

JOHN VARDILL: A LOYALIST'S PROGRESS

by

STEVEN GRAHAM WIGELY

B.A., University of California at Irvine, 1971

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF  
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF  
MASTER OF ARTS

in the Department  
of  
History

We accept this thesis as conforming to the  
required standard

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

May, 1975

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfilment of the requirements for an advanced degree at the University of British Columbia, I agree that the Library shall make it freely available for reference and study.

I further agree that permission for extensive copying of this thesis for scholarly purposes may be granted by the Head of my Department or by his representatives. It is understood that copying or publication of this thesis for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Department of History

The University of British Columbia  
Vancouver, Canada V6T 1W5

Date 9 May '75

## ABSTRACT

This thesis is a study of a loyalist of the American Revolution named John Vardill. A native of New York who went to England in 1774, he was an Anglican clergyman, a pamphleteer, a professor at King's College (New York), and a spy for the British. The purpose of the thesis is: 1. to tell his story, and 2. to argue that his loyalism was a perfectly reasonable consequence of his environment and experiences.

The text begins with an Introduction (Chapter I) which places Vardill in colonial and English society, and justifies studying one who was neither among the very powerful nor the very weak. It then proceeds to a consideration of the circumstances and substance of his claim for compensation from the British government after the war (Chapter II). Following the organization of the claim, the subsequent Chapters fill in the details, and remark upon the roots of loyalty.

These Chapters begin with his birth and education (Chapter III), showing that becoming a tutor and prospective clergyman at King's College was an easy path to follow. Chapter IV considers the episcopal debate of 1768 to 1770, which initiates Vardill into Anglican-Presbyterian warfare, and defines for him a religious-political position. Chapter V inspects his writings of 1772 against Dr. John Witherspoon of the College of New Jersey, and against the Tea Act opposition of 1773, both of which strengthen his incipient loyalism before his departure for England for

ordination.

Chapter VI has him in England, where he becomes involved with the government's ministers through promoting a charter for King's College, and advocating the establishment of an American episcopate. With the battle of Lexington, his visit becomes an exile, and he continues employment with government (Chapter VII) as a writer, adviser, and spy, in which capacity he performs one of the espionage "coups" of the war. After Saratoga and his assistance with preparation for the Carlisle Peace Commission of 1778, his usefulness wanes; after writing some pieces against the Yorkshire movement in England in 1780, he disappears. Chapter VIII therefore picks up where Chapter II left off, and regards the judgement of his claim. This Chapter continues to Vardill's death in 1811.

The conclusion (Chapter IX) reviews the thesis, and states the argument that loyalism was not unusual for Vardill, and hence was not unusual for his loyal contemporaries. The conclusion rejects the notion that men like Vardill were at "odds" with their times, and argues instead that, perfectly in tune with their times, they became involved in an argument which they lost; and that therefore it is only hindsight which makes them out to be narrowminded or unperceptive. Speculating on that premise, it is found that Vardill perceived some of the problems of post-revolutionary America.



## CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I INTRODUCTION: A RATIONALE . . . . .	1
II NOVEMBER, 1784 . . . . .	6
III EARLY YEARS . . . . .	13
IV APPRENTICE LOYALIST . . . . .	29
V JOURNEYMAN LOYALIST . . . . .	67
VI MASTER LOYALIST . . . . .	89
VII SERVANT OF THE CROWN . . . . .	103
VIII DEPENDENT OF THE CROWN . . . . .	126
IX CONCLUSION . . . . .	131
FOOTNOTES . . . . .	140
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	167

## Chapter I

### INTRODUCTION: A RATIONALE

The present work is a study of the activities of an American loyalist identified, in the eighteenth century, as "the Pope, Milton, Addison, & Swift of our Continent,"<sup>1</sup> and in the twentieth as "a rather unsavory character."<sup>2</sup> His name was John Vardill. He was a man of some obscurity, and no great importance. Why, then, a study of what he did?

His relative obscurity and unimportance are as opposite sides of a coin. Had he been more important he would no doubt be less obscure. But he occupied a station in the ranks of American loyalists below the highest level, and above the lowest. And his position in England as the Ministry's servant, while privileged compared to other exiles,<sup>3</sup> was blanketed beneath the numerous strata of government, and shared with other personalities--like Dr. Edward Bancroft and Paul Wentworth--of greater notoriety. He held, in other words, in America and in England, a place of middling fame or consequence; and his actions were such that they but fell within the bounds of a policy set by others. He was not, then, among that gallery of eighteenth century statues that

hindsight sees surmounting the mists of time; he was not among the great heroes, nor among the great villains.

Nor was he a part of that amorphous mass condescendingly called "the common people." The masses of men, women, and children who held responsibility for the success or failure of government policy, who were in some respects the government's and revolution's justification, who indeed forged policy by its execution, are together perhaps the most fit for study. A great hero or a great villain is but their reflection, ". . . like a child holding on to the straps inside a carriage and imagining that he is driving it."<sup>4</sup> But Vardill was no more among the "masses" than he was a giant of his times. He probably saw less a connection with the former, in fact, than with the latter. A history from the "bottom up" will not find him.

So within a hierarchical schema of colonial or English society, Vardill cannot be justified by reference to a top or a bottom, for both of which history provides an implicit legitimacy. Why, then, to ask a second time, a study of what he did? The answer should already be evident: because to portray him as a larger man's puppet in a consideration of the larger man, or as a lesser lord in a study of his subjects, distorts what meaning he might have had, cramming him into a bipartite division of history where there are only Great Rulers and Miserable Pawns, with

nothing but automatons in between; and because Vardill, with many others, was neither an historical giant nor an historical midget, but instead shared characteristics of both which combined to mark him away from either.<sup>5</sup>

He was, in the first place, a member of an intelligentsia. He lived as the beneficiary of an idea made pervasive by the enlightenment: that there is something especially virtuous, and deserving of privilege about making one's way with the mind. He was a tutor, a professor, and a writer. He was a dilettante of philosophy, a member of a self-important intellectual coterie. He was an observer, an analyst, who set his plate and built his roof with the labours of the mind. This fact distinguishes him from the greater part of colonial or English society.

But even within the world of intellects he fell somewhere close to the bottom, just above clerks, secretaries, and students. He could not retain his place by his own decision. He was a dependent. A whole series of officials existed above him, most of whom were ignorant of his existence; but of the rest he required a tacit approbation. His were the exigencies of a bureaucrat, an intellectual and published one to be sure, but politically similar. He depended upon a royally and parliamentary sanctioned political economy for the barter of intellect.

He depended equally on a political attachment of a

sort different from the bureaucrat busily scribbling away in some neglected office who is safe so long as the government survives. For his own advancement, if he would have any, and for his own security, Vardill needed a usefulness. He needed a place in the periphery of power. He found this by writing politically expedient (though no doubt sincere) defences of imperial and colonial policy, and by attachment to more powerful personalities. Put another way, it was insufficient to be an employee of an institution--King's College--which itself depended on political tolerance. He had as well to be personally connected with the powerful.

Yet another aspect of this bureaucrat cum intellectual attached to government was his membership in the hierarchy of that religious, spiritual, social, economic, evangelical, political, intellectual, transatlantic octopus-like would be colonial juggernaut, the Anglican church. The impact of spirituality and right theology on the minds of men is always hard to gauge, and presents a peculiar spectacle of irony and paradox in the Age of Reason. But for Vardill it was also a more easily discussed aspect of his environment, completing, as it were, the portrait of the loyalist that loyalist historians have been trying to repaint for the last decade.

And it is in his Anglican connection that a further peculiarity emerges. Sailing to England for ordination in

1774, Vardill shortly became one of the earliest exiles of the war. Spending the duration in England, he was spared the violence, the witch hunting, and the decisions which forced others to fly, and was given the opportunity of fitting himself into the English environment, which he did with alacrity, in a way later exiles were estopped from doing.<sup>6</sup> And by virtue of these circumstances he escaped much of what it is supposed to have meant to be a loyalist.

So Vardill falls without most loyalist classifications or categories. He was somewhere between the powerful and the weak, and off to one side away from mechanics and merchants. And since his place was neither highest nor lowest, and off to one side, he does not stand surmounting any mists of time. Leaving a middling record of his rather middling activities, he is that much harder to see, i.e., his is a place of "some obscurity." What this study attempts to do, insofar as it seeks an objective justification, is to peer below the highest echelons of the eighteenth century without going all the way to the "bottom," and to consider the experiences of John Vardill as an indication of what went on with at least a portion of the less powerful; history, as it were, from the middle out.

## Chapter II

NOVEMBER, 1784

Vardill awoke on the morning of the 9th in a Norton Street London flat. Nearly a year earlier he had filed a memorial and supporting documents with the Commission of Inquiry into the losses and services of the American loyalists. Now, at last, his claim would be heard. He would make his appearance to give testimony and be cross-examined, his witnesses would appear (in his absence) and give their testimony and be cross-examined, and, if everything went well, he would be the happy recipient of government's tangible recognition of its responsibility to the loyal refugees of the American Revolution; that is, he would receive money.<sup>1</sup>

Despite the anticipation, however, it must also have been a morning of nervousness for Vardill, for it was no less an important than portentous occasion. The war was over, his services done; it was essential that he make good his claim. And while his case was good, it could not be perfect. Hence as he made his way from Norton Street to Lincoln's Inn Fields, where the Commission was sitting, he no doubt reflected on his memorial, considered the case that he and his witnesses

would present, and, drawing on what remained of a failed political acumen, weighed his chances.

He was able to conclude that his chances were good. In the first place, he knew little about the Commission, and assumed a great deal. What little he knew probably centred on the Commission members. John Wilmot (later Eardley-Wilmot) and Daniel Parker Coke were two independent members of parliament who had been responsible for an earlier money saving inquiry concerning temporary loyalist pensions and who, ironically enough, had voted against the war. Wilmot, moreover, was willing to credit the loyalists with their fair share in the war's protraction and loss. Then there was the mystery Commissioner, John Marsh, known only as a civil servant lately returned from Ireland. The two others were military men, Colonels Thomas Dundas and Robert Kingston, and they too shared an ironical experience. They had both served in America to protect Great Britain and her loyalists from the situation they were now in, and both had been messengers from the capitulating Generals to the pre-capitulation ceremonies at Britain's most important American defeats: Dundas at Yorktown and Kingston at Saratoga.<sup>2</sup>

That much Vardill probably knew. He also knew that parliament, the King, the House of Lords, the Commission, his friends, in short, everyone of any importance, recognized that the loyalists deserved compensation. And he knew that



he himself deserved compensation. But what he did not know concerned the Commission's attitude toward the deserving supplicants.

Along with most other claimants, Vardill shared a kind of innocent optimism. The prevailing assumption among the claimants was that the most important part of their claims was the total value of the property and income they averred they had lost. They thought that the Commission would, after a perfunctory reading and a perfunctory standard deduction, make use of a rubber stamp. The loyalists' idea of a standard deduction flowed naturally from their pervasive faith in their own dishonesty, a faith they thought the Commission shared. As a consequence they did two things. First they inflated their claims, without actually committing fraud, so that a larger amount would be left after the deduction. Then they listed losses they did not claim to give the appearance of honesty, since they knew everyone suspected them.<sup>3</sup>

The Commissioners, in fact, had a different idea. They did not need to suspect the claimants of dishonesty, for no matter how many losses the claimant did not claim, he still had to prove the loss of the things he did claim. And more importantly, he had to show that the lost, claimed items were lost specifically in consequence of loyalty. That, of course, was why the Commission required witnesses and

supporting documents, why they established different classes of loyalists depending on the nature of their loyalty, and why they excluded certain kinds of losses. And this approach, turned around, was why some claimants, whose cheating tactics had failed to convince the Commission of their honesty, dubbed it the "Inquisition" and felt the victims of some injustice. After all, listing losses for which no claim was made seemed persuasive evidence of good faith, despite the fact that unclaimed losses were the easiest to inflate or invent, since no one would bother determining their legitimacy.<sup>4</sup>

In any event, Vardill followed suit and listed losses he did not claim, since he was an honest man. He even went a few steps further in this clever strategy and played down the importance of things he did not claim, which gave the impression of candour; and he may have been the only claimant to list unclaimed losses he did not lose, meaning his still living father's land in New York, which in the first place belonged to his father, and which in the second, for all Vardill knew, as he told the Commissioners, had not been confiscated. And with the rest, he gave a brief description of his loyalty and services.<sup>5</sup>

He entitled the first part of this story "Loyalty and Services in America," and began by identifying himself as a "Native of Newyork & . . . late Professor of Natural

Law & Moral Philosophy in King's College, & assistant Minister & Lecturer in the Episcopal Churches and Chapels in that City." This was a good start, since it sounded important, and associated him with a number of other unfortunate notables who sprang from like circumstances. He then went on to declare that he "had long been obnoxious to the Rebels from his uniform opposition to their measures," which was something of an exaggeration, since Vardill left America before there were any rebels. As a result, perhaps, and because the only things he could point to in his American experience were "his writings in defence of the British Church & Government," he reached as far back as he could to produce examples of behaviour that the Commissioners might read as loyalism or, at least, incipient loyalism. Hence he cited his participation in the Whip for the American Whig (1768-69), when he was only nineteen or twenty years old, his pamphlet in 1772 protecting "English Universities & Education in general" from the attacks of Dr. John Witherspoon, his publications against the opposition being made to the Tea Act in 1773, and various other literary inventions which he and his witnesses would swear "had a great Effect."<sup>6</sup>

Shortly thereafter he "Came to London for Ordination." At this point his "Loyalty and Services in England" began which, judging by the amount of space he allots to them, were more to the point. For a time he was something of a tourist

on official business. In addition to his ordination, he promoted a charter for King's College, pursued a number of other episcopal projects, attempted to corrupt the patriotism of two American congress members "by the promise of the office of Judges," and continued his published defences of government. All of this brought him into contact with persons in the Ministry, and bought him the assurance that "He should be no Loser by his Zeal & Services." Vardill found himself in a more important position in London than he had left in New York, and it may have been without dissatisfaction that he discovered, after prolonging his stay, that "He could no longer return to Newyork with safety."

As a consequence "He devoted his time, from 1775 to 1781, to the service of Government," which now paid him £200 per annum for not being able to return home. His devotion kept him busy. He proposed plans and procured persons, gathered intelligence and convinced American agents to "unbosom" themselves in far flung spy activities. His advice, "from an extensive American Correspondence," was sought after. He lived on Downing Street. British Peace Commissioners consulted him. He found publishers amenable, and the Yorkshire Association a fit object of publication. In short, the war was kind to Vardill, and provided this professor with an excitement he was not liable to encounter in his "Chambers, . . . Cellar, Yard & Garden" at King's

College. And the grand plum toward which he moved was a specially created "Regius Professorship of Divinity" inserted by a grateful King in his college's charter. All he needed for a successful war experience that would enable him to return triumphantly to New York, take his Regius Professor's chair, and tell spy stories in his garden, was a British victory. But these visions went unrealized. His promising future began fading at Yorktown, and he was rendered into one of many loyalists seeking compensation from an unimpressible Commission which could have only limited sympathy for the Vardills of the Revolution.<sup>7</sup>

Hence he made his way on November 9th toward Lincoln's Inn Fields. The optimism of the preceding ten years had passed; but still, his chances for compensation, he was able to conclude, were good. The brief memorial with which he made his last sanguine gamble with the British government was a remarkable distillation of thirty-five years whose estimated worth came to £500.<sup>8</sup> On paper it appeared very simple and concise, if not reasonable; thirty-five years equal £500. But of course it was not that simple. The memorial was not a dynamic culmination, it was a static sketch. The reflections and conjectures which could have occupied Vardill's attention on the way to the Commission, as with the spaces between the lines of the memorial, were filled with details unwritten, motivations unrevealed, particulars unrecorded.

## Chapter III

### EARLY YEARS

He is a Native of Newyork. . . .  
--Memorial of John Vardill

New York. "It was a mercantile community," writes L. F. S. Upton, whose ". . . tone of life was undoubtedly urban English."<sup>1</sup> In 1749 the city's population, white and black, hovered above 13,000, packed into a small area near the tip of Manhattan Island, growing slowly.<sup>2</sup> The immediate surroundings of the embryonic metropolis were pleasant. It could still boast a natural shoreline, clean air and water, virgin forest, open space. Manhattan was a geographical phenomenon in those days, instead of a human accident. But as a mercantile community, the paraphernalia of commerce was pervasive. "Innumerable small ships plied the coastal waters," and larger ones the ocean, in search of profits to be displayed in huge land holdings.<sup>3</sup> Urban English, New York had lost no time in importing the fantastical notion of "real property." Urban English, New York was a classified society. Rich important men went weightily about their petty businesses while the rest eked out varying degrees of

quasi-civilized subsistence.

New York. Urban English, mercantile; but equally fundamentally it was an enlightenment community. Men owned slaves and punished pickpocketing with death. Pillories, stocks, whips, and the stake were still instruments of justice.<sup>4</sup> God had elected a certain Hanoverian family to the great British throne to rule all it could grab by His Divine Grace, and had sensibly given New Yorkers a really remarkable tract of Indian lands and the mission there to prosper. The Enlightened Hysteria of the Great Awakening was just passed; the devil, presumably, still existed. At the same time, intellectual New York believed pietistically in the efficacy of reason with all the fervour earlier generations had embraced witchcraft, signs, and portents. Rationalism formed the fertile ground for the growth of new dogmas and superstitions: natural rights, social contracts, human improvability, divine clocks. Certain laws of nature and society had been discovered; the remainder lay hidden by an artful deity, promising a panacea if they could be found.<sup>5</sup> The conflict and intercourse of Rationalism and Pietism meant that New York existed in a phantasmagoria of logical inconsistencies where "the Holy Scriptures teach the only true system of natural philosophy as well as the only true religion."<sup>6</sup> Poised between the Middle Ages and the modern world, New York was at least as despicable as other human communities.<sup>7</sup>

Into this environment came John Vardill on or about 5 July 1749, the son, appropriately, of a captain of one of the innumerable New York ships, Thomas, and his wife Hannah (nee Tiebout).<sup>8</sup>

The Vardill family was not patrician, but neither was it penniless. Captain Vardill eventually owned a house and separate lot in the city, and later became, with his friend Joseph Jauncey (also a "mariner" and whose wife Thomas would subsequently inherit), a Port Warden. While nothing of finality can be said of his social connections, the Captain was on a footing of sufficient intimacy with an inn-keeper to be named executor of his will. Hannah, the wife and mother, did not bring any expensive social or economic credentials to the family. The Vardills appear decidedly middle class.<sup>9</sup>

But they were attuned to the potentials of a son, and capable of seeing them pursued. In an urban English, mercantile, enlightenment community, education represented one important method of upward social movement. If the Vardills had not already considered this fact in regard to their son, the violent controversy concerning the establishment of a provincial college to which they were now witness surely forced it upon their attention.

New York did not have an institution of higher learning in 1749 although, as with Anglican bishops, there



had been talk of one since the beginning of the century.

The first positive step was taken in 1746 when the Provincial Assembly raised more than £2,000 for the project by means of a public lottery.<sup>10</sup> A series of similar lotteries followed until by 1753, with the addition of a diversion of excise taxes, more than £6,000 had been vested in a board of trustees composed of seven Anglicans, two Dutch Reformed, and Presbyterian William Livingston.<sup>11</sup>

But by 1753 the issue had also grown more complicated. A year earlier Anglican Trinity Church had offered ". . . any Reasonable Quantity of [its] Farm" to the enterprise.<sup>12</sup> Tainted by its ownership, the farmland so offered was also originally intended for a church seminary, and the recently arrived Anglican William Smith hinted at as yet unspoken conditions to the gift.<sup>13</sup> Hence a Presbyterian vanguard--trustee Livingston and his brethren in ink William Smith, Jr., and John Morrin Scott--"raised a hideous clamor" at the scent of a damnable scheme of Anglican enslavement.<sup>14</sup> The pages of the Independent Reflector, a "literary magazine" produced by the Livingston, Smith, and Scott "triumvirate," blazed with the voice of offended reason and Presbyterian righteousness: a sectarian college would be "A Cage as the Scripture speaks, of every unclean Bird. . . .--A Fountain whose putrid and infectious Streams will overflow the Land, and poison all our Enjoyments."<sup>15</sup> Such noxious script ultimately wrote the Reflector out of print.

The Anglicans, perhaps less maniacal, were no more public spirited.<sup>16</sup> Acting as though there were a dearth of open space, they championed the church proposal. The Reflector's fears were partially confirmed when two conditions were attached to Trinity's ten acres and inserted in the charter: that the President and prayer services be forever Anglican. This posed a problem to acting Governor James DeLancey, who had to weigh his own Anglicanism against that religion's small minority among the population.<sup>17</sup> Anglicanism proved heavier, and the charter was approved by him and his council on October 31, 1754, later reaffirmed by Governor Hardy.<sup>18</sup>

So far the controversy was religious with political overtones: Anglican pro-Anglicans against mainly Presbyterian anti-Anglicans with Dutch Reformed and heretics in the middle. The question of the money, however, which still sat in Assembly controlled coffers, made the issue political with religious overtones, and it became subsumed in a Livingston-DeLancey rivalry. The net effect for King's College, as it was called, was nearly three years of waiting for an end to the Assembly deadlock, which refused money to a college whose charter it did not approve, and refused to approve the charter.<sup>19</sup> The issue ended "for peace' sake"<sup>20</sup> in 1756, when a compromise sent half the funds to the college, and half to the purchase of land and the "Building and Erecting

there on a proper Pest House," any remaining money to go for a new jail.<sup>21</sup>

While the colonial government turned its attention to other matters equally militant,<sup>22</sup> Thomas Vardill turned his attention to his son, now nearly eight. The possibility of a future connection between the son and the new native college could not have been long in coming to mind. But such a connection required preparation. The college's first president, Samuel Johnson, had made it clear in his initial advertisement that candidates for admission must possess certain qualifications.<sup>23</sup> Hence, despite what other courses the Captain might have thought agreeable for his son--something to do with the sea perhaps--John was introduced to a regimen which would make him acceptable to Johnson's tutelage.

The nature of John's pre-collegiate education is hazy, but it was probably inadequate: Johnson remarked "that our grammar schools are miserable."<sup>24</sup> Vardill might have studied at one of New York's own "miserable" grammar schools, or with any of a number of private individuals in the city or elsewhere.<sup>25</sup> In either case he was subjected to the necessary inculcation of Latin and Greek, the classics being of importance to any aspiring applicant. In 1754 Johnson hoped his entering students would have, in addition to the ability

to read and write and a knowledge of "the Five first Rules in Arithmetic,"

. . . a good Knowledge of the Grammars, and be able to make grammatical Latin, and . . . to give a good Account of two or three of the first select Orations of Tully, and of the first Books of Virgil's Aeneid, and some of the first Chapters of the Gospel of St. John, in Greek.<sup>26</sup>

But boys of John's age, and their parents, were warned that "higher Qualifications must hereafter be expected."<sup>27</sup> They were also warned that the successful candidate would be more than a budding creature of intellect. Johnson was as well looking for students who had been trained ". . . from their Cradles under strict Government, and in all Seriousness, Virtue and Industry, that they may be qualified to make orderly and tractable members of this Society,"<sup>28</sup> an admonition hardly likely to have been lost on Vardill's tutors.

So from an early age Master Vardill experienced training in the arts of the intellect and of virtuous, orderly, above all, pleasing behaviour. Education, however, was even then a reciprocal affair, and Vardill proved to be a student who, when lead to the water of knowledge and proper conduct, would drink. In fact he probably showed real promise, inasmuch as he showed real promise all his life, and by the age of thirteen he had learned the insular language and sober decorum of the almost educated well enough to gain admission.<sup>29</sup>

Vardill's four years at King's spanned the last year of Johnson's presidency, and the first three of Myles Cooper's. Although Johnson "was all along consulted" in the establishment of the college, and had penned some pieces in its favour, he was lured away from Connecticut and his Anglican ministry only with difficulty. He complained of his age (fifty-seven years) a fear of New York smallpox, and he could not see any material advantage in moving.<sup>30</sup> However, the prestige and possibility of public service with a relatively free hand helped him accept the offer, as well as his appointment as assistant minister of Trinity Church.<sup>31</sup>

In form, his curriculum was based on the English model through its manifestation at Yale, where he had received his own education; but in substance it owed more to Johnson's personal preoccupations. The object of a Johnson-King's education had been clearly set forth in the advertisement of 1754: "The chief Thing that is aimed at in this College is, to teach and engage the Children to know God in Jesus Christ, and to love and serve him . . . ; and to train them up in all virtuous Habits, . . . and useful Knowledge."<sup>32</sup> Moreover, it is clear he saw it as King's mission to extend the moral and ethical training he hoped the students would have received at home.<sup>33</sup>

What this meant in practice, and for thirteen-year-

old Vardill, was a succession of incredibly full days, wherein almost every waking moment was accounted for, a feat made easier by in-college residence.<sup>34</sup> Since most students arrived intellectually ill-prepared, the first two years were taken up, under Johnson, with Latin and Greek. Even here the moral dose was heavy. Johnson expected to teach his students "languages and religion and morality at the same time."<sup>35</sup> When the student was not in class, he was likely to be doing one of four things: eating, sleeping, studying, or praying. The most likely was the last, for while the college promised not to indoctrinate Anglicanism, it was dedicated to Christianity, and students found themselves "engaged in public prayer every several hours" and under the requirement to pray privately in their rooms.<sup>36</sup> In a normal twenty-four hour day, Vardill could look forward to having about two hours to himself.<sup>37</sup>

Naturally, even these two hours were not really his own. If the purity of his full schedule prevented him from cultivating any healthy vices, Johnson's efforts to make his students "perpetually upon [their] guard against all temptations"<sup>38</sup> completed his insulation from humanity. The panoply of attainted behaviour included, not surprisingly, most of the things a college student might want to do: "Drunkenness, Fornication, Lying, Theft, Swearing, . . . fight[ing] Cocks, play[ing] at Cards [or] Dice, . . .

slandering, or Grievously Abusing any person . . . or keep[ing] Company with any persons of known scandalous behaviour."<sup>39</sup>

Vardill's first two years of college, then, were spent in a strictly ordered existence from sunrise to sunset which, for all it might have seemed sensible in the eighteenth century, is no less remarkable. This picture of King's College life, in fact, is so rigidly pure that it is impossible to believe anyone, even Vardill who worked hard at being the model student, could have survived four years without transgression, a fact confirmed by the introduction of the Black Book some years later.<sup>40</sup> One mitigating circumstance, however, was that under Johnson the student could look to his last two years for a partial escape from the classics, where the study of mathematics and the practice of experimental philosophy would at least represent a change.<sup>41</sup> But this expectation faded with the arrival of Myles Cooper, an event of importance to Vardill no less than to the college.

