E 277
.D52
Copy 1

NEW HAVEN LOYALISTS

By FRANKLIN B. DEXTER, LITT.D.

Reprinted from
Papers of the New Haven Colony Historical Society
Volume IX

NEW HAVEN
1918

E277
.J52

By Transfer
JUN 23 1919

REG Ja.3726

NOTES ON SOME OF THE NEW HAVEN LOYALISTS, INCLUDING THOSE GRADUATED AT YALE.

By Franklin B. Dexter, Litt.D.

[Read January 18, 1915.]

A good many years ago, while spending a summer in London, I was interested in turning over, in the Government Record Office, the manuscript reports of the Commissioners appointed in 1783 to review the applications made by the American Loyalist refugees for compensation for losses which they had suffered. At that time I made notes of the testimony in cases of special interest; and some of these notes have formed the basis of the present paper. I should mention, however, that more recently a full transcript of all these records has been secured for the New York Public Library, in New York City; and as this transcript can be freely consulted by any one, with very slight trouble, my notes have no longer even the modest value which I may have once attached to them.

Any sketch, however slight, or superficial, of the sentiment in Connecticut at the time of the Revolution must be based primarily upon our historical development.

Under the self-government provided by the comparatively liberal charter of 1662, this Colony had been, generally speaking, quiet and prosperous for a century; with the consequence that in the exciting decade before the outbreak of the Revolution, a large proportion of the shrewdest and most influential public and professional men doubted, to say the least, if they were not likely to be better off under existing conditions in this favored spot than they would be if independent of Britain:—this being not merely a conviction in relation to their individual welfare, but also in consideration of the permanent interests of the community.

Foremost in the opposite scale was the healthy instinct of loyal coöperation in the united action of other provincial governments, which in its turn involved also a broader and more comprehensive self-interest; and in most cases this process of deliberation and argument resulted in the ungrudging support of a policy of armed resistance.

By a law of human nature, hesitation in taking up the attitude of rebels was at first especially the rôle of the older generation of public men, under the dominion of the habits of a life-time. Of this class an early example was the Governor of the Colony, Thomas Fitch, of Norwalk, born in 1700, and graduated at Yale in 1721, who after a lifelong service of the State, culminating in twelve-years' tenure of the chief magistracy, was relegated to private life in 1766, for regarding it his bounden duty to take the oath required by the British government to put in operation the odious Stamp Act. Of course I would not imply that Governor Fitch is to be classed as a pronounced Loyalist; but his attitude, and that of the four members of his Council who stood by him in this crisis (John Chester, of Wethersfield, Benjamin Hall, of Cheshire, Jabez Hamlin, of Middletown, and Ebenezer Silliman, of Fairfield), and of Jared Ingersoll, of New Haven, the unhappy Stamp-Agent, was practically an anticipation of that of many others who were active in public matters eight and ten years later; and when the need of decision arrived for these also, we cannot wonder if a natural instinct constrained some such to remain faithful to their traditionary obligations.

Perhaps I may illustrate the customary ways in which the thinking men of this next generation were affected by the problem set before them, by taking the examples of five of the more conspicuous public men of the group of Yale graduates in Connecticut,—a group, however, which included a large proportion of the leading men in civil life. The five whose names suggest themselves, and who were all about sixty years of age in 1774, are George Wyllys, of the Class of 1729; Elihu Hall, Class of 1731; Abraham Davenport, Class of 1732; and Benjamin Gale and Samuel Talcott, Class of 1733.

Colonel Wyllys, of Hartford, had grown gray in official service as the Secretary of the Colony, and continued to hold that useful station acceptably until his death at the ripe age of eighty-five; and though he was currently understood to be averse at first to the change of allegiance, he refrained prudently from overt action, and not only outgrew completely the faint odium of loyalty, but even the repute and recollection of it.

