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ABSTRACT

In spite of the volumes of material that have been published about the Revolutionary War, the lack of research about loyalists continues to be a great variable in any analysis of the war. It is the purpose of this paper to consider the Allaires as examples of loyalists and to determine what, in their case, may have motivated their choice of allegiance, what they did during the war, and how they were affected by it.

The Allaires' ancestors were French Huguenots who came to America when the Edict of Nantes was revoked. Their Huguenot background seemed to play little part in their decision to be loyalists, as several other descendants of Huguenots were active in the rebellion against George III. What the Allaires did inherit from their ancestors was a commercial background and outlook. As a mercantile family in New York City, they followed the example of their fellow merchants and became loyalists.

During the war, Peter Allaire was typical of New York merchants who never fought in battles but proved their loyalty by working to keep provisions coming into British occupied New York. What was atypical about Peter was his sense of adventure. Before the war it took him on a tour of Russia, which few Americans, if any, had visited. A few years later, he found himself in the Bastille, probably
because his enterprising endeavors had been misinterpreted by the French authorities. In contrast, his brother Anthony was actively involved in the war. He was a member of the Loyal American Regiment and later the American Volunteers. He is known for the journal he kept of the Volunteers, which was an eyewitness account of the Battle of King's Mountain as well as a description of rebel cruelty to prisoners following the battle.

Both Peter and Anthony left with several thousand other emigrants to find refuge in other British colonies because of the outcome of the war. Peter and his family went to Nova Scotia, but either because of the conditions there, his business concerns in New York, or both, he returned. Peter resumed trade, and his children grew to make contributions to the new United States of America. Anthony, who had gone with his regiment to New Brunswick, was content to settle there. He and his descendents worked together with other loyalist refugees to develop the maritime provinces of Canada.
INTRODUCTION

In any civil war, men are faced with the crucial decision of whether to join the rebel faction or to oppose it. Rarely is anyone permitted the freedom to choose a middle course. The American Revolution was no exception. People of the American colonies were often required to choose whether they would support the King of England and the established government, or whether they would favor the untried ideas of the outspoken colonial leaders, especially those of Massachusetts and Virginia. We have often heard about the courageous men willing to lose all they had to become free of English rule, yet the brave men who chose to be loyal to the king, and in turn, did lose their possessions and often their lives have usually been shrugged off as traitors and cowards. These men were actually quite similar to those whom our history has made heroes, but they chose to be American patriots of the King.

This paper will study a very small segment of these American loyalists; three brothers, Peter, Anthony and Uytendale Allaire. By piecing together some fragments of information about them along with other background information, suggestions will be made as to what factors may have contributed to their decision to support King George III of England. The paper will continue to trace what
these brothers did during the war, and it will conclude by describing how they, and many loyalists like them, were affected by the war. This paper will concentrate primarily on Peter and Anthony as very little record of Uytendale remains.
Chapter I: The Choice

To understand what may have motivated the brothers Allaire in their particular stand, it is necessary to examine their heritage. The Allaires have claimed descent from the Crusader Baldwin, who died in 1118. Baldwin owned a great deal of property in France, and was given the title King of Jerusalem for his conquests in the Holy Land. A closer ancestor of the Allaire brothers was Pierre Allaire Ecuyer, who lived in La Rochelle, France, in 1465. One of the early pastors of the French Reformed Church in La Rochelle was Paul Allard Esiccl, another relative. Alexander Allaire, grandfather of Peter, Anthony, and Uytendale, was born in France in 1660. He was a Huguenot who, when the Edict of Nantes was revoked in 1685, lost his freedom to worship and live as a protestant. To escape persecution, he fled to England, and then to the West Indies. As early as 1670, because of deteriorating conditions for French protestants in France, Allaires had already settled on the island of St. Christopher in the West Indies.

In 1686, a great number of these French settlers in the West Indies moved to New York. Not all people were

---


sure what role these newcomers would play. The governor of Canada, when he received a message that fifty to sixty Huguenots had arrived in New York, wrote, "Fresh material, this for banditti."3 Listed among the heads of the migrating families was Alexander Allaire and, as Charles Baird, in his book on the Huguenot emigration to America claimed, the majority of those who settled in Westchester County, New York, were Rochellese, and "The leading member of the settlement was Alexandre Isidé Allaire."4

Alexander Allaire continued to be a man of religious conviction throughout his life and was one of the early elders in the New Rochelle French Church. When many of the French churches joined with the Church of England in 1709, Allaire was one of the two members who refused to join. He became a leader in a new congregation which continued its Calvinist practices.5

Historians have speculated why France allowed the "manufacturers, on whom its wealth depended," to be driven out of the country and to "enrich other countries," by the revocation of the Edict of Nantes.6 These Huguenots were a "moral, industrious people, desirous of conforming to

3 Ibid., p. 231.
4 Ibid., p. 291.
the habits of those who received them kindly. 7 It is estimated that France lost approximately eight hundred thousand protestants during the exodus. 8 When the French eventually recognized their mistake, they compounded the situation by refusing to let protestants emigrate. 9

Several leaders of the American Revolution were descendents of these Huguenot refugees. For example, the ancestors of General Francis Marion, the "Swamp Fox" who thwarted the British army in the South, came to America when the Edict of Nantes was revoked and settled on the Cooper River near Charleston, South Carolina, eventually moving to Georgia. 10 The ancestors of John Jay, the American ambassador to Spain during the revolution and the first Chief Justice of the United States, came from France. In 1685, life became so restricted there that they escaped to Plymouth, England, and eventually came to America. 11 Paul Revere, a leader of the radical Sons of Liberty in Boston, also was a descendent of a Huguenot refugee. 12 Therefore, it is clear that their Huguenot heritage did

7 Ibid., p. 73.
8 Ibid., p. 61.
9 Ibid., p. 59.
10 Ibid., p. 81.
11 Ibid., p. 101.
not presage the Allaires' decision to oppose the revolution.

Philip W. Coombe's thesis on the life of James P. Allaire, a son of Peter, dwells on the history of the Huguenots, describing in detail the progression of events from the St. Bartholomew Day massacre to Henry IV and the Edict of Nantes and its revocation.13 Yet James Allaire's letters and papers give no indication of more than token interest in religion.14 In fact, already the generation before James Allaire, with which this paper is concerned, shows no evidence that it was guided by Huguenot ideals. The story of the religious wars in France may make interesting reading, but it has little relevance for a study of the descendents of the Allaire family beyond the first generation. The only general conclusion that can be drawn is that most Huguenot descendents probably favored the revolution out of an inbred distrust of repressive monarchs. Thus, if their Huguenot background was not likely to make the Allaires loyal to the King, some other consideration must have been responsible for the choices of Alexander Allaire's grandsons to become loyalists.


Although Alexander Allaire left his descendents little of his Huguenot religious convictions, he was a good example of the hard-working, commercial middle class that is often associated with Calvinist groups. He was an industrious manager of men and resources. On March 17, 1687, even before New Rochelle was established, he is recorded as having sold a piece of land to Theophelius Foretier. Two years later, on September 20, 1689, John Pell and his wife Rachel granted six thousand acres of land for the establishment of New Rochelle, and by September 24, a tract of land was transferred to Alexander Allaire. The same year, Jacob Leisler conveyed one hundred acres to Alexander Allaire. This was the Jacob Leisler, a New York merchant, who was authorized by a Committee of Public Safety, chosen by the people on August 16, 1689, to "use the power and authority of commander-in-chief" until further orders came from King William and Queen Mary. He was also empowered "to do all such acts as are requisite for the good of the province, taking counsel with the militia and civil authority as occasion shall require." For taking this authority, Leisler was charged and executed for high treason. It appears that Leisler's sentence was based not on any illegal action, because other colonies such as Massachusetts not only appointed leaders

\[15\] Bolton, History of County of Westchester, I:582.

\[16\] Ibid., pp. 585-6.
to fill positions, but even overthrew the authority established by the British government. Leisler's sentence was a result of the bitter relationship that had developed between the old aristocratic families of New York, and the nouveau riche middle class led by Leisler. The opposing faction blamed Leisler for many of the problems that New York was experiencing, including Indian attacks on unprepared settlements, and he reacted by charging them with traitorous behavior. When Governor Slaughter arrived to officially take control of the government, he promptly had Leisler jailed, tried and executed, primarily because his associates were those who opposed Leisler; and as an aristocrat, Slaughter distrusted any combination of "rabble." 17

Alexander Allaire survived Leisler's Rebellion as this incident came to be known, and was again mentioned as one of the first surveyors, along with Captain Bond, who measured and divided the township of New Rochelle as of November 20, 1693. This was done "by running a straight line directly north from the old Boston Road to Hutchinson River, and laying out lots on each side of it. The land south of the Boston Road was divided into twenty-six lots." 18 Sometime in 1693, he received a license to run a 17Lawrence H. Leder, Robert Livingston 1654-1728 and the Politics of Colonial New York, (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1961), pp. 57-76, passim.

18Bolton, History of County of Westchester, I:587.
tavern. The following year Allaire was the constable, a job he may have held the previous year as well.\textsuperscript{19} On February 6, 1696, he was one of six Huguenots in New Rochelle to be granted letters of denization or citizenship.\textsuperscript{20} On February 19, 1705, Alexander Allaire was one of the several merchants of New York City who submitted a petition to Governor Edward Viscount Cornbury relating to the use of foreign coin in trading.\textsuperscript{21} Allaire was a respected member of the community who was called on to witness the wills of his acquaintances. On December 31, 1706, he witnessed the will of Nicholas Jamain, a merchant of New York.\textsuperscript{22} There is a listing of freeholders of New Rochelle in 1708 and, as expected, among the twenty-three names is found Alexander Allaire.\textsuperscript{23} On January 16, 1717, he witnessed the will of Pierre Gendion, a French immigrant of New Rochelle.\textsuperscript{24} On March 11, 1717, and on May 18, 1720, Allaire witnessed the wills of two more of his fellow French refugees of New

\begin{thebibliography}{99}
\bibitem{19} Seacord, \textit{Biographical Sketches of Huguenot Settlers}, p. 9.
\bibitem{23} Bolton, \textit{History of County of Westchester}, I:599.
\bibitem{24} \textit{Abstracts of Wills}, \textit{Collections of the New York Historical Society for 1902}, p. 32.
\end{thebibliography}
Rochelle: Pierre Das and Jacques Flandreau. In 1719 and 1721 he was elected town poundmaster, and in 1722 he was the surveyor of highways. His last public office may have been as town clerk in 1723 and 1724. The last mention of Allaire in business occurs in a document dated April 17, 1724, which granted Anthony Lispenard a piece of land "for the erection of a mill." Allaire is one of the twenty-eight freeholders who made the grant. Alexander Allaire apparently was a leading citizen and an integral part of the development of business in New Rochelle for over forty years.