Cooper was born in England, educated at Oxford, and an ordained Anglican. He had been recruited through Dr. Thomas Secker, Archbishop of Canterbury, to fill Johnson's request for a new professor and prospective self-replacement. After an exciting passage, Cooper and his ship arrived in America in 1762.<sup>42</sup> By that date, Johnson's original complaints against New York had grown acute. He was now

sixty-six, his first wife had died, and he had been forced to leave New York and the college twice--amounting to about two years--on account of smallpox. In 1763, his second wife, whom the unromantic Johnson had married from "want of a careful and disinterested housekeeper,"<sup>43</sup> and whom the unheroic president had deserted on her death bed to avoid her contagion, died of his dreaded bane; Johnson's relation with smallpox appearing almost as one with the supernatural.<sup>44</sup> In any case, age, weariness, smallpox, and the loss of a housekeeper, coupled with less than felicitous relations with the King's College Governors, opened the way for Cooper's early ascension to president. After some haggling, he also received Johnson's salary at Trinity Church.<sup>45</sup>

Cooper's curriculum was, if anything, more backward facing than Johnson's, based wholeheartedly on his own Oxford. His educational plan called for students like Vardill--a sophomore in Cooper's first year as president--to continue with classics, ethics, rhetoric, and logic, instead of the expected attention to more modern subjects.<sup>46</sup> At the same time, he shared Johnson's preoccupation with right and virtuous conduct. In fact he was even more careful of it, "preferring," he wrote later, "to plague myself rather than not carry this necessary point."<sup>47</sup> He was as good as his word. In the case of a certain "D." for instance, who had refused "to open his Door when repeatedly called upon by the



President," Cooper caused "four Doors to be broke open before he could be laid hold of . . . found, at last, in the Room opposite to his own, where he had hid himself."<sup>48</sup> One of the new president's first changes had to do with a new fence and the appointment of a guard for the college gates, to more efficiently deal with wandering or tardy students.<sup>49</sup>

Even so, Cooper's youth--a fact that had originally caused some difficulty<sup>50</sup>--helped make him more personable. The intense disciplinarian is described as one who enjoyed the combination of good liquor and conversation. He also wrote English verse, owing no doubt to his early association with an "eccentric poet," and introduced this taste to the curriculum, along with a new attention to writing disputations in English. It was probably Cooper who sparked Vardill's politically oriented poetical nature.<sup>51</sup>

Younger and more personable, Cooper was undoubtedly more approachable, given the right demeanour. It was only a short time before Vardill became a favourite. The means by which this relationship took shape probably had to do with Vardill's choice of a career. The vast majority of his fellow students were intent on becoming lawyers or businessmen. Johnson and other Anglicans had complained of this, noting with Samuel Auchmuty that "The Church of Christ is starving for want of spiritual Teachers."<sup>52</sup> Cooper was no less concerned with filling gaps in Anglican ranks, and kept

alert for promising prospective clergymen. Vardill was one of few to move toward the ministry, a decision likely made well before graduation.<sup>53</sup> Together with his abilities, "his assiduous application to study," and perhaps as well his "most engaging sweetness of disposition,"<sup>54</sup> this fact singled him out to Cooper's eye. It was probably thus that Vardill entered upon a relationship that would introduce him to the inner circles of the colonial Anglican hierarchy.

The acquaintanceship also had the immediate advantage of providing employment upon graduation. If Vardill had worked hard at being a proper student, from 1766 to 1773 he worked at being the model tutor and prospective churchman. An anonymous supporter later said of him during this period that "His character has been ever clear of even the suspicion of vice or levity: on the contrary, he is, and always has been remarkably grave and serious." The same supporter declared that it was "a devout religious turn of mind, which solely induced him to enter holy orders."<sup>55</sup> Perhaps so, but then it is unlikely one would profess some other reason for the choice. Vardill himself later remembered that "he formed and directed his studies chiefly with a view to his Appointments in the Church & College at Newyork."<sup>56</sup>

These studies continued after graduation. In preparation for his church appointment, he pursued a course of independent theological reading, probably with the aid of

President Cooper.<sup>57</sup> For his college appointment, he underwent a kind of apprenticeship as a tutor, and "gave up his time as a Volunteer, in the promotion of Literature in the . . . College," and devoted "every Day, Vacations excepted, to Teaching the Classicks, Ancient & Modern History, Rhetoric, Moral Philosophy & Natural Law to the Students." In fact, he expansively discharged "every laborious Duty of a Professor or Tutor, without any Fee or Reward whatsoever from the College."<sup>58</sup>

At the same time he assisted Dr. Samuel Clossy in his anatomical lectures.<sup>59</sup> This must have been of great interest. The nascent clergyman learned more than the ordinary priest was likely to know from first hand experience about at least one unarguable aspect of the true nature of man. Clossy describes one of his lectures:

I dissected a Male Black for the Sake of the Skeleton, he belonged to a friend of mine and died of gripes and a Jaundice, in the lower belly I found the small Intestines pale Yellow, Carneous, thick as the Colon, the diameter of my little finger, and filled with nought but Yellow bile, the Gall bladder very large and turgid with green bile. . . .<sup>60</sup>

For nearly seven years, then, until his election as a bona fide professor of natural law and moral philosophy, Vardill was thus occupied: an officially unpaid tutor (though Clossy paid him about £30 currency per annum out of his own pocket)<sup>61</sup> reading theology.

This steady movement from student to tutor to candidate for orders was so smooth, so apparently premeditated, that it virtually leads to calling Vardill a loyalist in 1766. But by that date the deeper political and revolutionary implications of his association with Cooper, Anglicanism, and King's were hidden; only the more immediate inferences were visible. At the start of his career Vardill could understand the history of his college and the role played therein by his religion, to both of which he was developing a firm attachment. Moreover, as Upton writes, "no literate citizen of the colony could fail to acquire a political education,"<sup>62</sup> a fact assured by the spectacle of colonial Stamp Act opposition. But if Vardill understood the "toryism" of his tendencies, there is nothing unusual in that. Even without a close association with Anglican Cooper, King's seems to have been capable of exerting a conservative influence upon its students. Johnson had been engaged in a self-consciously conservative, in fact, reactionary, program of indoctrination, convinced, as he was, that he lived in a "wicked stupid age."<sup>63</sup> Cooper's changes did nothing to eradicate this initial conservative bias; if anything he strengthened it. While the role of King's in making loyalists is necessarily moot, the overwhelming majority of its graduates became loyalists. And among those who did not--like Vardill's friend and classmate John Jay--some at least remained

"protestants" (torys) to the revolution.<sup>64</sup> King's was poor soil for sedition.

Still, Vardill's political sense was maturing. And politics is foremost a matter of power arrangements; power arrangements having to do with men, not with mysterious, ethereal "forces" that float like clouds to rain upon one party or another. In 1766, Vardill could comprehend that Myles Cooper and his Anglican associates represented a certain kind of power, and as such a means of advancement. Possibly the primary consideration in "joining" Cooper, becoming a tutor, studying theology, and eventually becoming an Anglican advocate, was not so much that that is what he wanted to do (though apparently he did), but that Cooper would let him do it. It can therefore be no wonder that Vardill should have taken the opportunity presented and hitched his wagon to an Anglican team.

## Chapter IV

### APPRENTICE LOYALIST

He has long been obnoxious to the Rebels  
. . . from his Writings in defence of the  
British Church & Government against the  
Periodical Papers called The American Whig  
. . . .

--Memorial of John Vardill

Although Vardill graduated in 1766, his education at the hands of Johnson and Cooper had scarcely commenced. As a potential cleric, Vardill had a personal understanding of his professors' primary ecclesiastical preoccupation: obtaining bishops for America. Johnson had been advocating such a move since the 1750's. Cooper, though lately arrived on the continent, quickly learned that a middle-colony Anglican leader must be a champion of episcopacy.

The same lesson was impressed upon Vardill by a series of events beginning in his graduating year. His continued close association with Cooper as a tutor and theology student at King's soon brought him into a protracted pamphlet war over the episcopal question, which together his former mentors could justly claim a large measure of the credit for starting. It was a debate which in four years would translate

Vardill's vague ideas of the political implications of Anglicanism in New York, into an explicit religious and constitutional stance already carrying the seeds of loyalty.

The need of bishops had only lately been reaffirmed. For want of an American episcopate, Mr. Giles of New York and Mr. Wilson of Philadelphia met untimely death when their ship was "dashed to pieces near Cape Henlon." With no American bishops, colonial Anglicans were forced to go to England for ordination. Fifty-one had gone. The loss of Giles and Wilson brought to ten the number "who had lost their precious lives in going from hence for Holy Orders, either by sea or sickness."<sup>1</sup> It was a worse than clumsy way to run a religion. With the cost, inconvenience, and dissuading odds of one in five, no wonder, indeed, that the Church of England in America starved for spiritual teachers.

And if the need pressed, the time seemed ripe. The New Jersey Anglican convention of 1765 had been chastised by Bishop Terrick of London for its unseasonable request. But by late 1766 the colonies were sliding down the near side of the Stamp Act watershed, appearing to relapse into quiescence. The obnoxious legislation repealed, Parliament paused before its attempted circumlocution via Townshend's formula for external taxes. A false sense of stability pervaded the imaginative political perception of many American

Anglicans, and set the stage for Thomas Bradbury Chandler's public appeal.<sup>2</sup>

The idea for an appeal to the public on behalf of episcopacy originated with Samuel Johnson. He thought it "highly expedient that a pamphlet should be written professedly on the subject, for the information of all parties, showing that the Episcopate proposed was of such a nature as not to interfere with the civil or religious rights of people of any rank or denomination whatever."<sup>3</sup> The suggestion for such a "judicious tract" was transmitted to Chandler by Myles Cooper just before the Episcopal Convention of 1766, over which Chandler would preside, held at Shrewsbury, New Jersey.<sup>4</sup> Chandler agreed to attempt the task, although he thought "The Doctor himself would have been the proper person to execute his own proposal" if not prevented from so doing by a tremor in his hand. Once committed, Chandler persuaded the convention, which represented five colonies, to commission the pamphlet's production as part of a clear and forceful plan for an episcopacy.<sup>5</sup> After working on the public address for the better part of a year, "urged and assisted" by Johnson, the irrepressibly optimistic Chandler was full of hope at the end of summer, 1767: "as soon as affairs will admit of it, bishops will be granted us."<sup>6</sup> Full of confidence, he published his Appeal to the Public in Behalf of the Church of England in America.



It was an important publication. Bringing together most of the serious arguments in favour of bishops, it could be taken as an official, or quasi-official, statement of an inter-colonial Anglican convention which appeared to delineate the position of all episcopal supporters. But its importance to Vardill was not merely so general. It not only set events in motion which would involve him in a bitter newspaper controversy; its arguments represented a system of thought to which Vardill would explicitly attach himself in his own writing. And since his eventual position arose as well from the arguments of episcopal opposition, both the Appeal and its answers mark the starting point for an understanding of Vardill's political and ecclesiastical philosophy.

Chandler stayed close to Johnson's original directive. He struggled with partial success to maintain a low and inoffensive profile which would allow reason, despite his complaint that "we live in an Age, in which the Voice of Reason will not be heard," to do its work.<sup>7</sup> After a somewhat extraneous attempt to explain why bishops should exist in the first place--extraneous because their existence hinged on an institutionalized interpretation of scripture which ended up amounting to an article of faith--Chandler proceeded to a consideration of their functions and, therefore, why they were needed in America.<sup>8</sup>

These functions fell under three heads: government, confirmation, and ordination. Without bishops to perform these three essentials, the American church was in a pitiable condition. First, because it was the bishop's province to sit at the head of the church organization. He was the chief administrator, the fount of ecclesiastical authority. Without him there could be but little unity within the church; Anglican conventions, which supplied what little cohesion there was, were only a stopgap innovation. Nor could there be proper discipline. Even though the church in America operated according to the same laws as in England, that fact did not obviate the need. With a statement readily applicable to politics or imperial relations, Chandler drew a fine line:

after all, Men's governing themselves by certain Rules and Laws, and their being governed by others, who have a proper Authority, although according to the same Laws, are Things that will ever be found to be different. . . . [I]t is only in the latter case, that Health and Vigor and Permanency can be reasonably expected.<sup>9</sup>

Chandler quickly reassured his readers that this governing power would not extend over the laity, who were in any case unimpressed with a spiritual bishop's ultimate power of excommunication. The authority would instead be directed at miscreant clergymen, with whom it was presently difficult to deal. The mere presence of the symbol of discipline, thought Chandler, would make the clergy more regular in their

behaviour.<sup>10</sup>

Derivative of the first power were the second two: confirmation and ordination. None but a bishop could perform the necessary ceremony whereby a baptised member of the church voluntarily confirmed his baptismal promise of faith and membership.<sup>11</sup> Chandler ignored the implication that the vast majority of American Anglicans must therefore have been of a very inferior nature in the eyes of the church. He was anxious to get on to his central point: ordination.

The absence of this power was the bane of colonial Anglicanism. Only a bishop, of course, could perform the rite creating new clergy, and Chandler took it as a matter of right that new clergy should be created. The inconvenience, and bad luck, consequent to an Atlantic voyage for holy orders was considerable, and Chandler cited again the ratio of one in five lost. He also remarked on the cost: £100. The net effect, and this was the focal point of the argument's logic, was an acute shortage of ministers. There were only ten ministers for twenty-one New Jersey churches; in Pennsylvania the figures were six and twenty-nine. If these figures were caused by the problems incident to ordination, as Chandler and many others believed, then a removal of the problems and inconveniences by the arrival of a bishop would induce all of those who had been previously deterred, and those who would have been deterred in the future, to rush

in and swell the numbers of the colonial clergy. Small numbers, however, were not the only problem of the present system. Although small in quantity, the existing clergy were not necessarily of the highest quality. Bishops in London could have but a poor knowledge of the candidates, despite letters of recommendation. On the contrary, it was lamentably possible for "wretches, as are not only a scandal to the Church, but a Disgrace to the human Species," to be "fraudulently and surreptitiously" ordained.<sup>12</sup>

At this point Chandler switched to a more generalized justification of the proposal to strengthen the church. Indeed, what he justified now was less the importation of bishops, than the social and political role of the church itself. The impulse to extend religion, he argued, stemmed not only from a natural desire of people "to exert themselves, for the Preservation and Security of whatever they esteem and hold to be valuable," but also from

a fundamental Principle of sound and consistent Policy, which necessarily requires the Protection and Security of the national Religion. For as some Religion has ever been thought, by the wisest Legislators, to be necessary for the Security of Civil Government, and accordingly has always been interwoven into the Constitution of it; so, in every Nation, that Religion which is thus distinguished, must be looked upon as, in the Opinion of the Legislature, the best fitted for this great purpose.<sup>13</sup>

Thus the Anglicans, bound by the "sacred Ties of . . . religious Principles and Christian Duty, to support, to the

utmost, the National Civil Constitution," formed a bulwark for the protection of the Constitution.<sup>14</sup> Since "no Trumpet of Sedition was ever heard to sound from our Pulpits," the church was "a full Security to the Government for our honouring the King, and not meddling with them that are given to change."<sup>15</sup> It therefore followed that this conservative, stabilizing institution should be granted every opportunity to grow unfettered, i.e., American bishops should be landed.<sup>16</sup>

Finally, Chandler returned to the more moderate thrust of Johnson's original directive: that bishops, though obviously supportive of civil authority, would nonetheless be spiritual in nature, and neither a religious nor a political threat to any Dissenter. His often quoted assurance is entirely clear:

That the Bishops to be sent to America, shall have no Authority, but purely of a Spiritual and Ecclesiastical Nature, such as is derived altogether from the Church and not from the State--That this Authority shall operate only upon the Clergy of the Church, and not upon the Laity nor Dissenters of any Denominations--That the Bishops shall not interfere with the Property or Privileges, whether civil or religious of Churchmen or Dissenters--That, in particular, they shall have no Concern with the Probate of Wills, Letters of Guardianship and Administration, or Marriage-Licenses, nor be Judges of any cases relating thereto.<sup>17</sup>

Despite this declaration, there was much in the pamphlet to be argued with, not the least of which was its sincerity and candour. But at first it produced little reaction, owing partly, perhaps, to a poor circulation, but also

to a precedent event across the water. When Chandler's appeal first appeared, it was but the second part of an uncoordinated two-pronged trans-atlantic Anglican advance. Of this other "prong," Carl Bridenbaugh writes: "No Anglican prelate of the eighteenth century committed as great an indiscretion as did John Ewer, Bishop of Llandaff, when he preached the annual sermon before the S.P.G. [Society for the Propagation of the Gospel] on February 20, 1767."<sup>18</sup> This vivacious address momentarily prevented colonial attention from centering on Chandler's work, and with good reason. Insensitive to the slightest precaution and uncaring whether his profile be high or low, offensive or pleasing, Bishop Ewer slandered Americans in general, and gave Dissenters peculiar reason for complaint.

His message was clear from the scripture on which he spoke (Romans X, 14):

How shall they believe in him, of whom  
they have not heard?  
And how shall they hear without a  
Preacher?<sup>19</sup>

With more confidence than accuracy, the bishop characterized Americans as adventurers "Who, with their native soil, abandoned their native manners, and religion; and e'er long, were found in many parts living without remembrance or knowledge of God, without any divine worship, in desolute wickedness, and the most brutal profligacy of manners."<sup>20</sup> Revising

history, he maintained that "their neglect of religion was contrary to the pretences and conditions, under which they obtained royal grants and public authority to their adventures."<sup>21</sup>

If the Americans were to escape their barbarism, and amend the broken promise, they should have ministers of "their native religion." And for such ministers, they should have bishops. In company with Chandler, Ewer discovered the cost and inconvenience of obtaining holy orders to be a powerful dissuasion to new ministers, and that removing the dissuasion would repair the ministerial shortage.<sup>22</sup> Neither Ewer nor Chandler seemed to recognize that portraying their ministers as so easily dissuaded made them out to be men of extraordinarily little faith. This fundamental argument placed the issue of religious competition in America on an essentially material basis: if it were not so "inconvenient," more young colonials would be willing to become Anglican clergymen.

Such implications were not lost on their opponents. The answers to Ewer appeared first, emanating from the pens of Charles Chauncy of Boston, and New Yorker William Livingston. Just as Ewer's sermon anticipated parts of Chandler's appeal, so the answers to Ewer were anticipatory answers to Chandler. Chauncy and Livingston could attack Ewer on both his facts, and his interpretations. He was peculiarly

vulnerable to the first kind of disputation. Livingston, for whose wit Ewer represented a singularly appropriate target, remarked that he was unsure "whether there be a pamphlet in the nation, that in proportion to the length of the sermon, contains so great a number of aberrations from the truth."<sup>23</sup> Concerning the characterization of Americans and their manners, Livingston reflected: "I am almost tempted to think, that your lordship hath mistaken some history of the Cape of Good-Hope, for that of New-England."<sup>24</sup> Moreover, Ewer's revisionist account of the early settlers, which did injury to a native American myth, proved double edged: the colonists had not only not come to America to spread "their native religion," they had in fact come, to New England at least, to escape it and its bishops.<sup>25</sup>

This was an issue deeply felt. The primary argument against bishops derived at least partially from the paranoid legend of the flight into the wilderness. It was feared that, as in the seventeenth century, so in the eighteenth, bishops would be more than simple machines of ordination. Chauncy came to this conclusion by an examination of the reasons given for the episcopal requirement. The problem of the cost of ordination he found chimerical. Actually, he maintained, the burden of cost fell upon the S.P.G., not the candidate for orders. "Inconvenience," a flimsy premise, could withal be redefined. Chauncy would consider the



necessary voyage to England, financed by the S.P.G., a great opportunity "to visit the land of our fore-fathers' nativity," rather than an onerous dissuasion.<sup>26</sup>

These issues, however, were almost incidental to the seminal contention that a want of ministers proceeded from a want of bishops. Chauncy utterly refused that cause-effect relationship. The real reason for a ministerial shortage among the Anglicans, he revealed, was that the episcopal churches in America were so "small in number, weak in ability, and insufficient to maintain their own ministry" without S.P.G. aid, that young men were lured away by more promising professions--or denominations.<sup>27</sup> Hence the idea that the Church of England in America operated under a liability was untrue. Instead it was a gutless institution, subsisting on S.P.G. funds, and as such in a privileged position, not a handicapped one. No other church in America was financed from abroad.<sup>28</sup>

If, then, the problems of the church would not be corrected by bishops, if the fragile reasons advanced in their support were not only easily broken, but misleading and false, what was the true motivation behind the agitation for their importation? Since the presence of a purely spiritual bishop would not, by itself, create the growth projected by episcopal supporters, Chauncy apprehended that, sooner or later, the bishops would become political, and,

enlisting the aid of colonial and British government, force the growth of the American church. The real motivation, then, was to "EPISCOPIZE the colonies."<sup>29</sup>

This conclusion, the Dissenter's central answer to the Anglican's central argument, inflamed the imagination and raised the spectre of a threat to religious and political liberty. For if, as Chauncy wrote, the reasons given for an episcopate were false, and if coercive "episcopization" formed the real motive, a conspiracy existed; and with or without the visible political aid of Great Britain, such a religious conspiracy was dangerously coincidental with colonial interpretations of post-1763 imperial policy.

With Ewer's sermon, and Chauncy's and Livingston's replies, the renewed episcopal movement was becoming a hot issue. When at last attention drifted to the greater menace, or hope, of Chandler's appeal, emotions were already stirred. Although Chandler and Chauncy would go on to hold their own parallel debate, serious ecclesiastical disputation was nearing an end.<sup>30</sup> Livingston, perhaps satisfied with his answer to Ewer, felt that Chandler's pamphlet needed separate rebuttal, especially as the latter had concluded his essay with the suggestion that silence be taken as approbation. Hence, arousing the Triumvirate--himself, Smith, and Scott--Livingston determined on a course of "Noise and Clamour" to serve as Chandler's answer. His new literary creature,

dubbed the American Whig, began making its weekly appearances in New York on March 14, 1768.<sup>31</sup>

Those New York Anglicans, and the population in general, who could remember or imagine the King's College controversy must have suffered an acute sensation of *déjà vu*. But this time the Presbyterian attack was expected, though its abusive intensity was not. The time lag between the Appeal's initial appearance, the summer of 1767, and the appearance of the first Whig may have lulled some Anglicans, hopefully subscribing to Chandler's closing suggestion, into thinking that they would escape the kind of opposition which now developed. Samuel Johnson, for instance, had thought the Appeal successful until the New York newspapers belatedly went wild against it, and Chandler remarked in his Life of Johnson, "that although it seemed to be satisfactory to all parties at first, yet afterwards it was repeatedly attacked."<sup>32</sup>

Stung, perhaps, but not sundered, Chandler was a central figure in the Anglican counterattack, and he set about marshalling the episcopal forces. Irrepressibly optimistic, he appears in this matter irrepressible generally, and his correspondence makes it sound as though he enjoyed this new role, at least at first. As he wrote excitedly to Samuel Johnson: "The furious and outrageous attack of the American Whig and his fellow laborers proclaims my existence."<sup>33</sup> He found his troops, however, in need of encouragement.

In the first place, he was involved in a multi-front war. Besides publications in London, an American Whig counterpart, The Centinel, had taken up position in Philadelphia.<sup>34</sup> Chandler expected little help from the Pennsylvania clergy: "I suspect they would let me and my Appeal and the episcopate go to purgatory before they would move a fibre of their tongues or their fingers to prevent it."<sup>35</sup> Though an exaggerated suspicion, he well knew the reasons of its foundation. William Smith, Provost of the College of Philadelphia and provincial Anglican leader, had been defeated at the New Jersey convention which adopted Chandler's vigorous episcopal program and authorized the very Appeal which now wanted Pennsylvania support. Smith's more moderate proposal had been for a renovation of the commissary system.<sup>36</sup> Retreating after the loss, Chandler's ungenerous remark reflected the fact that Smith would make, at best, a recalcitrant supporter. It was, however, simply a matter of a slow start. Despite past differences, Smith felt constrained to support the church during the present strife.<sup>37</sup> Though careful to distinguish what he was aiding--"is Dr. Chandler the Church of England?"--he was eventually capable of some sympathy for the amount of abuse being heaped upon the New Jersey clergyman: "he shall not be left to stand alone, for the virulence of his antagonists is now not to be borne."<sup>38</sup> The Centinel's answer, Smith's Anatomist, began its Philadelphia run in September.

The home front also stood in need of enthusiasm. Samuel Seabury, the Westchester minister who would later prove himself one of the ablest loyalist political penmen, had begun the year lethargically: "he appears to be so dull and inactive," wrote Chandler in January, "that I almost despair of him."<sup>39</sup> Samuel Auchmuty, Rector of New York's Trinity Church, had his doubts even about Chandler's tract, and had foreseen the results. "I sincerely wish that my Advice concerning Chandler's Appeal had been followed," he wrote during the heat of the controversy, "which was not to begin with a Nest of Hornets 'till we were assured of Success."<sup>40</sup>

In spite of somewhat unready coadjutors, and a "profound silence" among Bostonian Anglicans, Chandler was able to organize an answer to the American Whig. After a conference with Cooper, Seabury, and Inglis in New York, he sent Samuel Johnson "a general sketch of my literary situation."

The first Whig was written by Livingston, the second by Smith, the third by \_\_\_\_\_, and the fourth by Smith, as far as to the Thunder-gust, and then Livingston went on in his high prancing style.\* I went over to New York, a fortnight ago, and then the Whip [for the American Whig] was agreed upon. C...p...r, S...y, I...s, &c. are to be the principal managers. The 1st No. is by I...s, the 2nd by Do. both confined to the first Whig; I have prepared a third Whip, to be applied to the posteriors of Whig the second; and so it will go round.<sup>41</sup>

---

\* This is a reference to the first sentence of an "Advertisement" following the text of Whig No. IV, and signed "The American Whig."

In addition, Chandler, Seabury, Inglis, possibly Cooper, and perhaps even Vardill determined to "watch all publications either in newspapers or pamphlets and to obviate the evil influences of such as appeared to have a bad tendency by the speediest answers."<sup>42</sup>

Thus not only the controversy itself, but the centre of pro-episcopal activity was in New York City. While some older clergy may have despised a renewed newspaper war with the Triumvirate and their Dissenting allies, younger Anglicans were apparently anxious to try out their hands at public debate.<sup>43</sup> Vardill was among the eager.