Colonel Elihu Hall, of Wallingford, on the other hand, is the sole representative in this group of pure and consistent toryism. His birth and family connections opened to him the best that Connecticut had to offer; and after his admission to the bar his success as a lawyer was phenomenally rapid. An extensive practice led to repeated trips to England, which increased his attachment to the mother country, and ensured his choice of it as a refuge after war began. He fled from New Haven to New York in January, 1779; and a letter is preserved, retailing his report to British authorities of conditions in Connecticut at that date, which is as untrustworthy as such reports were apt to be. He estimates, for example, that two-thirds of the inhabitants of the Colony are in favor of reunion with Great Britain; and announces that Governor Trumbull's popularity is declining—as evinced at the polls: an assertion entirely inconsistent with all other evidence. He also intimates that important conversions to the British side are imminent; but unfortunately the only two examples which he specifies do not display shrewd judgment. One of these, his own brother-in-law, the Rev. Chauncey Whittelsey, pastor of the First Church in New Haven, is abundantly known as of unswerving and otherwise unsuspected patriotism; and the same is, so far as I can learn, true of the other individual named, Colonel Thomas Seymour, of Hartford. Such baseless gossip was bound to react on the informer and his value as an adherent; and the sequel is not out of keeping with this prologue. For our latest glimpse of Colonel Hall is in London, after the war, pleading that, having lost his large American property, his only support, in an infirm and lonely old age, is his pension of £80 a year, which will not allow him to keep a servant. Others of the London colony of refugees add their testimony to the dismal picture,—to the effect that he has in earlier life been confined in a madhouse, and now squanders the little he has in liquor and debauchery.

In the College class below him was Abraham Davenport, of Stamford, a great-grandson of the first minister of New Haven, a prominent member of the Governor's Council, or Upper House of the General Assembly, and Judge of the County Court. He was naturally conservative in his judgment of public questions, and it was no secret that he viewed with great hesitation and disfavor a rupture with Great Britain; but when it became necessary for the Colony to range itself definitely in the organized struggle, he yielded to the paramount claims of the common cause, and thenceforth no one was more firm or more constant in its service.

In the Class of 1733 were Dr. Benjamin Gale, of Clinton, and Colonel Samuel Talcott, of Hartford. Dr. Gale was a learned and skilful physician, of very pronounced and not altogether orthodox views in religion and philosophy. He took also a deep interest in politics, and had served for years in the Assembly. He was one of the most striking characters of his generation in Connecticut, very pessimistic and critical in his outlook, and acknowledging no man and no group of men as master. To such an observer the revolutionary movement was full of danger. He was firmly attached to the cause of liberty, as he conceived it, but differed conscientiously from his neighbors and associates as to the proper *mode* of opposition to Great Britain; but in the issue, even this perverse and captious critic was clear-sighted enough to concede that one's preferences as to mode must give way, in cases where another mode has been commonly agreed upon.

His classmate, Samuel Talcott, son of the Governor of the Colony, and therefore, like George Wyllys and Abraham Davenport, placed at the head of his class by social standing, was by inheritance and descent counted among the richest and most highly favored gentry of the period. In middle life he had performed his due share of civil and military service, and now, in a leisurely old age, his circumstances and habits illy adapted him to welcome the hardships of the Revolution. In the result, however, he too is found standing firmly by the new State government and withholding nothing.

Like these, in their different ways, the better part of the maturer intelligence of the Colony went through the ordeal of a conflict between self-interest, or private judgment, and public policy, and rallied effectively in support of independence.

Under the Connecticut charter, the people elected their own rulers, and accordingly there was here no such large official class, dependent on the British power, as in the other American colonies; and what constituted the largest section of the Tory party in most of the neighboring governments, was here practically non-existent.

As one result of this situation, the most numerous group in Connecticut of those who were by personal affiliations predestined to sympathy with Great Britain, was the body of missionary clergy of the Church of England, all of whom, on receiving orders in the mother country, had taken a special oath of allegiance to the crown, and were moreover dependent in good part on the stipends furnished by the English "Society for the Propagation of the Gospel."

If I have counted correctly, there were at the outbreak of the war nineteen Episcopal clergymen in Connecticut, of whom fifteen were Yale graduates. The eldest of this group, the Rev. John Beach, born in Stratford in 1700, and graduated in 1721, had come as an undergraduate under the influence of Samuel Johnson, then Tutor; and after his settlement in the Congregational ministry in Newtown, while Johnson was in charge of the Church of England mission in the adjoining township of Stratford, he was led by the same influence to conform to Episcopacy, and eventually to accept the cure of missions in Newtown and Redding. It may be an indication of the weight of his character that the proportion of Episcopalians in Newtown before the Revolution is said to have been higher than in any other township in Connecticut. He is specially remembered for his intrepidity in continuing to use in public worship, after all his fellow-presbyters had closed their church-doors, the appointed prayer for the King, which included a petition to "strengthen him that he may vanquish and overcome all his enemies."

