





A Quaker Experiment in Government.

270

A QUAKER EXPERIMENT IN GOVERNMENT

*History of Quaker Government in Pennsylvania,
1682-1783.*

BY ISAAC SHARPLESS
PRESIDENT OF HAVERFORD COLLEGE

Popular Edition
TWO VOLUMES IN ONE

"For my country I eyed the Lord in the obtaining of it, and more was I drawn inward to look to him and to owe it to his hand and power, than to any other way. I have so obtained it and desire that I may not be unworthy of his love and do that which may answer his kind providence and serve his truth and people; that an example may be set up to the nations; there may be room there though not here for such a holy experiment."

WILLIAM PENN.

Philadelphia:
FERRIS & LEACH
29 NORTH SEVENTH STREET
1902.

THE LIBRARY OF
CONGRESS,
TWO COPIES RECEIVED
JAN. 29 1902
COPYRIGHT ENTRY
Jan. 28-1902
CLASS *a* XXc. No.
25895
COPY 2.

COPYRIGHT, 1902, BY FERRIS & LEACH.

F 52
S54

WASH DC
JAN 29 1902

PREFACE.

IT IS not at all unlikely that this contribution to the early history of Pennsylvania will show a bias towards the habits of thought and action which have characterized the religion of the ancestors of the writer. If so it is unintentional.

The purpose of the book is to include, with other sources of information, the contemporary Quaker view. This has been gained by a careful examination of Meeting Records and private letters of the times, and a fairly intimate personal acquaintance with many who probably represent, in this generation, in their mental and moral characteristics, the "Quaker Governing Class" of the first century of the province.

The ordinary public sources of information have, of course, been used ; but a dependence on these alone would incur the danger, if not of misrepresenting facts, at the best of giving to them a wrong coloring.

While the general ideas of Quakerism were worked out in Penn's Frame of Government, they were not fully manifest in the subsequent history

of the province, nor even in the Acts of the Assembly, though this body was controlled by Friends until 1756.

The minutes of the Yearly and other Meetings would give a different idea of the political principles and bias of Friends from that to be gathered from the printed proceedings of either the Council or the Legislature, and all should be considered in making up a correct historical judgment.

The efforts of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania have brought together much unused material. An authentic and impartial history of Colonial Pennsylvania is yet to be written.

I. S.

Haverford College,
1898.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER I.

PRINCIPLES OF GOVERNMENT, 1

CHAPTER II.

THE QUAKERS IN ENGLAND, 7

CHAPTER III.

THE QUAKERS IN PENNSYLVANIA, 21

CHAPTER IV.

DEMOCRACY AND CIVIL LIBERTY, 47

CHAPTER V.

RELIGIOUS LIBERTY, 116

CHAPTER VI.

THE INDIANS, 152

CHAPTER VII.

MILITARY MATTERS, 183

CHAPTER VIII.

THE LAST DAYS OF QUAKER CONTROL
OF THE ASSEMBLY, 224

A Quaker Experiment in Government.

CHAPTER I.

PRINCIPLES OF GOVERNMENT.

The principles upon which the settlers of Pennsylvania sought to base their government were,—

1. Perfect democracy. This hardly needs qualification. For while the governor was non-elective and to some extent thwarted the will of the people, this was probably not the original intention, but rather an unexpected development of proprietary rights as construed by unsympathetic heirs of William Penn.

2. Perfect religious liberty. There was no restriction on the free worship of any orderly sect, and originally no religious test for office except a profession of belief in Jesus Christ. It is not unlikely that this limitation was imposed by English authority or from fear of English veto.

3. Perfect justice and fairness in dealing with aborigines and neighbors. Without concerning themselves to define the Indian rights in the

soil, whatever existed were purchased, and all complaints were met by an evident desire to recognize in others the same personal privileges they claimed for themselves.

4. The absence of all military and naval provision for attack and defense. They recognized the necessity for force through police and other agencies in internal disturbance. They would never need any force for attack, because they would never be the aggressors. In the matter of defense there were differences of opinion, and the public acts of the Quaker Assembly may be fairly construed as in some instances inconsistent with their principles. But a careful study of the records of the meetings of Friends, as well as the public records of the government, will probably convince an unprejudiced person that a belief in the impropriety of an armed force was indeed one of their strongly held convictions.

5. The abolition of Oaths. This did not necessarily introduce any difficult principle of government. It afforded, however, an excellent opportunity for English and provincial enemies to harass those in official life, either by requiring them to take oaths themselves or to administer them to others.

All of these principles had been many times

expounded, and some of them practised, before 1682. But the collection had not before been tried. It was the legitimate fruit of the religious principles of the Society of Friends, and of the best thought and experience of William Penn. But it was only a "Holy Experiment,"—the responsibility was very great, the many chances for failure must have been at least partly foreseen, and the spectacle of these pioneers mustering their confidence in "the Truth," risking their happiness, their fortunes, and the reputation of their religious Society, is one of the exalted scenes of history. The measure of success they achieved deserves, probably, more recognition than it has received. Had they been independent of English control, the experiment would have been more conclusive. The frame of government was examined and perhaps modified by the Crown, and the royal power was appealed to not infrequently to threaten forfeiture of charter and abridgment of liberty in cases of disagreement. All laws enacted were subject to English veto. English quarrels with France, reproduced in the New World, strained the pacific principles of the Pennsylvania Quakers repeatedly, and finally broke their control of government. The consent of the governed retained

these principles in power for a half century after the sect which embodied them most conspicuously was in a minority, and would have retained them we know not how much longer, could that consent alone have determined the question. It was the power of the English government exercised in response to the demands of the minority in the Province which forced the alternative of sacrifice of power or sacrifice of principle on the part of the popularly-elected Quaker Assembly. It was the same power which by enforcing the necessity of administering oaths, drove from office many of the most reliable exponents of the Founder's policy.

William Penn and his friends, after three decades of suffering such as has seldom fallen to the lot of Englishmen to endure, found resting upon them the direct responsibilities of government. Hitherto the State had been to them not a beneficent agency, but a cruel oppressor. They suffered passively, for deeply engraved in their belief was the Biblical sentiment, "The powers that be are ordained of God." But they felt also that the maintenance of certain sacred principles was a duty which transcended all obligations to human government. Here in Pennsylvania was the chance to make the Divine Law and the

human law one. They embraced the opportunity, and the responsibility of success or failure was upon them. They had to prove that their beliefs were not, as their enemies claimed, chimerical and unworkable. So fearful seemed the consequences of failure, not to themselves, but to "Truth," that the retention of power was a duty, not a privilege. The English Crown, by a stroke of the pen, could subvert their liberties, destroy the fruits of their labors, and establish the triumph of that which in their eyes was the error from which they felt they had been delivered. It is not surprising that they went to the verge of consistency, and perhaps at times a little beyond, in order to tide over difficulties which it was hoped were only temporary. The alternative was a forfeiture of charter, perhaps fines and jails for conscience' sake, the destruction of all that which they had left their English homes to build up. They hoped to maintain a consistent policy until they should survive the experimental stage and establish a successful state. But there were sacrifices of principle they could not make, and after seventy-four years of control, they sadly gave up the contest with the knowledge that the battle had been only partly won.

No one can appreciate the history of Colonial Pennsylvania who does not understand the spirit, the methods, and the beliefs of the Society of Friends. The failure to grasp these firmly, the dependence upon public records exclusively for the materials of history, has been the cause of serious misjudgments in many otherwise admirable narratives of the times.

CHAPTER II.

THE QUAKERS IN ENGLAND.

William Penn was about 22 years old when he decided to become a Quaker. This decision has had a profound influence upon the history of America. He was the beloved son of Vice-Admiral Sir William Penn, a distinguished officer of the navy who had achieved distinction under the Commonwealth and Charles II. He was rich, talented, highly educated, attractive in person and manner, and a brilliant career at court or in his father's profession was open to him. But a growing seriousness at times threatened to disappoint the hopes his father entertained of his preferment.

It is hardly a matter of wonder that in these times a development of religious interests should provoke alarm in such a father. England was full of Puritan sects of all imaginable forms of belief, many of them crude, but most of them earnest. In fact, almost all of the religious fervency of the nation had gone in a Puritan direction. A growth in earnestness was very often a precursor to some unexpected outbreak of doctrinal allegiance, which, no matter how absurd,

would hold its votaries through obloquy and persecutions even unto death. The courage and honesty of England deserted the court and took up their abode among the secretaries. These lost all chance of official recognition in State affairs or court society, but a sense of a deeper loyalty and of a higher career was more than an equivalent for the loss.

Hence when the young Oxford undergraduate developed some distaste for the established forms, and rather than absent himself from certain unauthorized religious meetings with his companions, allowed himself to be expelled from the University, he did not receive a warm welcome at home. Driving from the house did not accomplish a cure, but an extended visit to Paris and to the theological school at Saumur was more effective, and he returned "a most modish person, grown quite a fine gentleman." *

This did not last long, and a growing seriousness took him to a meeting of Friends in Cork, whither he had gone to attend to his father's Irish estates. He there heard the words from the mouth of Thomas Loc which determined his religious association, his attitude towards society and government, and his lifelong convictions.

* Pepys.

This was in 1666. George Fox had been preaching for twenty years, and multitudes apparently ripe for the new teaching had flocked to his standard. There were already thousands of Quakers, as they were called in opprobrium. They were inhumanly persecuted, but they throve on it. The jails were full of them, and foul places the jails of those days were, but more crowded into the meetings, full of the martyr spirit.

It is not necessary to give here a full account of Quaker doctrine. Only such portions will be referred to as seem to have some bearing on the production of the type which afterwards found its way into Pennsylvania and embodied itself in the frame of government, the laws, the institutions, and the customs of the State.

That the Divine Being speaks directly to the heart of every man was the central point of the teaching—central in that it was the tenet most pressed by the ministers as of vital consequence to the individual believer, and central in that it was logically “the root of the goodly tree of doctrine which sprang from it.”* Their Christian lives consisted in obedience to this voice, variously called the Seed, Grace, Light of

* William Penn.

Christ, Word of God, Christ Within. George Fox said it was his business to point men to Christ and to leave them there, and almost any one of the countless sermons of which we have abstracts in the Journals of Friends contains in more or less obscure and mystical language the statement that the kingdom of God is within men. This doctrine was effective in their mouths and contagious, and thousands of Christians settled down under its influence, to draw their spiritual nourishment and impulses from this Divine Source. The plain layman looked to the Spirit of God to guide him in the comprehension of the Bible and other sources of spiritual truth, and to a greater or less extent in the affairs of daily life; the church officer performed his functions under a sense of its continual direction; the minister preached and preached only when he apprehended it gave him a direct and immediate message to the congregation before him. Men could not determine its course. Into the hearts of the most illiterate came its power, and words uttered by them were as authoritative as if spoken by the university graduate. It reduced to a spiritual level all ranks of birth, sex, fortune or education. The message, not the form of its delivery nor the messenger through

whom it came, was to be the object of reverence, for that message was from God, who selected among His servants the one to deliver it. If in a meeting the ministers sat upon a higher bench facing the congregation, it was only for convenience of speaking and not to assume direction, and not infrequently came the inspired voice of exhortation and prayer from the commonest member of the crowded assemblage. No line was drawn between clergy and laity. It was a spiritual democracy as well as a social one. No ordination made any hierarchy—only there was a formal recognition that upon this man or woman God had conferred a spiritual gift of some sort to benefit the world.

The Grace was universal. Every man in Christian or heathen lands had felt its influence, and if yielded to, his salvation might be effected. It was the function of the missionary to call attention to it, to turn hearts to the Christ within, as well as to inform them of the Christ of history, whose Deity and Atonement they plainly stated, to weaken dependence upon anything human, and to induce every one to take his own spiritual responsibility upon himself. The deliverances of this Divine grace were at first slight and obscure, but obedience brought clearness of

perception and definiteness of understanding, till the habit was begotten of living in the continual experience of its guidance and discipline.

Such men could not fail to be democrats in the ordinary affairs of life. Because many made a distinction in rank, by addressing some with a *you* and others with a *thee*, they testified against inequality by using the singular pronoun to all. Because in the obsequiousness of the manners of the day, men would bow to the great and scorn the poor, they bowed to none. Because the newly imported doffing of the hat was only given to those in high place, the Quaker's hat stayed on his head in the presence of King and courtier, priest, judge and magistrate.* The doctrine of human equality was to them more than a theory; it was a principle to be incorporated with their social and political institutions, to go to jail for, if need be to die for.

The same principles determined their manner of worship. Discarding all sacraments as tending to obscure the brightness of the spiritual

* "My friend Penn came there, Will Penn the Quaker, at the head of his brethren to thank the Duke (Ormond) for his kindness to the people of Ireland. To see a dozen scoundrels with their hats on, and the Duke complimenting with his hat off, was a good sight enough."—Swift to Stella, January 15th, 1712.

baptism and communion which above all things they desired, they met not to hear preaching or sacred music or emotional human impulses, or to take part in ritual or ceremony, but to hear the words of God as they came directly to the waiting heart, or mediately through an inspired messenger. Without preparation, each one believing in his own capacity for priestly approach to the source of all truth and instruction and comfort, they sat in silence to await whatever influences came to their souls, and so real was this communion that there are frequent accounts of meetings of entirely wordless worship, where there was such tender union of spirit that the floor was wet with their overflowing tears, their hearts were strengthened and confirmed in their Divine Master, and they were braced to stand with quietness and fortitude all the trials of their persecuted life.

Their morality was based on the New rather than the Old Testament, and they accepted the current views as to its inspiration and authority. The Sermon on the Mount, if not in every respect a literal standard of conduct, was not to be explained away as a millennial model only, but as something to be obeyed in this present world. But here again all Biblical truth was in one re-

spect subordinate to the voice of direct revelation, to which it owed its origin. It was permitted to use it to test the validity of professed inspiration, for the Divine teaching must be consistent with itself. It was of unquestioned authority, but the proper application of its rules could only be made by the same Spirit who gave it birth.

From the Bible, therefore, thus interpreted, the Friends derived their ethical ideas. It told them "Swear not at all," and that command they accepted unquestioningly and absolutely. Again, its direct teaching and whole spirit testified against war and fighting and in favor of love and forgiveness, and they refused all participation direct or, so far as they could, indirect in any war or warlike measures. It exalted the spiritual over the temporal, and they preached much and practiced much the greatest simplicity of dress, furniture and living. It exhorted obedience to government, and here they had a difficult task. For the government of the day commanded disobedience to their principles and, not following the teaching of Hobbes, then newly given to the world, they continuously disregarded its commands.

As Peter affirmed before the Sanhedrin, "We ought to obey God rather than man," as Socrates

declared before his judges, "Athenians, I will obey God rather than you," so when the slightest point of conscience was done violence to by law or human command, to the Friend it became as the apple of his eye, and no power on earth could require its violation. They obeyed the law which demanded their appearance at court on an unrighteous charge, or which detained them in a jail with open doors, when the authorities evidently hoped to be rid by inadvertence of a troublesome prisoner, but the conventicle act interfering with their religious worship had no validity for them. Deprived on trifling pretenses of all the rights of Englishmen, they never in an age of plotting did anything to justify the government in any suspicions as to their loyalty; but the legal requirement of an oath of allegiance was refused with the assurance of perfect rectitude. "Where we cannot actually obey we patiently suffer," says William Penn. and such was their consistent attitude.

It is surprising that a people so just as the English have generally proved themselves to be should have consented for so long a time to the severe persecutions of their pacific, conscientious fellow-citizens. It was very easy in those days to find excuses, legal and otherwise, to fine and

imprison them. They would not pay tithes to support a religion of which they disapproved, and hence incurred the enmity of the ecclesiastical Presbyterians and Independents of the Commonwealth, and the ecclesiastical Episcopals of the later Stuarts. Their goods were distrained in extravagant amounts, and they were brought into court. Once there it was very easy to fine them for contempt for not removing the hat and to send them to jail till the fine was paid, which it would never be with their consent; or to require them to take an oath of allegiance, always in order, which would result in a similar imprisonment. The Conventicle act of the reign of Charles II., prohibiting more than five persons outside the resident family to meet together except according to the forms of the Church of England, they most persistently disobeyed, and went wholesale to jail, to be followed next meeting day by the children, who kept up the assemblies, in the meeting houses, on their ruins, or in the street as near as the officers' presence would permit.*

The foulness of the dungeons into which they

* After explaining how easy it was to break up the worship of other denominations by abstracting some of their machinery, Masson says: "Not so a Quakers' meeting, where men and women were worshipping with their hearts

were cast, the cruelties of jailers, the impoverishment of families, produced untold sufferings, but cemented the Society in a strong family

and without implements, in silence as well as in speech. You may break in upon them, hoot at them, roar at them, drag them about; the meeting, if it is of any size, essentially still goes on till all the component individuals are murdered. Throw them out of the door in twos and threes, and they but re-enter at the window, and quietly resume their places. Pull their meeting-house down, and they re-assemble next day most punctually amid the broken walls and rafters. Shovel sand or earth upon them, and there they still sit, a sight to see, musing immovably among the rubbish. This is no description from fancy. It was the actual practice of the Quakers all over the country. They held their meetings regularly, perseveringly, and without the least concealment, keeping the doors of their meeting-houses purposely open, that all might enter, informers, constables, or soldiers, and do whatever they chose. In fact, the Quakers behaved magnificently. By their peculiar method of open violation of the law, and passive resistance only, they rendered a service to the common cause of all nonconformist sects which has never been sufficiently acknowledged. The authorities had begun to fear them as a kind of supernatural folk, and knew not what to do with them, but cram them into gaols, and let them lie there. In fact, the gaols in those days were less places of punishment for criminals than receptacles for a great proportion of what was bravest and most excellent in the manhood and womanhood of England."—Masson's "Life of John Milton and History of His Time," VI., 587-8.

"We shall engage by God's assistance to lead peaceable, just and industrious lives amongst men, to the good and example of all. But if after all we have said, sufferings should be the present lot of our inheritance from this gen-

feeling. They volunteered to serve out each other's sentences in jail,* they aided whenever possible, and finally organized the Meeting for Sufferings, under which peculiar title the repre-

eration, be it known to them all—That meet we must and meet we can not but encourage all to do (whatever we sustain) in God's name and authority, who is Lord of Hosts and King of Kings."—William Penn, "The Great Case of Liberty of Conscience."

* "In love to our brethren that lie in prisons and houses of correction and dungeons, and many in fetters and irons and have been cruelly beat by the cruel gaolers, and many have been persecuted to death and have died in prisons and on straw" we "do offer up our bodies and selves to you for to put us as lambs, into the same dungeons and houses of correction, and their straw and nasty holes and prisons and do stand ready a sacrifice for to go into their places that they may go forth and not die in prison as many of the brethren are dead already. For we are willing to lay down our lives for our brethren and to take their sufferings upon us that you would inflict on them. . . . And if you will receive our bodies which we freely tender to you for our Friends that are now in prison for speaking the truth in several places; for not paying tithes; for meeting together in the fear of God; for not swearing; for wearing their hats; for being accounted as vagrants; for visiting Friends and for things of a like nature: We whose names are hereunto subscribed, being a sufficient number are waiting in Westminster-hall for an answer from you to us, to answer our tenders and to manifest our love to our Friends and to stop the wrath and judgment from coming to our enemies." Among this noble band of men who thus offered themselves to Parliament were some who were afterwards settlers in Pennsylvania.

sentative body of the Yearly Meeting still exists in London and Philadelphia.

In 1680 William Penn and two others presented to King and Parliament a compilation of their sufferings. Ten thousand had been in prison, and 243 had died there, mainly from cruel usage. Two-thirds of the estates of a large number had been confiscated under the plea that they were Papists in disguise. Exorbitant fines had been imposed in other cases. As many as 4,000 were in jail at one time a little later than this, and there seemed but little prospect of the trouble abating. Nor had there been any effect, so far as stopping Quakerism was concerned. The Society was growing rapidly, and every one of the persecuted had practically said with William Penn, "My prison shall be my grave before I will budge a jot, for I owe obedience of my conscience to no mortal man."

Such was the man to whom was given Pennsylvania as a means of extinguishing an old debt of 16,000 pounds owed him by the Crown, and who was accorded quite large liberty in determining the nature of its government. Such were the people upon whom he depended to form the nucleus of his settlement and give it character.

Those who emigrated were mainly, but not exclusively, English yeomen—tillers of the soil, who found in Pennsylvania not only a congenial political atmosphere, but fertile lands which they knew how to improve. They very largely appropriated to themselves the country along the west side of the Delaware River from Trenton to Wilmington, and founded the cities of Philadelphia and Chester. That they retained the same characteristics in the New World they had developed in the Old, and added to them the more active qualities which come from the assumption of the responsibilities of government, will be evident as we proceed.

CHAPTER III.

THE QUAKERS IN EARLY PENNSYLVANIA.

The organization of the Society of Friends existing in England was reproduced in America. It was due to the good sense and practical genius of George Fox, and was probably worked out during his cruel imprisonment of nearly three years in Lancaster and Scarborough jails. The central authority, at first representative, ultimately became an assembly of all members of the Society, the men and women meeting as different bodies. This constituted the Yearly Meeting. The Quarterly Meetings reported to this, and were in turn divided into Monthly Meetings, the real working bodies of the organization, in matters relating to the individual members. The Monthly Meeting undertook to see that justice was done between man and man, that disputes were settled, that the poor were supported, that delinquents, whether as to the Society's own rules or those of the State, were reformed, or if reformation seemed impossible, were "disowned" by the Society, that applicants for membership were tested and

finally, if satisfactory, received, that all the children were educated, that certificates of good standing were granted to members changing their abodes, that marriages and burials were simply and properly performed, and that records were fully and accurately kept. Under these were the Preparative Meetings.

Philadelphia Yearly Meeting dates back to 1681, when a number of Friends met at Burlington on "the 31st day of the 6th month" (August). Oscillating for a time between Burlington and Philadelphia, it finally settled down to regular sessions in Penn's city. The territory embraced monthly meetings on both sides of the Delaware River, in New Jersey, Delaware and Pennsylvania, and later some in Maryland.

Had all the inhabitants been Friends and amenable to their discipline, very little civil government would have been needed in internal affairs. The work of the legislature might have been devoted mainly to questions involving titles, etc., to property, and courts of law would have been shorn of nearly all their criminal and much of their civil business, while sheriffs and policemen, jails and punishments might almost have been omitted as unnecessary. Indeed, this was practically the case for some decades in

Pennsylvania, in country districts where the Quaker element constituted nearly the whole population.*

The Friends had a testimony against courts of law, at least till all other methods had been tried. They provided tribunals of their own, unbound by any legal trammels, to decide differences among Friends by considerations of the equities of each particular case.† Such decisions cost

* "The flock committed to my charge is indeed small, but God be thanked generally sound, which is as much as can well be expected, considering the genius of the bulk of the people among whom we live. I need not tell you that Quakerism is generally preferred in Pennsylvania, and in no county of the province does the haughty tribe appear more rampant than where I reside (Chester), there being by a modest computation 20 Quakers besides dissenters to one true church-man."—December 30th, 1712, "Papers Relating to the Church in Pennsylvania," page 69.

† "That if any personal difference doth arise among Friends, that they may be speedily advised to refer it to one or two honest Friends, and if it cannot be ended, then to lay it before the preparative meetings to whom they belong for the speedy ending of the same."—Chester Quarterly Meeting Minutes, 3, IX., 1701. In these minutes the old spelling is not followed.

"It's the sense and agreement of this meeting according to the agreement of the Yearly Meeting of London in the year 1697, when any Friends have any difference one with the other (if they do not agree it between themselves) that they first speedily refer it to indifferent, impartial, and judicious friends, mutually chosen between them, and to

nothing, arrived at substantial justice, and left the disputants in an amicable frame of mind towards each other and the arbitrators. The early minutes of the monthly and quarterly meetings contain abundance of descriptions of such cases. After tracing the matter through several successive meetings, the account usually ends with the statement that all parties are satisfied.* This result was the more easily arrived at be-

stand to their award if they agree to make any, but if they do not agree, then either party may have liberty to bring their said difference to the preparative meetings to which both of them belong, and if they do not end it in mutual satisfaction, then they may have liberty to appeal to the monthly meeting, and so farther."—*Ibid.*, 2, IX., 1702.

* . . . "Difference between C. E. of one party and G. H. and R. W. of the other party, about the throwing down of some old ruins of a mill dam, which difference was debated in this meeting, and the said parties mutually referring the determination thereof to the meeting, which is that C. E. shall pay the court charges on G. H.'s account and two-thirds of the charges on R. W.'s account, and that G. H. and R. W. acknowledge that they were too forward in doing what they did without the said C. E.'s leave; and that the said C. E. shall acknowledge to this meeting his forwardness in prosecuting of them by law without the consent of the meeting. They jointly acknowledge their satisfaction."—*Chester Quarterly Meeting*, 7, VI., 1699.

"L. B. brought in his paper of condemnation for quarreling and fighting with some of the servants; and at his request it was read and accepted, and he advised to read it

cause in most quarrels errors exist on both sides, sometimes of action, sometimes only of hasty or derogatory words, and all parties could be induced not only to make financial restitution, but also to present the proper apologies and admissions. It is these small occasions of difference which often seriously mar the good fellowship of a neighborhood, and the plan of the Friends was admirably adapted to settle them in their

according both in the meeting and court.”—Bucks Quarterly Meeting, 1684.

“ ——— complain against some of our young Friends to assenting and assisting to a forward and unadvised action in going to correct a man for beating his wife, which practice is contrary to our principles; for which the said persons have offered their acknowledgment for their offence, which is accepted.”—Concord Monthly Meeting, 1740.

“The difference between J. R. and W. W. offered to the meeting in order to compose the same. W. W. acknowledgeth he spoke foolishly in comparing him to a London pickpocket and the like, and sorry for the same, which J. R. did accept of, desiring and intending hereby that there be an end of strife from the beginning to this day.”—Chester Monthly Meeting, 6, IX., 1686.

“Friends,—Whereas I contended with my neighbor for what I apprehended to be my right, by endeavoring to turn a certain stream of water into its natural course, till it arose to a personal difference; in which dispute I gave way to a warmth of temper, so far as to put my friend into the pond; for which action of mine, being contrary to the good order of Friends, I am sorry, and desire through Divine assistance to live in unity with him for the future.”—Wilmington Monthly Meeting, 1751.

initial stages. Should the arbitrament be refused, there remained only the recourse of separation from the Society; but this was only resorted to after every endeavor was made for months together to bring the offenders to terms. In rare cases it was necessary to have a judicial decision, especially where one party was not a member.*

The business matters of Friends were looked into, where any possibility of danger existed. It was felt that the body had a responsibility for the conduct of each individual which it could not evade.† Most cautiously was the duty performed. Advice was offered by “concerned Friends”; finally the power of the meeting was invoked, and only after months of earnest labor in the case of a refractory member was “disown-

* “J. C. having not made satisfaction according to the last monthly meeting’s order, therefore this meeting leaves J. W. to his liberty to take his course with him at law.”—Chester Monthly Meeting.

