of the Penn family initiated a movement to revoke the colony's Proprietary charter in favor of direct royal governance. German-speakers opposed the change. The reasoning they advanced in this dispute provides a clue for understanding their position during the Revolution. The refusal of the German-speakers to support what they saw as a radical and dangerous change has its roots in the decade before the proposal to turn Pennsylvania into a royal colony. Writing to the new Governor of Pennsylvania Robert Hunter Morris, a group of "German Protestants, Freeholders and Inhabitants" from

¹⁷⁶ Mark Häberlein, *The Practice of Pluralism: Congressional Life and Religious Diversity in Lancaster, Pennsylvania. 1730-1820*, (University Park, The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2009): 181-188.

Philadelphia County, had already claimed in 1754 they were acting on “Behalf of themselves and their Countrymen” in conveying their feelings towards Pennsylvania.¹⁷⁷ They wrote this letter in response to Benjamin Franklin’s concerns. Franklin had worried that the German-speakers in Pennsylvania would ultimately align with the French during the Seven Years’ War. This was particularly concerning to Franklin because the high numbers of German-speakers in Pennsylvania could form a significant voting bloc.¹⁷⁸ Franklin’s writings prompted these German-speakers to write a letter to the Governor. Through the examination of the signers of the documents, one can determine that they were members of the Reformed Church. Michael Schlatter was the eminent pastor of the Reformed Church in southeastern Pennsylvania. His friend and clerical colleague Heinrich Mühlenberg also signed. They expressly indicated that Franklin’s worries about their loyalty prompted this letter of support: “It might be possible that this our due Address would have also been intermitted at this time by reasons aforesaid...had not some Spirit...accused us very publickly both here and in England, of a secret Conspirace against our King and Government, which is no small Matter to Charge a Body of People with.”¹⁷⁹

The writers’ charge that Franklin had indicted an entire “body of people,” hence all Germans, deserves a brief examination. Franklin had failed in his first attempt to publish a German-language newspaper in the early 1730s since he did not have access to the correct fonts to replicate Gothic script. In his own increasingly prominent role as a lobbyist and someone who favored royal colonies, he became increasingly exasperated with the German-speakers who showed no interest in such schemes. Ultimately, his proposal to change the colony’s charter failed largely because of the German-speakers. This frustration caused Franklin and others to see

¹⁷⁷ “Address from the German Protestants–1754” in *Pennsylvania Archives: Second Series II*, (Harrisburg: Clarence M. Busch, 1896): 590.

¹⁷⁸ Frantz, “Franklin and the Pennsylvania German,” 23-25.

¹⁷⁹ “Address from the German Protestants–1754” in *Pennsylvania Archives*, 592.

the entire German-speaking population as one, completely ignoring the differences among the Church Germans and the Peace Church members.¹⁸⁰

If one examines the German-speakers' own arguments as to why they supported the maintaining the colonial structure, one discovers their preference for retaining the original Charter given to William Penn. The charter was equally important for their reasons to support the Crown during the Revolution. In the letter to Governor Morris, the writers explain, "Being very sensible of the Privileges and liberties we enjoy under the excellent Constitution of a British Government, we know very well that we cannot give a sufficient thanks to the Almighty for having conveyed us into such a Country and under so mild a Government, where the best Privileges in the known world are established."¹⁸¹ They also explained that William Penn and his family "hath Drawn Affection of a considerable number of Germans oppressed by arbitrary Powers and Slavery to transport themselves hither."¹⁸² In these letters, the German-speakers made it clear that they were loyal to the colony, as it afforded privileges that they knew they were not afforded elsewhere.

The high concentration of German-speakers in Pennsylvania, as opposed to other colonies, was not a coincidence; William Penn's "Holy Experiment" had offered them a home with low taxes and freedom of worship. Before the war Pennsylvania's legislature was controlled by Quakers.¹⁸³ The Quakers' practiced pacifism and refusal to create a militia led to many difficulties during the French and Indian War. Between the lack of experience in raising troops, and disputes about the proper way to amass funds, Pennsylvania spent months during the war

¹⁸⁰ Dietmar Rothermund, "The German Problem of Colonial Pennsylvania," *The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 84 (1960): 6.