Next to Mr. Beach, at least among those of Connecticut birth, in length of service in the Colony, was the Rev. Jeremiah Leaming, born on the confines of Durham and Middletown in 1717, and graduated at Yale in 1745. He also had been touched by Samuel Johnson's influence, and, after receiving orders and serving temporarily elsewhere, became in 1758 the minister of the parish in Norwalk, where after twenty years of devoted labor he suffered unhappily at the hands of both parties to the war,—first as a tory from wanton exposure while lodged on the floor of the county jail in winter, which rendered him a wretched cripple for the rest of his days, and secondly from the destruction of all his personal effects, a year later, when General Tryon, though himself a member of the Venerable Society whose commission Leaming bore, with equal wantonness burned his house and his church in the invasion of Norwalk. He was then transported within the British lines, but after the peace came back to Connecticut, and found in his destitute and forlorn old age an asylum here with that devoted Churchwoman, Madam Hillhouse, in whose mansion, known to us as Grove Hall, he died in 1804.

The most blatant and most notorious member of this group of Church clergy was Samuel Peters, of Hebron, born of Episcopal parents in 1735, and graduated at Yale in 1757, who became a missionary in his native town and the vicinity. On the news of British troops firing on Boston, in 1774, his arrogant and offensive attitude, and especially his activity in publishing resolutions condemning the popular opposition to Parliament, provoked such treatment and such threats that he fled forthwith to England.

His sworn statements of his resources and his losses, which are still on file there, in connection with his applications for compensation, are ludicrously and impudently overdrawn. He claims, for instance, that his father, who was a plain, ordinarily well-to-do farmer, in one of the poorest towns in Hartford County, had been the richest citizen of the entire Colony, and that his own confiscated estate was valued at the absurd figure of upwards of £40,000. By this extravagant tale he succeeded in gaining a pension of £200 a year, which was withdrawn some twenty-five years later, after fuller experience of his pretentious unreliability.

It may seem like slaying the slain to enlarge on the falsehoods of the notorious Parson Peters; but whenever I read over anew any of his attempts at narration, I am reassured that his colossal powers of untruth have never been properly appreciated. Take, for instance, his article in the *Political Magazine* of London, on the History of his near neighbor, Governor Trumbull, of Lebanon, who had striven hard to protect him from the mob in his troubles, but whose life Peters pretends to sketch in a series of the most outrageously unblushing and libelous falsehoods. In justification of such a characterization it will be enough to recall the initial statement in Peters' biography:—that Jonathan Trumbull, a scion of a family of unblemished reputation, was really an illegitimate child, and probably the son of the Rev. Samuel Welles, the minister of the town,—and this regardless of the plain fact that Mr. Welles was not settled in Lebanon until more than a year after Trumbull's birth.

It only emphasizes Peters' peculiar character, or lack of character, to note that he was the only minister of the Church of England in the Colony who thought it advisable or necessary to forsake his post for a foreign asylum, before the war began; though four others, James Scovil of Waterbury, Roger Viets of Simsbury, Samuel Andrews of Wallingford, and Richard Clarke, of New Milford, were induced, after peace was declared, under stress of poverty by the removal of their flocks, rather than from experience of enmity or odium, to accept the cure of parishes in the British Provinces, of kindred origin and sympathies.

There remain a dozen other Episcopal incumbents, whom I have not mentioned specifically, who retained their places through the Revolutionary struggle, with more or less discomfort and some ill-usage, and finally acquiesced peacefully in the results accomplished. Of this number were such familiar figures in this vicinity as the Rev. Richard Mansfield, Yale 1741, of Derby, the Rev. Bela Hubbard, Yale 1758, of New Haven, and the Rev. Abraham Jarvis, Yale 1761, of Middletown—all of whom lived to be doctorated in a succeeding generation by their *Alma Mater*. It should perhaps be noted that Dr. Mansfield, though not in any wise to be classed with Peters, had once found it prudent to take temporary refuge on Long Island, on account of the excitement caused by the report of a letter of his to a British officer, which merely included some conjectural estimate of the strength of Loyalist sentiment in Western Connecticut.