† “Pursuant to an order from the Quarterly Meeting this meeting appoints —— and —— to inspect into the concerns of Friends whom they have any suspicion of going backwards in their outward concerns, so as to bring reproach upon Truth and damage to the creditors.”—Chester Monthly Meeting, 25, X., 1710.

ment" resorted to. The advice* of the higher meetings finally crystallized into a requirement for each monthly meeting to answer three times a year, plainly and honestly, the query, "Are Friends punctual to their promises and just in the payment of their debts?" A man observed to be going into business beyond his ability to manage, or so largely as to detract from his attention to meeting matters, was warned in advance of a possible calamity, and often saved himself.† All preference to creditors or tendency to save anything from a business failure was sufficient cause for extended "labour" on the part of Friends, to be followed either by repentance or disownment.

Nor were moral delinquencies which involved directly the offender only ever passed over if they came to the ears of the meeting. The early records contain but little reference to any-

* "Advised that all Friends be very careful in making and vending all provisions and other commodities for transportation, taking care that the same be good and of due fineness, measure and weight."—Yearly Meeting, 1713.

† "Inasmuch as I have bought a piece of land in Chester contrary to the advice of Friends, for which I am sorry, and acknowledge I should not have done it."—Chester Monthly Meeting, 27, XI., 1693.

thing of the sort, being mostly taken up with getting the young people married according to the Quaker order. The original immigrants, brought together by convictions of stern duty under the persecutions of England, were not likely to indulge in any libertinism. Others, however, of a different sort came with them. It is known that very early in the history of the colony, the caves in the banks along the Delaware, made by the settlers while building their houses, became the resort of a class whose loose life greatly disturbed the orderly Quakers. The birthright idea brought a second generation of Friends upon the scene who had not endured the discipline of their fathers. These were in some cases infected by the influences around them. There are many evidences that Friends were alert to the dangers which seemed to be growing up.* The meetings

* " We find a pressing concern earnestly to excite all our dear Friends, brethren and sisters, seriously to consider the state of things in this land, so lately a wilderness. When on the one hand we look back to the many blessings we have received, and the protection and peace we have enjoyed, how greatly doth it concern us to be humbled before the Almighty, and with grateful hearts take due heed to our walking before him; and on the other hand, when we take a view of the great increase of the people, and consider how many among them appear regard-

brought all possible influence to bear on their Quaker Assembly to abate immorality. This Assembly did not seem at all unwilling to do what it could, and while not going quite to the length of the Puritan New Englanders, kept in operation laws against gambling, cards and dice, theatres, swearing, lying and drunkenness.

But the main duty of the meeting was to the individual offenders. After a few decades the Monthly Meeting minutes begin to show cases, not a few in the aggregate, of drunkenness and its attendant brawls, and also of personal immorality of other sorts, which were treated with the greatest plainness. The first record would be in the nature of a complaint of a preparative meeting that A. B. had been guilty of a definitely named offence, for which his or her friends had labored earnestly without avail to induce repentance, acknowledgment and reformation.

less of religion, probity and virtue, who seem to combine in an uncommon manner to rush into immoralities and tumultuous practices, using many artful means to draw others to fall in with them, and the more perhaps because of the number of Friends who are inhabitants here, and that some are concerned in the government, by this means, since they can not persecute them as in times past, to give them trouble of another sort—how very careful ought we to be to oppose and discourage them as much as in us lies.”
—Yearly Meeting, 1726.

The meeting then appointed a committee to continue the efforts. If there seemed any hope they were continued, month by month, or a new one appointed. In some instances the same name again appeared in a little time in a responsible position,—overseer or minister,*—showing how completely he had rehabilitated himself. Such a retention was always preceded by a written acknowledgment of error and sorrow, which, if accepted as sincere, was read in public in the home meeting on “First-day.” Perhaps in a greater number of cases the offender was considered irreclaimable, and “to clear the Truth and Friends from reproach,” a committee would be appointed “to draw up a testimony against him and produce it to next meeting.” At the next meeting the testimony which separated him from membership would be read and approved and another committee appointed “to read it at — meeting on a First-day.”

This course of discipline preserved to a remarkable extent the business and moral standing of the Society. By reforming some delinquents and excluding the others, a body was pre-

* Michener's “Retrospect of Early Quakerism,” page 324.

served in substantial harmony with the original ideals. It had the additional effect of enabling Friends to face squarely and honestly every moral reform as it rose. They did not blind themselves to the evils of slavery, or injustice to the Indians, or war, or intemperance by any specious pleas of Biblical authority or financial or national expediency. They saw the evil only, and struck it straight in the face. Forbearing to the last degree with offenders, they admitted of no compromise with any system involving wrong to humanity. The history of the growth of the anti-slavery sentiment has been often told, but so far as it concerns our Pennsylvania Friends, it may be repeated as an illustration of the effective way in which they cleared themselves by their admirable discipline of the evil before they launched their corporate testimony against an hostile nation.

The earliest minutes contain cautions against abuse of slaves, and advice to see that they be treated as human beings. In 1688, the German Quakers of Germantown memorialized the Yearly Meeting in a paper still in existence against "the buying and keeping of negroes." The meeting was not ready to act, but the movement was working its way among the sensitive

consciences of its members. In 1696 they advised against "bringing in any more negroes." Chester Quarterly Meeting sent in numerous memorials requesting positive action, but many wealthy Friends were slaveholders, and many saw no evil in the established system, no doubt leniently interpreted among them, and save general exhortation against slave-dealing, the Yearly Meeting could not be brought to a definite position till 1758. That year saw two memorable minutes adopted with substantial unanimity; one required Friends to give up all civil offices in which "they think they must enjoin the compliance of their brethren or others with any act which they conscientiously scruple to perform" (meaning especially places in the Assembly); the other went to the root of the matter of slavery, and not content with a declaration against dealing in slaves, as some urged, declared that Friends were "to set them at liberty, making a Christian provision for them," and appointed a committee to visit all slaveholders to induce compliance. They were largely successful, aided as they were by sympathizing Friends in the various meetings. But a considerable number held out, and in 1774 sentiment was so advanced as to call out a more emphatic con-

demnation of all slave-holding. In 1776 a declaration of independence for all slaves held by Friends was decreed, and monthly meetings were directed, after proper effort, to exclude from membership all Quakers who refused to comply. How faithfully yet how tenderly the work was done, while the Revolutionary War raged around them, the records of 1776 and 1777 in nearly every meeting testify.

But the Quaker sense of right was not yet satisfied. In 1779 the Yearly Meeting concluded that something was owing to the slaves for their past services. "The state of the oppressed people who have been held by any of us in captivity and slavery calls for a deep inquiry and close examination how far we are clear of withholding from them what under such an exercise may open to view as their just right." The matter was placed on the basis of justice, not of charity, and many former owners voluntarily paid an amount, adjudged by impartial umpires to be fair, as the recompense for unrequited labors.

Not only did the meetings relieve the State of a large part of its criminal procedures, but they also agreed to succor all, among their own members, in poverty and suffering. Much of

this was done quietly, but many cases came to the meetings and are on record.* Sometimes money was raised, at others personal attention was directed, and as there were no hospitals, Friends' houses and lands were used.†

* "Ordered that Caleb Pusey and Walter Faucett take care to hire a cow for the widow Rudman, and the quarterly meeting are obliged to answer them 30s."—Chester Monthly Meeting, 6, III., 1689.

"The condition of J. C., a Friend of Bucks County, being laid before this meeting, having lost by fire to the value of 162 pounds, this meeting orders that a collection be settled in each particular First Day's meeting, and two appointed to receive them."—Ibid., 2, IX., 1691. The practice of First-day collections for special cases was general in those days.

† "This meeting having taken into consideration the condition of T. N., he being generally weak and having a great family of small children, and living very remote from neighbors, it is agreed that he is to remove for the reasons aforesaid, and settle down upon the lands of B. C., Jr., having given his consent."—Ibid., 6, XII., 1692.

"J. P., being in necessity of a cow, having lost one, and being in necessity of milk for his children, this meeting have lent him £5 for one year to buy one."—Concord Monthly Meeting, 1699.

"Information being given this meeting that W. P. is very poor and in necessity, this meeting orders ——— to get a good pair of leather 'briches' and a good warm coat and waistcoat, one pair of stockings and shoes, and make

Nor did cases near at hand and of their own Society alone demand their attention, but we find collections taken up for captives among the Turks as early as 1691, when many of the donors had just reached the country.*

The ideas of these Pennsylvania Quakers on the subject of education were not very exalted. Among those who came over from England there were, besides Penn, several university men of high attainments, like Thomas Lloyd and James Logan. The great majority were common people very ordinarily educated, and they did not set any great value on the higher training. They did not, as did the New England settlers, have a college in the first score of years, because they lacked the incentive which most strongly influenced the Puritans. According to them the ministry did not depend on education, and in the minds of many of them, it was no better, perhaps worse, for its presence. Then

a report of the charge to next meeting."—Falls Monthly Meeting, 1701.

"Our preparative meeting having agreed with A. F. to keep N. M. one year with sufficient meat, drink, washing, shaving, and leading him to meetings for £15, 10s."—Wilmington Monthly Meeting.

* Chester Quarterly Meeting, 1, XII., 1691.

the classic languages were heathen, the modern tongues frivolous. They had no place for art or music. The range of possible education was therefore greatly restricted. The number of self-educated mathematicians and naturalists (chiefly botanists) who grew up among them was rather remarkable. But aside from this the education of those born in this country in the second and third generations was limited in scope and amount. There were no colleges except Harvard and Yale, and they were distant and alien. The medical was the only profession demanding much training, and except in this one field, there was but little high culture among them. It was not till 1856 that the first Quaker college was in operation.

What they lacked in the higher education they made up in the lower. As with crime and pauperism, they took the elementary training of their children in their own special care. Penn well knew the value of education. In his letter of instructions to his wife he wrote about his children: "For their learning be liberal. Spare no cost; for by such parsimony all is lost that is saved." In the first laws of the Province we find, "To the end that the poor as well as the

rich may be instructed in good and commendable learning, which is to be preferred before wealth,—Be it enacted that all persons having children shall cause such to be instructed in reading and writing, so that they may be able to read the Scriptures and to write by the time they attain to twelve years of age, and that then they be taught some useful trade or skill.” Then follows a penalty of £5 for failure to secure this attainment. In 1683 the Governor and Council employed Enoch Flower on the following terms: “To learne to read English 4s. by ye Quarter, to learne to read and rite 6s. by ye Quarter, write and cast accots 8s. by ye Quarter; for boarding a scholar, that is to say, dyet, washing, lodging and Scooling, Tenn pounds for one whole year.”*

In 1697 was chartered the “Public School,” intended to be a Latin school of considerable advancement after the fashion of an English grammar school, which now exists under the name of the “William Penn Charter School.” There were a number of branches over the city, and free scholarships were established to give the

* Colonial Records, Vol. I., page 36.

poor a fair chance to secure its advantages.* In the same year the Yearly Meeting says: "Meetings for the education of youth are settled in most counties except Bucks, Shrewsbury (N. J.), and Salem (N. J.)."

Advices began to go down to the subordinate meetings, the burden of which was that Friends should see to it that all children should be taught "to read and write and some further useful learning,"† and that teachers should also be "careful in the wisdom of God and a spirit of meekness gradually to bring them to a knowledge of their duty to God and one another."‡

These schools were not free schools, but the idea of mutual aid extended to education as well as to bodily distress, and probably nearly all

* "They (Quakers) have endowed a school with 80 pounds per annum, which is in effect to blast my endeavors."—J. Arrowsmith, March 26th, 1698. "Papers Relating to the American Church, Pennsylvania," page 7.

† "They are establishing a free school for the growth of Quakerism and apostacy."—Robert Suder, November 20th, 1698. *Ibid.*, page 11.

‡ "Our greatest want is a schoolmaster to instruct our children and youth, which we are obliged to see corrupted with the base principles they must needs suck in from Quaker masters and mistresses."—"Ministry and Vestry of Chester, alias Uplands, 1704." *Ibid.*, page 23.

‡ Yearly Meeting, 1746.

children received this elementary opportunity. It became a matter of comment that Quakers were the best educated people of the counties. It was as rare to find an entirely ignorant member as a poverty-stricken one. A number of private academies gave the well-to-do a better chance, and as a result the average mental development was not low. But it was a great loss to them and their successors that there were not, as in New England, a few highly educated men in each community to stimulate the intellectual life, and university opportunities to satisfy it.

But though without this advantage, a moral poise and a tenderness of spirit preserved them from some Puritan delusions. They never persecuted. There was only one trial for witchcraft in the colony. In 1683 a poor woman had the usual accusations of bewitching cattle brought against her. She was tried by jury, the evidence soberly sifted, its absurdity proven, and the jury brought in the verdict, "Guilty of having the common fame of a witch, but not guilty in manner and forme as she stands indicted."* No other witch got so far as to court. Nine

* Colonial Records, Vol. I., pages 40-41.

years later they were hanging them in Massachusetts.

There is a long minute of instructions among the records of Chester Quarterly Meeting in 1695 against those "who, professing astrology, have undertaken thereby to give answers and astrological judgments concerning persons and things, to the dishonor of God and the reproach of the Truth," also against "rhabdomancy, or consulting with a staff." Those who used them were required to bring all books into the Monthly Meetings or take the penalty of having "testimony given against them." Several were thus put through the disciplinary process,* and sorcery disappeared.

Another contrast to New England was the absence of any hierarchy. It often happened that ministers and men prominent in the meeting were also members of the Council or Assembly, or held judicial stations, but the connection was only accidental. In no meeting record, so far as a somewhat careful examination has revealed,

* J. T. offered an acknowledgment "for going to a man to be informed concerning my horse. I can truly say I had no desire he should use any bad art in the affair. Likewise was ignorant of Friends' rules; but hope not to fall into the like again."—Concord Monthly Meeting, 1738.

was there ever any attempt to influence legislation for any political purpose. Whenever the laws touched the consciences of the members, the old English spirit instantly revived, and advice was given, not to go into politics as reformers, but to suffer as martyrs rather than bring "reproach upon Truth." Indeed there seemed evidences under the surface, but becoming more open near the middle of the eighteenth century, of a breach between those who ruled the policy of the meetings and those who were honored by their constituents with public office. A sentiment was growing up that the activities of public life were unfavorable to that introversion of thought and quietness of spirit necessary for the highest development of spiritual life. A touch of asceticism was revealed in the characters of the men whose voices had most "weight" in the yearly assemblies. These had no presiding officer, and took no votes. The clerk recorded the evident judgment of the meeting, (every adult member being permitted to be present), after a temperate and quiet discussion, carried on, as they believed, under the immediate guidance of a Divine Power. In such a discussion the subdued and infrequent words of a man known to be living in close communion with

God, and evidently speaking under a conviction of duty, outweighed the most learned or eloquent speech of a secular orator. Not eloquence, not education, not business success or worldly wisdom availed against a simple, sincere utterance of unreasoned, but not necessarily unreasonable, conviction. The contrast between the qualities of the Quaker ecclesiastic and the politician would inevitably draw different temperaments into the different stations. Some, like William Penn, might combine the two, but in many cases a line would be drawn growing more and more definite as the century advanced. Ultimately the ecclesiastical Quaker triumphed over the political, and the body settled down into a growing conviction that for them obedience to righteous laws and passive resistance to unrighteous ones constituted the burden of a Friend's duty to the government.

Such was in imperfect outline the character of the sect into whose hands the government of Pennsylvania was committed. There were in Philadelphia a number of men successful in commerce or profession whose families were better educated and who did not live such simple lives as their country brethren. It was the latter, however, by virtue of numbers and probably, also, of

spiritual power, which set their stamp upon Quakerism, and which deserve to be taken as the prevailing type. They were earnest men of quiet but strong convictions. Absolutely uncompromising in matters of principle they, perhaps, made the mistake occasionally of exalting custom to the level of principle. They knew very definitely what they believed, though they admitted no creed but the Bible, and asked no one to sign any articles. Quakerism was to them a life, not a set of beliefs. They required spiritual enduement as well as conviction as a qualification for reception into membership, still more for official station. Of infinite tenderness and forgiveness toward offenders, they refused all implication with sin. They demanded righteousness as sternly as the Old Testament and charity as perennial as the New. They possessed large ideas,—universal peace, civil and religious liberty, the embodiment in society of the Sermon on the Mount,—but many of them held these in rather a small way. Beaten into them by English persecution were the testimonies of the seventeenth century Friends, and in some respects they failed to make the necessary eighteenth century adjustment, but their sincerity destroyed hypocrisy, and the

sweetness of their lives exterminated bitterness. That which prevailed in meetings was honest simplicity and consistent integrity.

Their ruling power in relation to government was their conscience divinely instructed. This called for obedience, for reverence, for submission. They were thus the most peace-loving and peaceable of subjects, restraining themselves and their froward brethren; insisting on the full performance of all governmental duties;* but back of this it was perfectly known that legislation offensive to their convictions would be met by a resistance absolutely invulnerable, requiring more bravery than an open armed fight, and entirely sufficient in itself in time to conquer the offending legislation.

Political life was to them not an absorbing

* "That inasmuch as some amongst us have refused to pay their respective Levies in this county to the support of Government and County charges, this meeting having taken the same into their serious consideration, do conclude as followeth: That whereas we have been always ready and willing to assist and support civil government, do order that all be advised not to refuse the paying of any Levy lawfully demanded, and if any person be heady and stubborn, and not take advise by the Brethren, let them be speedily dealt with according to Gospel order, that so our holy profession may be quit of them and Truth kept clear."—Chester Quarterly Meeting, 3, VI., 1702.

question. They had their duty to perform in Pennsylvania and they meant to do it, but around all such questions flowed the higher life they desired to live, which found expression in their calm meditation, their communion with their brethren and their God, at home and in meeting, their quiet but active furtherance of moral reforms. They did not care for government, most of them did not need any; they wanted to lead unambitious lives of attention to domestic and religious duty. They prospered in business. The great, homelike houses and capacious barns of the Quaker counties are sufficient evidence of this. Their religion cost nothing of consequence, and it is possible their liberality did not always grow with their sense of justice and other virtues.

Their Assemblymen did not ask their support. They asked their best equipped men to go to the Assembly and kept them there for years,—thirty, in two cases at least. These men truly represented their constituencies, their strength and their weakness, their inextinguishable courage to do the right, their inability in some cases to see right in more than one way. They carried on during their ascendancy the government of a

colony not inferior to any other in substantial freedom, peace and prosperity.*

* "And now, Dear Friends and Brethren, we recommend to you Peace and concord as the great fruits of charity, without which we are nothing; and that we labour to approve ourselves men of peace and makers of peace; which is our ornament, duty and ensign, as the disciples of Jesus. But if any be otherwise the churches of Christ have no such custom, nor can they therein be countenanced or suffered; but so it is to the grief of our hearts, and scandal of our profession, that some laying claim to the same (in divers provinces within the verge of this meeting) have been too factious and troublesome in the governments under which they ought peaceably to live; and have by their seditious words, insinuations and practices disquieted the minds of others, to the making of parties and disturbances; and some under the fair colours of law and privileges have promoted their sinister ends; when indeed it was but to take vengeance against those whom they had taken disgust against. And this we cannot but declare our just abhorrence of: that any should sacrifice the peace of the province to private revenge; warn all to beware of such; and wherever they find them; forthwith to deal with them, and to acquit our holy profession of them in a Gospel way. For by God's help, we have now for many years approved ourselves peaceable subjects to them whom God by his providence hath set over us: first, to the King as supreme, and next, to those in authority under him; being subject, not for wrath, but conscience. But when at any time it hath pleased God to suffer the rulers that hath been over us to impose anything against our allegiance to God, we have patiently suffered under them till the Lord hath been pleased to open their understandings and mollify their hearts towards us; and this we also recommend to be continued amongst us."—Yearly Meeting, 1701.

CHAPTER IV.

DEMOCRACY AND CIVIL LIBERTY.

Such a people would have had a government which would adequately express their beliefs and habits. It could not fail to be democratic, for equality was deeply ingrained in their religious doctrines; on its penal side it could not fail to be reformatory, for reformation was the characteristic of all their churchly efforts in dealing with offenders; it could not fail to demand individual rights to the full, for they had ever claimed for themselves the largest individual freedom. It mattered, therefore, comparatively little what William Penn's personal views were. The people who emigrated to Pennsylvania through his influence would sooner or later have moulded the State into the form it finally assumed. That it was done so quickly and effectually is, however, largely due to his substantial agreement and sympathy with his co-religionists. He held their views, and had suffered their sufferings, but unlike most of them he had a tolerably clear conception of the means to be used to achieve the results desired by all. He had experience

and leisure and education and access to authorities, and a large list of friends with whom to advise. He was, therefore, a fair representative of his people, and his Frames of Government largely expressed their convictions and temper. The colonists accepted all the liberty he gave them, but, as it seemed to him, rather ungenerously, demanded more. His paternal assumptions, which were accepted in his gracious and forceful presence, could not in his absence or in the hands of his heirs become permanent. The friction engendered by them was evidently a source of surprise and disappointment to him. That the peaceable and long-suffering Friends should quickly become staunch and well-organized supporters of popular rights, finding leaders of their own not entirely in sympathy with him, was an unwelcome and unexpected discovery. Yet it was in reality only a development of his own expressed ideas, a corollary of the principles he had so frequently and so forcibly enumerated. "For the matters of liberty and privilege I propose that which is extraordinary, and to leave myself and successors no power of doing mischief; so that the will of one man may not hinder the good of the whole country," he wrote in 1861, and the province accepted the

grant as fully as it was offered. Had the colonists of Pennsylvania been thrown together without previous arrangements, a government in harmony with the Quaker mind, free and democratic, shorn of the proprietary idea, concentrating the power in the popularly elected Assembly would have been the inevitable result.

It is not unlikely that the reaction from the restrictions of England carried the democratic party too far in its opposition to what little power the Proprietary hoped to preserve out of the advancing flood of popular privileges. The people, mostly farmers, underlings at home, now found themselves in a situation to secure all and more than all they had ever hoped for. "This people think privileges their due, and all that can be grasped to be their native right Some people's brains are as soon intoxicated with power as the natives are with their beloved liquor, and as little to be trusted with it,"* Logan writes in 1704. But Logan was never democratic in his tendencies, was violent in his statements, and just at this time was in the heat of partisan conflict. The life of Penn was greatly embittered by what he considered the in-

* Penn and Logan Correspondence, I., page 299.

gratitude of his people. After being most liberal in his concessions their repeated demands for more seemed to him to indicate "an excess of vanity that is apt to creep in upon the people in power in America, who, having got out of the crowd in which they were lost here, upon every little eminency there think nothing taller than themselves but the trees." He suggests that those in office should be brought occasionally to London "that they might lose themselves again amongst the crowds of so much more considerable people."* But this has been the charge urged against Americans in all ages since then. Whether the climate or the distance from established institutions has been the cause, the Pennsylvanians displayed very early the qualities which have made America free and vigorous, as well as sometimes self-assertive and irreverent. It was a pleasing sentiment that William Penn and his family should live as gracious and kindly feudal lords, dispensing the blessings of religious and civil liberty upon willing and trusting free-men, but it was opposed to the spirit of the age and of the race and could not be. The great goodness and liberality of the Proprietor, his

* Penn and Logan Correspondence, I., page 374.

misfortunes from the hands of those he trusted most, his evident desire to have his Province happy and prosperous and his perfect willingness to make any reasonable sacrifice in order to make it so, cause our sympathies to go out to him in his differences with an ungrateful people. In one sense a sadder life than his we seldom know. His letters again and again, sometimes pathetic,* sometimes indignant, portray the keen disappointment of an honest, conscientious and sensitive soul. There was undoubtedly provocation. Demagogues then, as always, led the people

* "O Pennsylvania! what hast thou cost me! Above £30,000 more than I ever got by it, two hazardous and most fatiguing voyages, my straits and slavery here, and my child's soul almost."—Penn and Logan Correspondence, I., page 280.

"I have cause to believe that had he (Logan) been as much in opposition, as he has been understood to stand for me, he might have met with milder treatment from his persecutors, and to think that any man should be the more exposed there on my account, and instead of finding favor, meet with enmity, for his being engaged in my service, is a melancholy consideration. In short, when I reflect upon all these heads of which I have so much cause to complain, and at the same time think of the hardships, I and my suffering family have been reduced to, in no small measure owing to my endeavors for, and disappointments from that province, I cannot but mourn the unhappiness of my portion dealt to me from those of whom I had reason to expect much better and different things."—Proud, "History of Pennsylvania."

astray. Sordid men refused grants which every consideration of fairness, to say nothing of gratitude, should have caused them to make. But underneath it all was the demand of the age for liberty, a demand expressing itself oftentimes unwisely and ungraciously, but leading on the people to the inevitable goal of perfect democracy.

Penn himself was an enthusiast for liberty. So far from desiring reservations of power for himself he spread abroad among the people the principles of the advanced republicanism of his day. In 1687 he published in Philadelphia for local circulation a copy of *Magna Charta*, with introduction and comments evidently intended to give his colonists a knowledge of their liberties and to incite them to demand them.* The treatise also contains "A Confirmation of the Charters of the Liberties of England and of the Forest made Anno XXV. Edward I.; the sentence of the Clergy against the Breakers of

* There is only one copy of this issue known to exist. This is in possession of "The Friends' Meeting for Sufferings" at 304 Arch Street, Philadelphia. A handsome edition of 155 copies has been published (1897) by the Philobiblion Club of Philadelphia. William Penn's name does not appear, but David Lloyd in 1728 refers to it as Penn's production.

these Articles; the sentence or curse given by the Bishops against the Breakers of the Great Charter; a statute made Anno XXXIV. Edward I., commonly called *De Tallagio non Concedendo*," an abstract of Penn's patent, and a copy of *The Frame of Government*.

It could hardly be doubted that the man who made the eloquent and effective defence, with William Mead, of himself and the jury that acquitted him, in 1670, understood and appreciated the full meaning of civil liberty. His views did not change when from being a prisoner he became the ruler of a province. Nothing could be more eloquent than his address "To the Reader" of his book of 1687.

It may reasonably be supposed that we shall find in this part of the world many men, both old and young, that are strangers in a great measure to the true understanding of that inestimable inheritance that every free-born subject of England is heir unto by birthright, I mean that unparalleled privilege of Liberty and Property beyond all the nations in the world beside; and it is to be wished that all men did rightly understand their own happiness therein; in pursuance of which I do here present thee with that ancient garland, the Fundamental Laws of England, bedecked with many precious privileges of Liberty and Property, by which every man that is a subject to the Crown of England, may understand what is his right and how to preserve it from unjust and unreasonable men; whereby appears the eminent care and wisdom and industry of our progenitors in providing for them-

selves and posterity so good a fortress that is able to repel the lust, pride and power of the noble as well as the ignorance of the ignoble; it being that excellent and discreet balance that gives every man his even proportion, which cannot be taken from him, nor be dispossessed of his life, liberty or estate, but by the trial and judgment of twelve of his equals, or Law of the Land, upon the penalty of the bitter curses of the whole people; so great was the zeal of our predecessors for the preservation of these fundamental liberties (contained in these charters) from encroachment, that they employed all their policy and religious obligations to secure them entire and inviolable, albeit the contrary hath often been endeavored, yet Providence hitherto hath preserved them as a blessing to the English subjects.