His relationship with Cooper had placed him near the controversy's birth, and now it put him in the vortex of Anglican agitation. Throughout 1766 to 1768 he had watched the Chandler-Ewer/Chauncy-Livingston controversy with more than simple interest. The Appeal defined the point of take-off for the subsequent debate, and defined for Vardill a position he became not only obligated, but quite willing, to defend. Though his thoughts on his own future voyage for ordination, which proved a propitious journey, are largely indeterminable, he wholeheartedly supported Chandler's rendition of the episcopal need, and abhorred its opposition.<sup>44</sup>

The new development, bringing the argument to the popular press, required "many hands," and Vardill was easily enlisted. It is unfortunately impossible to know which of

the Whips were his responsibilities, or which of the polemical verses appearing concurrently may have come from his pen. As a Whipper, however, he identified himself with the whole of the anti-Whig position, a fact which would prove of personal, no less than colonial, significance. A consideration of the Whig-Whip debate, then, is also an inspection of Vardill's own brand of politico-Anglicanism.<sup>45</sup>

Hostilities opened with the first Whig, which gained an immediate and inestimable advantage by setting the tone of the controversy. Sarcasm, invective, and a paranoid comingling of episcopacy with Anglo-American imperial relations formed its principal characteristics. Livingston and the other Whig contributors were engaged in a self-conscious war of propaganda--Livingston himself had called it "Noise and Clamour"--and the "debate" quickly devolved into a series of charges, counter-charges, and reciprocal name calling. The Whig's great aim was to defeat the episcopal proposition; the means were not restrained by considerations of ethics, morals, or truth. By stirring up enough popular resentment, or what appeared to be popular resentment as reflected in the press, Livingston hoped to dissuade colonial Anglicans or English statesmen from pursuing American episcopacy. The essential fact of the controversy was that it was a contest which the more skilful propagandist would win. Only the

appearances of truthfulness or righteousness were necessary.<sup>46</sup>

And in such a contest, Livingston held the stronger ground. He had only to raise what seemed--not what was--a reasonable doubt. He needed only give a convincing performance of fearing for his liberty. As the lawyer in him no doubt foresaw, the burden of proof rested with the Anglican innovators, just as it had rested with the defenders of that other innovation, the Stamp Act. Therefore paranoia, whether real or pretended, was Livingston's most useful tool. A combination of mindless fear and sarcastic reception obviated the validity of Anglican arguments, whereas a disdainful treatment of Whig charges did nothing to prove the Anglican case. It was Livingston's great success that he was able to render the controversy into an unreasoning argument, and the Anglicans' great failing that they met him on his own ground.<sup>47</sup>

The Whig's strategy, then, while cleverly executed, was essentially simple. It began with the easiest premise imaginable: a refusal to believe. All the pamphlets and appeals of which international Anglicanism was capable would not make the Whig believe that the proposed bishop would begin, or remain, restrictedly spiritual. To accept the idea that "the Doctor and the Convention would content themselves with a Bishop, so limited and curtailed" was possible to no man "above the capacity of an Ideot [sic]."<sup>48</sup>



Implications were obvious. If the Anglicans prevaricated, it seemed as obvious to the Whig as it had to Chauncy that they were covering something. And what could they be covering but some despotic conspiracy? Just as one who adamantly refuses to believe cannot be convinced, so one who insists on seeing plots cannot be made not to see them. Chandler had counterfeited "the voice of a sheep" in his Appeal because, instead of a primitive, spiritual bishop, "It is the modern, splendid, opulent, court favoured, law-dignified, superb, magnificent, powerful prelate, on which [the Anglicans'] hearts are intent."<sup>49</sup>

The evidence for this covert desire was purely circumstantial and largely irrelevant, but the attempt at proof was made. The Church of England had originally been established "from no very religious motive." The ensuing vacillation between Catholicism and Anglicanism brought papists into the church from self-interest, and created a class of High Church clergy more attentive to the direction of political breezes and the protection of their own power than to ecclesiastical duty or matters spiritual. Those who now advocated colonial episcopacy had evolved directly from that suspicious origin, and "are the true, if not the only, descendants and approvers of Arch-Bishop Laud's principles and measures." Moreover, the office of the bishop itself included civil powers, and the contention that an American

bishop would differ in this respect from an English one was simply impossible. But mainly the premise was true because of the mystical properties of self-evidence. The Anglicans, in a word, were evil. "To this day, inhuman severity has mark'd their character; and for aught I see, it is so deeply radicated in their very constitution, that they will not cease to be savages, till they cease to exist, without passing through some wonderful metamorphosis." In sum, both by preference, and by definition, the present episcopal agitators could not be sincere in requesting a primitive bishop, and by the same logic secretly coveted one with powers equally political, as ecclesiastical.<sup>50</sup>

But such reasoning was tangential. Livingston did not need to prove that the Anglicans wanted a civilly empowered bishop, much less explain why; all he needed to do was suspect it. Hence the reader was not particularly encouraged to wonder on the legitimacy of the premise; he was encouraged to imagine the consequences if it were true. Seeming to adopt the implicit assumption that the worse the consequences, the more convincing they appear, the Whig never tired of aiding the reader's imagination. And here the issue could be married to the general British conspiracy against colonial liberty.

Confusing chronology slightly, the Whig found it suspicious that the "seeds of universal discord" were sown

contemporaneously with the Townshend Duties, lending a "helping hand to involve us in ecclesiastical bondage into the bargain." The timing, of course, implied the intent. While parliament encroached upon American commercial freedom, and therefore its constitutional freedom, Anglicans pursued a plan of domestic enslavement, for "With Bishops, we shall naturally have the introduction or establishment of spiritual or ecclesiastical courts." This insidious institution would eventually enable a bishop to usurp all legitimate colonial power, for, independent of civil authority, and staffed by clergy-"dupes," they would ultimately put a bishop's power "beyond any governor upon the continent." And since "no lay characters in this country will be a match for the Bishop's," no one "will mount the ladder of perferment [sic], without his Lordship's aid." Times would be unkind to non-Anglicans, whom it was feared would have to finance the abdication of their own liberty by the introduction of tithes and taxes, themselves an unconstitutional deprivation of property. With this form of support, Chandler's and Ewer's prophesied growth of the episcopal church would follow naturally.<sup>51</sup>

The scenario for New York was somewhat different. Here, in addition to the dangers of the inevitable courts and taxes, an alliance would be forged between provincial government and the episcopate. The Whig painted a happy picture of New York religious life and liberty, which "depend

upon the partition of power, among our various denominations." But:

With two of the three branches of the legislature [the governor and council], in favour of episcopalianism; . . . and with the power of the crown and the nation, to protect them; that sect [the Anglicans] hath such a bulwark of defence, that every step taken to increase their security, ought to be considered as a demonstration, that not their own safety, but mischief to other, is the true end in view.

The only inhibition to religious monopoly was non-episcopalian control of the Assembly. This delicate balance would surely be upset "If ever a bishop drives his gilded equipage in our streets, and shares in the public councils of the colony," since his stupendous power would at last entail control of Assembly elections. And it was apprehended that the situation would become worse in America than it had ever been in England, for with a subservient civil government, the bishop would exercise more power "than that of all the [English] bishops put together."<sup>52</sup>

These dark visions gained added weight by reference to that same emotional memory Chauncy had played upon: the Dissenters' escape from England. The reader was reminded more than once that "those brave sons of religion and liberty, chose rather to run the risque of the rage and malice of the Indian savages, than of the perfidious and persecuting bishops,"<sup>53</sup> and that this "asylum in the wilds of America, among Indians and rattle-snakes, [was] more hospitable to

them than Bishops."<sup>54</sup> All would be for nothing if, more than a century of hard work later, an episcopate pursued them across the Atlantic to perpetrate Laud's "execrable designs."<sup>55</sup>

Thus spake the Whig in his pose as defender of the legend, protector of liberty. And while certainly there were other issues, some more blatantly personal, some more purely ecclesiastical, the major thrust was to represent Anglicans as insidious proponents of an enslaved America. Paranoia, from the legend of the flight, to the half crazed projections for the future, was the key.

The Whippers were appalled and disdainful. Inglis called the first Whig "an insolent, audacious attack on Dr. Chandler, on his appeal & our united Convention, . . . stuffed with low Witticisms, Buffoonery, Falsehoods & Blunders."<sup>56</sup> Chandler himself threw up a smoke screen while the Whips were prepared, feigning to decline to "enter the lists, in a match of flinging dirt, with scrubs and savages." As the first Whig was "thickly bespangled with drollery," Chandler excused himself for the moment by observing that "serious answers to funny writers, like throwing pearls before a certain kind of animals, are looked upon as improperly applied."<sup>57</sup> But while seriousness was out of place, answers were not. The Whig's unfair, animadverting approach made "Verdicus" ask:

What the deuce is the matter? What dæmon of late,  
Has awaken'd the fury of strife and debate?<sup>58</sup>

The Anglicans thought they knew, and their answer represented their potentially most effective counter-attack.

Inglis devoted the first Whip to the Whig's motivations and, fighting fire with fire, laid the groundwork for the discovery of a counter-conspiracy. Hunting the Whig's motives was justified by the reasoning that, "if it happens that this attack [Whig No. I] comes from an ambitious, disappointed faction, . . . who made religion a political engine to accomplish their designs; the unprejudiced reader, upon knowing this, will treat it with that neglect and contempt it deserves." Support for the idea was ready at hand. The Appeal was nearly a year old; why was "the fury of strife and debate" not awakened sooner? "The reason was, no ambitious attempts were then opposed,--no towering expectations were blasted."<sup>59</sup>

The knowledgeable reader caught the drift. It was widely known that the American Whig was a Livingston-Triumvirate production, and their religious affiliations were no secret. It was also well known that Livingston had lately suffered two significant defeats. The first was the failure, due to trans-atlantic Anglican lobbying, of a petition for the incorporation of New York's Presbyterian churches in which Livingston had been involved. The second was the

more recent (March 7-11) defeat at the polls, wherein the Livingston party succeeded in retaining only one of four contested Assembly seats, and had been stung by politically inspired anti-lawyer publications. These two setbacks, coupled with a strange DeLancy (conservative)-Sons of Liberty ("radical") coalition which threatened to leave him with a vapid middle ground, brought a sense of urgency and desperation to Livingston's (momentarily) waning political fortunes. A modern writer agrees with Inglis that these problems "spurred [him] . . . to a more determined attack on the proposed American bishopric."<sup>60</sup>

Inglis quickly pointed out the significance of this conclusion. "Now that their blooming hopes are withered," he wrote, "the faction is enraged to a degree of phrenzy; and the poor church, thro' the Appeal, must fall the devoted victim of their vengeance." Hence politics, more especially political spite arising from dashed hopes, explained the Whig attack. It had nothing to do with a concern for religious liberty, much less liberty of any other kind.<sup>61</sup>

When it came to appreciation of liberty, in fact, the Anglicans did not feel themselves bested. They were "warm friends to liberty, and enemies to slavery of every kind." And they did not oppose well considered defences of American constitutional rights from parliamentary infringement. Echoing the Whig's own words, the Whip observed

pointedly that it was not the Anglicans, after all, who had begun a divisive newspaper controversy to coincide with the Townshend Duties; it was the Whig who had chosen "to promote universal discord throughout the continent" at such a time, long after the Appeal had first appeared.<sup>62</sup>

Prevarication, it seemed, was not something restricted to the Anglican camp, and served the same ends in the pens of Presbyterians: it covered a plot. It was the Presbyterian Triumvirate, not the Anglicans, who from "their intolerant principles, . . . desire to enslave others, amidst clamorous outcries for liberty." Behind the mask of hypocrisy the Whig contributors were "in reality forging chains for their fellow-subjects." Newspaper warfare was instigated because it was:

an admirable vehicle to propagate those principles, by which the minds of a virtuous, and as yet loyal people, are it seems to be tainted, and their affections to their mother country, debauched.

Sedition, then, was the phantom behind the outcries of the "Independents." And the church was their target because "in its very frame, as well as doctrines, [it] is unfavourable to republican, leveling principles in government."<sup>63</sup>

So ran the counter-charge. It was largely ineffective, and the Whig did not feel compelled to reply. For while both plots were equally implausible, Livingston's was by far the vaguer of the two, and bore no relation to an ingrained tradition of anti-republicanism. As well, Livingston



was not suggesting anything, only opposing. The Anglicans, on the other hand, were hampered by the reality, or tangibility, of their scheme: an impending physical presence and the establishment of a new colonial institution. They were equally hindered by their forthright notion of church-state symbiosis, which had been made clear in Chandler's pamphlet.<sup>64</sup>

They were left, therefore, with the unenviable tactics of reiteration and denial. They hit again most of the arguments in the Appeal: that their's was but a reasonable, harmless proposal, meant to elevate the church to a status of mere equality, not superiority; that they suffered from the lack of domestic ordination, confirmation, and episcopal government; that the bishop would be spiritually empowered only; that Dissenters would incur no financial responsibility to support the office; and that episcopacy, if not ecclesiastically superior to Dissenting organization, was in any case not repugnant to "the Government settled in and for the Church by the Apostles," and was certainly "compatible with the reformation of evil."<sup>65</sup>

Regardless of what innocence these contentions may have held for some readers, the only way to meet the Whig's insistence that they covered a conspiracy was by denial. "The whole of it," Inglis wrote concerning Whig attacks, "I aver to be utterly false." Unfortunately for Inglis, the denials of an accused liar were a poor form of insurance.

When Livingston refused Chandler's celebrated assurance against episcopal political involvement, and called for an unspecified better one, there was nothing that could be done. To deny a thing does not prove its opposite, a fact which both the Whig and Whip seemed to understand. The latter realized that its arguments were being dispelled by contempt and attack. And the more often attacked, the more it was forced to deny until at last, no doubt, it assumed to the reader the aspect of one who "protesteth too much." The Whig, meanwhile, rarely felt constrained to deny anything, and when it did, the undignified chore was more likely to be relegated to a separate organ, A Kick for the Whipper. Matters of evidence were similarly dispensed. When Seabury challenged Livingston to produce something better than hearsay, Livingston replied that the Whig's hearsay was every bit as good as Seabury's. It was like arguing with a clever child. The best method for refuting the charges, and hence for substantiating the proposed bishop's spirituality, was to contend that civil powers did not inhere in the office, but were instead appended by parliament. This was poor insurance indeed.<sup>66</sup>

While the contest went badly for the Whip, it presented to Vardill a timely opportunity for exercising blossoming abilities. In the waning months of the controversy (January, 1769), at the age of nineteen, he ventured out on

his own in a series of anti-Presbyterian broadsides. The immediate cause of his writing was a scheme by William Livingston, the Whig himself, to unify the Presbyterian and Congregational churches. Ill-timed, the proposal fell apart of itself. But it posed to Vardill the excuse for a general attack which would bolster the beleaguered Whip. These essays substantiate the fact that Vardill had adopted Chandler's Appeal, and that the Whip's style of writing and thinking had become his own.<sup>67</sup>

The three major elements of Whip strategy were all found in Vardill's production: reiteration of the episcopal position, discovery of a plot motivated by political ambition, and denial of Whig charges. Explicitly referring to the Appeal, Vardill found the request for bishops as reasonable as had Chandler. The Anglican church simply wanted to be relieved of their present "intolerable burden" stemming from a lack of the powers of ordination, confirmation, and proper church government.<sup>68</sup>

The clamour against so sensible a proposal was suspicious, and not, on its face, to be taken seriously. "The Whig papers are justly held in low esteem," he wrote hopefully, "--they are Factious, but not instructive." With the Whip, he had no trouble finding the motive for factiousness. The opposition proceeded from the Presbyterians' realization "that the Bishop could be made a fine political Engine, to

serve their Ambition, and administer to their Malice." And their ambition was for nothing healthy to Anglicans or liberty. Meditating Anglican "Destruction," the Presbyterians "would subject them to all the Rigours of Intolerance." While Vardill did not venture far into the purely political consequences to be expected of Presbyterian power, he made his inference clear by referring to them throughout as "Independents," almost without exception in italics. And since they opposed the church of England, the same which the King swore at his coronation to protect, it was a simple, but as yet uncompleted, logical step to read disloyalty in the "Independents" opposition.<sup>69</sup>

But in the end, Vardill was also saddled with the policy of denial. The charge of Anglican conspiracy was "the mere Effussion of Malice, unsupported by Reason or Proof. . . . I defy them to produce a Spark of Evidence of our Intention . . . to infringe the Religious Rights of any Denomination." The denials were no more effective for Vardill than they had been for Inglis, and he knew it. The Presbyterians were not open to reason; they were not sensible men. The Appeal had been brought forthrightly to the public, only to be distractedly opposed by outrageous, unsupported accusations. Denying accusations would have no more effect upon madmen than reasoning. Vardill already saw in the Presbyterian "unforgiving Temper," "Pride," and "Violence," a form

of insanity; and insanity is frightening. "The Independents," he wrote, "we fear."<sup>70</sup>

The debate raged for more than a year, and the scene created was not pleasant. "Pacificus" complained publicly of both parties:

I expect to hear one of you saying to the other, 'your mother is a tyrant whore'; and the other replying, 'your mother is a bastard, a hypocrite and a fanatic.' I advise you both to forbear and be silent. It is not prudent for the pot to call the kettle names.<sup>71</sup>

Even Chandler could write that "The scene in New York of whigging, whipping, etc., is not pleasing to me . . ." and Auchmuty remarked to Johnson that "You will find that the wig [sic] and Whip are still existing to the scandal of Religion and disgust of the public."<sup>72</sup>

Though the war continued beyond its usefulness, it could not go on forever. The Whig left off in May, 1769, the Whip shortly after, while the Kick for the Whipper struggled on into 1770. By the end, some Anglicans were tired and losing hope; Samuel Johnson wrote in late 1769, "I now despair of bishops." But not Chandler, who if not pleased with the vision of "whigging and whipping," could retain optimism. At the height of the controversy he told Johnson: "In my opinion, the prospect was never more favourable, if we look beyond the present political confusion."

And at the close of the controversy, he was still energetically writing pamphlets at Bostonian Chauncy. The Whig, however, could claim the victory. Bishops were a project forestalled. Those few zealots in England who had thought of pushing the plan, were convinced by the outrageous opposition mounted in New York that such a move, presently, would be ill-advised.<sup>73</sup>

Vardill's postgraduate political and ecclesiastical instruction in the classroom of the New York press had brought him a great distance in four years. What did he learn? How greatly could he suspect that the hostility of new currents in American thought to his established church position presented errors to be set aright not merely in pamphlet debate, but eventually in war itself? Certainly the stage had been set. Vardill's religion, connections, and ambitions, so easily adopted as a King's graduate in 1766, now placed him squarely on one side of battle lines clearly drawn.<sup>74</sup>

The fundamental issue between Whip and Whig, and between Vardill and the "Independent" Presbyterians, was not that the former really did despise liberty and harbour a covert desire for colonial enslavement, as it has sometimes been presented.<sup>75</sup> In addition to conflicting religious and political motives, and sheer emotionalism, the conflict arose from incompatible notions of church-state relations. For the Whig,

the necessity of the clear and absolute separation of church and state was becoming a lucid doctrine. "Nothing can be more dangerous to church and state," the Whig had pronounced, "than the participation of the clergy in the power of the magistrate." Such a situation was becoming, to some Dissenters, and perhaps to some Anglicans, threatening by definition. Waxing universal, the Whig went on to proclaim: "civil and religious liberty is the foundation of public happiness, and the common birth-right of mankind."<sup>76</sup>

This was a novel conception. Vardill and his co-Whippers were more likely to find such liberties the peculiar possessions of British subjects living in a constitutionally protected society. Clearly there must be a connection between church and state, if only one of studied indifference. But the conservative Anglicans went further. Chandler was explicit in presenting the promotion of an established religion as an element of "sound policy."<sup>77</sup> And privately, he allowed that bishops would have a political effect in American beneficial to Great Britain, a sentiment he hid from his readers, but which was probably the most powerful argument for certain of the London audience.<sup>78</sup>

Entering rather too greatly into the mind of the eighteenth century Dissenter, some treatments label Chandler's hidden expectations "admissions," implying that what was good for England was bad for America, and implying also that such

political expectations tended to prove the existence of a conspiracy of enslavement. Hence Dissenting writers were "seeing through" Anglican moderate protestations. But it seems more likely they perceived a reflected phantom of their own fear, or an apparition of political expediency. Only the wholehearted acceptance of the Whig's premise of church-state separation as a prerequisite to the existence of liberty can lead, unexamined, to the conclusion that, therefore, the Anglicans were interested in enslaving America, or would endanger its liberty.<sup>79</sup>

Their hope was that a bishop would act as the cement in a stronger bond between colonial America and Great Britain, a hope that implied no necessary evil save to a revolutionary. Independence had not been proclaimed, was not openly avowed; it can be no aspersion on the Anglicans that they would wish for such a bond. Vardill was not alone in professing loyalty, and loyalty to a continued colonial connection was supposed to be mutually beneficial to England and America, as it had so far been, and not a one-sided slaveholding relationship. The dates of the controversy were 1768 to 1770, not 1776 to 1783; what was good for Great Britain carried no necessary threat to America.

Even further, it was simple fallacy to assume that the Anglicans were insensible to the idea of "liberty." As Vardill wrote:



It is absurd to suppose, that if the Introduction of a Bishop could be productive of the evil Consequences, which the [Presbyterians] proclaim, that churchmen would be less alarmed than Themselves--Can it be conceived that we have not equal Tenderness for our Consciences, equal dread of spiritual Domination, and equal Attachment to our Property? or, must it be taken for granted, that we have no Discernment, and that all Wisdom and Penetration are concentrated in the clamourous Juncto.<sup>80</sup>

But the churchmen perceived liberty's proper environment differently than did the Whig. A major element of what became Vardill's loyalist ideology was the idea that liberty was safe only under some form of the British status quo. He could reasonably expect its extinction under "republican, leveling" forms of government. An episcopate, which would strengthen the "native religion," cement the colonial connection, perhaps equilibrate imbalanced colonial constitutions, was an institution which would aid in the creation of a more nearly perfect copy of a properly ordered, English political society; and it was only within such a properly ordered setting, as history and contemporary governments proved, that liberty could flourish. Vardill and the other Whips, supporting church-state interaction, could see their advocacy as friendly to liberty, not inimical to it.

The Anglican position, then, implied no disregard for liberty. It was only when the belief in the necessity of church-state separation became a self-evident premise to political or religious freedom, where the very mention of political consequences to a religious development carried necessary

implications of sleeping tyranny, that the Anglican position was viewed as a threat. This way of thinking, entirely dogmatic and universalistic, was evident in the controversy, and it held a further inference which acted as a wedge driven between the two parties. If absolute church-state separation, and absolute civil and religious freedom as "birth-rights," were novel conceptions, they were becoming as well a native product of the American colonies. Livingston's and Chauncy's emphasis on the frightened escape into the wilds of New England was successful not only as a tool for the debate; it has become irrevocably imbedded in American ideology, lasting right down to the twentieth century. "Proper" church-state relations of the type Chandler, Inglis, and Vardill advocated were incompatible with this American invention. The Whig's case bespoke a kind of incipient nationalism, therefore, where a position was justified by reference to American colonial history, not the state of the art in England. Thus could Vardill be puzzled, even frightened, at such a departure from correct social ordering; liberty had been proven safe in a British system--an American aberration carried no similar guarantee.<sup>81</sup>

Hence Vardill's religious commitment came to imply a constitutional commitment. The Anglican self-presentation of undoubted loyalty and attachment to the British constitution was a conscious element in their argument for a bishop. They

naturally thought that Britain would help those who behaved properly, and punish those who did not, a situation to the benefit of everyone, but especially to the former at the expense of the latter. Just as this had been an assumption in their episcopal reasoning, so now it began to direct their behaviour. Vardill and the Whippers had internalized their loyalty.

## Chapter V

### JOURNEYMAN LOYALIST

. . . a Pamphlet, 1772, in answer to Dr. Witherspoon's Address; & . . . some Publications, in 1773, signed Poplicola . . . .  
--Memorial of John Vardill

There can be few things so tricky as hindsight. Looking back, the greatest surprise can become inevitable; the bizarre, normal; the aberrational, commonplace. In 1770, John Vardill would have been little less than astounded to learn that the American colonies were speeding headlong down a hill at independence. Its advocates lurked about, of course, but Vardill was perspicacious enough to suspect that every society contains elements only marginally sane. And, in any case, these independents were not such madmen as yet. In fact, they were rather too understandable. If the notion that they were pushed by the inexorable engines of history, by some surprising inevitability which it was patently beyond the capabilities of most contemporary witnesses to perceive, is momentarily suspended, and the idea that the road to independence was more likely a convenient medium of politics which eventually turned to a self-fed madness, is considered,

then it will be possible to see that Vardill could understand the independents very well. They were a faction. And at the beginning of the seventies in New York, it may have seemed that their inevitability had run its course.

Their import-export barricade against Great Britain crumbled with the repeal of the Townshend Duties (save that on tea). This could be claimed a victory; but it also ended an issue. The Anglicans had lost their episcopal hope, or so it could be thought, and that, too, was a victory; but again an issue ended. Indeed, it was a horse flogged so dead for nearly two years that it had perhaps become a nauseous "anti-issue." And the Livingston party, whom radical Anglicans identified as "independents," had lost another election (1769). So while New York was never free of intense, even physical, political warfare, how close could the city seem to revolution?<sup>1</sup> How much more a temporary faction could the "Presbyterian independents" appear? And for all that their "republican" principles were volatile, to men like Vardill they were more nearly an expedient object of hatred and contempt than, at this point, an inexorable threat.

Vardill had used that expediency to effect. By 1770 he had almost completed his first metamorphosis. From a King's graduate of no account in 1766, he had become a known figure in New York: a rabid Anglican, episcopal zealot, and anti-republican. But his reputation did not hinge only on

his participation in the Whip for the American Whig. In 1769, his grave and serious demeanour, and his security from hints of vice or levity, entitled him to a King's M.A. He was a standing acquaintance of a number of other King's graduates whose presence in the city was beginning to be felt: Egbert Benson, John Jay, Peter Van Schaack.<sup>2</sup> He had tutored many a King's undergraduate, thus making his name an ornament in more than a few city households. And he was about to embark upon a new apprenticeship, trying out his "clear, strong, manly voice" in the churches of Jamaica (Long Island) and the city.<sup>3</sup>

His position, then, did not rest solely on the Whip or episcopacy, but his fame, such as he could claim, owed most to literary productions dealing with those kinds of topics. He understood this well. Writing against the Whig had been a means of discovering the way to his patrons' applause at the expense of a ready evil. Three years later, his pen sharpened, and the motive clear, he watched for new game.

The quarry appeared on the continent in 1768, arriving from Scotland, preceded by reputation. Dr. John Witherspoon was his name, a devoted controversialist, and "calvinistical" Presbyterian, who had turned down the impressive calls to Rotterdam and Dublin in order to take the position of President of the College of New Jersey at Princeton.<sup>4</sup>

Chandler had noted his coming: "The celebrated Dr. Wither-spoon is arrived; but all I hear of him is that he makes but an indifferent figure in the pulpit."<sup>5</sup>

While he quickly became a provincial Presbyterian leader, the Doctor judiciously restrained his controversial predilections for the first few years of his American residence, and attended to his collegiate duties.<sup>6</sup> It was apparently an innocent move, then, to publish in 1772 a promotional pamphlet entitled An Address to the Inhabitants of Jamaica, And Other West-India Islands, In Behalf of the College of New Jersey. Its ostensible purpose was to solicit "Benefactions from the wealthy and generous" of those places for his "College of considerable standing." "Benefaction" could no doubt have also meant an outright gift, but the primary aim was to attract sons of wealthy and generous Anglo-Jamaican parents.<sup>7</sup>

In promoting his own institution, however, he found it necessary to denigrate other American seminaries,<sup>\*</sup> and at the same time convince his audience to send their children to America instead of England. While he cautiously refrained from slandering English universities--his criticisms were harsh enough--it appeared that an invidious comparison of his

---

\* "Seminary" is used in the pamphlets, and will be so used here, synonymously with "college."

chief competitors, Philadelphia and King's, to Princeton, was a motive equal to attracting Jamaican students; or perhaps he thought of it as a means thereto. Whatever his thinking, the net result was that a dry, dull, plodding pamphlet, with a great air of reasonableness, reserve, and modesty, in a word, everything to be expected from a college president, became as well a cover for what can justly be called "snide" remarks. And an inspection of his logic leads to the conclusion that the piece would have been safer in other hands.

The arguments against British schools are illustrative. First, England was too far away for proper parental supervision, whereas the College of New Jersey was in precisely the right location, neither too distant, nor so close as to allow feigned sickness and a trip home at every exam. New Jersey's college was also a much more healthy place than Great Britain, situated in the midst of a near magical climate. And it was, of course, a good school. But on the other hand, unlike the famous British universities whose guilded reputations bred professorial complacency, the College of New Jersey prudently attended to producing learned graduates. Its reputation was not so great that it could expect not to suffer by conferring degrees on those "coming out of college almost as ignorant as they went in." Further, Witherspoon's college was safer than England for rich children: located in



the country, there was virtually nothing on which to squander money, and therefore a better chance of moral purity. In England, however, such students risked a present danger of "contracting vicious habits."

. . . it is well known that, in all the great towns in Britain, a set of profligate boys, and sometimes artful persons farther advanced in life, attach themselves to such as are well supplied with money, impose upon their youth and simplicity, gratify them in every irregular desire, and lead them both into idleness and vice.