¹⁸¹ "Address from the German Protestants-1754" in *Pennsylvania Archives*, 591.

¹⁸² "Address from the German Protestants-1754" in *Pennsylvania Archives*, 591.

¹⁸³ Frantz, "Franklin and the Pennsylvania German," 23.

without a militia. Indians began raiding the frontier, culminating in protests by those on the frontier who were unprotected.¹⁸⁴ German-speakers were just one of the many groups who demanded the Quaker-dominated government protect them. Franklin and Johann Conrad Weiser, a German Lutheran who acted as the colony's official translator and emissary during the war, began building forts to protect from Indian raids. Although the forts helped, Indians still periodically raided the frontier.¹⁸⁵

Even considering the failure of the government to protect the frontiersmen, German-speakers still supported the colonial government. This was most apparent in the election of 1764. Benjamin Franklin ran for reelection to the Pennsylvania General Assembly in 1764, and ultimately lost. German-speakers were credited for Franklin's defeat.¹⁸⁶ This election is critical to understanding why German-speakers were hesitant to support the Revolutionary cause a decade later. Pennsylvanians had repeatedly elected Franklin in the years before his loss, but after spending time in England, and as he built his career as a lobbyist for various colonies, Franklin decided to run on another platform. While in England, Franklin discovered a movement to remove the Penn family from Pennsylvania, and establish it as a royal colony. When he returned to the colony, he began to campaign on that platform. He joined forces with Joseph Galloway and ran on an "anti-proprietary" platform, which contrasted themselves to the proprietary government.¹⁸⁷ This platform proved to be a political miscalculation. When considering the two platforms, voters considered a few factors. First, the governors of

¹⁸⁴ Matthew C. Ward, "An Army of Servants: The Pennsylvania Regiment during the Seven Years War," *The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 199 (1995): 76-77.

¹⁸⁵ Frantz, "Franklin and the Pennsylvania German," 26-27.

¹⁸⁶ J. Philip Gleason, "A Scurrilous Colonial Election and Franklin's Reputation," *The William and Mary Quarterly* 18 (1961): 81.

¹⁸⁷ Glenn Weaver, "Benjamin Franklin and the Pennsylvania Germans," *The William and Mary Quarterly* 14 (1957): 549.

Pennsylvania, under direction from the Penns, were advised to oppose taxation of land owned by the Proprietors.¹⁸⁸ Franklin, on the other hand, had proposed tax increases before; German-speakers were thankful the Pennsylvania Assembly had rejected Franklin's Albany Plan in 1754 because it called for taxation.¹⁸⁹ It appears there was an economic rationale for the German-speakers who wished to maintain the status quo that had historically meant no taxes and no militia service. Franklin's call to change the status of the colony threatened a radical governmental change, with inevitable consequences they would dislike: militia service and taxation. The German-speakers' support of the proprietary government indicates they were determined to retain the government that was in place, and the economic benefits and religious freedoms they had always enjoyed under it.

Franklin's miscalculation cost him the election and the fact that the German-speakers had always aligned with the Proprietary government gives insight into what values the German-speakers held, regardless of whether they were German Lutheran and Reformed, or members of the Peace Churches. Especially with regard to the German-speakers who did not belong to the Peace Churches, it is significant that they remained loyal to the Proprietary government. During the raids by Indians, the Reformed and Lutheran German-speakers continued to support the Proprietary Party instead of other parties who offered to defend the borders, even though these groups lacked a commitment to pacifism.¹⁹⁰ Decades of commitment to the status quo suggests the German-speakers felt the government, as it stood, was the most suitable version of government for them.

¹⁸⁸ Gleason, "A Scurrilous Colonial Election," 71.