The chief end of the publication hereof is for the information and understanding (what is their native right and inheritance) of such who may not have leisure from their plantations to read large volumes; and beside I know this country is not furnished with law books, and this being the sort from whence all our wholesome English laws spring, and indeed the line by which they must be squared, I have ventured to make it public, hoping it may be of use and service to many freemen planters and inhabitants of this country, to whom it is sent and recommended, wishing it may raise up noble resolutions in all the freeholders in these new colonies not to give away anything of Liberty and Property that at present they do (or of right as loyal subjects ought to) enjoy, but take up the good example of our ancestors, and understand that it is easy to part with or give away great privileges, but hard to be gained if once lost. And therefore all depends upon our kindest care and actings to preserve and lay sure foundations for ourselves and the posterity of our loins.—
“Philopolites.”

Could William Penn have lived a century longer he would not have seen the exact State of

his imagination, but he would have recognized the great impetus given to the cause of human liberty by his well meant and in the main wise efforts. Reformers never get what they work for just as they expect it.

Pennsylvania became the most consistently free colony in the country, the most consistently prosperous, the most rapid in its growth in freedom and prosperity. So nearly had the inhabitants everything they could desire that they hesitated to take up the Revolutionary cause in 1775. Their charter, their traditions, their thoughts were all free, and they were slow to understand the fervor of New England and Virginia.*

* The glowing words of Andrew Hamilton, when giving up his place as Speaker of the Assembly in 1739, were undoubtedly true:

“It is not to the fertility of our soil or the commodiousness of our rivers that we ought chiefly to attribute the great progress this province has made within so small a compass of years in improvements, wealth, trade, and navigation, and the extraordinary increase of people who have been drawn from every country in Europe; it is all due to the excellency of our Constitution. Our foreign trade and shipping are free from all imposts except those small duties payable to his Majesty by the statute laws of Great Britain. The taxes are inconsiderable, for the sole power of raising and disposing of public money is lodged in the Assembly. . . . By many years’ experience we find that an equality among religious societies, without distin-

By the charter of Charles II. William Penn was made absolute proprietor of Pennsylvania and was authorized, with the assent of the freemen or their representatives, to make all laws not inconsistent with those of England, and to appoint judges and other officers. In cases of emergency he might be absolute lawmaker without calling together the legislative body. There was to be an appeal allowed to England at the expiration of five years after the passage of any law, and the crown thus reserved the power of veto on all Pennsylvania enactments.

Armed with these powers and limitations he went to work at constitution-making. The various trials may be seen among the "Penn MSS." in the library of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania. Anyone having the time and patience to follow out the efforts of the author in the mass of old writings, with their erasures and inter-linear and marginal corrections, might probably trace the steps through which the final Frame of

guishing one sect with greater privileges than another, is the most effective method to discourage hypocrisy, promote the practise of moral virtues, and prevent the plagues and mischiefs which always attend religious squabbling. This is our Constitution, and this Constitution was framed by the wisdom of Mr. Penn."

Government was perfected. Evidently more than one hand and brain wrought for the establishment of the new State. The papers have neither date nor name, and it is difficult to tell whether they are products of different original drafts, or the same draft modified by different advisers. It is probable that Algernon Sidney aided Penn in the work. In proof of this we have the fact that Penn interested himself vigorously in furthering Sidney's election to Parliament, and had a high estimate of his character and political views. He says, in a letter to him, after referring to "the discourse we had together at my house about me drawing constitutions," . . . "I took my pen and immediately altered the terms so as they corresponded with thy objection and sense. Upon which thou didst draw a draft, as to the Frame of Government, gave it to me to read, and we discoursed with considerable argument." Benjamin Furly, a Friend of considerable influence in Holland, is known to have criticised the final "Frame," and it would have been well had his corrections been adopted in advance, as the logic of events required most of them to be finally. Others of Penn's co-religionists, and some intending immigrants, were also

consulted, and the result is the jumble now to be seen in the records of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania. It interests us only for our present purpose to know that William Penn adhered, through all the changes of detail, to the fundamental purpose expressed by him in 1676 in relation to West Jersey affairs: "We lay a foundation for after ages to understand their liberty as men and Christians, that they may not be brought in bondage but by their own consent; for we put the power in the people."

Out of this mass of suggestions arose Penn's "Fundamental Constitutions"—being twenty-four clauses embracing his general ideas of government,—*one* constitution, as we would express it. This was not adopted exactly as promulgated. Other influences were afterwards brought to bear, and changes were made which did not improve the plan. The original is among the Penn MSS. and has only recently been published.* It is interesting as probably being the nearest approximation possible to Penn's ideas of government. What he wanted was "the frame of government that shall best preserve Magistracy in reverence with the people and best keep it from being hurtful to them." He cast aside

* "Pennsylvania Magazine," October, 1896.

everything which would not conduce to the general peace and prosperity. "For it were a most condemnable superstition to perpetuate anything for being ancient or domestick that were not otherwise useful." In the forefront of his "Constitutions" he places the right of every one to worship according to his conscience and pledges himself to secure it. He further declares it a fundamental that an Assembly having the privileges of an English House of Commons be elected yearly, which shall meet whether called by the governor or not. For the purposes of election there shall be small districts, each one sending two men to the Assembly. These shall bring with them the written instructions of their electors, and if they are violated the Assemblyman shall be ineligible "unless the people, sensible of his repentance, shall forgive and choose him." They shall be required, moreover, to secure the approbation of their electors to each law or appropriation during the session of the Assembly, "that they may always remember they are but deputies." The Assembly might contain three hundred and eighty-four members, and had the power to select forty-eight Councilmen out of their own number as a permanent board and upper house of legislature,

with co-ordinate powers. During the sessions of the Assembly this Council shall consult with the larger body in order to send a law to the Governor. The Council has also executive duties. The Governor can veto laws within fourteen days of their presentation. Primogeniture shall be abolished except that in deference to the Jewish law the oldest son may receive double the share of each of the others. Imprisonment for debt for small sums shall be abolished, and for large ones when the debtor is not worth ten pounds. Capital punishment for felony shall be abolished. Affirmations shall be substituted for oaths. The law of Habeas Corpus shall be observed. There shall be no tavern or ale houses, and horse racing, bull and bear baiting and games of cards and dice shall be prohibited. All children—girls and boys—shall be taught useful trades. For each local office two names shall be chosen by the electors, and the Governor shall appoint one of the two. If he fail to do so, the one first named shall hold the office.

This is a remarkable Constitution for the year 1681. It anticipates by two centuries in some respects the best ideas of the most advanced republics. There could not well be anything more democratic than the Assembly. The initiative

and the referendum are both here. The prohibitionist will find there his plan for suppressing saloons. Nothing of vital consequence now in our American Constitution relating to individual liberty and the rights of popular assemblies is denied except the privilege of passing laws over the Governor's veto.

It would have saved some friction had these "Constitutions" stood. But Penn must have a colony before he could legislate for it, and we may well imagine that it was an uppermost subject with him to induce the right sort of men to emigrate in large numbers. As he truly said, "Let men be good and the government cannot be bad. If it be ill they will cure it. But if men be bad, let the government be ever so good, they will endeavor to warp and spoil it to their turn." * It is therefore probable that in order to conciliate large land purchasers he gave the Council, his upper house, in his final draft the sole power to originate laws—the Assembly being authorized only to pass on such laws as were presented to it. It was supposed that the largest property holders would constitute the Council, and he exalted it at the expense, not only of the

* Preface to the Frame of Government.

Assembly, but of the Governor and Proprietor as well, for he gave up the right of veto and only retained three votes in a council of seventy-two members.

Neither of these provisions could become permanent. The people immediately demanded full legislative rights for the Assembly, and after 1693 practically excluded the Council from any law-making powers. In 1701 it became an advisory board for the Governor, appointed by the Proprietor. Both people and Proprietor saw that the latter official or his representative would be powerless without the veto, and restored it in 1696. But the willingness of William Penn to give up power and privilege does credit to his generosity, if not always to his judgment.

The Assembly of the first year was to consist of all the freemen of the province, afterwards of two hundred members. But here again the desire for a pure democracy had outgrown the bounds of reason. The freemen would not come together. They were too busy. Nor could the sparse population support two hundred Assemblymen. Finally thirty-six became the maximum number, and near this it remained through the Colonial period.

The "Frame of Government" and the "Laws

agreed upon in England” were the final products of all Penn’s best thinking and conferences, and were brought with him to the Colony in 1682. Though changed in form many times they shaped all future Constitutions of Pennsylvania, of other States and of the Federal Union.*

This Frame was modified in 1683 to correct some glaring inconveniences, again in 1696 in the direction of popular freedom, and in 1701 it assumed the form which it maintained during the Colonial period. It was the Constitution of Pennsylvania until 1776. There seems good reason to believe that Penn preferred the earlier drafts, but that the concentration of the power in the hands of the Assembly was demanded by the democratic aspirations of the people. The Proprietor had said to them in 1700 with the greatest frankness, “Friends, if in the Constitution by charter there be anything that jars, alter it. If you want a law for this or that, prepare it. . . . Study peace and be at unity. . . . I desire to see mine not otherwise than in the public’s prosperity.” The demand of the people for liberty was met by a gracious surrender on the part of

* For an interesting comparison between Locke’s Constitution and Penn’s see Bancroft’s History.

the Proprietor. Himself greatly in advance of the times, he so far honored the principle of government by the people, as repeatedly to yield his own judgment and desires; so that while they were contending with him and his agents for additional privileges he was himself shielding them to his own pecuniary disadvantage from the attacks of enemies in England who were seeking to deprive them of privileges already granted.

The charter of 1701 which embodied the final triumph of radical democratic principles contained only nine articles. The first grants liberty of conscience to all who "Confess and acknowledge Almighty God," and grants to all who profess to believe in Jesus Christ the right to hold executive and legislative offices, by giving a promise of allegiance and fidelity.

The second requires an Assembly to be chosen yearly by the freemen to consist of four persons or more from each county. This Assembly has full powers to choose its officers, to judge of the qualifications of its own members, to adjourn itself, to prepare bills and make laws, impeach criminals and redress grievances, "with all other powers and privileges of an assembly according to the rights of free-born subjects of England."

The third requires the freemen to elect two or three people for each position of sheriff or coroner or other court officers, and the Governor to choose among them. Or if the Governor fails to select, the first named shall serve.

The fourth declares that all laws shall be issued in the form, "By the Governor, with the consent and approbation of the freemen in General Assembly met."

The fifth allows all criminals to have the same privileges of witnesses and counsel as their prosecutors.

The sixth requires that all cases concerning property shall be decided by courts of justice and not by Governor and Council.

The seventh prevents any one receiving a tavern license who is not recommended by the justices, and allows the justices to suppress a disorderly public house.

The eighth prevents the forfeiture of the estates of suicides or intestates; prohibits any law contrary to this Charter without the consent of the Governor and six-sevenths of the Assembly, and pledges the Proprietor to observe inviolably the first article concerning liberty of conscience.

Lastly the Proprietor binds himself and heirs

not to destroy the liberties of the Charter, and declares such actions if attempted to be of no force or effect.

Nothing was said in the Charter about a veto of laws by the Governor except such as is implied in the fourth article. This seems, however, never to have been questioned. When the Proprietor was in the Province his assent was necessary to all laws. When absent the Deputy Governor was to assent, but he was governed by general proprietary instructions. While excluded from law-making, the Council could exercise a salutary restraint upon both the Assembly and the Governor. It was composed of eight or twelve wise and solid men, and being appointed by the Proprietors largely to safeguard their interests, was out of direct reach of popular clamor. The Deputy Governors were usually instructed to perform no act without its consent. This gave it a valuable conservative place in government.

“ Thus did Penn perfect his government. An executive dependent for its support on the people; all subordinate elective officers elected by the people; the judiciary dependent for its existence on the people; all legislation originating exclusively with the people; no forts, no armed

force, no militia; no established church; no difference of rank; and a harbor open for the reception of all mankind of every nation, of children of every language and every creed;—could it be that the invisible power of reason would be able to order and restrain, to punish crime and to protect property?” *

Before entering upon the development of the principles of democracy and civil liberty in the Province, it will be interesting to know the extent to which the Quakers controlled the government. While William Penn was in his usual health his influence was of course very great. His proprietorship in its relation to the government, to his quit-rents due from lands sold, to his private ownership of vast acres of unoccupied land, as well as his personal character, purity and simplicity of life, the value of his religious ministry, and his great abilities, gave him a commanding influence. He was in the country in active control in 1682-4, and again in 1699-1701. In 1712 he was seized with a stroke of apoplexy, and was unable to do business until 1718, when he died. During this time his affairs were managed with great ability by his

* Bancroft's "History of the United States."

wife, who was, later, his executrix. After her death his sons by his second wife inherited his proprietary interests. They gave up their rights in the Society of Friends, and in general did not sympathize with it. During the latter part of the time covered by this narrative, they were in almost constant opposition to the Quaker elements of the Pennsylvania population. This was more due to the fact of diverse interests, arising from their private ownership of land, than to any denominational cause. The Quaker Assembly was the exponent of the democratic feeling of the country, and was in frequent collision with proprietary instructions and proprietary claims. This opposition may have been strengthened by a feeling of the sons' desertion of a cause with which the father was so prominently identified, but sooner or later feudal interests and popular interests would inevitably clash.

There was only one Deputy Governor who was a Quaker. When Penn returned to England in 1684 the executive responsibility was left with a council of five, of which Thomas Lloyd was President. This Presidency, involving the practical headship of the Province, was retained till 1688, when Captain John Blackwell was ap-

pointed Lieutenant Governor. This arrangement only lasted about a year, and Thomas Lloyd again came into power, as President of the Council, and in 1691 as Deputy Governor. In 1693 Colonel Fletcher was appointed Governor by William III., who had taken the government from Penn, and in 1694 William Markham received the same position from the Proprietor, who had regained his Province. Thomas Lloyd was a minister in the Society of Friends, much loved and trusted by all, though at least one of his acts led to Penn's very severe reprobation.* He was a younger son in a Welsh family of good standing, an Oxford graduate, and a man of retiring disposition, who accepted office with reluctance as a duty and gave it up with glad relief. Finding a number of disorderly characters frequenting the city he would go out at nights and give them religious advice. The combination of Deputy Governor and Quaker preacher was too much for the boisterous spirits,

* "I too mournfully remember how noble a law I had of exports and imports. But Thomas Lloyd, very unhappily for me, my family and himself, complimented some few selfish spirits with the repeal thereof."—Penn to Logan. Penn and Logan Correspondence, II., page 70.

and Philadelphia became under his control the most decorous of cities. He died in 1694, leaving a place which could not be filled by any member of the Society of Friends.* There may, however, have been other reasons why Penn preferred Governors who were not Friends. Orders of a character difficult for a Quaker to execute might at any time come from England.† William Penn had received power in his Charter from Charles II. to train soldiers and to make war. If the King should require warlike measures at the hands of the Governor it was convenient to have a Deputy without any scruples

* Edward Shippen, a Quaker, performed as President of the Council, in 1702-3, the duties of Deputy Governor in an interval between appointments, and James Logan in a similar way in 1736-7.

† The Deputy Governors after Penn's second visit were:

Andrew Hamilton	1701
John Evans	1703
Charles Gookin	1709
William Keith	1717
Patrick Gordon	1726
George Thomas	1738
James Hamilton	1748
Robert Hunter Morris	1754
William Denny	1756
James Hamilton	1759

of conscience to stand in the way of organizing militia and erecting fortifications.*

During the life time of William Penn the Council was Quaker by a considerable majority. His widow directed the Deputy to appoint at least half the Councillors from the Society.† After her death the Council naturally represented the changed feeling of the heirs, so that the whole executive branch was in certain respects disavowed by Friends. James Logan or his son William, both Friends, retained a place there through nearly all the proprietary régime. In early time many members were ministers.

Nothing more clearly shows the entire breakdown of the line between ministers and laity than the way they exercised indiscriminately all public offices. Whether Quakers or not, the

* As a illustration: Under date of 29th of Fifth month, 1702, Logan writes to Penn: "I have not much to advise of more than by the last packet arrived, with orders directed to thee, or the commander-in-chief of this to proclaim a war, which was accordingly done on the 6th day last, the 24th inst."

† "By order nine of twelve of my Council are Quakers, the Magistrates in the same proportion, and the Assembly twenty-three Quakers to three churchmen."—Governor Gookin to Secretary, March 16th, 1716-7. "Papers Relating to the American Church, Pennsylvania," page 109.

Council was composed of men of attainments and character, and the place was one of honor and usefulness, even after all law-making powers were taken from it.

The Quakers, however, revelled in complete possession of the Assembly from 1682 to 1756. The first meeting at Chester in the former year was to have consisted of all the freemen of the Province. But the counties sent up only twelve men each, thirty-six from Pennsylvania and thirty-six from Delaware, asking Penn to accept this as a competent legislature. The Quaker immigration had not set in very largely, and the Swedes and Dutch already in the country, particularly in the lower counties, had a majority of one in the Assembly. The lines seem to have been drawn on Quaker membership, and in choosing a speaker the absence of two of the non-Quaker members alone enabled Friends to organize it.*

* Letter of William Penn to Jasper Yeates, "Pennsylvania Magazine," Vol. VI., page 469. This letter contains many interesting features concerning Penn's attitude towards the government of his colony. Yeates had evidently reproached Penn for securing too much for his own family. Penn calls attention in reply to the fact that he had only three votes in joint legislature of 272 members, and after telling how near the Quakers were to losing control as

After this there seems to have been no question of ascendancy. Friends were elected not infrequently against their own protests. After the separation of the three lower counties, the Assembly came still more into their hands. In 1755 a militia law is thus prefaced: "Whereas this Province was settled by (and a majority of the Assembly have ever since been of) the people called Quakers, etc." Franklin speaks of them in 1747 as "That wealthy and powerful body of people who have ever since the war governed our elections and filled almost every seat in our Assembly." * They were partly aided in this by a somewhat inequitable division of assemblymen which gave a double representation to the three Quaker counties—Philadelphia, Chester and Bucks. It arose in this way. After 1701 it had been decided to constitute the Assembly of four members from each county, and if ever the lower

stated above, says that many Friends wanted him to take back part of the power he had granted them. But at this date he does not indicate any intention to do it. The pressure probably became stronger later, for in 1683 he accepted the veto power.

* A Church of England clergyman writes: "We can have no expectation of being a parish while seven-eighths of our Assembly are Quakers."—"Papers Relating to the Church of Pennsylvania," page 107.

counties separated their quota should be added to the three Pennsylvania counties then in existence. When new counties were added, they came in on the basis of the original numbers. This was excused by the ideas of property representation then prevalent, and on this basis was not unreasonable. It gave, however, double power to the counties which would naturally choose Quaker representatives. In the country districts of these counties there was a Quaker majority probably up to 1740 or 1750. In Philadelphia city there was never a Quaker majority except possibly for a very few years after 1682. In 1702 it has been estimated that the population of the city was equal to that of the country, and that one-third of the former and two-thirds of the latter were Quakers.* It was about this date, therefore, that they became a minority, and the minority grew smaller by immigration of others with each succeeding year. The estimates of their number in 1756 vary from one-sixth to one-fourth of the total population. The exact numbers will never be known, as no church censuses were ever taken.

* James Logan. Penn-Logan Correspondence, I., page 102.

Though thus in the minority, in 1740 there were only three non-Quaker members of the Assembly,* and in 1755, before they had themselves taken any measures to give up their seats, twenty-eight of the thirty-six members were Friends.† The responsibility for the actions of the Assembly therefore during these years, so far as their religious beliefs affected their duties as legislators, properly belongs to them.

With the exception of the unequal representation, disproportionate as to numbers, among the counties, there is nothing to indicate any improper efforts to retain power in the hands of Friends. Their root principle of denominational equality, never varied from and probably never seriously impeached, would prevent this.‡ They

* "Pennsylvania Magazine," X., page 291.

† Pemberton Papers.

‡ Shepherd, in his "History of Proprietary Government in Pennsylvania," makes a natural error when he says (foot-note, page 548): "The Quakers even went so far as to make up their party ticket at their yearly religious meetings." Any one familiar with the methods and spirit of a Yearly Meeting would know the impossibility of such an action. The authority for Dr. Shepherd's statement is the following from The Shippen Papers. Edward Shippen writes under date September 19th, 1756: "No ticket is yet

did feel a deep responsibility for the conduct of a state based largely on their principles and in which they had been the leading denomination from the start. The principles were on trial. It was an experiment, a "holy" one perhaps, but more than this was not claimed. It would be cowardly to yield their places to the clamor of enemies at home and in England, so long as in honest elections and by honorable methods they were legitimately chosen to places of power. There were among them ambitious and designing men who made the most of their opportunities to advance their personal influence. But if there are any adequate proofs of public immorality or personal aggrandizement of a serious character, or unrighteous expedients to perpetuate church control or to establish a religion by state aid, or as a church to retain political ascendancy, they have escaped a tolerably careful scrutiny of public and meeting records. Until 1756 they

settled for this county (Philadelphia), nor can any be until the result of the Yearly Meeting at Burlington is known." At first sight this seems to confirm the statement. The facts are, as will be seen in a succeeding chapter, that both London and Philadelphia Yearly Meetings were about to make strenuous efforts to prevent any Friend taking a seat in the Assembly, and several possible candidates refused to offer themselves till the action of the Yearly Meeting should be known.

probably voted for their own members, but the election turned very largely on the German vote, which from similarity of religious and political views naturally went to them, while the Scotch-Irish Presbyterians of the frontiers and the Episcopalians of the city of Philadelphia supported the Proprietary party of the later days. The Quakers were never outvoted so long as they consented to be candidates.

How the parties in those days selected their candidates, what substitute they had for the modern caucus, and what machinery they used to make their leadership effective, may not be known. The Quakers seem to have become efficient politicians. They elected their best men, and kept them continually in office.

Resuming now quite briefly the political history of the country so far as the preservation of civil rights is concerned, we find, as we might expect from the nature of the country whence the immigrants had come, and the age in which they lived, that they had the instincts for freedom, the suspicion of any power but popular power, sufficiently strong and sufficiently close to the surface. For the first twenty years the politics of the country is full of bickerings and difficulties over not very large matters. When

Thomas Lloyd was in power after Penn's first absence, there was some degree of harmony between the executive and the legislature. But Blackwell and Fletcher and Markham each was at the helm at different times, and each was engaged in a struggle with the popular Assembly which ended ingloriously for him. Blackwell, who came in in 1688, was an old soldier, son-in-law to Cromwell's General Lambert, with no tact, but excellent intentions. He meant to rule the country; he was under the impression that Penn gave him some sort of power, and he undertook in his own wisdom to revise the Council then elected by the people. But Thomas Lloyd, Quaker preacher though he was, proved a most doughty and persistent opponent and effective champion of popular rights, and would not be put out. Samuel Richardson, in words which remind one immediately of the spirit of English Puritanism of the earlier times, refused to own the Governor, and when asked to withdraw while his case was being considered replied, "I will not withdraw. I was not brought hither by thee, and I will not go out by thy order. I was sent by the people, and thou hast no power to put me out." * There was nothing for Blackwell to

* Col. Rec., Vol. I., p. 20.

do but to give up the fight and to ask for a recall. When it came he no doubt sincerely told the Council, " 'Tis a good day; I have given and I do unfeignedly give God thanks for it (which are not in vain words), for to say no worse I was very unequally yoked." Thus ended the first attempt to govern a body of Quakers by a soldier.

After this Thomas Lloyd came in again as President of the Council and then Deputy Governor, and harmony reigned for a little time. But the lower counties (the present State of Delaware), connected with the Province but not largely settled by Quakers, did not work harmoniously with the others. George Keith got up a religious schism which developed into a political opposition to the dominant powers. There was a growing party of Churchmen, which afterwards, under the leadership of Colonel Quarry, an officer appointed by the Crown to attend to admiralty cases and hence independent of the provincial government, was entirely out of harmony with Quaker notions on war and oaths, and was striving to discredit the government in England so as to secure the forfeiture of the Charter and the establishment of a Crown colony. The Assembly was rent internally by dissensions in efforts to punish members for disrespect and to

gain power from the Governor and Council, and seemed to justify Logan's complaint that they were intoxicated with the liberty to which they were unused. To crown all William Penn was thrown into prison on the charge of Jacobinism, his government taken from him, and Governor Fletcher of New York appointed to manage the disordered but not turbulent Province.

Thomas Lloyd and many other Friends refused positions under him, acting on Penn's advice "to insist on their patent with wisdom and moderation." The old laws were, however, declared invalid. "These laws and that model of government is dissolved and at an end. . . . The King's power and Mr. Penn's must not come in the scales together." This dispute was long in settling. The Assembly adhered tenaciously to their old privileges, and the nineteen months of Fletcher's rule saw very little done, but nothing lost to the cause of liberty.

Upon the restoration of Penn to liberty and power in 1694, he appointed Markham as his Deputy, and this arrangement lasted until his return to the colony in 1699. Markham held to what he could, but was not able to resist the growing desires of the Assemblymen under the able leadership of David Lloyd. They secured

the charter of 1696, giving them the power of originating, as well as vetoing bills, thus reducing the Council to a co-ordinate rather than a superior body, a reduction still further continued in 1701, when it was shorn of all part in law-making. The need of money by the Governor was a perfect boon to the Assembly, which, English-like, coupled its grant with conditions requiring unwelcome concessions from the proprietary deputy.

An unfortunate ecclesiastical schism was not without its political effects. George Keith had been a doughty defender of Quakerism. He was perhaps the best scholar of his Society, had been associated with Barclay in the preparation of the Apology, and with Fox and Penn in their travels in Holland and Germany. He had proven the sincerity of his convictions by his sufferings, and when, in 1689, he came to Philadelphia as the first Headmaster of the School which is now the William Penn Charter School, it was with the highest reputation for Quaker orthodoxy, as well as linguistic, scientific and philosophical attainments. A change came over his views very soon after this. It is unnecessary to accept any of the reasons given by Quaker historians for this change; all cannot be correct. The times

were strenuous, and strong language was used on both sides. Political controversy raged fiercely, and some of the tenets advocated were crude and trifling. Keith's charges against his former brethren were the exaltation of the Inward Light at the expense of the historic Christ and the Bible, too great use of outward resistance by magistrates, and the practice of capital punishment. He had many sympathizers, but the Yearly Meeting decided against him, and a separate meeting was the result. The Foxian and the Keithian Quakers became convenient terms of distinction in the writings of the day, and opposed each other in church and state.