There was as well to be feared the availability of "Balls, Concerts, Plays, Races," and other entertainments "Highly pernicious to youth in the first stages of their education," all of which was notably absent in rural New Jersey. And appealing to North American patriotism, Witherspoon reminded his readers that Americans with American educations would more likely become much needed American teachers.<sup>8</sup>

But as he then changed to extolling his college's virtues in the American context, he also began insulting King's and the College of Philadelphia. The evils found in British schools were endemic to any city seminary, and hence missing from New Jersey. But more important, the College of New Jersey was "altogether independent." Owing no favours arising from government largess, there was no danger of professors or tutors being chosen by "Ministerial" suggestion. The College Governors were as "far removed as the state of human nature will admit, from any Temptation to a fawning,

cringing spirit and mean servility in the hope of Court favour or promotion." On the contrary, at New Jersey "the spirit of liberty has breathed high and strong in all the Members," surely preferable to "the dead and vapid state of one whose very existence depends upon the nod of those in power." And New Jersey had been able to grow to its present educational opulence without "pompous descriptions, or repeated recommendations in the public papers." Finally, with a regard for religious freedom, and no attachment to any particular sect, "there is neither inclination nor occasion to meddle with any controversy whatever."<sup>9</sup>

The references were obvious. Philadelphia and King's were headed by Anglicans, Provost Smith and President Cooper. And it was well known on which side of the Whig-Whip fence they had stood. The implication that the city schools' Anglican connections precluded religious freedom, while neither fair nor true, was clear. And both schools had received government financial aid which, if involvement in controversy did not already demonstrate, indicated a good reason for the discovery of a "cringing, servile" attitude.

Vardill and Cooper could not let such innuendo pass. Vardill later saw their response as a "Vindication of the English Universities & Education in general," the third element of his defence of the "British" in "British North America" (i.e., church, state, and now, education).<sup>10</sup> While

it was probably hindsight which provided this interpretation, and the needs of the moment,\* obviously Vardill was coming to live in a world peopled heavily with enemies; paranoia "breathed high and strong" elsewhere than in New England. And as well, disputing "independents" and protecting things English was a rewarding formula. The vehicle this time out was called Candid Remarks on Dr. Witherspoon's Address

. . . . 11

The pamphlet is a stylistic hodgepodge. It is divided into so many Roman numbered sections that probably the authors even confused each other. What must have been the hand of Cooper echoed a proper Presidential dustiness, while the energetic and still clumsy Vardill "bespangled" it with a pretence of wit and sharp invective. The influences of ad hominem bellicosity from his formative literary years would apparently not wear off. But the pamphlet's importance here is not so much its style, although that is an indicator of Vardill's development, or even its confutations of Witherspoon's easily confuted assertions. Its importance instead is that it gives an interior view of Vardill's (and Cooper's) perception of the purposes of education, and generalizes precisely that road which he had so far travelled. It can be no exaggeration to presume that the pamphlet is a self-

---

\* The quotation is from his Memorial to the Loyalist Claims Commission; see chapter two.

characterization.

It began by dispensing with Witherspoon's more insipid assertions. Princeton's climate was not charmed; if anything, its nearness to uncleared swamps posed a health hazard. Its propinquity to Jamaica was also unimportant except to those of middle income, for whom it would be a difficulty to send sons to England. The argument that a British university's reputation would prevent a proper education was simply backwards. Vardill<sup>\*</sup> "would deem a Physician who had perform'd many beneficial Cures, more fit to be entrusted with his Health, than a Stranger . . . whose Reputation was not yet establish'd." The English universities would obviously hesitate to lavish their precious reputations on "the Indolent and Undeserving." And as to potentialities of vice, such entertainments existed in America; a New Jersey student with sufficient desire could find the means of self-corruption.<sup>12</sup>

But Witherspoon had made a great point of his college's seclusion, which he thought would tend to provide a motivation for study, since there was little else to do. Vardill also found this turned around, and in ignorance of a proper method for instilling assiduity. With no little insight, he maintained that there were four common reasons for

---

<sup>\*</sup> Vardill will be cited in the text as author.

a student to do his work. The first came from a fear of punishment. But this was only to be used on those whom "Principles of Honour and Duty cannot reach," and would in any case tend "to create an Aversion to, rather than a love of Science." Another was the "Prospect of Subsistence." A rather unseemly motive, it could be of little impact on students supported by rich parents. Next came the "Spirit of Investigation." But this was a rarity even among men, who "are very rarely strenuous Students from a mere Desire of Knowing." The most effectual principle for prodding students, Vardill found, was the "Spirit of Emulation." By this attitude the student would attempt to imitate his professors, and the members of his prospective profession, out of the "Prospect of Applause, of Eminence, and Distinction." The instinct to seek such prizes represented the universal well-spring of intellectual discipline.<sup>13</sup>

A seminary in the city would most easily instil such a desire, and nurse it to greatest advantage. The reasons were simple: the audience was larger, more important, probably more attentive, and the media to the audience more available and efficient. An audience moreover was essential, for it prevented the situation where "opening Genius [would] expand its Flowers, and waste its Sweets unnoticed and unadmired." The press, for instance, was a great inducement to production: "The Satisfaction of having met with public

Approbation on past, rouses the Ambition of higher Applause on their future attempts"; and again, with equal relevance: "Casual Applause of a lame and uncouth Stanza has perhaps blessed the World with many an excellent Poet."<sup>14</sup>

But the city audience served more than an observer's role; it was the future milieu of the student, and as such it should be both courted and understood. A seminary in the city allowed "Intercourse with Mankind."

The Variety of Dispositions, Incidents, and Occasions in Life, which require our Prudence, are too vast, variable, and numerous, to be crowded [sic] into any Description of Art; they can only be accurately studied in the grand Original itself. . . . Hence it is, that we so often see the Man of profound Erudition, who bends under a Load of learned Lumber, hesitating, and miserably stumbling, in executing the most common Offices of Life.

Only with a knowledge of men could the "Art of pleasing" be properly learned.<sup>15</sup>

Learning this adulatory art, Vardill had proved, was of the first importance to the ambitious. The city college enjoyed the advantage of men at the tops of their professions. This was useful not only for their knowledge; "If only with a View to their Patronage, this Circumstance is momentous." In more detail, Vardill explained the manner of ascent:

If he [the student] has attracted the Notice of those around him, (as Merit will infallibly do when it has so many Witnesses, and so many whose Interest will lead them, and who have such Opportunities, to proclaim it) he will have the superior Benefit of entering on Business

with the good Opinion of his Fellow-Citizens; of being perhaps patronized by some Persons of Eminence and Generosity, acquainted with his Abilities, or of returning Home preceded by a shining Reputation.<sup>16</sup>

A proper spirit of emulation, then, augured well intellectually and professionally; but also morally. Vardill had an understanding of what would now be called "socialization," or the means by which learned values, due to various environmental pressures, are inculcated. The most basic beliefs did not arise "from Conviction by Reasoning," but by experience. Thus, "Had Locke or Bacon been born in Lapland or Egypt, the one would probably have idolized a Stone, and the other a Monkey." A spirit of emulation would therefore guide the student in value formation, and have a natural tendency to obviate other, wicked, youthful passions. With an evident comprehension of sublimation, Vardill described how these passions would be productively channelled:

Passions themselves are on the Wing for some Object of Gratification. . . . The Prospect of Fame, of Eminence and Applause, is an Object which will most probably succeed, as it highly agrees with the Violence of Passion, Vivacity and Pride, natural to Youth; and from the Extent, Variety, and Beauty of its Faïery Scenes, tends most forcibly to engage the juvenile Imagination.

In this way, then, the student would learn that "extraordinary Devotion and Sanctity, [are] the surest Road to Applause, and Profligacy of Manners, the keenest to Reproach." Thus had King's and Philadelphia, Witherspoon's logical webs

notwithstanding, produced, in the satanic urban environment, graduates "remarkable for the Purity of their Morals."<sup>17</sup>

Finally, the Candid Remarks proceeded to rebut Witherspoon's more political inferences. And here the cracks of the Whip were remembered: that attachment to government breeds liberty. "The Obligation they are under to Government, will undoubtedly induce Members of [King's and Philadelphia] to propagate no Principle contrary to its Spirit and Interest . . ." Vardill admitted; but "how will this interfere with their cherishing a Spirit of Liberty?" The Doctor had been more than confused in his insinuation that "ministerial interposition would be unfriendly to the Spirit of Liberty"; he had been more nearly seditious, for Princeton was under the influence of "the Independent Faction." Hence, an attachment to government, while not inimical to liberty, despised independence from Great Britain; and independence, and here the crucial point is manifest, was "essentially different from that of Liberty, and dangerous to Society." With perfect conscience, then, Vardill could find that the correct function of King's and Philadelphia, was "disseminating a Spirit of Religion, Learning and Patriotism, by inculcating a Love of our happy Constitution, Obedience to the Laws, and Zeal for the Welfare of our Country."<sup>18</sup>

Vardill's co-author and employer, President Cooper,



could easily be impressed with the Candid Remarks on Wither-  
spoon's imprudence. In proof of the pamphlet's description  
of the advantages of a city college, little more than a year  
after its publication Vardill was elected Professor of  
Natural Law and Moral Philosophy at King's. The Governors  
also voted him a hundred pounds for prior service, which  
would enable him, with his nearly two years of preaching  
experience, to go to England for ordination. But before he  
left a new series of events began involving the "independents"  
in yet another scheme of opposition to parliament, this time  
founded in tea.<sup>19</sup>

To some Anglicans, the Tea Act of 1773 provided a  
very remarkable reason for working the engines of rebellion:  
it introduced high quality tea to the colonies at lower  
prices than poor quality tea. Those who entertained this  
uncomplicated picture seemed to forget that the beverage was  
still an irritant to some unforgiving Americans. A vestige  
of the Townshend Duties, its three pence per pound "tax"  
represented a tangible reminder of parliament's declaration  
of legislative supremacy.<sup>20</sup>

The new legislation was a sop for the East India Com-  
pany. Ailing from the expense of military adventures in  
India, the company courted bankruptcy. Under the Tea Act,  
parliament authorised the use of North America as a dumping  
ground for 17,000,000 pounds of excess tea. It did so by

granting the company a special licence for direct importation at a low price made possible by a rollback of company duties. When the plan was first announced in America, it was greeted with a yawn. Not until the text of the law was printed in October, and smugglers began to understand what cheap, legal, "English" tea would do to profits derived from cheap, smuggled, "Dutch" tea, did opposition commence. To Vardill, the importation of good, inexpensive tea constituted a weak premise for resistance, and he felt compelled to say so in a series of New York broadsides signed "Poplicola."<sup>21</sup>

The essays appeared a month before the Boston Tea Party, where the issue was changed from one of constitutional commerce to malicious mischief and the sanctity of property. Hence their topical elements were quickly made obsolete. After the tea had been destroyed at Boston, arguments concerning where the "tax" was paid, whether it constituted a legal-external or illegal-internal impost, whether it was a tax at all, whether it was patriotic or sinister to drink "Dutch" Chinese or "English" Chinese tea, whether the one tasted better than the other, and whether or not smugglers deserved the sympathy or disdain of fellow citizens, became even more empty than they had already been.\* Reliance on

---

\* These "issues" all appear in "Poplicola."

these arguments for anything but rhetorical flourish before the Tea Party had been in ignorance of the fact that a final determination of the constitutional problems arising from commercial regulation would, in the "Age of Reason," certainly not proceed "from Conviction by Reasoning." It was coming much more to the point where one set of colonists "idolized a Stone, and the other a Monkey." After the Tea Party, nice logic and specific illustrations (e.g., that three pence per pound is very little to pay) were bathetic intrusions having no effect on complaints of faith.

Vardill's faith persevered. The notions of liberty, security, freedom, and proper government, and who were their friends and who enemies, forged in the heat of the Whig-Whip war, restated in the educational connection as an answer to Witherspoon, could be no different in the present circumstances. Those who opposed parliament over tea were relatives of the same "independent" faction which had opposed bishops. Their motives, then and now, were self-interested. In 1768 to 1769, they had attempted in New York to regain a disappearing political power by bewailing the evils of bishops; now they hoped to protect illegal profits by bewailing the evils of parliament and the East India Company.

Whether Vardill thought the independent faction really wanted independence is a difficult question; but that he found them crying for measures which would promote its

attainment as a means to power, is certain. And since self-interest, not public disinterest, was the motive, as surely as Chauncy had "seen" in Ewer, and Inglis had "seen" in Livingston, as surely as Anglicans had been seeing in Presbyterians and Presbyterians in Anglicans since 1754, so Vardill now saw in the smugglers' supporters a reawakening of the plot against American liberty. His fellow citizens, enigmatically "deluded by passionate Exclamations for Liberty," were falling victims to "Measures introductive of the most imperious TYRANNY."<sup>22</sup>

Vardill came to this conclusion via the same route that the celebrated "Patriots" discovered inalienable rights to mate with their then eight-year-old religious "birth-rights." He came to it with reference to Locke, Montesquieu, and the social contract. It is an often overlooked fact of revolutionary history that the loyalist pamphleteers in general, and Vardill, that most inveterate loyalist, in particular, did not reject the right to revolution, disrespect legitimate American claims, ignore the idea of natural rights, or view the basics of civil society "fundamentally" differently than the revolutionaries. In this respect, Vardill is a "conservative estimate" of the positions of the less radically loyal. And even he was willing to proclaim that, "should oppression stalk openly forth, recourse must be had to those latent powers of society, which no precedents,

no social contracts, can destroy." In such a situation, "the inalienable rights of humanity would justify" violence.<sup>23</sup>

But the moaning of a smuggler's pocket book was no example of stalking oppression. Without some sufficient cause to invoke the disclaimer, men in civil society held responsibilities to the preservation of the social contract. They had made their powers "latent" as consideration to the contract, in exchange for which, as in all contracts, they received a thing of value: security. The manner of rendering their power latent was to submit to the rule of law; and the rule of law was made possible by the resulting contractual stability. Hence, fragility was not the only fundamental of the social contract, which is the emphasis arising from an inspection of the "Patriots"; security of person and property from the actions of others, through obedience to the law, which together form the premise to liberty, were equally fundamental. In Vardill's words: "It is obvious, therefore, that Civil Liberty can be nothing else but natural liberty so far restrained by human laws, as is necessary and expedient for the general benefit of the publick."<sup>24</sup>

As to Vardill, as to the Whip, the British system offered the safest contract. He quite recognized that there were problems in the present imperial arrangement, that a more effectual method of colonial parliamentary representation should be discovered. But the way of finding the

solution to such problems depended upon a "cordial union," not hostility. Indeed, hostility was contrapositive to the solution, a fact so obvious it persuasively argued that the "independents" were not at all interested in succouring American liberties, but in destroying them.

And here he could launch into the metaphor of infancy. Just as the Anglicans did not find religion's proper role from an examination of New England Puritan exiles, but rather with reference to the "Mother Country"; so now Vardill did not look to a responsible, innovative America for a discovery of the origins or protection of civil liberty. On the contrary, all signs told him that the Americans were not responsible, and that their "innovations" would lead, as another loyalist phrased it later, to "such a system of lawless tyranny, as a Turk would startle at." Vardill therefore looked instead to parental Great Britain. America's hope was to retain a symbiotic imperial connection: "The authority [of parliament] should be the beneficial authority of a parent; the obedience of the other, the liberal obedience of a child." Where, he might ask, was the colonial spirit of emulation? In a departing, lamenting summation, Vardill sought to rekindle that spirit by a conjuration of its instructors, and a restatement of its lessons:

SPIRITS of immortal Worthies! that expired in the bright Cause of Freedom, teach us, O teach us by your Example--

that a Love of Liberty is a Love of our Country--. . .  
 That genuine Liberty can only be found in Civil Society  
 --that without Laws, Civil Society cannot stand--that  
Laws are of no Benefit, if they may be transgressed at  
Pleasure--that if one Part of the Community transgresses  
them, another may also--that where all are free from the  
restraints of Law, there is no SECURITY for ANY.<sup>25</sup>

But the immortal worthies stayed hidden in their netherworld. Tea Act resistance intensified instead of abating. By January, 1774, when Vardill was ready to leave for England, refusal of tea at American ports was commonplace, and distracted opposition was again in full swing.

One wonders if Vardill despaired. The existence of the "independents" posed three questions which might lead to an answer. First, did they really want independence from Great Britain? Vardill's response would probably have been ambiguous. If the independent faction succeeded in achieving power through resistance to legal government, they would probably drop their independent pose. Nothing so greatly engenders affection for the way things are than a personal stake in the status quo. But the independents could not be granted legitimate political power, any more than they could be granted the continent, simply to soothe their ambitions or to avoid nasty scenes. So whether they really wanted to end the imperial connection or not, they could be relied upon to continue to act as though they did.

But still, suppose that a few deluded enthusiasts sincerely wished for independence, and the rest became carried away and rashly made the attempt. What then? Would they succeed? The answer was a definite negative. The loyalists had implicit faith in what they thought was their own, and Great Britain's, overwhelming numerical and military superiority.

There was, however, a third question. Granted that the independents really wanted independence, or might stumble into wanting it; and granted that they would surely fail in the event; would they actually make the attempt? After all, men have been known to try the impossible. But even if they could not be dissuaded by the utter futility of such an endeavour, the difference between riots and war was great, and the latter was necessary for independence. The idea of an American army to contest a British one, with cannons and uniforms (where would they get them?), officers, even Generals, and perhaps a cavalry, was absurd; and how much more unreal to formulate a challenge to British sea power. More likely a revolutionary force, if it ever came into being, would be a motley assortment of riff-raff and low-lives, lead by a few power hungry (but otherwise potentially respectable) politicians who could not compete successfully in a legal government. There would be riots, perhaps, even a kind of rebellion was possible. But an organized, armed



attempt to establish a new and independent government? Ten months before the First Continental Congress it was too fantastic to imagine with any sense of reality.

## Chapter VI

### MASTER LOYALIST

Came to London for Ordination, 1774 . . . . .  
--Memorial of John Vardill

London. Civilization at last.

Huzza, happy Britons, whom Neptune secures,  
The high Car of crest-blessing Glory is yours!  
Let Spain boast the Treasures that glow in her Mines,  
Let Gallia rejoice in her Olives and Vines;  
In bright-sparkling Jewels let India prevail;  
And her odours Arabia diffuse in each Gale:  
Tis Albion alone that is blest with a Soil,  
Where the fair Fruits of Virtue and Liberty smile.<sup>1</sup>

Vardill's exultant verse was predictable. He had been convincing himself for at least eight years that the centre of God's creation and Man's greatness, agents of which had only imperfectly infected America, would be found in the imperial capital, London. He arrived with the expectant awe of the colonial whose vision of the Mother Country rested on hearsay.

One of those whom Vardill had heard before his departure was Myles Cooper, who had gone to London in 1771 on a number of errands for the church and College. The two most important of these had been left undone: securing a royal charter for making King's a university, and convincing government to

establish an American episcopate. The responsibility for completing the work commenced by Cooper devolved on Vardill when he left for England.

After receiving ordination at the hands of the Bishop of London in April, 1774, the Reverend Vardill could concentrate on obtaining approval for the charter. Cooper had succeeded in gaining general approbation for the idea in 1772. He was prevented from eliciting explicit approval because he was championing an unwritten document, and was afraid to write it without the consultation of the College Governors. Vardill, however, possessed the details.<sup>2</sup>

The proposed university was to have been modelled on Cooper's alma mater, Oxford. The charter concerned itself mainly with the complicated governing structure which would oversee the expanded institution, creating a board of regents and an "academical" senate. As well, the political role of the university would have been greatly enlarged. The charter carried the unlikely recommendation that a large body composed of the regents, the faculty, and all holders of a university or King's M.A. or higher degree, be empowered to elect two members to the New York Assembly. Of more importance to Vardill, the charter also suggested the establishment of Regius Professorships, the type and occupants of which were cordially left to His Majesty's good sense.<sup>3</sup>

When Vardill arrived, then, he was his College's

advocate. The way had been well paved by Cooper. The general approbation he had obtained came from Lord Hillsborough, then President of the Board of Trade and Secretary of State for the Americas. After returning home, Cooper sought aid for his project from New York's new Governor, William Tryon. It was not unexpected when the latter agreed to assist. Anglicans had great faith in the Governor's attachment to their church, and by association to their College. Chandler had written to Samuel Johnson before Tryon's instalment: "We earnestly wish for Mr. Tryon in New York; such a governor, North America has hardly ever seen. He has already done more for the church than any governor ever did."<sup>4</sup> He was given the added inducement of an honorary LL.D.<sup>5</sup>

As it happened, Lord Hillsborough was one of Tryon's more important London acquaintances; in fact he was a family connection through Tryon's wife. But it also happened that Hillsborough was replaced by William Legge, Earl of Dartmouth, in 1772. The Secretary of State for the Americas, however, was still the logical office through which to proceed, and Tryon corresponded with Dartmouth on the matter. The consequence of these various circumstances was that Vardill had a ready and important contact in government.<sup>6</sup>

With Dartmouth's assistance, the charter was promoted. Progress was slow. The government was preoccupied with other more pressing matters. But some attention was given to the

plan, since Vardill's advocacy proved at least personally effective. Perhaps there had been some agreement on the subject before he left New York, or perhaps it was a momentary inspiration on his part, in either case Vardill could write James Duane, one of the College Governors, in September, 1774:

his Majesty has been pleased to appoint me his Royal Professor in the College, for the purpose of defending the Christian, & maintaining the grand Principles of Natural, Religion, by annual Lectures on those Subjects.

The salary was £200 per annum. Although he asked Duane not to broadcast the news, word of the appointment appeared in Rivington's New York Gazetteer in December.<sup>7</sup>

The same day, Rivington's Gazetteer carried the report of still another promotion for Vardill. Now that he was ordained, and a Royal Professor into the bargain, he was eligible for ecclesiastical advancement in the American church. In November, the Assistant Minister of Trinity Church in New York City, Dr. John Ogilvie, had died, leaving his post vacant. With the superfluous help of Thomas Bradbury Chandler, Vardill was unanimously elected Ogilvie's successor.<sup>8</sup>

With the decision on the royal charter pending, Vardill pursued the second part of his mission. His advocacy in London for the establishment of an American episcopate represented his introduction to secret agency. The Whig-Whip debate had not ended public discussion of bishops, and any popular

support Anglicans could create through the press was welcome. But the consequences of Chandler's Appeal had demonstrated that bringing their case to the judgement of public reason would not achieve the goal. What could not be done openly should therefore be accomplished covertly. The Whig had driven the Episcopalians underground.

Knowledge of the new attempt to obtain a bishop for America was even kept from Vardill's friends. They were told to expect a relatively long absence, since Vardill was to study "Irish pulpit oratory," and view the speaking style of Irish barristers. New York acquaintances therefore understood when his stay was lengthened, though they were confused when they heard no word of his preaching. Edward Laight was frankly worried: "people tel [sic] us they dont [sic] hear of your preaching in England as they expected, and I must Confes [sic] I am afraide [sic] you dont [sic] apply you Self [sic] to it as you propposed [sic] before you went away."<sup>9</sup> They could not know the true reason. Vardill and his correspondents on episcopacy enjoined each other to secrecy. As Chandler replied to one of Vardill's admonitions; "You have no need to caution me against entrusting any Person now, with an Account of our Negotiations. I am sufficiently guarded."<sup>10</sup>

Vardill again worked through Dartmouth, who was considered a warm friend of episcopacy. He was a former pupil of the Reverend Dr. George Berkeley, an English Anglican who had

decided in 1772, from self-interest, to "devote [his] life to the service of the Episcopal interest" in America.<sup>11</sup> Their confidence in Dartmouth was well founded. He agreed with Vardill's opinion that "the Equity and Utility of such a Measure seems no longer doubted," so far as to arrange a meeting to discuss it with the Bishop of London.<sup>12</sup>

The equitable and utilitarian "Measure" had changed in four years. The present proposal did not vaguely call for sending bishops across the ocean, as Chandler's Appeal had seemed to suggest. The scheme had grown more specific. For a start, it called for the promotion of American clergymen instead of the importation of English ones. Chandler expounded on the topic to Vardill:

I have conversed with several Gentlemen of Figure among the Laity, by way of sounding out their Sentiments; and it is their Opinion, that if some of our own Clergy were invested with the episcopal Character for America it would leave no Room for Jealousy, and they would be cordially received by all Members of our Church, and not be opposed by the Dissenters. If the Matter were once put in to this Channel, it would be likely to continue in it; and this is a Consideration which would have great Weight with our Clergy in general, especially the younger Set, and make them ambitious of literary Eminence that they may become in Time Candidate for this Preferment. Hitherto we have had in this Country no Premium to animate us, no Stimulus to excite us, excepting what was to be discovered by the Eye of Faith in another World; and the Consequence has been, as might be expected, that we have been indolent and torpid.<sup>13</sup>

Chandler could easily wish for the speedy arrival of the institution which would have such good effects: he and Cooper were

the designated candidates for the office. It was this fact which explained Chandler's courtship of Vardill's good offices in helping his election to replace Ogilvie at Trinity Church, and which accounted for such remarks as:

Your Connexion with [Cooper] has been much greater than it has been with me; and You must be under greater personal Obligations to serve him than me. But the only Reason of this Difference is, that his Opportunities to oblige You have been greater than mine, but not his Disposition and Desire.<sup>14</sup>

He not only hoped Vardill could have him made a bishop, he even put in his bid for a diocese.

Under the new plan, America would be divided into a northern and a southern diocese. The southern section would include the West Indies. This was the diocese for which Chandler was intended, while, obviously, Cooper would be installed in the northern one. But the proposal was not so finalized that it was not still subject to haggling. Chandler wrote Vardill that "it is my candid Opinion that he [Cooper] is fitter for the Southern District than I am, and that I could do as well in the n[or]thern one as he can, and should be as agreeable both to the Clergy and People. A hot Climate to me would be intolerable, and a triennial Tour through the West Indian Islands would be much more suitable for" the bachelor Cooper.<sup>15</sup>

Such were the details of the scheme for which Vardill retained "the public Character of Plenipotentiary."<sup>16</sup> Chandler



could expect him to realize that he was as yet only an agent, not a present candidate. He could also understand that Vardill's faithful advocacy would cost more than kind words. Hence he told him that if "American Clergymen should have the Superintendency of the American Church, there is but little danger, if you live, of your failing to have a Share in this Superintendency."<sup>17</sup>

Vardill could see the relevance of the offer. It was he, after all, who was in London conversing with the powerful, meeting with Dartmouth and Bishop Lowth of Oxford. Indeed, the youthful Vardill was at the moment the driving force of the episcopal movement. But when victory seemed nearest, the movement fell to pieces. Just when the supporters of the ambitious plan could convince themselves that its implementation was at hand, Bishop Lowth, though in favour of the idea, recommended caution. He wanted, wisely, to see how the business over Boston's port would end. It ended at Lexington.<sup>18</sup>

If the plan for an American bishop had been again forestalled, and the charter remained to be approved, it had still been a fortunate year for Vardill. In the course of less than twelve months he had become the Reverend Vardill, a Regius Professor designate, and Assistant Minister of the prestigious Trinity Church. Coming to England had indeed proved propitious.

He could justly conclude that a nearness to the corridors of power increased the likelihood of preferment, and raised him in the estimation of those at home. But where, really, did this succession of accolades leave him? While in England he had no congregation. The appointment as Assistant Minister would do him little good until his return to New York. And the most attractive possession was yet to be firmly grasped: the Regius Professorship of Divinity in a nonexistent university was as yet only a mirage.