¹⁸⁹ Weaver, "Benjamin Franklin and the Pennsylvania Germans," 542.

¹⁹⁰ Rothermund, "The German Problem of Colonial Pennsylvania," 6.

Factors influenced German-speakers to vote in the manner they did during the elections in 1764. The one of most consequence was Franklin's insulting ethnic remarks about German-speakers. Franklin had written his "Observations Concerning the Increase of Mankind, Peopling of Countries, Etc." for the *Gentleman's Magazine* in November 1755. The essay resurfaced thanks to the Proprietary party during the 1764 election, hurting Franklin's campaign. In his "Observations," Franklin wrote "why should the *Palatine Boors* be suffered to swarm into our settlements, and by exclusion of ours? Why should *Pennsylvania*, founded by the *English*, become a colony of *Aliens*, who will shortly be so numerous as to Germanize us."¹⁹¹ These remarks angered German-speakers. Some scholars have pointed to this document as the reason Franklin lost the German-speakers' votes.¹⁹² But it is also possible to argue that the German-speakers supported the Proprietary party because they believed that maintaining that government was in their best interest. This interpretation fits with their longstanding support of the Penn family and the original Charter, even when other parties offered promises, especially royal, and military protection. Thus, given the fact that German-speakers—both Church Germans and the Peace Church members—had long supported the Pennsylvania colonial form of government, even when it failed them, it is reasonable to conclude that for many of them, those same motivating factors persisted a decade later during the Revolution.

For German-speakers in Pennsylvania, reasons peculiar to that colony's history accounted for their loyalty. In the case of the Peace Churches, who are best described as neutral participants in the Revolution; there was a religious basis for their neutrality, which centered on a deeply rooted belief that warfare is incompatible with Christian belief and practice. Some among

¹⁹¹ Benjamin Franklin, *Observation Concerning the Increase of Mankind, Peopling of Countries, Etc.*, (Boston: S. Kneeland, 1755): 10.

¹⁹² For example, see Glenn Weaver, "Benjamin Franklin and the Pennsylvania Germans," 550.

the Church Germans also held to a religious belief that caused them to declare loyalty. Older Lutherans and Reformed German-speakers understood Romans 13 as teaching that princes and kings were God's appointed means of exercising one kind of authority in the world, and thus they concluded rebellion against a King constituted rebellion against God. Yet, it was not simply religious teaching that influenced the German-speakers' loyalty. German-speakers had already resisted changing the governmental structure of Pennsylvania. The colony had granted them freedom of conscience, freedom from militia service, and taxes; all of which were important considerations. The German-speakers' previous actions indicate that they were unwilling in most situations to change the colonial status of Pennsylvania from Proprietary to royal, even if there existed unsatisfactory laws.

As in the cases of New York and North Carolina, Pennsylvania non-English loyalists demonstrated that there were serious reasons for non-English speakers to remain loyal—or neutral rather than to support a Revolution they regarded as radical. Although Pennsylvania shows there were culturally specific reasons that influenced their loyalty – religion – a related theme centered around the fear of social, economic, and military consequences of changing one's government. It appears that for many non-English loyalists, the consequences of that shift posed graver threats than the promised benefits. They had not felt dissatisfaction with the Proprietary governance of their colony under British rule; for both Peace Church Germans, and for older clergy and laity among the Reformed and Lutherans, the call to an even more radical change in the way political authority in the world was not now to be exercised proved to be too threatening and inconsistent with their inherited beliefs and practices.

Chapter 5

Conclusion

The story of the American Revolution is not a dichotomy between patriots and loyalists, and loyalists were not comprised solely of wealthy people who feared losing their power. Instead, those who experienced the Revolution maintained a variety of stances, with a multitude of reasons for their position. Although this thesis examined people who lived in different colonies, with a variety of environments, and came from different ethnic groups, common themes appeared that explained their loyalty. In each colony there existed reasons for loyalty specific to that region, and each person had their personal motivations as well. But, the commonality between populations in these three colonies is striking and insightful to the perception of the Revolution.