Keith appealed to England with similar results. His learning and his preaching made him friends, but the decision, carefully made, was adverse to his claims. After a vain attempt to divide Friends, he joined the Episcopal Church, and spent the rest of his life in refuting the doctrines he had done so much to establish. He never denied his inconsistency. He paid a second visit to America, as the first missionary of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, and between 1700 and 1704 traveled from Massachusetts to Carolina, setting up churches. He claims to have induced about five hundred peo-

ple in Pennsylvania, mostly Friends, to join the Episcopal Church, and large numbers of Presbyterians in other colonies. His "Christian Quakers" had disappeared as an organized body by 1700, some returning to the fold, more joining the Baptists and Episcopalians.

Politically, they associated themselves sometimes with David Lloyd and the democrats, sometimes with Quarry and the Churchmen; and by the rancor they received and returned, added greatly to the disunion of the time.

Notwithstanding these continuous dissensions among the rulers, petty and great, the country as a whole was peaceful and prosperous. The farmers tilled and cleared their lands, and built up their homes undisturbed; they went to their semi-weekly meetings, and managed their church affairs generally in a sweet spirit of brotherly love. Merchants and traders carried on increasing business, and laid the foundations of considerable fortunes. Immigrants flocked in at a great rate, and found homes and occupations in pleasing contrast to their state in Europe. When Penn landed, in 1699, he found a government somewhat in confusion, from an experiment of tyros not altogether "holy," but a people in the main contented and satisfied, and

containing all the elements of liberty and prosperity.

Some of the Philadelphia merchants were making much money by trade. Samuel Carpenter, prominent in the Council and in meeting, had extensive interests in lands, mills and commerce, and was, about 1700, the wealthiest man in the province. Isaac Norris and Edward Shippen—the latter of whom was appointed by Penn as the first Mayor of the city—were also men of large enterprise and resources. Philadelphia had drawn to herself, very early in her history, a large number of energetic and wealthy merchants, and her commerce exceeded that of New York. Her farmers, too, were prosperous and happy.

Penn's presence composed, at least superficially, most of the differences. No one questioned his authority. He was displeased with the too great tendencies to license, as he deemed them, but wisely accepted the inevitable, and granted such changes in fundamental law as were desired. His two years—all too short a time for the work to be done—were full of conferences with the Council and Assembly, of visits to and from Indian chiefs, of religious services in the numerous meeting houses which

were now scattered over the three upper counties. Matters were left in quietness, though for a few years an unfortunate choice of a Deputy Governor delayed the better days.

Three political parties sprang into existence on Penn's departure. There was first the party devoted to proprietary interests and sympathies, embracing the more wealthy and highly educated Quakers, principally of Philadelphia, of which in a little time James Logan came to be recognized as the leader. Secondly, there was the popular party, led by David Lloyd, composed mainly of country Friends, and reinforced in time by sympathetic Germans and other liberty-loving people; and thirdly, there was an opposition non-Quaker party, not strong in Council or Assembly, whose ultimate object was to make a crown colony and an established church.

James Logan and David Lloyd were such prominent men in early Pennsylvania, that they deserve more than a passing notice.

James Logan was born in Ireland in 1674 of Scotch parents, who were Friends. When William Penn was coming to Pennsylvania, in 1699, he brought Logan with him as secretary and agent. He held successively the posts of Provin-

cial Secretary, Commissioner of Property, Chief Justice, and, as President of the Council, was for about two years the Governor of the Province. He was an excellent scholar, to his friends an agreeable gentleman, thoroughly faithful to the Proprietor, who in turn placed implicit confidence in his judgment of other men, of great influence in the Council, of which he was almost continuously a member, but not always courteous and condescending to men of smaller abilities and fewer advantages.*

He gave very censorious verdicts of his opponents, calling them "rogues," "composition of vinegar and wormwood," "lurking snake," etc. These were evidently written in the heat of partisan controversy, and unfortunately influenced Penn's mind against some who ought to have been his warmest friends and supporters. No more faithful agent for the proprietor and his widow could have been found, though one could conceive a more judicious one.

In later years he retired to his place at Stenton, and largely gave himself over to literary work. He wrote several books in Latin, and translated "De Senectute," which was printed

* Proud, "History of Pennsylvania," Vol. I., page 478.

by Benjamin Franklin in 1744. He gave to the people a valuable collection of books, now incorporated in the Philadelphia Library.

He was not a very influential member of the Society of Friends in religious matters, partly on account of his views on defensive war; but his character and attainments were greatly respected.

David Lloyd was a Welshman. He arrived in the colony in 1686, commissioned by Penn as Attorney General. He was an excellent lawyer, exemplary in all the relations of private life, of great force of character and commanding influence. Were it not for the dark colors in which he is painted by Logan, Norris, Proud, and other authorities, we should regard him as a noble fighter for popular rights. He seems, however, to have been of a contentious spirit, and opposed Penn by methods and in words which neither the circumstances could justify, nor good political morality commend. He had probably honesty of purpose in his aims, and in the main a good cause. He was intense, dogmatic, unbending, perhaps politically unscrupulous in his early life; but later he became softer and more gracious. He never failed to be the trusted leader to his party so long as he was in

the Assembly. The cause to which he gave his great energies and political abilities was the cause of the future, and the net result of his labors was to sustain in the colony strong attachment to the principles we now consider to be fundamentally American. He was a Quaker in good standing, at first living in Philadelphia; after 1710 in Chester.

It is interesting to note that Logan and Lloyd drew together in later years, working for the good of the State, and that Lloyd joined in an affectionate memorial to Penn after his death.

Penn left his Province in 1701, with Andrew Hamilton as Deputy Governor, and the play of political forces immediately began. The Church party, under Colonel Quarry, small but active, would ally itself for the time with David Lloyd, who, however, was far from sympathizing with it. The main strength, however, lay in English sympathy.* The malcontents were also with Lloyd. "It is the very leaven of George Keith" (now mostly Episcopalians), "left among

* The feeling between the Churchmen and the Quakers was quite severe.

"I hope your grace being at the helm will be mindful of us at the stern, when Providence shall think to bless us with a qualified government under his royal majesty; then

the people at his separation, and now fermenting up again," * writes Logan in 1706. Isaac Norris also says in 1709: "Most of the sticklers in the Assembly are either Keithians or those who stand fast and loose with Friends." †

Governor Hamilton, unfortunately for the Province, died after about a year of administration, and Penn sent over John Evans, a Welsh-

Christianity will flourish in this Province, Quakerism will be rooted out, and the church will be more than conquerer." July 12th, 1700. "Papers Relating to the Church in Pennsylvania," page 16.

The Episcopalians evidently desired the establishment of a state church, and this deepened the Quaker opposition, political and otherwise. This feeling very much softened towards Revolutionary times, and we find James Pemberton lamenting the growth of the Presbyterians at the expense of the Episcopalians. The Scotch-Irish Presbyterians, in many respects the Quaker antipodes, were their great political opponents of the pre-Revolutionary days. This culminated in the "Paxton boys" invasion of 1763-4.

Even in early days all the losses of Quakerism went to the Church of England. George Ross writes, under date of August 28, 1716: "But though we and the Quakers do thus differ widely, yet 'tis observable that when any of them do leave their own way and become Christians, they generally make their application to your missionary for baptism, instead of going to the dissenting teachers, who, though ten to one of us, do not count one Quaker to ten that come over to the Church."

* Penn and Logan Correspondence, Vol. II., page 190.

† Penn and Logan Correspondence, Vol II., page 422.

man, "an honest and discreet young man," as he styles him. Penn was wofully deceived, as often happened in his choice of men. He writes most enthusiastically about each new appointment, and after events usually were a strange contradiction to his judgment. Evans, if personally honest, was certainly not discreet. A worse choice could scarcely have been made to govern a colony of strict Quakers. He unnecessarily shocked their anti-martial principles by pressing forward his schemes for colonial defense. He tried to force them into compromising measures by a false report that the French fleet was in the Delaware, and rode through Philadelphia asking all to arm. To this the Quakers responded by quieting attending their mid-week meeting. In company with William Penn, Jr., the degenerate son of the proprietor, he engaged in festivities in the poorer haunts of the city, and in the Indian towns, which shocked the sense of stern morality to which the people's thoughts were attuned. He tried to collect a fine for disrespect from an honest but rather irascible old Quaker minister and Assemblyman, who cried out: "He is but a boy. We'll kick him out," and won only contempt for his persecution. He persuaded the Delaware authorities to erect

a fort and levy a tax on Philadelphia commerce, which was a violation of charter. Three Friends of his own party—Richard Hill, Isaac Norris and Samuel Preston—ran their boat past the fort in spite of the fire, and when the commander pursued, carried him off and landed him at Salem, New Jersey. This broke up the exaction of “powder money.” Altogether Evans was a great failure as Governor. Logan did his best to advise his chief, but finally counseled Penn to recall him, as also did the Assembly. It is not to be wondered at that the anti-proprietary party, under Lloyd, ruled the Assembly, and the friends of Penn hung their heads.

In 1704 a remonstrance was sent to the Proprietor, which was the most severe stroke he ever received. It was the work of Lloyd, signed by him as Speaker of the Assembly, and if we are to believe Isaac Norris and James Logan, the signature was effected after adjournment, when he was no longer Speaker, the address was never read to the Assembly, and in order to preserve the appearance of regularity, the minutes were interpolated. That the people had some ground to complain of the choice of Deputy Governor may well be admitted, but this was quite as much Penn’s misfortune as theirs, and was

only an error of judgment. That they had just then cause to complain of the hardships the English government was putting on them in the matter of oaths, was also true, but Penn was doing all he could to remedy it. The other charges of oppression "about our civil rights by the Proprietary," in various details were too trivial to be so seriously enumerated and intemperately advanced. There was an animus about the paper worse than the complaints, which hurt the good-hearted Proprietor deeply. He had spent his fortune, and was in debt as a result of his Pennsylvania burden. He thought he had given every reasonable concession, more than were enjoyed elsewhere, and if things were wrong he had expected kindly and reasonable co-operation, not bitter, unfriendly and unreasonable attack.

That Friends were to some extent on Lloyd's side in the matter, is evident.* In their minds he was the champion of personal liberty, to which the country Friends especially were inordinately attached. But that they still held to Penn is proven by the next election, in 1705,

* "He carries so fair with our weak country people, and those that long looked upon him to be the champion of Friends' cause in government matters in former times, that there is no possessing them."

Logan to Penn, Correspondence, Vol. II., page 119.

when Lloyd's party was left in a small minority in an Assembly of which all the members were Friends except one.* Lloyd himself got in by the election of the city after being left out by the county, but lost his speakership.

The doings of Evans, however, restored Lloyd's majority for several years following, and the attempted impeachment of Logan on

* Even the quiet Friends did not get through this election without reproach. "This meeting, understanding of some disorderly carriage, language and deportment at Chester, the last election, by some professing truth, the meeting appoints —— to draw something in reprehension thereof, and bring the same to the next Quarterly Meeting."

The next meeting adopted their report. "This meeting understands there have been some persons that make profession of the blessed truth and peaceable spirit of the Lord Jesus with us, but for want of keeping to it in themselves contrary fruits appear, so as to take liberty to speak and act as they please. . . . Some in this county at the last election, where their moderation should have appeared, but other fruits were brought forth, and seditious words and practices, insinuations and turbulent behavior . . . under a fair color of liberty and privilege to promote their sinister ends, to take revenge on those against whom they have taken a disgust. The consideration of these things hath brought a weighty concern upon this meeting that any should sacrifice the peace of the people to a private revenge. This meeting desires all monthly meetings to deal with such, and if they prove stubborn and unruly, and will not be reclaimed, then to acquit our holy profession on them."

Chester Quarterly Meeting, 1706.

certain charges relating to the tenure of office of the judges, was the result. Logan defended himself vigorously, and finally went to England, where he was triumphantly acquitted a little later, both legally and morally.

The people seemed to be tired of the bickerings of the Assembly, and in 1710 elected a new one, not one old member being returned, and every one friendly to Penn. For the two remaining years of the Proprietor's healthy life matters went smoothly. Evans' successor, Charles Gookin, was a reputable gentleman, of a difficult disposition, and probably insane the latter part of his career. He did not harmonize with the Assembly, nor indeed with his Council, but did not greatly shock the people. David Lloyd was temporarily out of public life, and when he returned it was with a more kindly spirit.

The year 1710 was the beginning of a better time for Pennsylvania. A succession of fairly good Governors ensued. The people settled down under the wise charter of 1701, which granted all reasonable liberties. Immigration was intensely active. Material prosperity developed at a rapid pace. Questions connected with oaths were somewhat troublesome, and small war clouds caused occasional uneasiness to

conscientious Friends, but in the main peace reigned.

Bad as some of Lloyd's methods were, there can be no doubt that they made Pennsylvania a democratic State, tenacious of liberty. A different result would undoubtedly have ensued had the more dignified, but more aristocratic, system of Logan and Norris and the proprietary party, remained unchallenged in power. Lloyd only voiced a very prevalent feeling which could not be restrained.

The heart of the people had always been with Penn. They believed in his liberality, his sincerity, his wisdom. Had he remained with them as Governor, or sent sympathetic and discreet deputies, there would have been practical unanimity in his support; at least there would have been no permanent opposition party. When his honest and pathetic address came to them in 1710, after his triumphant vindication by the election, every heart responded, and with this we may fitly close the account of the not very harmonious early period of Pennsylvania legislative history:

London, 29th Fourth month, 1710.

My Old Friends:—It is a mournful consideration, and the cause of deep affliction to me, that I am forced, by the oppressions and disappointments which have fallen to

my share in this life, to speak to the people of that Province in a language I once hoped I should never have had occasion to use. But the many troubles and oppositions that I have met with from thence oblige me, in plainness and freedom, to expostulate with you concerning the causes of them.

When it pleased God to open a way for me to settle that colony, I had reason to expect a solid comfort from the services done to many hundreds of people; and it was no small satisfaction to me that I have not been disappointed in seeing them prosper and growing up to a flourishing country, blessed with liberty, ease and plenty, beyond what many of themselves could expect, and wanting nothing to make them happy but what, with a right temper of mind and prudent conduct, they might give themselves. But, alas! as to my part, instead of reaping the like advantages, some of the greatest of my troubles have arisen from thence. The many combats I have engaged in, the great pains and incredible expense for your welfare and ease, to the decay of my former estate, of which (however some there would represent it) I too sensibly feel the effects, with the undeserved opposition I have met with from thence, sink me into sorrow that, if not supported by a superior hand, might have overwhelmed me long ago. And I cannot but think it hard measure that, while that has proved a land of freedom and flourishing, it should become to me, by whose means it was principally made a country, the cause of grief, trouble and poverty.

For this reason I must desire you all, even of all professions and degrees, (for although all have not been engaged in the measures that have been taken, yet every man who has interest there is, or must be, concerned in them by their effects)—I must therefore, I say, desire you all, in a serious and true weightiness of mind, to consider what you are or have been doing: why matters must be carried on with these divisions and contentions, and what real causes have been given on my side for that opposition to

me, and my interest, which I have met with, as if I were an enemy and not a friend, after all I have done and spent here and there. I am sure I know not of any cause whatsoever. Were I sensible you really wanted anything of me, in the relation between us, that would make you happier, I should readily grant it, if any reasonable man would say it were fit for you to demand, provided you would also take such measures as were fit for me to join with.

Here follows a resumé of the Frame of Government, which he declares he cares nothing about except to promote their good.

The attacks on my reputation, the many indignities put upon me in papers sent over hither into the hands of those who could not be expected to make the most discreet and charitable use of them; the secret insinuations against my justice, besides the attempt made upon my estate; resolves passed in the assemblies for turning my quit-rents, never sold by me, to the support of my government; my lands entered upon without any regular method; my manors invaded (under pretence I had not duly surveyed them), and both these by persons principally concerned in these attempts against me here; a right to my overplus land unjustly claimed by the possessors of the tracts in which they are found; my private estate continually exhausting for the support of the government, both here and there, and no provision made for it by that country.

.

In short, when I reflect on all these heads, of which I have so much cause to complain, and, at the same time, think of the hardships I and my family have been reduced to, in no small measure owing to my endeavors for and disappointments from that Province, I cannot but mourn the unhappiness of my portion, dealt to me from these of whom I had reason to expect much different and

better things, nor can I but lament the unhappiness that too many of them are bringing on themselves, who, instead of pursuing the amicable ways of peace, love and unity, which I at first hoped to find in that retirement, are blind to their own interest, are oversetting that foundation on which your happiness might be built.

Friends, the eyes of many are upon you; the people of many nations of Europe look on that country as a land of ease and quiet, wishing to themselves in vain the same blessings they conceive you may enjoy; but, to see the use you make of them, is no less the cause of surprise to others, while such bitter complaints and reflections are seen to come from you, of which it is difficult to conceive either the sense or meaning. What are the distresses, grievances and oppressions that the papers sent from hence so often say you languish under, while others have cause to believe you have hitherto lived or might live the happiest of any of the Queen's dominions?

It is a certain sign you are strangers to oppression, and know nothing but the name, when you so highly bestow it on matters so inconsiderable; but that business I find is adjusted. Could I know any real oppressions you lie under, that it is in my power to remedy (and what I wish you would take proper measures to remedy if you truly feel any such), I would be as ready on my part to remove them as you to desire it; but according to the best judgment I can make of the complaints I have seen (and you once thought I had a pretty good one), I must, in a deep sense of sorrow, say that I fear the kind hand of Providence, that has so long favored and protected you, will, by the ingratitude of many there, to the great mercies of God hitherto shown them, be at length provoked to convince them of their unworthiness.

I must think there is a regard due to me that has not of late been paid; pray consider of it fully, and think soberly what you have to desire of me, on the one hand,

and ought to perform to me on the other; for from the next Assembly I shall expect to know what you resolve and what I may depend on. If I must continue my regards to you, let me be engaged to it by a like disposition in you toward me. But if a plurality after this shall think they owe me none or no more than for some years I have met with, let it, on a fair election, be so declared; and I shall then, without further suspense, know what I have to rely upon. God give you his wisdom and fear to direct you, that yet our poor country may be blessed with peace, love and industry, and we may once more meet good friends, and live so to the end, our relation to the truth having but the same true interest.

I am, with great truth and most sincere regard, your real friend, as well as just Proprietor and Governor,

WILLIAM PENN.

It required about thirty years to settle down into steady government. Then followed thirty years of the greatest peace and prosperity. There were no more contentions between Governor and Assembly; no more angry recriminations upon which to base partisan capital; no more striving for liberties, for every reasonable liberty worth striving for was secured; no more attempts to exalt proprietary interests at the expense of public interests; no more partisan strife, for there were no parties. The era of internal dissension had closed; the era of external war had not opened. For a generation the Quaker government went quietly on, performing its functions with vigor and system. Paper

money, fully secured by individual property, as well as State credit, was issued in moderate amounts, was never depreciated, and developed business enterprise by taking the place of gold and silver drained to England to purchase the needed importation of a busy and growing population. Taxes were light and were mostly raised from tavern licenses. Indians were friendly, and were kept so by frequent presents and purchases of land. The criminal laws, while rather severe, were humanely executed, and life and property were secured by an alert magistracy and a conscientious population. Oaths were voluntary; war did not exist. There were no militia companies, but little martial feeling. All religions were free and on an equal footing. Political and personal rights were guarded with jealous care. The best men of the colony, men of the highest education, morality and property interests, held, by the choice of the people, the high offices of government. No taint of political corruption seems to have visited the dignity of office-holding, but there "was magistracy in reverence with the people, and kept from being hurtful to them." Could Penn have seen this thirty years' peace, he would not have

been utterly discouraged, nor deemed the "Holy Experiment" a failure.

In 1739 England and Spain went to war, and this was the beginning of the end. In another chapter military questions will be taken up. It is only necessary here to refer to the protection and extension of popular privileges indirectly resulting from the wars. War meant privateering, and privateering destroyed commerce, and this touched Pennsylvania immediately. War meant taxes, and taxes produced discontent, differences with the Governors about the rights of the Assembly, cessation of friendly feeling, and a re-creation of parties.

The Spanish war was soon over, but it was followed by one with the French and their Indian allies in 1744. This lasted in America, in some part or other, practically continuously till 1763, and when it ended the Quaker Assembly was no more.

Parties were now formed on new lines. They had largely disappeared during the twenties and thirties, but at this time we find a marked difference, growing more emphatic with the years between the proprietary party and the "country" party. The Quakers were now in considerable minority in the Province, but were practi-

cally all on one side. The Proprietors had left the Society and joined the Episcopal Church, and that body rallied around them. So also did the Presbyterians, and all who believed in a vigorous, warlike policy. These stood together for proprietary rights and interests, and had as their stronghold the Governor and Council.

The Friends and the Germans and their sympathizers maintained their ascendancy in the popularly elected Assembly, where they did practically as they pleased. They opposed proprietary pretensions, favored grants to the Indians, and cut down expenses for military operations wherever possible. Their efforts during the years from 1740 to 1756 were directed to securing their rights as representatives of the people in the matters of protesting against secret and arbitrary instructions to the Governor by the Proprietors; of raising money in whatever way seemed good to them; of insistence on the large proprietary estates being subject to taxation as other similar estates were; and of independence of royal instructions when they contravened their charter.

The machinery by which the Quakers held their party together, judging from the results, was effective. During the thirty years of peace

they had become competent politicians. It is uncertain how they selected their candidates, or by what means they elected them. There is no reason to suspect any immoral proceedings, for their Assemblymen were men of excellent standing, and many of them served for a long time. Most of them were farmers, and this gave the few men who knew something about law, like David Lloyd, the two Norrises, and Benjamin Franklin, their great influence. It is probable that a loosely organized town meeting (called for each case as it arose) determined the choice, and that the general interest in the issue, and community of political tendencies carried the election. We hear nothing of difficulties within the party, and they were not the sort of people to tolerate bosses quietly. In these matters of liberty they were solidly and effectively united in the general struggle against Crown and Proprietor, which led up to the Revolutionary war, and held their own as honorably and as successfully as the liberty party of any other colony.

The Province very early in its history, while supplied with many of the necessities of life, was short of money. This resulted from the large purchases from England, which drained the

country of gold and silver. This condition existed up to the Revolution, the balance of trade being almost continually against the Colony. Much real suffering and great stagnation in trade resulted from this state of affairs, and the issuance of paper money became almost a necessity. It was entered upon cautiously. There being no banks or opportunities for specie redemption, it was arranged that bills of credit, which could be used as money, should be issued to individuals as a loan for a term of years, secured by real estate or plate. Interest and a part of the principal were paid back yearly. The amount of the issue being reasonable and the security ample the money never depreciated, as was the case in nearly all the Colonies, while the stimulus to trade was sudden and marked. This process was prudently repeated, and the interest, with tavern licenses, enabled the Colony to get along almost without taxes during the years of peace. Though Logan, Norris, and other conservative men opposed the practice, it seems to have been justified by the results, and there was sufficient self-restraint to prevent an over-issue.

But the wars demanded a vast proportionate increase in the expenses of government, and new problems presented themselves. The Assembly

proposed to meet the increased expenses by further issues of bills of credit, but were in 1740 restrained by the English Privy Council, acting probably at the instance of the Proprietors, by an order prohibiting any new issues, unless a clause was also enacted suspending the execution of the law till the royal assent was obtained. The Governor was instructed to refuse to sign any bill violating this order.

The charter of William Penn had by this time become an object of veneration with the popular party in Pennsylvania, and under it they had deemed themselves secure in the manner of raising money, subject only to the veto of the Governor. It is true that after five years they might also look for a royal veto, but this only involved the necessity of re-enacting the offending law. The new order of the Privy Council therefore seemed an interference with one of their choicest privileges. However, if they could persuade Governor Thomas to sign notwithstanding hostile orders from abroad, the laws would be valid; and this they managed to do by a judicious reduction of his salary until he was brought to terms. The struggle was continued with successive Governors till the Revolution, under the effective leadership of Franklin,

and while often baulked by the proprietary interests, the popular party in the Assembly gradually regained all lost ground. While legally there was no change, practically there was a constant decrease of proprietary interference and a constant growth of popular rights.

The question was complicated with another. The Governor was appointed by the Proprietors, and was in fact their agent. It was his duty to look after first the interests of his employers, and afterwards those of the Colony. When peace prevailed those interests were so nearly identical that no controversy arose. In some cases, notably that of Sir William Keith, the representatives of the people were so much nearer, and it was so much more pleasant to live in harmony with them, that the Governor elected popular rather than proprietary favor, and lost his place, through the efforts of James Logan. Later the Governor had to give a heavy bond, amounting during the wars to £5,000, to obey instructions. Popular bids for favor could hardly be expected to exceed this sum, and the Governor was fairly secured to the side of the Penns.

It was conceded that the Governor had certain executive duties in which it was proper that he should receive detailed instructions, but when it

came to legislative questions stringent and sometimes secret instructions as to vetoing bills were felt to be a tacit invasion of legislative privileges. William Penn, at the urgency of David Lloyd, had wisely given up the power of veto in the case of a bill previously assented to by his deputy, and he and his widow had carefully confined instructions to general directions to suppress vice, to discourage faction, to follow the advice of the Council, and to protect every one in his rights. During the era of good feeling the Assembly would ask to see the instructions to the Governor and he would good-naturedly comply.

After the wars began the Governor refused to show his instructions, and the Assembly protested against the folly of their spending much time in elaborating bills when all the time the Governor had in his closet his private instructions to veto them. They wished to be able to confer with him and by judicious compromises to secure his assent to their bills. All they could do was to find out gradually the character of his limitations by his actions, and they rightly felt they were kept working in the dark. They procured from their agent in England in 1755 a copy of Governor Morris's instructions, and raised a

storm against him by its publication. They refused, notwithstanding the urgency of the war, to vote any supplies if these instructions were brought into operation. Their importunity and firmness finally prevailed, and like the opposition to bills of credit, proprietary instructions before the Revolutionary war were allowed to drop out of sight.

Another subject of conflict was the taxation of Proprietary properties. The Penns were not only the owners of the unoccupied lands of the Province, they were also in their private capacity owners of large tracts within the State which they held like any other private persons. Moreover, they enjoyed an income from quit-rents from most of the lands they had sold. All this property they claimed was exempt from taxation. It would have been manifestly improper to tax the large extent of unproductive land of early times, and besides, there were no land taxes of consequence levied, except for county purposes, and these did not reach the unsurveyed domain of the Proprietors.

But as in the other cases the wars brought this to a focus. The people in response to a demand for money to protect their frontier against invasion insistently made by the Governor, sug-

gested that the Penn estates should bear their share in the joint defence. The Proprietors, in the view of the Assembly, while possessing certain feudal rights which they did not propose to disturb, were also private land owners and on a level with all other private land owners. In 1755, after Braddock's defeat, they levied a tax on all estates in the Province, real and personal, including quit-rents and unsettled land, which tax was to redeem bills of credit to the amount of £60,000. Governor Morris insisted that his instructions required him to protect the interests of his employers, and refused to pass the bill. The Assembly replied to his arguments that it was better to give part in taxes than to lose the whole by the French, and threw upon him and the Proprietors the responsibility for the defenceless state of the Province. The Indians were scalping on the frontiers, and there were daily distressing demands for protection, but the Assembly judged that the principles involved in their struggle with the Governor were worth more than temporary security. Neither yielded until finally a solution was found in an offer of a free gift by the Penns of £5,000, with the understanding that it should not be considered as a substitute for the tax. The Assembly said noth-

ing on this latter point, but passed a bill raising £55,000, and omitted the taxation of the property of the Penns. The £5,000 was to be collected by the Assembly out of the arrears of quit-rents, and hence was not quite so liberal as it seemed to be.

