"all that her Sex would permit her to do..."

Loyalist Women and their Claims

During

The American Revolution

by

Marcelle R. Wilson

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

for the Degree of

Master of Arts

in the

History

Program

Youngstown State University

June, 1996

"all that her Sex would permit her to do..."

Loyalist Women and their Claims

During

The American Revolution

by

Marcelle R. Wilson

I hereby release this thesis to the public. I understand this thesis will be housed at the Circulation Desk of the University library and will be available for public access. I also authorize the University or other individuals to make copies of this thesis as needed for scholarly research.

Signature:

Marcelle R. Wilson May 30, 1996
Student Date

Approvals:

[signature] May 30, 1996
Thesis Advisor Date

Lowell J. Satre May 30, 1996
Committee Member Date

Frederick Blue May 30, 1996
Committee Member Date

[signature] June 3, 1996
Dean of Graduate Studies Date

ABSTRACT

The American Revolution was a crucial time in American history. It caused people to question the very nature of their political existence and doubt England's motives toward the colonies. Men and their roles and actions during this time are addressed in numerous books and accounts, while the roles women played, especially loyalist women, in the American Revolution are, to some extent, ignored or overlooked.

An examination of claims filed by women loyalists, often the wives, widows, and daughters of male loyalists gives us a true and accurate picture of women in the colonial era. Using contextual analysis to study women's claims from several colonies provides a general, as well as specific portrait of women's lives during the War for Independence. This thesis will examine fifty-nine claims filed by loyalist women. It is broken down into six parts which examine the women and their claims. It will focus on the items women claimed, colonies they came from, and the compensation the received from the British Government and the areas they settled after the war. This thesis is based on primary and secondary sources which are outlined in the select bibliography.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

THOSE WHO REMAINED LOYAL

The American Revolution was a turning point in American history. This war was the beginning of the end of British rule in North America. The colonies rebelled against the "mother country" in a desire to establish a free and independent government. The war for independence not only pitted the colonies against Great Britain, but it also matched colonist against colonist, brother against brother and, sometimes even husband against wife, in a struggle to make sense of the turmoil and upheaval which plagued this country. Some colonists chose loyalty to Great Britain over any desire to become independent. The men and women labeled loyalist or Tory "were those colonists who sooner or later opposed independence and favored reconciliation with Great Britain."[1] The choice to support Great Britain did not indicate that the loyalists agreed with all of Parliament's policies and legislation; it only signified their acknowledgment of its (Parliament's) right to tax and legislate colonial matters. Prior to 1773, most, if not all colonists were loyal and did not consider a break with Great Britain. Legislation and taxation, such as the Stamp Act and the Intolerable Acts, which colonists perceived as unfair initiated a split between those who wanted change and those who did not.

The colonists most likely to remain loyal included recent English, Scottish and German immigrants and cultural minorities such as Indians and African-Americans who sided with the British.[2] The immigrants "felt gratitude to the British Government, which

---

[1]Wallace Brown, The Good Americans: Loyalists in the American Revolution (New York, William Morrow and Company, Inc., 1969): 29.
[2]Ibid. : 45-49.

had sometimes paid their passage and granted them title to land that they now feared to lose."[3] Slaves, who joined the British, did so partly because of the opportunity of gaining freedom. Some colonists signed oaths of loyalty to the side which had the most to offer in the form of aid, protection and chance of victory. Others were forced to sign oaths in order to avoid confiscation of their land, imprisonment and even execution at the hands of angry mobs. The colonists did not necessarily agree with the oaths; they did whatever was necessary to survive.

Loyalists did not always agree with laws passed by Parliament, but they "were captivated by the ideal of the British Empire and by the theory of how British institutions should operate."[4] They advocated change and reform of the existing system which they believed would ultimately benefit Great Britain and the colonies. Loyalists saw "British ignorance of colonial conditions and lack of concern for American interests...[as the]...key deficiencies which had to be overcome if the empire was to survive."[5] This did not occur, and after the war began, many loyalists fled to Great Britain, Canada, the West Indies, and Nova Scotia in anticipation of Britain's victory over the rebellious colonies.

Punishments such as imprisonment, confiscation of land, tar and feathering, branding and even execution often inflicted on loyalists by the rebels made exile an attractive idea. Many loyalists fled to Great Britain or other areas such as Canada, Ireland, or Nova Scotia to avoid mob violence. Once in exile, the loyalists were surprised at the differences they found. Great Britain was a foreign land for many who had called it home but were not born there. Many of the British people were not supportive of the war

---

[3]Ibid.: 46-49.
[4]Janice Potter, The Liberty We Seek: Loyalist Ideology in Colonial New York and Massachusetts (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1983) : 153.
[5]Ibid.: 157.

with the colonies and did not like the loyalists who added to the competition for work. Loyalists typically had few friends in England and many longed to return to their homes in the colonies. They saw their exile as temporary, and believed they would go home as soon as Britain won the war. When the rebels won and a peace treaty was signed, the loyalists faced the dismal reality that England would be their permanent home. Fortunately, the British Government set up a Claims Commission in order to compensate loyalists for their sacrifices and material losses during the war.

The Claims Commission was comprised of five men who were members of the Board of Trade. Parliament passed a law late in July, 1783 which provided monitary compensation to loyalists and refugees. A five man commission was created to delve into the loyalists schedules of losses. The Prime Minister, Lord Shelbourne, appointed J. Eardley Wilmot, Daniel Parker Coke, Colonel Robert Kingston, Colonel Thomas Dundas, and Mr. John Marsh to the Commission. These men had varied backgrounds and experiences which uniquely qualified them for position on this delegation.[6] J. Eardley Wilmot and Daniel Parker Coke had been independent members of Parliament, were well educated, and of the elite class in England. Both men requested that they not be paid for their work in an effort to avoid the appearance of receiving a "ministerial job" or "being under ministerial influence". Coke was a trained lawyer whose ability to contemplate the individual merits of each claim greatly benefited the Commission.[7] Colonels Robert Kingston and Thomas Dundas had served in the British military and fought against the rebels in America. These two men had first-hand experience of conditions in America.

---

[6]Mary Beth Norton, The British Americans: the Loyalist Exiles in England, 1774-1789 (Boston, Little and Brown, 1972) : 192.

[7]Hugh Edward Egerton, editor. Mass Violence in America: The Royal Commission on the Losses and Service of American Loyalists 1783 to 1785. (New York, Arno Press and The New York Times, 1969): xxxii.

John Marsh had been "...an experienced civil servant..." in Britain and was able to lend his familiarity with government policies and procedures to the Commission. These men were directed to review and investigate claims of loyal Americans. They were appointed for a two-year-term, but the immensity of reviewing (and sometimes re-reviewing) some 3,000 petitions took the Commission six years to complete.[8] This Commission set guidelines for a loyalist's eligibility to receive recompense. Claimants were divided into six classifications: "those who had performed exceptional service on behalf of Great Britain,...those who had borne [sic] arms against the Revolution,...uniformed loyalists,...loyalists resident in Great Britain,...those who took the oath of allegiance to the Americans but afterwards joined the British...and those who bore arms for the Americans, but afterwards joined the British forces."[9] These classifications helped the Commissioners determine the extent of a loyalist's fealty to the British cause and his aid in the war against the rebels. The Commission also classified types of damages admissible for compensation: "the only losses considered legitimate were quite rigidly defined--for example, damage by British troops, the loss of escaped slaves, trading set-backs attributed simply to the dislocation caused by the Revolution, ...property owned at the beginning of the war and lost directly through loyalty, the loss of salaries for royal offices, and loss of professional income were allowed."[10] Claims for unrecovered debts, damage done by Indians and other claims for losses were disallowed.

The Commission was very thorough in its investigation of any and all claims. The Claims Commission interviewed witnesses and claimants. Important evidence needed to prove the validity of their claims and claimants provided items such as deeds, titles, bills of

---

[8]Norton: 192.
[9]Egerton : xxxvi.
[10] Brown: 181.

sale, mortgage records and proof of property confiscation and any letters of reference stating the claimant's honesty and good character. Very few loyalists made fraudulent claims due to the numerous experts, witnesses and background information the Commissioners had gathered. The Commission aimed to "establish what had been lost specifically by loyalty and then come to a fair appraisal of the cash sum--thus the Commissioners had to be familiar with the differing values of the various colonial currencies, and had to be able to appraise everything from, say a brass bedstead in Boston to thousands of acres of frontiers land in Pennsylvania to a town house on Broadway in New York."[11] Loyalists never received the full amount of their losses. Generally the compensation was less than half the actual value of the claim and was usually paid in small, yearly stipends. These stipends were customarily a token payment and many loyalists were left destitute in a strange country, with few friends or connections to help them find inexpensive accommodations and some form of work.

As a source of information, the memorials or claims prove to be bountiful and confounding. The source is munificent in its seemingly unlimited information and raw data, but does contain multifarious difficulties for today's researcher. The Public Records of Great Britain are an eighteenth century document that have some inherent eighteenth century quirks. First and foremost, all one-hundred and some odd volumes of claims were hand-written by various clerks. It was mercifully transferred to microfilm to preserve it for future generations and to make it accessible to the general public. Unfortunately some of the claims (prior to being put on microfilm) were damaged. Water, the ravages of time and other occurrences such as mold and mildew have blurred or destroyed parts of the text, making certain claims unreadable. The idiosyncrasies of eighteenth century language,

---

[11]Ibid.: 183.

while quaint, tend to perplex unaccustomed and unsuspecting readers. Throughout the claims and even within the same document the spelling of names and words is erratic, unusual abbreviations are employed, unclear terms and references are used and incomplete names are common. The claims did not always provide complete information. Often first names of both the claimant and or witnesses were omitted, addresses were not fully recorded, and filing dates were sometimes missing. Difficulties arise from the absence of spouses' names, amounts of estates, the number, age, sex, and names of children, and other facts which are periodically lacking. The failure to note a claimant's full name, destination (upon leaving the colonies), total amount of compensation awarded, status after resettlement, and the like, in this thesis, indicates the information is absent in the claims or has been obliterated due to water and other damage, and was not simply omitted by choice. This characteristic of the claims makes them challenging to work with. When available, full information concerning a claimant's name, losses and compensation are disclosed in this work. Where such information is lacking indicates its absence in the claim records. Fortunately, the claims were uniform in their format and tend to follow a routine pattern. This makes the claims easier to read and allows the exceptional and/or unusual cases to be more readily identifiable. It also suggests that these formal documents were solemnly submitted to the Commissioners after careful and often painstaking deliberation was given to them by the claimants. The Commission required that each claim be forwarded to them in quintuplicate. Claims which were accompanied with authenticating documentation such as deeds, bills of sale, letters of reference, and the like received a more favorable reception and the claimant's chance was better for receiving payment.[12] The format of the claim was simple and consisted of approximately eight parts. The first

---

[12]Norton: 197.

part of the claim was a statement of purpose; next was a"...declaration of unswerving eternal allegiance to Great Britain"; then a general description of losses, a plea and a detailed description of all losses followed by a total monetary amount of the claimant's loss.[13] Testimony from witnesses followed and the claimant usually included a sworn oath of truthfulness in relating his or her claim.

Determinations and decisions also followed an identifiable and somewhat predictable paradigm of approximately eight sections or parts. The decision stated the claimant's name, the date, and where they were from (in the colonies), restated the claim briefly and discussed proof or lack of proof of the refugee's loyalty to Great Britain. Next the determination of the Commission was listed, losses were noted and a conclusion of the evidence and its proof (or lack of proof) of losses was listed. This was followed by the claimant's present address, the amount (if any) of the stipend or allowance, and the date the payments were scheduled to begin. Payments could be immediate, retroactive up to a year, or delayed for six to twelve months, depending on the Commissioners' decisions.

An allowance was not awarded to every claimant. Some memorials were disallowed due to lack of evidence, unreliable and/or suspect witnesses, or failure to prove any substantial loss. While some claimants exaggerated the value they assigned to their land and possessions, few manufactured wholly false claims. In an effort to get better settlements and "to prevent mendacious rebel sympathizers from submitting successful claims" loyalists were honest about their schedule of losses and about informing on false and misleading testimony and illegitimate claims.[14] The loyalists also decreased the total amount of their own schedules in a naive belief or wish that the British Government would

---

[13]Ibid.: 198.
[14]Ibid.: 193-194.

grant them complete reparation of the reduced total.[15] Loyalist leaders banded together and compiled detailed instructions for refugees to follow when filling out memorials, hence their relative uniformity. They supplied the Claims Commissioners with lists of typical items and their values, land prices in each colony in America and the advice to "trust no one". They also provided the Commission with types of inquiries to help ferret out fallacious data. The loyalists believed if they were honest in their claims, eliminated fraud, and minimized the amount requested for compensation, they would receive better settlements.[16]

The loyalists misunderstood the purpose of the Claims Commission. Its goal was to award small stipends to loyal and deserving refugees for a limited time, until the refugees could return to their homes in America. After the defeat at Saratoga, the British Government and the loyalists began to realize the war would not end quickly and more permanent plans for their lives must be arranged.[17] What neither the British Government nor the refugees yet realized was that they would never be able to go home. This realization would not occur to many of them for a few more years.

An examination of claims filed by women loyalists, often the wives, widows, and daughters of male loyalists gives us a true and accurate picture of women in the colonial era. A contextual analysis of various women's claims from several colonies provides a general and specific picture of women's lives during the Revolutionary War. This thesis will examine fifty-nine claims filed by loyalist women. It is broken down into six parts which examine the women and their claims. The introduction broaches the topic and describes the types of people most likely to remain loyal to Great Britain. Chapters 1 - 3

---

[15]Ibid.: 193-194.
[16]Ibid.: 193-198.
[17]Ibid.: 122.

discuss the women, their claims,, their status, and experiences. Chapter 4 describes and recounts the stipends awarded. The concluding chapter sums up the claims and helps to illustrate many of the similarities and differences between the women. It illuminates the treatment and conditions these women bore because of their political decisions. It will focus on the items they claimed, colonies they came from, the compensation they received from the British Government and the areas they settled after the war. This study reveals the types of lives the women lived in the colonies and also illustrates the hardships they and their families endured throughout the war. Their claims describe their wealth, possessions and items which they considered important. The items claimed also represent the differences which existed among women of wealth, the middling sort and the poor. For the purpose of this examination, the claims have been divided into four categories. Merchant or middling class refers to claimants owning property, a home, a moderate amount of personal belongs and/or livestock. This group ranges from the upper middle ranks to the working ranks. These people were usually merchants, professionals and skilled workers. They possessed some education and needed to be employed to support themselves and their families. The term wealthy or elite applies to those claimants owning thousands of acres of land, one or more homes and in general having lengthy and detailed schedules of losses. These were people who were independently well off and did not need to work to earn a living. Lower class or poor applies to those claimants who owned little real or personal property, did not own their home and were semi-skilled or unskilled laborers. The final term "exceptional" refers to those women whose claims, professions and/or actions during the war were atypical of the larger society. This category includes women who owned their own business, performed heroic acts and suffered extreme punishments for their loyal stance. These four terms were devised by examining a combination of the women's former status (in the colonies), economic position, and losses

in comparison to each other. It is not as specific as might be desired, but it is more than adequate for the purpose of this study.

CHAPTER 1

THE MIDDLING SORT

Once the Claims Commission had reviewed a claim, compensation was awarded in many cases. Recompense, however, was not equitably and impartially granted to the refugees. Larger awards were habitually conferred on those loyalists who were former officials in the colonies, had friends or acquaintances in the British Government, or were friends or relations of wealthy and influential loyalists.[1] In the fifty-nine claims examined, fifty-six percent of the women were of the middling sort, twenty-seven percent of the women were considered wealthy, and seventeen percent were classified as poor. There were more claims filed by middling sort exiled women loyalists than by the wealthy and the poor. This fact indicates that the poor had little real or personal losses to declare, were less knowledgeable of their husbands'/fathers' possessions and their value, and did not have the documentation to provide as proof of their losses. Loyalists' claims varied from person to person and colony to colony, depending on the social and economic background of the claimant, and the types and extent of the losses. The first group of claimants examined represented the middling sort. The second is representative of wealthy women loyalists. The third section discusses the memorials of the poor and the fourth examines the exceptional or unusual claims found. This last section includes all of the women who were not typical or representative of colonial women of the time.

---

[1]Norton, Mary Beth, The British Americans: the Loyalist Exiles in England 1774-1789 (Boston, Little and Brown, 1972) : 58.