One reoccurring event that influenced loyalists in their decision was intimidation. These non-English loyalists all experienced intimidation by patriots in some capacity, which often soured them to revolutionaries' cause. The patriots were able to punish those who remained neutral or loyal to the Crown; in North Carolina they imposed economic embargos, in Pennsylvania those who refused to take the oath were unable to access jobs and the courts, and in New York threats of mob violence was frightful proposition. Certainly those punitive measures affected how these groups viewed the revolutionaries, and often such tactics backfired on the revolutionaries, as it pushed neutral parties towards loyalism.

The non-English loyalists examined were considered middling-class individuals, and thus existed in the economic margin: not extraordinarily poor, but not wealthy enough to always

ensure a comfortable financial position. For that reason, economic factors played a role in their choice. Unlike the more well-known wealthy loyalists, their economic considerations did not revolve around loss of landed estates, they contemplated the poverty that might befall them if the revolutionaries lost. For the non-English loyalists in each colony, that economic fear manifested itself differently. Middling-class merchants in New York City feared trade disruption and inflation, German-speakers in Pennsylvania worried that a new government would result in taxes.

The importance of studying these commonalities between populations for loyalty is it illuminates how they experienced the American Revolution. Historical hindsight grants the American Revolution a relatively tame reputation: the Revolution was successful and the government formed from the event persists to this day. A comparison with the French Revolution less than decade later further colors the American Revolution as calm – or at least as calm as a revolution can be. Yet, for those living through it, the American Revolution was far from a mild revolution. It was a radical shift in governmental and societal structure, hence why middling class colonists supported the British. Conceivably, under a new governmental system, those in the middling class could improve their lifestyles, where as under the current system they would likely maintain the same status. But, as they understood it, likely they would only hurt their status under the revolutionaries' new system, thus remained content with the British's current system. The concerns expressed by non-English loyalists indicate that they believed the latter outcome as the more likely one. Harassment by patriots and economic uncertainty motivated non-English loyalists to maintain their position, because these events indicated that society was shifting, and not in a favorable manner.

The American Revolution is a radical event, and in order to fully understand and study it, the radical nature must be accounted for. Through examination of non-English loyalists, it is possible to recreate the environment they faced. It was an environment of uncertainty and fear, where the future was ambiguous, as the revolutionaries called for changes in the government that would radically shift the society the non-English colonists lived in. Non-English loyalty is perplexing at initial glance, but understanding the radical nature of the Revolution, explains why they were compelled to maintain loyalty towards the Crown.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- “Address from the German Protestants–1754.” In *Pennsylvania Archives: Second Series II*. Harrisburg: Clarence M. Busch, 1896.
- Bartlett, John Russell. *Dictionary of Americanisms. A Glossary of words and phrases usually Regarded as Peculiar to the United States*. New York: Bartlett and Welford, 1848.
- Bonomi, Patricia. *A Factious People: Politics and Society in Colonial New York*. New York: Cornell University Press, 1971.
- . *Under the Cope of Heaven: Religion, Society, and Politics in Colonial America*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- Brodhead, John Romeyn. *Documents Relative to the Colonial History of the State of New-York*, “Governor Clinton to the Lords of Trade, 22 June 1747.” Albany: Weeds, Parson, 1853.
- Buchnea, Emily. “Transatlantic Transformations: Visualizing Change Over Time in the Liverpool–New York Trade Network, 1763–1833.” *Enterprise and Society* 15 (2014).
- Burkholder, Jared S. “Neither ‘Kriegerisch’ nor ‘Quäkerisch’: Moravians and the Question of Violence in Eighteenth-Century Pennsylvania.” *Journal of Moravian History* 12 (2012).
- Cash, Arthur H. *John Wilkes: The Scandalous Father of Civil Liberty*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2006
- Campbell of Airds, Alastair. *A History of the Clan Campbell: From the Restoration to the Present Day*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2004.
- Chopra, Ruma. *Unnatural Rebellion: Loyalists in New York City during the Revolution*. Virginia: University of Virginia, 2013.
- “Documents Relative to the Colonial History of the State of New York.” Albany: Weed, Parsons and Company, 1857.
- Dippel, Horst. *Germany and the American Revolution, 1770-1800: A Sociohistorical Investigation of Late Eighteenth-century Political Thinking*. Chapel Hill: Institute of Early American History and Culture by the University of North Carolina Press, 1977.
- Dziennik, Matthew P. "Through an Imperial Prism: Land, Liberty, and Highland Loyalism in the War of American Independence." *The Journal of British Studies* 50 (2011).
- Encyclopædia Britannica Online, s. v. "Townshend Acts," <http://www.britannica.com/event/Townshend-Acts>.
- Franklin, Benjamin. *Observation Concerning the Increase of Mankind, Peopling of Countries, Etc*. Boston: S. Kneeland, 1755.
- Frantz, John B. “Franklin and the Pennsylvania German.” *Pennsylvania History: A Journal of Mid-Atlantic Studies* 65 (1998).
- Frost, J. William. *A Perfect Freedom, Religious Liberty in Pennsylvania*. University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1990.
- Gardiner, Richard. “The Presbyterian Rebellion.” *Journal of American Revolution* (2013).
- George the Third of the United Kingdom, “The Royal Proclamation - October 7, 1763.” The Avalon Project, Yale Law School.