Bills for revenue followed in rapid succession, and the controversy was renewed. Benjamin Franklin was sent to England to look after provincial rights, and he invoked the aid of the home government. After considerable fencing the proprietary case was defeated, and the Assembly had the satisfaction of completely carrying its point.

The controversies of the time are shown in a private letter of James Pemberton, a member of the Assembly, to Henton Brown, an Englishman, dated 15th of Tenth month, 1755:

“When I last wrote thee, our new Governor, R. H. Morris, was but just come to town, and as the Representatives were but newly elected the Assembly had not met him; their sessions began soon after, agreeable to our charter, on the 14th of October, which were but short at that time and passed chiefly in compliments to each other, and being unusual to do business at the first time of their sitting, they made the Governor a present of five hundred pounds, and, what is a particular privilege to their own, adjourned to the 2d of last, when they met for the dispatch of business. The Governor very warmly recommended to them the making provision for dislodging

the French on the borders of this and the neighboring Provinces. A majority of the House being of our Society, they could not (as they never at any time have) literally comply with such a demand. However, as we are always willing to demonstrate our allegiance to our King, by a ready compliance with his instructions, as far as they do not affect our religious principles, in imitation of the practice of former Assemblies of this Province, they cheerfully voted the sum of twenty thousand pounds for the King's use, and sent up a bill to the Governor for striking that sum in paper bills of credit to be sunk in ten years by extending an act for laying an excise on spirituous liquors, which act hath subsisted for several years in this Province, and been experienced to be a tax the least burthensome to the inhabitants. In which time the said bills of credit would be called in, and the demand of the Crown immediately satisfied, the excise being proved sufficient to raise more, one year with another, than two thousand pounds. Notwithstanding this scheme is so reasonable in itself, yet the Governor hath positively refused passing that bill, urging it to be contrary to the instructions from the King, in the year 1740, to Governor Thomas.

“ At this time we have but £80,000 in paper bills of credit amongst us, none of which goes out to the people, but on mortgages, which yield an annual interest to the Province, by which the heavy expenses of maintaining our friendship with the Indians and other charges of government are defrayed; as well the farmers who purchase land from the Proprietaries are enabled to improve their settlements, and make their payments to them by borrowing from the loan office, by which means the paper currency hath proved of singular service in advancing their interest and all parties share the benefit thereof, which would be more extensive could we obtain an additional sum to what is now current, more especially as our importation of English manufactures is prodigiously increased within these few years. But nothing of this kind is at

tempted at this time, and I only mention it to convince thee of the real advantages of paper currency, and that the sum now current is very trifling compared with the income of our trade, and that we cannot do without it while we continue to send to you the silver and gold we procure from the West Indies in return for the produce of the country which we export thither. The only intent of striking the present sum proposed is that the crown may have the immediate benefit of it, there being no other fund by which such a sum can be raised in the same time. A land tax would be a grievance too great for this infant colony, and such as the people cannot at this time bear to pay; besides, is it not reasonable we should have the liberty of raising money upon ourselves in a manner least burthensome. A long contest hath subsisted between the Governor and the Assembly, in the course of which, from his manner of treating the subject, as well as the opinion of our last Governor Hamilton in his message to the last assembly, we have very strong reasons to conclude that the royal instructions are not the obstacle to the passing our bill, but some private instructions from our Proprietaries, who in every place of their conduct towards the people of this province for some years past appear to be aiming to subvert the valuable privileges granted us by the charters from King Charles and their worthy father, in consequence of which under Providence this province was settled and is now become a great income to them and of no small advantages to our mother country; therefore the assembly, finding no prospect of redress by contesting the point with the governor here, have drawn up a remonstrance to the King which was sent via New York to our agents R. Partridge and Robert Charles to be presented to him setting forth what we would have done had not as we apprehend the proprietary restrictions to their lieutenant prevented; therefore the request I have to make to thee relates to the province in general, and it will be kindly accepted here, if thou wilt so far favor us with thy friendship as to join thy assistance to obtain a ready

passage of our remonstrance to the King, being suspicious some of the Proprietaries' friends may use their endeavors to prevent it, as was the case with an address of a neighboring province lately. We have requested the assistance of the Meeting for Sufferings, which I hope they will cheerfully afford us, to which thy influence may greatly contribute. It is a matter of considerable consequence to the inhabitants; our liberties are at stake, and I think we have as much reason to dread an attack upon them from our Proprietary, whose ambitious views seem bent on enslaving us, as any danger that may be at present thought to threaten us; as should they gain their point, and we are to be governed by their private instructions inconsistent with our charter, we can no longer pretend to claim the title of being the freemen of Pennsylvania. It may be necessary further to remark that our public funds are much reduced by very heavy expenses of Indian Treaties and maintaining at this time a large number of Indian allies who have taken refuge in this province from the Ohio; and though this is the case, the Assembly has exerted themselves as far as they had the means in their own power, and have voted five thousand pounds to be laid out in provisions for the King's troops against the time they may arrive, in pursuance of the royal orders from Sir Thos. Robinson of the 26th October, received while the Assembly was sitting.

While the Quakers gave up control of the Assembly in 1756 the policy of the succeeding Assemblies in respect to these difficult subjects remained the same down to the Revolutionary war. Gradually there grew up a party which, angered by proprietary resistance, urged upon the English government the destruction of the Charter and the creation of a Crown Colony.

On this point the Friends were divided. A decade earlier none of them would have considered the forfeiture of Penn's charter. Now the vexations of proprietary government seemed very objectionable, and many joined with Franklin and other radicals in the movement. It was always opposed by the more substantial members, and nothing was accomplished till the Revolution solved the problem in an unlooked for way.

It has been usually represented that the troubles of the years between 1740 and 1756 were the result of a conflict between the Governor and the Quaker Assembly over the subject of the defence of the Province from French and Indian attack. How much this may have been an effective cause below the surface it is difficult to tell. So far as one can judge from the public records, it was a controversy between proprietary and popular rights and privileges, in which the popular party, almost exclusively Friendly in its representatives though not in its membership,* acquitted itself so as to win success without sacri-

* Thomas Penn writes to Governor Hamilton, in 1760, referring to a proposed visit of William Logan to England: "You may be assured I will treat him with regard, and show him I have no disregard to those of his profession (the Friends), except on their levelling republican system of government so much adopted by them."

ficing the stability of the government. A French invasion was less terrible than the surrender of the powers of the Assembly, and the people demanded that the Proprietor should yield. Then they were as liberal as in any other State in supplying the resources for defence. They bought or intimidated the Governors one by one and finally carried the war into England and conquered.

CHAPTER V.

RELIGIOUS LIBERTY.

The strenuous and in the main consistent belief of the early Quakers in religious liberty and the supremacy of conscience was founded on their doctrine of the divine character and authority of the Light by which the conscience was guided and instructed. It was sealed to them by the severe persecutions of England. While they contended that this light would in essential particulars lead all obedient children into closeness of sympathy and substantial similarity of belief, they recognized the varying degree of its acceptance by different people, and were willing to leave the uninstructed to its further operations and the inspired teaching of those who were more fully confirmed in its counsels.

The writings of the English Quakers and of William Penn in particular are replete with expressions against interference by government with the private beliefs of any subjects, and with the actions for which they claimed a conscientious sanction, so long as they were orderly and moral. Penn announced in 1670 that he was "a

friend of universal toleration in faith and worship," and wrote "The Great Case of Liberty of Conscience Briefly Debated and Defended." His main statement is "That imposition, restraint and persecution for conscience' sake highly invade the Divine prerogative." This is amplified by the arguments now so familiar, and illustrated by historical references and quotations from classical and Christian writings in great profusion.

The persecutions of the Quakers were a penalty for the staunch maintenance of principles and practices for which they believed they had the authority of enlightened consciences. They were firmly convinced of their rightfulness, and loudly exclaimed against the injustice of oppression. They, however, unlike the Puritans, generalized from their own case and arrived at the conclusion that they were working for a common liberty, not the establishment of their own ideas of truth. The settlers of Massachusetts had formed a commonwealth in which "truth" was to rule, and "error" to be punished and exiled. They, too, had suffered in England, and had emigrated to secure liberty of conscience for themselves. They had formed a Puritan reservation at great expense of time, treasure and heroic self-

sacrifice. They must preserve this at whatever cost. "There is no room in Christ's triumphant army for tolerationists."* How could they see their State invaded, their laws defied, their ecclesiastical system scorned, by the very agencies they had left England to avoid? If Episcopacy was on one hand to be ruled out, still more necessary was it that they should show to the world that the errors of the Baptists and Quakers had no place there, and so the heretics were sent to Rhode Island and Pennsylvania, and the very persistent Quakers were hanged on Boston Common.

But matters were a little further developed by Penn's time—Quaker theology a little less dogmatic and literal than Puritan; there was more faith in Truth making its own way, and the broader view prevailed.†

* Longfellow's "New England Tragedies."

† "Let the tares grow with the wheat, errors of judgment remain till removed by the power of light and conviction. A religion without it is inhuman, since reason only makes humanity. For my part, I frankly declare that I cannot think that God will damn any man for the errors of his judgment, and God forbid that all or most of the world err willingly in understanding."

William Penn to Duke of Ormond, "Academy," January II., 1896.

Nor did the principle stop with toleration. Pennsylvania was not to be a Quaker Colony where other sects were tolerated. One might as well tolerate the holding of property as of opinion. The principle was not based on the favor of rulers; it was an inherent right. It was not to be toleration; it was to be religious liberty and freedom from all State interference. So said Penn, and he placed the maxim in the forefront in all his "Frames of Government," and despite some dissatisfaction at first among a few Quakers * it always remained there.

We have seen that the "Fundamental Constitutions" were the products of Penn's wrestling in company with unknown advisers with the problems of government, and that they express, perhaps more nearly than subsequent publications, his own ideas. The first article is worth quoting entire.

Considering that it is impossible that any people or Government should ever prosper, where men render not unto God that which is God's, as well as to Cæsar that which is Cæsar's; and also perceiving the disorders and mischiefs that attend those places where force is used in matters of faith and worship, and seriously reflecting upon the tenure of the new and spiritual Government, and that both Christ did not use force and that He did not ex-

* "Pennsylvania Magazine," Vol. VI., page 467, et seq.

pressly forbid it in His holy religion, so also that the testimony of His blessed messengers was, that the weapons of the Christian warfare were not carnal but spiritual; and further weighing that this unpeopled country can never be planted if there be not due encouragement given to sober people of all sorts to plant, and that they will not esteem anything a sufficient encouragement when they are not assured, but that after all the hazards of the sea, and the troubles of a wilderness, the labours of their hands and sweat of their brows may be made the forfeit of their conscience, and they and their wives and children ruined because they worship God in some different way from that which may be more generally owned, Therefore, in reverence to God, the father of lights and spirits, the author, as well as object, of all divine knowledge, faith and worship, I do hereby declare for me and mine, and establish it for the first fundamental of the government of my country, that every person that does or shall reside therein shall have and enjoy the free possession of his or her faith and exercise of worship towards God, in such way and manner as every person shall in conscience believe is most acceptable to God; and so long as every such person useth not this Christian liberty to licentiousness, that is to say, to speak loosely and profanely of God, Christ or Religion, or to commit any evil in their conversation, he or she shall be protected in the enjoyment of the aforesaid Christian liberty by the civil Magistrate.*

The first clause of the charter of 1701, under which was operated the government of Pennsylvania till 1776, was:

Because no people can be truly happy, though under the greatest enjoyment of civil liberties, if abridged of the freedom of their consciences as to their religious profession and worship, and Almighty God being the one Lord of

* "Pennsylvania Magazine," October, 1896.

Conscience, father of Light and Spirits, and the author, as well as object, of all divine knowledge, faith and worship, who only doth enlighten the mind and persuade and convince the understandings of people, I do hereby grant and declare that no person or persons inhabiting in this province or territories who shall confess or acknowledge one Almighty God, the creator, upholder and ruler of the world, and profess him or themselves obliged to live quietly under the civil government, shall be in any case molested or prejudiced in his or their person or estate, because of his or their conscientious persuasion or practice, nor be compelled to frequent or maintain any religious worship, place or ministry, contrary to his or their mind, or to do or suffer any other act or thing contrary to their religious persuasion. And that all persons who also profess to believe in Jesus Christ, the Saviour of the world, shall be capable (notwithstanding their other persuasions and practices in point of conscience and religion) to serve this government in any capacity, both legislatively and executively, he or they solemnly promising, when lawfully required, allegiance to the king as Sovereign, and fidelity to the Proprietor and Governor, etc.

We have from these Penn's idea. It involved perfect liberty of conscience, opinion and worship, and perfect equality among Christian people in the matter of office holding. That it did not extend to non-Christians is a matter of regret. It is probable that a charter could not have been obtained on this basis. It was expected that Penn would found a Christian colony. At this time there were practically no professing non-Christians, except perhaps a very few Jews.

Some of the associates and immediate successors of the Founder took a narrower view of this principle. Not content with excluding Jews, they also deprived Catholics, by a religious test, of the opportunity to hold office.

Penn was largely instrumental in securing the passage in England of the Toleration Act, in 1689. This greatly relieved his fellow-believers of the extreme suffering they had endured for nearly fifty years for conscience' sake. It also enabled various dissenting sects to practice unmolested their forms of worship, provided they would subscribe to a declaration of fidelity to the sovereign, and would condemn the doctrine of transubstantiation, and of the worship of Mary and the Saints.

This act, beneficent and liberal in comparison with anything England had known, was used to fetter the broader principle which Penn sought to establish in his colony. Not only when his charter was taken away, in 1692-4, and Governor Fletcher administered affairs in a way to displease all of Penn's friends, but afterwards as well, was lower ground taken. The tests which in England were made a condition of the permission of public worship, became under Fletcher an indispensable requisite for all offices.

In 1696, in the Markham constitution, to which Penn acquiesced, the same tests were continued. The acquiescence may have been due to the very slender hold he felt he had on his charter under William and Mary, and the Whig politicians by whom they were surrounded. When he returned to the colony he again forced his freer scheme into the constitution of 1701, and attempted to make it permanent by the pledge "for himself and his heirs, that the first article of this charter, relating to liberty of conscience, and every part and clause thereof, according to the true intent and meaning thereof, shall be kept and remain without any alteration inviolably forever."

His charter, granted by authority of the English crown, gave him full right to make such a pledge. But in violation of this right, in 1702, another order of the crown required of all officers of colonies that they should subscribe to all the tests of the Toleration Act. Penn felt too insecure to object to this, and Colonel Quarry, the Judge of the Admiralty, the bitter opponent of the Quakers, forced it upon members of the Council, Judges and Assemblymen. They all took it, to Penn's indignation, who asked, "Why should you obey any order . . . which

is not according to patent or law here, nor the laws of your own country?" * He advised resistance, but met with no support in Pennsylvania. Even Logan deserted him. "Be pleased not to set such a value as thou dost upon the charter (that of 1701, just quoted) granted, for most are of opinion it is not worth so many pence, and if mine were asked, I should still rate it much lower."

Not content with submitting quietly to the imposition of the test by English authority, the Assembly, in 1705, practically re-enacted it themselves. They required all members of the Assembly, and the provision afterwards extended to all civil officers, to subscribe to the test, and support it by oath or affirmation.†

* Penn and Logan Correspondence, Vol. I., page 247.

† The test taken by all civil officers in Pennsylvania was:

"I, A. B., do sincerely promise and solemnly declare before God and the world, that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Queen Anne. And I do solemnly profess and declare that I do from my heart abhor, detest and renounce as impious and heretical that damnable doctrine and position that princes, excommunicated or deprived by the Pope or any authority of the See of Rome, may be deposed or murdered by their subjects or any person whatsoever. And I do declare that no foreign prince, person, prelate, state or potentate, hath or ought to have any

This test stood, with some modification as to a denial of the rights of the Pretender, until removed by Franklin and his associates in 1776, when Penn's old test of 1701 was readopted.

It does not appear that any protests, either by

power, jurisdiction, superiority, pre-eminence or authority, ecclesiastical or civil, within the realm of England or the dominions belonging thereunto.

“ And I, A. B., do solemnly and sincerely, in the presence of God, profess, testify and declare that I do believe that in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper there is not any transubstantiation of the elements of bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ, at or after the consecration thereof by any person whatsoever; and that the invocation or adoration of the Virgin Mary, or any other saint, and the sacrifice of Mass, as they are now used in the Church of Rome, are superstitious and idolatrous.

“ And I do solemnly, in the presence of God, profess, testify and declare that I do make this declaration, and every part thereof, in the plain and ordinary sense of the words read unto me, as they are commonly understood by English Protestants, without any evasion, equivocation or mental reservation whatsoever, and without any dispensation already granted me for this purpose by the Pope, or any other person or authority whatsoever; or without thinking I am or may be acquitted before God and man, or absolved of this declaration or any part thereof, although the Pope or any other person or persons or power whatsoever should dispense with or annul the same, or declare that it was null and void from the beginning.

“ And I, A. B., profess faith in God the Father, and in Jesus Christ His eternal Son, the true God, and in the Holy Spirit, one God blessed forevermore; and do acknowledge the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament to be given by Divine Inspiration.”

the Assembly or the meetings, were made against the use of this abridgment of the rights of office-holders. During the seventy years all officials subscribed without apparent demur. Catholics, Jews and Socinians were excluded from positions under the State. They were also, by the imposition of the same test, denied the legal right to hold church property, or to become naturalized. In other words, while freedom of worship was permitted to all, it was intended to make Pennsylvania's government one of and for Orthodox Protestant Christians only. This was in advance of other colonies (except Rhode Island and Maryland), where the Catholic worship was prohibited, but behind Penn's enlightened conceptions of religious liberty and equality under the law.

It is true Catholics were few in number (1400 only in 1757), while the other prohibitions kept almost no one out of State employment. The Catholic religion was, both in England and America, the subject of bitter reprobation for its historical association with the Stuarts, and with the Colonial enemies, the French. These facts may explain, but hardly justify, the complacency with which their official disabilities were viewed during these years. In the general

eulogy given to the Pennsylvania constitution, this exception to religious freedom should be borne in mind.* One also is surprised to find that the Quakers made no objection to the imposition of *any* religious test. They could honestly subscribe to this one, but their general opposition to creeds, except when expressed in biblical words only, might have been expected to show itself in some public or private protest.

It must therefore be recognized that notwithstanding the liberal charter, Penn's and the Assembly's right to enact liberties and make laws was greatly restricted. The Privy Council annulled what it chose, and its decisions were determined by the views of the Attorney General, who thus became a greater power in legislation in certain particulars than Penn himself. Thus with regard to Penn's act concerning liberty of conscience, that irresponsible official writes: "I am of opinion that this law is not fit to be confirmed, no regard being had in it to the Christian religion, and also for that in the indulgence allowed to the Quakers in England by the statute of the first William and Mary," etc. The whole of Penn's liberal scheme, supported

* This subject is fully treated in the *Pennsylvania Magazine*, Vol. IX., pages 365, etc., by Dr. Stillé.

at first by the voice of the people's representatives, went down before the opinion of one man.

Penn was in no condition to resist. Burdened by debt incurred in support of his colony; his deputy a failure; his steward a fraud; his son a disappointment; he saw no recourse but to sell his province to the crown. Under these circumstances, he could only protest and be silent. Of the fifty-three laws vetoed by the Crown in 1705, some he agreed to have returned and amended, some he apologized for, and some he feebly defends. But when the "Act of privileges to a freeman," reading, "That no freeman shall be hurt, damnified, destroyed, tried or condemned, but by the lawful judgment of his twelve equals, or by the laws of the Province," was objected to because "This, we think, will interfere with the act for preventing frauds, etc.," he flamed out with his old liberty-loving spirit,—“I cannot help it; 'tis the great charter that all Englishmen are entitled to, and we were not so far to lose a little of it.” *

* For a detailed description of the English treatment of Pennsylvania enactments, see appendix to "The Statutes at Large of Pennsylvania," published by the State, Vol. II., 1896. The limitations of Penn's powers were never so clearly shown as in the extracts there printed from the Public Records of London. This work is not complete,

To what extent did Penn desire favors for his own people in connection with government? That he hoped he was founding a Quaker State, conducted by and for them, is evident from many expressions. He probably shared the belief then prevalent in the Society, that Quakerism was simply Christianity shorn of human accretions, and was destined to become universal. It was only necessary to entrench it in power by proper means, and its own intrinsic worth would draw the people to it. But he vigorously refused to allow any constitutional advantages to his denomination. "Every particular denomination of the Christian religion is perfectly upon a level in Pennsylvania," wrote Thomas Penn, in 1757, speaking of facts as they were, and had always been, with the exceptions noted above. In the letter to Jasper Yeates, already quoted, Penn rebukes him for desiring to keep those not of the "Stock of David" from the government. "We should look selfish and do that which we have cried out upon others for, namely, letting nobody touch with government but those of their own way. And this hath

but it is becoming more and more evident that Penn and the Quakers were greatly hampered in their liberal intentions by ridiculous but effective opposition at home.

often been flung at us, viz.: If you Quakers had it in your power none should have a part in government but those of your own way." He says also that property has a right to representation which cannot be denied. He explains very fully and very succinctly in a letter to Roger Mompesson his purposes in the effort to establish a State:—

"I went thither to lay the foundation of a free colony for all mankind that should go thither, more especially those of my own profession; not that I would lessen the civil liberties of others because of their persuasion, but screen and defend our own from any infringement on that account."*

Thirty years before Penn led his colony to America, the far-sighted George Fox had under consideration the project of procuring a place there to which persecuted Friends might emigrate. He requested Josiah Cole, a minister going to see the Indians of the interior, to look for a favorable location, where he might purchase from them a home, not for his Society bodily to move to, but for the poor who could not stand the shock of persecution. But Cole, while favorable to some territory on the Susquehanna, reported in 1660 difficulties in the

* Penn and Logan Correspondence, Vol. I., page 373.

way of the purchase.* The matter, however, appears to have been kept in view, and in 1674, when Lord Berkeley offered for sale one-half of New Jersey, it was purchased by two Quakers, John Fenwick and Edward Billinge, probably with the knowledge and approval of others of their persuasion. Billinge, however, soon failed, and in order that the opportunity should not be lost, assigned to William Penn and two others nine-tenths of the new territory. Many Quakers moved there, and thus New Jersey became in a sense a Quaker colony. It grew so rapidly in population, that the experiment was extended to east New Jersey, and in 1681 William Penn, and eleven other Friends, purchased of the proprietor, Sir George Carteret, the remainder of the province, organized the government, and invited immigration. Robert Barclay, of Urie, the Quaker apologist, was made Governor for life. There were, however, in the country such numbers presumably not in sympathy with Quaker views that the experiment was deemed hardly a fair one, and Pennsylvania, "virgin settlement," was at last procured. "My God hath given it me in the face of the

* Bowden's *History of Friends in America*, Vol. I., p. 389.

world," Penn says in 1682, and evidently the long-delayed desire was accomplished.

There was some excuse then for the fact that Friends felt a sense of proprietorship in the new colony, and wished to hedge themselves around with some power and preferment. That they took so little is greatly to their credit. They asked only what their numbers and character would give them. William Penn was anxious they should take office in government and give their principles a full trial. When complaint was made to England that a man was sentenced to death by an affirmed rather than a sworn jury, he writes to Logan in 1703: "It was not to be thought that a colony and constitution of government made by and for Quakers would leave themselves and their lives and fortunes out of so essential a part of the government as juries. . . . If the coming of others shall overrule us that are the originals and made it a country we are unhappy; that it is not to be thought we intended no easier nor better terms for ourselves in going to America than we left behind us." *

The Quakers, therefore, meant to retain for themselves just what they were willing to grant

* Penn and Logan Correspondence, Vol. I., page 205.

to all other Protestants. But because they held peculiar views concerning the immorality of oaths and of war, the ordinary forms of government had to be seriously changed to conform to the new conditions. While therefore they felt that they were only asserting for themselves a reasonable liberty of conscience, it seemed to others that they were giving away the stability and permanence of the State. Hence arose the strong opposition to Quaker rule among certain elements of the population of Pennsylvania, which found a still stronger echo in England.

Part of this was reasonable. Evidently there could be no possibility of arrangement between those who believed oaths to be indispensable and those who believed them to be sinful. One or the other must prevail. The Quaker, determined to have the share in government to which his numbers and character entitled him, would neither take oaths nor administer them. He did not deny them by statute to others, and an Episcopalian could take them without prejudice if he could find an Episcopalian to administer them. The subject was a standing bone of contention on which there was an honest fundamental difference of opinion.*

* Penn and Logan Correspondence, Vol. I., page 65.

Still more strongly were pressed the views denying the possibility of conducting a government on the basis of anti-martial principles, and there was at times a fear, real and honest, that Pennsylvania would be given over to the merciless slaughter of the Indians, or lost by conquest by the French.

Other charges were less respectable. James Logan intimates that the Episcopal church felt a grievance from the fact that it had not the superiority that it had in England and in some other colonies, and hence declined to certify to the justice of Quaker rule. Others wrote to sympathizing friends across the water that the Quakers had what we would now call a political machine conducted by the church organization. This charge has been echoed by writers of recent times.* If true it has been most carefully kept out of the records. The proceedings of the meetings never touch legislation, except incidentally when they deal with moral questions like oaths or slavery. No candidates were ever suggested

* "History of Proprietary Government in Pennsylvania," by W. R. Shepherd, page 548. See note, page 75 of this book.

"Pennsylvania, Colony and Commonwealth," by Sydney George Fisher, page 91.

or discussed. No political conclusions or advice ever appear. The most important case in which the meetings undertook any oversight of the Assemblymen was in 1756 and the following years, when they were trying to induce them to resign. There is no doubt that considerable *esprit de corps* existed in the Society. When Friends met before and after meetings, doubtless the affairs of politics were talked over, and no doubt also the trend of a sermon or letter of advice on a moral or religious subject would influence votes, as it does to-day. That the Quakers held together so well and controlled the State so long is due not to any political organization, or church organization worked for political purposes, but to the fact that the State expressed the principles in which they in common with many German sects believed, and that they were loyal to the representatives of these principles. The continuous attacks of their enemies doubtless held them together, even when their natural divisions between the Proprietary party and the democrats would have drawn them apart.

The attacks upon them are therefore just from the standpoint of those who believe oaths and war essential to government, and relief from them not properly embraced in the liberties to be

granted to sensitive consciences, but hardly on the other grounds of complaint.