In consequence, he could by no means relax in self-congratulation. Until the charter was finally granted, government's sympathy remained essential. After the war he rather confused this matter before the Loyalist Claims Commission. He contended then that the Professorship had been granted in recognition of his services to government. In fact, the Professorship was held out to him before his services properly commenced. When they did begin, his behaviour was directed by two important characteristics of his improved but unsure circumstances. To actually gain possession of both the offered prizes, he had to await government's final nod, and in the meantime maintain his candidacy. At the same time, a rapid ascent had brought him into personal contact with the Secretary of State for the Americas, and his name to the ear of the King, proving the worth of his doctrine of emulation when used in the right setting. This pointed the way to consolidating his gains.

With limited foresight, he disregarded his friend Edward Laight's advice that "the emoulment [sic] arising from the favour of a Minister can last only during his political Glory," and attached himself to those in power.<sup>19</sup>

He was aided by events in America. As he wrote Duane of his appointment at King's, the First Continental Congress was gathering at Philadelphia to deal with the acute problems of Anglo-American relations. The Bostonians had refused to pay for the tea destroyed just before Vardill's departure. Parliament had responded with its "Intolerable Acts," which closed the port of Boston, suspended the Massachusetts charter, and established a military government. To American conservatives it was a firm stance long overdue; to the "independents" it was the enactment of a nightmare. Rejecting Joseph Galloway's inventive proposal for a new kind of colonial relationship with Great Britain, the Congress passed a number of hostile resolutions. It formulated a non-importation, non-exportation, non-consumption association against British goods with the exhortation that local radicals enforce compliance. It adopted the Suffolk Resolves, which among other things called for colonial military exercises. And it sent an otiose petition to the King while pointedly ignoring parliament. Rebellion had virtually been proclaimed, and conservatives in America were being transformed into loyalists.<sup>20</sup>

Vardill had conflicting reports of these events from friends in America. While all but John Jay were critical of

of Congressional measures, they differed in their assessment of the country's sentiments and of what the future held. Jay, a member of Congress, was reserved but apprehensive: "God knows how the contest will end."<sup>21</sup> Chandler, as ever, was optimistic: "I cannot yet but hope that a strong Revulsion may be made in New York."<sup>22</sup> But Vardill also received the foreboding advice that opposition to Congress was nearly impossible, since "to oppose them . . . there should be a probability of success; at present the whole continent is against us."<sup>23</sup> Samuel Auchmuty, and many of the pamphleteers of the period, saw war approaching.<sup>24</sup> Vardill's visit, in other words, could easily become an exile, a fact which provided further motivation, and opportunity, for carving out a territory in London.

This he accomplished with speed. His first point was to resharpen his quill. Beginning in 1774 he wrote a series of periodic columns over the signature "Coriolanus."\* They were explicitly in support of North's ministry, and as explicitly against its opposition in parliament. At the same time they were used as a vehicle of propaganda to damn Congress, and later to paint lurid pictures of circumstances in America which would, presumably, help justify government policy. Simultaneously, he sought to capitalize on his position as a well connected American. Since his views were obviously aligned with govern-

---

\* Reference will be had to these columns as relevant.

ment, and he was known in London primarily on the basis of flattering recommendations and his demonstration of the "Art of pleasing," he was enabled to construct a better than reasonable case for his reliability as an adviser on American affairs. His intimacy with most of the middle-colony Anglican leaders supported this pose, and his friendship with Jay gave him an air of transatlantic influence. Realizing this, he made a show of attempting to win Jay's affections for the Crown.

In a letter to Vardill in May, 1774, Jay had informed him of the coming Congress, and mentioned the prospect of his involvement. He also advised Vardill that he and Robert Livingston had applied through Governor Tryon for the positions of Judges of the Courts of Common Pleas, or inferior county courts. Blocked by his Council, Tryon agreed to pursue their appointments with London. Vardill's assistance was requested. He was only too glad to help. Gaining a Congress member's support for government would greatly aid Vardill's appearance of utility. By the end of the First Congress, however, Jay's letters had become markedly cooler, and the negotiations were terminated unsuccessfully in early 1775.<sup>25</sup>

The impression of a busy and effective government supporter, however, had been created. In a letter to Chandler in late 1774, he had claimed Dartmouth, and through the Secretary of State, Lord North himself, as patrons. Later in 1775 he was

even described as Dartmouth's "confidant." With such supporters, Vardill now occupied a relatively safe niche in the periphery of power.<sup>26</sup>

He enjoyed a modicum of security for which he could be grateful. In April of 1775, wanton insanity finally conquered the last vestiges of prudence, and the independents began a war, creating a scene of horror in America. New York seemed to be falling apart with a vengeance. "Coriolanus" told his readers of Isaac Sears' Connecticut based invasion of New York City, during which Samuel Seabury was "arrested" and incarcerated, and James Rivington's loyalist newspaper office was destroyed. Vardill's own mentor, Myles Cooper, narrowly escaped the indignities of a group of "patriots" who attempted to capture him in his College apartments in a midnight raid. These were the fine examples of republican liberty for which the independents had so long wished. Vardill's prophesies were entirely fulfilled. The absence of British authority meant lawlessness, and without law, liberty could not survive. Oppression stalked openly forth.<sup>27</sup>

Since independency had shown itself to the light of day, and would now have to be destroyed by British arms instead of the written word, many erstwhile pamphleteers, their mission ended in failure, came to London. Cooper and Chandler were among the refugees. Soon after their arrival in late 1775, they made contact with Vardill. They found him a changed man.

The venerable Chandler's obsequious letters to twenty-five year old Vardill on the subject of episcopacy demonstrated that, from the perspective of New Jersey, his mere presence in London gave him power and importance beyond any he had had in America. When in London, Cooper and Chandler saw the change in roles continued. Vardill had a rare accessibility to the offices of the powerful. In fact to some he had become more important than the Governor of New York: Tryon had been kept "waiting long at Dartmouths [sic] Levee" while Vardill was "called in before him tho' he came in after & sent in the last Card." Cooper and Chandler could no longer claim to be Vardill's patrons. The relationship had sufficiently reversed itself so that it was Vardill who acted the benefactor in securing to the two Anglicans £200 pensions for their services. He had reached an impressive manhood quickly, and his knowledge of London power arrangements made him independent of his former mentors.<sup>28</sup>

## Chapter VII

### SERVANT OF THE CROWN

[I]nstead of retiring into the Country,  
or employing himself in the Line of his  
Profession, He devoted his Time, from 1775  
to 1781, to the service of Government . . . .  
--Memorial of John Vardill

The Anglican triumvirate had attempted to avert war. Vardill now felt beckoned to help win it. As a result, his services after Lexington took on a new complexion. He drew apart from his old mentors who with remarkable tenacity tried to keep alive the movement for an American bishop. Along with Cooper and Chandler, Vardill was authorized from America to act on behalf of the American Anglican church. Cooper and Chandler pursued their plan for an episcopate through the S.P.G. until 1777.<sup>1</sup> Vardill was only tangentially involved. His expectation of a bishopric was vague at best, while his contact with government had ceased being merely incidental to the accomplishment of projects designed for post-war America. His writings as "Coriolanus" and his posture as an adviser on American affairs proved him willing to serve the Crown in whatever capacity was available. This had been a choice of necessity.



Cooper and Chandler could rely more heavily than he upon the prospect of preferment in the church, especially as the two candidates for mitres could conceivably be promoted regardless of the outcome of the war. Vardill, however, had only the promises of offices in New York, the enjoyment of which absolutely required British victory.

In contrast to his place at King's College, or within the hierarchy of the church, Vardill's standing with government depended upon a pragmatically justifiable utility. Given his past experience, it is remarkable that he understood this principle so well. That he did understand it is certain: "I have no other object," he wrote, "but to be useful."<sup>2</sup> He probably gave less thought to the more comforting fact that the situation was reciprocal. For if Vardill perceived himself in a position which required him to be useful, the government, after granting a pension and offering a Royal Professorship, felt itself in a position which required discovering a use for Vardill.

His uses were limited. In its complacent wisdom, the government allowed the American loyalists to remain a largely wasted resource. Vardill was already an exception to the rule. That he had any access at all to the offices of the powerful was a mark of distinction belonging to no more than a handful of exiles throughout the war.<sup>3</sup> But his future services would still fall within the bounds of a pre-decided policy. The imperial government had proved itself fully capable of stumbling

into a war; it considered itself fully capable of stumbling out of it, without having to base its decisions on the advice of those embarrassing reminders of its past failures, the loyal American exiles. A man of Vardill's background was useful for his acquaintances, and for his specific knowledge relevant to individual problems. That is, he was useful as a puppet.

He was therefore introduced to the under-secretary of state for the northern (European) department, William Eden, afterwards Lord Auckland. Eden was an ambitious man, busily preoccupied with directing Britain's large and complicated system of European espionage. His organization of spies and double agents--he could never be sure which was which--grew up with remarkable quickness after the commencement of hostilities, a growth which resulted from the diplomatic and economic conditions of the early war years.<sup>4</sup>

British trade had been the life blood of America's peace time economy. When the rebels began killing British soldiers, they cut themselves off from that trade more completely than Congress's commercial boycott could ever have done. Without British goods, and without domestic industry, direct European trade became essential for prosecuting the war. This matter was at first left up to private enterprise. Officially opening American ports to foreign trade was closer to a declaration of independence than Congress wished to proceed in 1775. By the spring of 1776, however, the necessity of greater Euro-

pean assistance pointed to the inevitability of independence, and Congress dispatched an agent to Paris to appeal for French aid.

The choice of France was obvious. Congress reasoned correctly that England's traditional enemy, still smarting from the defeat of the Seven Years War only eleven years before, would be willing, its monarchy notwithstanding, to take the opportunity of weakening British power through support of the rebellious colonies. Silas Deane, the congressional agent, arrived in Paris to negotiate the procurement of supplies in mid-1776. By the end of the year he had been joined by Benjamin Franklin and Arthur Lee. Their mission in 1777 was not only to secure continued aid, but to negotiate a treaty of amity and commerce, and, if possible, to drag France into the war.<sup>5</sup>

Suffering under the delusion that secret information was of some special value, the presence of the American Commission in Paris gave Eden ample opportunity to build a bureaucratic empire. What he expected to do with his agents's information was, in the beginning, little more than an afterthought. He simply forwarded the data to Lord North and the King, or used it to plan further adventures. What Lord North and the King expected to do with the information from Eden was even more curious. The government did not respond well to new intelligence, especially if it conflicted with standing policy. Instead of aiding the creation of some brilliant new diplomatic

or military manoeuvre, secret intelligence more often presented a puzzle which caused vacillation and procrastination. Moreover, it was virtually impossible to make use of secret information and at the same time maintain the information's secrecy. And once the information was no longer secret, it could not be relied upon as an indicator of future policy.<sup>6</sup>

Such considerations were repugnant to Eden. The sixth sense, if not the common sense, of a political bureaucrat told him that what Lord North and the King did with the intelligence he provided was not his problem. Gathering secret, seemingly vital information was to his advantage whether it actually aided the war effort or not; and so Eden became an assiduous gatherer of secrets.

His operation depended heavily upon Americans recruited in England. Hence Vardill was referred to his office sometime in 1776. Their relationship was conspiratorial from the start. The first meeting was arranged for Eden's lodgings, either at "1/2 past 3" in the afternoon, or, if it was thought "hazardous that He should come in the Day Time there is an American Family opposite me" to which Vardill could report. The under-secretary was impressed, and assured Vardill's patron that "if his . . . powers are such as I hope to find them, I shall [work] for his own solid Benefit immediately."<sup>7</sup>

Vardill's powers remained idle until Franklin's arrival in Paris in late 1776 signalled the start of Franco-American

diplomatic activity. Eden's forces came to life. Vardill was given an office on Downing Street close to Eden, and he quickly became one of the under-secretary's three most important agents. His colleagues were Dr. Edward Bancroft and Paul Wentworth, both Americans by birth.

Bancroft had been living in London for some time before the Revolution. He was an acquaintance of Franklin's, and as such Deane contacted him soon after going to Paris. After Franklin joined Deane, Bancroft became Franklin's personal secretary and took lodgings in the same house with the Commissioners. In December of 1776, he engaged himself as a spy through Wentworth, then in London, and later entered into a written agreement to supply information to Lord Stormont, the British ambassador in Paris. Bancroft was thus the primary connection in Paris, where, in addition to performing the functions of personal secretary, he posed as an American spy to Franklin, Deane, and Lee, which explained his frequent trips to London. Wentworth had also been in London since before the war, and early played upon his position as a confidential correspondent of Congress to attach himself to Eden. Throughout 1777, he made numerous excursions between Paris and London, acting as an undercover observer in France, and an interpreter of information for Eden in London. Vardill's activities were centered more directly on Americans in England, where he kept alert to opportunities for obtaining information or recruiting new agents.<sup>8</sup>

Two such opportunities appeared in early 1777. The first concerned an American named Van Zant, a member of a prominent New Hampshire family which otherwise sided with the revolutionaries. Vardill called him in his Memorial "a Gent. of Birth, Fortune, & considerable influence with Dr. Franklin." He met Van Zant in London by accident. "After much persuasion & promise," Van Zant "confessed that he was here on Congress-Business, had brought Letters from Dr. Franklin & others at Paris, & was about to return with some from hence." Vardill prevailed upon him to "disclose them, &, for a certain Reward, to continue his Residence at Paris, & to give all the information he could to Ld. Stormont . . . . ." Although Van Zant, alias Mr. Lupton, later proved an embarrassment from his high living, he had an early effectiveness. "He, among other Things, informed Govt. of the fictitious Titles & Directions under which the Rebel Correspondents have received their Letters." This was of particular aid to Eden, who had the services of the British Post for intercepting letters entirely at his disposal.<sup>9</sup>

A more far reaching scheme was begun at around the same time.<sup>10</sup> One of Vardill's contacts in England was a Mrs. Jamp, proprietor of a combination bordello-boarding-house in Dover. Through her Vardill heard of an American sea captain named Hynson who had boasted that he was on an important mission from the American Commissioners in Paris. His purpose was to purchase a cutter for the Commissioners to use as a packet boat

for their correspondence to Congress. Vardill met Hynson in London, and persuaded him to "unbosom himself." From the information obtained, Vardill concocted a plan for intercepting the next set of dispatches from the Commissioners.<sup>11</sup>

Hynson had originally been intended by Deane to carry the dispatches aboard a ship under the command of another captain. Deane sent him the following instructions in June:

. . . you will embark as a passenger for the West Indies, to which she [the ship] must appear to be destin'd, but before you sail the Cap<sup>n</sup> must sign Orders to be directed by you in everything. You will stand as far North as possible as to fall in with Portsmouth in New Hampshire, if possible, & make the first safe port to the East of Rhode Island, unless by speaking with any Americans or others you receive advice to the Contrary. You are to be very cautious who you speak to at Sea, & avoid speaking to them if possible . . . .

P.S. You are to be particularly careful that no Letters, or papers fall into the hands of the Enemy, to prevent which keep the whole always ready for sinking in Case of Accident.

Under Vardill's plan, Hynson would instead command the ship himself, and Deane agreed to the arrangement. After leaving France, Hynson would rendez-vous with a British ship, and pretend to sink the dispatches by dropping a false packet overboard, by which ploy Deane would not know he had been defrauded. The British ship would then "capture" Hynson's ship, and gain possession of the dispatches.<sup>12</sup>

With this scheme in mind, Hynson went to Paris, accompanied by Vardill and a Colonel Smith, also in Eden's employ.

Vardill returned to London shortly afterwards, but Hynson stayed on until August when he left for Havre du Grace. During his time in Paris he met regularly with Stormont or his secretary to relate whatever information he had obtained from Deane. Vardill wrote later that as a result of Hynson's intelligence "many Vessells bound to America were taken." He also claimed that a "Gent. of Distinction," probably Colonel Smith, "was also privately sent over to him to direct and receive Information, & he had proceeded thro the Capt. very far in Negotiations for Peace, with Dr. Franklin, but the Capture of Burgoyne blasted it."<sup>13</sup>

In the meantime, Hynson had devised a plan of his own. Instead of actually sailing, he decided simply to steal the dispatches and take them to London. For this, however, he would need a cover, which he found in one Captain Folger, also at Havre and in the Commissioners's service. Hynson apparently reasoned that if he postponed his departure long enough, Deane would eventually become disgusted and entrust the dispatches to Folger instead. Throughout the summer of 1777, then, Hynson repeatedly found fault with the ships being prepared for him. Deane was taken in entirely, but lost patience. He therefore sent the dispatches to Hynson to give to Folger with the instructions that the latter should set sail for America, unless, for some reason, he was prevented from so doing. In that case, Hynson should take charge and leave immediately.<sup>14</sup>



Instead, Hynson removed the dispatches from their cover and replaced them with blank papers. He then gave the dummy package to Folger, who dutifully sailed for America and delivered his embarrassing cargo to Congress. Hynson meanwhile went to London and gave the stolen papers, through Colonel Smith who had returned from France, to Eden. The dispatches contained the complete correspondence between the American Commissioners and the French Court from March 12 to October 7, 1777, as well as a number of letters to Congress and private persons in America. The dispatches represented the only communications from the Commissioners to Congress from May, 1777 to May 2, 1778.<sup>15</sup>

The theft was of course a masterful example of espionage, for which Vardill could take much of the credit. Moreover, it came on the heels of two other successes he had had in September. One involved a certain Captain Deveraux, whose vessel had been captured after a mutiny of the crew. Vardill "invited him to his House, & led him to confess, that He was bound to Amsterdam, that he had a number of letters, (one from the Board of War at Boston) to People in Holland, France & England." He delivered this information to Eden, "by which means, . . . Govt., was informed of the Articles most wanted by Congress, & of the Houses and Persons with whom they corresponded, & the Ships employed for the purpose."<sup>16</sup>

The second was an action against Bancroft's mistress. Bancroft was so successful at playing the double agent that Vardill did not know his true loyalty. But then neither did Bancroft's employer, George III, who declared to North: "Bancroft is entirely an American." In a testimony to the complexity and absurdity of Eden's organization, Vardill "formed an Acquaintance" with Bancroft's mistress, "& found, as he suspected, that She had Letters to convey from the Factions in this Country" to the Commission in Paris. Vardill's powers of persuasion must indeed have been estimable. He was eventually able to obtain "a Copy of the most material Contents of the Letters" which he gave to Eden.<sup>17</sup> Eden made a summation of the Letters, presumably for North's use, which did little more than identify the correspondents, all of whom were cautious in what they wrote in recognition of the precariousness of the conveyer.<sup>18</sup>

Nonetheless, it was a neat piece of work. In conjunction with the information from Deveraux, and the theft of the dispatches, Vardill's credibility as a government secret servant was established. His reward came soon after. In January of 1778, the warrant for his Professorship was issued.<sup>19</sup>

The information Vardill had gathered would have other effects as well. In the long run, the theft of the Commissioners's dispatches did more harm than good. They were filled with news that Congress would have found depressing, and painted a bleak picture of the possibility of a French alliance. From October to November, 1777, such information tended to strengthen the British government's resolve to continue the war, and more importantly, it presented the possibility of a negotiated peace without independence. When word of Burgoyne's defeat came at the end of November, the motive was provided to attempt the negotiated peace without delay.<sup>20</sup>

Paul Wentworth was accordingly sent to Paris to meet with Deane and Franklin. The purpose of his trip was narrow. He was not a plenipotentiary entrusted with discretionary powers, but was rather a fact finder sent to sound out the Commissioners on the idea of returning America to an amicable colonial status. His first interview was with Deane on 17 December, at which a long conversation ended with Deane insisting on independence. More than two weeks passed before the next meeting, during which time London was virtually in the dark, since, as the King remarked: "The letters from Mr. Wentworth are wrote with so little method and are so verbose it is very difficult to collect all that he wishes to convey." On January 6 he met with both Deane and Franklin. Franklin was intransigent, and refused to make sense. "I never knew him to be so

eccentric," Wentworth later wrote, "nobody says less generally and keeps a point more closely in view, but he was diffuse and unmethodical to-day."<sup>21</sup>

The reason for Franklin's strangeness was beyond Wentworth's knowing. The fact was that he and Eden were playing directly into Franklin's artful hands. The French foreign minister, Vergennes, knew of Wentworth's visit. With the news of Burgoyne's surrender, the French were given an important inducement to at last join the Americans. At the same time, Wentworth's presence raised the possibility, similar to that raised in London, of a negotiated settlement between the former colonies and Great Britain, an impression Franklin fostered by hints of an impending peace. If the French did not act quickly, it seemed that their chance to usurp Britain's overgrown power would slip away. Vergennes therefore gave hasty assurances to Franklin of a willingness to recognize American independence even before the second interview with Wentworth. On January 7, 1778, the determination to negotiate a treaty of amity and commerce with the United States was made official, and such a treaty was signed a month later.<sup>22</sup>

Eden's spies had utterly failed to prevent a Franco-American alliance. Wentworth's visit, the product of Eden's secret information from Hynson's theft, and the news of Burgoyne's defeat, had in fact precipitated a European crisis. In this instance, Eden's secret doings involved him in the con-

sequences. He and North searched for a way to quickly terminate the American troubles. Their results were the Conciliatory Act and the Carlisle Commission.

The first was legislation aimed at returning Anglo-American relations to roughly the situation of 1763, rescinding the obnoxious legislation of the pre-war years, including the Boston Port Bill. In addition, Parliament declared its abdication of the power to tax the colonies. To more effectually obtain American consent to a peace based on a return to 1763 colonial status, a commission was proposed to go to America to negotiate with Congress. This body became known as the Carlisle Commission, after its appointed head, the Earl of Carlisle. Eden, who had been instrumental in drafting the legislation for the attempt at peace, was named a member.

He was not optimistic, writing Vardill that "I am not sanguine in my Expectations by any Mode." Nonetheless, he tried to prepare himself as best he could. Eden therefore asked Vardill for "any Particulars in writing relative to the Principal Persons whom I am likely to see, & their Character, respective Opinions, & Parties."<sup>23</sup>

Vardill responded with a bitter, cutting document. Since Eden would arrive in New York, he was advised to respect the notions of proper conduct in the middle colonies, which meant maintaining "Gravity in your Deportment," avoidance of "Convivial Parties & Public Diversions," and regular church

attendance. He was strictly warned away from the loyalists of the state. Their information was unreliable, as they were under the influence of "Passion & Prejudice." Neither were they useful for their political connections. They were too obnoxious to the rebels to be helpful in "conciliating their affections. Indeed," he went on, "I humbly conceive it will, in general answer no good purpose to show preference to any man or Family friendly to Government."<sup>24</sup>

When it came to specific characters Vardill was kind to none. William Tryon, who had given Vardill financial assistance on his voyage to England, was "made by his Vanity a Dupe to every flattering Imposter." His former classmate John Jay "is possessed of a strong Understanding tho much perverted by the study of Law . . . He is obstinate, indefatigable, & dogmatical." William Smith, Jr., whom Vardill thought was Eden's potentially most valuable contact, could be "secured by an application to his Ambition." Finally, the old arch-enemy, William Livingston, was granted grudging respect. He "is a man of Genius & Understanding, an elegant writer, in principle a Republican, & violent Advocate for Independency, which has ever been his favourite Object."<sup>25</sup>

Vardill also took the opportunity to offer his suggestions for the most efficient manner of gaining congressional, and individual, acquiescence to a renewed colonial connection. Eden's best hope would be to "propose a Scheme of Government

by a Parliament in the Colonies, composed of an Order of Nobles & Patricians, & a lower House of Delegates from the Different Assemblies." Such an arrangement, besides planting the seeds of political stability, would secure to the prominent rebels "their precarious power," and assure it to "their Posterity."<sup>26</sup>

But even that unlikely plan could fail. Vardill was no more optimistic than Eden about the Commission. He warned that success depended upon Benjamin Franklin's prior approbation, which of course Eden did not have. Moreover, revealing to Eden a conception he never admitted in America, Vardill further warned that there were more rebels than Livingston who favoured "Independency from principle," which would therefore make them more difficult to convert.<sup>27</sup>

Eden could not have been encouraged. He and the Commission sailed in April and arrived in America in June. Congress, which had been denied the pessimistic dispatches from Paris by the efficiency of Eden's agents, continued to rely on what it thought was the favourable response generated in France by Burgoyne's defeat, and refused to deal with the Commission. The mission soon became a farce. Loyalist historian Thomas Jones gave a description which may not have been far removed from Vardill's private estimation:

The Commissioners, having stayed long enough in America to expend many thousands of the public money to no purpose;

to be despised by the Loyalists, laughed at, abused, insulted, and ridiculed by Congress; published some useless declarations, issued some foolish, idle, trifling proclamations; attempted to bribe some of the leading members of Congress without effect; and being denied the liberty of seeing the country and conversing with the American 'patriots,' . . . which was as submissively asked as insultingly refused, returned to England.<sup>28</sup>

Whatever slim hope the Commission had represented to Vardill was now vanished. His rapid ascent in London had come to an abrupt halt, and the idea of permanent exile in England had become a real possibility. He therefore attempted to salvage what he could from former promises. The only one remaining within the government's power to fulfil was the salary for the Regius Professorship, still a disputed matter. The salary for the position had mysteriously failed to attend the issue of the warrant. Eden's last word in April before leaving London was that he had referred the question to John Robinson, secretary of the treasury, whom he thought would satisfy Vardill's claim. In January, 1779, after his return from America, Eden confessed to Vardill to be "surprized to find that [your situation] remains as unsettled as ever." Vardill's agitation was not successful until 1780, when he received a lump sum instead of a life salary.<sup>29</sup>

At the same time he searched for something permanent which would survive the war. In early 1779, he had written John Robinson requesting an appointment in the church. The response



was negative. "In respect to Church preferment here," Robinson wrote, "you must be well aware of the great difficulties which must attend that, and I realy [sic] dont [sic] know of anything vacant or likely to become so soon that Lord North cd. confer on you."<sup>30</sup>

Robinson's difficulties arose in part from increasing opposition to the war, and a consequent tightening of the government purse. When a short, successful military action had been envisioned as an adequate measure to subdue the colonies, government could be liberal with its money. The situation had changed, and the issue of money "wasted" on servants like Vardill soon became more than a tool of government's opposition in parliament, although it continued to be that; it provided the spark for a popular mass movement. In so doing, it also provided Vardill with his last opportunity to vent his spleen against republicanism while still in government's employ.

