John Rutherfurd: Loyalist

by Alan D. Watson

Dr. Watson is an associate professor in the Department of History, University of North Carolina at Wilmington.

John Rutherfurd, royal placeman in colonial North Carolina, exemplified the passive loyalist in the Revolutionary conflict who finally declared openly his allegiance to the crown only to lose his fortune and his life as a result of his decision. Born at Bowland in Midlothian County, Scotland, Rutherfurd was the eldest of seven children. His brothers who survived to majority, James and Thomas, also came to America. By 1743 James conducted a mercantile business in Wilmington after which he moved to Cumberland County where he became justice of the peace and colonel of the county militia. Thomas, also a resident of Cumberland County, was deputy secretary of the province in the 1760s and register and clerk of the Cumberland court in the 1770s.1

John Rutherfurd’s interest in America derived from his cousin, James Murray, who ventured to the Cape Fear in 1735 to improve his economic position via mercantile and plantation operations. Four years later Murray brought Rutherfurd to North Carolina to assist in his mercantile business. As Rutherfurd was only fifteen years old at the time and experiencing his first ocean voyage, Murray “expected to See Cousin John Very Sick, but instead of that, He was the only person of all the Cabin Passengers that was not Sea Sick, & took a most compassionate Care of us in our Distress.”2 When Rutherfurd was not attending the passengers, he studied geometry at the instance of Murray, who found the boy an apt learner. Rutherfurd continued his studies upon arrival in the Cape Fear when he was “not employed in the store” by “Delivering out Goods, Writing in the Waste Books & copying Letters . . .”.3

Although Murray early became involved in the political turmoil of Governor Gabriel Johnston’s tenure, particularly in the contention for commercial superiority between the towns of Wilmington and Brunswick, his friendship with the governor as well as his general influence and patronage gave Rutherfurd a ready entree into Cape Fear government and society. Rutherfurd was barely twenty-one years old in 1745 when he served New Hanover County as a commissioner of the roads. By 1749 he and Lewis DeRosset were churchwardens of St. James Parish.4

Under Murray’s tutelage Rutherfurd learned the mercantile trade and by 1747 he was living in Wilmington where he conducted the affairs of Rutherfurd and Company, dealers in lumber and merchandise. He was elected town commissioner of Wilmington in 1749 and 1750 but declined the latter appointment in order to journey to England. However, upon his return in 1751, Rutherfurd was immediately elected to fill a vacancy on the town commission.5

In March 1750 Rutherfurd had embarked for England where by assiduous personal effort and the assistance of Surveyor General of the Customs Robert Dinwiddie he procured a commission as Receiver General of the Quitrents for North Carolina. As Murray remarked, “Mr. Rutherfurd with all his easy Temper is more pushing than one would imagine. . . He is daily expected here with a Commission for Receiver General of the Kings Quitrents . . .”. According to Murray the position would “be attended with much fatigue and Perquisites worth about two hundred (pounds) a year.”6

Although Rutherfurd improved his standing in the government by obtaining an appointment to the council of the province in 1752, it was the office of Receiver General that kept him involved in turmoil throughout the remainder of the colonial era. His lot was an easy one at first because Governor Johnston died in 1751 and the interim governors who followed him were mere caretakers of provincial affairs until Arthur Dobbs arrived in late 1754 to assume the governorship. In the meantime Rutherfurd found tax collection from an obstreperous people difficult at best and turned his attention to more satisfying endeavors such as courting and eventually marrying Frances Johnston, the widow of the governor.

If Rutherfurd expected the office of receiver general to be a sinecure, he was quickly disabused of the idea by Dobbs. A week after being sworn into office the governor submitted to the Board of Trade proposals for improving the collection of quitrents. He told the Board that he had no reason to doubt Rutherfurd’s honesty but believed that he “is quite indolent, and am told gives himself no trouble to go about to collect the Quit rents; whether his being married to the late Governor’s young widow makes him unwilling to go abroad or whether it is his natural inactivity I can’t tell; but I’m told he has received very little of late, under pretense that he would await my arrival.” Dobbs went on to hint that a suspension of the receiver from his office until the pleasure of the crown was known might “rouse him out of his lethargy.”7

(Continued on Page Three)
MEETING

Date: Sunday, February 26, 1978

Time: 4:00 P.M.