Throughout this period, the French settlers in New York City developed a close relationship with the English. The government had provided them with assistance when their own exiled them. It had not only given aid to the emigrants who came to America, but it also provided for the needs of the Huguenots who fled to London. French merchants, such as Alexander Allaire, shared common interests with English merchants, and the most ambitious of the exiles came to realize that the way to power would be found through the English who controlled the colony.

26 Seacord, Biographical Sketches of Hugenot Settlers, p. 9.
27 Bolton, History of County of Westchester, I:600.
Alexander married Jean Docus, another refugee from La Rochelle, sometime in the early 1700s. She had arrived around 1699. One of their ten children was Alexander, who was born in New Rochelle. There is not much information remaining about him. It is known that the younger Alexander's first wife's name was Esther Clothworthy, and that they had seven children. His second wife, Mary Lispenard, was the widow of Anthony Lispenard. Her mother had been a Van Uytendaeel, which is where her second son's name came from. The Van Uytendaels were Dutch emigrants, who had arrived in St. Thomas in the West Indies about 1688, where they prospered and eventually owned plantations and slaves. From the wealth of her family and her inheritance from her husband, she was an heiress of moderate means.\textsuperscript{29} Alexander continued in his father's business according to the records of another merchant, Charles Nicoll. In Nicoll's account book are the records of shipments of goods to London and Philadelphia in the years 1757-9, to the joint risk of Charles Nicoll and Alexander Allaire. There is also a specific mention of Alexander Allaire in relation to an invoice of cargo from the ship \textit{Union}.\textsuperscript{30} He may have captained a merchant vessel at some time or might have served in the military, perhaps in the Seven Years' War, because

\textsuperscript{29}Dorothy Bliss Payne, personal letter from a direct descendent of Anthony Allaire to author, October 20, 1981.

on the family monument he was referred to as Captain Alexander Allaire. 31 He was apparently a respected member of the merchant class because he was called on to witness the will of Michael Michaels, a prosperous merchant of New York, on February 12, 1736. 32

As the scene developed in the period before the revolution, New York City was divided into castes. According to Oscar T. Barck, the top group was made up of the provincial officers, often appointed from London, and the landed gentry. Second in class, but not necessarily in power, were the merchants and traders, who held the political power. Although their numbers were few, they comprised the largest percentage of voters. They also possessed much of the city's wealth, which was increased and merged through intermarriage. The third class was composed of lawyers, followed by the middle class of master workmen and lesser merchants. This "petite bourgeoisie" had the vote, but had "no social or political prestige." The great majority of people were in the lowest class. These "poor landowners, clerks, journeymen, apprentices, laborers, and mechanics" had no vote, but their action as


a mob over various issues was not easily ignored.\textsuperscript{33} In Virginia Harrington's view, this social structure was even more simplified. She claimed that generally speaking, the large landowners, merchants, and lawyers formed a cohesive "privileged, ruling class" which was strengthened by inter-marriage. By the time the war began, their interests were fused together. This class maintained itself against the larger class of "freeholders, tenant farmers, shopkeepers, artisans, and laborers."\textsuperscript{34}

In either case, the Allaires as a successful merchant family would likely follow the example of the upper class. Their wealthy friends such as the DeLanceys and Robinsons\textsuperscript{35} became loyalists, and it was natural for them to follow suit. Perhaps merchants who had been prosperous under British rule did not see a need for a change in government that might hurt their business; yet, merchants in Philadelphia and Boston continued to act as though every parliamentary statute affronted their rights as English businessmen and increasingly frustrated their relationship


\textsuperscript{35}Payne, personal letter to author, dated October 20, 1981.
with England. The difference seems to be that the Allaires lived in New York where there was a rather unique situation. Wallace Brown, who has written extensively about loyalists, has stated that,

Although the New York merchants took the lead in the opposition to imperial policies after 1763, the majority were . . . "eventual conservatives," ending up as neutralists or Loyalists as they gradually lost control of the pre-Revolutionary movement. 36

New York merchants did organize and speak out against various taxes before merchants of other cities. After the French and Indian War, the prime minister, George Grenville, worked to reorganize the customs system. He sent naval officers to seaports to enforce "fair trade by the prevention of smuggling." New York merchants generally agreed with this action at this time; indeed, on December 7, 1763, they had complained to the Lords of Trade about the lax inspection in the ports of New England and to the south of New York. The measures might have been successful had they stopped here, but it was soon clear that they were just a part of a whole plan to control the colonies better. The Sugar Act of 1764 was issued to raise revenue and regulate the sugar trade. It was unpopular because New York merchants believed that payment of the tax would lower profits and would destroy their trade. It actually did not affect trade substantially, and the New

York merchants did not complain loudly. 37

However, Grenville's Stamp Act met with extensive hostility for very basic reasons. The tax had to be paid in silver, which would drain the colonies' supply, and it was impractical to implement. Whether the colonists lived in seaports or frontier outposts, all were required to use specified stamped paper for almost all legal documents, customs papers, newspapers, and even calendars. 38 This was also an example of what the Americans considered to be "taxation without representation."

In October 1765, the New York Assembly drew up a petition, to be read in Parliament, so defiant that no one could be found who would introduce it. On October 31, the New York merchants formed the first non-importation association to begin in January and continue until the Stamp Act was repealed. Their agreement was formulated one week before a similar one was written in Philadelphia and five weeks before the one in Boston. 39 The merchants were understandably concerned because most of the burden of the act would fall on them. They were required to use the stamped paper for all commercial documents, policies, clerk


38 Ibid., pp. 25-6.

fees, charters, notarial acts, letters, and advertisements. The representatives of New York to the Stamp Act Congress were all merchants except Robert R. Livingston. The Sons of Liberty, made up predominantly of artisans and laborers, worked to incite the unenfranchised into action. The merchants at first did nothing to control mob action. Many of them thought that perhaps a popular movement could succeed whereas the Congress was not getting results. Riots began on November 1, when the act was to go into effect. Many merchants became disgusted with the riots, and a conservative reaction set in among the upper classes; however some of the aristocrats, such as John Jay, knew that to achieve the goal of independence which some of them shared, they would have to ally themselves with the radical craftsmen and farmers. They used the terminology of republican ideals to encourage the lower classes, but they sought to keep control of the movement and to keep it moderate. No one liked the Stamp Act, but people were sharply divided as to how to get rid of it.

A major result of the Act in New York was a great halt in trade. The ports were shut, money stopped circulating and artisans, mechanics, and laborers were out of work. Businesses could not operate without using the stamped paper, and they refused to use the paper. Consequent

41 Kammen, Colonial New York, p. 343.
quently business halted. The winter was a period of waiting. There had been so much flour exported before November 1, that there was a great shortage of bread. This happened just when there was an increased number of sailors in port. On December 4, customs officials opened the port to get the unoccupied sailors out, which it was hoped would prevent some of the potential mob action, but Captain Archibald Kennedy prevented ships from leaving without the requisite stamped paper even though he allowed ships to enter. In December, lawyers resolved to do business without stamps, but the risk they were taking was diminished by the provincial courts which adjourned until repeal of the Act. There were naturally many problems because of this. Landlords could not evict tenants for nonpayment of rent without the aid of the courts, and debt collection was almost impossible. When the news arrived in April that the Stamp Act had been repealed and that the Sugar Act was revised, there was widespread rejoicing of all classes, and receptions and parties given throughout the city. After May 20, when the repeal was made official, there was a general return to loyalty to the King. When the Declaratory Act, which maintained Parliament's right to tax the colonies, was announced,

44 Harrington, New York Merchants, p. 331.
it was largely ignored. 45

In the next two years, the city continued to suffer from a money shortage, which naturally kept trade down. In addition, news arrived that Prime Minister Charles Townshend had just proposed new Acts, which would soon be put into effect. Before the Acts became official, the merchants of New York City adopted a resolution on August 7, 1768, to refuse to import from Great Britain after November 1, unless the Townshend Acts were repealed. Any orders that had been placed after August 16, were to be disregarded, and any merchant who broke the agreement was to be treated as a traitor. If any goods arrived in violation of the resolution, they were to be placed in public warehouses until the Townshend Acts were repealed. 46 The nonimportation agreement in 1768 was adhered to more in New York City than in New England or Philadelphia. 47 Because of the general support of this resolution, Parliament repealed the new Acts on April 12, 1770, except the tax on tea. 48

The repeal caused many unforeseen problems for New York City now that there remained only that tax on tea. The city was even more sharply divided as to what course

45Kammen, Colonial New York, p. 354.
46Barck, New York City during the War, pp. 29-30.
48Barck, New York City during the War, p. 30.
of action should be taken. Most of the officials and members of the gentry had supported Parliament's Acts from the beginning, because their positions and wealth could be lost if they did not support English rule. The merchants, although they had been against the Stamp Act and Townshend Acts for economic reasons, were generally conservative. They had at times called on the lower classes to join with them for the repeal of the Acts, but they did not think that a small tax on tea should prevent them from getting back to business. Besides that, the economy had suffered a great deal in the last few years. Agricultural prices had dropped, the West Indies trade had declined, land value was down, and the expensive British goods were not selling. The merchants knew that to be successful they had to resume good relations with Great Britain, and they made preparations to do so. Lawyers continued to support resistance to Great Britain, but they had less to lose. The local Sons of Liberty were furious. They did not want New York to appear "infamous" to the other colonies, nor to be deserted by them for breaking the non-importation agreement.