The war question will be dealt with in a later chapter. The ground of the Quaker objection to oaths was partly Biblical, partly resentment at the suggestion of untruthfulness involved in them; and the sufferings endured in England on account of this objection had only fortified their beliefs in their position. They did not intend to have to suffer further in Pennsylvania if they could avoid it. One of their prime reasons for emigrating was to be able to have their honest promise, their yea and nay, accepted at its face value without the need of any confirmatory solemnities. A clause of the first "Great Law" of 1682 enacted "that all witnesses coming or called to testify their knowledge in or to any matter or thing in any court, or before any lawful authority within the said Province, shall there give in or deliver their evidence or testimony by solemnly promising to speak the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth to the matter or thing in question." Then follow severe penalties for falsehood. Had this law been permitted to stand for the Commonwealth, oaths would have disappeared, the penalties for falsehood would have replaced the penalties for perjury,

justice would have been administered, and loyalty secured, as perfectly by affirmations as by oaths, and the people in a little while would have adjusted their thoughts to the new order. The good man would have preferred to tell the truth, and the bad man would have feared the punishment for untruth, and as has been amply proved since, oaths even if right in theory would have become unnecessary in practice. But unfortunately for this solution of the problem, Pennsylvania was not an independent State.

The council in 1685 refused to administer an oath even to the king's collector of customs, who came armed with English instructions to be sworn, telling him "it was against their methods to take an oath."

The matter seemed to have worked smoothly on this basis till 1693. Then Penn was deprived of his proprietorship, and Fletcher was appointed Governor by the Crown. The English laws were supposed to be applicable. The act of 1689 permitted Quakers in England to offer a solemn affirmation "in the presence of Almighty God" in place of an oath, but prohibited them from giving evidence in criminal cases, from serving on juries, or from holding any office. The original laws of Pennsylvania made the official qual-

ification a profession of faith in Jesus Christ. The English made the additional requirement of a belief in the Trinity and the Scriptures. The matter for the time was allowed to go by default. The Assembly protested against the new impositions, but finally accepting the declaration of fidelity and orthodoxy, were allowed to continue the exercise of their functions without an oath.

By this time many non-Quakers were in Pennsylvania. Some thought oaths necessary, others liked to worry the Quakers and drive them from government. To satisfy the former it was enacted in the Frame of 1696 that affirmation should be permitted to all whose conscience did not permit them to swear, and that the penalties for false affirmation should be the same as those attached to perjury. The English officers in Pennsylvania should take the oath according to English law.

For several years there followed a contest with the Crown officers and Governor. The Assembly passed bills the object of which was to prevent Quakers from being disqualified from office-holding by their objections to administering oaths, which bills were repealed in England. The Church party in the State sent formal remonstrances to England against the liberties

allowed in taking affirmations. On the other hand the anti-proprietary Quaker party, under the leadership of David Lloyd, sent to England a formal protest in 1704 against William Penn because he had not secured relief from administering oaths, so that many Quakers were driven from government employment.

This resulted from an order obtained in England in 1703, doubtless for the sake of annoying the Quakers,* that judges and other officers should be required to administer oaths to all persons willing to take them. If they refused, the proceedings were to be null and void. This created great confusion in the Province. In some sections there were none but Quakers suitable for justices, and government was suspended. Some Quakers appear to have administered the oath or allowed it to be administered, and some resigned. Penn, who was in England at the time, wrote disapproving of both courses. He said they should have disobeyed and held their places. "I desire you to pluck up that English and Christian courage to not suffer yourselves to be thus treated and put upon." "Spirit him (the new Governor) and creep not. . . .

* Penn and Logan Correspondence, Vol. I., page 214 et seq.

Lose what you lose like men and Christians.” * Here spoke again the old spirit of martyrdom which said that his prison should be his grave before he would sacrifice a principle. The Pennsylvanians were forgetting how to suffer, and were being spoiled by their liberties.

The Assembly, however, was not inactive. Law after law was sent to the Governor, making affirmations valid in all courts. Either he did not believe with Penn, who appointed him, in the invalidity of the Queen's order, or was swayed by opposition to the party which dominated the Assembly. He refused his consent. Then a joint meeting of Governor, Council and Assembly was held.† The Attorney-General had advised that no charter could abrogate the law of England requiring a jury to be sworn in a capital case. Notwithstanding this it was decided that Governor and Council had power to pass a law, substituting affirmations for oaths, because it had been done in the past and the Crown had not objected. Moreover, there were country places where juries could not be made up without Quakers unless they should consist

* Penn and Logan Correspondence, page 248.

† Colonial Records, Vol. II., page 233 et seq.

“ wholly of Swedes and other foreigners in whom there would be much less security.” It was further urged that those willing to take oaths would be permitted so to do, if the official was also willing to administer them.

To this the Governor objected that in many cases where the magistrate was not willing to administer oaths there would be no chance to have them taken, and that the Queen’s order requires them in such cases. The Assembly replied to this that it had been well known that Quakers who had “ first settled and now chiefly inhabit this country ” would have nothing to do with oaths, and moreover that this had been recognized by allowing these same judges and magistrates to be qualified by an affirmation, and that it was very unlikely the Queen meant to remove all of them from office.

But, the Governor replied, some Quakers get along very well as judges notwithstanding the Queen’s order.

On the other hand, said the Assembly, where there are conscientious Quaker justices, if some one desires evidence to be sworn to before them, the whole proceedings become null and void. Hence they ask that in such cases the affirmation may be legal.

The Governor finally decided to sign the bill, to take effect after a lapse of time sufficient to allow the Crown to veto it.

The Episcopalians sent a protest against the bill to London and it was repealed. The Assembly re-enacted it and sent it to the Governor, who now refused to sign it. The Assembly protested with great vigor that there was no security against murder in a Quaker community, for their evidence would not be received.

The next Assembly, in 1711, conceded some points to the Governor, and a fairly satisfactory measure was passed, to be vetoed by the Crown in 1713. Until vetoed it remained in force. After this the process was again and again repeated, the Governor objecting each time to the passage of the bill. Finally in 1718 an act was passed carrying most of the provisions that the Assembly had contended for,—the right to consider an affirmation as valid as an oath in evidence, and as a qualification for office, and affixing the same penalties for lying under such circumstances as for perjury. This managed to escape repeal in London.

Another question now came up. Some Quakers objected to the phrase "in the name of Almighty God," as approximating an oath in effect.

James Logan, in 1706, while admitting the form to be objectionable, thought that greater security than ordinary was needed in Pennsylvania, "where such a rotten and insensible generation shelter themselves under the name"* (of Friends). (This was in the heat of his controversy with David Lloyd.)

The Yearly Meeting in 1710 recognizing the difference refused to take sides, but asked for charity. "The solemn affirmation is a thing of the greatest moment. We exhort all to be very careful about it. . . . That Friends be charitable one to another about it; they that can take it, not to censure or reproach those who can not; and those who can not, to use the like caution and regard to those who can, till further relief can be had for us all."

The whole matter so far as government was concerned was finally laid at rest by a law finally ratified by the king in 1725, prescribing the forms of declaration of fidelity to King George, and renunciation of a belief in the power of the Pope over the English Crown, of abjuration of allegiance to the Stuarts, and of affirmation. The latter form omitted any reference to God, and

* Penn and Logan Correspondence, Vol. II., page 187.

as administered simply was, "Dost thou, A. B., solemnly, sincerely and truly declare and affirm _____?" To which the answer is to be "yea" or "yes."

The Yearly Meeting this year expresses its satisfaction at the favorable turn of affairs. It calls attention to the fact that the preamble to the act says: "It is evident that the said people called Quakers have not abused the liberty or indulgences allowed to them by law," and urges that the further liberties be so used as to justify this favorable notice.

The expense of securing the ratification of the act must have been considerable, for we find records in several, perhaps all, the meetings* advising subscriptions towards the funds raised for the purpose.

Oaths, however, were still administered and taken by those who had no scruples, and the two systems did not work side by side without friction. In 1732 Chester Quarterly Meeting asked whether justices in a mixed court are responsible for the acts of the body in administering oaths,

* "Ordered by the Quarterly Meeting (Bucks), that every Monthly Meeting shall make a subscription towards the charge of gaining the royal assent to the Affirmation Act as others have done." 1726.

and also whether clerks who are Friends can carry out orders to swear witnesses. The Yearly Meeting decided negatively in the latter case. In the former it determined that Quaker justices should have no part in such administration. If, however, there are enough other justices to make the act legal without their concurrence they may retain their places without sacrifice of principle.

There seemed, however, no way to allow a conscientious Quaker to serve as a judge or other official from whom the right to take an oath could be claimed. One such place after another they resigned, at their own motion or the urgency of the meeting. Some retained the office and disobeyed instructions, and in some places the difficulty of securing competent officials not Quakers disposed the meetings to look leniently on the offenders.

One of the "queries" answered three times a year by all the meetings was, "Do you maintain a faithful testimony against oaths," and other specified Quaker immoralities. Towards the middle of the century there were many exceptions in the matter of administering oaths.* The cases

* "That Friends are generally pretty clear with respect to military service, defrauding the King of his duties, payment of church rates so-called, or being concerned in

were taken up one by one by the monthly meetings, under directions from the Yearly Meeting.* This body also advised its members not to vote for Quakers for such offices. Many were induced to decline to serve,† and a very general refusal to accept judgeships and magistracies resulted.

It may seem strange that a belief so unanimously accepted as a cardinal ethical principle, should after the lapse of a century have to be

prize goods, or goods unlawfully imported; though not from the administering of oaths." Bucks Q. M., 28, VIII., 1760.

* "Recommended that the care of Friends, where occasion requires it, may be exerted to labor in Christian love, to convince such of their error who are deficient in respect to our testimony against oaths, and that where these endeavors prove unsuccessful, that Friends proceed according to our discipline; and it is likewise further desired that all Friends may be particularly careful that they be not accessory in promoting or choosing their brethren in such offices, which may subject them to the temptation of deviating from our Christian testimony in this or any other branch thereof." Yearly Meeting, 1762.

† "I. T. so far condemns his having administered an oath, as to declare himself determined not to accept of any office for the future which may subject him to the necessity of doing it, and that he now sees the practice inconsistent both with the rules of the Society and the convictions of his own mind."

Middletown M. M., 1762.

inculcated upon unwilling members as a condition to the continuance of fraternal relations. Its triumph in Pennsylvania and in a modified way in England was so secure, that in the minds of most of them the sufferings of their ancestors were justified by the result. The Society as a whole apparently never wavered in its support. No corporate defection ever resulted from it. The responsibility of government, the duties and privileges of place, brought the Quakers incidentally to the stand where they must adhere to convictions or to office. The decision went forth, as clear as a bell, to hold no office and give no vote which would render nugatory the unchanging testimony of the fathers, and a certain line of offices knew no Quaker incumbents even in communities almost unanimously of their persuasion. The few exceptions to this were, after a long time of unsuccessful kindly discipline, disowned by the Society.

The laws of Pennsylvania, of the States in general, and of the United States, are practically those to which the agitation of the question brought the Pennsylvanians in 1725. They amount to freedom to choose between oath and affirmation on the part of the taker, but no such freedom on the part of the

giver. The law for which the Quakers pressed so assiduously as the best possible under the circumstances allowed all denominations except their own to hold judicial positions. Their ideal was doubtless expressed in the original law of 1682, but having been beaten out of this by the pressure of opposing interests fortified by English authority, they retained what they could, and secured to all the future the liberty to have their yea counted as yea and their nay as nay without the implied invocation of a curse for every falsehood, or the irreverent use of a sacred name in every formal proceeding of the courts.

This was purchased coincidentally with if not consequent upon the sacrifice of another principle, which most people would judge of equal importance with that against oaths.

The "Great Law" of 1682, passed under the impulse of the influence of William Penn and his immediate friends, reduced the death penalty to cases of treason and murder (practically to the one crime of malicious murder only). This stood till 1718. There does not appear to have been any alarming increase of crime, though numerous reports were sent to England by enemies of the Provincial government, tending to show in-

security of life and property as a result of too great leniency. While we have no evidence that Penn changed his mind on the subject of capital punishment, he frequently wrote urging a vigorous enforcement of laws against criminals, as one means of aiding him in defending the good name of the Province.

In 1715 a prominent citizen, Jonathan Hayes, was murdered in Chester County. This was while the affirmation question was unsettled, just after Governor Gockin had decided that the English disqualifying law applied to Pennsylvania. As judges, and probably witnesses and part of the jury, would have to be Quakers, who refused to be sworn, the prisoners were released on bail for about three years. In the meantime Governor Keith came into power, and he and his Council considered their case.* It was said that immunity had encouraged crime. They appealed to England, but before the appeal could be heard the sentence was executed.

The affair made a great excitement, especially in England, which was studiously fanned by the anti-Quaker party in Pennsylvania. That the lives of Englishmen could be taken by an unsworn jury was considered monstrous.

* Colonial Records, III., page 32.

The Assembly became alarmed at the threats to exclude Quakers from office by the imposition of oaths, and were ready to take advice of the Governor. He shrewdly intimated that they would secure favor at court by re-adopting the criminal laws of England so far as they would apply to Pennsylvania. Hence the act of 1718 "for the advancement of justice and the more certain administration thereof," the very act which as we have seen made an affirmation as good in law as an oath, contained also the authority to inflict the penalty of death upon a dozen crimes, including robbery, burglary, malicious maiming, arson, and manslaughter by stabbing, to which was afterward added counterfeiting.

This act was passed by a Quaker Assembly, drawn up by a Quaker lawyer, and its acceptance by the Crown brought with it a sense of relief and satisfaction to a Quaker community. The royal approbation was triumphantly announced by the Governor, securing on the one hand liberty to hold office without taking an oath, and on the other the great extension of capital punishment. Penn and his liberal penal code died in the same year. This act was in force till after the revolution. Not only was the existing law adopted as the Governor advised, "as the sum

and result of the experiences of the ages," but persons convicted or attainted were to suffer "as the laws of England now do or hereafter shall direct." If there was any testimony in Quakerism against capital punishment, which there does not appear to have been prior to the Revolution, it was bartered, and the right to make laws was surrendered to the English power. That in defence of a principle fully accepted Friends could brave all dangers had been fully proven, and the only explanation of their anomalous position is that the taking of life judicially was not at that time an iniquity in their eyes. The question was one of expediency upon which a compromise could properly be made.

CHAPTER VI.

THE INDIANS.

No phase of early Pennsylvania history needs less defense than the Indian policy of the colonists. The "Great Treaty" at Shackamaxon has been immortalized by West on canvas and Voltaire in print, and historians have not hesitated to do it ample justice. The resulting seventy years of peace and friendship, as contrasted with the harassing and exterminating wars on the boundaries of nearly all the other colonies, attest its practical utility. The date of the treaty is more or less uncertain, its place rests on tradition, and its objects are not positively known.* It seems probable that it occurred in June, 1683, under the elm tree whose location is now marked by a stone, and that it was held for the double purpose of making a league of friendship and of purchasing lands.

There can be no doubt of Penn's benevolent intentions regarding the Indians. The Quaker

* "Pennsylvania Magazine," Vol. VI., pages 217 to 238. Article by Frederick D. Stone, which is frequently used in the succeeding pages.

doctrine of universal divine light seemed to give encouragement to do missionary work among them. George Fox again and again in his letters urges ministers to convey to the Indians the messages of Christ's life and death, and God's love for them.* The Indians responded as if they knew the reality of the indwelling of the Great Spirit. On that point their theory and that of the Quakers agreed, and this may have been the basis of the bond of sympathy which existed between them.

On the "18th of the Eighth month (October), 1681," the Proprietor sent by his cousin and deputy, William Markham, a letter † to the In-

* "You must instruct and teach your Indians and negroes and all others how that Christ by the grace of God tasted death for every man, and gave himself a ransom for all men, and is the propitiation not for the sins of Christians only but for the sins of the whole world."—G. F., in 1679.

"And God hath poured out his spirit upon all flesh, and so the Indians must receive God's spirit. . . . And so let them know that they have a day of salvation, grace and favor of God offered unto them; if they will receive it it will be their blessing."—G. F., in 1688.

† "My friends: There is a great God and power that hath made the world and all things therein, to whom you and I and all people owe their being and well-being; to whom you and I must one day give an account for all that we do in the world.

"This great God hath written his law in our hearts, by

dians, simple, brief and kindly, admirably adapted to dispose them favorably to him. He had been authorized by his charter "to reduce the savage nations by gentle and just manners to the love of civil society and Christian religion." He was evidently greatly interested in them, as his long and elaborate descriptions sent home on the basis of rather insufficient knowl-

which we are commanded to live and help and do good to one another. Now this great God hath been pleased to make me concerned in your part of the world, and the King of the country where I live hath given me a great province therein, but I desire to enjoy it with your love and consent, that we may always live together as neighbors and friends; else what would the great God do to us, who hath made us not to devour and destroy one another but to live soberly and kindly together in the world? Now I would have you well observe that I am very sensible of the unkindness and injustice that hath been too much exercised towards you by the people of these parts of the world; who have sought themselves, and to make great advantages by you rather than to be examples of goodness and patience unto you; which I hear hath been a matter of trouble to you, and caused great grudging and animosities, sometimes to the shedding of blood, which hath made the great God angry. But I am not such a man; as is well known in my own country. I have great love and regard towards you; and desire to win and gain your love and friendship by a kind, just and peaceable life; and the people I send are of the same mind and shall in all things behave themselves accordingly; and if in anything any shall offend you you shall have a full and speedy satisfaction for the same by an equal number of just men on both sides. . . . "

edge testify; and he seems to have had great hopes of making acquisitions to Christianity among them.

He saw, however, that Christian sentiment alone would not advance the standard or even prevent the degradation of Indian morality. He knew, at least partly, the character of frontier traders, the valuable bargains to be obtained from a drunken Indian, and the weakness of Indian character in the face of sensual temptations. Whatever he could do to lessen these evils he stood ready to attempt. He refused an advantageous offer when he needed money badly lest he should barter authority to irresponsible people to the disadvantage of the Indian. "I did refuse a great temptation last Second-day, which was £6,000 . . . to have wholly to itself the Indian trade from south to north between the Susquehanna and Delaware Rivers. . . . But as the Lord gave it to me over all and great opposition . . . I would not abuse His love nor act unworthy of His providence, and so defile what came to me clean." *

There is additional proof of the correctness of this statement in a letter of one of the intending

* Hazard's "Annals of Pennsylvania," page 522.

purchasers, James Claypoole : “ He (W. P.) is offered great things,—£6,000 for a monopoly in trade, which he refused. . . . I believe truly he does aim more at justice and righteousness and spreading of truth than at his own particular gain.”

This was in 1681. In the same year he places in his “ Conditions and Concessions ” made with his purchasers of land, the stipulations that wrong-doers towards the Indians should be treated as if the misdeeds were against fellow-planters, that Indian criminals should be proceeded against before magistrates just as white criminals were, and that in cases of difference an arbitration committee of twelve, six Indians and six whites, should end them. He probably over-estimated the capacity and willingness of the Indians to adapt themselves to English customs, and the latter measure, apparently unworkable, was soon abandoned. But as an evidence of his desire for justice it is valuable.

William Penn had paid King Charles £16,000 for Pennsylvania. He recognized, however, the Indian claims to the same territory, and was ready to purchase them. Moreover, as he determined never to engage in warfare with the na-

tives, and was trustful in the efficacy of justice and reason to settle all disputes, he would begin with a friendly bargain with them for the land he was to occupy.

The purchase of lands of the Indians was no new thing. It had been frequently but not uniformly done in New England and New York. The early "Pennsylvania Archives" give several instances of such purchases in New Jersey. The Dutch and the Swedes had acquired title to lands in the same way in Pennsylvania. In fact it had become rather common, and Penn probably thought but little of the mere act of purchase.

What seems to have impressed the Indians was the fact that Penn insisted on purchase at the first and all subsequent agreements as being an act of justice, to which both parties were to give their assent voluntarily. They also felt that the price paid was ample to extinguish their claims, and that no advantages were taken by plying them with drink or cheating them with false maps. The treaties were open and honorable contracts, and not characterized by sharpness and chicanery. As the Indians reflected on them at their leisure they saw nothing to repent of, and everything to admire in the conduct of

Penn and his friends, and they preserved inviolably the terms to which they had solemnly agreed. They instinctively felt the honorable intentions and methods of "Onas," and handed down from generation to generation the belts of wampum which ratified the treaties, and the words of kindness and interest they heard from his mouth in the conferences between them. These traditions still exist in the West, and a band of Quaker Indians in Indian Territory is a testimony to their vitality. The Shawnees, forced from Pennsylvania, found a temporary home in Ohio, still keeping in touch with their Quaker friends, and when moved by the Government first to Kansas and then to the Indian Territory, made a request that their agents and teachers should be members of the Society which they and their ancestors had been able to trust.*

The first land purchased † of the Indians by

* "American Friend," Vol. IV., page 79.

† The consideration paid by William Penn was:

- 350 fathoms of wampum.
- 20 white blankets.
- 20 fathoms of Strand waters (coats).
- 60 fathoms of Duffields (coats).
- 20 kettles.

Penn was on July 15th, 1682, before his arrival, when Markham conducted the negotiations. This was for a tract in the northern part of Bucks County, between the Delaware River and Neshaminy Creek.*

20 guns.
20 coats.
40 shirts.
40 pairs of stockings.
40 hoes.
40 axes.
2 barrels of powder.
200 bars of lead.
200 knives.
200 small glasses.
12 pairs of shoes.
40 copper boxes.
40 tobacco tongs.
2 small barrels of pipes.
40 pairs of scissors.
40 combs.
2½ pounds of red lead.
100 awls.
2 handfuls of fish hooks.
2 handfuls of needles.
40 pounds of shot.
10 bundles of beads.
10 small saws.
12 drawing knives.
4 anchors of tobacco.
2 anchors of rum.
2 anchors of cider.
2 anchors of beer.
300 gilders.

* "Pennsylvania Archives," Vol. I., page 47.

Another tract adjoining this was sold* by Tamanen to William Penn, on June 23d, for "so much wampum, so many guns, shoes, stockings, looking glasses, blankets, and other goods as the said William Penn shall please to give unto me." At the same treaty other chiefs sold out their lands "to run two days' journey with an horse up into the country as the said river doth go" for a similar consideration. Other treaties of June 25th and July 14th, expressed in the same indefinite way, conveyed to Penn all southeastern Pennsylvania.

It was probably the transaction of June 23d, 1683, which constituted the great treaty. † Penn writes shortly after, in a letter to the Free Society of Traders:

I have had occasion to be in Council with them upon terms for land, and to adjust the terms of trade. . . . When the purchase was agreed, great promises passed between us of kindness and good neighborhood, and that the Indians and English must live in love as long as the sun gave light. Which done, another made a speech to the Indians in the name of all the Sachamakers or kings; first to tell them what was done, next to charge and command them to love the Christians, and particularly live in peace with me and the people under my government; that many governors had been in the river, but that no gov-

* "Pennsylvania Archives," Vol. I., page 62, et seq.

† "Pennsylvania Magazine," Vol. VI., page 218.

ernor had come to live and stay here before; and having now such an one that had treated them well, they should never do him harm or his any wrong. At every sentence of which they shouted and said Amen, in their way.

While many of the details given by some earlier writers are imaginary, there seems to be no doubt from the above that a treaty covering sales of land and a compact of perpetual amity, answering well the established traditions on the subject, was held, and that West's picture does substantially represent a historical fact, and Voltaire's eulogium is deserved.

Nor has the effect upon the Indian mind been in any way exaggerated. Again and again, in subsequent negotiations, they refer to the arrangement with William Penn in terms of the greatest respect. 1712, in an interview with the Conestoga Indians, Indian Harry said: *

The Proprietor, Governor Penn, at his first coming amongst them, made an agreement with them that they should always live as friends and brothers, and be as one body, one heart, one mind, and as one eye and ear; that what the one saw the other should see, and what the one heard the other should hear, and that there should be nothing but love and friendship between them and us forever.

In 1715, Sasoonan said: †

* "Colonial Records," Vol. II., page 578.

† "Colonial Records," Vol. II., page 628.

To prevent any misunderstanding, they now come to renew the former bond of friendship that William Penn had at his first coming made a clear and open road all the way to the Indians, that they desired the same might be kept open, and that all obstructions might be removed, of which on their side they will take care.

The chief of the five nations, in 1727, told the Governor: *

Governor Penn, when he came into this Province, took all the Indians by the hand; he embraced them as his friends and brethren, and made a firm league of friendship with them; he bound it as with a chain that was never to be broken; he took none of their lands without paying for them.

Practically the whole of Pennsylvania was purchased of the Indians, some of it several times over. The Six Nations of New York claimed a suzerainty over the Pennsylvania Indians, and in this capacity Penn, in 1696, bought of them, or of the Governor of New York, acting for them, the lands on both sides of the Susquehanna throughout the whole Province.† The subject Indians, however, not feeling satisfied to be left out of the purchase, Penn explained that he was only buying the right of the Six Nations, which was thereby extinguished, and he laid the parch-

* "Colonial Records," Vol. III., page 288.

† "Pennsylvania Archives," Vol. I., page 121.

ment on the ground between the red and white men to indicate joint ownership. In 1700, he bought over again the same lands "for a parcel of English goods," to the perfect satisfaction of the occupants.

During Penn's lifetime the relations continued so good that there was no difficulty in restraining unruly Indians. We find in the early minutes of the Council several complaints against Indians for stealing the settlers' hogs. The kings were sent for and presumably settled the matter.

Penn writes, in 1685, of the Indians:

If any of them break our laws they submit to be punished by them; and to this they have tied themselves by an obligation under their hands.

He was equally desirous to punish white trespassers on Indian rights. The great difficulty was to keep settlers off lands not already purchased. During his lifetime, he bought so far in advance of settlement that he managed to avoid any sense of injury on the part of the Indians. Later in the history of the Colony the problem became a serious one.

Another cause of complaint was the demoralization wrought by rum. The Indian was helpless in the presence of this ruinous beverage, and

that helplessness was an appeal to Christians to keep it from him.

Penn's cellar at Pennsbury was well stocked with liquors of various degrees of strength, which he dispensed with generous hospitality to his callers, whether Indian or white. He appears to have recognized very early the devastations wrought by rum among the Indians, and we do not find it given as one of the considerations for lands after the Markham purchase of 1682. An early law prohibited the sale of rum to the Indians, but in 1684 Penn informed his Council, that at the request of the chiefs he had consented to allow them to buy rum if they would take the same punishment for drunkenness as the English. This did not, however, last long, and in 1701 a very stringent law against selling strong liquors to the Indians was enacted.*

* Statutes at Large of Pennsylvania, Vol. II., page 168:

“Whereas our Proprietary and Governor and the representatives of the freemen of this Province and the territories in General Assembly met, are still desirous to induce the Indian nations to the love of the Christian religion by the gentle, sober and just manners of professed Christians (under this government) towards them; and it being too obvious that divers persons within this Province have used and practiced the selling of rum, brandy and other strong liquors in such quantities to the Indians, many of whom

In the meantime the Quaker meetings had taken up the matter.