The opposition to the war in parliament became intense after Saratoga. The subsequent conciliatory proposals which abdicated parliamentary supremacy over the empire--the original reason for going to war--made the American conflict appear an expensive Royal fiasco, instead of a national one. Added to the war's blatant mismanagement, the entry of France on the side of the Americans, and the seeming inevitability of American independence, the issue of wasted money and the King's power drifted outside the walls of the Commons, and sifted "down" to

to the freeholders of the counties. The result became known as the Yorkshire movement.<sup>31</sup>

The movement began, curiously, in Middlesex. A dispute over an election to a seat in the Commons created an excuse for a mass petitioning movement which it was hoped could be spread to county committees throughout England. The Middlesex issue, however, was not large enough for a national demonstration. That larger issue was discovered at York in December, 1779. Instead of centering protest on a county election irregularity, the Reverend Christopher Wyvill at York hit upon the complaint of wasted public money. This was a topic of universal appeal, and gave rise to a generalized reform movement prosecuted through county organizations associated into a larger, national organ intended by some to be nearly, and by others to be actually, a counter-government. For the problem of wasted money quickly became a constitutional issue. Through insufficiently guarded expenditures, the King had been able to corrupt the affections of many members of parliament, with the result that His Majesty's power in the constitution had grown rather too great. From that premise it was but a short step to propose general parliamentary reform: reappportionment, elimination of rotten boroughs, and the addition of 100 seats in the Commons.<sup>32</sup>

The movement was clearly quasi-revolutionary, involving mass meetings, committees of correspondence, riots, and threats of civil violence. At the same time, however, it carried a constitutional legitimacy, since it supplied the basis for opposition's challenge in 1780 to North's ministry, leading in April to Edmund Burke's "Oeconomical Reform Bill." The Reform Bill, which embodied Wyvill's aim of curtailing unnecessary expenditures, and therefore curtailing the King's parliamentary influence, failed. It thus became the celebrated cause of popular and parliamentary opposition, demonstrating the need for even further reaching reforms, and for a continuance of extra-constitutional activities of protest.<sup>33</sup>

To Vardill, who lived "chiefly on his Majesty's bounty," the movement's call for economy posed a personal threat. He had neither been granted his promised rewards, nor yet arranged a post-war position. For him an attack on "placemen" and the King's power was particularly ill-timed, a disastrous portent.

But it was more. Vardill had expected to find in England a vindication of the constitutional argument that had been lost in America. The Yorkshire movement was a repudiation. It represented the importation to England of those same republican, anarchical ideas which had plagued him since 1768. The Furies had followed him across the water. He therefore rose again to the constitution's defence in a series of papers called

the "Alarm," and in a pamphlet, which drew heavily upon and sometimes quoted whole paragraphs from the "Alarms," entitled An Address to the Inhabitants of London and Westminster Containing Reflections on the present State of Public Affairs.<sup>34</sup>

To begin, he registered his amazement that opposition would proceed so far at a time of national disappointment. "In a time of distress and danger," he wrote, "the lover of his country will not enfeeble its efforts by the language of despondence." The movement was a national, therefore personal danger, for an unsuccessful Britain would destroy whatever small hope he may have maintained for a return to New York. The domestic opponent, then, "who endeavours to spread a panic in the hour of danger, who exhorts us to lay down our arms, or turn them against one another!" was "an enemy more dangerous than any foreign one."<sup>35</sup>

His reasoning was reminiscent of 1768 or 1773. Indeed, he virtually quoted "Poplicola" when he charged that the leaders of the movement were "sounding the trumpet of sedition, and labouring to rouse into action those LATENT POWERS OF SOCIETY, the employment of which nothing but the EXTREMIST NECESSITY can justify." His readers could but little comprehend the danger. The idea of assembling the people for a determination of national sentiment was an appealing one, but "visionary." "Who,"

he asked, "will limit their progress?" He pointed to revolted America as the end result of mass participation in government.<sup>36</sup>

This was the fundamental point. Vardill perceived keenly, and believed firmly, that in a political society there were rulers on the one hand, and subjects on the other, and that the two should not be confused. While each individual was in a sense a part of the legislature, and retained his latent powers of violence, a properly ordered society was one where that power was delegated to legal representatives: "Poplicola's" social contract. The new movements, where people whose qualifications were "unascertain'd" were organized into associations and committees, where legal government was circumvented by mass meetings, was not only a frightening and acutely disappointing re-enactment of the drama of pre-revolutionary America. It implied and resulted in a system of government, in Yorkshire as in New York, that was destructive of liberty, controlled by demagogues, and simply would not work.

Vardill received £500 in 1780 in recognition of past services despite the Yorkshire movement. But since 1778, except for the pieces written against opposition, his services had become superfluous both to government and to himself. After 1780 he disappeared from view, convinced by Yorktown in 1781 of the reality of permanent exile. The provisions of the peace

would not be able to do for Vardill what he could not do himself; since 1775, at least, his name had been anathema in New York.

When the loyalist claims commission was established, Vardill was among the first to apply. After waiting a year --from November, 1783, when he submitted his claim, to November, 1784 when it was heard--he made his way to Lincoln's Inn Fields. The optimism of the preceding ten years had passed; but he could still expect the inadequate justice of compensation.

## Chapter VIII

### DEPENDENT OF THE CROWN

Vardill's hearing before the Loyalist Claims Commission began with an oral reading of his Memorial. Upon the completion of the reading, Vardill himself was sworn in preparation for his examination on the claim's substance. Before his examination could commence, Commissioner Dundas interjected the dry and altogether unexpected observation "that the Principles & Performances of some Persons at the beginning of the Dispute did great hurt in this Country."<sup>1</sup>

Vardill was struck dumb. Thrown into a state of mental confusion, he was prevented from "giving some Explanations, Remarks & Evidence which are material." The remainder of his testimony, repeatedly interrupted by Dundas, proceeded very badly. Indeed, his coherency seems to have fled, and his testimony to have devolved into nonsense.<sup>2</sup>

His central witnesses, Chandler and Inglis, did a better job. They both presented the claimant as uniformly loyal and of service to the Crown. Also they corroborated his losses: £100 per annum as Professor of Natural Law and Moral Philosophy at King's, and a salary as Assistant Minister of Trinity Church.

They did not attempt testimony on his salary as Regius Professor, but Inglis did him no good by overestimating his salary at Trinity by £300.<sup>3</sup>

The Regius Professorship was rejected out of hand, since "No such Office ever existed." The Commission also rejected Vardill's sly manoeuvre to obtain back pay at a professor's rate for his "four or five years" as a tutor at King's. Moreover, the fact that he was still receiving £200 per annum (begun in 1775 with Cooper and Chandler), previously £400, and had received £500 in 1780, did not auger well. Coupled with his "loyal services," the reception of so much royal bounty throughout the war made him appear a ministerial apologist and obnoxious place hunter to a government now disgraced and fallen. His claim was in real danger of complete dismissal.<sup>4</sup>

Vardill returned to his apartments in turmoil. The embarrassment before the Commission brought memories of the war years into vivid relief, and fed a moral sickness arising from the feelings of keen injustice. After sacrificing all, he was to be granted neither the honour of the country's recognition of his commitment to her cause, nor the financial compensation simple justice demanded. Moved by the desperation of unexpected trauma, he penned, that same day, a complaint to the Commission. Convinced of his own worth, he saw the prospect of the denial of compensation as a perverse error, a case of



mistaken impression to be hastily corrected.

His feelings poured from his pen in an effusion of resentment which reads like a stream of consciousness, which in a sense it was. The meticulous professor dropped all form, apparently but little recovered from the confusion of the hearing. Sentences became whole paragraphs; fragments were fitted together as they came to mind; interconnected logic vanished. Writing to request that his case be left open, his most important purpose was to refute Dundas, whose "Canons & Maxims would bear . . . very hard on me, --but on calmer Reflection I cannot conceive that the Gentleman was in earnest; but that they were thrown out for the purpose of Examination & [Searching]." Vardill's searching had not proceeded far in an atmosphere of calm reflection to judge by the chaos of his letter. Dundas had said:

'That a Man's Conduct in America before the Sword was drawn, could not be admitted in proof of his Loyalty & Merit' tho, before that Event, was perhaps, the time when the most essential Service could be performed by [ending] the Rebellion in its [birth, and] 'that it was a matter of great Indifference how a Man acted before the Sword was drawn, as many were Loyalists in 1773 who were afterwards Rebels, & that many were Rebels at that time & afterwards Loyalists,' which is true as to the Fact; but not as to the Inference it implies, (viz) that Uniform, consistent & long Usefulness & Loyalty were of no moment.--'that if a Man served his King & Country with a view to a Reward (however good his other Motives) he destroys entirely his Merit' & what seems to be the natural consequence, [he] has no title to the Reward itself nor to any Compensation for his Losses, is a Doctrine which I conceive would not be . . . in our Fleet & Armies, or even in Westminster Halls--'that Services, Information, or Publications tending to assist Government in supressing

the Rebellion are not entitled to Reward if not done in America' or because that Person thought Himself, as Regius Professor of Divinity, a Servant of the Crown, 'they are to be deemed Services to the Ministry & not to the State.'<sup>5</sup>

He followed the next day with a stinging expression of pent up frustration at the irony of being denied compensation by the very government whose ill management of the war had brought him to his present straits:

I agree with the Gentleman who . . . asserted 'that some Writings have done hurt during the Rebellion,' & will only add, that if the Clergy had wrote better & wrote more, & our Generals had fought more & wrote less, it would have been happier for Great Britain; but it is a strange inconsistency of Character prevailing in this Age in that the Clergy have become Fighters & [the] Generals [writers].<sup>6</sup>

If a fighter, writing was yet Vardill's weapon, and he deluged the Commission with letters from Eden relative to secret service, testimonials, press clippings, and "explanations." The Commission dutifully received and filed it all, ignoring Vardill's request that the materials be returned. In the end, he was successful, one of the few successes he could claim for his writings. In 1785, he received £500 for lost salary.<sup>7</sup>

Vardill disappeared almost entirely after his bout with the Commission. He is reported to have been in Ireland in 1785 and 1786. Perhaps at last he studied Irish pulpit oratory. He still sought an appointment in the church, and was

eventually successful in that as well, receiving the living at Skirbeck near London in 1791. In this he returned to an emulation of his teacher, Myles Cooper, who ended his life in Edinburgh as rector of a number of county churches.<sup>8</sup>

Vardill remained at Skirbeck until 1811, the year of his death. He was sufficiently disillusioned that there is no trace of his participation in the great events of the decade of the 1790's. At the age of forty he had retired his pen, and given up the bitter struggle of protecting men from themselves.<sup>9</sup>

## Chapter IX

### CONCLUSION

Twentieth century American myths should not be allowed to render Vardill into a myopic creature of archaic habits. He should not be considered, as Carol Berkin finds Jonathon Sewall of Massachusetts, a man "at odds with his times" and "of little faith."<sup>1</sup> Nor should he be wedged into the mould of a perpetual adolescent who was "heavily dependent on the imperial connection for psychological support" due to an infantile incapacity to "accept the emotional burdens of freedom," as Edwin G. Burrows and Michael Wallace characterize all loyalists.<sup>2</sup> One can as easily argue, and with more justice, that Vardill and the loyalists he represented acted according to the dictates of reasonable assumptions, and that, far from being myopic, he was a visionary of wide perspective. This portrait emerges from a consideration of Vardill in reference to the grand questions of loyalism: why he was loyal, why he failed, and what he had to say about the revolution.

He was, however, a somewhat limited representative. His constituents were a narrow group of colonials in middle echelon positions, dependent upon the more powerful, well edu-

cated, engaged in intellectual activity, and Anglican. Moreover, Vardill had two important distinctions. First, he left America before the bonds of social order disintegrated, and therefore did not need to base his reaction to revolution on a personal fear of violence. Second, his principles survived five years of war to be used in an English setting against the Yorkshire movement, where his response was the same as it had been in America. Vardill cannot speak for all loyalists; he cannot speak for the great and powerful, nor the poor and weak, nor even for many non-Anglicans who were otherwise in roughly similar situations.

So within his context, as an individual and a representative of an admittedly hazy class, why was he loyal? Fundamentally the answer must be, "because it was in his nature to be loyal." A large circuit may be traced to arrive again at that response, beginning with the character of his beliefs.

Vardill was born with the capacity to believe. Man is a territorial, hierarchically organized social species with a complex language. That much in itself predetermines the existence of faith, and to some degree predetermines the substance of faith. That Vardill would form beliefs of some kind was a necessary consequence of his species and his environment. At the most basic level, his beliefs filled that space in the human psychology reserved for them.

The substance or "content" of faith was both learned and innate. That there should be a leader to society, that a society can claim rights to a tract of territory, that deference should be paid to some and received from others, that at a moment of danger members of the same community should band together; these are beliefs which are traceable to instinct, not education.<sup>3</sup> But the more specific questions of who should govern and how, what amount of participation the governed should have in government, whether a parliamentary or republican arrangement is better, whether to be loyal to one group or another, will be answered more as a result of socialization, or the inculcation of learned behaviour.

Both of these sorts of "content" were to some degree beyond Vardill's control. Yet on a more specific level they were not. With the development of logical consciousness, Vardill could ferret out some of his assumptions which made less sense than he required of them, or, if not abandon them, at least recognize them for what they were. By the same token he could reinforce his attachment to other principles. His ideas of social constitution were attended by a panoply of theoretical arguments. When the argument proved the belief, the principle was strengthened.

Still more particularly, the world offered physical evidence to support or reject what would otherwise have remained mere hypotheses. As a tutor, Vardill could see the results of

poor discipline: poor learning, undesirable behaviour. As an Anglican, he could perceive the consequences of the absence of an American bishop: a lack of church unity, a dwindling stock of ministers. As a citizen, he also saw the issue of lawlessness: anarchy or tyranny. Concurrently he could see benefits to certain principles. Obedience to law protected his liberty.

These, then, were the origins of his beliefs, origins his pamphlet against Witherspoon demonstrated he understood: instinct, socialization, thought, and evidence. With the exception of the influence of instinct (which makes him a product of his species), Vardill was a product of his times. He was the son of a middle class family in New York. He attended King's College which, despite its rigours, was certainly no "Cage as the Scripture speaks, of every unclean Bird." The ease with which he slid into his profession upon graduation was perfectly in keeping with his society. And what young graduate, in Vardill's time or some other, will go far under the direction of his superiors within a hierarchical institution, who lacks the proper "Spirit of emulation?" His initiation into high level Anglicanism, into pamphlet writing, into the identification of enemies, and into the transference of religion to politics, was a matter of course. His behaviour and his political conclusions were not at odds with his times; they were at odds with a small group of revolutionaries.

Yet most of his ideas did not differ fundamentally from the revolutionaries. All societies originated in a social contract. The British version was unique for its protection of liberty. It allowed individual and collective freedom through representation, counterpoised with appointive, less controllable institutions. Representation was justified by the idea that the people should retain a part of their primeval power in the workings of government; the force of law was justified with the idea that it provided the social stability in which liberty could flourish. Society was a contract, a system of give and take. To Vardill, appointed officials, nobility, and an established religion were manifestations of the terms and conditions of a bargain struck between anarchy and tyranny at the dawn of history.

His thinking diverged on the question of independence. To Vardill it was perfectly obvious that, if America would have the blessings of England, it should copy that country. When this advice was followed, New York politics seemed to function fairly well, i.e., seldom. The infrequency of smooth political activity unconnected to a crisis indicated that America was still too young to break away from its parent. It did not yet possess the necessary social ingredients to make the break, and Vardill, in the words of Burrows and Wallace, was "little inclined to see the economic development of the colonies as evidence of their movement out of 'childhood.'"<sup>4</sup> He realized that relying on



economics as a substitute for social institutions as a means of stability within the contract would lead to an imbalanced, perverted atmosphere in which British liberty could not exist.

The reasons for America's youthfulness were clear. Immaturity did not proceed from a reliance on Great Britain. It resulted from agitators who cried for liberty as a guise for destroying liberty's necessary precondition. A call for independence from Great Britain was therefore a call for independence from liberty. This was shown no more dramatically than in the tactics of the independents. Their hostility in approaching the problems of imperial relations demonstrated that they were less interested in liberty than in the maintenance of self-serving political turmoil. Independence was therefore not only premature; it was chimerical, a false issue. Vardill did not arrive at this conclusion from personal knowledge of the revolutionaries, but from an analysis of American society and the tendency of revolutionary behaviour.

In rejecting independence, Vardill became a loyalist. He was not simply a man of little faith. On the contrary, he had too great a faith in the British version of the social contract. Nor was he incapacitated by a psychological reliance on Great Britain and its "external" support for social and political order. Vardill strenuously advocated erecting an American episcopate to free the American Anglican church from its abject reliance on Great Britain; emulation is not self-emasculation.

In his own way, a slower and more careful way, Vardill was heading toward a form of independence. But it was to have been an independence based on amicable equality after America had developed more than its economy to serve as a social buttress.

Why did he fail? No simple rubric of the loyalist position will suffice in an exchange for the myriad of physical and human conditions involved in war as an explanation for defeat. He failed because Burgoyne was a bad general, and France entered the war. He lost because Lord North did not cut the ground from under American rebels with sweeping reforms which would have left Sam Adams all alone in the streets of Boston.<sup>5</sup> The revolution was a physical contest. It did not occur in the "minds of the people," but in the minds of the revolutionaries, and they killed, captured, and banished enough of their opponents to claim the victory. Immeasurably aided by a large contingent of neutrals, they successfully seized political control, as Vardill had all along proclaimed was their object, and which is the object of any revolution. After the battles had been won came the time for completing the revolution in the minds of the people, a process unhindered by the presence of men like Vardill.

The subsequent mental revolution has made it easy for the descendants of the revolutionaries to find a rightness about the loyalists's failure. Carol Berkin's characterization

of Sewall applies well to Vardill:

Sewall's pessimism about reform, his cynicism about men's motivations, and his total lack of confidence in the masses of men were common traits among the officeholding Loyalists.<sup>6</sup>

Vardill shared Sewall's suspicions and lack of confidence. Neither the revolution in America nor the Yorkshire movement in England gave him any reassurance about the motivations of men who would reform an efficient political system. And obviously he had no faith in the "masses of men." Where would he have acquired such faith? There was little in his background to make him trust the "masses," and one can ask if there is evidence to show such faith would have been well placed.

On the one hand, then, Vardill opposed mass participation in government beyond representation; on the other he mistrusted the sincerity of republicans. His view of the resulting combination in America, an ideology of popular political involvement which formed the fertile ground for demagogues, was pernicious in both respects. The independent country began its career in the midst of dangerous self-delusion. Easily led by unscrupulous men, it was in any case possessed of an imbalanced ideology. The fact that the country survived does not negate Vardill's evaluation. He did not contend that an imbalanced society would die. His position was that it would be a society pervaded by violence and devoid of liberty.

How wrong was he? In 1775, Vardill had already perceived a hypocrisy of the revolution which would endure for two hundred years. As "Coriolanus" he parodied the Second Continental Congress:

Resolved . . . That all Men, as the Offspring of the same Parent, have an equal Right to Liberty, but that, for the Advancement of Agriculture and Commerce, and for the Convenience and Ease of civil Life, it is just and reasonable for every American to keep in Bondage and Servitude as many Indians and Blacks as he can [entrap], purchase or seize.<sup>7</sup>

How many other sacrifices have been made "for the Advancement of Agriculture and Commerce?" Moreover, where is the post-revolutionary trust in reform and mass movements? And did Vardill perceive that, after cutting the ties with England, the ascent of the radicals would engender a xenophobic, intensely ethnocentric ideological isolation, to be broken only by war or coercive economic exploitation? Did he as well foresee that the bigotry of the revolutionaries would transfer itself into an incestuous "Americanism," enshrining a narrow two party spectrum of legitimate political activity?<sup>8</sup> The success of the revolution crystallized an imbalanced society, which to Vardill implied fearful consequences. His fears, unfortunately, have been realized as greatly as have the hopes of the revolution.

F O O T N O T E S

## Notes for Chapter I

<sup>1</sup> John Maunsell to John Foler, Esq., New York, December 20, 1773, American Loyalists: Transcripts of the Manuscript Books and Papers of the Commission of Enquiry into the Losses and Services of the American Loyalists, Public Record Office, London, "Memorial of John Vardill," and supporting papers, Audit Office 13, Vol. 105 [hereinafter: P.R.O.A.O. 13/105], p. 243 [microfilm; microfilm pagination].

<sup>2</sup> Bruce E. Steiner, Samuel Seabury, 1729-1796, A Study in the High Church Tradition (Ohio: Ohio University Press, 1971), p. 408, n.

<sup>3</sup> Mary Beth Norton, The British-Americans, The Loyalist Exiles in England, 1774-1789 (Boston, Toronto: Little Brown and Company, 1972), p. 45.

<sup>4</sup> Count Leo Nikolayevich Tolstoy, War and Peace, 2 vols., Rosemary Edmonds, trans. (Middlesex, England: Penguin Books, c. 1957), II, 1193; the reference is to Napoleon.

<sup>5</sup> It is worthy of noting that War and Peace is a classic of this very approach--with the addition of fiction--both in its choice of perspective and its historiographical passages.

<sup>6</sup> Norton, p. 45.

## Notes for Chapter II

<sup>1</sup> Residence ascertained from: John Vardill to the Honble. Commissioners, November 9, 1784, P.R.O.A.O. 13/105, pp. 309-11; examination of witnesses in claimant's absence: Mary Beth Norton, The British-Americans, The Loyalist Exiles in England, 1774-1789 (Boston, Toronto: Little Brown and Company, 1972), p. 202.

<sup>2</sup> Norton, pp. 200, 202-3; Danby Pickering, ed., Statutes at Large From Magna Charta to the End of the Eleventh Parliament of Great Britain Anno 1761 (Cambridge: John Archdeacon, Printer to the University, 1786), 34, 371; for the Commissioners see Hugh Edward Egerton, ed., Coke, Daniel Parker, The Royal Commission on the Losses and Services of American Loyalists, 1783 to 1785, Being the Notes of Mr. Daniel Parker Coke, M.P., One of the Commissioners During that Period (New York: Burt Franklin, 1971) [hereinafter: Egerton, The Royal Commission], pp. xxxii, xxxiv-xxxv; for Wilmot's attitude see The Parliamentary History of England, From the Earliest Period to the Year 1803 (London: T. C. Hansard, Peterborough-Court, Fleet Street, 1813), 36 vols., XXIII, 563-70, also quoted in John Eardley-Wilmot, Historical View of the Commission for Enquiring into the Losses, Services, and Claims of the American Loyalists, At the Close of the War Between Great Britain and Her Colonies, in 1783: With an Account of the Compensation Granted to them by Parliament in 1785 and 1788 (London: J. Nichols, Son, and Bentley, 1815), pp. 24-37.

<sup>3</sup> Norton, pp. 198-200.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid., pp. 202-4; Eardley-Wilmot, "Appendix No. I," pp. 113-16, importance of personal appearance, pp. 117-18; John Bassett More, ed., International Adjudications, Arbitration of Claims for Compensation for Losses and Damages Resulting from Lawful Impediments to the Recovery of Pre-War Debts (New York: Oxford University Press, 1931), p. 464.

<sup>5</sup> "Memorial of John Vardill," P.R.O.A.O. 13/105, pp. 186-91 [three copies with slight differences]; American Loyalists: Transcripts of the Manuscript Books and Papers . . . , Public Record Office, London, Audit Office 12, Vol. 12, pp. 22-35 [microfilm: 12-18] [hereinafter: P.R.O.A.O. 12], "Memorial of John Vardill."

<sup>6</sup> P.R.O.A.O. 13/105, pp. 186-91; last quotation is from Egerton, p. 254. Wallace Brown also remarks on

Vardill's early residence in England, saying that he, Dr. Edward Bancroft, and Paul Wentworth ". . . could hardly be called refugees because they left before the troubles began . . . ," The Good Americans: The Loyalists in the American Revolution (New York: William Morrow and Co., Inc., 1969), p. 154.

<sup>7</sup> P.R.O.A.O. 13/105, pp. 186-91.

<sup>8</sup> P.R.O.A.O. 12/109, p. 293 [microfilm: 134].



## Notes for Chapter III

<sup>1</sup> L. F. S. Upton, The Loyal Whig, William Smith of New York & Quebec (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1969), p. 4.

<sup>2</sup> Edmund B. O'Callahan, ed., The Documentary History of the State of New York (Albany: Weed, Parsons & Co., 1849-51), 4 vols., I, 473; by 1756 the city's population had shrunk by 158 whites and ninety-six blacks. For population distribution see Herman R. Friis, "A Series of Population Maps of the Colonies and the United States, 1625-1790," in The Geographical Review, XXX (July, 1940), 463-70.

<sup>3</sup> Upton, p. 4; pp. 4-5.

<sup>4</sup> Julius Goebel, Jr., and T. Raymond Naughton, Law Enforcement in Colonial New York, A Study in Criminal Procedure (1644-1776) (Montclair, New Jersey: Patterson Smith, 1970), pp. 702-6. Treatment of offending slaves was as barbaric as any Inquisition: in ". . . trials incident to the alleged conspiracies of 1712 and 1741 sixteen slaves were burned alive, one was hanged in chains until he was dead from lack of sustenance and one was ordered broken on a wheel and to continue languishing until death," pp. 703-4. The trend in English law in the early and middle eighteenth century was toward harsher penalties and enlargement of statute-defined capital offences, suggestions being made that the fate of the New York slaves be put into general practice for all capital offenders, who ranged from pickpockets netting more than 12 Pence to one who cut down another's trees, Leon Radinowicz, A History of English Criminal Law and its Administration from 1750 (London: Stevens & Sons Limited, 1948-68), 4 vols. Volume I, The Movement for Reform, 231-237, 11. Goebel and Naughton remark that "Colonial practice was built upon a fairly exact copy of the English. . . ." p. 702, though with a haphazard compassion.

<sup>5</sup> Newtonian Physics, whose "natural laws" were able to explain most of the physical universe until the early twentieth century, suggested there were other similarly "simple" systems of explanation for other disciplines, e.g., a system of the body for medicine [Daniel J. Boorstin, The Americans: The Colonial Experience (New York: Vintage Books, 1964), p. 214].

<sup>6</sup> Samuel Johnson, "Autobiography" [1768-70], in Herbert and Carol Schneider, eds., Samuel Johnson, President

of King's College, His Career and Writings, Volume I, Autobiography and Letters (New York: Columbia University Press, 1929) [hereinafter: Schneiders, Johnson], p. 45.

<sup>7</sup> For the eighteenth century conflict of Rationalism and Pietism see Edwin Scott Gaustad, The Great Awakening in New England (Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1968), pp. 1-3, 81-82; for a classic rationalization of Newton and God by an English clergyman see "Bishop Berkeley to Dr. Johnson" in Thomas Bradbury Chandler, The Life of Samuel Johnson, D.D., The First President of King's College, in New-York (New York: Printed by T. & J. Swords, No. 160 Pearl-Street, 1805), "Appendix," pp. 158-60.

<sup>8</sup> Milton Halsey Thomas, "Vardill, John," in Dumas Malone, ed., Dictionary of American Biography (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, c. 1936 by American Council of Learned Societies, 2nd ed.), 12 vols., X, 222-23 [hereinafter: D.A.B.]; "Abstract of Wills Recorded in the Surrogate's Office, City of New York," New York Historical Society Collections, XXV-XLI, VIII, 357. There is some question regarding Vardill's birthday. Frederick Lewis Weis puts Vardill's birth at 1752 with his A.B., King's in 1766 ["The Colonial Clergy of the Middle Colonies: New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania, 1628-1776," Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society, April 18, 1956-October 17, 1956 (Worcester, Mass.: Published by the Society, 1957), vol. 66, 167-351, p. 335], possibly based on the information in Gentleman's Magazine (January, 1811), which has him die on 16 January, 1811 at the age of fifty-nine, which would mean he was born in 1752. The information in the D.A.B., however, is preferred until its source can be checked (T. A. Wright, Records of the Reformed Dutch Church . . . New York: Baptisms) owing to circumstantial evidence. If he spent the normal four years in obtaining his degree, he would have enrolled at age ten, contrary to the evidence of David C. Humphrey, who found the youngest freshman to be just under twelve. If that student happened to be Vardill, he would have enrolled in 1763, and taken an unlikely three years ["King's College in the City of New York, 1754-1776" (Ph.D. Dissertation, Northwestern University, 1968), pp. 344, 373].