49 Ibid., p. 31.
50 Kammen, Colonial New York, p. 357.
51 Barck, New York City during the War, p. 31.
New York was soon denounced by other colonies. From Connecticut came the news that people there were astonished that the same New Yorkers who had drawn up the agreement would be the first to ignore it. From Boston and Philadelphia it was made clear that merchants in these cities unanimously supported the non-importation agreement as it had originally been drafted. But the New York merchants were determined, because of all the economic problems they had experienced, to regain trade with England despite what merchants in other seaports did, and the Earl of Halifax sailed for England with orders for everything but tea. This news traveled quickly to the other eastern cities. The Philadelphia merchants wrote, "however you may color your proceedings, we think you have in the day of trial deserted the cause of liberty and your country." 53

New York developed into the most loyal of all colonies in terms of numbers. This is shown by the contemporary reports of both John Adams and Alexander Hamilton who said that in 1777 half the population of New York was Tory. 54 A modern historian, Esmond Wright, illustrated New York's practical loyalism. Two out of three claimants for reparations following the war stated that they had

53 Ibid., pp. 26-7.
served under the British armed forces as a member of a militia or as a regular soldier, which was the ultimate test to the commission reviewing loyalist claims. The British used the services of 23,500 New Yorkers, while the total American contribution to the British was only somewhat over 50,000. A distinction must be made between loyalism in New York City and loyalism in the colony of New York, and the time period is also significant.

After the war had begun, but before the British captured the city, a Provincial Congress in New York City governed the colony in the same way that the Continental Congress governed America from Philadelphia. This Congress passed harsher laws against loyalists than any other colony. On October 6, 1775, the general recommendation was made that all persons whose freedom endangered the liberty of the colonies were to be arrested. Those who sympathized with the King were forbidden from making speeches. No one could enter the colony without a certificate from a committee from his place of origin which proved his support of the revolution. On March 14, 1776, the Continental Congress voted that all loyalists were to be disarmed as soon as possible. New York officials complied immediately. Riots against loyalists were frequent,

55 Ibid., p. 79.
56 Barck, New York City during the War, p. 42.
57 Brown, King's Friends, p. 78.
and many times some were attacked, ridden on rails, or jailed. On June 5, a Committee to Detect Conspiracies was formed. Its seven members were to examine individuals to determine whether they were loyalists. Among its findings was the "Hickey Plot." This was supposedly organized by former Governor Tryon to murder Washington and deliver the city and the American army to the British.58

Several men who would be significant loyalists in the war were brought before this committee. At Washington's headquarters at Newburgh, Beverly Robinson was questioned by this committee on February 22, 1777. John Jay was the chairman of this committee. Robinson was interrogated about his loyalties because he appeared to be neutral about the war, and his son had gone to British New York City. He was requested to take an oath to "disclaim and renounce all Allegiance to the said King and Crown" and to pledge his support of "the Measures of the General Congress of the United States of America for the Establishment of the Liberties and Independence of the said States in opposition to the Arbitrary Claims, wicked usurpations, and Hostile Invasion of the King and Parliament and of Great Britain, their Agents and adherents." He refused to take the oath, and although the committee gave him six weeks to change his mind, he left to join the British before the

58 Barck, New York City during the War, pp. 42-3.
time was up. 59

As the British army advanced on New York City, most of the supporters of the revolution left. In fact, the population dropped from 25,000 in 1775 to 5,000 in 1776, before the army arrived. This drop of four-fifths compares to a one-half decrease in population in Philadelphia and Newport, and a three-quarters drop in Boston. 60 The city then became a haven for loyalists.

It would seem that the modern historian Esmond Wright was correct in ascertaining that New York City's loyalism was merely due to location:

It was the natural base for any campaign to cut off New England from the Middle colonies. As the major British stronghold throughout the seven years of war, it became in fact a Fortress Britannica, part refuge, part port, and part supply base for the British army, dependent on the stormy and vulnerable Atlantic line of communication. 61

One Tory wrote in June 1775, "we are at present all Whigs until the arrival of the King's troops, "making it clear that a loyalist position was the safe one in New York, which the British army held longer than any other city. New York became the refuge for loyalists as one city after another laid down its arms against the rebels. From this port many of these people at the war's end left


60 Brown, King's Friends, p. 99.

for England, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and the West Indies. Many people living in New York were constantly aware of the British presence, so they were more likely to believe that the Americans did not have a chance for success against the experience of the British army.

The occupation certainly would have influenced the Allaires to be loyalists, if they were not already. Merchants were able to continue to trade with Great Britain and other British colonies throughout the war, as well as with the soldiers and refugees constantly moving in and out of the city. 62

There were several other reasons, which had little to do with the British occupation, as to why many people in New York chose to be loyal. One important factor, which was true throughout the colonies, was that many immigrants had come from Great Britain and remained loyal to their homeland. Sixty claimants for reparations stated that they had fought as soldiers during the Seven Years' War and had remained in the colonies. Many loyalists had always been Tories in their political thinking, and so continued to follow the Tory position in England. Some were intellectual loyalists, because they respected the Constitution and Law of England, whether or not they agreed with the Stamp Act and other forms of taxation. 62

62 Brown, King's Friends, pp. 88, 96.
Anglican ministers were usually loyalists because of their tie to the hierarchy of the Church of England, and often their congregations followed their lead.\textsuperscript{63}

The Allaires seem to have acted in a way typical of their position and class. Like other merchants who wanted to maintain their successful businesses in New York, they chose to support the King.

\textsuperscript{63}Ibid., pp. 90, 92, 99.
Chapter II: Peter in Wartime

Peter Alexander Allaire was the oldest son of Alexander and Maria Allaire, born in 1749, and in the eighteenth century tradition, he entered the field of commerce in which his family had been engaged. When he was sixteen years old he was listed as one of several men who were left money in the will of William Heysham, a New York merchant.¹ When the war broke out, he would have to choose which side to support, but like many other merchants in New York City, he never donned a uniform or fought in any battle. During the dissension between the colonies and Great Britain, it seemed as though the impending war was not to affect his life at all. On April 20, 1774, almost exactly a year before the "shot heard round the world" at Lexington, he left from Gravesend, England, for a tour of Russia. American students have often been led to believe that after Parliament passed the so-called "Intolerable Acts" in early 1774, following the Boston Tea Party on December 16, 1773, all Americans became united in their distrust and disgust of George III, Parliament, and Great Britain. That oversimplification is not true. Life for many like Peter Allaire continued on as before. Trading continued, as well as the travel and adventure that a merchant could afford.

¹Abstracts of Wills 1776-1771, New York Historical Society Collections for 1898, p. 3.
Information about Peter's trip and his impressions of the fascinating places he visited have been preserved in the diary that he kept for a large part of his journey. His journal contains colorful descriptions of not only the land and weather, but the people, their customs, occupations, architecture, and museums. He described such varied events as seal "ketching" on the Baltic, the arrival of the Empress Catherine and her entourage at her summer palace, and a very detailed account of an awards ceremony for girls who had "behaved and studied well" in the local convent. This was the famous Smolny Institute founded by Catherine the Great to promote education for girls of both, the upper as well as lower classes, although Allaire clearly showed that the treatment of the students was not equal, but differentiated according to their class. Throughout the diary, the reader can clearly see that a merchant who had been used to quantifying information had written it. In one typical example, Peter described a garden which was approximately one hundred feet square. It had a terrace around it about four feet high by twenty feet, and in the middle of it there was a bridge about eight feet square. In another place, he described a wealthy landowner who had 170,000 serfs, including 780 house servants, and spent 400,000 roubles or about 75-78,000 silver pounds a

year. But with all the detail Peter gave, he failed to mention the landowner's name.\(^3\) The journal ended when Peter described experiencing carriage trouble on his return to St. Petersburg. At the conclusion of his trip, it is likely that he remained in England for awhile, since the situation between England and America had worsened.

The next time Peter is mentioned in a document is in the minutes of the Committee to Detect Conspiracies. When the committee met at Conner's Tavern at Fishkill on December 13, 1776, John Jay informed the members that the previous evening he had released Anthony Allaire from prison when his brother Peter became "Surety for his appearance." Anthony had been imprisoned by General Wadsworth, and he was one of the prisoners who, as General Morris had informed the committee, was "notoriously disaffected to the American Cause," and "ought to be removed to one of the neighboring States."\(^4\)

Two years later Peter was again in Europe, but it is not clear whether he was there because of business or because of the war. On May 22, 1778, he wrote from Calais, France, informing Benjamin Franklin, the American minister to France, that he had just arrived from England, and that he wanted to relay to him that the British fleet was on

\(^3\)Ibid., pp. 21-2.

its way and that it was likely that the twelve ships from St. Helens had sailed too.\(^5\) It is not certain at this time, nor later in 1780 when Peter was in the Bastille as to how he got his information, or which side he supported. Did he work for the English against America, or was he the true American patriot who could state in a letter from the Bastille, "I flatter myself that I have done more for this country than any American whatsoever."\(^6\)

On February 14, 1780, Peter wrote to Benjamin Franklin to request a pass to go to Brussels. He later wrote, in a journal that he kept while in the Bastille, that he had made this request because he wanted to settle in a seaport in France until the war was over. Since France and America were allies, there should have been no reason, according to him, why he as an American should not have been granted his petition.\(^7\) A seaport would be a logical place for a merchant to live if he wanted to continue business. Franklin's grandson, William Temple Franklin, wrote to Peter the next day to inform him that


his request was denied. 8

At this particular time, Benjamin Franklin was a very popular and influential American figure in Paris, one whom the French authorities felt it was in their best interests to keep well protected. Suspicion fell on anyone who communicated with Franklin for fear of threats to his life, as well as disruption of the relationship between France and America. At 11:00 A.M. On February 15, 1780, two men arrested Peter and searched his rooms for two hours for incriminating evidence to prove that he was plotting against Franklin. He was taken to M. LeNoir, the Lieutenant General of the Paris police, and questioned about why he was in Paris, what he was doing with Dr. James fever powder (a preparation of antimony used as an eighteenth century medicine), what was in the bottle he had sent Franklin (a bottle of wine), and what was the book he had also sent him. According to Peter's journal, the enterprising merchant was in Paris to get some kind of payment for debts owed him by the government, and perhaps it could repay him by purchasing packets of Dr. James fever powder from him. He had also thought that he might be able to supply it to the American army through Franklin. He had sent Franklin a bottle of fine Madeira wine, because in dining with Franklin previously, he had discovered that Franklin drank no red wine. He had sent Franklin a

8 Hays, Celebration of Birth of Benjamin Franklin, V:303.
pamphlet entitled *Eden's Letters to Lord Carlisle* because William Franklin had requested him to send it for his grandfather's amusement.  