Place: Thalian Hall

Subject: Location and Identification of the Ironclad U.S.S. Monitor

Speaker: Gordon P. Watts, Jr.

Mr. Watts received his A.B. and M.A. degrees in history from East Carolina University. His thesis was "Monitor of a New Iron Age: The Construction of the U.S.S. Monitor."

While teaching in the Beaufort County School System from 1968 through 1970, Mr. Watts conducted archaeological research at Woodstock, a Colonial town site on the Pungo River.

From 1971 through 1972, he served as Salvage and Exploration Field Agent for the Florida Division of Archives, History, and Records Management. During that time he supervised the investigation of several major prehistoric and Colonial period sites. Of these, the Little Salt Springs Project was the largest underwater archaeological excavation in the United States.

Presently, Mr. Watts holds the position of underwater archaeologist with the North Carolina Division of Archives and History. The emphasis of his work has been the development of a state-wide program to identify, investigate, and manage North Carolina's underwater archaeological resources. In addition to supervising the Salvage Contract Program, he has directed major efforts toward the establishment of cooperative programs to involve students from participating educational institutions. Projects conducted under North Carolina's archaeological program include: supervision of the salvage contract issued to Underwater Archaeological Associates, Inc., involving two blockade runner sites; U.S.S. Monitor project; Chincoteague Survey in Pitt County; New Inlet Site investigation of a ship constructed of woods indigenous to the southeastern United States; C.S.S. Raleigh Wreck Survey; Hatteras Beach Survey; Newkirk House Site, Wilmington; Marine Archaeology Field Schools.

In conjunction with agencies outside North Carolina, Mr. Watts has conducted the survey of sites in the York River, Virginia, and Chesnut Neck, New Jersey, and directed the Fort Branch Survey and Recovery Project in the Roanoke River. He also provided assistance to the Little Salt Springs Early Man Site in Florida and to the Gulf South Research Institute of Baton Rouge, Louisiana.

Articles by Mr. Watts have appeared in The International Journal of Underwater Archaeology, Spiegel Historical, and other professional publications.

Mr. Watts is a member of the Society for Historical Archaeology, Society for American Archaeology, Society for Historians in Eastern North Carolina, American Historical Society, and the North Carolina Archaeological Council. He serves on the Marine Advisory Committee of Cape Fear Technical Institute and is Technical and Governmental Review Operations Coordinator for the Monitor Marine Sanctuary.

Congratulations to the Junior League of Wilmington for twenty-five years of outstanding service to the community, 1952-1977.

A social hour at the Latimer House will follow the February meeting.

The President's Message

The candlelight Christmas tour was a success. One thousand four hundred ninety-two attended. The Wassail Bowl provided a delightful gala on the eve of the tour. Receipts from both events totaled $8,310.00. We thank the members, homes, churches, and organizations for their participation.

The archaeological phase of the Servants' Quarters Preservation Project is completed. Request for reimbursement of this phase as well as final architectural plans have been sent to the National Park Service. We hope to have contracts to begin restoration and renovation by spring. An exhibit of artifacts from the Servants' Quarters cellar is now on display in the kitchen of the Latimer House.

Kind donations of one hundred twenty-five dollars have been received from Mrs. J. Haughton James and Mrs. Patrick Welder. Mrs. Walter Craven has graciously given an Empire sofa signed by John and Thomas Needham of New York. She has also loaned a tea table and a drop leaf table. The National Society of the Colonial Dames in the State of North Carolina kindly loaned us two mid nineteenth century porcelain vases. Mr. John Kalmar has placed two white figurines on loan. Mr. George E. London has given Memorandum 1800 by John London to the archives. The Society is very appreciative of these gifts and loans.

The Latimer House Committee is formulating plans for restoration of the original dining room and kitchen in the
basement. The dining room will serve as part of the house museum and as our board room. If you have furnishings that you could give, please let us know. We also plan to start restenciling of the hall in the near future with a grant stipulated for that purpose.

As a fund raising project, a Latimer House yard and bake sale is planned for March 11 from ten until five. Please search your basements and attics for items you can donate for the sale and bring them to the Latimer House.