The Friends who had settled at Burlington in advance of Penn's purchase of Pennsylvania had very early seen the effects of the sale.* By 1685 the Yearly Meeting was convinced on the

are not able yet to govern themselves in the use thereof (as by sad experience is too well known), that they are generally apt to drink to great excess, whereby they are not only liable to be cheated and reduced to great poverty and want, but sometimes inflamed to destroy themselves and one another, and terrify, annoy and endanger the inhabitants, and forasmuch as several Sachems and Sagemucks, kings of the Indian nations, have in their treaties with the Proprietary and Governor earnestly desired that no European should be permitted to carry rum to their towns, because of the mischiefs before expressed, and since these evil practices plainly tend to the great dishonor of God, scandal of the Christian religion, and hindrance to the embracing thereof, as well as drawing the judgment of God upon the country, if not timely prevented, for the prevention thereof for the future”:

[Section I. makes an absolute prohibition of all spirits by sale, barter, gift or exchange, and affixes a penalty of 10 pounds for each offence.

Section II. makes the testimony of one professed Christian sufficient for conviction.

Section III. forfeits all liquors carried to Indian towns.

Section IV. prohibits receiving any article of the Indians as pawn for strong drink, and forfeits the pawn.]

* “It was desired that Friends would consider the matter as touching the selling of rum unto the Indians [if it] be lawful at all for Friends professing Truth to be concerned in it.”—Burlington Monthly Meeting, 1679.

subject, and “doth unanimously agree, and give as their judgment, that it is not consistent with the honor of Truth for any that make profession thereof to sell rum or other strong liquors to, the Indians, because they use them not to moderation, but to excess and drunkenness.” Two years later they say, if possible still more emphatically, it “is a thing contrary to the mind of the Lord, and a great grief and burden to His people, and a great reflection and dishonor on the Truth,” and directed that the minute “be entered in every monthly meeting book, and every Friend belonging to said meeting subscribe the same.” Even this did not seem to have rooted out the practice among some Friends, so in 1719 Monthly Meetings were directed to “deal with” (i.e., separate from membership if not repentant) those who sold directly or indirectly to the Indians. By this time it was a penal as well as a moral offense.

The Indian chiefs were sensible of the honesty of these efforts. In a conference held about 1687, one of them spoke as follows: *

The strong liquor was first sold us by the Dutch, and they are blind; they had no eyes, they did not see it was for our hurt. The next people that came among us were

* Janney's "Life of William Penn," page 123.

the Swedes, who continued the sale of the strong liquors to us; they were also blind, they had no eyes, they did not see it to be hurtful to us to drink it, although we knew it to be hurtful to us; but if people will sell it to us, we are so in love with it that we cannot forbear it. When we drink it, it makes us mad; we do not know what to do; we then abuse one another; we throw each other into the fire. Seven score of our people have been killed by reason of drinking it, since the time it was first sold to us. These people that sell it have no eyes. But now there is a people come to live among us that have eyes; they see it to be for our hurt; they are willing to deny themselves the profit of it for our good. These people have eyes. We are glad such a people are come among us; we must put it down by mutual consent; the cask must be sealed up; it must be made fast; it must not leak by day or by night, in light or in the dark, and we give you these four belts of wampum, which we would have you lay up safe and keep by you to be witnesses of this agreement, and we would have you tell your children that these four belts of wampum are given you to be witnesses, betwixt us and you, of this agreement.

At the time of the death of Penn the relations between the whites and Indians could not well be improved. While there were individual outrages on the Indians, and individual stealings from the whites, they were punished as completely as the circumstances would admit, and never produced ill-feeling. The frontier was safe from marauders, tomahawks and scalping knives were unknown, and traders carried on their business with safety. A perfect confidence in the fairness of Penn and the Quakers existed

among the Indians, which in time deepened into an abiding respect.

As lands became more in demand for settlement, difficulties increased. But it was a different spirit in the white negotiators, rather than inherent perplexities, which drove the red men first to estrangement, then to hostility, then to bloody revenge, making them an easy prey to French machinations. Much was said at the time about the peace policy of the Quakers making the Province insecure against French and Indian attack. A more profound study would indicate that that insecurity was primarily caused by rank injustice to the Indians at the hands of the sons and successors of William Penn. A policy of peace and one of justice combined may be successful; it is hardly fair, however, to provoke attack by iniquity and then saddle the inevitable consequences upon the lack of preparation for military resistance. Had the sons of Penn maintained the confidence and friendship of the Indians, an effective buffer against all hostile French designs would have existed, and Pennsylvania been spared the horrors of 1755 and succeeding years. This friendship, notwithstanding the increasing pressure on the Indian lands, might have been maintained,

had there been no deceitful measures which left the red man quiet but sullen, with a brooding sense of wrong, and desire for revenge. Even then he seems to have understood that the Quaker was his friend and shielded him in his frontier raids. It is said that only three members of that sect were killed by the Indians in the Pennsylvania troubles, and they had so far abandoned their ordinary trustful attitude as to carry guns in defense.*

There were inherent difficulties in preventing rum being furnished to the Indians, and in keeping settlers off their hands. Charles Thomson † says, in the case of the rum, that while ample promises were held out to them, they were never kept. In 1722 the Indians told Governor Keith that they "could live contentedly and grow rich if it were not for the quantities of rum that is suffered to come among them contrary to what William Penn promised them." Again in 1727 they complain of traders who cheat them, and

* Dymond, "Essay on War."

† "An Enquiry into the Cause of the Alienation of the Indians," 1750. The facts which follow are mainly derived from this book. C. T. was afterwards secretary of the Continental Congress and author of a translation of the Bible.

give them rum and not powder and shot, so that the Indians nearly starve. The Governor in reply to this said he could not control traders, that Indians and whites all would cheat, and that they were at liberty to break in the heads of all rum casks. Such complaints came in continuously, and we can well understand were hard to deal with. In the matter of settlement of lands prior to purchase of the Indians, probably all was done that was possible. The Scotch-Irish and Germans were pressing in at a tremendous rate and cared nothing for Indian titles. It seemed to them absurd to allow Indians a great stretch of fertile land for hunting purposes only. Sometimes the settlers were removed, at other times the Indians were satisfied by payments, but they still felt aggrieved as they saw their lands melting away before the ubiquitous whites.

These causes, while adding to the general discontent, would not with proper management have produced serious disaffection had they not been re-enforced by a few cases of glaring injustice. The first of these was the notorious "Walking Purchase."

In a treaty in 1728 James Logan said that William Penn never allowed lands to be settled till purchased of the Indians. Ten years before

he had shown to their chiefs deeds covering all lands from Duck Creek, in Delaware, to the "Forks of the Delaware," * and extending back along the "Lechoy Hills" to the Susquehanna. The Indians admitted this and confirmed the deeds, but objected to the settlers crowding into the fertile lands within the forks occupied by the Minisink tribe of the Delaware Indians. Logan accordingly forbade any surveying in the Minisink country. White settlers, however, were not restrained, and the Indians became still more uneasy. A tract of 10,000 acres sold by the Penns to be taken up anywhere in the unoccupied lands of the Province, was chosen here and opened for settlement. A lottery was established by the Proprietors, the successful tickets calling for amounts of land down to 200 acres, and many of these were assigned in the Forks, without Indian consent.

In order to secure undisputed possession and drive out the Delawares, who it must be remembered had always been more than friendly, a despicable artifice was resorted to, which will always disgrace the name of Thomas Penn. A deed of 1686 of doubtful authenticity was

* Between the Delaware and Lehigh Rivers, where Easton now stands.

produced, confirming to William Penn a plot of ground beginning on the Delaware River a short distance above Trenton, running west to Wrightstown, in Bucks County, thence north-west parallel to the Delaware River as far as a man could walk in a day and a half, which was no doubt intended to extend to the Lehigh Hills, thence eastward by an undefined line, left blank in the deed, presumably along the hills to the Delaware River at Easton. It was one of numerous purchases of a similar character which in the aggregate conveyed to William Penn all southeastern Pennsylvania, and had with his careful constructions made no trouble. The walk, however, had never been taken, and in 1737 the Proprietors brought out the old agreement as a means of securing a title to the Minisink country.

The route was surveyed, underbrush cleared away, horses stationed to convey the walkers across the rivers, two athletic young men trained for the purpose, and conveyances provided for their baggage and provisions. Indians attended at the beginning, but after repeatedly calling to the men to walk, not run, retired in disgust. Far from stopping at the Lehigh Hills, they covered about sixty miles and extended the line thirty

miles beyond the Lehigh River. Then to crown the infamy, instead of running the northern line by any reasonable course they slanted it to the northeast and included all the Minisink country. It was a gross travesty on the original purchase, an outrageous fraud on the Indians, which they very properly refused to submit to. They remained in their ancestral homes, and sent notice they would resist removal by force. There unfortunately seems to be no doubt of the iniquity of the transaction. There is the testimony of at least two witnesses to the walk. It appears to have been a common subject of remark. Indifferent men treated it as sharp practice, and honest men were ashamed. But the Proprietors had a sort of a title to the fertile lands along the Delaware.

The outrage did not stop here. The Proprietors, probably knowing the temper of the Assembly, did not ask a military force to eject the Delawares. They applied to the Six Nations, who claimed all the Pennsylvania Indians as their subjects. In 1742 a conference was held in Philadelphia, where a large number of the chiefs of the various tribes were present. Presents worth £300 were given to the Six Nations,*

* "Colonial Records," Vol. IV., page 597, et seq.

and after hospitable entertainment of several days after the manner of the times, they were brought into conference with their tributary chiefs, the Governor, and his Council. The Iroquois sachem, after saying he had judicially examined the deeds, pronounced judgment in favor of the whites, and turning to the Delawares, who apparently had nothing to say, he addressed them: "Let this belt of wampum serve to chastise you; you ought to be taken by the hair of the head and shaken severely till you recover your senses." Then with the bitterest taunts he proceeded: "But how came you to sell land at all? We conquered you. We made women of you; you know you are women, and can no more sell land than women. . . . For all these reasons we charge you to remove instantly. We don't give you liberty to think about it. You are women; take the advice of a wise man and remove immediately. . . . We assign you two places to go to, Wyoming or Shamokin. You may go to either of these places and then we shall have you more under our eye and shall see how you behave. Don't deliberate, but remove away and take this belt of wampum."

There was nothing for the Delawares to do but to obey. They saw that the league between

the whites and the Six Nations was irresistible. They placed them in the same category of enemies and bided their time. If in the Indian sense they had been women—that is, peaceful and trustful—they were soon to show that the injury had made them capable of coping with their dreaded Iroquois oppressors, and of sending the white frontiersmen fleeing in terror to towns and forts. But the cup of their injurious treatment was not yet full.

The Six Nations having completed their contract in removing the Delawares, demanded a reciprocal favor. The lands along the Juniata River had never been purchased, and were claimed by these New York Indians as a part of their imperial domain. Moreover they were valuable hunting grounds. But the whites were pressing in, and the government of Pennsylvania was asked to clear them out. They could not well object to the request, and an expedition was sent into the country which demanded the removal of the settlers and burned their buildings. The whites moved back as soon as the authorities were gone, and the old complaints were renewed.

No doubt the French were continually fomenting the disturbances. By artfully promis-

ing the recovery of lands and giving presents to chiefs, they were welding together most of the Indians except three nations of the Iroquois into a confederacy against the English. The Pennsylvanians, sensible of the danger, began to make counter presents, and here the Quaker Assembly and the Proprietors joined hands. It was a fortunate season for such Indians as could take advantage of the competition, but in the nature of things could not last.

Finally the Penns concluded at one stroke to extinguish all Indian titles to Western Pennsylvania. The rest was practically their own. The Indian chiefs were collected at Albany, and by means which will not bear examination were induced to sign the contract. It gave to the Proprietors all the land south and west of a line drawn from Shamokin to Lake Erie and extending to the extreme boundaries of the Province. The Indians said they were cheated; some chiefs were privately bought; most of the Pennsylvania tribes were not represented and did not know what was going on; they did not understand the compass courses, and did not know the extent of the sale; they were told they were only clearing themselves of charges of having sold to the French or the people of Connecticut, who were

then making claims on the northern part of Pennsylvania. How much of this is true cannot be certainly known. But when the Pennsylvania Indians became aware that they had been induced, by methods which seemed to them fraudulent, to sign away all their hunting grounds, the pent-up dissatisfaction of years came to a head. The grievances which the Proprietors and frontiersmen had heaped upon them seemed now a part of a settled policy. They felt excused from fulfilling the obligations they had assumed to William Penn and the Quakers, who, they rightfully conjectured, had nothing to do with these iniquities; they joined heartily with the French in their hostilities, and shot down Braddock's army in the summer of 1755 with a right good will. The terrors of Indian warfare to which the other colonies had been subjected were now for the first time reproduced in Pennsylvania, and the effects of the "Holy Experiment" were ended.

The victory over Braddock turned all doubtful Indians into the ranks of the hostiles. The fall of 1755 and spring of 1756 were dire seasons for the frontiers of Pennsylvania. The burning of houses, the shooting down of men, the outrages on women and children, the flight

to places of safety, the demands for protection from government and friendly Indians,—from all these things the policy of William Penn had shielded the settlers for seventy-three years. The very tribes with which he had formed his treaties, which were always so warm in their friendships for him, which had been the victims of the “Walking Purchase,” been branded as women by the Six Nations, and moved about from place to place,—the Delawares and the Shawnees,—now proved as fierce as any. All that the brilliant author of the *History of the Conspiracy of Pontiac* has said of their general peacefulness was disproved. When ill-treated they had their bloody revenge, exactly as in New England. They showed no lack of Indian spirit. Hitherto overcome by the superior numbers and organization of the Iroquois, they now, under French tutelage and a sense of wrong, turned on their oppressors and proved their equality in endurance, in resource and in cruelty. That Pennsylvania was saved by the just and pacific policy of the first settlers, and would have suffered just as the other colonies did by the reverse, seems as probable as any historical conclusion.

War was declared against these two tribes by the Governor and Council in the spring of 1756.

This was the final act which drove the Quakers from the Assembly. Rewards for scalps, one hundred and thirty "pieces of eight" for a man and fifty for a woman, were offered to friendly Indians and guerilla whites, and a slightly larger amount for prisoners. But the scalps were more easily handled and prisoners were not brought in. The war raged primarily in the unpurchased and doubtful lands, in the Cumberland and Juniata Valleys, and in the "Forks of the Delaware," whither the Minisinks had returned to their old home.

The French were busy in the north, and could not do more to aid the Pennsylvania Indians than furnish them with supplies. Hence it seemed possible to detach the Delawares and Shawnees from the hostile alliance. For this purpose the "Friendly Association" was formed. This was composed of Quakers, now out of the government, but anxious to terminate the unfortunate warfare. They refused to pay war taxes, but pledged themselves to contribute in the interests of peace "more than the heaviest taxes of a war can be expected to require."

While this Association was objected to by the State authorities as an unofficial and to some extent an impertinent body, and charged with

political motives, it succeeded in a remarkable way in bringing together the Indians and the Government in a succession of treaties, which finally resulted in the termination of the war and the payment to the Indians of an amount which satisfied them for the land taken by the Walking Purchase and other dubious processes. Representatives of the Association, either by invitation of the Indians or of the Governor, were invariably present, and their largesses to the Indians much smoothed the way to pacific relations. As Israel Pemberton, a prominent member, said in 1758, after speaking of the misconception of their motives by various persons:

If we can but be instrumental to restore peace to our country and retrieve the credit of it with our former kind neighbors, but of late bloody enemies, we shall have all the reward we desire. . . . It was by this [justice] the first settlers of the Province obtained their friendship, and the name of a Quaker of the same spirit as William Penn still is in the highest estimation among their old men, . . . and there's a considerable number of us here united in a resolution to endeavor by the like conduct to fix the same good impression of all of us in the minds of the rising generation.*

Treaties were held at Easton in the summer and fall of 1756. Tedyuscung conducted the negotiations on behalf of the Six Nations, who

* "The Friend," Vol. XLVI., page 187.

in the main remained friendly, and the Delawares. The Lieutenant-Governor and his Council were present. The Friendly Association requested to be allowed to send delegates, and were at first forbidden, but being doubtful either of the perfect wisdom or perfect sincerity of the Governor,* and finding that the Indians desired them, sent their deputation, and had important influence in securing a favorable conclusion.

Tedyuscung was very plain. "This very ground that is under me (striking it with his foot) was my land and inheritance, and is taken from me by fraud." † He went over the old grounds of complaint, but desired now to live in peace. The Council, with apparent intention to evade the real question, brought up the old decision of 1742, when the Six Nations chastised their "women," as evidence of the fairness of Proprietors, and proposed that they should, when they adjourned to Philadelphia, inquire into the matter and do what was right. This was evidently insincere. The Walking Purchase and its consequences were too well known to need

* "The Friend," Vol. XLVI., page 201. Letter of James Pemberton.

† "Colonial Records," Vol. VII., page 324.

further investigation, and so the commissioners acting for the Assembly seem to have known, for they advised settling the claims immediately. This was finally done. The Quakers added their present of clothing, and the Indians went off in better humor than for years.

This did not entirely stop hostilities on the sparse frontier. Scattered tribes still had private revenge or French designs to spur them on. But Tedyuscung, who was now a Christian, used his greatest endeavors to bring them one by one into friendly relations with the English, and a little interval of quiet allowed the disordered border to repair itself before another war again stirred up the Indians.

The year 1757 saw peace restored by the efforts of the heroic Moravian, Christian Frederic Post, sent out by the Friendly Association to the Ohio Indians, and by the capture of Fort Duquesne by General Forbes.

CHAPTER VII.

MILITARY MATTERS.

Of all Friendly ideas the most difficult to incorporate practically into government machinery was that of peace. The uncompromising views which most Quakers held as to the iniquity of all war, seemed to those outside the Society utopian if not absurd, and did not command the united support of its own membership. That justice and courtesy should characterize all dealings with other states, that no aggressive war could ever be justified, that in almost every case war could be honorably avoided, all were willing to endorse and practice, but a minority, probably a small minority, held that circumstances might arise when warlike defense was necessary and proper, and that the Sermon on the Mount was not to be interpreted any more literally when it commanded "Resist not evil" than when it commanded "Lay not up treasures on earth."

The general tenor of authoritative Quaker teaching, however, admitted no such interpretation. It is not found in the writings of Fox, Barclay, Pennington or Penn. Their language

is always unequivocal in opposition to all war. The Quaker converts among Cromwell's soldiers, of whom there were not a few, left the ranks for conscience' sake as uniformly and as unhesitatingly as the Christian converts of the early centuries abandoned the Roman armies, with the plea, "I am a Christian, and therefore cannot fight."

"Not fighting, but suffering," says William Penn * in 1694, "is another testimony peculiar to this people. . . . Thus as truth-speaking succeeded swearing, so faith and patience succeed fighting in the doctrine and practice of this people. Nor ought they for this to be obnoxious to civil government; since if they cannot fight for it neither can they fight against it, which is no mean security to any state. Nor is it reasonable that people should be blamed for not doing more for others than they can do for themselves."

We have important testimony to Penn's position in the unsympathetic statement of James Logan.† After expressing his own view that all government was founded on force, he says: "I

* "The Rise and Progress of the People Called Quakers."

† "Pennsylvania Magazine," Vol. VI., page 404.

was therefore the more surprised when I found my master on a particular occasion on our voyage hither (in 1699), though coming over to exercise the powers of it here in his own person, showed his sentiments were otherwise." * He adds that "Friends had laid it down as their principle, that bearing of arms, even for self-defense, is unlawful."

There seems therefore no doubt that the Society had with practical unanimity accepted military non-resistance in its most extreme form.

Not content with arguing on moral grounds against the unrighteousness of war, Penn elaborated, in 1693, a large scheme "of an European Dyet Parliament or Estates" to which disputes

* This refers to an incident mentioned in Franklin's Autobiography. When the vessel was thought to be about to be attacked by a hostile boat, Logan prepared to resist, while Penn and the other Friends retired to the cabin.

It seems strange that Logan should prior to this have been ignorant of Penn's views on defensive warfare, inasmuch as the treatise quoted above had been several years in print, and other writings published long prior were equally plain. But Logan was then only 26 years old, and though he says he "considered of 't very closely before I engaged," his knowledge of Friends was probably limited. Indeed, he never felt such sympathy with Friends as to attend meetings for business with regularity.

When Penn took his young secretary to task for his hostile preparations on shipboard, Logan suggested rather unkindly that the objections were not stated till all danger was past.

should be presented for settlement. All nations were to be represented by Deputies, and the advantages of such a Court and the various expedients to make the decisions final and satisfactory are pressed with great wealth of suggestions.*

William Penn's mind was full of profound and comprehensive projects. Three years later he published a plan for the union of the American colonies, of course in dependence upon the English Crown. Two representatives were to meet in New York from each province at stated times to arrange for their common interests. They would settle all questions about the return of criminals, arrange details of commerce, and "consider ways and means to support the union and safety of these provinces against the public enemies." He was too early with this suggestion, but it would have preserved them from rather bitter controversies if it had been adopted.

It was easy to hold peace views as an academic proposition, supported by the spirit and letter of the New Testament; but when the actual problems of government arose how was this non-resistant principle to be applied to the protection

* This is published as a tract by the "Old South" Association of Boston.

of society against criminals? This logical difficulty does not seem to have troubled the early Pennsylvanians. So far as appears they drew a line between police and military measures, making one effective and barring out the other. There was to them no contradiction to call for explanation. With strict logic they might have been driven to the position of Count Tolstoi, who carries his non-resistance so far as to object to all government, and all restraint on criminals. Or the line might be supposed to be drawn on the sacredness of human life, but, as we have seen, opposition to capital punishment, *per se*, never arose before the Revolution. Probably if pressed for an answer to the question why it was right to resist a street mob of subjects with police and not to resist an attacking force with soldiers, they would have replied that one act was in defence of life and property under authority of civil powers "ordained of God," and involving no iniquitous means, while all military measures necessarily included the destruction of life and property, of innocent as well as of guilty, and reversed the established rules of morality in sanctioning stealing, lying, and killing those who were not personally offenders.

The Quaker Assembly of 1740, in their

ethical controversy with Governor Thomas, argued thus: "And yet it is easy to discover the difference between killing a soldier fighting (perhaps) in obedience to the commands of his sovereign, and who may possibly think himself in the discharge of his duty, and executing a burglar who broke into our houses, plundered us of our goods, and perhaps would have murdered too if he could not otherwise have accomplished his ends, who must know at the time of the commission of the act, it was a violation of laws, human and divine, and that he thereby justly rendered himself obnoxious to the punishment which ensued." *

Penn did not hesitate to commend force in civil affairs when necessary. "If lenitives would not do, coercives should be tried; but though men would naturally begin with the former, yet wisdom had often sanctioned the latter as remedies which, however, were never to be adopted without regret," he wrote in 1700.† The whole machinery of courts and police was intended to be effective in resisting crime and criminals. All prisons were more or less work-houses, and the

* "Colonial Records," Vol. IV., page 373.

† Janney's "Life of Penn," page 441.

reformation idea had larger vogue than in some places, but there was no hesitation apparent to secure by force the ascendancy of law.

The position they took was probably this: We will never do an injustice, provoke a war, or attack an enemy. If attacked we will, therefore, always be in the right. We cannot do wrong even to defend the right, but will trust that having done our duty, Providence will protect us. Beyond this we cannot go.*

Penn had authority by his Charter "to levy, muster and train all sorts of men of what condition or wheresoever born in the said province of Pennsylvania for the time being, and to make war and pursue the enemies and robbers aforesaid as well by sea as by land, yea even without the limits of said province, and by God's assistance to vanquish and take them, and being taken, to put them to death by the law of war, or save them at their pleasure, and to do all and

* In a pamphlet printed in 1748 entitled, "The Doctrine of Christianity as held by the people called Quakers Vindicated," in answer to Gilbert Tennent's sermon on the "Lawfulness of War," substantially this position was taken. The pamphlet appeared anonymously, but is known to have been written by a Friend of prominence, closely connected with James Logan, who doubtless was expressing the recognized views of the Society. A copy is in the Philadelphia Library.

every act or thing which to the charge and office of a Captain-General belongeth, as fully and freely as any Captain-General of an army hath ever had the same.”

These powers were doubtless ample for a peaceable Quaker. He could not exercise them himself without trampling on the views to which he was indelibly committed. The power to use them implied the power to transmit them, and this is just what Penn did.

He was in a delicate position. He was, as feudal lord of the province, liable to be called upon to support Britain's causes by force of arms against Britain's enemies. This he could not personally do, but if the Deputy-Governor had no conscience in the matter, Penn would not interpose to prevent obedience to the commands of the Crown. He selected non-Quaker deputies, and doubtless this consideration had its effect in inducing the choice. If some were inclined to criticize him for appointing others to perform acts he could not do himself, it must be remembered that deeds concerning whose culpability differences may properly exist, are evil or good for an individual, dependent on the attitude of his own conscience. The Friends never asked a man to violate conscience, and recognized the

differences due to education, enlightenment and mental constitution. If others honestly thought war right, it was right for them. Hence the actions of the Deputy were not of the character which involved evil-doing on his part, even though the same actions would have been evil for Penn himself. Such was Paul's attitude, and such was probably Penn's argument. What, however, seems a less defensible position, was that taken by him in 1694, as a pledge of the restoration of his government:

At the Committee of Trade and Plantations, at the Colonial Chamber at Whitehall, the 1st and 3d of August, 1694. . . .

The Committee being attended by Mr. Penn, who, having declared to their Lordships, that if their Majesties shall be graciously pleased to restore him to the Proprietary according to the said grants, he intends with all convenient speed to repair hither, and take care of the government and provide for the safety and security thereof, all that in him lyes. And to that end he will carefully transmit to the Council and Assembly there all such orders as shall be given by their Majesties in that behalf; and he doubts not but they will at all times dutifully comply with and yield obedience thereunto and to all such orders and directions as their Majesties shall from time to time think fit to send, for the supplying such quota of men, or the defraying their part of such charges as their Majesties shall think necessary for the safety and preservation of their Majesties' dominions in that part of America.

It is true William Penn only promised "to transmit to Council and Assembly" the orders

of the Crown, which was safe enough. But when he states "he doubts not" they will comply, the remark seems disingenuous. For he must have known that these Quaker bodies would do nothing of the kind. Indeed he, himself, about that time, was carefully explaining the general unrighteousness of these acts which he appears to expect his co-religionists will perform. It looks as if he intended to promise a course of action for the future, and then to unload this promise upon a body which would not redeem it.

The first trial of Quaker faith had, however, occurred prior to this, in 1689. The Crown had suggested that in order to defend the Colony against an attempted attack by the French, a militia should be formed. Governor Blackwell urged this, and he was supported by Markham and the non-Quaker portion of the Council. The Friends refused to have anything to do with it. They told the Governor that if he desired a militia he had power to create one, and they would not interfere if it did not offend any consciences.

John Simcock said: "I see no danger but from bears and wolves. We are well and in peace and quiet; let us keep ourselves so. I know not

but a peaceable spirit and that will do well. For my part I am against it clearly.”

Samuel Carpenter said: “I am not against those that will put themselves into defence, but it being contrary to the judgment of a great part of the people, and my own, too, I cannot advise the thing nor express my liking for it. The king of England knows the judgment of Quakers in this case before Governor Penn and his Patent. If we must be forced to it I suppose we shall rather choose to suffer than to do it, as we have done formerly.”