After presenting his case in the initial inquiry, Peter was told by the lieutenant general of police that he believed that Allaire's "character and reputation were good." Allaire was politely asked to "accompany an officer" who, instead of returning him to his rooms, took him to the infamous Bastille. Although historically the Bastille was not the legendary prison of horror that it has been often referred to, Peter did not know this. He had heard all too much about the legendary history of that place where people disappeared without their friends ever learning their whereabouts. During his first few days of confinement, he ate little and became ill. On the seventh day, he was taken before the lieutenant general of the prison where the bottle of wine he had earlier sent to Franklin was brought out to be examined. Allaire drank some of it to prove that it was not poisoned, but two chemists were still called on to test the wine's purity. It was proven safe, and all in the room sampled the rest and commented on its excellence; however, Peter Allaire was still kept locked up without materials with which to write or read to pass the time.  

10 Ibid., p. 184.
During his fifteenth day of imprisonment, Allaire was led into a torture chamber where various instruments of torture were easily available for use. He was seated at a table where he was questioned, and his answers were all carefully recorded. It was at this time when he first was informed that he was suspected of spying for England. According to his own report, he never really denied that he was a spy but challenged his interrogator to find anything false in what he had thus far declared. After having left the room, his fears of torture wore him down physically and emotionally. The next day he was brought before the commissioner who had questioned him in the chamber. He told Allaire that he believed him to be innocent, but ordered him to be locked up again. His baggage was brought to him, and he was allowed books and writing materials.\textsuperscript{11}

He wrote to Franklin repeatedly, because he knew that the American minister was probably the only person who could convince the French authorities to release him. On March 20, 1780, he wrote that as proof of his loyalty to the American cause, the English had burned and destroyed his home.\textsuperscript{12} A letter which is not dated pleaded, "much has my mind been in continual Torture, expecting every

\textsuperscript{11}\textit{Ibid.}, pp. 184-6.

\textsuperscript{12}Peter Allaire, letter to Benjamin Franklin, Mar. 20, 1780, Huguenot and Thomas Paine Historical Society, New Rochelle, New York.
moment to be my last. Tho I am now allowed Books I cannot read for my Imagination is constantly thinking what you are doing to get me out . . . I beg and desire you will take such steps as you think most proper to obtain my liberty."  

On April 25, he wrote that he had as of then spent seventy days in the Bastille, and that felons in the United States were treated better than he was, because they were allowed counsel, whereas he only saw his guard who fed him and occasionally led him out into the yard.  

On May 26, he requested Franklin to deliver to the bearer of his letter, the powders and pamphlet so that his innocence could be proved.  

Apparently Franklin finally acted, because Allaire was released, and on June 26, 1780, he wrote from outside the prison to William Franklin asking him whether John Jay was in Paris, and confirming the news that the Martinique fleet had been taken. It is evident that he could obtain news about the British fleet before Benjamin Franklin could, but whether or not he was a spy was never proved conclusively.


15 Hays, Celebration of Birth of Benjamin Franklin, III:253.

16 Ibid., V:38.
The next mention of Peter was in New York in the loyalist paper, Rivington's *Royal Gazette*. It was announced that Peter had been married by Reverend Samuel Seabury to Miss Fanny Wilmot, the oldest daughter of James Wilmot of New York City, on November 8, 1780.\(^{17}\)

Dr. Seabury was active in the war effort. He served as a chaplain of one of the loyalist regiments, and he wrote a great deal in defense of British measures and against the acts of the Continental Congress. During the most difficult period of the war, he supported his family by practicing medicine.\(^{18}\)

The Allaires' first two children were born in New York. Maria was born in 1781 and Elizabeth in 1783.\(^{19}\)

On December 14, 1781, Peter's mother, who was a widow at this time, granted him a letter of administration over some of her assets.\(^{20}\) Beyond these few facts there is not much information describing how the Allaires lived in wartime New York City. But material about New York merchants at this time should indicate what their life may have been like.


\(^{19}\) Payne, personal letter to author, October 20, 1981.

The early part of the occupation was difficult for New York merchants, but Peter had avoided this period by being out of the country. The largest profits to be made in the city, as before the war, were still in shipping, but the merchants were not only hampered by the restrictions already in effect, but by the new Prohibitory Act passed by Parliament on January 1, 1776. The act was issued to prevent merchants from exporting merchandise from New York until the conclusion of hostilities. Export licenses could be obtained from the Commander-in-Chief or from the King's commissioners known as the Commissioners for Restoring Peace, who supervised the Act, but these were rarely issued until later in the war. Merchants could import, but they could not export in exchange. Not until the Commissioners made some concessions in 1778 was the "struggle to regain the right to trade" settled. What prevented the city from being drained of capital was the influx into it of the British army and the loyalist refugees and their resources, as well as illegal trade with the rebels. 21

Shipping continued to increase during the war in spite of the restrictions. By October 1776, there were almost five hundred ships in New York harbor, most of them private mercantile ships. The extent and variety of trade was vast because since New York became isolated, almost everything had to come by ship. However, General

21 Barck, New York City during the War, pp. 120-1.
Howe, the Commander-in-Chief in the early part of the war, believed that trade must be tightly regulated to keep all goods traveling to and from New York out of the hands of the rebels. All incoming cargo was to be carefully checked and permission was to be given to sell a specified quantity of goods to a named purchaser. Any exports were similarly regulated, and anyone who gave evidence resulting in a conviction for breaking the laws received half the proceeds from the sale of the forfeited goods.

The merchants were often accused of speculating and profiteering with food supplies for the army, and some army officers were evidently involved too; however, merchants were more likely to be prevented from speculating by the laws that were passed against it. Although these laws were often the result of military orders, the military speculators were not always included in the laws, and they were able to continue their operations. The mercantile rules were not consistently enforced, which resulted in the illegal trade with American rebels. When times were especially difficult, the British authorities seemed to ignore the rules if it meant that the trade brought fresh food, but they still did not like anything getting to the rebels. In 1778, the merchants petitioned the Commissioners to have the Prohibitory Act amended to improve trade with Great Britain. They were then allowed to import goods without a license, which
increased trading; but even the Commissioners could not interfere with the military and naval authorities who set local restrictions. These increased as the war continued.22

It was the mercantile trade which insured New York City's survival during the war. The Commanders-in-Chief, Sir William Howe, Sir Henry Clinton, and Sir George Carleton, were each aware of this fact. The trade in sugar, rum, and molasses from the West Indies and the import of manufactured goods from Great Britain, prevented complete business stagnation and poverty for the city.23 Peter Allaire arrived sometime in 1780 and, as a trader with the West Indies, he would have played a role in preventing the economic collapse of the city.24 The greatest success of the merchants, with which Peter may or may not have been involved, was privateering against American ships. At one time during the war, over six thousand men were engaged in it, and King George approved of it as a means to weaken the rebel cause. British ships also got involved in privateering because of the great profits that could be made. Once a vessel was captured and its goods confiscated and sold, everyone on board the privateer received

22 Ibid., pp. 122-134, passim.
23 Ibid., pp. 205-6.
a share. 25

Even with the merchants' persistence in keeping the city well provided, the people of New York City lived through the war in a state of uneasiness and insecurity. The greatest problem of the city was the overcrowded conditions. As the city was abandoned by the American supporters and the British army approached, a fire broke out on the docks and spread through a large part of the city, burning such important structures as the well known Trinity Church. As the army entered the city, it was not only necessary to find housing for them with limited housing available, but also for their wives and children. By March 1779, there were 1,550 wives and 968 children to be provided for, and most of these had come from Great Britain. A more difficult problem was to provide shelter for the ever increasing numbers of loyalist refugees. The city also had to provide for the sick and wounded, who arrived daily from the battlefields, as well as a large number of prisoners. Such diverse buildings as those at King's College, the Baptist Meetinghouse, the Lutheran Church, Montagne's Tavern, and several private homes were used for treating the sick. Larger buildings such as sugar refineries and churches were used as prisons. Because of the severe housing shortage, ships were turned into what became some of the most infamous prisons of the

25 Barck, New York City during the War, pp. 207, 299.
war. The churches of St. Paul's and St. George's were not commandeered for other uses, because the military authorities felt that Anglican churches should be rewarded for their loyalty. 26

After New York's first six months of occupation, the city fell into the general course of life that it would maintain until the end of the war. Food and fuel were always scarce. People were anxious to hear any news of the war as well as what was going on in Europe and how it might affect them. The care of the sick was a serious problem as well as the poverty of large numbers of people who were forced to live in tents and shanties. Life under military government was always dissatisfying for those used to political power. The growing importance of privateering for survival was a far different way of life for most of the people involved. One of the most surprising aspects of the city was the number of formerly wealthy people who now lived on charity. 27