<sup>9</sup> That the Vardills were not among the "elite" is supported by Humphrey, p. 362, where he says only ". . . two boys from elite families entered the ministry, and one of these did not do so until 1800." It is unlikely that the remaining "elite" student was sea Captain Thomas Vardill's son. Remainder of paragraph drawn from: "Abstract of Wills," NYHS Collections, XXXVIII, 106, 306, XXXI, 389, XXXIX, 107,

82; "Diary of William Dunlap (1766-1839), The Memoirs of a Dramatist, Theatrical Manager, Painter, Critic, Novelist, and Historian," in *ibid.*, LXII, 252; "The Letters and Papers of Cadwallader Colden: Additional Letters and Papers, 1749-1775, and Some of Colden's Writings," in *ibid.*, LXVIII, 191-92.

<sup>10</sup> Dorothy Rita Dillon, The New York Triumvirate: A Study of the Legal and Political Careers of William Livingston, John Morrin Scott, William Smith, Jr. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1949), p. 32.

<sup>11</sup> Patricia U. Bonomi, A Factious People: Politics and Society in Colonial New York (New York: Columbia University Press, 1971), pp. 176-77; and Upton, p. 28; although for some reason Carl Bridenbaugh reports only six Anglicans, Mitre and Sceptre, Transatlantic Faiths, Ideas, Personalities, and Politics, 1689-1775 (New York: Oxford University Press, 1962), p. 144.

<sup>12</sup> Quoted in Bridenbaugh, p. 144.

<sup>13</sup> Dillon, pp. 33-35; Upton, pp. 28-29.

<sup>14</sup> Johnson, "Autobiography," in Schneiders, Johnson, p. 33.

<sup>15</sup> William Smith, Jr., "A Prayer," Independent Reflector, May 31, 1753, quoted in Upton, p. 29.

<sup>16</sup> As Humphrey remarks: ". . . the movement to found a college faltered because it could not serve the interests of both civic concern and intercolonial Anglicanism," p. 4.

<sup>17</sup> Bonomi, p. 177.

<sup>18</sup> Dillon, p. 39; Upton, p. 33; Humphrey, p. 46.

<sup>19</sup> Upton, pp. 31-33.

<sup>20</sup> Johnson, "Autobiography," in Schneiders, Johnson, p. 36.

<sup>21</sup> New York, "An Act for appropriating the Moneys Raised by diverse Lotterys for Erecting or founding a College in this Colony," 1 December 1756, in The Colonial Laws of New York From the Year 1664 to the Revolution (Albany: James B. Lyon, 1894), 5 vols., IV, 161-62; quotation, p. 161.

22 The French and Indian War had come to New York's interior, identified by Upton as a factor in the compromise on funds, p. 33.

23 Samuel Johnson, "Advertisement," The New York Gazette: or the Weekly Post Boy, June 3, 1754, in "Old New York and Trinity Church," NYHS Collections, III, 145-408, 166-69 [hereinafter: Johnson, "Advertisement"], see below.

24 Quoted in Humphrey, p. 421.

25 Ibid., p. 345.

26 Johnson, "Advertisement," p. 167.

27 Ibid.

28 Ibid., p. 168.

29 See note 8, above.

30 Johnson, "Autobiography," in Schneiders, Johnson, pp. 32-33. His salary amounted to £400.

31 "At a meeting of the Rector, Church Wardens and Vestrymen . . . 20th December 1753," in Schneiders, Johnson, p. 172.

32 Johnson, "Advertisement," p. 168.

33 Ibid.; Humphrey, p. 391.

34 "Laws and Orders of King's College, adopted June 3, 1755," in A History of Columbia University, 1754-1904 (New York: Columbia University Press, 1904) [hereinafter: "Laws and Orders of King's College," and page number], pp. 449-50; "Plan of Education of King's College, adopted March 1, 1763," in ibid. [hereinafter: "Plan of Education of King's College," and page number], p. 452.

35 Samuel Johnson, "A paper which I desire may be read to the Governors . . . ." quoted in Humphrey, pp. 424-25.

36 Humphrey, pp. 416-17; "Laws and Orders of King's College," pp. 447, 449; "Plan of Education of King's College," pp. 452-53.

37 "Laws and Orders of King's College," p. 449.

<sup>38</sup> Samuel Johnson, "An Exhortation to the Graduates" [Commencement, 1762], quoted in Humphrey, p. 419.

<sup>39</sup> "Laws and Orders of King's College," pp. 447-48.

<sup>40</sup> Clarence Hayden Vance, "Myles Cooper," The Columbia University Quarterly, 22 (September, 1930), 261-86, 270.

<sup>41</sup> Comparison of programs in "Laws and Orders of King's College" under Johnson, and "Plan of Education of King's College" under Cooper; see also, Humphrey, p. 479.

<sup>42</sup> Vance, pp. 262-63; Johnson, "Autobiography," p. 38; formal requests for a "vice-president" were made by the Governors of the College: Vance, *ibid.*; Humphrey, p. 174.

<sup>43</sup> Johnson, "Autobiography," in Schneiders, Johnson, pp. 39-40.

<sup>44</sup> *Ibid.* Johnson's personal life was something of a tale of woe: his son died of smallpox, 1756; his wife of some other illness, 1758, while out of the city to avoid the smallpox; his step-daughter Gloriana Maverick, "the stay of the family," died in 1759; and his step-son, Benjamin Nicoll, died in 1760 [Humphrey, pp. 144-45], all of which preceded the death of his second wife.

<sup>45</sup> Vance, pp. 163-64; for relations with Governors see Humphrey, p. 154, *passim*.

<sup>46</sup> See note 41.

<sup>47</sup> Myles Cooper to John Vardill, 13 April 1775, P.R.O.A.O. 13/105.

<sup>48</sup> Book of Misdemeanors alias Black Book, quoted in A History of Columbia University, pp. 38-39.

<sup>49</sup> Vance, p. 263; A History of Columbia University, pp. 37-38.

<sup>50</sup> Chandler, p. 106; and Archbishop Secker to Samuel Johnson, n.d., in "Appendix," in *ibid.*, pp. 179-80.

<sup>51</sup> Vance, pp. 262, 279-80; Humphrey, pp. 188, 489-94.

<sup>52</sup> Samuel Auchmuty to Samuel Johnson, May 25, 1767, quoted in Humphrey, p. 360.

53 Vance, p. 266; Vardill had no doubt let it be known before graduation that he intended to read theology and would appreciate a post as tutor.

54 "A Real Churchman," The New York Journal; or, the General Advertiser, December 22, 1774, in "Old New York and Trinity Church," NYHS Collections, III, 257.

55 Ibid.

56 John Vardill to the Honble. Commissioners, December 15, 1784, P.R.O., A.O. 13/105, p. 341.

57 Humphrey, pp. 363-64 describes post-graduate training for the ministry at King's.

58 John Vardill to the Honble. Commissioners, December 15, 1784, P.R.O., A.O. 13/105, p. 341; italics deleted.

59 Ibid., November 9, 1784, p. 310.

60 Samuel Clossy to Mr. Cleghorn, August 1, 1764, in Byron Stookey, "Samuel Clossy, A.B., M.D., F.R.C.P. of Ireland, First Professor of Anatomy, King's College (Columbia), New York," Bulletin of the History of Medicine, XXXVIII (March-April, 1964), 153-67, 166.

61 John Vardill to the Honble. Commissioners, November 9, 1784, P.R.O., A.O. 13/105, p. 10.

## Notes for Chapter IV

<sup>1</sup> Samuel Johnson, "Autobiography" [1768-70], in Herbert and Carol Schneider, eds., Samuel Johnson, President of King's College, His Career and Writings, Volume I, Autobiography and Letters (New York: Columbia University Press, 1929) [hereinafter: Schneiders, Johnson], p. 47; for a fuller account of Giles and Wilson, see Charles Inglis to the S.P.G., April 9, 1766, in John Wolfe Lydekker, The Life and Letters of Charles Inglis, His Ministry in America and Consecration as First Colonial Bishop, from 1759 to 1787 (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1936), pp. 53-55.

<sup>2</sup> Carl Bridenbaugh, Mitre and Sceptre, Transatlantic Faiths, Ideas, Personalities, and Politics, 1689-1775 (New York: Oxford University Press, 1962), pp. 266-67; Milton Klein, "The American Whig: William Livingston of New York" (Ph.D. Dissertation, Columbia University, 1954), pp. 596-97. The most opportune moment--the end of the Seven Years War--had already passed, and chances for a bishop after the Stamp Act were dimmer than American Anglicans knew [Thomas Secker to Samuel Johnson, December 20, 1761, in Thomas Bradbury Chandler, The Life of Samuel Johnson, D.D., The First President of King's College, in New-York (New York: Printed by T. & J. Swords, No. 160 Pearl-Street, 1805), "Appendix," p. 184; A. L. Cross, The Anglican Episcopate and the American Colonies (Hamden, Connecticut: Archon Books, 1964), p. 252].

<sup>3</sup> Chandler, Life of Johnson, pp. 114-15.

<sup>4</sup> Bridenbaugh, p. 289.

<sup>5</sup> Chandler, Life of Johnson, p. 115; Bridenbaugh, p. 266; Cross, p. 164.

<sup>6</sup> Samuel Johnson to the Archbishop of Canterbury, September 25, 1767, in Schneiders, Johnson, p. 419; Thomas Bradbury Chandler to Samuel Johnson, August 20, 1767, in *ibid.*, p. 417.

<sup>7</sup> Thomas Bradbury Chandler, An Appeal to the Public in Behalf of the Church of England in America (New York: James Parker, 1767), p. 31; although Klein finds Chandler a dubious choice for the task, being something of a controversy-monger; still, Chandler's restraint is obvious, though it is without compromise or apology [Klein, "American Whig," pp. 597-98].

<sup>8</sup> Chandler, Appeal, p. 3, *passim*.

- 9 Chandler, Appeal, pp. 29-30.
- 10 Ibid., pp. 32-34.
- 11 Ibid., pp. 16, 25.
- 12 Ibid., pp. 36, 34-39.
- 13 Ibid., p. 45.
- 14 Ibid., p. 41.
- 15 Ibid.
- 16 Ibid., pp. 40-45.
- 17 Ibid., p. 29; the entire passage is in italics.
- 18 Bridenbaugh, p. 293.
- 19 Quoted in John Ewer (Bishop of Landaff), A Sermon Preached before the Incorporated Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts; At their Anniversary Meeting in the Parish Church of St. Mary-Le-Bow, On Friday February 20, 1767 (London; New York: rpt. by James Parker, 1768), p. 3.
- 20 Ibid., p. 5.
- 21 Ibid.
- 22 Ibid., p. 16.
- 23 William Livingston, A Letter to the Right Reverend Father in God, John, Lord Bishop of Landaff, Occasioned by Some Passages in his Lordship's Sermon, on the 20th of February, 1767, in which the American Colonies are loaded with great and undeserved Reproach (New York: Printed for the Author, 1768), pp. 1-2.
- 24 Ibid., p. 7.
- 25 Ibid., p. 8; Charles Chauncy, A Letter to a Friend Containing Certain Remarks on Certain Passages in a Sermon Preached by the Right Reverend in God, John Lord Bishop of Landaff (Boston: Kneeland & Adams for Leverett, 1767), p. 47.
- 26 Chauncy, A Letter to a Friend, pp. 44, 43.
- 27 Ibid., p. 46.



28 Chauncy, A Letter to a Friend, pp. 52-53.

29 Ibid., pp. 52, 47.

30 Chauncy answered the Appeal in April, 1768 (The Appeal . . . Answered); Chandler replied in May, 1769 (The Appeal Defended); in January, 1770, Chauncy hit back with A Reply to Chandler's Appeal Defended, and anticipated the answer with A Complete View of Episcopacy (May, 1771); Chandler's last was The Appeal Farther Defended (June, 1771); for full titles and publication data see "BIBLIOGRAPHY."

31 William Livingston to Noah Welles, February 2, 1768, quoted in Bridenbaugh, p. 297; Bridenbaugh's italics.

32 Samuel Johnson to Thomas Secker, May 10, 1768, in Schneiders, Johnson, pp. 439-40; Chandler, Life of Johnson, p. 116.

33 April 7, 1768, in Schneiders, Johnson, p. 436.

34 Cross, p. 195; Thomas Bradbury Chandler to Samuel Johnson, September 9, 1768, April 7, 1768, in Schneiders, Johnson, pp. 447-48, 437.

35 Chandler to Johnson, in Schneiders, Johnson, p. 437 [April 7, 1768].

36 Bridenbaugh, pp. 266-67.

37 William Smith to Bishop Terrick, Philadelphia, October 22, 1768 (vii, 40-41), in William Wilson Manross, ed., The Fulham Papers in Lambeth Palace Library: American Colonial Section Calendar and Indexes (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965), p. 116 [hereinafter: Fulham Calendar followed by entry number and page number].

38 Quoted in Bridenbaugh, p. 300.

39 Chandler to Samuel Johnson, January 22, 1768, in Schneiders, Johnson, p. 433.

40 Auchmuty to Samuel Johnson, March 21, 1769, in Bridenbaugh, p. 302; see also *ibid.*, p. 292. For a sketch of Samuel Auchmuty, see "Old New York and Trinity Church," NYHS Collections, III, 280-82.

41 April 7, 1768, in Schneiders, Johnson, p. 436.

42 "Memorial of Samuel Seabury," P.R.O., A.O. 12/19,

p. 356 [microfilm plate 196]; the possibility of Cooper's involvement stems from the fact that he would later (around 1772) engage in a similar scheme with the same participants [Vance, "Myles Cooper," p. 274]; the possibility of Vardill playing a part is simple speculation.

<sup>43</sup> Klein, p. 621.

<sup>44</sup> Vardill later complained to the Loyalist Claims Commission: "My being in England seems to have led to an Idea, that I had quitted or resigned my Appointments at Newyork; but it must be remembered that we had no Bishop in America to ordain . . . ." John Vardill to the Honble. Commissioners, November 9, 1784, P.R.O., A.O. 13/105, p. 310.

<sup>45</sup> Chandler remarked to Johnson that ". . . where so many people are in their turn to have a lick at the Whig, it is not to be expected that all will acquit themselves with equal prudence, dexterity, and decency," quoted in Bridenbaugh, p. 304; possibly, then, Vardill was not the only King's graduate student involved, for it is difficult to think Chandler would make the comment referring only to the members of the Whip planning conference.

<sup>46</sup> American Whig No. I, March 14, 1768, in [John Holt, ed.] A Collection of Tracts From the Late News Papers, &c. Containing Particularly The American Whig, A Whip for the American Whig, With Some Other Pieces, On the Subject of the Residence of Protestant Bishops in the American Colonies, and in answer to the Writers who opposed it, &c. (New York: John Holt, 1768-69), 2 vols. [title varies slightly], I, 4-5. All references below are to Holt's Collection. To avoid needless repetition, only the volume number and pages are given following the title of the piece and its number and date. The American Whig appeared in James Parker's New York Gazette, or The Weekly Post Boy, and the Whip appeared in Hugh Gaines' New York Mercury [title changes to The New York Gazette; and the Weekly Mercury in February, 1769]. Therefore, only additional insertions, such as "Advertisements," are identified by paper. "Ibid." will refer only to the Whig, Whip, or other piece; it will not be used to indicate Holt's Collection.

<sup>47</sup> Livingston seemed to realize the invulnerability of his position, which was, essentially, that he had little, or nothing to lose; see below in text with reference to Seabury's request for evidence.

<sup>48</sup> American Whig No. I, March 14, 1768, I, 5.

<sup>49</sup> Ibid., pp. 2, 6.

<sup>50</sup> American Whig No. III, March 28, 1768, I, 20-22; ibid., No. IV, April 4, 1768, "To the Author of the American Whig," I, 28; ibid., I, 32.

<sup>51</sup> American Whig No. I, March 14, 1768, I, 5; ibid., No. IV, April 4, 1768, I, 31, 31-32.

<sup>52</sup> American Whig No. XXVIII, September 19, 1768, II, 170, 170-71, 171, 172.

<sup>53</sup> American Whig, No. III, March 28, 1768, I, 20.

<sup>54</sup> "Remarks on the Title, of a Whip for the American Whig," New York Gazette, or The Weekly Post Boy, April 4, 1768, I, 28.

<sup>55</sup> American Whig No. III, March 28, 1768, I, 21.

<sup>56</sup> Inglis to Samuel Johnson, March 22, 1768, in Lydekker, p. 77.

<sup>57</sup> "An Advertisement to the Public," New York Gazette, or The Weekly Post Boy, March 21, 1768, I, 8-9, 10.

<sup>58</sup> "Verdicus's Verses to the Whig Writer," April 4, 1768, I, 51.

<sup>59</sup> A Whip for the American Whig No. I [hereinafter: "Whip"], April 4, 1768, I, 37-38, 39.

<sup>60</sup> Carl Lotus Becker, The History of Political Parties in the Province of New York (Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press, 1960), pp. 58-59; Klein, p. 605; Patricia U. Bonomi, A Factious People: Politics and Society in Colonial New York (New York: Columbia University Press, 1971), pp. 240-44. Klein is the 'modern writer.'

<sup>61</sup> Whip No. I, April 4, 1768, I, 39; superior letter supplied.

<sup>62</sup> Whip No. II, April 11, 1768, I, 54.

<sup>63</sup> Whip No. II, April 4, 1768, I, 56, 54; Whip No. VII, May 16, 1768, I, 137; "Independent" label: Whip No. XXIV, September 19, 1768, II, 161.

<sup>64</sup> See note 13.

<sup>65</sup> Whip No. XXXV, December 5, 1768, II, 317.

<sup>66</sup> Whip No. I, April 4, 1768, I, 41; Livingston and Seabury: Seabury, "Advertisement," Gaine's New York Mercury, March 28, 1768, I, 13, and American Whig, Nō. IV, April 4, 1768, I, 34; that the Whip understood that its arguments were being dispelled without being refuted: Whip No. XXVI, October, 3, 1768, II, p. 197; that civil power derived from parliament: Whip No. XLI, January 23, 1769, II, 395.

<sup>67</sup> [John Vardill] "A Freeholder," "Answers to the Reasons Lately Published . . .," Nos. I, II, III (Clifford Ship-ton, ed., Early American Imprints 1639-1800, Nos. 11260-62; hereinafter: AI, and number) ["The Freeholder" will hereinafter be referred to there as, with its own number corresponding to AI]; these papers also appear in P.R.O., A.O. 13/105, beginning on p. 52, with authorship ascribed to Vardill in his own hand; Klein, p. 637.

<sup>68</sup> "The Freeholder," III.

<sup>69</sup> Ibid., III, II.

<sup>70</sup> Ibid., III.

<sup>71</sup> "To the Authors of the American Whig, and Timothy Tickle, Esq., his Ghostly Flagellator," Connecticut Journal (New Haven), May 13, 1768, I, 136.

<sup>72</sup> Both quoted in Bridenbaugh, Chandler, p. 304, and Auchmuty, p. 302.

<sup>73</sup> Samuel Johnson to William Samuel Johnson, November 24, 1769, in Schneiders, Johnson, p. 477; Chandler to Samuel Johnson, July 7, 1768, in ibid., p. 444.

<sup>74</sup> See William Nelson, The American Tory (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1961), pp. 16-17.

<sup>75</sup> That is, Bridenbaugh and Cross.

<sup>76</sup> American Whig No. XXVIII, Sept. 19, 1768, II, 167; ibid., No. II, March 21, 1768, I, 6.

<sup>77</sup> See quotation, p. 30, and note 21.

<sup>78</sup> Chandler had early seen a connection between the state of the colonial Anglican church and the degree of harmony existing between America and Britain, contending that if the latter had paid more attention to the church, "a general submission in y<sup>e</sup> Colonies to y<sup>e</sup> Mother Country, in everything not sinful, might have been expected" [Chandler to the S.P.G., January 15, 1766, quoted in Albert H. Hoyt, "The Rev. Thomas Bradbury Chandler, D.D., 1726-1790," New-England Historical

and Genealogical Register and Antiquarian Journal, XXVII, July 1873, 227-36, p. 233]. Notice his disclaimer: "in everything not sinful." The definition of the phrase seems to be the crux of the matter, and Bridenbaugh and Cross appear to conclude that Chandler would not consider slavery "sinful," for his "admission" to Bishop Terrick (October 21, 1767) that he omitted certain "Facts and Reasons" from the Appeal which would have had a great effect on "our Superiors . . . as are governed altogether by political Motives," is considered by them a persuasive support for Dissenter and Whig arguments [see Bridenbaugh, p. 292; and Cross, p. 166].

79 For example, Bridenbaugh, pp. 288, 292.

80 "The Freeholder," III.

81 In this, however, I agree with Bridenbaugh, pp. 306-7; though he finds [p. 307] church-state separation as necessary as does the Whig, which automatically implies evil to the Whippers.

## Notes for Chapter V

<sup>1</sup> For a brief but lucid description of New York in 1770 through the eyes of William Smith, Jr., see Upton, The Loyal Whig, pp. 66-75; Lawrence Henry Gipson makes it clear that finding the period 1770 to 1773 "quiet," although he would add "pregnant," is not unusual [The Coming of the Revolution, 1763-1775 (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1962), p. 222].

<sup>2</sup> Henry Van Schaack, The Life of Peter Van Schaack, LL.D., Embracing Selections From His Correspondence and Other Writings, During the American Revolution, and His Exile in England (New York: Appleton & Co., 1842), pp. 5, 22; Frank Monaghan, John Jay, Defender of Liberty (New York and Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1935), p. 39.

<sup>3</sup> "A Real Churchman," The New York Journal; or, the General Advertiser, December 22, 1774, in "Old New York and Trinity Church," NYHS Collections, III, 257.

<sup>4</sup> "J.E.P." [unlisted in "Contributors"] D.A.B., X, 435-38.

<sup>5</sup> Chandler to Samuel Johnson, September 9, 1768, in Herbert and Carol Schneider, eds., Samuel Johnson, President of King's College, His Career and Writings, Volume I, Autobiography and Letters (New York: Columbia University Press, 1929) [hereinafter: Schneiders, Johnson], p. 448.

<sup>6</sup> D.A.B., X, 435-38.

<sup>7</sup> John Witherspoon, Address to the Inhabitants of Jamaica, and Other West-India Islands, In Behalf of the College of New Jersey (Philadelphia: William and Thomas Bradford, 1772), p. 6

<sup>8</sup> Ibid., pp. 7-8, 10-11, 12, 14.

<sup>9</sup> Ibid., pp. 20, 21, 22, 25.

<sup>10</sup> Memorial of John Vardill, P.R.O., A.O. 13/105, pp. 186-91

<sup>11</sup> [John Vardill and Myles Cooper] Candid Remarks on Dr. Witherspoon's Address to the Inhabitants of Jamaica And the other West-India Islands; &C. In a Letter to those Gentlemen (Philadelphia: 1772), AI 12346. This is ascribed in a contemporary hand to Vardill, who also published a newspaper rebuttal to Witherspoon, but which was not available [New-York

Gazette and Weekly Mercury, October 24, 1768]. Cooper's authorship established: Myles Cooper's testimonial re Var-dill's claim, December 1, 1783, P.R.O., A.O. 13/105, p. 307.

<sup>12</sup> Ibid., pp. 5, 6, 11, 20, 23.

<sup>13</sup> Ibid., pp. 23-25.

<sup>14</sup> Ibid., pp. 28, 29.

<sup>15</sup> Ibid., pp. 35, 33-34.

<sup>16</sup> Ibid., pp. 31, 29.

<sup>17</sup> Ibid., pp. 56, 37, 45.

<sup>18</sup> Ibid., p. 52.

<sup>19</sup> Columbia University, History of Columbia University, has him the first American professor of law, p. 335, and "Index," p. 492; D.A.D., X, 222-23.

<sup>20</sup> Gipson, pp. 217-18.

<sup>21</sup> "To the Worthy Inhabitants of New York" (New York: 1773), AI, 12955-12957 [originally in Rivington's Gazette beginning November 8, 1773]; Gipson, pp. 218-19.

<sup>22</sup> "To the Worthy Inhabitants of New York," I, III.

<sup>23</sup> Ibid., III. The right to revolution and related beliefs will be found in a number of loyalist pamphlets; see for example: Joseph Galloway, "A Candid Examination," in Merrill Jensen, ed., Tracts of the American Revolution, 1763-1776 (Indianapolis, New York, Kansas City: Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1967), p. 368.

<sup>24</sup> "To the Worthy Inhabitants of New York," III.

<sup>25</sup> Ibid.; the "later loyalist" is "Grotius," Pills for the Delegates . . . . (New York: James Rivington, 1775), AI, 14094, p. 31.

## Notes for Chapter VI

- <sup>1</sup> John Vardill, "Old England's Triumph: For the Sons of St. George (Tune, Hail England, Old England, etc.)" (New York: n.d.), P.R.O., A.O. 13/105, p. 114.
- <sup>2</sup> D.A.B., X, 222-23; Memorial of John Vardill, P.R.O., A.O. 13/105, pp. 186-191; Vardill to the Commissioners, November 9, 1784, *ibid.*, p. 310; David Humphrey, "King's College in the City of New York, 1754-1776" (Ph.D. Dissertation, Northwestern University, 1968), pp. 310-11, 294-95, 301.
- <sup>3</sup> Humphrey, pp. 295-302.
- <sup>4</sup> Chandler to Samuel Johnson, March 14, 1771, in Schneiders, Johnson, p. 477.
- <sup>5</sup> Humphrey, pp. 294, 308, 312.
- <sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 309, 312; "Extract of a Letter from Ld. Dartmouth . . . Nov. 17, 1784," P.R.O., A.O. 13/105, p. 320.
- <sup>7</sup> Vardill to James Duane, September 15, 1774, quoted in Humphrey, p. 311; Dartmouth obtained the appointment for Vardill, "Extract of Letter from Ld. Dartmouth," P.R.O., A.O. 13/105, p. 320; Vardill claimed £200 in his Memorial, but the supporting documents also speak of a £100 salary ["Mr. Robinson's Certificate of Mr. Vardill's Loyalty and Services, the nature of his Professorship & the Salary annexed to it. Nov. 22, 1784," in *Ibid.*, p. 314]; announcement in newspapers, December 8, 1774, clipping in *Ibid.*, p. 286.
- <sup>8</sup> "Old New York and Trinity Church," NYHS Collections, III, pp. 250-52, 254; also in Morgan Dix, ed., History of the Parish of Trinity Church in the City of New York (New York: Putnam, 1898), p. 365; Chandler's assistance: Chandler to Vardill, December 15, 1774, P.R.O., A.O. 13/105, p. 286.
- <sup>9</sup> Laight to Vardill, December 17, 1774, in *ibid.*, p. 221; John Maunsell to John Foler, Esq., December 20, 1773, in *ibid.*, p. 241.
- <sup>10</sup> Chandler to Vardill, December 15, 1774, in *ibid.*, p. 288.
- <sup>11</sup> Quoted in William Samuel Johnson to Myles Cooper, January 18, 1773, in Schneiders, Johnson, p. 486; the same letter establishes Dartmouth as a friend to episcopacy.



<sup>12</sup> John Vardill to William Legge, Earl of Dartmouth, September 1, 1774, in M. Lambert, ed., Historical Manuscripts Commission; Fourteenth Report, Appendix, Part X: The Manuscripts of the Earl of Dartmouth: Vol. II; American Papers (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, for Her Majesty's Stationary Office, 1895) [hereinafter; "Lambert, Historical MSS"], p. 224.

<sup>13</sup> Chandler to Vardill, August 3, 1774, P.R.O., A.O. 13/105, p. 284.

<sup>14</sup> Ibid., December 15, 1774, p. 287.