Many lay-members of the Episcopal Church were also avowed or suspected loyalists; but comparatively few went to the length of exile. In such a conspicuous case as that of the Hon. William Samuel Johnson, of Stratford, Yale 1744, one of the most eminent lawyers in the Colony, he must be credited with an honest doubt as to the right course of action; on finding himself unable conscientiously to advocate independence, he retired definitely from all public employment, but let it be known that he had no inclination to aid the enemy, and had without hesitation contributed to the patriotic cause; and when peace was established, he assumed a prominent and effective part in the councils of the State and of the nation.

One locally well-known lay-churchman who had to be dealt with for his loyalty was Ralph Isaacs, a native of Norwalk, who had settled in New Haven as a merchant after his graduation at Yale in 1761, and became the grandfather of the Hon. Ralph Isaacs Ingersoll, and uncle of the wife of the elder President Dwight. He was a rather volatile person, and was early mistrusted as a sympathizer with the enemy, so that for over a year he was held under observation and restraint in one of the interior towns, where it was presumed he would lack opportunity of making trouble; but he soon transgressed by taking advantage of his partial liberty to supply his neighbors surreptitiously with rum. After a further period of surveillance, he took the oath of fidelity, and lived thenceforth in comparative retirement, and mostly on his farm in Branford.

Another lay-churchman of New Haven, who accompanied Mr. Isaacs in his temporary banishment, was Captain Abiathar Camp, a native of Durham; and he also, after a like period of detention, took the oath and was allowed to return to his residence here. But his allegiance was fickle, and finally he and his family went off with the British after the invasion in 1779. He had been a successful merchant, and in presenting in 1783 a claim for compensation, he estimated his income from his business at £200 per annum, and his total losses at over £8000, though this claim was eventually much reduced. It may be of interest to know that while a diligent business man at that date, of no special educational advantages, he owned a library of English and Latin books, valued at ten guineas; and also that he filed in support of his demands a certificate of loyalty, furnished in 1786 by his quondam fellow-townsman, General Benedict Arnold,—which document praises him specifically for activity in providing guides and pilots for the expedition which Arnold himself had conducted against New London in 1781.

Captain Camp died in Nova Scotia soon after the adjudication of his claim. I should add that there were included in his company in exile a son, Abiathar Camp, Junior, who had entered Yale in 1773, but did not reach graduation, and who died in the Provinces at a great age in 1841; and also a son-in-law, Daniel Lyman, Junior, Yale 1770, a convert to the church, who became eventually a Major in the British army.

Besides the Episcopalians, there was one other minute group of less conspicuous sectarian Loyalists.

For local reasons Connecticut had never proved congenial soil for Quaker colonists; but about 1764 the disciples of Robert Sandeman, called Sandemanians, who imitated the Quakers in being conscientiously bound to a policy of passive resistance to war, and thus considered themselves obliged to remain loyal to King George, had gained a scanty foothold here, especially in Danbury and New Haven.

They were mostly of undistinguished social standing and small political influence. The best known of the group were Richard Woodhull, Yale 1752; Daniel Humphreys and Joseph Pynchon, Yale 1757; Titus Smith, Yale 1764; and Theophilus Chamberlain, Yale 1765.

Richard Woodhull, from Long Island, had been a favorite pupil of President Clap, and had therefore been employed to fill with rather indifferent success for seven or eight years a College tutorship. He remained, after his first conscientious protest, peaceably and inconspicuously in New Haven until his death. Daniel Humphreys, the ablest member of the company, was a son of the minister of Derby, and brother of General David Humphreys. He practiced law here, and also taught a private school of high grade; but removed by the close of the war to Portsmouth, New Hampshire, where he had a long and rather brilliant career at the bar. His classmate, Joseph Pynchon, from Springfield, had inherited a good estate, and lived in dignified leisure in Guilford, where he had married. After becoming a Sandemanian, he removed to New Haven, perhaps for religious privileges, but was made so uncomfortable here that he retired within the British lines, thus sacrificing a large portion of his estate. He returned a year or two after the peace to Guilford, and is to be remembered as the ancestor of well-known New Haven citizens and of President Pynchon, of Trinity College. Titus Smith and Theophilus Chamberlain, who were also of Massachusetts birth, had both done good service as missionaries among the Indians, and after their abandonment of Congregationalism were recognized as the preaching elders in charge of the obscure handful of Sandemanians in this city. Like Pynchon, they felt constrained to take refuge with the British, and they both ended their days in Halifax.