- Gilbert, Daniel R. "Bethlehem and the American Revolution." *Transaction of the Moravian Historical Society* 23 (1977).
- Gilje, Paul A. *The Road to Mobocracy: Popular Disorder in New York City*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1987.
- Gleason, J. Philip. "A Scurrilous Colonial Election and Franklin's Reputation." *The William and Mary Quarterly* 18 (1961).
- Greenberg, Douglas. *Crime and Law Enforcement in the Colony of New York: 1691-1776*. New York: Cornell University Press.
- Gruber, Ira D. *The Howe Brothers and the American Revolution*. New York: Institute of Early American History and Culture, 1972.
- Häberlein, Mark. *The Practice of Pluralism: Congressional Life and Religious Diversity in Lancaster, Pennsylvania. 1730-1820*. University Park, The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2009.
- Heaton, Charles. "The Failure of Enlightenment Military Doctrine in Revolutionary America: The Piedmont Campaign and the Fate of the British Army in the Lower South." *North Carolina Historical Review* 87 (2010).
- Heinrichs, Johann. "Extracts from the Letter-book of Captain Johann Heinrichs of the Hessian Jäger Corps, 1778-1780." *The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 22 (1898).
- Ireland, Owen S. "The Ethnic-Religious Dimension of Pennsylvania Politics, 1778-1779." *The William and Mary Quarterly* 30 (1973).
- Jasanoff, Maya. *Liberty's Exiles: American Loyalists in the Revolutionary World*. New York, New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2011. PDF e-book.
- Kammen, Michael. *Colonial New York*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1975.
- Kramer, Leonard J. "Presbyterians Approach the American Revolution." *The Journal of Presbyterian Historical Society* 31 (1953).
- "Presbyterians Approach the American Revolution (Concluded)." *The Journal of Presbyterian Historical Society* 31 (1953).
- Landsman, Ned C. "Nations, Migration, and the Province of the First British Empire: Scotland and the Americas, 1600-1800." *The American Historical Review* 104 (1999).
- Legge, William. "Letter from William Legge, Earl of Dartmouth to Josiah Martin." Reprinted from B.P.R.O. Am. & W. Ind.: No. Carolina. Vol. 222. Documenting the American South. University Library, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 2004.
- Lengel, Edward G. "Southern Showdown," *American History* 50 (2015).
- "Letter from an inhabitant of North Carolina [Extract]" 10 March 1776. Reprinted from *Jones' Defence of North Carolina*. P. 342. Documenting the American South. University Library, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 2004.
- Lloyd, Charles. *The Conduct Of The Late Administration Examined, With An Appendix, Containing Original And Authentic Documents*. Boston: Edes and Gill, 1767.
- Lynch, Jack. "Wilkes, Liberty, and Number 45." *Colonial Williamsburg* (2003).
- Martin, Josiah. "Letter from Josiah Martin to William Legge, Earl of Dartmouth [March 23, 1775]." Reprinted from B.P.R.O. Am. & W. Ind.: No. Carolina. Vol. 222. Documenting the American South. University Library, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 2004.
- "Letter from Josiah Martin to William Legge, Earl of Dartmouth [October 16, 1775]." Reprinted from B.P.R.O. Am. & W. Ind.: No. Carolina. Vol. 222. Documenting the