Although the claims of elite women were typical of their class, the claims from middle class women differ from their wealthy counterparts in the items claimed and professions they and their husbands held in the colonies prior to the war. Mary Kearsley, the widow of Dr. John Kearsley, lived in Philadelphia, prior to her escape to safety in England in October 1778. Trouble began for the Kearsley family in the fall of 1775. A violent band of rebels dragged Dr. Kearsley from his home in the middle of the night, severely beat him and injured his hand by piercing it with a bayonet. The rebels then paraded him throughout the town in the back of a wagon. After they let him go, Dr. Kearsley's health declined. One month later, the mob returned to the Kearsley residence and again seized the doctor. This time he was imprisoned, dying during his incarceration as result of harsh treatment by the rebels. His wife Mary and their five children fled to their house in the country, hoping for a respite from the fighting. Mrs. Kearsley took what belongings she could carry, but left much behind which was consequently seized by rebel forces. She noted the loss of the following in her claim: a house, main buildings and fences in Philadelphia worth four-hundred pounds, her husband's "library, medicines, surgeon instruments and fixtures in his surgery" (300 pounds), seven blood horses (278 pounds), four draft horses (fifty-five pounds), and a chariot horse (worth fifteen pounds).[2] Also listed as stolen were "...sundry implements of husbandry...fifty tons of hay...two hundred bushels of Indian corn...three-hundred bushels of wheat...twenty loads of straw...two hundred bushels of potatoes...[worth about 270 pounds, and] ...a barrell [sic] of flax."[3] Other items included in the claim were the house and furniture at Strawberry Hill (300 pounds), a winery (which, in actuality, turned out to be a vinegar distillery) and

---

[2]Public Records of Great Britain, Series 1, American Loyalist Claims 1776-1831 (Exchequer and Audit Department, 1972), vols. 38-42: 278.
[3]Ibid., vols. 38-42: 279.

various losses due to the illegal sale of the estate (valued at 800 pounds). Mrs. Kearsley also claimed the expenses incurred in her passage from the colonies to England (500 pounds).[4] Witnesses for Mrs. Kearsley were numerous. Robert Douglas, her son-in-law, generally supported her account, and Samuel Shoemaker, J. Kearsley and Charles Stedman (people who knew Mr. and Mrs. Kearsley and/or their property in America) all attested to Dr. Kearsley's loyalty and faithfulness to England during his lifetime. Alexander Middleton knew of the Kearsley's land and testified to the vast size of their plantation and its subsequent plunder by rebel troops. Mrs. Kearsley lost all of her possessions, two homes, her property and her husband. The precise detail of her account of losses signifies her awareness of her husband's possessions. It indicates Mrs. Kearsley's close involvement with her husband in the daily running and management of their household and plantation. The fear and violence the Kearsley family experienced was typical and is a recurrent theme throughout the claims.

Mary McAlpin, a loyalist from the province of New York, experienced an ordeal at the hands of the rebels prior to her journey to England. Mary's McAlpin's husband, Major McAlpin, was a loyal and staunch supporter of England during his lifetime. His continuous refusal to join rebel forces resulted in his imprisonment. Upon release, he joined a loyalist military group in Canada. His health was poor and he soon died leaving a wife and children in New York. Mary McAlpin, who remained on her farm, provided an abundance of aid to loyalists hiding in the woods on her property. She and her family were constantly harassed by rebels, who eventually ransacked her home, stole her belongings and placed Mary and her children in jail. In her claim to the British government, she listed the loss of "...six-thousand acres of land...an improved farm...six

---

[4]Ibid., vols. 38-42: 279.

hundred acres of improved land [valued at ten pounds per acre]...and three-hundred acres of unimproved land..." on the banks of Sara Lake (worth 150 pounds).[5] She included various farm animals such as hogs, sheep, horses and cattle (300 pounds), along with money, furniture, linen, grains and seeds, oil, tallow, leather and other supplies (worth 850 pounds). To support her claim, she provided letters from Generals Haldemand, Tryon, Burgoyne and Robertson, Captains Duncan and Freaser, and a Mr. Hoakesly which all attested to Mr. McAlpin's allegiance and assistance to the crown. Corroborating testimony from witnesses such as Captains Simeon and John Munro, Colonel Ebenezer Jessup, Majors Edward Jessup and Robert Mathews, General McLean, Reverend Munro, Samuel Gale and James Campbell attested to Mrs. McAlpin's truthfulness in relating her case. Her numerous losses show the McAlpin's holdings and position prior to the war. Fifteen men corroborated Mrs. McAlpin's account and verified her possessions in the colonies, giving the claim a truthful and reliable appearance.

Catherine Tweed, previously from Charles Town, South Carolina, lost her husband, William, due to his loyal actions during the war. William Tweed was originally from England. When war broke out in the colonies he refused to take the rebel oath and instead joined a loyalist army unit under the command of Colonel Campbell. He was eventually captured by rebel forces and hanged. His wife and three children were imprisoned and later sent into exile. Mrs. Tweed's losses were numerous: fifteen male and two female slaves (worth 1,700 pounds), 6,000 pounds in outstanding debts and loans due the Tweeds, the furniture and household implements from two houses (valued at 1,100 pounds), and 800 acres of land in Craven County worth 200 pounds. She also listed fees paid to a lawyer in South Carolina, jail fees and the loss of bonds and cash (500

---

[5]Ibid., vols. 43-47: 55.

pounds). Witnesses John Mills and George Davidson vouched for William Tweed's loyalty and character and supported the claims Mrs. Tweed listed. Catherine Tweed was a very wealthy middle class woman prior to the war. Due to her and her family's loyalty, she lost her husband, homes and possessions in addition to the debts owed to her husband.

The Howard family from North Carolina also suffered because of their support of England during the war. Mr. Howard was a faithful servant of the British cause and served as Chief Justice in Newburn, North Carolina until his death at the hands of rebels in that area. Mary Howard and her daughter fled to England fearing the loss of their lives as well. In her claim, Mrs. Howard asked for compensation for property in North Carolina (worth 3,000 pounds), goods and furniture lost or stolen and the salary from her husband's office worth 800 pounds a year.[6] Mary Howard's losses were substantial. She suffered the loss of her husband and all of her worldly possessions, which were numerous. She and her daughter escaped with their lives, but the fear which plagued them in the colonies would not be quickly forgotten, especially since it was compounded by the daily fear of how they would survive in a new country without any visible means of support.

Mary Farmar and her husband, Major Robert Farmar of the 34th regiment, were both originally from England. Mary Farmar filed a claim for herself and her three children after the death of her husband. She noted the loss of a vast estate in West Florida, where her house was destroyed during the defense of Fort Mobile. She also listed the loss of furniture, farming implements and crops worth 12,000 pounds.[7] Mary Farmar's claim was short and less detailed than many of the other middling sort claims. She noted the total worth of her and her husband's holdings in the colonies but was not very specific as to listing the exact items lost. She did not attach a value to each lost item, which was a

---

[6]Ibid., vols. 99-100: 13.
[7]Ibid., vols. 99-100: 20-21.

bit unusual. This indicates that Mrs. Farmar was not intimately involved in the daily business aspects of the estate and unaware of its value and worth. Mrs. Price, from New York, lost her husband, a surgeon for the 2nd Battalion of Royal Arms, during a battle at Bunker Hill. She lost three homes worth 800 pounds sterling, one in New York (left to her by her father) and two in the Jerseys, along with all the furnishings in them, and land at Brunswick in Jersey.[8] She received a pension of 16 pounds per year from her late husband's position as a surgeon and she subsidized her meager income by mending clothes. Although Mrs. Price claimed a fairly large amount of losses, she had little evidence to substantiate her case.

Mary Miller and her husband owned and operated a public house in Charles Town, South Carolina. Mr. R. Miller also piloted sailing vessels in the area, and often aided the British. He eventually became a prisoner of war and died in jail. Mrs. Miller, with her two small children, fled to safety in England and filed for reparation. Her losses included "...stock in trade, rum, gineva, wine, brandy, sugar, tea and coffee."[9] She also listed the debts owed to her husband by three boarders amounting to 100 pounds. Two witnesses, Robert Dee and Catharine Williamson, provided testimony to the respectable character of Mr. Miller, stating that he was a "loyal...sober and decent man.... ."[10] Mrs. Miller lost an annual income of approximately 120 pounds per year from her business and her husband's various jobs. She lost all of her possessions and was left alone in the world to care for her two children. It is unusual that Mrs. Miller's claim was so brief when comparing it to claims made by women in similar professions. It indicates that Mrs. Miller was less intimately involved with the business aspects of her and her husband's pub and boarding

---

[8]Ibid., vols. 99-100: 50.
[9]Ibid., vols. 48-50: 81.
[10]Ibid., vol. 48-50: 82.

house. Sarah Maitland claimed the loss of goods which her husband, Captain Maitland, had transported to Savannah and South Carolina. He was the Commander of a transport vessel and aided the British throughout the war. Captain Maitland was reported as ill-treated by the rebels and died in 1779. Mrs. Maitland believed that she was entitled to recompense for the loss of the income derived from the sale of those goods worth 1,000 pounds sterling.[11] Mrs. Maitland's case was not authenticated by witnesses or supporting documentation. Her description of losses was vague, and proof of loyalty, although stated, was not vehemently upheld. She did not provide a very strong case to the Commissioners.

Similarly Eleanor Maybee's husband, Peter Maybee, bore arms, fought and died for the British cause. Eleanor Maybee claimed the loss of 150 acres of property in Saratoga (New York) worth 1,160 pounds. The claim brought forth by Eleanor Maybee was not supported with documents or witnesses, like other claims had been. She did not provide letters of reference to confirm her husband's actions during the war or to her own losses. Compared to other claims, Mrs. Maybee's was flimsy. In a claim brought about by Elizabeth Smith, widow of Michael Smith (a Naval Officer and Sheriff of Beaufort and Controller of County Duties, in South Carolina) losses were minimal. Mrs. Smith, along with her three children, listed some currency, personal property (worth 1,600 pounds) and Michael Smith's salary of 600 pounds per year.[12] The lack of witnesses or a detailed list of lost and stolen items and personal articles makes Elizabeth Smith's petition, no matter how true, seem lacking truthfulness. Mary Hind's petition for compensation listed her husband's occupation in New Jersey as a jeweler. She stated that she lost a large tract of

---

[11]Ibid., vols. 51-54: 171.
[12]Ibid., vols. 99-100: 15.

land (28,000 acres) in New Jersey and some currency. Mrs. Hind was able to produce documentation to show her ownership of the lost land. Her documentation was very important to prove the veracity of her case. In an atmosphere of doubt and fraud, any type of corroborating evidence which sustained one's case was vital to the final decision of the commission.

Mrs. Lucy Necks, the widow of a Virginia merchant and trader, claimed the loss of stock for her husband's business totaling 7,000 pounds. Mrs. Necks' case was brief, less than half a page long. Her ambiguous losses were not sympathetically received because so many other claimants had prepared lengthy petitions fraught with proof to verify their lost property. Lack of a full and itemized claim showed Mrs. Neck's limited involvement with her husband's business. Mrs. Mary Sargent, whose late husband had been a clergyman in New England and a "...missionary from the Society for Propagation of the Gospel", claimed the loss of his income (worth 100 pounds per year), in addition to some land (worth 1,380 pounds sterling).[13] She had two young daughters to care for and produced a sworn statement from Lieutenant Governor Oliver, which attested to Mr. Sargent's "...loyalty and general character."[14] By providing a sworn statement from Lieutenant Governor Oliver which bore out her testimony of her husband's loyalty to Great Britain, Mrs. Sargent's case was greatly enhanced. This type of evidence was readily accepted and trusted by the Claims Commissioners. Mrs. Bowers, a loyalist widow from Newport, Rhode Island, was the wife of a merchant. Rebels confiscated or destroyed all of the Bowers' property, which consisted of: "...a house and land at Newport...warehouses...three or four-hundred pounds sterling...furniture...[and] dry

---

[13]Ibid., vols. 99-100: 47.
[14]Ibid., vols. 99-100: 47.

goods...[and]...wine in New York."[15] Mrs. Bowers case would have been more acceptable had it been fortified with eyewitness testimony, deeds, certificates and other proof. She might not have been able to give a complete description of all items lost, but certainly could have given a list of her personal and household effects which had been stolen by the rebels.

Mrs. Hutchinson, also a merchant's widow, had lived in Philadelphia, prior to her escape to England. Mr. Hutchinson was killed in 1775, and Mrs. Hutchinson carried on the business and provided goods and services to British forces until they evacuated Philadelphia. The Hutchinsons' owned no land, but "...lived handsomely", owning some slaves, a horse and carriage, and the various stock and goods involved in running a store. Colonel Balfour vouched for Mrs. Hutchinson's aid and support to English troops, and Mr. Banks (a witness) verified Mrs. Hutchinson's claims.[16]

A similar claim, presented by Mrs. Parker of Wilmington, North Carolina, told of her experiences, when she and her husband were local shopkeepers. After her husband's death, Mrs. Parker's shop was repeatedly looted by the rebels. She and her daughter were the targets of rebel violence because of their loyalty to Great Britain. Mrs. Parker, frustrated and fearful of escalating violence, sold the last of the shop's remaining goods to provide money for passage to England. She contended that her total losses were approximately 1,300 pounds (sterling). Living in Newhorn, North Carolina, Mr. and Mrs. Mackey supported themselves and their four children as bakers. They owned no land but did possess four slaves, material and utensils for the bakery (valued at 300 pounds) prior to Mr. Mackey's death and rebel confiscation of their personal property.[17] Although Mrs.

---

[15]Ibid., vols. 99-100: 48.
[16]Ibid., vols. 99-100: 56.
[17]Ibid., vols. 99-100: 84.

Hutchinson and Mrs. Parker were more affluent than Mrs. Mackey, these women all operated similar businesses. These businesses were profitable and allowed them a modicum of comfort. The fact that two of these three women owned slaves demonstrates their wealth and is an indicator of the women's desire to have help in their businesses and improve them rather than own homes.

Janet Russell was another woman who lost her husband and a great deal of property due to her loyalty to Great Britain during the war. The Russell's were originally from Ireland and moved to America in the early 1760's. They settled in St. George, a province of Georgia, and started a family. When the "troubles" began, David Russell rejected the Tory side and was persecuted for his beliefs. This caused him to flee to Florida. Once in Florida, Russell enlisted in Colonel Brown's Rangers and fought for Britain. Unfortunately, he was captured and imprisoned in a rebel jail. Due to the British invasion and capture of the area a year later, Mr. Russell was released . Soon after, Sir James Wright appointed Russell to the rank of major in the militia. Major Russell was killed in battle just ten short months later.

Janet Russell filed a petition for compensation on behalf of herself and her six children in hopes of regaining a portion of the vast amount of property her husband had lost in consequence of his loyalty. Mrs. Russell claimed the loss of 147 acres of improved and 1,053 acres of unimproved land in Georgia. She also lost riding horses, wagon and work horses, colts, two wagons, 100 cows, twenty each of steer and sheep, and fifty hogs. Other items included a barrel of both rum and sugar, linen, clothing (which belonged to her children) and other sundry items. The rebels also seized her husband's silver watch and money, all of her beds and linen, 100 bushels of Indian corn, wheat, barley, rye and oats. To substantiate her claim, Mrs. Russell produced sworn statements and certificates from Governor James Wright, Samuel Montgomery, James Lyle, Richard Davies and

Stephen Haven. These statements attested to David Russell's service and loyalty during his lifetime. They also verified Mrs. Russell's true account of her losses.[18] Mrs. Russell was able to provide adequate proof of her husband's loyalty and her losses which were due to the war. This was the type of claim which would have been well received. It did not have the import of exaggeration or fallaciousness which plagued many of the petitions. The large number and reliable nature of the witnesses which Mrs. Russell provided also aided her claim.

Susannah Wylly's account of her harrowing experience at the hands of the rebels is typical of the level of violence endured by loyalists in America during the Revolution. Prior to the war, Mrs. Wylly's husband, Alexander Wylly, was Clerk of Council and also a member in the Upper House of Assembly in Georgia. He earned approximately 300 pounds per year. Once war broke out, Mr. Wylly served the British under Major General Prevoit and died during the siege of Savannah. Susannah Wylly and her children suffered for their loyalty. Rebels attacked Mrs. Wylly in her home, shooting into her house and ransacking it. They stole everything they could carry and demolished the remainder, leaving nothing.[19]

Mrs. Wylly claimed the loss of 4,495 acres of land (2,650 were worth ten pounds per acre and 1,500 worth fifteen pounds per acre) in Georgia, two lots in Brunswick, one town lot in Hardwiche, a wharf in Savannah, an island lot on Tybee, in addition to income from a plantation in Georgia. She claimed the lost interest on the land, debts owed to her husband, her husband's annual salary and a house and outbuildings in Savannah. Her total claim amounted to approximately 8,329 pounds.[20]

---

[18]Ibid., vols. 4-8: 36-38.
[19]Ibid., vols. 4-8: 114.
[20]Ibid., vols. 4-8: 115-117.