In the midst of all the despair and poverty, there was another side of New York experienced by a minority of people. Balls, dinners, and receptions, where expense was not spared, continued as trade kept improving. By the ruins of Trinity Church, benches were placed along the walls where orchestra members sat and played for well dressed people who walked along the street or sat under 26 Wertenbaker, Father Knickerbocker Rebels, pp. 105-6. 27 Ibid., p. 124.
the lanterns. On September 26, 1781, a British fleet arrived with the seventeen-year-old Prince William Henry, the third son of George III and later King William IV. A series of balls and banquets were given in his honor, and his birthday on August 21 was celebrated with as much flourish as was possible.28

Not all New Yorkers supported the festivals and displays as being appropriate. In one example, a group of officers and civilians gathered together to organize a great celebration for the King's birthday. A man named Henry White remarked, "My opinion is that the best preparation for the birthday is to beat Washington before the French reinforcements arrive."29

In spite of these more serious men, celebrations continued, and horseracing became a favorite pastime for officers. Bull baiting was popular with the common soldiers. Plays were performed by members of the army, and advertisements were frequently placed in the newspapers for women to take the ladies' parts. Music performed within the homes was a usual part of life, and Rivington sold violins, guitars, flutes, fifes, French horns, clarinets, hautboys or oboes, and harps through his own paper. The two groups which enjoyed the parties and other diversions of the city were the British officers and the New

28 Ibid., pp. 198-200.
York merchants.  

Although Cornwallis surrendered his entire force at Yorktown on October 19, 1781, the British army continued to occupy New York until the completion of the Treaty of Paris in 1783. In the meantime, trading was reduced with England in the late spring of 1782, because English merchants were warned that at any time New York might be evacuated because the peace talks were going on. Trade continued in the city, although this was not officially legal until May 20, 1783. As the British army left, so did many people who had either openly or secretly supported the loyalist cause. Among them were Peter Allaire and his small family. It was probably proof enough that Peter was a loyalist because he returned to New York in the middle of the British occupation, but the fact that he left the city at this time, proved it conclusively. The Allaires were in New York at least until July, because there was a notice in Rivington's paper that a mulatto named Jack, who was between eleven and twelve years of age, had run away from Peter Alexander Allaire. They did leave that year for Bermuda, but later went to Annapolis Royal, Nova Scotia. Three sons were born to the Allaires

\[30\] Ibid., pp. 204-5.
\[31\] Barck, New York City during the War, p. 130.
\[33\] Payne, personal letter to author, October 20, 1981.
in Canada, including their most famous child, James Peter Allaire in 1785.\textsuperscript{34}

\textsuperscript{34}Dutch Bible in which Peter Allaire recorded the date and place of birth of each of his children. A copy of his notations is in the Allaire papers of Mrs. Myron Taylor, Brielle, New Jersey.
Chapter III: Anthony and Uytendale in Wartime

Anthony, as the youngest son, would not be given the priority in the family business or have any property designated to him such as the oldest son would take for granted. He would have to make his own fortune in some other way. He was born in 1755, which made him twenty years old when the war broke out. The next year, Anthony was no doubt impressed by the incoming British army with all of its color and display, and by the opportunity available for a young man with the right kind of background and skills. Anthony enlisted with many of his friends in the Loyal American Regiment raised by Colonel Beverly Robinson, a family friend. He purchased a commission to become a lieutenant, probably with the financial assistance of his mother.¹

The first record of Anthony was hardly auspicious. On March 27, 1778, at the regimental headquarters in New York, Lieutenant Anthony Allaire was brought before the Provincial Court Martial for taking a sword that had belonged to the late Lieutenant Colonel Campbell of the 52nd Regiment, and of allowing himself to be drawn into an argument with a Mr. Hunt and Adjutant Cunningham, also of the 52nd Regiment. The court ruled him innocent of any crime in taking the sword, and acquitted him "with Honor

¹Payne, personal letter to author, October 20, 1981.
of any blame on that account." The court also felt that his "Youth and Inexperience in the Service" explained his behavior with Hunt and Cunningham, and he was "cleared of Censure" and acquitted of any charge.2

In reviewing several of the court martial cases, it is clear that Allaire's trial was typical of other officers' trials. They were often brought before the court for action unbecoming of an officer, but rarely was there enough evidence to convict them. If there was such evidence, the sentence was rather lenient. Ensign Quarter Master Old of the First Battalion was tried for using ungentlemanlike language on the parade ground which led to physical blows. His sentence was that he was to be reprimanded in front of the entire regiment.3 Lieutenant Alexander McDonald of the Kings Orange Rangers was accused of sending a challenge to a Lieutenant Hamilton of the same regiment, and of defaming his character. For this crime, he was suspended from duty for two months.4 Lieutenant and Adjutant Patrick Henry of the New Jersey Volunteers was tried for putting Ensign John Lawrence on duty out of turn and for general conduct inappropriate for an officer. The court ruled that the charges were "frivolous and vexatious," and there was

3Ibid., p. 58.
4Ibid., pp. 53-4.
no evidence to substantiate Ensign Lawrence's claims.⁵

These cases should not lead one to think that court martial cases usually dealt with petty arguments or charges of improper conduct. In contrast, the cases involving enlisted men were far more serious as were the results. Sam Webb Matross of the Royal Artillery was charged with striking Captain Campbell of the 35th Regiment and therefore of mutinous behavior. He was found guilty and sentenced to death.⁶ In another case Thomas Stanley, Michael Brady, Michael Shannon, and Christopher Smith of Captain Emmericks Chasseurs were found guilty of stealing two oxen and a cow, and were sentenced to receive one thousand lashes each. Some favorable evidence was brought to the court on their behalf, and the sentence was reduced to five hundred lashes each.⁷

Before 1780, there is no full account of Anthony's activities in the war. There is only the record of the Loyal American Regiment, of which he was a member. It can then be presumed that he wore that regiment's uniform of a green coat faced with buff or green trim. Later in the war, the unit wore red coats.⁸ The purpose of these provincial regiments was to assist the regular army. They

⁵Ibid., pp. 60-1.
⁶Ibid., pp. 59-60.
⁷Ibid., p. 52.
were also to serve garrison duty in any area that the British had taken. The largest force was needed in New York since it was the center of British authority. As a member of one of these regiments, Anthony probably took part in the Philadelphia campaign in 1777, as well as the attacks on Forts Clinton and Montgomery the same year.  

It is certain that sometime in 1779 Allaire joined Ferguson's Corps, which was to be a unit of riflemen selected from various loyalist units. The American Volunteers, as this corps was known, had a strength of only 132 men, and wore a uniform of green jackets. The British plan to secure the southern states was underway and Major Patrick Ferguson was to take his men to support the British army there. The unit was sent to Charleston in 1780, before the city fell to the British.

North Carolina was the next British goal. To set the groundwork for the regular troops, General Cornwallis ordered Ferguson to march through the back country to recruit loyalist supporters, since it was Cornwallis' belief that the vast majority of people in the area were loyal to the King and ready to join to fight the rebels. Although Ferguson had a far better reputation for treatment of the people through whose lands he traveled and the prisoners


10Katcher, British, Provincial, and German Army Units, p. 91.

11Ibid., p. 82.
he had taken than had Cornwallis or Tarleton, he issued an ultimatum to the settlers of the western Carolinas which led to one of the greatest defeats of loyalists in the war. Ferguson paroled a prisoner to be sent to Colonel Isaac Shelby, the American military leader in the area. The mountain men were to "desist from their opposition to the British arms, and take protection under his standards" or he would "march his army over the mountains, hang their leaders, and lay their country waste with fire and sword. 12 This united these frontiersmen who previously had been rather disinterested in the war, but who now felt that their settlements were being threatened and that they must act. The confrontation between Ferguson's force and the backwoodsmen took place at King's Mountain in South Carolina. This was the only major engagement of the war in which all the participants, with the exception of Major Ferguson, were Americans. Captain Abraham DePeyster of New York was in charge of the New Jersey Rangers and the second in command under Ferguson. His adjutant was Lieutenant Anthony Allaire, who kept a journal of the American Volunteers from their sorties around Charleston to the battle of King's Mountain and its aftermath. 13

This diary contained a detailed description of the daily conditions under which a loyalist regiment operated


during the war. It indicated that the war was not a series of large conclusive battles, but rather a steady succession of small altercations against the enemy, endless marching and packing of baggage, a constant search for shelter, and then the occasional battle. The journal began on Sunday, March 5, as various regiments were marching through Savannah. The Light Infantry, the American Volunteers under Ferguson, the New York Volunteers, the North Carolinians, the South Carolinians, the Dismounted Legion, one company of Georgia Dragoons, and the First Battalion of the Seventy-first Regiment made a total of fifteen hundred loyalist militiamen. Throughout the months leading to the battle at King's Mountain, these various groups were rarely idle. The American Volunteers were involved almost daily in securing and repairing bridges, scouting or marching to plantations which were suspected of harboring rebels.¹⁴ Rarely were the loyalists given the authority to pursue the enemy on their own. Throughout most of the action in the South, the British army was usually nearby, often under the direction of Colonel Tarleton, to carry out whatever battles took place and to take charge of the prisoners captured.¹⁵ The American Volunteers did play an important role in the defeat of Charleston, because they attacked and held Fort Moultrie in Charleston Harbor, but it was the British army that con-


¹⁵ Ibid., p. 8.
trolled the battle. Through the summer months, Ferguson's men continued to be active in hunting out rebel resistance in villages and plantations throughout the Carolinas.

As autumn approached, so did the frontiersmen who had felt threatened by Ferguson's ultimatum. He realized that he needed reinforcements to defeat these settlers, but the closest commanders, Tarleton, Hanger, and Cornwallis, all happened to be ill at the time. He proceeded to take his men eastward to join Cornwallis' troops. Ferguson knew the mountain men were closing in on him, so he used the traditional strategy of establishing his corps on a hill from which the militia could shoot down on the enemy. He did not take into consideration the fact that these frontiersmen's lives depended on their ability to be excellent marksmen at every shot. These farmers and hunters surrounded King's Mountain and shot as many loyalists as possible even though many of them had thrown down their weapons and surrendered. Some of these sharpshooters had to have their rifles knocked from them before the slaughter was stopped. By his own account, Anthony Allaire was one of the few loyalists who killed a "mountaineer with one stroke of his sword." Major Patrick Ferguson was among

16 Ibid., pp. 15-7.
17 Ibid., pp. 17-30, passim.
18 Dykeman, With Fire and Sword, pp. 54-67, passim.
19 Callahan, Royal Raiders, p. 215.
those who were killed in the battle.