Your support and enthusiasm is greatly appreciated.

James Robert Warren
President

Tribute to Mrs. Ida B. Kellam

A tribute luncheon was held for Mrs. Ida B. Kellam, our Archivist, on November 25 to honor her outstanding service to the community during the past fifty years. Mr. Leslie N. Boney, Jr., presided as master of ceremonies. The Mayor of Wilmington, the Department of Cultural Resources, the Historic District Commission, the Historic Wilmington Foundation, and the Lower Cape Fear Historical Society paid tribute to Mrs. Kellam for her work in the areas of historical research, publication and preservation on her fiftieth anniversary in Wilmington.

We owe a great deal to this great lady who has served as teacher, genealogist, researcher, historian, and as an active force in education, motivation, and preservation concerning the history of Wilmington and the Lower Cape Fear area.

Due to the extraordinary expenses incurred during the past year with the roof leaks, falling parlor ceiling, and the disappointing response to Historic Wilmington Tours, we are in dire need of extra funds. If each member would make a gift we can continue with our good work.

Latimer House Yard and Bake Sale
March 11, 1978
10:00 A.M. until 5:00 P.M.

Empty your attics and basements,
Part with your treasures,
Start your baking
For the festive day of March eleventh.
Items may be left at the Latimer House anytime during the open hours of the house.

John Rutherford
(continued from Page One)

The governor apparently intended to act upon his quick judgment of Rutherford's competence by replacing the receiver regardless of the sanction of the crown. By 1757 Rutherford presented the governor with the pretext that he needed. In that year Dobbs suspended Rutherford and Murray from the council and supplanting the former as Receiver General of the Quitrents with Lewis DeRosset. At least four allegations were lodged against Rutherford: permitting Murray to issue small bills which would be accepted for quitrent payments; utilizing quitrent moneys for personal benefit; failing to execute the duties of the receiver general properly; and aiding Murray and John Starkey in forming a juncto in the council and assembly to block the will of the governor.8

The first charge involved a private agreement between Rutherford and Murray by which the latter was allowed to issue an unlimited amount of notes signed by the receiver general which would be taken for payment of quitrents. Murray at first dispensed the notes in New Hanover, Onslow, Duplin, and Bladen counties. Upon finding the practice successful, he issued them throughout the province where quitrents were due the crown. The governor contended that it was an irregular practice which would contribute to the depreciation of the paper currency of the colony. Moreover, it was discriminatory in that other royal officials did not receive the same privilege.9

Rutherford responded by saying that the crown owed Murray arrears of salary as secretary of the province, that the practice of issuing certificates or notes had been used by preceding receivers, and that the notes served the public because money was scarce. Since the notes were not legal tender, were not "Issued to any considerable Extent," and could not supplant the provincial currency, they would not depreciate the money supply.10 Nonetheless, Dobbs, with the consent of the council, forbade the further issuance of the notes.11

The second charge against Rutherford maintained that the receiver had unlawfully stopped payment of £88.15.4 to be paid to the executors of Joseph Anderson, former attorney general of the province, as part of the arrears of Anderson's salary. Dobbs charged that Rutherford appropriated the money for his own use. Rutherford countered by asserting that £20.11.4 was an overcharge; £63.3.11 represented money which Anderson owed Rutherford but which in turn Rutherford owed a third party, Sir Samuel Fludger in London. Instead of waiting for payment from Anderson's executors, Rutherford canceled the obligation on Anderson's part and paid Fludger;12

However, as the governor contended, the practice was highly unusual if not patently illegal. Receivers were authorized neither to mix public and private funds nor to make disbursements without the approval of the Auditor General in England (or occasionally by the governor of the province). Moreover, Dobbs charged that Rutherford had entered these transactions in the quitrent accounts ten months after the business had been concluded and had manipulated the monetary figures in such a way that he covered his indiscretions.13

The accusation that Rutherford had not executed the duties of his office properly by failing to collect quitrents was true to the extent the collection of the king's levy was inadequate. But Rutherford cannot be blamed wholly for the deficiency. The quitrent system had been in a state of confusion since the crown had purchased the province from the proprietors in 1729. A satisfactory rent roll had never been formed and disarranc proved an inadequate means of compelling observance of the quitrent obligation. Of course Rutherford may not have been as diligent in carrying out his duties as his counterparts in other provinces but that hardly constituted a grievance sufficient to suspend him from office without approval of the Lords of the Treasury from whom he received his appointment.14 It may be noteworthy that Dobbs criticized Rutherford's suggestion that a court of exchequer be created by saying that it would be impractical and "might throw the Province into a flame...".15