Governor Graham verified Mrs. Wylly's claim and affirmed Mr. Wylly's good character, fealty to the crown and persecution because of his stance. Josiah Falmall, Alexander Thompson, William Greenwood and John Stove all confirmed Mrs. Wylly's account and vouched for Alexander Wylly's service to Britain. Mrs. Wylly was unable to authenticate her claim further with deeds, titles or other documents due to the destruction of her home by rebel forces.[21] Mrs. Wylly's claim is more typical of the upper middling sort. She was able to specify the amount of her and her husband's lost land, its worth and location. She was aware of her husband's income and general possessions, and articulated his total annual worth in an effective manner. Her ability to produce such noted witnesses to confirm her stated valuation of losses added to the trustworthy nature of the claim.

John Barnes was a loyalist who fought and died for the British cause. Prior to the war, Barnes was named High Sheriff of the County of Huntertown in New Jersey. As High Sheriff, John Barnes earned approximately 1,600 pounds per year. Once war was declared, Barnes steadfastly supported the British. In 1776 he became a soldier under Sir William Howe in Brunswick; later he was appointed Major in the 3rd battalion of the New Jersey Volunteers. He died during an attack on Staten Island. John Barnes willed his entire estate to his wife Mary. The estate was confiscated and sold by the rebels, which left Mary Barnes and her daughter penniless. Mrs. Barnes subsisted on the generosity of Sir Henry Clontor (or Elonton) and Sir Guy Carleton until she fled to England.

In her claim, Mrs. Barnes sought compensation for losses incurred due to her and her husband's loyalty. She lost currency, a house, office and one and one-half acres of land in New Jersey, furniture and belongings, outstanding debts owed (Major John Barnes) and the loss of Major Barnes' income as Sheriff of Huntertown. Mrs. Barnes'

---

[21]Ibid., vols. 4-8: 117.

claim totaled 3,400 pounds. In her behalf, Brigadier General Skinner attested to John Barnes' loyalty. Governor Franklin described Major Barnes as a "...gentleman of good character...[who] ...left a worthy and helpless wife and daughter...".[22] Daniel Cox recounted the energetic part Barnes played in battle. The Reverend Mr. George Panton noted Barnes' loyal stance, refusal to join the rebels or take their oath. He also mentioned that the facts concerning the lost property and possessions of the Barnes were, to the best of his knowledge, true. The claim of Mary Barnes was well documented, substantiated with honorable and renown witnesses and followed the general pattern of the claims. Mrs. Barnes professed her and her husband's loyalty, Major Barnes active role in the war and the ultimate sacrifice of his life for England. Her claim was full of substantiated facts which attested to Mary Barnes' truthfulness in telling of her losses to the Claims Commission.

Rachel Noble filed a claim on behalf of herself and her four children. Rachel Noble's late husband Issac Noble was a hindrance to the rebel's cause. He fought and died for his loyalty, and during his lifetime..."showed himself on every occasion a zealous assertor of the British Government and endeavored to promote those sentiments wherever his influence extended, which was great among the German inhabitants..." in New Jersey.[23] Mr. Noble knew the German language and was able to create a band of men to serve under Brigadier General Skinner's Corps. Mr. Noble also served as a scout and became a major under Colonel Ruskin. He was severely injured during a skirmish and suffered a bayonet wound to his eye. He was sent to a safe area in New York to recover from his injury.

---

[22]Ibid., vols. 14-16: 132.
[23]Ibid., vols. 14-16: 160.

Amid all the fighting, Rachel Noble and her children bore the brunt of rebel hatred and animosity at home on their New Jersey farm. Many of Mrs. Noble's neighbors were rebels and mistreated this woman. On the eve before Mrs. Noble was to be arrested, "...she fled by favor of a dark night with a [sic] infant of nine months at her breast..." and avoided capture and subsequent incarceration.[24] She was unable to take all of her children into hiding with her, and three Noble children were imprisoned by the rebels. The rebels stripped the defenseless children of all of their clothes and kept them in jail for over a year. The rebels also ravaged the Noble home and farm. They stole "...every portable thing and destroyed what they could not carry away...", thus leaving the Nobles nothing to call their own.[25]

During those twelve months her children were in jail, Mrs. Noble was reunited with her husband in New York. General Clinton intervened on the Noble's behalf and affected their children's release. Unfortunately, there was no happy resolution to this story. Soon after the children's liberation, Mr. Noble was captured and killed by a band of rebels, because he "...was...so obnoxious to the Rebels that they promised a Reward of 500 Dollars to any who should take or destroy him".[26]

Rachel Noble and her children fled to England in 1780. They lived with her brother-in-law until his death a year later. She then was left penniless and without any means to care for or support herself or her children. Her hopeless situation forced her to file for compensation of her and her late husband's losses. Mrs. Noble listed her losses, including a seventy-six acre farm in New Jersey along with a home, barn and other outbuildings. She lost linen, clothes, nine horses, fourteen cows, (three of which were

---

[24]Ibid., vols. 14-16: 160.
[25]Ibid., vols. 14-16: 160.
[26]Ibid., vols. 14-16: 161.

heifers) three oxen, thirty sheep, seventy bushels of wheat, eighty bushels of Indian corn, sixty tons of hay, wagons, carts, sledges, and farming tools.[27] To bolster her claim, Rachel Noble furnished certificates of Issac Noble's fidelity to the British Government and devoted military service from Generals Harcourt and Skinner, Major Drummond, John Seton, and Lieutenant Governor Elliot. She also provided a deed for her farm as additional proof of her losses. Considering Mr. Noble's ability to speak the German language, it is logical to assume that he was a recent immigrant to the colonies. He probably felt allegiance to a government which most likely helped him leave Germany and resettle in America. His constant aid to the British made his family a target to the disruptive rebels. The violence which the Nobles' endured ultimately achieved its goal. Mr. Noble was killed and his family fled, leaving all of their possessions behind in the colonies.

Sarah Fowler lived in the County of West Chester and the Province of New York with her husband, Solomon, and children prior to the war. When the battle began, Solomon Fowler joined forces with the British. Because of his service and ability, he was soon made a Captain under the command of Colonel James DeLancey in the West Chester Refugees Corp. Captain Fowler lost his life while in battle defending the crown.[28]

Before and after the death of her husband, Sarah Fowler had been harassed by rebels in the area. Although Sarah Fowler was saddened by her husband's death, she hoped it would ease her predicament of continuous rebel animosity, and fervently awaited the end of her family's vexation by rebels in the area. This did not occur and Mrs. Fowler was soon in court defending herself and her property from the Whigs. The rebels wanted Mrs. Fowler jailed and her property confiscated. She lost her case and was dispossessed

---

[27]Ibid., vols. 14-16: 162.
[28]Ibid., vols. 23: 95.

of her real and personal estate. Mrs. Fowler fled to Halifax to avoid further persecution and filed for recompense of her losses and her husband's role and contributions in the war. In her schedule of losses, Mrs. Fowler included a house, barns and outbuildings, and 200 acres of farm land in New York. She also lost five horses, two oxen, three cows, thirteen tons of hay, wheat, twenty bushels of Indian corn, farming tools and an ox cart. A debt of 250 pounds was owed to Solomon Fowler by Thomas Barton. Mrs. Fowler was able to present a certificate from Colonel James DeLancey which attested to Captain Fowler's fealty, military service and death in battle. She also produced an affidavit signed by Oliver DeLancey and John Barton substantiating her schedule of losses. She supplied Soloman Fowler's will naming her and her daughter, Rachel, as beneficiaries. Mrs. Fowler produced a certificate signed by Isaac Stoutenbury from the Commissioners of Forfeited Estates which showed her estate's confiscation. She also submitted a certificate from Treasurer Gerard Banker indicating his receipt of Thomas Barton's repayment of a debt owed to Solomon Fowler. This debt was paid to the state and not to Solomon Fowler.[29]

Witnesses for Mrs. Fowler were John Fowler (a relative), Isaac Williams, Major Thomas Huggerford and Frederick Williams. The witnesses all attested to Captain Fowler's loyal service, large amount of land and his death in battle against the rebels. Mr. Isaac Williams added the interesting information that Mrs. Fowler's maiden name was Hunt and that her family was considered great rebels in America. Mrs. Fowler presented a well-documented petition to the Commission. She and her husband were loyal. Captain Fowler fought for England's victory and died in battle. Mrs. Fowler and her family were constantly harassed by the rebels until they fled, fearing escalated violence. She detailed her losses, their worth and supplemented her claim with documentation and eye witness

---

[29]Ibid., vols. 23: 95.

testimony. It is obvious that Mrs. Fowler was well acquainted with her husband's possessions, income and worth. Her decision to flee must have been deliberated and difficult to reach. The fact that Mrs. Fowler's extended family was not loyal illustrated the decisive nature of the war.

Helen Macleod, a native of New York, married Captain Norman Macleod, who was always an active participant in the British military in America. In 1756 he joined the 42nd Regiment as an ensign. In 1773, he became a lieutenant in the 80th regiment, and later a captain. Captain Macleod constantly resisted the rebels and in 1775 enlisted with the 84th regiment and embarked on a mission to gather loyalists willing to fight for the King. Rebel forces soon discovered Captain Macleod's important role in the military and intimidated the Macleod family into fleeing the area. Shortly afterward, Captain Macleod was killed while serving the 84th regiment.

Mrs. Macleod, fearing further persecution from the rebels, quickly fled to the safety of England with her young son. Mrs. Macleod lived in Scotland and filed a claim for her lost property and her husband's loyalty. Her schedule of property illustrated her position in the colonies and the persecution she and her family endured. Helen Macleod listed the loss of 3,000 acres of land in Tryon County (a province of New York), household furniture, kitchen furnishing, and a house. She also noted livestock consisting of cattle and horses, wagons and sleighs, farming stock and utensils, china, glasses, pictures, linen, beds and bedding, blankets and table linen. She included the loss of three-hundred pounds in New York currency.[30]

To substantiate her schedule of losses, Helen Macleod produced a certificate from General Gage which attested to Captain Norman Macleod's faithful military service to the

---

[30]Ibid., vols. 24: 171.

crown. General Gage also verified the amount of land the Macleod's owned in New York. Three men, Colonel Small, Colonel Claus and Major McDonald, bore witness to Mrs. Macleod's claim. Colonel Small noted the Macleod's wealth prior to the war, and Captain Macleod's bravery and fealty in service. Colonel Claus detailed Captain Macleod's loyalty and the need for the Macleod's to flee rebel territory. Major McDonald described the well stocked home of the family and the fact that they fled their home and left all of their possessions behind. Eight years after Mrs. MacLeod and her son John had gone to Scotland, they moved to Halifax.[31] Mrs. Macleod well documented her schedule of losses. The numerous and prestigious witnesses who testified in her behalf definitely bolstered her chances of receiving a settlement.

Elizabeth Travis petitioned the court for compensation for herself and her eight children. William Travis, Elizabeth's husband, "was a staunch friend to British Government ...[and]...he had to seek refuge in New York early in the war because he was obnoxious to rebels... ".[32] Due to Travis' fervent support of the British, he and his family suffered. The rebels confiscated all of William Travis' real and personal estate and he was imprisoned on account of his loyalty. He died in prison. Mrs. Travis was able to provide for her family until 1783, when conditions became dire and she and her children fled to the safety of English shores.

Mrs. Travis asked the British Government for monetary consideration for the service and loyalty she and her husband had given. She stated that the "...estate of William Travis was seized, confiscated and sold by the state of New York in consequence of his loyalty".[33] Listed as lost were eighty-one acres of land in New York, of which seventy-

---

[31]Ibid., vols. 24: 174.
[32]Ibid., vols. 25: 174.
[33]Ibid., vols., 25: 84.

nine acres had been improved, a home, outbuildings and a barn. She also included four horses, eleven cows, sheep, hogs, fifty bushels of wheat, eight bushels of buck wheat, farm tools and debts worth a total of 274 pounds.

Mr. Travis left a will in which his children received two-thirds of the estate and Elizabeth Travis received one-third. Noah Cox, Jeremiah Travis (son), and Jeremiah Travis (William Travis' brother) served as witnesses to this claim. Noah Cox had been present during an inventory of the late William Travis' home and was thus able to verify Mrs. Travis' losses. Both Travis men upheld Elizabeth Travis' claim. Mrs. Travis eventually settled in St. John, New Brunswick, and began her life once again.[34] The fact that Mrs. Travis was able to provide an itemized accounting of her and her husband's losses and their value showed her daily involvement in her family's finances. Witnesses for Mrs. Travis told of her accurate accounting in her listing of lost property and personal items. More documentation such as deeds, bills of sale, and the like would have aided her claim.

In her account to the Claims Commission, Elizabeth Green described herself as "a refuge from Courtland's Manor, New York" which had been her home prior to the war.[35] Mrs. Green's husband and two sons served in the war. The Green family lived in New York on a farm, and once war began, they chose loyalty to Britain over the Americans and they paid dearly for their choice. Mr. Green joined Colonel Emerick's Corps and later served under Colonel Delaney until his death. The Green's sons joined the Guides and Pioneers. One died during the war, doubling the family's grief.

Mrs. Green fled America and settled in St. Ann's, New Brunswick. She petitioned the court for the loss of her home, two beds, four chairs and two trammels, kitchen

---

[34]Ibid., vols. 25: 84-85.
[35]Ibid., vols. 26: 13.

supplies, livestock worth forty five pounds and lost wages from her late husband's position in the Corps, which earned him twenty pounds per year. Witnesses for Mrs. Green included Jacob Vanwart and Mr. Thomas. Mr. Vanwart described Mrs. Green's home and general contents, her husband's service and loyal stance throughout his lifetime. Mr. Thomas noted Mrs. Green's livestock and the destruction of her house by rebel forces.[36] Although Elizabeth Green's claim totaled only approximately sixty five pounds, it was representative of a vast majority of the upper middling and wealthy class claims. In her petition, every item Mrs. Green had owned and lost due to loyalty and rebel looting was included and an appraisal of its worth entered next to it. Such a comprehensive claim demonstrated Mrs. Green's awareness of her possessions, their value and her ultimately depraved condition upon finding herself widowed, alone and in a foreign country.

Mary Van Maple lived in New York with her husband Henry and their daughter prior to the war. Henry Van Maple was always faithful to the crown and ardently refused to join the rebel cause. Mr. Van Maple died intestate in 1776. Mrs. Van Maple filed a claim for her losses. In it, she listed the loss of her brick, two story New York home, which was destroyed during the "Great Fire" in 1776. She also lost household furniture and cash. Her total loss amounted to 160 pounds in New York currency. Mary Van Maple supplied two witnesses, Francis Staples, her son-in-law, and William Sheels to support her petition. Mr. Staples stated that Mrs. Van Maple was seventy-one years old and very infirmed. She fled America and settled with her daughter in Burton, St. John's River (in New Brunswick Province). Mr. Staples also noted Henry Van Maple's loyalty to the British Crown. Mr. Sheels testified to Henry Van Maple's good character and about his large brick house in New York.[37] The brevity in which Mrs. Van Maple related her

---

[36]Ibid., vols. 26: 13-14.
[37]Ibid., vols. 26: 44-46.

case indicated the small part she played in her husband's daily affairs. This was most likely due to her advanced age and poor health.

The claims of women in the middling rank are full of similarities and some differences. These women all come from upper and middling sort backgrounds. They owned their homes (often more than one) and were usually aware of the daily affairs of their households. They were able to articulate (in a well organized and intelligent manner) their losses. In most cases, these women provided a detailed schedule of lost and stolen belongings with an accurate list of each and every item's value. The middling sort claimed land, homes and buildings, personal items and possessions. They also included the number and quality of their live stock, crops and tools/equipment. These women substantiated their claims with an adequate amount of documentation, witnesses, and letters which testified to their truthfulness and their and their husbands' service during the war. These women were aware of all they had lost and thus sought compensation from the British government.

The differences which appeared in the claims filed by middling rank women were economic in nature. These women were all considered middling because they and their husbands' had to work for a living. These women differed within the classification of middling sort. Some of the claimants, such as Mary Kearsley, Mary McAlpin, and Catherine Tweed represented the wealthiest of the middling rank. Other women such as Mary Farmar and Mary Miller represented the middle to lower, less prosperous women of this category. They provided less detailed claims with smaller total amounts, which indicated their limited income. They still qualified as middling but they occupied the lower end of that group. This economic difference was the most striking. Similarities abounded with in this group. Most of the women were married, had husbands participating in the war, and lost their spouses in battle. These women experienced the hardships of

widowhood, compounded by the stress of rebel animosity and harassment. They maintained their homes in the colonies (after their husbands deaths) as long as possible before fleeing to the safety of another country. Once resettled, many of these middling rank women filed for compensation for their losses. They set up households and tried patiently to wait for the end of the war. A majority of these claimants anticipated an English victory, which would have enabled them to return to their homes in the colonies.