- American South. University Library, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 2004.
- "Letter from Josiah Martin to William Legge, Earl of Dartmouth [November 12, 1775]," Reprinted from *B.P.R.O. Am. & W. Ind.*: No. Carolina. Vol. 222. Documenting the American South. University Library, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 2004.
- Matson, Cathy. *Merchants and Empire: Trading in Colonial New York*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998.
- Minardi, Lisa. "Pastors & Patriots: the Mühlenberg Family and the War for American Independence." In Hermann Wellenreuther, Thomas-Müller Bahlke and A.G. Roeber, eds. *The Transatlantic World of Heinrich Melchior Mühlenberg in the Eighteenth Century*. Halle: Verlag der Franckeschen Stiftungen-Hassarowitz, 2013.
- Morris, Gouverneur. "Gouverneur Morris to John Penn" *American Archives*. Edited by M. St. Clair Clarke and Peter Force. 4th ser., 6 vols. Washington, D.C., 1837.
- Morgan, Edmund S., and Helen M. Morgan, *The Stamp Act Crisis: Prologue to Revolution* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1962
- Muhlenberg, Henry Melchior. *The Journals of Henry Melchior Muhlenberg*. Philadelphia: Evangelical Lutheran Ministerium of Pennsylvania and Adjacent States Journal, 1958.
- Murdoch, Alexander. "A Scottish Document Concerning Emigration to North Carolina in 1772." *North Carolina Historical Review* 67 (1990).
- North Carolina Provincial Congress. "Minutes of the Provincial Congress of North Carolina [April 03, 1775 - April 07, 1775]," Reprinted from MS. Records in Office of Secretary of State. Documenting the American South. University Library, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 2004.
- "Minutes of the Provincial Congress of North Carolina [August 20, 1775 - September 10, 1775]," Documenting the American South. University Library, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 2004
- Norton, Mary Beth. *The British-Americans: The Loyalist Exiles in England, 1774-1789*. Boston, Massachusetts: Little, Brown, 1972.
- Nelson, Eric. *The Royalist Revolution: Monarchy and the American Founding*. Cambridge: President and Fellows of Harvard College, 2014.
- Papas, Phillip. *That Ever Loyal Island: Staten Island and the American Revolution*. New York: New York University Press, 2009.
- Pennsylvania Packet, June 17, 1778
- Plank, Geoffrey Gilbert. *Rebellion and Savagery: The Jacobite Rising of 1745 and the British Empire*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006.
- Pollock, Anne. "Letter from Ann Pollock to Joseph Hewes," Documenting the American South. University Library, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 2004.
- Purviance, William. "Letter from William Purviance to the North Carolina Provincial Council [February 29, 1776]," Documenting the American South. University Library, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 2004.
- Rhoden, Nancy L. "Patriots, Villains, and the Quest for Liberty: How American Film Has Depicted the American Revolution." *Canadian Review of American Studies* 37 (2007).
- Rankin, Hugh "The Moore's Creek Bridge Campaign, 1776." *North Carolina Historical Review* 30 (1953).