Allaire wrote a letter to the Royal Gazette January 30, 1781, which was very similar to his diary entry on October 4, 1780, describing what happened after the battle. The next day, October 7, the captured loyalists were force marched sixteen miles. Orders were given by Colonel William Campbell, the American commander, that if they were attacked by British forces while en route to their destination, the prisoners were to be fired upon. They trudged two days without provisions. 20 Another source reported that Campbell had to issue an order to "restrain the disorderly manner of slaughtering and disturbing the Prisoners." 21 At a place called Bickerstaff's Old Fields, a court martial was convened to try the prisoners. Thirty-six were condemned, but there was a problem in finding an oak tree which could be used for hanging the prisoners. Only one suitable tree was found which could be used for hanging three men at a time. The first nine men were hanged, but the rest were pardoned because the process was becoming too time consuming. Some of the rebels were also civil magistrates and they justified their proceedings by claiming that they were carrying out a North Carolina law of 1776, in which capital punishment was the sentence for those who aided


21 Dykeman, With Fire and Sword, p. 71.
Although most of the loyalists who fought at King's Mountain were from New York, all of the men hanged were from the South. On October 15, Colonel Campbell received news that Colonel Tarleton was on his way, and he again issued the order that if Tarleton should catch them, the men were first to fire on Captain DePeyster and his officers and then on the others. Allaire listed several examples of cruelty, such as when Dr. Uzal Johnson was knocked down and beaten for trying to dress a wound of a man who had been cut by rebels on the march. The prisoners were also required in one instance to pay thirty-five continental dollars for an ear of Indian corn and forty for a drink of water.

To the loyalists in New York who read this account, or perhaps to modern students who have emphasized the more admirable actions of the American patriots, this record of rebel atrocities seems surprising; however, this battle must be looked at in the context of that period, and many factors must be understood. First of all, the rebels were as unsophisticated fighters as could be found in the entire war, and only understood the fight as one of survival. Another factor was the barbaric method of fighting that the mountain


24 Crary, *Price of Loyalty*, p. 239.
men had heard so much about, waged by the more "civilized" Oxford graduate, Colonel Banastre Tarleton. On May 29, 1780, five months before the battle of King's Mountain, he had caught up with a large group of Americans in Waxhaws County, South Carolina, near the North Carolina border, and had demanded their surrender. Their commander, Colonel Abraham Buford, had refused and Tarleton attacked. As a surgeon for the Americans recorded the encounter:

Not a man escaped . . . The demand for quarter, seldom refused to a vanquished foe, was at once found to be in vain. Not a man was spared, and it was the concurrent testimony of all the survivors that for fifteen minutes after every man was prostrate, they the British went over the ground, plunging their bayonets into everyone that exhibited any signs of life. 25

These backwoodsmen remembered what was known as "Tarleton's Quarter" as they went into battle.

Anthony Allaire described briefly in his journal another example which took place in the Carolina village of Ninety-six. In June of 1780, rebel prisoners were brought there to be confined, and five of them were executed. 26 This set an example for the rebels to follow when they had prisoners.

Another factor to better understand the atrocities after King's Mountain is the rule of war practiced in the eighteenth century, based on Emerich Vattel's The Law of Nations, printed in 1758. He said that the principles of

25 Dykeman, With Fire and Sword, p. 21.
26 Diary of Anthony Allaire, p. 20.
natural law were superior to man-made law, and he attempted to meld the laws of war with man's natural rights. The ambiguity was that every law had qualifications. No violence should ever be done to women, children, the sick, and elderly in wartime, but if they had been involved in "acts of hostility," they were to be punished accordingly. Regarding the situation at King's Mountain, Vattel had said that once an enemy has surrendered his weapons, his life could not be taken. But there was an exception. If the enemy had been guilty of a violation of the laws of war, such as denial of quarter or clemency, the injured side had the "right to inflict" punishment including execution. According to this law, the Americans may have been justified in their treatment of prisoners, because of Tarleton's disregard for the request for quarter, and other examples of the British contempt for rebel prisoners, such as the execution at Ninety-six.

Vattel also dealt with the question of whether in certain cases prisoners should be killed or released. "When our safety is incompatible with that of the enemy . . . it is out of all question but that in cold blood a great number of prisoners should be put to death."\(^\text{27}\) Apparently these uneducated frontiersmen were acting within

the eighteenth century concept of war even if they were not aware of it.

While Ferguson's corps was still being held, Anthony Allaire escaped. It took him over twenty days to get from where the Volunteers were being held, to safety in British occupied Charleston, but he was helped daily by loyalist sympathizers who provided him with food, shelter, and often a guide to the next stop on his journey.28 He returned to the Loyal American Regiment, which had been temporarily sent to the South. It returned to New York in June 1781, and was sent on a raid to New London, Connecticut, in August 1781. In the fall, the regiment was sent to Canada aboard the ship Ann, as part of a whole fleet of ships which sailed away from the United States with loyalist soldiers and refugees.29 Lieutenant Anthony Allaire was listed as one of several men who confirmed receipt of the Royal Bounty provisions which were distributed to the officers and non-commissioned officers at St. Ann's Point. He and Ensign William Edwards signed for the Loyal American Regiment.30 Anthony settled in New Brunswick, where he married and lived the rest of his life.

Alexander and Maria Allaire's middle son was Uyten-


29 Payne, personal letter to author, October 20, 1981.

30 Esther Clark Wright, The Loyalists of New Brunswick, (Fredericton), p. 86.
dale, born in 1752. The information about him is scarce and contradictory. One source claims that he was commissioned on February 2, 1776, in the Second Regiment of Harrison's Precinct where he became quartermaster. Another source claims that he was an officer in the American Revolutionary army, which would destroy the whole idea that he was ever a loyalist. Following the war, he married Sarah Simonds, the sister of Anthony's wife. He and his wife had thirteen children, but it appears that he lived out the rest of his life in relative obscurity in the state of New York.

31 Payne, personal letter to author, October 20, 1981.
33 Payne, personal letter to author, October 20, 1981. In the Collections of the New Brunswick Historical Society, (St. John: The Daily Telegraph Steam Boat and Job Print, 1894), I:33, the writer claims that Anthony was the only loyalist in his family. This might be partially explained by the fact that the passage written about Anthony takes place when Peter had already returned to New York.
Chapter IV: The Effects of the War

Peter and Anthony's flights to Canada were typical of the action taken by loyalists who believed that their safety depended on getting out of the country, or who had lost most of their possessions during the war and hoped that the British government would repay them for their loyalty. It is estimated that about 100,000 refugees left the country. About half of that number traveled north to Canada, and the rest went to various places abroad such as the West Indies and Great Britain.¹ Most of those who went to Canada settled in Nova Scotia, which at that time included New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island.² These numbered approximately 35-40,000 immigrants.³ Nova Scotia was the most logical place of exile because it was the closest British territory to New York; however, Canada was a foreign land that was peopled by French settlers who spoke French and were Catholics, and France was an ally of the American rebels. The next choice would be the West Indies, but these islands were even further away, had people of other races, and the climate was conducive to

²Wright, Loyalists of New Brunswick, p. 109.
tropical diseases, such as yellow fever. Nova Scotia seemed to offer the fewest obstacles to settlement.⁴

For many loyalists, the Treaty of Paris in 1783, was an insult that made them feel that even England was not going to support those who had remained loyal to her. The fifth article of the treaty stated that "restitution of all estates, rights and properties" should be made to those "real British subjects" who had lost these things. The question was who should be considered a "real British subject?" Many loyalists such as Colonel Beverly Robinson thought that most loyalists were excluded by the terminology. For all their sacrifice they were "slighted and cast off as beggars."⁵ The fifth article also included loyalists who had not fought against their fellow Americans.⁶ This made the feeling of betrayal even greater for those who had risked their lives in battle to support the King. The sixth article stated "that no further confiscations should be made nor prosecutions commenced" against any participants in the war. The phrase that angered the loyalists was the "further confiscations."⁷ How were they to be repaid for all that had already been taken

⁴Wright, Loyalists of New Brunswick, p. 28.
⁵Wertenbaker, Father Knickerbocker Rebels, p. 256.
⁷Wertenbaker, Father Knickerbocker Rebels, p. 256.
from them? Throughout the treaty discussions, the British had tried to have the loyalists reimbursed, but no such clause was accepted by the American delegates. They said that their Congress was not authorized to legislate for the individual states, but could only make recommendations that the loyalists be treated equitably. Everyone in America knew that this would mean nothing. Even as early as Cornwallis' surrender, he had requested in Article ten of the articles of capitulation that those who had joined the British should not be punished, but the Americans refused to acquiesce to this because they claimed that this was a civil problem rather than a military one.

The close of the war began a period of time in which loyalists were treated roughly by the revolutionaries and sometimes tarred and feathered. General Guy Carleton was sent to New York in May 1782 to oversee the conditions of peace upon completion of the treaty. In the meantime, he tried to establish a relationship with Washington by writing to him to alleviate some of the problems of disension after the war. His primary concern was to seek to have the loyalists treated with some kind of consideration. Unfortunately, Washington had already stated that the logical course for loyalists was suicide. Adams believed

8 Bradley, Colonial Americans in Exile, p. 115.
10 Wertenbaker, Father Knickerbocker Rebels, p. 256.
that all of them should be hanged.\textsuperscript{11} Eight colonies officially banished the known loyalists within their Borders, and the other five did in practice unofficially.\textsuperscript{12} Loyalists came to realize that escape to another country was worth any expense or danger involved. Travel by ship could never be taken for granted as being a completely safe method of escape. In November 1783, the ship \textit{Martha} sailed from Maryland to take loyalist families to Canada. It sank and 250 refugees drowned.\textsuperscript{13}

Shortly after the treaty of Paris was completed, Parliament established a commission to investigate the losses suffered by loyalists in property and rights, and to take action accordingly. The commission was authorized to offer an annual salary, a lump sum of money, and eventually it would be able to bestow grants of land in Canada. The same law which gave the commission its authority, stated that George III would continue to

\begin{quote}
procure from the United States restitution of or recompense for the estates and effects of those who had thus unhappily suffered, and as it was intended to give all due aid and assistance to those who might return to America for their recovery of their former possessions under the provisional articles, and to extend to others, who might be deprived of that advantage, such relief as their respective cases might require, it was necessary that a diligent and impartial inquiry should be made into the losses and services of all such persons as might within two
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{11} Bradley, \textit{Colonial Americans in Exile}, pp. 109,111.