CHAPTER 2

THE VERY WEALTHY AND THE VERY POOR

The politics of the war transcended every barrier, even race, religion, and economic stratification. Loyal colonial women came from the elite and the very poor populations as well as the middling sort in the colonies. Close examination of claims filed by the wealthy and the poor loyalists illustrates the extremes in wealth and possessions which existed between the "haves" and the "have nots". As previously stated, the elite were a small sector of the economy which held a majority their wealth and resources. The elite of the colonial era were affluent and owned luxurious homes, large tracts of land and fine and expensive amenities. They were independent and did not "need" to work to maintain their lavish life styles. Conversely, the poor barely survived on the low wages of the tenant farmer or day laborer, whose unskilled job allowed a subsistent existence. Since income was so low, poor colonists were unable to acquire their own land and homes. The poorest of this group lived from day to day, often relying on the charity and good will of others. They rented rooms, had few possessions, and lived a spartan life.

Lady Juliana Farmer Penn lived in Pennsylvania with her late husband John Penn, the younger, prior to her escape to Great Britain. Lady Juliana Penn claimed the loss of over 27,000 acres of land which had been granted to the Penn family in 1682 by King Charles II and the Duke of York. Lady Juliana Penn requested recompense for her husband's lost land and rental income from this property. She also claimed the loss of her inheritance from her husband's will. The will bequeathed her approximately 600 pounds

per year. Lady Penn produced Andrew Allen, Mr. Thomas Dunn, Mr. Physick, Mr. Galloway, John Penn, the elder, William Franklin, William Baker, and Daniel Cox as witnesses who all attested to her and her husband's loyalty to Great Britain prior to and during the war. They likewise verified the veracity of Lady Penn's claim. Lady Juliana Penn additionally produced deeds and certificates to substantiate her case. She did not receive any compensation for her loss of over 1,000,000 acres of land and rents as she was entitled in the Articles of the Treaty of Peace between Great Britain and the United States and thus asked the Claims Commission for restitution.[1] Lady Penn provided an abundance of documentation to substantiate the amount of land she and her late husband had lost. Her witnesses were influential men with connections in the British Government, which aided her case. The fact that the Claims Commission operated under a limited budget and restricted the number of loyalists and the amount of stipends they received at any given time would make the likelihood of Lady Penn's receiving any settlement near her actual losses impossible.

Mary Ann Balfour, formerly of South Carolina, suffered for her late husband's loyalty. Along with her three children, she fled to England to avoid the violence and hatred which loyalty received. Three English officers certified John Balfour's service to England during the war, and witnesses John Champness and James Cafvelle supported Mary Ann Balfour's lengthy inventory of losses. She enumerated her losses including 850 acres of land (worth 7,619 pounds), a house fully equipped with furniture, plantation tools (300 pounds), five slaves worth 300 pounds, crops of indigo, tobacco and maize (600 pounds), half a dozen horses worth 200 pounds, 100 cows and 100 hogs worth 155 pounds. She also claimed loss of the "labour of fifteen negroes annually" and a "...large

---

[1]Public Records of Great Britain, Series 1, American Loyalist Claims 1776-1831 (Exchequer and Audit Department, 1972), vol.43, 63, 88, 91, 202-210.

parcel of tar and turpentine at Orangeburg" worth 300 pounds.[2] Mrs. G. Sandford, sister of the late Governor Hutchinson was an old, sick woman, whose claim was filed by nephew and care taker Mr. T. Hutchinson. Mr. Hutchinson claimed that Mrs. Sandford had two farms in the colonies prior to the war and he wanted "...reimbursed...[for her care] because he was under no obligation to keep her".[3] Five other loyalists belong in this list of wealthy refugees. Mrs. Mary Brant and Mrs. Sarah Stockton were both wealthy but also go into the exceptional or unusual category. Eleanor See and Margaret See, and Miss Galloway were wealthy but fit into the category for claims made by adults for minor children. Mary Ann Balfour's claim was lengthy and detailed, Mrs. G. Sandford's was not. Mrs. Sandford's failure to provide proof in the form of letters, certificates, deeds or witnesses did not hinder her case or her ultimate recompense. The fact that a man submitted her petition to the Commission and that her brother was influential in the colonies and England overrode the obvious weaknesses in her case. Unfortunately, Mrs. Balfour did not have such prominent friends or relations to put forth her case.

Claims for compensation which stemmed from poor loyalists were less common. Of the fifty-nine loyalists claims examined in this paper, only four fall into this category. Hannah Brown, from Charlotte County, filed a claim on behalf of her husband Jesse Brown, a loyalist who bore arms in defense of the British and died in battle. She claimed the loss of fifty-eight pounds. Mrs. Brown did not have any children and did not list any personal belongings such as furniture, farming tools or crops. Her claim indicated the dire circumstances she and her husband had endured as tenant farmers in the colonies.[4] The lack of any schedule of losses is a somber example of the extreme poverty and degradation

---

[2]Ibid., vols. 48-50, 240.
[3]Ibid., vols. 99-100, 39.
[4]Ibid., vols., 64-71, 3.

which occurred in the colonies. Mrs. Brown's failure to list her few meager belongings was typical of poor claimants. Poor petitioners were more concerned with eking out a daily existence than with keeping track of the number and value of each pan, chicken or piece of bedding they owned. It illustrates the very different cares, concerns and values the middling and wealthy had as opposed to the poor.

Margaret Crawford was also a poor but loyal colonist who filed for herself and her three children. Her husband, James Crawford, was an active soldier in the British army. He participated from 1773 until his death in 1783. He aided the British during the blockade in Boston, and served in New York, Philadelphia and New Jersey. Prior to the war, James Crawford was a truckman in Boston. The Crawford's poverty is illustrated by the fact that they owned neither land nor a house. During an escalation in the fighting, Mrs. Crawford was evacuated from Boston and had to leave all of her belongings behind, which amounted to 100 pounds sterling. She claimed the loss of debts owed to her husband worth 100 pounds sterling. Archibald Cunningham asserted Mrs. Crawford's account as truthful and vouched for her honesty and her husband's loyalty to Britain. The absence of a lengthy claim is indicative of the Crawford's poor position in the colonies. Mrs. Crawford's claim showed the few items which she and her family had owned prior to the war. Although they had owned more than the Brown's, the lack of a detailed schedule of losses with their accompanying values was typical of poor claimants. Just as there were different degrees within the group making up the wealthy and middling sort, the poor were also stratified in their income, possessions and positions in the colonies.

The wealthy claimants noted every lost item and expected to be compensated in order to maintain their status and life style while in exile. The main concern for poor refugees was providing for themselves and their children. Essentially, they had worked hard and struggled in the colonies to make a living and now that struggle was more

difficult. They suddenly found themselves in a foreign land with nothing. They lost everything they had known and earned in the colonies. To begin again in a foreign country and without their husbands was a formidable task. In many ways, the poor were more fortunate than their wealthy counterparts. They had lost fewer material goods and knew the hardship which accompanied poverty. They were still poor but this was not a new sensation, it would just be experienced in a new location. In contrast, the wealthy exiles had lost all of their vast holdings and possessions, their status, and position. They were not accustomed to being without needed and/or wanted items and few would have possessed any skills or training which would enable them to earn a living. Everything in their world had been destroyed and starting over would prove to be a tremendous task.

CHAPTER 3

EXCEPTIONAL WOMEN LOYALISTS

There are always exceptions to every situation, and some of the women loyalists who filed claims in England differed from their counterparts. The women who filed claims categorized as unusual or exceptional are so described for several reasons. Their claims differ because many of the women owned their own property and claimed for their own losses incurred through their loyalty to the King. These women were atypical in that they did not rely on men to support and provide for them. They provided for themselves, either out of necessity or circumstance. Many women in this category had their own jobs and were displaced by the war. Other women included in this category had male friends, relatives or representatives present their cases to the Claims Commission. Since there were only six such cases, or ten percent of the fifty-nine reviewed, they can be considered remarkable. Nine women, or fifteen percent, filed for recompense of lost inheritance due to the war. Four of these women were widows who had lost their husbands during the war. They remarried and filed for their property from their first or previous husband. Another group of petitions considered particular were those filed on the behalf of minor children. At a time when adult women had few legal and/or property rights, the idea that a claim for monetary compensation of a child's inheritance seems surprising. These four children represent six percent of the claimants in this study.

The first group of claimants to be examined were filed by women who had remained loyal and lost their own property and/or profession due to their political stance. Mary Airey lost her husband during the siege of Havanakin in the year 1762. Soon after

his death, Mrs. Airey opened a supply or grocery shop in her New York home. She was quite successful and aided the British cause by furnishing rooms and goods to soldiers in need. Mrs. Airey lost her home, business, and all her stock in the great New York fire.

When the British evacuated New York, Mrs. Airey left America. Once in England, she filed for recompense. Her lost property included a vast array of goods used in her trade. She listed tea, sugar, brown sugar, Jlover[sic], beef, pork, gammon, butter, spirits, money, furniture, bedding and linen, and clothing. She lost a large house as well.[1] Due to the nature and extent of the fire, Mrs. Airey's records were destroyed, thus she could not provide any deeds, certificates or receipts. She did provide three witnesses who bore out her claim. Lieutenant General Robertson and Sir James Wallace testified to Mrs. Airey's loyalty during the war. They also noted her aid to British soldiers, the general contents of her house and business, and her honest nature. Colonel Small, had been a border in Mrs. Airey's house for many years. He was cognizant of the tremendous loss the fire had caused her, and "...he himself furnished her with some of his own shirts that she might have a change of linen" which illustrated the entirety of her privation. Colonel Small observed that Mrs. Airey's home and business were fully furnished before the fire and that she suffered for her continued fealty to England. Although he was unable to give a complete listing of Mrs. Airey's losses, he stated that "...she is a woman of such great principles and he is certain she would not state anything that was not perfectly just and true".[2] Mrs. Airey relied on her own abilities and established and ran a successful store. She chose her own destiny when she gave aid and comfort to British troops. Although the consequences of her choice to support Britain could cause her great loss and even harm,

---

[1]Public Records of Great Britain, Series 1, American Loyalist Claims 1776-1831 (Exchequer and Audit Department, 1972), vols. 24: 78-79.
[2]Ibid., vols. 24: 80.

Mrs. Airey remained faithful to a decreasingly popular government and King. Her claim was quite detailed and authenticated by several reliable witnesses. Unfortunately, this did not make a big difference in the end decision of the Commissioners in regard to Mrs. Airey's recompense. She received a small stipend.

Catharine Leach was a spy for the English military during the war for independence. A native of Scotland, Mrs. Leach journeyed to New York after the death of her husband John Leach, in 1773. John Leach had been a teller in the bank of England. Mrs. Leach moved to New York to be close to her three sisters. Once established in the colonies, she opened a grocery store and prospered handsomely. When the war began, Mrs. Leach did not need to ponder the question of which side to support during the war. Mrs. Leach remained faithful to the British and "...on the commencement of the Rebellion she saw with Horror the cruel practices of Rebel Riding, etc. exercised on the Friends of Government and endeavored by every means in her power to conceal and preserve many faithful Subjects from the Persecution of the Rebels which conduct excited their animosity and subjected her to the most mortifying insults... ".[3] As consequence of her support of Great Britain, Mrs. Leach was often the target of marauding rebels. Her home was ransacked, looted and plundered and she was arraigned in a rebel court. Mrs. Leach was "...charged with favouring British Government and conveying Intelligence to the Commanders of His Majesty's Ships... ."[4] On account of the continuing rebel harassment, Mrs. Leach left her business and America to settle in England. She filed a claim for her service to the British government and her material losses. Mrs. Leach lost clothing, linens, bedding, furniture, kitchen tools and wares, grocery supplies and stocks, as well as her business and home. Judge Jones attested to Mrs. Leach's honest and moral

---

[3]Ibid., vols. 24: 350.
[4]Ibid., vols. 24: 350.

countenance and Mr. Furlong testified to Mrs. Leach's fealty. He was familiar with her business in New York and verified her claim. Mrs. Leach was a courageous woman who did more than many to ensure a British victory. She endured rebel attacks, robbery, insults and prosecution in a rebel court. Her fortitude to remain loyal to Great Britain in the midst of such blatant hostility to herself and destruction to her home and personal effects demonstrated her belief in the English cause. Her petition for restitution was typical of the middling sort because of its length and detail, but her brave actions during the war were unique.

Miss Margaret Francis Hill filed a claim for her lost property, which amounted to 567 pounds and 5 pence.[5] Miss Hill was a native of England and ventured to America in May, 1776, to be a housekeeper for Colonel Guy Johnson. Miss Hill was loyal to both England and to Colonel Johnson, and due to this loyalty, suffered greatly. Colonel Johnson and his brother Sir John Johnson were fiercely hated by the rebels. The Johnson's had ignited Indian unrest, which led to fierce battles between the Indians and rebels. Miss Hill was taken into the custody of rebel forces on two separate occasions and they "...treated her with every degree of Barbarity, hardship and indignity..." one could imagine.[6] The rebels kept Miss Hill in a cold, dark cell for three long months over the winter, and kept her in an unclothed state and deprived her of any and all comforts and necessities. Miss Hill's persecution continued even after her release from prison. The rebels repeatedly demanded that Margaret Francis Hill kill her employer and his brother. They attempted to bribe her and when that did not work, they increased their vexation. Miss Hill finally fled, fearing increased and more wicked treatment and possibly her own death.

---

[5]Ibid., vols. 24: 71.
[6]Ibid., vols. 24: 70.

While traveling to Quebec on a private ship full of refugees, an American privateer seized the vessel Hill was traveling on. The rebels purloined what possessions she had remaining. They gave her one option. She could regain her personal belongings on the condition that she murder one or both of the Johnson brothers. Once more, she refused and was left penniless. Miss Hill eventually made her way to England and filed for her losses, which included money, clothing and a few pieces of furniture worth approximately 567 pounds.[7] She provided certificates from Lord Rawdon, Colonel Guy Johnson and Dr. Morris, who attested to her bravery and steadfast resistance to rebel entreaties. Miss Hill's actions were bold and strong, especially when faced with repeated threats and harassment. Even during her long and harsh imprisonment, Miss Hill remained faithful. Her brief claim of lost items indicates her extreme poverty, which made her continuous rebuffs of rebel bribes all the more admirable.

Mrs. Sarah Simpson's claim was for the losses of cash, merchandise and furniture used in conjunction with her shop and boarding house. Mrs. Simpson's husband, David Valentine, was a land surveyor in New York and died before the war. To garner a living, Mrs. Simpson opened a shop and kept boarders, which supplied her with a healthy income. During the war, Mrs. Simpson aided the British cause. She billeted English soldiers in her home and gave them supplies. This made her the target of rebel aggression and malice. One rebel officer in particular, a Captain Lewis of the Rhode Island Corps, was especially ruthless in his treatment of Mrs. Simpson. Captain Lewis looted Mrs. Simpson's home and stole more than 1,300 pounds worth of clothing, merchandise and furniture from her.

---

[7]Ibid., vols. 24: 71-74.

Witnesses such as Thomas Osborne and Azor Bell testified to Mrs. Simpson's claim. Osborne told of the boarding house Mrs. Simpson ran in New York, her service to the crown and of her good character. He also described the rebel attack on her house and its vacuousness afterward. Bell was acquainted with Mrs. Simpson prior to the war, and attested to her business's success. After the rebels had plundered her home, Mrs. Simpson fled to Nova Scotia. At the time of her claim, she lived in St. John with her second husband, Drummond Simpson of the English navy.[8] Mrs. Simpson was another remarkable loyalist. During a time of upheaval and uncertainty, she successfully operated her own shop and boarding house. She risked her shop, property and freedom to quarter British soldiers and supply them with needed items. Her choice eventually caused her to lose her possessions and flee. Her claim was relatively complete and her influential witnesses verified her loyal support and aid during the war. They also described her shop and boarding house and its contents, confirming Mrs. Simpson's claim.