- Roeber, A. Gregg. "Henry Miller's *Staatsbote*: A Revolutionary Journalist's Use of the Swiss Past." *Yearbook of German-American Studies* 25 (1990).
- , "Lutheranism in the Atlantic World in the Age of Revolutions." In Hermann Wellenreuther, Thomas-Müller Bahlke and A.G. Roeber, eds, *The Transatlantic World of Heinrich Melchior Mühlenberg in the Eighteenth Century*. Halle: Verlag der Franckeschen Stiftungen-Hassarowitz, 2013.
- , *Palatines, Liberty, and Property*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1998.
- Romans 13:1-2 21st Century King James Version
- Rothermund, Dietmar. "The German Problem of Colonial Pennsylvania." *The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 84 (1960).
- Rohbough, Faith E. "The Political Maturation of Henry Melchior Mühlenberg." *Lutheran Quarterly* 10 (1996).
- Sadlier, Sarah. "Prelude to the American Revolution? The War of Regulation: A Revolutionary Reaction for Reform." *History Teacher* 46 (2012).
- Smith, Barbara Clark. "The Adequate Revolution." *The William and Mary Quarterly* 51 (1994).
- Stievermann, Jan. "A 'Plain, Rejected Little Flock': The Politics of Martyrological Self-Fashioning among Pennsylvania's German Peace Churches, 1739-65." *The William and Mary Quarterly* 66 (2009).
- Szechi, Daniel. *1715: The Great Jacobite Rebellion*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2006.
- Tait, L. Gordon. "John Witherspoon and the Scottish Loyalists." *Journal of Presbyterian History* 61 (1983).
- Tiedmann, Joseph S. *Reluctant Revolutionaries: New York City and the Road to Independence, 1763-1776*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1997.
- United States Continental Congress, "Minutes of the Continental Congress [Extract]," Reprinted from the American Archives. Vol. 3. P. 1925. Documenting the American South. University Library, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 2004.
- Ward, Matthew C. "An Army of Servants: The Pennsylvania Regiment during the Seven Years War." *The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 199 (1995).
- Watson, Alan D. "The Committees of Safety and the Coming of the American Revolution in North Carolina, 1774-1776." *The North Carolina Historical Review* 73 (1996).
- Weaver, Glenn. "Benjamin Franklin and the Pennsylvania Germans." *The William and Mary Quarterly* 14 (1957).
- Wellenreuther, Hermann. *Citizens in a Strange Land: A Study of German-American Broadides and Their Meaning for Germans in North America, 1730-1830*. University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2013.
- , *The Revolution of The People: Thoughts and Documents on the Revolutionary Process in North America 1774-1776*. Göttingen: University of Göttingen, 2006.
- Wilmington Committee of Safety. "Minutes of the Wilmington Committee of Safety [July 20, 1775 - July 21, 1775]," Reprinted from MS. Records in Office of Secretary of State. Documenting the American South. University Library, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 2004
- Witherspoon, John. *The Dominion of Providence over the Passions of Men a Sermon Preached at Princeton, on the 17th of May, 1776. Being the General Fast Appointed by the Congress through the United Colonies: To Which Is Added, an Address to the Natives of Scotland Residing in America*. Philadelphia Printed: Sold by the Booksellers in Town and Country, 1777.

- Wokeck, Marianne S. *Trade in Strangers: The Beginnings of Mass Migration to North America*,. University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2003.
- Wood, Gordon S. "Equality and Social Conflict in the American Revolution." *The William and Mary Quarterly* 51 (1994).
- . *The American Revolution: A History*. New York: Modern Library, 2003.
- . "The Problem of Sovereignty." *The William and Mary Quarterly* 68 (2011).
- . *The Radicalism of the American Revolution*. New York: A.A. Knopf, 1992.
- Zabin, Serena R. *The New York Conspiracy Trials of 1741*. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin, 2004.
- Zuckerman, Michael. "Rhetoric, Reality, and the Revolution: The Genteel Radicalism of Gordon Wood." *The William and Mary Quarterly* 51 (1994).