\textsuperscript{12} Chidsey, \textit{The Loyalists}, p. 174.

\textsuperscript{13} Ibid., p. 171.
years from the passing of the act, claim or request such aid or relief as it was intended to give. 14

Three further Acts followed to further specify the duties of the commission.

Many of the land grants received were in Nova Scotia or New Brunswick, which became a separate province in 1784. Not only land and money were distributed, but also picks, shovels, axes, fishnets, and muskets to help the settlers get established on their new land. 15 For many of the newcomers life was very difficult. The food in America had generally been good, but here the refugees had to subsist on British provisions which included worm-eaten hardtack, salt pork, salt beef, and salt fish. 16 Mosquitoes and black flies from the previously uninhabited forests and swamps made life miserable. Another problem was that many of the loyalists were from the upper classes and so had little or no experience with manual labor. 17 Although provisions and land were distributed rather freely, only about one-third of the claimants received any monetary recompense for their loyalty. Only 303 were given life pensions and of these, only 18 received more than 200 pounds a year. Some of the greatest loyalist military figures of


15 Chidsey, The Loyalists, p. 179

16 Ibid., p. 180.

17 Bradley, Colonial Americans in Exile, p. 122.
the war did not receive much. Colonel David Fanning, a South Carolina hero, claimed 1,635 pounds, but only received 60 pounds.\textsuperscript{18} Some of the large landowners did quite well. Oliver DeLancey received 108,957 pounds, but he had lost an estate worth 140,000 pounds.\textsuperscript{19}

Peter Allaire was able to prove his loyalty to the King, and in 1784, he was granted a total of 250 acres of land in Nova Scotia. He received 100 acres in Digby Township and then 150 acres in Clements Township. Both were in Annapolis County. He was not as destitute as many of the other settlers. The list of refugees records Peter Allaire with his wife, two children, one servant over ten years of age, and two servants under the age of ten.\textsuperscript{20}

The Allaires lived in Canada at least until 1791, when their third son was born in Digby, Nova Scotia,\textsuperscript{21} but apparently Peter was not content as a Canadian farmer. By 1792, the family had returned to New York and Peter was again active in business. Peter Allaire, Westchester, Yeoman, was allowed to take a share in a coffee house which was established as

\textsuperscript{18}Chidsey, \textit{The Loyalists}, p. 167.

\textsuperscript{19}Bradley, \textit{Colonial Americans in Exile}, p. 113.

\textsuperscript{20}The \textit{Muster Rolls of Disbanded Officers, Discharged and Disbanded Soldiers and Loyalists in the County of Annapolis}, (Annapolis Royal, July 30, 1784), XXIV:30., located at Fort Anne Historical Museum, Annapolis Royal, Nova Scotia.

\textsuperscript{21}Dutch Bible in which Peter entered the date and birthplace of each of his children. A copy of his entries are in the Allaire collection of papers owned by Mrs. Myron Taylor, Brielle, New Jersey.
a corporation in 1792. One historian reports that those who had shares in this company were all aristocrats, the "crème of the crème of New York society."22 This would mean that Peter either could not have been only a farmer in Nova Scotia, or he had salvaged a great deal of wealth when he fled New York. It would also mean that New York society easily forgave those who had left the city previously as loyalists or that much of society had always been loyalist and was pleased to have these emigrants, such as Peter Allaire, return. This was a far different attitude than the prevalent one in the United States. Usually Americans hated loyalists after the war more than they did the British.23

A collection of Peter Allaire's accounts and bills is found in the Huguenot and Thomas Paine Historical Association in New Rochelle. Besides amusing the reader over how inexpensive items were at that time, most of the documents tell no more than that Peter remained active in business for several years. It is not clear when Peter's first wife died, but it is known that he remarried although his wife Calicia was not accepted by his children, nor was she treated with a great deal of affection by her

husband. The lives of his children would prove that descendents of loyalists could and did make vital contributions to the development of the United States.

One of the social events of 1802, described in newspaper articles, was the marriage of a young successful businessman named John Haggerty to the "lovely Maria Allaire," one of the "most charming girls of the city." The Reverend Dr. Beach of Trinity Church performed the ceremony at the home of the father of the bride, Peter Allaire. One reporter noted that the talk at the reception was primarily about the death of James Rivington on the previous Sunday morning. He was known as the most famous loyalist printer during the war, and was at one time the best known printer and bookseller in the colony of New York.

Maria's husband, John Haggerty, had an interesting and varied career as a merchant, and it has been estimated that millions of dollars passed through his concerns. He began business in 1799 and in 1801 started a dry goods company. Marrying into a merchant family in 1802 certainly helped him to become more well known. In 1806 Hag-

24 Mrs. Myron Taylor, a personal interview with a direct descendent of Peter Allaire, July 21, 1980.
26 Scoville, Old Merchants, III: 128.
27 Barrett, Old Merchants, V: 32.
gerty went into partnership with David Austin and they founded the firm of Haggerty and Austin. In 1810 he joined with a Mr. Tuttle to establish Haggerty and Tuttle, while his other partnership was still in operation. In about 1814, his association with Tuttle terminated, but Haggerty, Austin & Company grew to become the largest auction house in New York City, and perhaps the largest in the world. At some time during this partnership, David Austin married the daughter of John Haggerty. In 1833 this firm dissolved into two companies. One was John Haggerty & Son, because there was a younger John Haggerty to carry on the business. In 1836, it was reported falsely in the Herald that Haggerty & Son was one of the houses that had failed in the city. Haggerty sued and the court ruled in his favor. His company continued to be successful throughout his business career, but in his later years it was known as Haggerty & Company. In 1844, John Haggerty retired and the firm dissolved because his two sons John and William retired also. His son Ogden entered the new auction company of Haggerty, Draper & Jones. In 1845, John Haggerty's assets were estimated to be worth at least

\[28\] Ibid., pp. 128-132.


\[30\] Barrett, Old Merchants, V: 132-3.
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Peter's most famous child was James Peter Allaire. He received a basic education at a schoolhouse near White Plains, New York, and by the time he was fifteen, he was working as a druggist's clerk. He soon became a brass founder under a Mr. Ellsworth, and when his employer died in 1804, James inherited the business at nineteen years of age. There is some evidence to indicate that James Allaire cast the brass air chamber for Robert Fulton's Clermont. In 1815, Allaire entered into a partnership with Charles Stoudinger, a former manager under Fulton. Stoudinger died, and in 1816, the James P. Allaire Works was established. His business became one of the largest marine engine companies in the United States. To obtain the pig iron necessary for his shops, he bought the Monmouth Furnace in Monmouth County, New Jersey. He built an entire community there complete with a church, and he supplied a schoolteacher for the children. He kept this business, known as the Howell Works, going until 1846, when the bog industry collapsed as a result of the discovery of more profitable grades of iron in other parts of the country. The village decayed into ruin during the lifetime of his son Hal who did nothing to prevent it. Visitors to what is now called


the Deserted Village of Allaire can see the furnace, coal house, and most of the buildings that made up the community when it was in full operation. 33

In contrast to the loyalists who returned to their former lives in the States, more of the emigrants were like Anthony Allaire who began a new life in Canada and remained there. His regiment was disbanded in 1783, and Anthony was granted land to settle on near Fredericton. He was to pay an important role with many other loyalists in the development of the new province of New Brunswick. He married Mary Simonds, the daughter of James Simonds, another loyalist, 34 and continued to receive a half-pay from his service as a lieutenant in the Loyal American Regiment. 35

In February 1793, France and England officially resumed their state of war that had been discontinued since 1783. During this intervening decade, the loyalists in the maritime provinces had greatly changed the economy and standard of living from a primarily trading post society to one based on growing commerce and development of the land. These people were "intensely" loyal to Great Britain because their support of the King had cost them their homes

33 Ibid., pp. 4-22, passim.

34 Payne, personal letter to author, October 20, 1981.

in the United States, and Britain provided them with their new homes. The war with France was not even known in New Brunswick until April 1793. Governor Thomas Carleton was instructed to raise a "corps for the defense of the Province." The British treasury was to pay the expenses of this new corps which was called the King's New Brunswick Regiment.

The province was not prepared to resist any kind of attack, but the regiment was soon organized at Fredericton, the new capital of the province. Commissions in the unit were given almost entirely to the officers already receiving half-pay from serving in the American Revolution. Almost all of the recruits were experienced veterans of the war. Governor Carleton was commissioned as brigadier general, and Beverly Robinson the lieutenant colonel of the Loyal American Regiment, became lieutenant colonel of this unit as well. Four captains were instated including Joseph Lee, the senior captain. Anthony Allaire was in the list of eight lieutenants. This regiment rapidly grew to four hundred troops.36

In 1794, the King's New Brunswick Regiment continued to build the province's defenses. It was reported that "No militia in the world, probably was more intelligently and

36 Collections of the New Brunswick Historical Society, (St. John: Daily Telegraph Steam Boat and Job Print, 1894), I: 13-6.
efficiently commanded than that of New Brunswick." The regiment took the responsibility of garrisoning posts on the Upper St. John, and of establishing a succession of signal stations between Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. The corps also set up means of communication by which dispatches could be sent throughout all of the surrounding provinces in the winter months. In 1794, the Duke of Kent, the father of Queen Victoria, arrived at Fredericton to inspect the regiment in his duty as commander-in-chief of the forces in British America.