Aside from these whom I have enumerated, the next most notable company of Loyalist exiles from the New Haven township was the family circle of Joshua Chandler, Esquire, Yale 1747. He was a native of Woodstock, and a fellow-townsman and first cousin of that stout Churchman, the Rev. Thomas Bradbury Chandler, Yale 1745, of New Jersey, who was active just before the Revolution in promoting the scheme for an American Episcopate, and went later into exile as a Loyalist.

Joshua Chandler had adhered to the Congregational church, and had become a successful lawyer, with every worldly motive to prompt him to side with the popular current. His ample town-house, built early in the same decade (1760-70) with other notable old New Haven residences, on the site of the Tontine Hotel and the new Post-office, and thence removed in 1824 or 5, is now occupied by Mr. Henry B. Sargent. Like other well-to-do citizens of the day, Mr. Chandler had also bought extensive landed estate in the suburbs, and after 1765 lived principally on one of his farms in North Haven. In 1775, in the full tide of his professional and political reputation, as Justice of the Peace, Selectman, Deputy to the General Assembly, and Chairman of the town's Committee of Correspondence, he announced, from conscientious motives, his determined loyalty to King George, and accepted the consequent suspicion and obloquy. Four years later he left town with the British invaders, accompanied by his wife, a daughter of Joseph Miles, of New Haven, three daughters, and four sons. He had moved in the first circles in the community, and in letters sent back after his flight professed a strong affection for his native country; but the records of the London commissioners in 1783 who received his appeal for compensation quote his statement to them that he had remained so long as he did in the Colony, as thinking that he might thus be able to communicate essential information to General Tryon in his invasion, and in other ways to be of service to the home government. The property which he abandoned, to the estimated value of about £4000, was confiscated by the town, and he recovered compensation, covering three-fourths of that amount.

His eldest son (John Chandler, Yale 1772) alone remained here; but his career was blighted by the opprobrium of the family record. The second son, William Chandler, Yale 1773, had early espoused the British cause, and in 1777 raised a company in New York of over a hundred men for the King's service; and he and a younger brother earned infamy by aiding to pilot the British in their invasion of New Haven. It is a satisfaction to know that he failed to secure an allowance from the government after the close of the war, except a paltry annual pension of £40; which was to cease, if he should be put on half-pay as a retired army-officer.

With the family went also Amos Botsford, Yale 1763, a son-in-law and a New Haven attorney, who stated frankly in his later application for compensation that he was obliged to flee on account of the odium arising from the action of his brothers-in-law as guides to the invaders. He claimed that he had abandoned property worth over £2500, including a library, chiefly of law-books, valued at £37 sterling; and that his annual professional income was about £600, of which he had been able to lay up on an average £225, after spending £375 for the support of his family, which included a wife and three children. He also testified that, when filing this application in Annapolis, his available income scarcely exceeded thirty guineas a year; and on this showing he was allowed an annual pension of £224.

There remain a few other names of notable New Haveners, who were temporarily or permanently disaffected. One such is that of Judge Thomas Darling, of Woodbridge, Yale 1740, a son-in-law of the Rev. Joseph Noyes, pastor of the First Church: a stubborn, cross-grained person, of strong convictions, unable on principle to accept without dispute the current arguments for renouncing British sovereignty, but judicious enough in the long run to restrain himself from fruitless opposition to the moral sense of the community in which his lot was cast. With him may be named his College classmate and pastor, the Rev. Benjamin Woodbridge, in whose honor, when the farmers of Amity Parish asked for town privileges, they preferred the name of Woodbridge—a sufficient proof that imperfect sympathy on the part of their old pastor with the new political order had not made any serious breach in the regard of his people.

The two classmates, Darling and Woodbridge, agreed also in their theological position, both being firm supporters of the Old-Light party, which some of the patriotic New Lights tried to discredit generally, as applying its conservatism to the political field. But in fact disaffection was not limited, among the Congregational clergy, to the conservatives. Dr. John Smalley, of New Britain, Yale 1756, a leader of the new theology of the day, may serve as a typical instance of one who, starting from a reasoned policy of non-resistance, reproved at first the patriotic ardor of his flock, and was only slowly and laboriously converted to their point of view.