In another claim, Elizabeth Allen asked for compensation for her losses and those of her brother, the Reverend Bennett Allen. Prior to the war, Elizabeth Allen lived in Frederic Town, Maryland, with her brother. Her brother fled to England early in the war and Miss Allen remained behind and gave her utmost to the British cause. Miss Allen helped British prisoners of war in multifarious ways. She lent them money, helped them obtain release from prison, and aided in a lightening or easing of their sentences or punishments. She also provided these prisoners of war with food and clothing. She persisted with her mission of mercy toward British soldiers and prisoners until she was penniless due to her continental money losing its worth. Unable to continue her assistance

---

[8]Ibid., vols. 25: 27-29.

and in great peril of famishment, Elizabeth Allen acquired a passport and left America for England, believing she had made a significant contribution to the war effort.[9]

Once in England, Miss Allen was in a dire position. She was poverty-stricken; her brother was unable to support her and she could not find employment. In 1780, Miss Allen applied to the Lords of the Treasury, but they provided no aid. Three years later, she turned to the Commissioners of Enquiry for monetary relief. She received twenty pounds per year, which proved insufficient for her daily existence. Once again she petitioned for recompense from the British government for her services to the crown and the losses she and her brother had incurred in America. This time she requested 300 pounds yearly. Miss Allen listed her and her brother's losses as a house, supplies and goods used to aid and comfort British prisoners of war and American loyalists from 1775 to 1780. Included in this category was rum, money, clothing and linen/bedding worth 300 pounds. She also lost over 300 books, linen, manuscripts, clothing, a violoncello, wine, furniture, a slave and money (Maryland currency). The Allen's total loss amounted to 622 pounds.[10] To sustain the veracity of her claim, Miss Allen provided letters from the prisoners of war whom she had aided. Lieutenant Wilson of the 55th Regiment described the help Miss Allen gave to British soldiers and told of her lending him money. He also described her obtaining release of his servant from a rebel jail. Lieutenant Stewart from the 71st Regiment wrote of the monetary aid Elizabeth Allen had provided to him during the war. William Hamilton, an English spy, verified that Miss Allen had him released from prison. Unfortunately, Mr. Hamilton was later captured and hanged by the rebels in the area. William King, of the 33rd Regiment, attested to Miss Allen's aid to British prisoners of war. She was able to get his punishment reduced, so he could work during the day and

---

[9]Ibid., vols., 4-8: 207-208.
[10]Ibid., vols. 4-8: 208.

was only incarcerated at night.[11] Robert Smith had known Elizabeth Allen in Maryland and bore witness to her loyal service to the Crown, her good character and her generous aid to British prisoners of war. Reverend Allen also affirmed Miss Allen's fealty and her accurate portrayal of her (and his own) losses while serving the crown. Miss Allen's schedule of losses was quite specific. She was able to provide written and oral testimony from several very reliable witnesses who corroborated her claim. The type of assistance Elizabeth Allen gave to British soldiers stationed near her home was unusual, especially because she was a single woman living alone in a time of war. Her aid was invaluable but did not make much of an impression on the Claims Commission. More concrete records such as bills of sale and certificates might have abetted her case.

Another claimant, Eleanor Lestor, filed a claim on her own behalf for the loss of her shop and property, not those of her husband. Eleanor Lestor owned and operated a public house for over thirteen years in South Carolina. She not only helped the British stationed in Charles Town when she provided goods and provisions, but also demonstrated her loyalty when she "...concealed British sailors in her house."[12] Her schedule of losses included rum, sugar, slaves, goods and furniture, 15,000 dollars in Continental Currency (which was worthless) and the loss of income from boarders. Many witnesses supported Eleanor Lestor's account. Robert McGheown attested to her shop and of her secreting British sailors in her home, and James McGheown, Thomas Harper and James Moore substantiated the account. Mrs. Sestor was also a shopkeeper in Charles Town, South Carolina. She sold English merchandise and goods and lost her shop and stock as a result of the war and her loyalty to the crown. She claimed to have

---

[11]Ibid., vols. 4-8: 207.
[12]Ibid., vols. 48-50: 358.

lost 12,000 pounds worth of property, but did not provide any witnesses.[13] Eleanor Lestor 's loyalty was proven through numerous accounts. Her schedule of losses was more difficult to establish due to the absence of concrete proof in the form of deeds, bills of sale and the like. These documents would have strengthened her petition and enriched her case. Mrs. Sestor's account is doubtable, as she claimed a large monetary amount of losses but provided little, if any, documentation and no witnesses. With the large number of American refugees in London, finding at least one or two people from Charles Town, South Carolina, could not have been difficult.

Other women who were "exceptions" were Mrs. Cumming and Mrs. Griffiths of Charles Town, South Carolina. Mrs. Cumming was a mid-wife with a large practice, worth upward of 400 pounds a year. Due to the war and her political support of England, she lost a large home and plot of land as well as personal property worth approximately 6,300 pounds. Mrs. Griffiths was a milliner, leaving South Carolina during an evacuation of loyalist residents by the British. She had owned furniture and materials for her craft, which she was forced to sell at a loss before she left for England. She requested a stipend only to provide an apprenticeship for her young son.[14] Mrs. Griffiths and Mrs. Cumming lost all of their possessions as well as their livelihood. Their claims, valuation of their belongings, homes and various and miscellaneous items, in addition to their yearly earnings seem reasonable. In an era of upheaval and turmoil, these women were able to support themselves and earn good livings. The destructive forces of the war robbed these women of more than just their belongings; it stole their independence and their freedom.

Rebecca Callahan's claim is unusual. She was still in possession of her property after she fled America and sought refuge in England. She claimed loss of its worth due to

---

[13]Ibid., vols. 99-100: 43-44.
[14]Ibid., vols. 99-100: 219.

damage by the rebels. Prior to the "troubles", Mrs. Callahan and her husband and children lived in Pawnalburg in the Province of Maine, Massachusetts Bay. The Callahan's owned a well furnished, two-story brick home, live stock, farm tools and 240 acres of land. When war broke out, Charles Callahan remained loyal to the British Government. In consequence of his decision, he became the target of rebel hatred and harassment. This annoying treatment escalated to the point that Mr. Callahan feared for his own life. In 1777, he fled to safety in Halifax, Nova Scotia where he was named Commander of the armed sloop General Gage. He continued in this position until his death in 1779.[15]

In the meantime, Mrs. Callahan and her children remained at home, where the rebels continually bothered them. In 1778, rebel soldiers confiscated Charles Callahan's real and personal estate and declared Mr. Callahan a disaffected person. They ransacked Mrs. Callahan's home and destroyed her belongings. She left what remained of her property in her brother's care and fled to England.[16]

Mrs. Callahan filed a claim for the destruction done to her house and land. She also claimed for her husband's service and loyalty to Great Britain during his lifetime. The Reverend Mr. Baily attested to Charles Callahan's faithful service to England, the rebel persecution endured by the family, and the terrible destruction which occurred to Mrs. Callahan's property, home, and furniture. He also noted that Mrs. Callahan's property was greatly damaged and devalued in its present state. She was still a rebel target and thus could not return to America. Mr. John Macnamara also served as a witness. He testified to Mr. Callahan's loyalty and service, and to the destruction of his land by rebel mobs.[17] Mrs. Callahan wanted to be reimbursed for the damage done to her property, and for her

---

[15]Ibid., vols. 9-13: 73.
[16]Ibid., vols. 9-13: 175.
[17]Ibid., vols. 9-13: 175.

husband's loyalty and service. She wished to sell her property in America and live in England. Mrs. Callahan was one of few "lucky" loyalists who retained ownership of her land after she fled the colonies. Few men or women could boast of this achievement. The fact that Mrs. Callahan only claimed the loss of her land's value and her husband's service during the war was significant. While other petitioners requested reimbursement for every minute item lost, Mrs. Callahan wanted only what she may have felt was necessary and fair. She may have seen her loss of personal and household items as her sacrifice to the war effort and thus believed she was not entitled to recompense for them.

The second set of claimants in this section represents the ten percent of women loyalists who had male relatives, friends, or representatives take their petitions before the commission. The memorial of Joseph Chew on behalf of the children of Mrs. Mary Brant is an unusual claim. Sir William Johnson Brant and his wife Mary lived with their children in New York prior to the war. During the fighting, Brant died. In his will, he appointed Joseph Chew to serve as guardian to his children. The schedule of losses for the Brant children was extensive. Joseph Chew claimed the loss of over 10,110 acres of land in Tryon County, colony of New York. In addition to the land, the children lost over 6,000 pounds in rental income, and all of the houses, barns and outbuildings included on their lands. This claim was quite detailed in its listing of land, buildings and rent lost due to rebel activity. No witnesses were ever called to confirm Mr. Chew's statements. Deeds, certificates and supporting letters were absent and Mrs. Brant was never mentioned or called to testify in her children's behalf. In an era when women and children had few legal rights or status, it is reasonable that a man would present a woman's case in a legal setting. It is unusual that Mrs. Brant did not have Joseph Chew present a claim for her widow's third of her late husband's estate.

Mrs. Ann Burns, formerly a Charles Town resident, had her case filed by a Mr. Mayne, a friend who had been loaning her money. Mayne stated that Mrs. Burns' husband was killed in 1773, leaving her to care for her only child. He noted her possessions lost to rebels as the following: "...wharfs and wharehouses in Charles Town worth 700 pounds per year", which her son would have one day inherited.[18] A claim made for Mrs. M. Achmuty of New York was presented to the claims commission by her son, Mr. Achmuty. Mrs. Achmuty's late husband was the Rector of Trinity Church in New York, where he earned 300 pounds per year. Mrs. Achmuty was sixty years old and had two children. Mr. Achmuty listed his mother's losses of real and personal property, at 7,075 pounds.[19] Mrs. Achmuty was fortunate in that she was able to leave the colonies with 200 pounds. Mrs. Achmuty's case, filed by her son, was vague. No witnesses were produced, no deeds furnished and no statement of loyalty ever mentioned. In spite of its lacking evidence, Mrs. Achmuty's case was well received and she was granted undue compensation.

Another unusual case was that of Sarah Grant. Alijah Willard, Mrs. Grant's attorney, filed the claim on her behalf. The claimant died during her claim's review, but her attorney and her children pursued the case. Sarah Grant, her husband Alexander, and their five children had lived in New York prior to the war. Once fighting began and people started taking sides, Alexander Grant remained loyal. He enlisted in the New York Volunteers, a provincial corps in his Majesty's Service, and quickly became a major.[20] Like many of his compatriots, Major Grant was killed in battle. He died during a rebel assault on Fort Montgomery. Mrs. Grant and her children were left to the mercy of rebel

---

[18]Ibid., vols.99-100: 29.
[19]Ibid., vols.99-100: 65.
[20]Ibid., vols. 26: 48.

troops. They were deprived of all of their possessions, being left with only the clothes on their backs. When New York was eventually evacuated, the Grant family was sent to Nova Scotia "...where they are now in great poverty and distress".[21] Listed in the schedule of losses were numerous and varied items. The rebels confiscated over 4,000 acres of land, livestock, farm tools, linen and bedding. They also took household furniture, cured ham, pork, flax seed, bonds, book debt and mill wright utensils.[22] Witnesses were provided to substantiate the case. Robert Grant, a son, told of his father's loyal and brave conduct during the war. He also described the death of his mother (on March 9, 1787), while sailing from Annapolis to Nova Scotia. Colonel Alijah Willard described Major Grant's active role in the war, Mrs. Grant's untimely death and the orphans she left in a strange country. An affidavit was procured from Malcolm Morrison who verified the claim Attorney Willard had submitted. Mrs. Grant's claim was well presented. Numerous witnesses confirmed the Grant's experiences in the colonies at the hands of the rebels. Evidence was provided which upheld the claim's veracity. This case, like so many others, illustrates the levels of violence the rebels used to frighten their opponents, even if they were defenseless women and children.

The claim of Sarah Stockton, widow, is quite unusual. Although the claimant was Sarah Stockton, the testimony and petition seem to have originated with her son, James Stockton in Bermuda. Sarah Stockton and her husband Joseph lived on a vast plantation in East Jersey with their eleven children. Mr. Stockton was incarcerated for ignoring the rebels call to arms. When the chance presented itself, Mr. Stockson offered his services as a guide to British forces, in November of 1776. Less than five months later, he was slain at Brunswick.

---

[21]Ibid., vols. 26: 48.
[22]Ibid., vols. 26: 50.

After his death, the rebels seized Joseph Stockton's estate and sold it for their own benefit. The Stocktons, prior to the out break of war, had once owned 600 acres of farm and pasture land, two slaves, a goodly amount of livestock, 500 bushels of wheat, and farming equipment.[23] James Stockton stated that his father, who served as a guide to the British during the war, died in 1777. In addition, his mother Sarah Stockton was mistreated and deprived of her property. James Stockton solicited his father's estate, less the widow's third. He provided a lengthy and detailed report of his father's real and personal property and its worth amounting to almost 7,000 pounds. To bolster the claim, James Stockton supplied ample documentation, including the rebels' confiscation order, an estate inventory, a property assessment, a certificate from Governor Livingstone, and an accounting completed by Aaron Dunham, (auditor of accounts in New Jersey) of Joseph Stockton's confiscated estate.[24] Mrs. Stockton's claim was clearly filed by her son, James Stockton, and it is unusual that the fact was not clearly stated within the body of the document. Mrs. Stockton did not provide testimony or any statements in her own claim. She probably would have received a better settlement had Mr. Stockton's involvement been conspicuously declared in the petition.

Colonel Johnson presented the claim of Mrs. Thomas, widow of the Superintendent of Indian Affairs in West Florida. Colonel Johnson noted losses for Mrs. Thomas as 1600 acres of land, 13,754 pounds in personal property, Mr. Thomas' salary, and the destruction of a plantation. He included the fact that Mrs. Thomas was incarcerated by the rebels twice while in West Florida.[25] Mrs. Thomas and her husband were loyal and participated in the war. Additional documentation would have greatly

---

[23]Ibid., vols. 14-16: 171-172.
[24]Ibid., vols. 14-16: 171-173.
[25]Ibid., vols. 99-100: 61.

enhanced her case. As indicated above, Mrs. G. Sandford's claim could fit in this category (of claims filed by male relatives and friends for women loyalists) as well as the one of wealthy loyalists. (This was discussed earlier.)

The next group illustrates claims for lost inheritances. The claimants' loyalty and the war interrupted the heirs' usual method of receiving property, thus these women filed for their losses. Mary Pashall, along with her brother John Roberts, filed a claim for her father's property. John Roberts (Senior), High Sheriff of New York (owned a large elegant estate in New York) and earned approximately 700 pounds per year. He resisted the rebel call and "...had always distinguished himself by his active zeal and Loyalty in favor of His Majesty's Government as can be testified by Sir Henry Clinton, General Vaughan, General Robertson and many other persons of respect...".[26]

When rebel forces seized the town in which Roberts lived, they sought out Mr. Roberts. They burned down his home due to his loyalty to Great Britain. He lost everything, including books, bonds and private papers. Mr. John Roberts (Senior) died in May 1783, and three months later the claimants (Mary Pashall and John Roberts, Jr.) went to England where they filed a claim. They claimed the inheritance of an estate worth almost 400 pounds and were awaiting documentation from America to prove their case. To bolster their petition, the claimants had General John Vaughan testify to knowing John Roberts (senior) and his family in America. He described Mr. Roberts as faithful to the British cause and the British government.[27] Mary Pashall's claim on her father's estate was well documented. Credible witnesses substantiated the petition and confirmed her schedule of losses. The fact that Mary Pashall and her brother presented the claim jointly probably worked in Miss Pashall's favor.

---

[26]Ibid., vols. 24: 80.
[27]Ibid., vols. 24: 93.

The next claim examined was jointly filed by a mother and son for the loss of property left to them in a will. Mrs. Sarah Cory, wife of the late Griffin Cory of West Chester County, New York, had eight children and was relatively wealthy. When war broke out, Griffin Cory was a good and loyal subject to the crown, in spite of the fact that he was too old to participate in the war. Two of his sons took up arms against the rebels. Griffin Cory was harassed due to his and his family's beliefs, but he refused to change his allegiance. Rebel harassment continued and he was forced to seek asylum behind British lines on Long Island, New York. Eventually the rebels apprehended and jailed Mr. Cory, who died during incarceration.