<sup>15</sup> Ibid., pp. 287-88.

<sup>16</sup> Ibid., p. 287.

<sup>17</sup> Ibid., August 3, 1774, p. 285.

<sup>18</sup> Bruce E. Steiner, Samuel Seabury, p. 178; Bishop Lowth to Dr. Chandler, May 29, 1775, in Chandler Life of Johnson, p. 207 re Chandler's letter to Vardill of March, 1775.

<sup>19</sup> Edward Laight to John Vardill, June 11, 1777, P.R.O., A.O. 13/ 105, pp. 262-63; Memorial of John Vardill, *ibid.*, pp. 186-191.

<sup>20</sup> See Lawrence H. Gipson, The Coming of the Revolution, 1763-1775, pp. 228-33; Joseph Galloway, "Candid Examination," in Jensen, ed., Tracts of the American Revolution.

<sup>21</sup> John Jay to Vardill, September, 24, 1774, P.R.O., A.O. 13/105, p. 283.

<sup>22</sup> Chandler to Vardill, December 15, 1774, in *ibid.*, p. 288.

<sup>23</sup> Unknown to Vardill, January 5, 1775, in *Ibid.*, p. 264.

<sup>24</sup> Samuel Auchmuty to John Vardill, March 16, 1775, in *ibid.*, p. 252.

<sup>25</sup> John Jay to John Vardill, May 23, 1774, in *ibid.*, pp. 281-83; also printed in Frank Monaghan, John Jay, Defender of Liberty (New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1935), pp. 53-54; Vardill also attempted to take credit for the New York Assembly's petition to parliament and its disassociation from Congress in early 1775, measures he had been recommending in his correspondence home, see Memorial of John Vardill, P.R.O., A.O. 13/105, pp. 186-91; Jay to Vardill, September 24, 1774 in *ibid.*, p. 283;

Carl Lotus Becker, The History of Political Parties in the Province of New York, 1760-1776 (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1960), p. 177.

<sup>26</sup> Chandler to Vardill, December 15, 1774, P.R.O., A.O. 13/105, p. 287; "Extract of a Letter from Ld. Dartmouth . . . ." in *ibid.*, p. 320; William H. Sabine, ed., Historical Memoirs, From 16 March 1763 to 9 July 1776, of William Smith, Historian of the Province of New York, Member of the Governor's Council, And Last Chief Justice of That Province Under the Crown, Chief Justice of Quebec (New York: 1956), 2 vol., I, 237.

<sup>27</sup> [John Vardill], "Coriolanus," in P.R.O., A.O. 13/105, miscellaneous clippings at end of volume; Roger J. Champagne, "New York's Radicals and the Coming of Independence," The Journal of American History, LI, June, 1964, 21-40, p. 34; Edward F. Delancey, ed., Thomas Jones, History of New York during the Revolutionary War (New York: 1879), 2 vol., I, 59-60.

<sup>28</sup> Sabine, I, 237.

## Notes for Chapter VII

- <sup>1</sup> Bruce Steiner, Samuel Seabury, pp. 180-82.
- <sup>2</sup> B.F. Stevens, Facsimiles of Manuscripts in European Archives Relating to America 1773-1783 (London: 1889) [hereinafter: "S.F." and number of document], Vardill to Eden, January 25, 1777, No. 42.
- <sup>3</sup> Norton, British-Americans, p. 45.
- <sup>4</sup> Samuel Flagg Bemis, "British Secret Service and the French-American Alliance," The American Historical Review, XXXIX, April, 1924, 474-495, p. 474.
- <sup>5</sup> Richard W. Van Alstyne, Empire or Independence: The International History of the American Revolution (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1967), pp. 88, 90, 113, 116.
- <sup>6</sup> Van Alstyne finds that the information was general knowledge in any case, pp. vi-vii, 118. However, some information was secret; and the importance is not its secrecy, but what the government did with the information.
- <sup>7</sup> William Eden to unknown, n.d., P.R.O., A.O. 13/105, pp. 233, 271. Jenkinson was in contact with Vardill in October, 1775 (ibid, p. 295), promising that he was "very ready to be of Service to You"; it might also have been Robinson who arranged the introduction. For information on Robinson and Jenkinson, see Steven Watson, The Reign of George III, 1760-1815 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1960), pp. 645- 204.
- <sup>8</sup> Bemis, pp. 474-75; Vardill's office was No. 17 Downing Street; Silas Deane to Robert Morris, March 16, 1777, The Deane Papers, NYHS Collections, XIX-XXII, XX, 24.
- <sup>9</sup> Memorial of John Vardill, P.R.O., A.O. 13/105, pp. 186-191.
- <sup>10</sup> The "Hynson story," about to be related in its essentials, is told also in Lewis Einstein, Divided Loyalties, Americans in England During the War of Independence (Freeport, New York: Books for Libraries Press, Reprint, 1969; first published, 1933), and in Cecil B. Currey, Code Number 72: Ben Franklin, Patriot or Spy? (New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1972).
- <sup>11</sup> Memorial of John Vardill, P.R.O., A.O. 13/105, pp. 186-191.

<sup>12</sup> Deane to Hynson, June 1, 1777, in Deane Papers, XX, 60-61; Einstein, p. 60; Currey, pp. 137-38, shows that Deane may have been part of the conspiracy, since he was also an agent of Eden; however, he was a double agent, and Currey's speculation relies on Deane operating only in the capacity of an agent of Eden.

<sup>13</sup> Memorial of John Vardill, P.R.O., A.O. 13/105, pp. 186-191.

<sup>14</sup> Deane to Hynson, October 7, 1777, Deane Papers, XX, 176-77; Einstein, pp. 62-63; Memorial of John Vardill, P. R.O., A.O. 13/105, pp. 186-91.

<sup>15</sup> Deane to Jonathon Williams, October, 24, 1777, Deane Papers, XX, 200; William Eden to George III, October 20, 1777, in Einstein, p. 65.

<sup>16</sup> Memorial of John Vardill, P.R.O., A.O. 13/105, pp. 186-191.

<sup>17</sup> Ibid.; George III to Lord North, John Fortescue, ed., The Correspondence of King George the Third From 1760 to December 1783 (London: MacMillan and Co., Ltd., 1927), 4 vols., 3, 532, No. 2132.

<sup>18</sup> S.F., No. 138.

<sup>19</sup> D.A.B., X, 222-23.

<sup>20</sup> Bemis, pp. 483-84.

<sup>21</sup> Fortescue, ed., III, 527, No. 2127.

<sup>22</sup> Van Alstyne, p. 135; Bemis, pp. 489-490.

<sup>23</sup> Eden to Vardill, April, 1778, P.R.O., A.O. 13/105, pp. 201-91.

<sup>24</sup> John Vardill, "Sketches of American Public Characters and Hints for the use of the Commission," April, 1778, S.F. No. 438.

<sup>25</sup> Ibid.

<sup>26</sup> Ibid.

<sup>27</sup> Ibid.

<sup>28</sup> Jones, History of New York, I, 160-61; It is possible Vardill helped ruin the Commission's chances of success by writing the "spurious" letters of George Washington, which appeared just before the Commission arrived, and engendered colonial mistrust. The evidence that Vardill was the author, however, is sketchy; see Carl Van Doren, The Secret History of the American Revolution (New York: The Viking Press, 1941), pp. 87-8, and W.C. Ford's introduction to The Spurious Letters Attributed to Washington (Brooklyn, New York: Printed privately, 1889).

<sup>29</sup> Eden to Vardill, January 14, 1779, P.R.O., A.O. 13/105, p. 205; also Eden to Vardill, April, 1778, p. 201, and April 16, 1778, p. 266, in *ibid.*; Egerton, ed., The Royal Commission, p. 255.

<sup>30</sup> John Robinson to Vardill, February 17, 1779, P.R.O., A.O. 13/105, p. 301.

<sup>31</sup> G.H. Guttridge, English Whiggism and the American Revolution (Berkeley and Los Angeles: The University of California Press, 1963), pp. 103-110; Address From The Committee of Association of the County of York (N.P.: n.p., 1781), p. 11.

<sup>32</sup> H. Butterfield, George III, Lord North, and the People, 1779-1780 (London: G. Bell and Sons, Ltd., 1949), pp. 192-200.

<sup>33</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 309, 262-63; Address From The Committee, p. 7.

<sup>34</sup> London, 1780; also in P.R.O., A.O. 13/105.

<sup>35</sup> An Address to the Inhabitants, p. 1.

<sup>36</sup> "Alarm," No. IV; An Address to the Inhabitants, pp. 9, 12.

## Notes for Chapter VIII

<sup>1</sup> Vardill to the Commissioners, November 9, 1784, P.R.O., A.O. 13/105, p. 309.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid.

<sup>3</sup> Egerton, The Royal Commission, p. 255.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid.

<sup>5</sup> Vardill to the Commissioners, November 9, 1784, P.R.O., A.O. 13/105, pp. 309-10.

<sup>6</sup> Vardill to the Commissioners, November 10, 1784, in ibid, p. 316.

<sup>7</sup> P.R.O., A.O. 12/109, p. 293 [microfilm: 134].

<sup>8</sup> D.A.B., X, 222-23; Vance, "Myles Cooper," pp. 282-83; The Gentleman's Magazine: and Historical Chronicle, LXI, July, 1791.

<sup>9</sup> Gentleman's Magazine, LXXXI, January, 1811.

## Notes for Chapter IX

<sup>1</sup> Carol Berkin, Jonathon Sewall, Odyssey of an American Loyalist (New York: Columbia University Press, 1974), p. 161.

<sup>2</sup> Edwin G. Burrows and Michael Wallace, "The American Revolution: The Ideology and Psychology of National Liberation," in Donald Fleming and Bernard Bailyn, eds., Perspectives in American History, VI, 1972, 167-308, pp. 298, 295.

<sup>3</sup> N. Tingbergen, "On War and Peace in Animals and Man," in Heinz Friedrich, ed., & tr., Man and Animal, Studies in Behaviour (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1968), p. 127; see also, Konrad Lorenz, On Aggression, Marjorie Kent Wilson, tr. (New York: Harcourt, Brace, & World, 1966).

<sup>4</sup> Burrows and Wallace, p. 299.

<sup>5</sup> Zhigniew Brzezinski, "Revolution and Counterrevolution," The New Republic, A Journal of Opinion, 158, No. 22, June 1, 1968), 24-27; see page 25 for the common mistakes of governments faced with revolution; "dribbling" our concessions, which characterized North's ministry, is one.

<sup>6</sup> Berkin, p. 161.

<sup>7</sup> [John Vardill] "Coriolanus," P.R.O., A.O. 13/105, in miscellaneous clippings at the end of the volume.

<sup>8</sup> See Gad Horowitz, "Conservatism, Liberalism, and Socialism in Canada: An Interpretation," The Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science, XXXII, 1966, 143-71, where he argues similarly in contrasting Canada and the United States.

B I B L I O G R A P H Y



## A. PRIMARY SOURCES

1. Manuscripts

American Loyalists: Transcripts of the Manuscript Books and Papers of the Commission of Enquiry into the Losses and Services of the American Loyalists. Public Record Office, London, Audit Office 12. 146 vols. (Microfilm.)

Stevens, B. F. B. F. Stevens's Facsimiles of Manuscripts in European Archives Relating to America 1773-1783 with Descriptions, Editorial Notes, Collations, References, and Translations. London, 1889.

Vardill, John. "Memorial of John Vardill," and supporting documents, letters, and printed matter, in Public Record Office, Audit Office 13, vol. 105. (Microfilm.)

2. Printed Material

"Abstract of Wills on File in the Surrogate's Office, City of New York." Collections of the New York Historical Society. 17 vols. Vol. XXXI, 1898; XXXII, 1899; XXXVIII, 1905.

Address From The Committee of Association of the County of York, To The Electors of Great-Britain. N.P.: N.P., 1781

Chandler, Thomas Bradbury. An Appeal to the Public in Behalf of the Church of England in America. New York: James Parker, 1767.

\_\_\_\_\_. The Appeal Defended: Or, The Proposed American Episcopate Vindicated, In Answer To The Objections and Misrepresentations of Dr. Chauncy and Others. New York: Hugh Gaine, 1769.

\_\_\_\_\_. The Appeal Farther Defended In Answer to the Farther Misrepresentations of Dr. Chauncy. New York: Hugh Gaine, 1771.

\_\_\_\_\_, D.D. The Life of Samuel Johnson, D.D., The First President of King's College, in New-York. New York: Printed by T. & J. Swords, No. 160 Pearl-Street, 1805.

Chauncy, Charles. A Letter to a Friend Containing Certain Remarks on Certain Passages in a Sermon Preached by the Right Reverend in God, John Lord Bishop of Landaff. Boston: Kneeland & Adams for Leverett, 1767.

Chauncy, Charles. The Appeal To The Public Answered, In Be-  
half of the Non-Episcopal Churches in America; Containing  
Remarks on what Dr. Thomas Bradbury Chandler has advanced,  
on the four following points, The Original and Nature of  
the Episcopal Office, Reasons for sending Bishops to  
America, The Plan on which it is proposed to send them,  
And the Objections against sending them obviated and re-  
futed; Wherein the Reasons for an American Episcopate are  
shewn to be insufficient, and the Objections against it  
in full Force. Boston: Kneeland and Adams for Thomas  
 Leverett, 1768.

---

. A Reply to Dr. Chandler's Appeal Defended, Wherein  
His Mistakes are rectified, his false Arguing refuted,  
and the Objections against the Planned American Episcopate  
shewn to remain in full Force, notwithstanding all he has  
offered to render them invalid. Boston: Daniel Kneeland  
 for Thomas Leverett, 1770.

---

. A Complete View of Episcopacy As Exhibited from  
the Fathers of the Christian Church, until the Close of  
the Second Century: Containing An Impartial Account of  
Them, of their Writings, and of what they say concerning  
Bishops and Presbyters; With Observations, and Remarks,  
Tending to Shew, that they esteemed these One and the  
Same Order of Ecclesiastical Officers. In Answer to  
those, who have represented it as a certain Fact, univer-  
sally handed down, even from the Apostles Days, that  
Governing and Ordaining Authority was exercised by such  
Bishops only, as were of an Order Superior to Presbyters.  
 Boston: Daniel Kneeland for Thomas Leverett, 1771.

Deane, Silas. The Deane Papers. Collections of the New-York  
Historical Society. Vols. XIX-XXII, 1886-90.

"Diary of William Dunlap (1766-1839), The Memoirs of A Drama-  
 tist, Theatrical Manager, Painter, Critic, Novelist, and  
 Historian." Collections of the New York Historical  
Society. Vol. LXII, 1929.

Eardley-Wilmot, John. Historical View of the Commission for  
Enquiring into the Losses, Services, and Claims of the  
American Loyalists, At the Close of the War Between Great  
Britain and Her Colonies, in 1783: With an Account of the  
Compensation Granted to them by Parliament in 1785 and  
1788. London: J. Nichols, Son, and Bentley, 1815.

Egerton, Hugh Edward, ed. The Royal Commission on the Losses  
and Services of American Loyalists, 1783 to 1785, Being

the Notes of Mr. Daniel Parker Coke, M.P., One of the Commissioners During that Period. New York: Burt Franklin, 1971.

Ewer, John (Bishop of Landaff). A Sermon Preached before the Incorporated Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts; At their Anniversary Meeting in the Parish Church of St. Mary-Le-Bow, On Friday February 20, 1767. London; New York: rpt. by James Parker, 1768.

Ford, Worthington Chauncey. Letters of Jonathon Boucher to George Washington. The New-England Historical and Genealogical Register, 1899. Vol. 53, pp. 303-9, 417-26.

\_\_\_\_\_. The Spurious Letters Attributed to Washington. Brooklyn, N.Y.: Privately Printed, 1889.

Fortescue, John, ed. The Correspondence of King George the Third From 1760 to December 1783. London: MacMillan and Co., Ltd., 1927.

Galloway, Joseph. "A Candid Examination of the Mutual Claims of Great Britain and the Colonies: With a Plan of Accommodation on Constitutional Principles, 1775." In Merrill Jensen, ed., Tracts of the American Revolution, 1763-1776. Indianapolis, New York, Kansas City: Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1967.

The Gentleman's Magazine: and Historical Chronicle. Vols. LXI (July 1791); LXXXI (Jan. 1811).

"Grotius." Pills for the Delegates: or the Chairman Chastised, In a Series of Letters, Addressed to Peyton Randolph, Esq., On His Conduct, as President of the General Congress: Held at the City of Philadelphia, September 5, 1775. New York: James Rivington, 1775.

[Holt, John, ed.] A Collection of Tracts From the Late News Papers, &c. Containing Particularly The American Whig, A Whip for the American Whig, With Some Other Pieces, On the Subject of the Residence of Protestant Bishops in the American Colonies, and in answer to the Writers who opposed it, &c. 2 vols. (title varies slightly). New York: John Holt, 1768-69.

Jones, Thomas. History of New York During the Revolutionary War and of the Leading Events in the Other Colonies At That Period. 2 vols. Edward Floyd DeLancey, ed. New York: Printed for the New York Historical Society, 1879.

Lambert M., ed. Historical Manuscripts Commission; Fourteenth Report, Appendix, Part X; The Manuscripts of the Earl of Dartmouth. Vol. II; American Papers. Intro. by B. F. Stevens. London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, for Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1895.

"The Letters and Papers of Cadwallader Colden, Additional Letters and Papers, 1749-1775, and Some of Colden's Writings." Collections of the New York Historical Society. Vol. LXVIII, 1937.

Livingston, William. A Letter to the Right Reverend Father in God, John, Lord Bishop of Landaff, Occasioned by Some Passages in his Lordship's Sermon, on the 20th of February, 1767, in which the American Colonies are loaded with great and undeserved Reproach. New York: Printed for the Author, 1768.

Manross, William Wilson, ed. The Fulham Papers in the Lambeth Palace Library: American Colonial Section Calendar and Indexes. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965.

New York. The Colonial Laws of New York From the Year 1664 to the Revolution. 5 vols. Albany: James B. Lyon, 1894.

O'Callahan, Edmund B., ed. The Documentary History of the State of New York. 4 vols. Albany: Weed, Parsons & Co., 1849-51.

"Old New York and Trinity Church." Collections of the New York Historical Society. Vol. III (1870), 145-408.

The Parliamentary History of England, From the Earliest Period to the Year 1803. 36 vols. London: T. C. Hansard, Peterborough-Court, Fleet Street, 1813.

Pickering, Danby, ed. Statutes at Large From Magna Charta to the End of the Eleventh Parliament of Great Britain Anno 1761. Cambridge: John Archdeacon, Printer to the University, 1786.

Sabine, William H. W., ed. Historical Memoirs, From 16 March 1763 to 9 July 1776, of William Smith, Historian of the Province of New York, Member of the Governor's Council, And Last Chief Justice of That Province Under the Crown, Chief Justice of Quebec. 2 vols. New York, 1956.

Schneider, Herbert and Carol Schneider, eds. Samuel Johnson, President of King's College, His Career and Writings,

Volume I, Autobiography and Letters. New York: Columbia University Press, 1929.

Shipton, Clifford K., ed. Early American Imprints 1639-1800. Worcester, Mass.: American Antiquarian Society, n.d.

[Vardill, John, et al.]. "Whip for the American Whig," New York Gazette and Weekly Mercury. New York: Hugh Gaines, April 4, 1768-July 10, 1769.

[Vardill, John]. "A Freeholder." Answer To The Reasons, Lately published by the Independents, in support of their Malicious Combination, The Freeholder, No. I. New York: John Holt, 1769.

[\_\_\_\_\_]. "A Freeholder." A Continuation Of The Answers, To The Reasons, Freeholder, No. II. New York: John Holt, 1769.

[\_\_\_\_\_]. "A Freeholder." The Conclusion Of The Answers, To The Reasons, The Freeholder, No. III. New York: John Holt, 1769.

[\_\_\_\_\_]. Candid Remarks on Dr. Witherspoon's Address To The Inhabitants of Jamaica And the other West-India Islands, &c. In a Letter to those Gentlemen. Philadelphia, 1772.

[\_\_\_\_\_]. Poplicola. To the Worthy Inhabitants of the City of New-York. No. 1. New York: James Rivington, 1773.

[\_\_\_\_\_]. Poplicola. To the Worthy Inhabitants of New York. No. 2. New York: James Rivington, 1773.

[\_\_\_\_\_]. Poplicola. To the Worthy Inhabitants of New York. No. 3. New York: James Rivington, 1773.

\_\_\_\_\_. [Cassandra]. The Alarm. Nos. I-VI. Leeds: G. Wright & Son, 1780.

[\_\_\_\_\_]. Unity and Public Spirit, Recommended in an Address to the Inhabitants of London and Westminster, To which are added Two Odes: Viz., The Miseries of Dissension and Civil War, and The True Patriot. London: n.p., 1780.

Witherspoon, John. Address to the Inhabitants of Jamaica, And Other West-India Islands, In Behalf of the College

of New Jersey. Philadelphia: William and Thomas Bradford, 1772.

## B. SECONDARY SOURCES

### 1. Books

- Becker, Carl Lotus. The History of Political Parties in the Province of New York, 1760-1776. Madison: Univ. of Wisconsin Press, 1960. [Second Printing; First Printing 1909 as No. 286 of the Bulletin of the University of Wisconsin History Series, Vol. 2, No. 1.]
- Bemis, Samuel Flagg. "British Secret Service and the French-American Alliance." The American Historical Review, XXIX, No. 3 (April 1924), 474-95.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Diplomacy of the American Revolution. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1959.
- Bonomi, Patricia H. A Factious People, Politics and Society in Colonial New York. New York and London: Columbia University Press, 1971.
- Boorstin, Daniel J. The Americans: The Colonial Experience. New York: Vintage Books, 1964.
- Bridenbaugh, Carl. Mitre and Sceptre, Transatlantic Faiths, Ideas, Personalities, and Politics, 1689-1775. New York: Oxford University Press, 1962.
- Brown, Wallace. The Good Americans, The Loyalists in the American Revolution. New York: William Morrow and Co., Inc., 1969.
- Butterfield, H. George III, Lord North, And the People, 1779-80. London: G. Bell and Sons Ltd., 1949.
- Columbia University. A History of Columbia University, 1754-1904. New York: Columbia University Press, 1904.
- Cross, Arthur Lyon. The Anglican Episcopate and the American Colonies. Hamden, Connecticut: Archon Books, 1964.
- Currey, Cecil B. Code Number 72: Ben Franklin, Patriot or Spy? New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1972.

- Dillon, Dorothy Rita. The New York Triumvirate: A Study of the Legal and Political Careers of William Livingston, John Morin Scott, William Smith, Jr. New York: Columbia University Press, 1949.
- Dix, Morgan, ed. History of the Parish of Trinity Church In the City of New York. 6 Parts. New York: Putnam, 1898.
- Dumas, Malone, ed. Dictionary of American Biography. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, Co., 1936, by American Council of Learned Societies. 2nd ed. 12 vols. Vol. X, 222-23.
- Einstein, Lewis. Divided Loyalties, Americans in England During the War of Independence. Freeport, N.Y.: Books for Libraries Press, 1969.
- Gaustad, Edwin Scott. The Great Awakening in New England. Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1968.
- Gipson, Lawrence Henry. The Coming of the Revolution, 1763-1775. New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1962.
- Goebel, Julius, Jr., and T. Raymond Naughton. Law Enforcement In Colonial New York, A Study In Criminal Procedure (1664-1776). Montclair, New Jersey: Patterson Smith, 1970.
- Guttridge, G. H. English Whiggism and the American Revolution. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1963.
- Lorenz, Konrad. On Aggression. Marjorie Kent Wilson, tr. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1966.
- Lydekker, John Wolfe. The Life and Letters of Charles Inglis, His Ministry in America and Consecration as First Colonial Bishop, from 1759 to 1787. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1936.
- Monaghan, Frank. John Jay, Defender of Liberty. New York and Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1935.
- More, John Bassett, ed. International Adjudications, Arbitration of Claims for Compensation for Losses and Damages Resulting from Lawful Impediments to the Recovery of Pre-War Debts. New York: Oxford University Press, 1931.
- Nelson, William H. The American Tory. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1961.

- Norton, Mary Beth. The British-Americans, The Loyalist Exiles in England, 1774-1789. Boston, Toronto: Little, Brown and Company, 1972.
- Radzinowicz, Leon. A History of English Criminal Law and Its Administration from 1750. 4 vols. London: Stevens & Sons Limited, 1948-68. Vol. I, The Movement for Reform.
- Steiner, Bruce E. Samuel Seabury, 1927-1796, A Study in the High Church Tradition. Ohio: Ohio University Press, 1971.
- Tolstoy, Count Leo Nikolayevich. War and Peace. 2 vols. Rosemary Edmonds, tr. Middlesex, England: Penguin Books, c. 1957.
- Upton, L. F. S. The Loyal Whig, William Smith of New York & Quebec. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1969.
- Van Alstyne, Richard W. Empire and Independence, The International History of the American Revolution. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1965.
- Van Doren, Carl. Secret History of the American Revolution. New York: The Viking Press, 1941.
- Van Schaack, Henry C. The Life of Peter Van Schaack, LL.D., Embracing Selections From His Correspondence and Other Writings, During the American Revolution, and His Exile in England. New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1842.
- Watson, Steven J. The Reign of George III, 1760-1815. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1960.

## 2. Articles

- Brzezinski, Zhigniew. "Revolution and Counterrevolution." The New Republic, A Journal of Opinion, 158, No. 22 (June 1, 1968), 24-27.
- Burrows, Edwin G., and Michael Wallace. "The American Revolution: The Ideology and Psychology of National Liberation." In Donald Fleming and Bernard Bailyn, eds., Perspectives in American History, VI (1972), 167-308.
- Champagne, Robert J. "New York's Radicals and the Coming of Independence." The Journal of American History. Vol. LI,



No. 1 (June 1964), 21-40. Menasha, Wisconsin: George Banta Co., Ind., for the Mississippi Valley Historical Association, 1964.

Friis, Herman R. "A Series of Population Maps of the Colonies and the United States, 1625-1790." The Geographical Review, XXX (July 1940), 463-70.

Horowitz, Gad. "Conservatism, Liberalism, and Socialism in Canada: An Interpretation." The Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science, XXXII (1966), 143-71.

Hoyt, Albert H. "The Rev. Thomas Bradbury Chandler, D.D., 1726-1790." New-England Historical and Genealogical Register and Antiquarian Journal, XXVII (July 1883), 227-36. Boston: Published at the Society's House, 1873.

Stookey, Byron. "Samuel Clossy, A.B., M.D., F.R.C.P. of Ireland, First Professor of Anatomy, King's College (Columbia), New York." Bulletin of the History of Medicine, XXXVIII (March-April, 1964), 153-67. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1964.

Tingbergen, N. "On War and Peace in Animals and Man." Heinz Friedrich, ed., & tr. Man and Animal, Studies in Behaviour. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1968.

Vance, Clarence Hayden. "Myles Cooper." The Columbia University Quarterly, 22 (September, 1930), 261-86.

Weis, Frederick Lewis. "The Colonial Clergy of the Middle Colonies: New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania, 1628-1776." Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society, April 18, 1956-October 17, 1956. Worcester, Mass.: Published by the Society, 1957. Vol. 66, 167-351.

### 3. Unpublished Dissertations

Humphrey, David C. King's College in the City of New York, 1754-1776. Ph.D. Dissertation, Northwestern University, 1968.

Klein, Milton. The American Whig: William Livingston of New York. Ph.D. Dissertation, Columbia University, 1954.