Within College walls sentiment was overwhelmingly on the side of the American cause. President Ezra Stiles, the typical broad-minded student of his generation, and strictly speaking neither a politician nor a theologian, had been from the first an outspoken patriot; and Professor Daggett's fearless, not to say foolhardy, exposure of his person is one of the best known incidents of the attack on New Haven. But, on the other hand, the only other permanent member of the Faculty, the Rev. Nehemiah Strong, the Professor of Mathematics and Natural Philosophy, who was by the way an Old Light in theology, was decidedly lukewarm in his support of revolution, and perhaps for this reason in part was provided so meagre a stipend that he found himself in the course of the struggle driven to resign his post.

The student body could naturally be counted on as enthusiastic for liberty, with a few marked exceptions: such, for instance, as John Jones, a native of Stratford, of the Class of 1776, who went directly from College into the British army; and Jared Mansfield, of New Haven, of the following class, a nephew of the Rev. Dr. Richard Mansfield, who after a lawless and broken College career, was among those inhabitants who remained passively in the town when the British troops took possession of it, and thus laid himself open to the charge of toryism. The public spirit and efficiency of his later career have redeemed the memory of his early vagaries.

One peculiarly interesting connection of Yale with the contending armies relates to the family of Dr. George Muirson, of Long Island, who spent his last years in New Haven, and had in early life taken a highly notable part in the promotion of inoculation for the small-pox in America. Himself a loyal Churchman, two of his sons, graduates respectively in 1771 and 1776, fought in the war—the elder on the British and the younger on the American side,—an unparalleled instance in Yale or New Haven history. Besides at least one other line of New Haven descendants, a sister of these youths was the paternal grandmother of President Woolsey.

There were perhaps somewhat over a thousand Yale graduates in active life at the time of the Revolution, and it is a satisfactory evidence of their substantial agreement in sentiment that less than twenty-five, or 2½ per cent, sided at once and permanently with the mother country and sought refuge in British territory or died in British military service; of this number the majority were employees of either the Crown or the Church of England.

Besides such of this brief list as have already been noticed, only some half dozen more of the Yale Loyalists were persons of any special distinction; and their record can be easily summarized.

There was, for instance, the Rev. Dr. Henry Caner, of English birth, the son of that master builder who was brought to New Haven in 1717 to construct the original building named Yale College, and who through the marriage of a granddaughter into the Hillhouse family furnished a name for our (misspelt) Canner Street. Born in the Church of England, he entered her ministry in Fairfield, after his graduation in 1724, and proved so attractive a preacher that in 1747 he succeeded to the rectorship of the most conspicuous and aristocratic Episcopal congregation in New England, that of King's Chapel in Boston. When the Revolution came, in his old age, he accompanied the British on their evacuation of the town, and finally settled down in England in poverty and obscurity. His attested loss of an annual income of £200 was at length made up by an equivalent pension; and he attained a great age, which made him for eight years the oldest surviving graduate of Yale.

A second venerable Loyalist of prominence, who also attained the distinction of being the oldest living graduate, was David Ogden, of Newark, New Jersey, Class of 1728, the leading lawyer of that Province, and a Judge of the Supreme Court. As early as January, 1777, his active sympathy with the British led him to seek the protection of the troops in New York and to receive honor there as a political counselor. Then followed exile in England, where he lived in pitiful illness and loneliness, on borrowed money, under the care of a servant, until on the representation of his losses he was given a pension of £200, which he relinquished, however, in extreme old age, to return to the asylum which he craved under the flag of the United States.

Of a younger generation was another eminent graduate, who was firm in conscientious opposition to the Revolution, William Smith the younger, the historian of the Province of New York, of the Class of 1745. As a lawyer he stood at the head of his profession for ability and integrity; and after he felt constrained to an attitude of neutrality, his advice in matters of law and policy was still sought by his former associates and freely given. Finally, when unable to take the oath of allegiance to the new government, he was driven into the British lines, where he was complimented with the titular rank of Chief Justice of New York, and after the peace with the real and valid appointment of Chief Justice of Canada.