The final charge was blatantly political and lends credence to the charges that Dobbs suffered from paranoia, was censorious, and could not accept opposition gracefully.
The governor claimed that Murray, Rutherford, and Starkey intended to form a junta, presumably to thwart measures of the governor, and in the case of Starkey, who was castigated as a republican, to transfer the powers of the prerogative to the assembly. The governor admitted that Starkey was a man of innocuous appearance and excellent reputation but found him "the most designing Man in the Province." Although the charge against Starkey may have been true, it is difficult to believe that Murray and Rutherford were "rebucics" and had joined Starkey in an attempt to augment the authority of the assembly at the expense of the crown.

The Board of Trade accepted Dobb's explanation, however, and upheld the suspension of Murray and Rutherford from the council. Although the Board admitted that the council minutes did not reflect the concerted action charged by Dobb's, it could not "doubt his veracity that [Starkey, Rutherford, and Murray] have formed parties in the Council and Assembly with a design to embarrass and oppose the measures of your Majesty's Governor to lessen your Majesty's Prerogative and to add to the Power of the Assembly." The Board referred to a similar and recent case in South Carolina involving William Wragg who had been dismissed from the council of that province.

Rutherford fought for the retention of his offices. Journeying to England in 1757, he apparently spent the next four years seeking redress. He complained to Lord Granville that "It is well known that the understanding & Judgement of the Governor is wasted, & greatly impaired and also how much he is guided by his countrymen residing in the province and determined to elbow out anybody in Place of Trust to make room for them." According to Dobb's biographer, these and similar accusations "marked the initial steps taken by a disgruntled faction to impugn the integrity and honesty of the Governor," and he proceeds to deny "the charges of nepotism, choleric temperament, and dodging senility" which have since been associated with Dobb's.

Still, while the Board of Trade supported Dobb's, it is incorrect to maintain that "the Murray and Rutherford episode ended in a victory for the Governor ...". The receiver general represented his case successfully before Robert Cholmondeley, Auditor General in England, the Treasury Board, and the Privy Council. On April 2 and 30, 1761, Rutherford received renewed commissions as receiver general and councilor respectively. By December 1761 he again enjoyed the occupancy of those offices.

Upon the death of Dobb's in 1765, a cordial relationship appeared between Governor William Tryon and Rutherford. The governor evinced an admirable interest in improving quitrent collections but had to contend with Rutherford's pessimistic assessment of the situation in 1764 wherein the receiver had enumerated "several difficulties and obstructions in the Execution of His Office ...". The problems centered upon ascertaining the location and ownership of land. The creation by the assembly of a multiplicity of counties left the location of much land in doubt. Clerks of the county courts, with whom wills were filed, failed to apprise the receiver of the devisees of lands. The registers of the counties failed to notify the provincial secretary of land transfers, and, of course, few persons volunteered the location and acreage of their holdings. For that matter, many landowners could not be found. If perchance the receiver were aware of the location and ownership of land, he often had little property to distress in order to force payment of quitrents. And if distress were contemplated, the receiver and his deputies were threatened "with the utmost Rigor of the Law if they receive a shilling more than is due which said Receivers not knowing when the Last payments were made may very innocently do." 24

In giving attention to improving quitrent collections, Tryon not only displayed his zeal to serve the crown but also reflected an increased interest on the part of the authorities in England in the quitrent revenues. Lord Shelburne, the American Secretary, briefly flirted with the idea of using quitrents rather than imposing additional taxes on the colonials in the aftermath of the Stamp tax debacle. He abandoned the proposal after receiving negative responses from the royal governors in America to queries about the extent of quitrent collections. Yet, Lord Hillsborough, who succeeded Shelburne, expressed his consternation at "The little improvement which has been made in His Majestys Revenue of Quit Rents not withstanding the rapid progress of settlement ...". Tryon submitted a "Scheme proposed for the forming of [a] Rent Roll and obtaining a regular collection of his Majestys Quit Rents," but the governor's efforts, like those of his predecessors, were in vain.