The rebels seized the Cory's home, land, and possessions, and deprived them of all they had acquired over the years. Mrs. Cory and her son Thomas were named executrix and executor respectively in Griffin Cory's will. Listed as lost were three tracts of land in West Chester County, New York, 267 acres and ninety seven square rods of land in New York. Also included was a house, barn, orchards and meadows. Plundered from their farm was twenty bushels of oats, seven bushels of wheat, ten bushels of rye, over twenty loads of hay, and livestock consisting of cows, horses and sheep. The rebels stole an ox cart, farming tools, linen, furniture, clothing, cookware, wheat, oats, flax seed, corn and other miscellaneous and related items.[28]

The Corys produced a document from a rebel court which stated that Griffin Cory's estate had been seized due to Mr. Cory's politics. Solomon Dinjey and John Yeomans served as witnesses to bolster the Cory's claim. Mr. Dinjey described Griffin Cory's vast estate in New York, his allegiance to England, and the distress he incurred in consequence of it. He noted that Griffin Cory did not leave any debts. Mr. Yeomans also

---

[28]Ibid., vols. 25: 363

verified Mr. Cory's good character and service to the crown. He agreed with the claim presented by the Corys' and also stated that Mr. Cory was free from debt when he expired.[29] The Corys' petition for recompense was well prepared. They provided documents, believable witnesses and a detailed list of the items and land lost through loyalty. The fact that Mrs. Cory's son was asking for reimbursement along with her strengthened the case, making the chance of a better or larger settlement possible.

Mrs. Payton, of South Carolina, filed a claim for the loss of her estate. Her husband, Mr. Payton, was alive and stationed in Scotland, and Mrs. Payton asked for compensation for land she had inherited from her previous husband (who had been an English officer). Ironically, the Claims Commission examination brought out the fact that Mrs. Payton's father was a famous rebel in the colonies, thus illustrating the war's and politics' abilities to separate families.[30] Mrs. Payton's claim was unusual because most of the women filing claims did so because they had lost their husbands, who in many cases were the women's sole support. Although it was not explicitly stated, it appeared to be the norm that when a woman's husband was alive, he would file for his losses. In this type of case it was not necessary for the wife to file a claim, even if it was for her own property. In Mrs. Payton's case, she asked for recompense for her own property which she had inherited.

Mrs. Woolridge, a mother of five, made a claim for property and money due her from an inheritance. Mrs. Woolridge, previously from New Jersey, was left 4,000 pounds and an estate in New Jersey in her late father's will. This estate would have generated annual earnings of up to forty pounds for Mrs. Woolridge, had she been in possession of

---

[29]Ibid., vols. 25: 366-370.
[30]Ibid., vols.99-100: 23.

it. She produced a copy of the will as evidence of her loss due to the war.[31] The fact that she had children to support most likely helped her case. The absence of an account of Mrs. Woolridge's experiences in the colonies, her loyalty or her husband's role in the war was quite unusual. It was extraordinary that Mrs. Woolridge did not ask for recompense for damages of her stolen or destroyed personal property at the hands of the rebels.

Elizabeth Wannamaker Posh lived with her first husband, Richard Wannamaker, on a farm in New Jersey. Richard Wannamaker remained faithful and supportive of the British government throughout his lifetime. He enlisted in the British military in New York in 1776. During a battle at Paulus Hook, Richard Wannamaker was captured and transported to a prison in Philadelphia where he died soon after his incarceration.[32] Mrs. Wannamaker later married Sergeant John Posh of Colonel Bushkirk's Regiment and moved to St. John in 1783.

Mrs. Posh filed a claim for lost property acquired from her first husband Richard Wannamaker. The Wannamakers owned approximately 100 acres of land in Bergen County in New Jersey, a house, six cows, three horses, five sheep and young cattle. The rebels confiscated and sold all of this property, leaving the Wannamakers in poverty. To substantiate the claim, James Sarvarnier served as a witness for Mrs. Posh. Mr. Sarvarnier averred that Mrs. Posh's claim was accurate and noted Mr. Wannamaker's enlistment in the New Jersey Volunteers, his subsequent capture and death at the hands of the rebels. He described the Wannamaker's farm and mentioned Mrs. Posh's marriage to Sargent Posh. Mrs. Posh's claim was well documented and supported by a strong witness. It was not a frequently seen claim and Mrs. Payton's relatively quick remarriage indicates that she

---

[31]Ibid., vols. 99-100: 37.
[32]Ibid., vols. 14-16: 166.

may have experienced severe financial trouble due to the rebels seizing her land and all of her possessions.

The two claims, filed upon the estate and losses of Colonel Thomas Howard, are interrelated. Thomas Howard lived in New York prior to the war. He owned 10,000 acres of land in Cumberland County, Province of New York, 6,000 acres of land in Thirming township, and 34,000 acres of land in Windham township. Howard was a colonel in the First Regiment of Foot Guards and died in battle in August, 1778. In his will, Colonel Howard bequeathed the land in Cumberland County to this brother and sister, Philip and Mary Howard, He legated 7,000 acres each (3,000 acres of land in Thirming township and 4,000 acres of land in Windham township) to his sons George Meyer Howard and Thomas Ward Howard, and 4,000 acres of land (in Windham township) to the unborn child of his wife Elizabeth Meyer. To Francis Ward he left 1,000 acres of land in Windham and the remaining 22,000 acres in Windham township, was left to his mother, Margaret Howard.

Two separate claims were filed by Colonel Howard's relatives for lost inheritances from his estate. Philip and Mary Howard filed for the loss of 10,000 acres left to them in his will. They were not certain of the land's exact value, so they estimated its worth by the price Colonel Howard paid for it plus the improvements made on it. They believed the land to be worth 900 pounds sterling. They submitted the will and other documents to substantiate their case and stated that General Tryon and any officer, who served with their brother, would confirm his service, loyalty, and death during battle.

Mrs. Margaret Howard, Colonel Howard's mother, filed a claim for the minor children, Thomas Ward Howard and George Meyer Howard, of her son. Witnesses for Mrs. Howard included Colonel Philip Skene, John Tabor Kempe and Henry White. Colonel Skene testified to Colonel Howard's honesty, action in battle and death. He also

noted that Mrs. Howard cared for Colonel Howard's children. Mr. Kempe explained that a majority of Colonel Howard's land was in the newly expanded title of the people of Vermont. Mr. White discussed the extensive land holdings Colonel Howard possessed in New York.[34] Mrs. Howard's case was equally strong. It was unusual that the Howards did not present a joint petition for recompense before the court. By pooling their evidence, the case could have been even more effective. Perhaps the Howards felt that by jointly filing a claim it would reduce their overall settlement.

Rachel Wetmore filed a claim for the losses incurred by her first husband, Benjamin Ogden. Prior to the war, Mrs. Wetmore lived with her first husband and their four children in New York. When war broke out, Benjamin Ogden took up arms as a Lieutenant in the Prince of Wale's American Regiment. Lieutenant Ogden raised battalions of loyal men to fight against the rebel insurgency. In service to the crown, Ogden served as a British spy, attending countless meetings with Governor Tryon on board HMS Asia. He supplied valuable information to General Howe and Captain Montozure. He also converted his home into a safe haven for fugitive loyalists. Lieutenant Ogden died during a battle at Hanging Rock in South Carolina, and left his wife and four children helpless and alone in the world.

Soon after her first husband's death, Mrs. Wetmore fled to St. John seeking a safe place for her family to live. She filed for her losses totaling 525 pounds. Her first husband, Benjamin Ogden, had been a successful businessman during his lifetime. He had employed journeymen and apprentices, and had owned tools for one or two dozen workers. Mrs. Wetmore lost her home, beds, linen, furniture, kitchen utensils and kitchen ware. She also lost tables and the income from apprentices.[35] To substantiate her case,

---

[34]Ibid., vols. 22: 248-252.
[35]Ibid., vols. 25: 193-195.

Mrs. Wetmore produced Azor Bells and Benjamin Close as witnesses. Mr. Bells knew the claimant's first husband. He described Benjamin Ogden as a loyal soldier for Britain, who had been condemned for his stance. He also noted Ogden's home and possessions and worked as a spy for Britain. Mr. Bells mentioned that after Lieutenant Ogden's death, Mrs. Wetmore's home was ransacked by the rebels. Mr. Close was also well acquainted with Mr. Ogden and gave similar testimony as Mr. Bells had concerning the man. Additionally, Rachel Wetmore presented two certificates and a warrant which illustrated Lieutenant Ogden's service and fealty.[36] Rachel Wetmore presented an excellent case. Her witnesses were well acquainted with her late husband and testified to his service and loyalty to Great Britain. Benjamin Ogden was a fine example of what the British believed a loyal citizen should have been. He fought for England, spied against the Americans and even recruited additional troops to reinforce the British soldiers. Mrs. Wetmore provided several certificates which verified the important role her husband had played during the war. Mrs. Wetmore certainly deserved recompense for her losses and her first husband's service to the crown.

Mary Hamilton Rice's claim is also peculiar. Her first husband, John Hamilton, filed a claim on his own behalf in England in 1779, but died before his claim was settled. Mrs. Rice filed a claim for compensation in 1782 for her husband's losses and services during the war. John Hamilton, originally from Scotland, traveled to America in the midst of the Revolution. He was a surgeon and settled in New York, establishing a practice there. During the war, Hamilton served the British effort as a spy, reporting to General Tryon through the latter's secretary, Edmund Farming. Hamilton raised 150 men to fight against the rebels and used his own funds to send them to New York. His deeds were

---

[36]Ibid., vols. 25: 196-198.

soon uncovered. In May, 1776, angry rebels stormed Hamilton's house, beat him, and threw him in prison. He was put on trial as a traitor to the American/rebel cause, but was exonerated on the grounds of insufficient evidence. Upon return to his ransacked home, John Hamilton steadfastly continued his espionage. When he was seized a second time, the rebels intended to try and to execute him in Philadelphia. He shrewdly broke away from them, eluded capture, and journeyed back to the safety of British lines in New York. Once in New York, he accepted the position of surgeon on board HMS Hinchinbrook. That ship was destroyed in 1778 and Hamilton received an appointment aboard HMS Zebra, which soon was destroyed. Finally John Hamilton was designated surgeon to the British vessel HMS Centaur where he died on ship, in July, 1780.

Prior to his sailing on HMS Centaur, Mr. Hamilton filed a claim for his losses in New York. He stated his total losses as more than 1,000 pounds. Mrs. Rice had the claim and presented it with her own. She also presented the certificate of sale when the rebels had sold her property. Mrs. Rice's schedule of losses was brief. She claimed a house, some horses, servants, furniture, medical supplies, books and a little bit of money. Mr. George Urquhart was an acquaintance of the late John Hamilton, and his wife Mary Hamilton Rice. Prior to his death, Hamilton discussed his losses in America with Mr. Urquhart. Mr. Urquhart said that John Hamilton lost furniture, jewelry, dinnerware, and cows, pigs, and horses. A certificate from Captain Collins provided further evidence of Mrs. Rice's losses. Captain Collins affirmed her story and John Hamilton's claim.[37] Mrs. Rice's case was well documented and substantiated by witnesses. Mrs. Rice's first husband, John Hamilton, served the British cause. His personally recruiting and funding

---

[37]Ibid., vols. 17-20: 21-26.

of troops was a great example of his patriotic enthusiasm. Had more people been as involved, the final outcome of the war might have been different.

The last group in this section contains the cases filed for minor children and their losses. The last four claims by loyalist women were claims made not by wives, but by daughters and/or their guardians. Ann Ragg, an orphan of ten years of age, was represented by her guardian Mr. Douglas. Miss Ragg's father, prior to his death, was the Maryland Comptroller of Customs, where he earned about sixty pounds a year. Mr. Ragg was a prisoner of war and died as a result of his confinement. No property was claimed, although Mr. Douglas did produce a will which left all of Mr. Ragg's possessions to his daughter Ann.[38] The girl lost her father and was left with no means of support. The fact that no land, house or personal possessions were claimed denotes the extreme conditions the Raggs' had lived in prior to and during the war.

Eleanor and Margaret See, sisters aged eleven and seven years, were in a similar situation. Their parents were killed in Maryland as a result of the war. Philip See, their father, was a member of Council in the Province of Maryland and a loyalist. Their paternal grandfather, Mr. See, filed the claim on the girls' behalf. He stated that they were from one of the most respected and wealthiest families in the colonies and would have inherited land and property valued in excess of 5,000 pounds. Sir Robert Edens and Mr. Molleson attested to Philip See's character, loyalty, and wealth.[39] The See children's case lacked documentation. The fact that Philip See had been a member of Council should have made documenting that position easy and have been helpful to the case. The girls' ages and sex were counted against them in the end and their awards were minimal.

---

[38]Ibid., vols. 99-100: 49.
[39]Ibid., vols.99-100: 79.

Joseph Galloway, the infamous loyalist, made a claim on behalf of his daughter. He claimed that she had lost an inheritance of over 20,000 pounds sterling from both his and his wife's estates. Miss Galloway lost this property because of her father's strong loyalist stance and had to leave the colonies after she experienced abuse at the hands of the rebels, prior to the end of the war.[40] Miss Galloway's case was unusual. Her father was a famous loyalist, while her mother, who had remained in the colonies, supported the rebels. Grace Galloway (Miss Galloway's mother) still retained possession of her farm while the war raged on. This was another example of the war's ability to pit husband against wife. Miss Galloway's case was quite brief and her father did not provide any evidence to prove his daughter's losses. This smug loyalist had relied on his reputation rather than facts to put his daughter's case to the Commissioners. The result, mentioned later, was quite interesting.

What was most fascinating about these exceptional and atypical women was their ability to endure and adapt to the changing political atmosphere in the colonies. They chose to remain loyal to Great Britain in the midst of great peril. They did not give in to the various scare tactics and violent measures which the rebels employed to pressure loyalists to change their allegiance. Some provided moral support to British troops, while many gave comfort and shelter, supplies, information, and money. The fact that many women fled the colonies during the war was not an indication of cowardice. Had these women been cowards, they would have succumbed to the rebels' campaign of terror and forsaken their King. Loyalist women fled to safer countries in an effort to save their lives and the lives of their children. Loyal sympathizers suffered greatly for their beliefs and an escalation of violence caused even the stoutest Tory to seek a safe environment. Once in

---

[40]Ibid., vols. 99-100: 79.

exile, these loyalists continued to support their cause in the colonies and anxiously awaited a British victory. Up until the end of the war, many enthusiastic refugees could or would not conceived the thought of defeat. This made the rebel victory over Great Britain an extreme shock to those who held a hope of returning to their homes in the colonies.

CHAPTER 4

DECISIONS AND RECOMPENSE

While loyalists made claims and supplied witnesses and corroborating evidence to substantiate their petitions, the Claims Commission was scrupulous in its investigation of all losses. Seldom, if ever, were petitioners compensated with any settlement near their actual monetary loss. Usually loyalists received annual payments which were meager and barely enough to support themselves and their families.

At least five women, Sarah Simpson, Sarah Stockton, Susannah Wylly, Mary Farmar and Miss Galloway, received no compensation. The Commissioners did not believe that Mrs. Simpson provided sufficient evidence to establish her lost cash and personal property.[1] The Commissioners stated that Sarah Simpson "...deserves compensation but lives in America" and "...it is impossible to extend relief [to her] without setting [a] dangerous precedent", which the Commissioners were eager to avoid. Mrs. Stockton resided in England, but her case was dismissed. Had her case been accepted, it is doubtful she would have received a stipend of more than fifty pounds.[2] The lack of documentation was detrimental to her case. Susannah Wylly was supplied with a pension of 240 pounds per year from her late husband. The Claims Commissioners felt that her pension was more than sufficient to provide for Mrs. Wylly and her children. Thus they awarded her no recompense.[3] In Mary Farmar's case, the commission found that her

---

[1]Public Records of Great Britain, Series1, American Loyalist Claims 1776-1831 (Exchequer and Audit Department, 1972), vols. 64: 92.
[2]Ibid., vol. 99: 201.
[3]Ibid., vol. 100: 30.

losses were due to Indian attacks in the area. Thus she was not entitled to a stipend from the British Government. Miss Galloway's claim, made by her father, argued that she had lost her inheritance of land and money because of her father's loyalist actions. The Commission dismissed this claim because both of Miss Galloway's parents were still alive. She was not entitled to her parents' estate until they had passed away.[4]

Although the Claims Commission's stated purpose was to review a loyalist's claim and allot a fair yearly payment, its goal was not always met. The Commission was scrupulous in its examination of claims, witnesses and evidence, although the payments it awarded were not as impartial as one may believe. The largest settlements went to women who had male relatives or friends present their cases. Mrs. G. Sandford, sister of the late Governor Hutchinson, is one such example. Her claim was for two farms of undefined size or value in Rhode Island. No mention was ever made of her or her husband's contribution to the British war effort, yet she was awarded 110 pounds annually.

Ann Burns, Mrs. Thomas and Mrs. Achmuty, all middling and upper class women, had men present their claims and each received eighty pounds per year in compensation. Mrs. Payton and Mrs. Burns' claims requested compensation for their property. Mrs. Payton filed on her own while Mrs. Burns had a male friend file for her. Mrs. Achmuty's son filed her case for her. She received a decision of eighty pounds per year, in spite of the fact that her claim lacked evidence. Colonel Johnson presented the claim of Mrs. Thomas, widow of the Superintendent of Indian Affairs in West Florida. Colonel Johnson noted losses for Mrs. Thomas as 1,600 acres of land, 13,754 pounds in personal property, Mr. Thomas' salary and the destruction of her plantation. He included the fact that Mrs.