Three years younger in College age was the Rev. Samuel Seabury, a native of Groton, who took orders in the Episcopal church, in which he had been reared. The approach of the Revolution found him stationed in Westchester, N. Y., on the Connecticut border, where he had already been extensively occupied as an anonymous pamphleteer in behalf of the claims of the Church of England, and in opposition to the union of the Colonies. In 1774 he printed, still anonymously, a series of remarkably able and even brilliant papers in criticism of the Continental Congress, the authorship of which he avowed in his appeals to the Commissioners for compensation in 1783, although contradictory statements over his signature are also alleged to exist. In November, 1775, he was seized and brought to New Haven by a posse of Connecticut soldiers, who resented his partisan activity, was paraded ignominiously through our streets, and was kept here under guard for a month. After his release he took refuge within the British lines, and there received an appointment as Chaplain, from which he enjoyed to the end of his life a small half-pay pension. His later career, as the first Bishop of the American Episcopal Church, to which office he was chosen after the peace, while still in New York City, is too well known to need rehearsal.

Another graduate of high official standing who adhered to the British side was Judge Thomas Jones, of the New York Supreme Court, of the Class of 1750. He held court for the last time in April, 1776; and after repeated experiences of arrest and imprisonment for disaffection to the American cause, he embarked for England in 1781. In 1783 he estimated his losses at upwards of £14,000 sterling; and a small pension was assigned him, which he received until his death in 1792. He is now perhaps most generally remembered as the author of a bitterly partisan *History of New York during the Revolution,* which was published from his manuscript in 1879; in this work he refers to his *Alma Mater* as "then and still a nursery of sedition, faction and republicanism."

Another of the same group was Edmund Fanning, a native of Long Island, and a graduate of 1757. He settled as a lawyer in North Carolina, where he so won the favor of Governor Tryon as to become a trusted and influential factor in the public service. When Tryon was promoted in 1771 to the New-York governorship, Fanning went with him, and there also held important office. In 1776, as an ardent Loyalist, he raised and took command of a regiment, remaining in the field through the war. Later, as a reward for his fidelity, he was made successively Lieutenant-Governor of Nova Scotia and of Prince Edward Island. He accompanied Tryon on his expedition for the invasion of New Haven, in 1779, and when soliciting an honorary degree from Yale a quarter of a century later claimed that through his intervention the College buildings were saved from pillage and destruction.

I have not as yet emphasized the admitted fact that a considerable minority of the business men of New Haven in these pre-Revolutionary days are credited with Tory proclivities; but it is fair to remember that, however exasperating the differences in opinion may have been, there was no open scandal; and the vote in town-meeting in 1766, of 226 to 48 in favor of supporting the Colony officials in ignoring the Stamp Act, probably expresses about the usual strength of the two parties.

In any account of New Haven society, I should also mention that, after the trying experiences of the war were over, and the community had settled down again into its ordinary routine, the development of interests tended to consolidate, in their opposition to the older and more conservative elements, the greater part of the Episcopalians with the more venturesome commercial adventurers and the restless, drifting fringe of the population, who, with little at stake, were indifferent to hardly-won standards. These miscellaneous elements, the nucleus of the future Jeffersonians and Tolerationists, absorbed into their camp the remnants of the loyalist faction, and so conspicuous a part did these form that the whole group was often described as "Tories," and classed as not altogether well-affected to the Federal government. Thus, President Stiles, when he comments in his *Diary* on the inauguration of the City government in 1784, refers with evident asperity to the numerous Tory element—estimating one-third of the duly enrolled citizens as "hearty Tories," one-third as "Whigs," and one-third as "indifferent." Of the forty voters who are Episcopalians, he labels all as "Tories" but two, and includes from the same camp from twenty to thirty of the First-Church flock. The credulous President's figures may have been warped by gossip and prejudice; but at all events it is clear that thus early after the war a considerable weight in public affairs was conceded to the party which embraced the former Loyalists, in whom—so far as local traditions show—there was no pretence of reversion to dead issues, but a healthy and active interest in helping to work out the adaptation of the familiar conditions of life in our old democratic Colony to a new set of responsibilities and obligations in the Union of independent States.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
0 011 802 186 1

E277
.D52

[redacted]

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
0 011 802 186 1

Hollinger Corp.
pH 8.5