ACADEMIC VITA

Academic Vita of Jule Walsh jule.walsh9@gmail.com

Education

The Pennsylvania State University, Schreyer Honors College	May 2016
Bachelor of Arts in History	
Bachelor of Arts in Anthropology	
Bachelor of Arts in Political Science	
Minor in Business and the Liberal Arts	
Thesis: "Non-English Loyalists in the Revolutionary War: Reasons and Motivation for Loyalty"	April 2016

Work Experience

The Schreyer Honors College	2014 – Present
------------------------------------	-----------------------

Career Services Intern

- Organized, planned, and executed six events with alumni
- Collaborated with other interns in creating an externship program for 50 scholars
- Screened student applications for mentorship program, and matched students with alumni

The Office of Senator Robert P. Casey	May 2015 – August 2015
--	-------------------------------

Regional Office Intern

- Interacted with constituents who required the help of Constituent Services
- Liaised with the Senator's scheduler to update constituents on scheduling requests
- Informed constituents of the Senator's position on a range of issues and updated database with their opinions and concerns

Paradise Stream Resort	2010 – Present
-------------------------------	-----------------------

Food and Beverage Server

- Worked to ensure a pleasing experience for guests
- Developed and used conflict resolution and customer service skills when dealing with unsatisfied guests
- Trained 20 new employees on dining room procedures

Leadership Experience

Penn State Dance Marathon (THON) Communications Captain	2015 – Present
--	-----------------------

General Organization Liaison

- Aided THON's mission by educating and inspiring student volunteers while serving as a liaison to 45 organizations
- Met with individual organizations, facilitated fundraising seminars, and kept in contact with all organizations through timely communication
- Directed committee members at various THON events

Schreyer Honors Student Council	2014 – 2015
--	--------------------

THON Chair

- Planned fundraising excursions, executed fundraising events, and kept detailed financial records
- In coordination with 15 volunteers, raised approximately \$12k the Four Diamonds
- Provided direction, delegated tasks, and monitored a team of student volunteers

Activities

Dancer Relations Committee Member **2013 – 2015**

- Committee members are assigned a dancer, who they must support throughout the entire 46 hours of THON Weekend
- Positions held within the committee
 - Random Events Coordinator 2014 – 2015
 - Dancer Registration Coordinator 2013 – 2014

Liberal Arts Envoy **2013 – 2015**

Secretary 2014 – 2015

- Distributed meeting minutes to members in a timely fashion
- Attended events as a representative of the executive board
- Accompanied new members on alumni and prospective student tours
- Spoke at Accepted Student Days

Liberal Arts Undergraduate Council **2013 – 2015**

- Helped staff events that were organized by the College of the Liberal Arts
- Represented Liberal Arts Envoys at weekly meetings

Fellowships

Malini Foundation Social Entrepreneurship and Cultural Immersion Fellow **Summer 2014**

- Fellowship focused on instilling critical problem solving, analytical, and entrepreneurial skills through multidisciplinary engagement
- Participated in field experiences and discussions with social entrepreneurs during a ten day trip to Sri Lanka
- Fellowship concentrated on dialogues about sustainable non-profit organizations

Paterno Fellow **2012 - Present**

- Fellowship requirements are to graduate with a minimum of two fields of study, develop leadership ability, execute independent research, and gain a global perspective

Honors and Awards

Phi Beta Kappa

Dean's List **All Semesters**

The Reverend Thomas Bermingham, S.J. Scholarship in the Classics **April 2014**

Lori E. Master Director's Fund in the Jewish Studies Program Award **April 2014**

The President Sparks Award **March 2014**

The President's Freshman Award **April 2013**

Atherton Society Brunch Student Speaker **October 4, 2015**

History Department Student Marshall **May 7, 2016**