---

[4]Ibid., vols. 99-100: 80.

Thomas was incarcerated by the rebels twice while in West Florida.[5] In spite of all of Colonel Johnson's efforts, Mrs. Thomas did not receive recompense.

Women of the middling sort, who presented documentation and witnesses to verify their accounts (like Mrs. Howard, Mrs. Smith and Mrs. Sargent) generally received a determination of fifty pounds per year. Mrs. Payton and Mrs. Cumming, who filed for losses of their own property (and not that of their husband's), were paid fifty pounds annually. Mrs. Griffiths asked for a one-time grant of twenty pounds, which she received. She stated in her claim that she had sold her belongings in South Carolina and had not really lost anything. (Incidentally, she used the money to help her son). Mrs. Woolridge received sixty pounds a year until she was able to recover her inheritance in the colonies. Lucy Necks was not considered by the commission to be a refugee, because she had no proof of being loyal to Great Britain. Her only loss was a debt owed to her husband.[6] However, this type of claim was not considered a loss and was not acceptable under the rules the Claims Commissioners had set forth for their criteria for judging claims of losses. The Commission granted her a single payment of sixty pounds, not the 300 pound sum she had requested, to use for her return to Virginia. Mary Barnes' claim made a good impression on the Commissioners. They remarked that "Mrs. Barnes' Husband had no great Property but it is impossible for any Woman to have a better claim upon Government for a proper share of its Bounty than Mrs. Barnes has...". She was awarded forty pounds per year for her and her husband's contributions to the crown.[7] Another refugee, Mary Airey, also inspired the Commission to remark, "This woman seems to have done all that her Sex would permit her to do to show her attachment to her Native of

---

[5]Ibid., vols. 99-100: 61.
[6]Ibid., vols. 99-100: 45.
[7]Ibid., vols. 99-100: 147.

Country."[8] Mrs. Airey was given thirty pounds per annum as compensation for her lost shop, stock, personal property, and her husband's service to the King and subsequent death during battle. Rachel Noble lost her husband during the war and endured many hardships for her loyalty to Great Britain. She totaled her losses near 1,000 pounds. Generals Harcourt and Skinner, Lieutenant Governor Elliot, Major Drummond and Mr. John Seton provided loyalty certificates for Mrs. Noble's late husband. Mrs. Noble was compensated 100 pounds per year.[9] Margaret Francis Hill, a hard-working housekeeper, rebuffed repeated rebel entreaties for her to poison her employer, Colonel Guy Johnson. She was loyal to Great Britain and her employer. Miss Hill was incarcerated on two separate occasions and relieved of all her possessions for her stance against the rebels. For her duty and fealty, Miss Hill was granted a stipend of twenty pounds a year.[10] Janet Russell provided four witnesses for her case. Her husband had fought and bore arms for the British. He even spent time in a rebel prison for his loyalty. He was killed in battle and left his wife and five children alone in the world. Mrs. Russell was given a yearly stipend of forty pounds.[11] Elizabeth Allen provided money, clothes and support for British prisoners of war and soldiers. She was influential in having a few soldiers released from a rebel jail. After filing several times without success, Miss Allen was finally granted twenty pounds annually for her service.[12] This amount was later reviewed and revoked by the Commission. They sighted lack of proof as their motivation in spite of the testimony of numerous witnesses in Miss Allen's behalf.[13] Mary Pashall, who filed jointly with her

---

[8]Ibid., vol. 101: 29.
[9] Ibid., vol. 104: 21.
[10]Ibid., vol. 89: 14.
[11]Ibid., vol. 102: 39.
[12]Ibid., 99: 295.
[13]Ibid., vol. 109: 72.

brother John Roberts for loss of an inheritance, received twenty pounds a year.[14] Later Mrs. Pashall's son died and she was granted an additional twenty pounds a year to subsidize the money she had regularly received from him.[15] Mrs. Hutchinson and Mrs. Price both received only thirty pounds per year, even though they both provided evidence of their loyalty and losses in the colonies at the hands of the rebels. The See children were only allotted twenty-five pounds each for a few years, even though their parents and grandparents were loyal and helped to further the British cause in the colonies. It was not included in the claim but the small payment for the See children was probably due to their age and inability to oppose the determination. Mary Hind, Mrs. Sestor, Mrs. Bowers, Mrs. Parker and Mrs. Mackey all were granted between twenty and thirty pounds each per year. These five women had lived lower and middling class lives in the colonies and were unable to provide proof of their losses or of their loyalty to the British during the war. They owned little personal property in the colonies and did not actually have any large monetary losses due to their loyalty.

The colonists who resisted rebellion and remained loyal to Great Britain were scattered throughout the colonies and represented a small number of the total population in the colonies. The loyalists were "outnumbered and unorganized" and the "campaign of intimidation" employed by rebels made leaving their homes and country a necessity. The rebels made a conscious and decided effort to utilize violent and threatening tactics to drive away any and all opposition to their cause.[16] They quickly organized, silenced their critics and prepared for war. The rebels did not want reform, they wanted independence

---

[14]Ibid., vol. 100: 147.
[15]Ibid., vol. 101: 363.
[16]Mary Beth Norton, The British Americans; the Loyalist Exiles in England 1774-1789(Boston, Little and Brown, 1972) : 10-20.

from a tyrannical government which was "deliberately attempting to enslave the colonies."[17]

The loyalists fled to several different countries, including Nova Scotia in an effort to escape the rebels' reign of terror. The journey to Halifax, Nova Scotia was brief, but difficult for those colonists sailing from the New England area. The ships that carried loyalists to safety in Nova Scotia were chronically teeming with masses of people. Conditions aboard ship were less than adequate, and passengers habitually arrived in ailing health. Ill, scared, far from home and often penniless, the loyalists arrived in Halifax to learn that their ordeal was not over, but would start a new and different, but nonetheless depressing chapter. Halifax was not a paradise. It was a cold, damp, and foreign land, hostile and inadequate to these exiled colonists. Halifax residents were opportunists and charged the loyalists inflated prices on everything. Food and clothes were doubled in price and landlords charged six-fold their normal rent. Loyalists were quite unhappy in Halifax and found it lacking in even the most basic conveniences and necessities. Many loyalists decided to go to England and try their fate in the country most had called home.

England was more to the liking of the exiles; while some re-settled in Scotland and Ireland, many loyalists rented rooms in London. London proved to be an exciting city at first, and many were content to spend their few months of exile in such an energetic place. Loyalists were able to amuse themselves in many ways in London. They could visit the museums, stroll through the park, look at local statues and the Tower of London. They attended the theater, magic shows, local zoos and the circus. Once these activities became routine, other and more bizarre events replaced them. Loyalists attended church services at Newgate prison and "rubbed elbows" with many different classes of criminals

---

[17]Ibid.: 4.

and felons. They also frequented the displays of public executions in the city.[18] Wealthier exiles spent a great deal of the summer traveling, and a quick trip to Paris was easily manageable, especially when the loyalists shared transportation and accommodations with each other .[19]

Predictably, few loyalists spent their time in search of work or tried to re-establish their former businesses. They languished under the misapprehension that their exile would be brief. Loyalists wanted to believe that England would be victorious over the colonies, and they would soon return home. Thus, seeking employment seemed a fruitless and futile pursuit. It was difficult for those loyalists interested in working to find jobs in London. Jobs were not plentiful in the crowded city, especially for Americans who were seen as "foreigners" by Englishmen, most of whom were opposed or indifferent to the war in the colonies. Loyalists were unable to find positions in their chosen fields or professions and often were not equipped for the work which was available. Some women were able to find position as housekeepers, laundresses or as domestic staff, but others were unable or unwilling to employ themselves in such menial tasks. Colonial lawyers, doctors, officials and the like were not able to practice their profession or find offices in their new and foreign home. The idea of seeking employment did not occur to many until 1777 and later, after the English had been defeated at Saratoga. This battle and its subsequent victory by the rebels was a signal to many American refugees that their stay in England would be indefinitely extended. Others were more perceptive and began seeking less costly rooms, some even far from the expensive city of London. Some loyalists also began an intensive search for some form of work. The English government also recognized the defeat at Saratoga as a turning point in the war. It may have been the first time that the

---

[18]Ibid.: 82.
[19]Ibid.: 82.

British Government doubted its ability to defeat the American rebel forces. The government's attitude drastically changed toward the refugees after that time. The British Government now saw the refugees as a long term or permanent burden which it was expected to bear. The government reduced the amount of awards and compensation it was giving to loyalists. The Claims Commission painstakingly scrutinized each claim presented to it and often reviewed and reduced previously appointed awards. It limited the number of people collecting compensation at any given time. It also narrowed the scope which the claims for compensation would cover; for example, the Claims Commission would not recognize damage done by Indians or the loss of debts owed to a loyalist. Compensation now served as a form of relief. It began to be based on a claimant's need, not on his/her losses. It was meant to be "...a minimum temporary support" and compensation took on a charitable mien and awards were kept in check.[20]

Complaints abounded from most refugees, who never believed they received enough compensation. It would have been virtually impossible for the British Government to have compensated fully every loyalist for his or her losses. The British people, many who were not supportive of the war, would not have willingly paid the bill for the loyalists who were now in their country. The government was also careful not to reward a loyalist with too large a stipend for fear it would elevate his or her status above his or her position in the colonies prior to the war. The Claims Commission used a standard amount of money for its awards, taking into consideration the loyalist's service, loss, and need. In case after case, "the treasury indeed seems to have regarded an annual 100 pounds as the necessary minimum income for an American accustomed to a comfortable existence".[21]

---

[20]Ibid.: 56.
[21]Ibid.: 56.

That amount was then proportionally increased or decreased to compensate the petitioner according to their losses, proof of loyalty and former status in the colonies.

When viewed as a group, the women who filed loyalist claims in England had many similarities. A majority of claims, filed by women, were submitted by widows. These forty-two widows represented seventy-one percent of the fifty-nine claimants examined, and suggested that few women owned property, but did request compensation for their husbands' land, property and wages. Sixty-nine percent of these women (forty-one women) had children and brought them to England to escape the violence of the colonies. As previously noted, a majority of the claimants were upper middle class, owning one or more homes, a large farm, and land, in addition to furniture, farming utensils, crops and other goods and live stock. Some owned slaves. The loss of all of their material possessions and the move to a new country only compounded their hardships in England. This fact illustrated their comfortable life style in the colonies.

Violence was also a central theme throughout the claims filed by these women. Many, along with their children, were subjected to imprisonment by rebels. They were treated poorly while in jail, and received little food, water or other comforts. Many of the claimants' husbands were killed by the rebels, through poor treatment, beatings and incarceration. Rebel forces confiscated, looted, and destroyed countless homes and farms, stealing everything they could carry. Most of the loyalists who filed claims received compensation. This was usually some small annual payment from the British Government for service and sacrifice rendered during the war.

The rebels employed formulaic methods of violence and intimidation toward their adversaries. Intimidation was subtle and restrained at first, in an attempt to assess a person's political stance. Once this was accomplished, heightened levels of harassment were employed. The rebels hoped to accomplish one of two goals. They wanted to

silence their opposition by terrorizing their opponents into fleeing or changing their attachment to the rebel cause. Techniques employed included public humiliation, such as tar and feathering, incarceration in the stockade, and parading the captured loyal sympathizers around the town bound in the back of a wagon. If such tactics were unsuccessful in silencing and/or eliminating the Tories, heightened levels of coercion and duress were applied. Mob violence took on new and more frightening forms. Loyalists were roused from their homes in the middle of the night, beaten, and left far from home. Houses were ransacked, looted and burned to the ground. Women and children were tormented, frequently being ill-treated and thrown into jail. Loyalist men were roughed up and incarcerated for long periods of time. The prisoners had to endure poor conditions, inadequate food and facilities which often took their toll on these men and women. Many loyalists died while held in rebel jails. If the men did not die while imprisoned, some died during battle. In extreme cases, bands of angry rebels hunted down and executed loyalists by hanging, shooting and other violent means. It was typical for rebel courts to confiscate loyalists' land, homes and personal possessions. The courts would declare a person a traitor, loyalist sympathizer or even spy (almost any trumped up charge was used) in order to alleviate them of all of their possessions. This was one more way to demoralize their opponents and weaken their morale and desire to aid Britain.

The methods employed by the rebels were very efficient and precisely employed. They effectively identified loyalists in their towns, silenced them, imprisoned them or caused them to flee. Land, farms, and businesses which were confiscated were sold to generate revenue for the rebel troops. Intimidation, fear, and uncertainty motivated many to keep their allegiance to Great Britain a secret. It caused others to flee the colonies in search of peace and tranquillity. Many died for their beliefs. In any event, it was a unifying catalyst which strengthened the rebel appetite and lust for victory.

There were many differences among the women loyalists which were evident from their claims. Not all of the women who filed claims did so for the loss of their husband's estates. Some women filed for losses on their own behalf, of items and property they owned during the revolution. Other women filed for the aid and patriotic activities they accomplished during the war. Eleanor Lestor, Mrs. Sestor, Mrs. Griffiths, Mary Airey, Catharine Leach, Sarah Simpson, and Mrs. Cumming all requested recompense for loss of their property and profession. Elizabeth Posh, Rachel Wetmore, Mary Hamilton Rice and Mrs. Payton filed for the loss of their own land, acquired as a result of the death of their first husbands. Mrs. Burns' claim was comparable to that of Mrs. Payton, in her claim for lost land from a deceased husband, although he did not die as a result of the war. Mrs. Woolridge and Mary Pashall asked to be compensated for the loss of an inheritance from their fathers. Mary Howard requested compensation for an inheritance from her brother, and Margaret Howard wanted compensation for her son's children and their lost inheritance from their father. Her son left her land which she was prevented from receiving due to the war. Four claimants, Miss Galloway, Eleanor and Margaret See, and Ann Ragg, were minors whose requests were made by relatives or guardians. Not all of the women made their own claims; Sarah Stockton, Mrs. Thomas, Mrs. Achmuty, Mrs. G. Sandford, and Mrs. Burns had claims made on their behalf by male relatives or friends. Sarah Grant and Sarah Brant both had claims made by their attorneys. Rebecca Callahan asked for recompense for the damage and destruction done to her property, which she still retained ownership of in America. Elizabeth Allen and Margaret Francis Hill petitioned the Claims Commission for a stipend for their aid to the British cause. This evidence was

all taken from the women's claims and indicated the differences which each claimant had with her fellow claimants.[22]

The geographical areas represented by these claimants vary as well. Thirteen colonies are represented in the fifty-nine claims examined. Twenty of the women, representing thirty-four percent, were from New York and represent the largest number of wealthy and middling class petitioners. Nine claimants, fifteen percent, came from South Carolina, seven or twelve percent from New Jersey and three women or five percent from both Pennsylvania and North Carolina. The remaining colonies mentioned had only one or two wealthy or middle class claimants from them. These figures indicate that wealth and opportunity existed throughout the colonies, but places such as New York, New Jersey and South Carolina, with merchant and/or shipping industries, were especially profitable. The poorest claimants in this study came from Massachusetts, Maryland and South Carolina. No further conclusions can be drawn at this time based upon the fifty-nine women studied, because over 7,000 loyalists fled the colonies and some 3,000 filed claims. Such a comparison would prove to be inaccurate. This sample is too small to be reliable for the larger number of claims available, but does illustrate some interesting trends.[23]

The settlements from the Claims Commission were not always consistent with the loyalists' losses and contribution to the British cause in the colonies. Mrs. Sandford seemed to have contributed little to the war effort but received a large settlement, presumably because of her brother's position in the colonies prior to the war. As stated previously, cases of similar merit presented by women were typically awarded a smaller settlement. Children and the poor fared the worst, receiving the lowest settlements of all the loyalist claims.

---

[22]Public Records of Great Britain, vols. 99-100: 61, 65, 39, 29.
[23]Egerton: xiv.