When Josiah Martin succeeded Tryon, he investigated the state of the king's revenue pursuant to royal instructions. Relying upon Rutherford, the governor explained to Hillsborough the reasons for the inadequate collection of quitrents: the lack of legislation compelling landowners to list their holdings; the failure of suits to restrain property for payment; and the debilitating influence of the Granville lands. Eventually, however, the governor became convinced that Rutherford served the crown poorly as receiver general, and when Rutherford and the Attorney General of the province, Thomas McGuire, quarreled over culpability for failure to prosecute vigorously those who evaded rent payments, Martin agreed with McGuire, claiming that Rutherford was the culprit and calling the receiver "in every respect utterly disqualified for his office." The governor proposed to replace Rutherford with Samuel Strudwick but the Revolution intervened and thwarted Martin's plans.

Thus, despite suspension by one governor and threatened replacement by another, Rutherford retained his post as receiver general until the outbreak of hostilities. The principal criticisms leveled at the receiver were his poor business practices and lethargy as well as an "invincible deafness" which rendered him unfit for public office. Rutherford admitted his deafness as early as 1758. Nonetheless, he was an industrious, even tenacious, individual. His efforts to secure the offices of councilor and receiver general attest to his indefatigability.

Certainly Rutherford conducted his public and private affairs without undue hindrance. He served the province in the French and Indian War, surveyed the Cherokee boundary in 1767, participated in the campaign against the Regulations in 1771, and with William Dry in 1772 joined commissioners from South Carolina to survey an extension of the boundary between the colonies. Henry Laurens in 1763 called Rutherford "the greatest Traveller in America. You talk of a 400 Mile Ride as any other Man would of about 40." And when Janet Schaw arrived in the Cape Fear with Rutherford's children in 1775, she noted that the receiver was "some hundred miles up in the country, so it will be several weeks before he hears his children are arrived ...".

Although a traveler, Rutherford could also be a retiring, scholarly individual who enjoyed the confines of a large library. His ruminations, however, occasionally reached print, particularly with the appearance of The Importance of the Colonies to Great Britain, with some Hints towards Making Improvements to their Mutual Advantage: And
upon Trade in General, which was published in 1761 while Rutherford was in London. According to J. M. Burnstede, the pamphlet represented "the last significant statement on general imperial policy in the public debate over Canada and the forthcoming peace treaty." A victory for England over France in the Seven Years War was imminent and pamphleteers had been discussing the advisability of demanding Canada as a reward for English efforts.

Rutherford offered his observations as a merchant and a colonial. He denied the prevailing contention that adding Canada to the empire would encourage the colonies along the Atlantic coast to turn to manufacturing for themselves, which would be anathema to mercantilists and English merchants. Actually, England ought to seek to revive its slumping trade by encouraging manufacturing in the mother country and agriculture in the colonies concluded Rutherford. Cheap land and high wages for skilled labor in the colonies militated against colonial manufacturing in competition with the mother country. The colonies would naturally tend to purchase finished goods from England. However, the mother country must redress the unfavorable flow of trade with the provinces, rely on bounties and other stimulants to promote the production of raw materials, and maintain a ready supply of cheap land in the West. Thus Rutherford supported the English acquisition of all French territory on mainland North America.

In addition to penning the pamphlet and regaining his governmental offices, Rutherford attended to other, more personal, business while in England from 1757 to 1761. Upon marrying Frances Johnston, the receiver found that the province owed Governor Johnston a large sum of money for arrears of his salary. Frances had already petitioned Auditor General Horatio Walpole for payment and Rutherford spent much of his time in London after 1757, when he was trying to regain his governmental offices, seeking restitution for the arrears of salary due to the Johnston estate. Again tireless effort was rewarded as a royal warrant, dated February 5, 1761, was drawn by the Treasury for £12,500.8.8 sterling and made payable to the Johnston estate. Ordinarily it would have been mandated payment from the North Carolina quitrent fund but insufficient moneys caused the Treasury to rely upon the South Carolina quitrent fund for the payments.