In 1795 the war came to New Brunswick. The French captured some ships from St. John and some Americans tried to attack the town of St. Andrews from Maine, but the attempt failed. The next year passed without incident, but in 1797, Britain declared war on Spain and New Brunswick's militia prepared for action which never really took place in that part of Canada. By this time, Beverly Robinson, the son of the well known loyalist commander, was placed in charge of the regiment. On February 29, 1798, it was reported in the St. John Gazette that Abraham DePeyster, the treasurer of the province, had died at the age of forty-six. This was the same Abraham DePeyster who had served in Ferguson's American Volunteers and had Anthony Allaire as his adjutant. The terms of service for the New Brunswick regiment expired in the summer of 1799,

Ibid., p. 20.
but most of the men re-enlisted for the rest of the war.

Allaire purchased Captain Lee's commission, and after
the regiment was disbanded in 1802, he continued to re-
ceive the half-pay of a captain. In the meantime, he
and his wife had one child, named Eliza Marie, who later
married Colonel John Robinson, the grandson of the first
Colonel Beverly Robinson. Anthony Allaire continued to
live in New Brunswick until his death at the age of eighty-
four in the parish of Douglas.

38 Ibid., pp. 20-39, passim.
39 Payne, personal letter to author, October 20, 1981.
Conclusion

In spite of the volumes of material that have been published about the Revolutionary War, the lack of knowledge about loyalists continues to be a great variable in any study of the war. Most historians usually choose to ignore the study of loyalism when there is so much information about the supporters of the revolution. It seems to be almost un-American to study the other side of the war. In every other war that the United States has participated in, there might be more studies by American historians about the opposing side. A major problem of any study of loyalism is the lack of any statistical data such that the study can be more easily quantified. It would be far easier to use John Adam's formula that one-third supported the revolution, one-third were loyal, and one-third were indifferent than to try to find a more accurate account. Paul Smith quotes William Nelson's *The American Tory* that one-half of New York was loyalist, one-quarter to one-third of the South, and about one-tenth of New England.¹ In other words, with the most sophisticated historical techniques in use today, no one can attempt to make an accurate statistical report.

The difficulty is that there are too many variables

to consider in trying to understand who the loyalists were, how many there were, and what they contributed to the war. Loyalism was difficult to assess even by participants in the war. Probably the greatest British blunder was that the army failed to use the loyalist volunteers to best advantage. The loyalists often joined eagerly but they were poorly organized, rarely informed about what was going on, and they were not provided with qualified leadership. The British rarely allowed them to participate in any real battle, even though they should have seen the obvious advantages of using loyalists rather than continuing to pay for German mercenaries. By the end of the war, there were 8,000 Americans in the British army. Between 30,000-50,000 loyalists fought in the war at some time. This compares to Washington's army of 9,000 which suffered regularly from desertion. In fact, it has been suggested by Donald Chidsey in his study of loyalists, that their numbers were growing, and that the British could have won after the battle of Yorktown. The rebels were tired, hungry, discouraged, and wanted their pay, but the British attitude seemed to be, "If our boys can't do it, it can't be done."^2


There were other factors which must be considered. Where and when the war was taking place was crucial. People living near Boston, New York, and Philadelphia were more likely to become involved in the war than those who
lived on the frontier of Virginia, because the war was in their neighborhood. Many of the frontiersmen of the Carolinas did not have to make a commitment until the Battle of King's Mountain. 3

There was also a scarcity of accurate records in the eighteenth century of birth and death and immigration rates, which could have lent some aid. Information about loyalist military units can be used to assess loyalist strength, but these suffer from too many inaccuracies as well. Most people rarely served in the war when it was no longer a local issue, unless they had few other responsibilities as in the case of Anthony Allaire, because the whole idea of making a personal commitment was still not understood by a large percentage of people throughout the colonies. There are also very few records of the number of loyalists who were killed in battle, wounded seriously enough to be discharged, died of disease or were captured. The desertion rate was not accurately recorded either. Allaire's Loyal American Regiment was listed as having a maximum strength of 392 enlisted men. The known number of dead, discharged, or deserted was 99. The attrition rate was estimated as being moderate, which hardly gives any information at all. The number of officers known was 62, which brought the cumulative total to 604. The estimated total was 693, which means that the figures may have been as

much as 13% in error or even more for just this one unit.4

One method that can be used to get some kind of understanding of who these loyalists were, or what they did in the war, is to focus on specific cases, and to evaluate how they might be representative of the whole group of loyalists. This was the purpose of this paper. The Allaires are the sample. They were certainly not outstanding loyalists. They are not mentioned in the Who was Who during the American Revolution, and are only rarely mentioned in books that list loyalists. Lorenzo Sabine's extensive sketches of loyalists contain only three sentences about Anthony.5 Even in a list of loyalists in the city of New York during the revolution years of 1776-1783, compiled by William Kelby of the New York Historical Society, we find no Allaire mentioned.6

What can be learned by a study of Peter, Anthony and Uytendale Allaire is that the choice during the American Revolution with regard to loyalty appears to have been more due to geographic location, and to a somewhat lesser degree professional occupation than anything else. The Allaires were from New York City, which had more claimants for recompense after the war than the rest of the state. Indeed, most of the wealthier claimants

4Ibid., pp. 265, 274.
came from New York City. Wallace Brown describes the city's average loyalist claimant as a member of a considerable minority, who was usually more wealthy than the Loyalists in other parts of the state, and was usually a member of a family which had immigrated from the British Isles long before; and was likely to be a merchant or shopkeeper.  

Except for having British ancestry, this description profiles the Allaires. It may well be that had the Allaires lived in Boston or Baltimore, they would have been staunch supporters of the revolution.

During the war, Peter was a good example of the great number of loyalists who never actually fought in the war, but still continued to keep good relations with Great Britain. As a merchant in New York City, Peter could not only maintain his business, but he could be a part of those merchants who profitted a great deal as the war continued. It is certain that there were many loyalists like Peter throughout the colonies who did not actively participate in the war, because of the reference in the fifth article of the peace treaty which specifically dealt with loyalists in this category. It should be noted that Peter dealt with the revolutionaries as well. This is proven by his contacts with Benjamin Franklin and John Jay while he was in Paris.

Anthony may serve as an example of the loyalists who

Brown, King's Friends, p. 87.
join the military efforts. As he described in his diary, he was involved in many of the mundane tasks and some of the exciting events typical for loyalists who served in other regiments. The atypical factor was Anthony's length of service. Family men and eldest sons who were expected to carry on the family business, would not have been likely to have served as long as Anthony did.

As a result of the war, loyalists in New York chose one of three courses of action which have been described in detail by Alexander Flick in his book on loyalism in New York. According to Flick, the three courses of action were represented by three categories of loyalists. The first group never left the state after the war. They were the largest and least vociferous. This class was made up of those who remained loyal to Britain, but outwardly followed the congress and committees, and those who refused to actively support the American cause, gave secret aid to the English but never actually joined to fight the rebels. Peter could be considered with this group in the early part of the war. He appeared to support the American cause while he apparently remained loyal to the King.

Many of these people had been brought before the Committee to Detect Conspiracies and other rebel courts, but besides suffering imprisonment and abuse, they often remained in New York and kept their property. After a period of scrutiny by their fellow citizens, they were
eventually allowed full political rights. Thousands of loyalists in southern New York claimed that their loyalty was due to the pressure of the British occupation, and were therefore acquitted of charges of treason. They also comprised such a large number in their area that it was impractical to prosecute them all. This was evident by the much larger percentage of loyalists that felt they had to flee their homes because of mistreatment in northern counties of New York rather than in counties around New York City. The proportion has been figured out to be 439 to 27. If in fact Uytendale Allaire was a loyalist, he would have been in this category. Although he may have fought as a loyalist, once the war was over, he never thought that the result was worth leaving the country.

The second category of loyalists in New York were those who left as refugees for England and other British colonies, but returned to their homes in America. This was the smallest of the three groups and the one to which Peter Allaire eventually belonged. The families of many of these refugees continued to maintain the family property, and therefore there was reason for them to return. Maria Allaire still had property which Peter as the oldest son would inherit.8 Poor conditions in Canada, the in-

8On July 14, 1784, Maria Allaire again granted a letter of administration over more of her assets to her son Peter, who was listed as being a New York merchant, even though he was living in Canada at the time. Abstracts of Wills, New York Historical Society Collections for 1903, p. 412.
difference of English hosts in Great Britain as well as
the loyalists' view that they had been inadequately repaid
for their sacrifices, were all incentives for these re-
ugees to return to their former lives. New York City be-
came one of the only havens where loyalists could return
and restart lives in the United States, but this was not
ture throughout the state of New York. The Albany jail in
1784 was "reported to be full of tories who were whipped
and persecuted." The state advised its citizens to treat
loyalists "as persons contaminated with the most dreadful
contagion," and to let them remain, as they deserve,
"vagabonds on the face of the earth."9

The third class of New York loyalists were those who
left forever. They were a large group and included the
strongest supporters of the King. Many of these people
left America because of persecutions or fear of what might
happen to them. There was a popular saying among the rebels
which made any loyalist uncomfortable:

    That Tories, with their brats and wives,10
    Should fly to save their wretched lives.

A great many of them left the country simply because they
had lost the war. "They loved British institutions, were
ture to their oaths of loyalty, dreaded the scorn and con-
tempt of their victorious brothers, hated republicanism,

9Flick, Loyalism in New York, pp. 164-8.
10Chidsey, The Loyalists, p. 172.
loved adventure, and wished to help preserve the integrity of the British empire." Some of these refugees received grants of land and pensions to help them begin new lives.¹¹ One of these refugees was Anthony Allaire who with his wife settled and worked together with other loyalist families, such as the Robinsons. They developed a new province where the citizens were industrious, conscientious, but most of all, they remained loyal to their King.
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