While examining the Claims Commission records, several slave claims were discovered. At a time when slaves held no legal status, it is unthinkable that the British government would allow them to file for losses. It certainly would not have occurred in America at this time, or for many years to come. Similar to the claims of the very poor or of minor children, these few slave claims were extremely brief, approximately half a page in length. The claim of George Mills, a slave from Virginia, is typical of such claims. Mr. Mills had escaped from his owner and joined the British forces. The British, in an attempt to bolster their ranks, offered to grant freedom to any slave who would fight against the rebels. In his claim, George Mills declared his loyalty to Great Britain and listed his losses as ten pounds in currency. Mr. Mills did not own any property and thus lost little for his political beliefs which ultimately benefited him. The Claims Commission found that Mr. Mills had gained his freedom through his association with the British cause. The Commission stated that Mr. Mills' freedom was invaluable. They believed that his freedom was worth more than the ten pounds he had lost and thus denied his claim.[24]

An examination of the experienced loyalist women encountered throughout the war helps us attain a better view of their lives. They received little compensation for their sacrifices during the war. The fact that they were permitted to file claims on their own behalf is startling, but the small stipends they received was not. The prevailing theme of violence throughout the claims was shocking, mainly because a large portion of it was directed at women and children. The numerous accounts of the cruelty, mistreatment, and abuse heaped upon this group is disheartening and enables readers to gain greater understanding and sympathy for these people. Discussion of the areas the women fled to and resettled in, and activities they participated in while awaiting an English victory,

---

[24]Ibid., vols., 99: 84-85.

illustrates their character and naive faith in Britain's ability to make everything "right" again. They did not make any long-range plans or seek employment because they believed their absence from the colonies would be short lived.

CONCLUSION

POINT OF NO RETURN

The American Revolution was a major crisis for colonists in North America. It was a point of no return in which events took on meanings of their own, and nothing could ever be the same. Lives were lost and property destroyed in an attempt, for some, to break away from the noose of British imperialism and domination. In the end, the rebel cause won, and they defiantly drove out the British troops and loyalists who had bitterly opposed them. Loyalists fled, ending up in many places around the globe. An examination of claims for aid and compensation by women exiles in England, usually the wives and daughters of deceased loyalists, illustrates many of their similarities and differences. It also shows the conditions and treatment women loyalists endured during the war in America.

Most of the fifty-nine claims examined were filed by wealthy upper and middling class women. Generally they filed for property, land, and other miscellaneous items such as furniture, slaves, crops, and livestock owned by their husbands. The most significant indicator of wealth was the possession of large tracts of improved or cultivated land. Owning one or more large houses, with lavish furnishings, slaves, supplies and other tools and material necessary in running a farm or plantation, all demonstrated a person's wealth in the colonies. Middle class colonists generally owned some land, a home and furnishings, some even owned a few slaves. The middling sort usually owned less acreage, much of which might have been unimproved. Their homes were well furnished, but unlike their wealthier counterparts, it was generally their sole dwelling. The poor commonly did

not own land, and were primarily tenant farmers or day laborers. Their possessions were meager and they frequently rented homes or resided as boarders in boarding houses.

The wealthy and middling sort loyalist women who filed for compensation generally furnished deeds, bills of sale, mortgages and certificates of loyalty (for their own and their husband's actions during the war), and supplied witnesses who substantiated their claims. They were well aware of their husbands' possessions and holdings, which facilitated their ability to file detailed claims of losses. Working class and poor women filed fewer claims than their elite counterparts, and the poor's losses would have been minimal. Also, many were unable to leave the colonies and seek asylum in England. These two facts account for the lower number of claims filed. Additionally, the poor provided little, if any, documentation or witnesses to authenticate their cases. In an atmosphere of doubt and fraud, these women were unable to prove their losses and thus received little or no compensation.

The records of the Claims Commission vary in their accounts. The claims of the wealthy were quite detailed, listing every lost barrel, fixture and piece of furniture. They were also exceedingly long, from ten pages to thirty or more. The claims were very precise, attaching a value to every item lost, even the labor of slaves and the price of pigs, which had already been fattened for market. Lawyer fees, travel expenses, linen, material, crops, parcels of tar, turpentine, and candles were all listed (with values placed on every item). The claims of most middling sort women were shorter in length, but just as precise, not allowing any household item to go unrecorded. The specific number of acres of improved and unimproved land was listed, along with lost stock and rent or debts from a business or plantation. The claims by both the wealthy and middling sort also included the husband's occupation, an account of his devout loyalty to England and the loyal services he engaged in during the war. It often included the treatment that the family

received by the rebels and the suffering they endured for the British cause. Claims by the poor and minor loyalists were usually brief. They noted the loyalty of the husband or parent and usually listed the person's occupation. Little if any mention was made of possessions and no evidence or witnesses were produced. Some of these claims were half a page long, a somber reminder of the person's life in the colonies.

The wealthy, middling sort and poor women loyalists discussed in this paper all suffered for their support of the British cause. It would be difficult to note who suffered more. The wealthy and middling sort lost all of their material possessions, their position in the colonies and their friends. The poor lost little if any material possessions and had to adjust to living in a strange country. The adjustment might have been easier for the poor, because they were familiar with poverty and the meager stipends which they received from the British would have been similar to their previous income in the colonies. Most of the women lost their husbands, and had to cope with starting their lives over again in an unfamiliar place, with few friends and little money. It was an unusual and unexpected ending for these women, many of whom never really believed England would lose the war.

Overall, records from the Claims Commission indicate the extreme differences in the elite and the poor. They described the terrible ordeals loyalists encountered in their desire to remain faithful and true to England, and more importantly, the King. The records also illustrate the naive beliefs this group held. They believed that Parliament was responsible for the intolerable condition of the colonies. They also felt that with modification of legislation and an easing of taxation and other restrictive measures, the rift between England and the rebels could be resolved. They did not grasp the whole issue that the rebels raised. They wanted a continuance of the benign neglect with which they had been familiar. Rebels wanted much more, and in the end achieved independence, at the shock and dismay of England and the loyalists.

The women loyalists discussed here never thought England or Nova Scotia (and other countries) would become their permanent home. They assumed that their new residences were temporary and when they returned to the colonies, things would return to normal. This was not the case and their adjustment to life in England and elsewhere would not occur overnight.

Women in the American colonies possessed little if any rights. They could not vote or own property (unless widowed), or be mistress of their own destiny, often having no say in who they married, of it unwed, what profession they pursued. Women, along with slaves and some cultural minorities, for all intents and purposes did not have any legal status. They were similar to chattel, possessions or property. In such an atmosphere, it is amazing that they were permitted to present claims in a governmental/legal setting. Women were standing up and asking for compensation for their own property (usually acquired through inheritance), possessions, and loyal actions for England. Their cases were solemnly received and seriously acted upon. Many of the women who presented credible cases and authentic documentation substantiating their claims actually received recompense.

The American Revolution changed more than just the obvious. It made women, both loyalists and rebels, more independent. They were now in charge of their homes, farms, plantations, and businesses because their husbands and fathers were participating in the war and absent from home for long periods of time. They had to rely upon themselves and one another to survive. Many women even chose opposite sides from their husbands and fathers, breaking from the old tradition of blind followers. They were often subjected to cruelty, violence and imprisonment from their adversaries for their political choices. This did not sway all of them from their position. Some fought against the rebels by spying for the British, harboring English soldiers, and providing goods and money for their

cause. The rebels were indiscriminate in their violent campaign to rid the colonies of the British and British sympathizers. Loyalist women and children were not spared from the barbarous acts committed by rebel mobs. Such savage acts as public intimidation, ransacking, looting and burning of homes and imprisonment caused many male and female loyalists to flee. The violence only strengthened many loyalists' resolve, it did not change their minds. It only made some change their location to a safer, less hostile environment. They fled, but anticipated a quick English victory.

The transformation many women were forced to make due to circumstances beyond their control had far reaching effects. They gained courage and knowledge that they could support themselves and their families when necessary. It was not an ideal situation, but when put to the test, these women survived. It was an important lesson they would never forget. Once the war was over and people began to rebuild their lives, many women returned to their traditional roles as wives and mothers, but things would never be the same. The new self-confidence and self-reliance these women earned would be instilled in their daughters and granddaughters. Its effects would be generational and not drastic or readily apparent, but they were there nonetheless. It would be a slow and subtle transformation which would generate significant changes for women in the future.

Considering all of the fifty-nine claims examined, several stand out from the rest for their exceptional detail, numerous witnesses, and corroborating evidence. Mrs. Mary Kearsley's claim exemplifies these characteristics. Mrs. Kearsley and her family experienced great hostility and violence at the hands of the rebels. Dr. Kearsley was repeatedly attacked and harassed for his political stance, the result of which was his untimely death in a rebel jail. Mrs. Kearsley was forced to flee to the countryside in an effort to avoid further enmities. Her respite at her country home was short lived and she soon took refuge in England. In her claim, Mary Kearsley provided a lengthy and

itemized inventory of her possessions which were stolen and/or destroyed by rebel forces. Her minute attention to detail along with five honorable witnesses made Mrs. Kearsley's claim thorough, giving the Claims Commission and anyone reading her document an accurate glimpse of her experience as a loyal sympathizer.

Mrs. Mary McAlpin also provided a clear and startling portrayal of her life in the colonies. Mrs. McAlpin provided aid and comfort to the British and loyalist soldiers on her property. This charity was soon discovered and she and her children were harassed and persecuted. Her home was repeatedly looted and her belongings pilfered. Eventually, the rebels threw Mary McAlpin and her children into prison. It seems unconscionable that innocent children would have been so severely punished for their parents' political beliefs. It is just one more example of the rebels' intense campaign of terror to eliminate their opposition. In her claim's schedule, Mrs. McAlpin enumerated her lost and stolen belongings and furnished a value for each and every item. She strengthened her case by providing letters from five military officers and one civilian who verified her claim and her family's loyal service during the war. She further bolstered her case by supplying nine witnesses who testified to the truthfulness of her claim.

Lady Juliana Farmer Penn's case is outstanding for many reasons. The claim itself is over thirty pages in length and recounts every piece of property, dwelling, building and rent she had lost due to her loyalty to Great Britain. Her claim is replete with witnesses, deeds, certificates and letters attesting her and her family's extensive land holdings and wealth in Pennsylvania prior to the outbreak of war. In every way, Lady Juliana Penn's claim could withstand the most arduous scrutiny.

Janet Russell, Rachel Noble and Sarah Fowler also provided thorough and well documented claims. They each had five witnesses, letters or certificates which substantiated their cases and bore testament to the women's loyalty and service to England

during the war. These women endured the turbulence of the time and remained true to the British cause. Their claims convey the turmoil, loss and heartache which these and other women suffered at the hands of ruthless rebels.

In comparison to some of the most detailed claims, an examination of the most speculative and circumspect schedules of losses is in order. Mrs. G. Sandford's case is one of the most notable in its lack of documentation and witnesses. Mrs. Sandford's nephew, Mr. Hutchinson, filed her claim and stated that this elderly loyalist had owned two large farms in the colonies prior to the war. To prove his statements, Mr. Hutchinson provided no deeds, certificates, letters or witnesses. He did not even provide a confiscation order which would have shown Mrs. Sandford's ownership of the farms. The claim did not even include a list of lost and stolen personal and household goods, indicating Mrs. Sandford's advanced age, poor health and unfamiliarity with the daily operation of her home. The absence of any documentation or eyewitness testimony did not deter a large settlement for this lady. Mrs. Sandford's brother, the late Governor Hutchinson, had been an important official in the colonial and thus she received preferential treatment.

Mrs. Sarah Maitland, Mrs. Elizabeth Smith, Mrs. Eleanor Maybee, Lucy Necks, and Miss Galloway submitted extremely weak cases to the Claims Commission. Each of these ladies supplied a detailed claim but did not provide any evidence to support her cases. It is difficult to believe that with over 7,000 loyalists exiled in England, these women could not find a few witnesses to corroborate their schedule of losses. It makes them and their cases appear especially suspect.

The cases of Mrs. Catharine Leach, Miss Elizabeth Allen, and Mrs. Eleanor Lestor represent women who exemplified bravery, courage and self-sacrifice in the face of tremendous and frightening odds. These women were loyal and active contributors to the British cause. Catharine Leach risked her life to garner information about rebel activity.

She then passed it on to British officers in an effort to contribute to the war effort. She was persecuted for her activities and even faced serious charges of spying for Britain in a rebel court. Repeated harassment and ransacking of her home and business finally caused her to seek safety in England.

Elizabeth Allen was truly a courageous woman. She was a single woman who gave aid and comfort to British soldiers and prisoners of war near her home. She contributed monetarily as well and even helped to gain the release of some imprisoned British soldiers. When Miss Hill was penniless and unable to support herself or others she finally fled to England. Numerous letters and eyewitness testimony verified her significant contribution during the war.

Eleanor Lestor also did her part to help England win the Revolution. She was a shopkeeper and owner of a boarding house where she secreted British sailors from the rebels. She also provided food, clothing and other necessities to the British military whenever she could. Eleanor Lestor's claim described her losses and her active participation and aid in the war.

These three women provided a great deal of aid to the British. Their claims were detailed and witnesses and documentation verified their assistance and faithful devotation to the crown. It is remarkable that they were so dedicated to the British cause that they were willing to risk everything to contribute to its success.

This war was fierce. It did not discriminate in its horrible effects, causing men, women, and even children to suffer. The tragedy of the battle, the continued rebel harassment, depredation, and degradation all took their toll. Rachel Noble and her family experienced great torment and sadness because of their support of the crown. Mrs. Noble was separated from her husband and her children were incarcerated for one a year in a rebel jail. Rachel Noble faced repeated badgering from her rebellious neighbors who

repeatedly looted her home. After the death of her husband at the hands of rebels, Mrs. Noble and her children fled to the safety of England. Mrs. Noble provided certificates, deeds, and eyewitnesses who supported her detailed claim and affirmed her terrible ordeal in the colonies.

Mary Airey aided the British by supplying them with goods and rooms in her home. She suffered repeated harassment because of her kind acts and lost her home and possessions during a great fire in New York. She lost everything and had to rely upon the generosity of the British soldiers for such basic items as clothing. The fire destroyed all of Mrs. Airey's records, but she was able to provide several soldiers as witnesses to her former possessions, store, and home.

Miss Margaret Francis Hill was a constant target of rebel soldiers due to her position as housekeeper to Colonel Guy Johnson, an important official in the British military. Miss Hill had intimate contact with Colonel Johnson and his brother, Sir John Johnson and was repeatedly asked to poison them. Miss Hill was loyal to Britain and her kind employer. She steadfastly refused every entreaty to murder the Johnson brothers. This defiance enraged the rebels. They imprisoned Miss Hill on two separate occasions, keeping her locked up in a cold, damp cell without clothing for months at a time. Her resolve never wavered. When she was free, she quickly fled to Quebec in anticipation of a respite from the rebels who had so plagued her in the colonies. While enroute, the ship she was sailing on was seized and once again Miss Hill was in the hands of the hated and feared rebels. They confiscated her belongings and money because she refused to help them. Fortunately, they released her.

It is extraordinary that this woman, and the other women had the courage to resist such frightening tactics. They never wavered in their support of the King or in their belief that Britain would win the war. Once they fled the colonies and submitted claims for their

losses their bravery and dauntlessness were revealed. Their extensive schedule of losses, supporting documentation and reliable eyewitness accounts illustrates the significant contribution they gave to the war effort. It is unfortunate that all of their suffering and sacrifice were in vein. Defeat by rebel forces and small or no compensation were difficult to accept. In the end, these women and many of the exiled loyalists were still loyal. All of their efforts and losses, they believed, were worthwhile and they would go to their graves believing that the rebels had made a terrible mistake.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

Egerton, Hugh Edward, editor. Mass Violence in America: The Royal Commission on the Losses and Services of American Loyalists 1783 to 1785. New York: Arno Press and The New York Times, 1969.

[Galloway, Grace Growden]. Diary of Grace Growden Galloway. New York: The New York Times and Arno Press, 1971.

[Hulton, Ann]. Letters of a Loyalist Lady: Ann Hulton. New York: The New York Times and Arno Press, 1971.

The Public Records of Great Britain, Series 1. American Loyalist Claims 1776-1831. Exchequer and Audit Department, 1972.

[Wells, Louisa Susannah]. The Journal of a Voyage from Charles Town to London: Louisa Susannah Wells. New York: The New York Times and Arno Press, 1968.

Secondary Sources

Allen, H. C. and Roger Thompson, editors. Contrast and Connection: Bicentennial Essays In Anglo-American History. Athens: Ohio University Press, 1976.

Brown, Wallace. The Good Americans: The Loyalists in the American Revolution. New York: William Morrow and Company, Inc., 1969.

DePauw, Linda Grant. Founding Mothers: Women in America in the Revolutionary Era. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1975.

Evans, G. N. D., editor. Allegiance in America: The Case of Loyalists. Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1969.

Norton, Mary Beth. The British Americans: the Loyalist Exiles in England 1774-1789. Boston: Little and Brown, 1972.

Potter, Janice. The Liberty We Seek: Loyalist Ideology in Colonial New York and Massachusetts. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1983.