Rutherford, acting for his wife and the Johnston estate, collected the money with difficulty from George Saxby, Receiver General in South Carolina. Although the South Carolina quitrent system was far more remunerative than its counterpart in North Carolina, Saxby had more demands on the king's revenues and had to be prodded often by Henry Laurens, Rutherford's friend and attorney in Charleston, to make the payments. Laurens sometimes despaired of obtaining the money, complaining in 1763 that "At present my applications are necessarily made in the stile & address of petitions & consequently must be awkward & a little irksome." Eventually Laurens and Rutherford threatened to sue Saxby and even take the case to London. Saxby, aging rapidly, did not have the health or resources to prepare for battle in England. Aided by an increase in South Carolina's quitrent receipts, he subsequently raised Rutherford's payments to an average of more than £1,000 sterling per year between 1767 and 1774. At the outbreak of the Revolution only £2,018.19.2 remained outstanding on the warrant, which the Rutherford heirs eventually collected with much difficulty.

In order to provide a suitable home for his wife, Rutherford purchased 2,560 acres at Rocky Point from Maurice Moore in 1757 and called his plantation Bowland. In addition to his efforts at planting he maintained a mercantile partnership with Alexander Duncan between 1762 and 1766. Rutherford must have supported many of his ventures with a £7,440 loan from John Murray of Philiaupha, which was obtained in 1761. Although he liquidated a number of his landholdings in the mid-1760s and received a £1,000 sterling bequest from Duncan at the latter's death, Rutherford proved unable to repay his debt. Eventually he was bankrupted and by a decision of the Chancery court in 1771 presumably lost most of his assets. Laurens referred to his situation in sympathetic terms in 1772 when he noted that Rutherford's "Circumstances from boundless Libarility and Beneficence on one Side, and too careless an Attention to the Sources of his Estate on the other, have of late been narrow'd."

His desperate situation caused Rutherford to consider leaving the province in 1772 as he inquired from friends about possible government positions in London. Yet, by 1775 he had executed a remarkable financial recovery which is not readily ascertainable from the records. On the eve of the Revolution Rutherford possessed a 4,000 acre plantation, Huntshill, which was located about thirty miles north of Wilmington on Holly Shelter Creek. The plantation contained about 150 slaves, over 300 acres of cleared land, 150 cattle, a grist mill, a large double saw mill, and naval stores facilities. When Janet Schaw visited the area, she mentioned a ride in Rutherford's phaeton, which must have been one of the very few in the province, and later an excursion in his "very fine boat with an awning to prevent the heat, and six stout Negroes in neat uniforms to row" the craft.

With the outbreak of the Revolution in the colony Rutherford proved a determined adherent of the British cause. Although he had differed with Governor Martin on controversial political matters, most notably the court question, Rutherford came to the aid of the governor when the crisis of separation occurred. After Martin had taken refuge on the frigate "Cruizer," Rutherford was the only councilor to answer the governor's summons for a meeting of the royal council on the ship, and that despite being afflicted with gout so badly that he had to go without a shoe. Upon his return the Wilmington-New Hanover Safety Committee demanded that Rutherford relinquish his seat on the council and resign his commission as receiver general. Rutherford refused but was relieved of both positions upon the establishment of provisional government by the patriots.

Thereafter Rutherford apparently retired to Hunt Hill to escape the hostilities which beset the Lower Cape Fear in 1776. Although he harbored pro-British sentiments, he remained unmolested. He, like so many others, however, represented the latent Loyalist strength upon which the British counted heavily to crush American resistance. But the British bungled the opportunity granted them by marching through contested areas, calling upon Loyalists to announce their support of the crown, and then withdrawing their armies to leave the professed Loyalists at the mercy of the patriots.

Rutherford epitomized the results of this blundering British practice. When Cornwallis arrived in the Cape Fear in the spring of 1781, Rutherford affirmed his allegiance to the crown. But with the departure of Cornwallis's army Rutherford was forced to abandon his plantation, taking only a few slaves and household goods with him to Charleston. Diminishing funds and declining health eventually forced him to sail for Europe. He died at Cork in 1782.46
Rutherford's case is instructive. The British had a deep reservoir of support in North Carolina but squandered their legacy and thereby helped to insure American independence.
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