After much discussion the five Quaker members of Council asked leave to retire for a conference. On their return they announced, “We would not tie others’ hands, but we cannot act. We would not take upon us to hinder any, and do not think the Governor need call us together in this matter. . . . We say nothing against it, and regard it as a matter of conscience to us. . . . I had rather be ruined than violate my conscience in this case.”* The matter was dropped.

Again in 1693, Governor Fletcher, who was

* “Colonial Records,” Vol. II., page 470.

Samuel Carpenter, who expressed this sentiment, was adjudged the richest man in the Province.

also Governor of New York, in the interval of Penn's deposition, asked the Assembly for money to support a war against the French and Indians of Canada, which had been raging on their frontiers. He knew the difficulties. "If there be any among you that scruple the giving of money to support war, there are a great many other charges in that government for the support thereof, as officers' salaries. . . . Your money shall be converted into these uses and shall not be dipt in blood." * Upon the basis of this promise, after some delay, the money was voted.

In May, 1695, a requisition was made on Pennsylvania for eighty men with officers for the defence of New York. The Council advised calling together the Assembly, but not until harvest was over. The Assembly united with the Council in refusing the bald request, reminding the Governor of Fletcher's promise that the last appropriation should not "be dipt in blood," but should be used "to feed the hungry and clothe the naked" Indians, and suggested that such of it as had not been used as promised should go towards the present emergency. The Council finally offered two bills, one to make an appro-

* "Colonial Records," Vol. I., page 361.

priation, and one to demand a return to Penn's Frame of Government, which was held in abeyance since his return to power. As the Governor had to take both or neither he dissolved the Assembly. A year later he was willing to make the required concession, and urged that the money was needed in New York "for food and raiment to be given to those nations of Indians that have lately suffered extremely by the French, which is a fair opportunity for you, that for conscience cannot contribute to war, to raise money for that occasion, be it under the color of support of government or relief of those Indians or what else you may call it." The Assembly made the necessary vote and the Constitution of 1696 was obtained in payment.

The next time the pacific principles of the Assembly were tried was in 1701, when the English Government asked for £350 for the purpose of erecting forts on the frontiers of New York on the plea that they were for the general defence. Penn, who was then in the Province, faithfully observed his promise "to transmit," but declined to give any advice to the Assembly. The members were evidently greatly agitated, and repeatedly asked copies of his speech, which was in fact only the King's letter. After some

fencing two reports appeared. One, from the Pennsylvania delegates, urged their poverty, owing to taxes and quit-rents, also the lack of contributions of other colonies, but added plainly, "We desire the Proprietor would candidly represent our conditions to the King, and assure him of our readiness (according to our abilities) to acquiesce with and answer his commands *so far as our religious persuasions shall permit*, as becomes loyal and faithful subjects so to do." * The other answer came from the Delaware portion of the Assembly, excusing themselves because they had no forts of their own.

When the Assembly met, a month later, Penn again referred to the King's letter, but nothing was done, and the matter was not pressed.

Governor Evans made several attempts to establish a militia, but the Assembly refused any sanction, and the voluntary organizations were failures.

The military question came up in 1709 in a more serious form. An order came from the Queen to the various colonies to furnish quotas of men at their own expense towards an army to invade Canada. New York was to supply 800, Connecticut 350, Jersey 200, and Pennsylvania

* "Colonial Records," Vol. II., page 26.

150. In transmitting the order Governor Gookin, who evidently anticipated difficulty, suggested that the total charge would be about £4,000. He says, "Perhaps it may seem difficult to raise such a number of men in a country where most of the inhabitants are of such principles as will not allow them the use of arms; but if you will raise the sum for the support of government, I don't doubt getting the number of men desired whose principles will allow the use of arms." *

This was too manifest an evasion for the Assembly to adopt. Its first answer was to send in a bill of grievances. The opportunity was too good to be lost, and David Lloyd, then Speaker, made the most of it.

In the meantime the Quaker members of the Council met some of their co-religionists of the Assembly "and there debated their opinions freely and unanimously to those of the House, that notwithstanding their profession and principles would not by any means allow them to bear arms, yet it was their duty to support the government of their sovereign, the Queen, and to contribute out of their estates according to the exigencies of her public affairs, and therefore

* "Colonial Records," Vol. II., page 740.

they might and ought to present the Queen with a proper sum of money." *

The Assembly the next day sent an address to the Governor which said, "Though we cannot for conscience' sake comply with the furnishing a supply for such a defence as thou proposest, yet in point of gratitude of the Queen for her great and many favors to us we have resolved to raise a present of £500 which we humbly hope she will be pleased to accept, etc., etc." †

To this the Governor replied that he would not sign the bill. If the Assembly would not hire men to fight, there was no scruple which would prevent a more liberal subscription to the Queen's needs. The Assembly was immovable, and asked to be allowed to adjourn, as harvest time was approaching.

The Governor refused consent, when the House abruptly terminated the whole matter:

Resolved, N.C.D., That this House cannot agree to the Governor's proposal, directly or indirectly, for the expedition to Canada, for the reasons formerly given.

Resolved, N.C.D., That the House do continue their resolution of raising £500 as a present for the Queen, and do intend to prepare a bill for that purpose at their next meeting on the 15th of August next, and not before.‡

* "Colonial Records," Vol. II., page 478.

† *Ibid.*, 479.

‡ *Ibid.*, 486.

The House then adjourned without waiting for the Governor's consent.

The Governor sadly admitted that nothing could be done with such an Assembly, and gave a rather facetious but truthful account in a letter to London, two months later. "The Queen having honored me with her commands that this Province should furnish out 150 men for its expedition against Canada, I called an Assembly and demanded £4,000: they being all Quakers, after much delay resolved, N.C., that it was contrary to their religious principles to hire men to kill one another. I told some of them the Queen did not hire men to kill one another, but to destroy her enemies. One of them answered the Assembly understood English. After I had tried all ways to bring them to reason they again resolved, N.C., that they could not directly or indirectly raise money for an expedition to Canada, but they had voted the Queen £500 as a token of their respect, etc., and that the money should be put into a safe hand till they were satisfied from England it should not be employed for the use of war. I told them the Queen did not want such a sum, but being a pious and good woman perhaps she might give it to the clergy sent hither for the propagation of

the Gospel; one of them answered that was worse than the other, on which arose a debate in the Assembly whether they should give money or not, since it might be employed for the use of war, or against their future establishment, and after much wise debate it was carried in the affirmative by one voice only. Their number is 26.* They are entirely governed by their speaker, one David Lloyd." †

The service performed by "one David Lloyd" to the integrity of the Quaker testimony against war is strikingly revealed in this letter. The Assembly, more emphatically than the official records show, took effective measures to maintain their position with perfect consistency.

In 1711 a similar request was made by the Government, and in response £2,000 was voted for the Queen's use. This money never aided any military expedition, but was appropriated by a succeeding Governor to his own use, and the fact was used as an argument in 1740 against similar grants. ‡

"We did not see it," Isaac Norris says, in

* Eight from each county and two from Philadelphia.

† "Historical Collections Relating to the American Colonial Church, Pennsylvania," page 366, et seq.

‡ "Colonial Records," Vol. IV., page 366, et seq.

1711, "to be inconsistent with our principles to give the Queen money notwithstanding any use she might put it to, *that* not being our part but hers."

Then followed the thirty-years peace, when no calls for military service or money were made. Occasionally the Governor would think it necessary to establish a militia, when the Assembly would caution him to make it purely voluntary and force no conscience. There were friendly relations with the Indians. No European troubles necessitated money or troops for Canadian attack or defense. But, beginning with 1737, the gradual alienation of the Indian tribes made a disturbed frontier ready to be dangerous at the first outbreak of war, and new conditions prevailed.

Hitherto the relation of the Friends to these inevitable military solicitations had been largely that of passivity. They would not interfere with the movements of those who desired to form military companies. If the Governor chose to engage in the arming and drilling of voluntary militia, he had his commission from the Proprietors, and they from the Charter of Charles II. It was no matter for the Assembly. The meeting organizations would endeavor to keep all

Quakers from any participation in these unfriendly proceedings, and the Quaker Assemblymen had their own consciences to answer to, as well as their ecclesiastical authorities, if they violated pacific principles.

When it came to voting money in lieu of personal service, the legislators had a difficult road to follow. If the government needed aid, it was their duty, in common with the other colonies, to supply it. Even though the need was the direct result of war, as nearly all national taxes are, they were ready to assume their share of the burden. Caesar must have his dues as well as God, and a call for money, except when coupled directly with a proposition to use it for military attack or defense, was generally responded to, after its potency as an agent in procuring a little more liberty was exhausted. They would not vote money for an expedition to Canada or to erect forts, but they would for "the King's use," using all possible securities to have it appropriated to something else than war expenses. The responsibility of expenditure rested on the King. There were legitimate expenses of government, and if these were so inextricably mingled with warlike outlay that the Assembly could not separate them, they would still support the Government.

It is easy to accuse them of inconsistency in the proceedings which follow. It was a most unpleasant alternative thrust before honest men. The responsibility of government was upon them as the honorable recipients of the popular votes. Great principles, the greatest of all in their minds being freedom of conscience, were at stake. Each call for troops or supplies they fondly hoped would be the last. Their predecessors' actions had secured the blessings of peace and liberty to Pennsylvania for sixty years, and if they were unreasonably stringent, their English enemies held over their heads the threat to drive them from power by the imposition of an oath. Then the persecutions of themselves and their friends, which their forefathers had left England to avoid, might be meted out to them, and the Holy Experiment brought to an end.

Nor is it necessary to assume that their motives were entirely unselfish. They had ruled the Province well, and were proficient in government. Their leaders doubtless loved the power and influence they legitimately possessed, and they did not care to give it away unnecessarily. They tried to find a middle ground between shutting their eyes to all questions of defense on the one side, and direct participation in war on the

other. This they sought by a refusal for themselves and their friends to do any service personally, and a further refusal to vote money except in a general way for the use of the government. If any one comes to the conclusion that during the latter part of the period of sixteen years now under consideration the evasion was rather a bald one, it is exactly the conclusion the Quakers themselves came to, and they resigned their places as a consequence. The iniquities of others over whom they had no control brought about a condition where Quaker principles would not work, and they refused to modify them in the vain attempt. For a time rather weakly halting, when the crucial nature of the question became clear, and either place or principle had to be sacrificed, their decision was in favor of the sanctity of principle.

They were on the popular side of the questions of the day, in close association with Benjamin Franklin and others. The fact that these allies in their other battles were unwilling to stand by them on this question made their position especially difficult. They, however, always carried the popular Assembly against all combinations.

In 1739, urged by the Proprietors, the Governor presented to the Assembly the dangers of

the defenceless condition of the Province in the approaching war with Spain and asked for the establishment of a militia.

This opened the way to an interchange of long argumentative papers between Governor and Assembly in which the positions of the two parties were laid down with considerable ability. The Assembly said: "As very many of the inhabitants of this Province are of the people called Quakers, who, though they do not as the world is now circumstanced condemn the use of arms in others, yet are principled against it themselves, and to make any law against their consciences to bear arms would not only be to violate a fundamental in our constitution and be a direct breach of our charter of privileges, but would also in effect be to commence persecution against all that part of the inhabitants of the Province, and should a law be made which should compel others to bear arms and exempt that part of the inhabitants, as the greater number in this Assembly are of like principles, would be an inconsistency with themselves and partial with respect to others, etc."*

To this the Governor replied that no religious opinions would protect the country against an invading force, and as representatives of the

* Col. Rec., Vol. IV., p. 366, et seq.

whole people, not of a denomination, they must defend the Province from external enemies as they did from criminals within, and that there was no intention to force any one's conscience. Their reliance on Providence without doing their whole duty was as futile as if they expected to reap without sowing, or protect their vessels from the waves without seamanship.

The Assembly reminded him that the Province had prospered under Quaker management for a number of years before he had anything to do with it, and would in the future, if his misrepresentations should not prevail in England, even "though some Governors have been as uneasy and as willing and ready to find fault and suggest dangers as himself."

The Governor in despair replies: "If your principles will not allow you to pass a bill for establishing a militia, if they will not allow you to secure the navigation of a river by building a fort, if they will not allow you to provide arms for the defence of the inhabitants, if they will not allow you to raise men for his Majesty's service for distressing an insolent enemy is it a calumny to say your principles are inconsistent with the ends of government?"

After pages of argument, which the curious

reader will find detailed in "Colonial Records," Vol. IV., the Assembly refused to do anything.*

Governor Thomas, under royal instructions, approached the same subject a year later with a similar result. A voluntary company was, however, organized and supplied by private subscriptions. This took away from their masters a number of indentured servants, whose time was thus lost, and in voting £3,000 for the King's use the Assembly made it a condition that such servants should be discharged from the militia and no more enlisted. The Governor refused to accept it, and in wrath wrote a letter to the

* "I looked over several messages and votes of your House of Representatives, and if I may be permitted to give my opinion of the management of your controversy with the Governor, I can scarcely upon the whole forbear to take his side. Your cause is undoubtedly good, but I am afraid you discover a little more warmth than is quite consistent with the moderation we profess. The provocations I confess are great, and more than flesh and blood can well sustain, but there is a rock which many of you know where to seek, but to which he discovers himself to be a perfect stranger. The arguments made use of by the assembly are strong and cogent, but he justly accuses you of too much acrimony. Truth never appears more agreeable than when dressed with mildness and temper. . . . And be pleased to remember that a deference is due to a magistrate in some sense, though a wicked one, and in every set of opposition to his measures, plainness and inoffensive simplicity are the principal ones we can manage."—Dr. Fothergill to Israel Pemberton, Second month 8th, 1742.

Board of Trade not intended for home reading, berating the Quakers for disobedience, stating how they had neglected following his advice to withdraw themselves from the Assembly, but had rather increased their majority there. He advised that they be refused permission to sit there in the future. A copy of this letter was secured by the Assembly's agent in England, and great was their indignation. The disturbances culminated in an election riot in Philadelphia in 1742, in which both sides used force, the Quaker party having the best of it and electing Isaac Norris. They re-elected their ticket, with the aid of the Germans, and controlled the Assembly by an overwhelming majority. To show their loyalty they voted a considerable sum for the King's use, but refused Governor Thomas any salary until he had given up his pretentious show of power and signed a number of bills to which he had objected. After this he worked very harmoniously with them till 1746.

In 1744 he used his authority as Captain-General in organizing a voluntary force said by Franklin to amount to 10,000 men. On this the Assembly took no action.

The next year the Governor asked them to aid New England in an attack on Cape Breton.

They told him they had no interest in the matter. He called them together again in harvest time to ask them to join in an expedition against Louisburg. A week later came word that Louisburg had surrendered, and the request was transferred to a call for aid in garrisoning the place, and in supplying provisions and powder. The Assembly replied that the "peaceable principles professed by divers members of the present Assembly do not permit them to join in raising of men or providing arms and ammunition, yet we have ever held it our duty to render tribute to Cæsar." * They therefore appropriated £4,000 for "bread, beef, pork, flour, wheat or other grain." The Governor was advised not to accept the grant, as provisions were not needed. He replied that the "other grain" meant gunpowder, and so expended a large portion of the money. † There is probably no evidence that the Assembly sanctioned this construction, though they never so far as appears made any protest.

Again in 1746 aid was asked of the Assembly towards an expedition against Canada. After forcing the Governor to yield the point as to how the money should be raised, they appropriated £5,000 "for the King's use."

* "Colonial Records," Vol. IV., page 769.

† This is on the authority of Franklin.

This seems to have been the attitude of the Quaker Assembly for the ten years to come. Again and again did the successive Governors call for military appropriations. As often did the Quaker Assembly express a willingness to comply provided the money was obtained by loans to be repaid in a term of years rather than by a tax. The governors said their instructions prevented their sanction to this proceeding, and except when the necessity was urgent refused to permit the bill to be enacted into a law. The Assembly frequently reminded the Governor that they were unable to vote any money for warlike purposes, and personally would contribute nothing in the way of service, but that they were loyal subjects of the King and acknowledged their obligations to aid in his government. Had they granted regular aid, war or no war, their position would have been greatly strengthened, but being given "for the King's use" in direct response to a call for military assistance, knowing perfectly how the money was to be expended, they cannot be excused from the charge of a certain amount of shiftiness. The effect, however, was to save their fellow-members in the Province from compulsory military service, and from direct war taxes. They thus shielded the consciences of sensitive Friends,

preserved their charter from Court attack, broke down the worst evils of proprietary pretensions, and secured large additions of liberty. Whether or not the partial sacrifice of principle, if so it was, was too high a price for these advantages, was differently decided in those days, and will be to-day. An unbending course would but have hastened the inevitable crisis.

That they paid these taxes unwillingly and were generally recognized as true to their principles is evidenced by many statements of their opponents. In 1748 the Council writes to the Governors of New York and Massachusetts asking for cannon for the voluntary military companies then forming through Benjamin Franklin's influence, and says, "As our Assembly consists for the most part of Quakers principled against defence the inhabitants despair of their doing anything for our protection." * Again later Thomas Penn writes on the same subject: "I observe the Assembly broke up without giving any assistance, which is what you must have expected." † This belief that the Quakers in the Assembly would not do anything for the armed defence of the Province was general both in England and America.

* "Colonial Records," Vol. V., page 207.

† "Colonial Records," Vol. V., page 241.

The Assembly in this attitude was always supported by the people. The members were re-elected, after the most cutting criticisms of the Governor and Council, by undiminished majorities, in open elections. The Friends were now in a small minority of the population, but during all this time they were three-fourths of the Assembly. They could afford to refer their critics to their constituents with confidence. "What motives could we possibly have for judging amiss? Have we not also estates and families in the Province? . . . Have not divers of our fathers and some of our grandfathers been of the first settlers? . . . If we have committed any mistakes the time draws near in which our constituents, if they think it necessary, may amend their choice. And the time also draws nigh in which your (the Council's) mistakes may be amended by a succeeding governor. Permit us to congratulate our country on both."*

In 1754 the Governor, at the instance of the Proprietors, who anticipated the French and Indian troubles on the western frontier, endeavored to induce the Assembly to pass a bill for compulsory military service for those not con-

* "Colonial Records," Vol. V., page 342.

scientious about bearing arms.* He evidently did not expect much. "As I am well acquainted with their religious scruples I never expected they would appropriate money for the purpose of war or warlike preparation, but thought they might have been brought to make a handsome grant for the King's use, and have left the disposition of it to me, as they have done on other occasions of like nature,"† he wrote to Governor Dinwiddie of Virginia. "But," a few months later he added, "I can see nothing to prevent this very fine Province, owing to the absurdity of its constitution and the principles of the governing part of its inhabitants, from being an easy prey to the attempts of the common enemy."‡

This was after the Assembly had voted £10,000, but coupled the grant with conditions the Governor would not accept.

While they were debating the question Brad-dock came into the country as commander of the combined forces in an expedition against Fort DuQuesne. Pressure came down strong and heavy on the Quaker Assembly. Their

* "Pennsylvania Archives," Vol. II., page 189.

† "Colonial Records," Vol. VI., page 2.

‡ *Ibid.*, page 49.

own frontier was invaded. Their own Indians, as a result of the wicked and foolish policy of their executive were in league with the invaders. All classes were excited. To aid the great expedition which at one stroke was to break the French power and close the troubles was felt to be a duty. Franklin diligently fanned the warlike spirit, procuring wagons for the transfer of army stores, and was extremely valuable to the expedition at some cost to himself.

The Governor wrote to Braddock telling him they had a Province of 300,000 people, provisions enough to supply an army of 100,000, and exports enough to keep 500 vessels employed. They had no taxes, a revenue of £7,000 a year and £15,000 in bank, yet would neither establish a militia nor vote men money or provisions, notwithstanding he had earnestly labored with the Assembly, and he was ashamed of them. He does not explain that they had repeatedly offered sums of money, but that he would not accept the conditions. As Braddock himself admitted, Pennsylvania had supported him quite as liberally as Virginia. This was partly done by private enterprise and partly by appropriations of the Assembly to reward friendly Indians, to open a road to Ohio, and to provision the troops.

Braddock was defeated. The Indians were let loose on the frontiers. Daily accounts of harrowing scenes came up to the Council and Assembly.* Settlers moved into the towns and many districts were depopulated. Strong were the expressions of wrath against the Quakers, who were held responsible for the defenceless state of the Province.†

This was hardly a just charge, even from the standpoint of those who favored military defence, for the Assembly had signified its willingness to vote £50,000, an unprecedented amount, to be provided by "a tax on all the real and personal estates within the Province," which the Governor refused to accept. While the matter was in abeyance the time for the new election of Assemblymen came around, and both parties, except the stricter Quakers, who were becoming alarmed, put forth their greatest exertions. The old Assembly was sustained, the Friends, with those closely associated with them, having twenty-six out of the thirty-six members.

* Votes of Assembly, Vol. IV., pages 481, 699.

† The people exclaim against the Quakers, and some are scarce restrained from burning the houses of those few who are in this town (Reading).—Letter of Edmund Biddle, "Colonial Records," Vol. VI., page 705.

The new House went on with the work of the old. They adopted a militia law for those "willing and desirous" of joining companies for the defence of the Province. This is prefaced by the usual declaration: "Whereas this Province was settled (and a majority of the Assembly have ever since been) of the people called Quakers, who though they do not as the world is now circumstanced condemn the use of arms in others, yet are principled against bearing arms themselves,"* explaining also that they are representatives of the Province and not of a denomination, they proceed to lay down rules for the organization of the volunteers. After the Proprietors had given their £5,000 the Assembly also voted £55,000 for the relief of friendly Indians and distressed frontiersmen, "and other purposes," without any disguise to the fact that much of it was intended for military defence, though it was not so stated in the bill. Before this was done, while they were still insisting on taxing the Penn estates, in answer to the charge that they were neglectful of public interests, secure in the confidence of their constituents just most liberally given, they say: "In fine we have the most sensible concern for the poor

* "Pennsylvania Archives," Vol. I., page 516.

distressed inhabitants of the frontiers. We have taken every step in our power, consistent with the just rights of the freemen of Pennsylvania, for their relief, and we have reason to believe that in the midst of their distresses they themselves do not wish to go further. *Those who would give up essential liberty to purchase a little temporary safety, deserve neither liberty nor safety.*”* Their position definitely was, We will vote money liberally for defensive purposes, but we will take care to secure our rights as freemen, and we will not require any one to give personal service against his conscience.

The money was largely spent in erecting and garrisoning a chain of forts extending along the Kittatinny hills from the Delaware River to the Maryland frontier.†

The amount of defence the Assembly had provided, while probably expressing the will of their constituents, did not satisfy the more peace-loving of the Friends on the one hand, nor the advocates of proprietary interests on the other.

In Eleventh month, 1755, twenty Friends, including Anthony Morris, Israel and John Pem-

* Votes of Assembly, Vol. IV., page 501.

† “Pennsylvania Magazine,” July, 1896. Dr. Stille on “The Frontier Forts of Pennsylvania.”

berton, Anthony Benezet, John Churchman, and others, representing the most influential and "weighty" members of the Yearly Meeting, addressed the Assembly. They say they are very willing to contribute to taxes to cultivate friendship with Indians, to relieve distress, or other benevolent purposes, but to expect them to be taxed for funds which are placed in the hands of committees to be expended for war, is inconsistent with their peaceable testimony, and an infringement of their religious liberties. Many Friends will have to refuse to pay such a tax and suffer distraint of goods,* and thus "that free enjoyment of liberty of conscience for the sake of which our forefathers left their native country and settled this then a wilderness by degrees be violated." "We sincerely assure you we have no temporal motives for thus addressing you, and could we have preserved peace in our own minds and with each other we should have declined it, being unwilling to give you any unnecessary trouble and deeply sensible of your difficulty in discharging the trust committed to you irreproachably in these perilous times, which hath engaged our fervent desires that the immediate instruction of supreme wisdom may in-

* This afterwards happened in numerous cases.

fluence your minds, and that being preserved in a steady attention thereto you may be enabled to secure peace and tranquillity to yourselves and those you represent by pursuing measures consistent with our peaceable principles, and then we trust we may continue humbly to confide in the protection of that Almighty Power whose providence has hitherto been as walls and bulwarks round about us.”*

As the Assembly was composed, this was an earnest plea from the responsible Friends to their fellow religionists to stand uncompromisingly by their principles. It was not very kindly received. The reply indicated that the signers had no right to speak for others than themselves, that they had not duly considered the customs of the past, particularly the grant of £2,000 in 1711, and the address “is therefore an unadvised and indiscreet application to the House at this time.” Four members of the Assembly dissent from this reply.†

On the other hand we have a strong petition sent about the same date to the King, signed by numerous influential men in Philadelphia, stat-

* Votes of Assembly, Vol. VI., page 530.

† “ Pennsylvania Archives,” Vol. II., page 487.

ing that the Province was entirely bare to the attack of enemies, "not a single armed man, nor, at the public expense, a single fortification to shelter the unhappy inhabitants." . . . "We have no hopes of seeing the grievances redressed here while a great majority of men whose avowed principles are against bearing arms find means continually to thrust themselves into the Assembly of this Province." They ask the interposition of royal authority to insist on proper defence being provided.*

The attorneys for the petitioners before the Board of Trade made the most sweeping and unfounded charges, full of errors of fact and unconcealed animus, and ending with the recommendation "that the King be advised to recommend it to his Parliament that no Quaker be permitted to sit in any Assembly in Pennsylvania or any part of America," and that this result should be produced by the imposition of an oath.

In the minds of the Friends the crisis was reached when the Governor and Council (William Logan, son of James Logan, only dissenting) in the spring of 1756 declared war against the Delaware Indians, the old allies and friends

* "Pennsylvania Magazine," Vol. X., page 283, et seq. Article by Dr. Stillé.

of William Penn, but now in league with the French and killing and plundering on the frontiers. They were quite sure that peaceful and just measures would detach the Indians from their alliance, and that war was unnecessary. The lines were becoming more closely drawn, and the middle ground was narrowing, so that it was impossible to stand upon it. Either the principle of the iniquity of war must be maintained in its entirety, or war must be vigorously upheld and prosecuted. Some Friends, with Franklin, took the latter position, but the great majority closed up their ranks around the principle of peace in its integrity. In Sixth month, 1756, six of the old members of the house, James Pemberton, Joshua Morris, William Callender, William Peters, Peter Worrall and Francis Parvin, resigned their seats, giving as their reason, "As many of our constituents seem of opinion that the present situation of public affairs calls upon us for services in a military way, which from a conviction of judgment after mature deliberation we cannot comply with, we conclude it most conducive to the peace of our minds, and the reputation of our religious profession to persist in our resolution of resigning our seats, which we now accordingly do, and request these our rea-

sons may be entered on the minutes of the house.”* The same fall several other Friends declined re-election, and after the next House assembled four others, Mahlon Kirkbride, William Hoyl, Peter Dicks and Nathaniel Pennock, also resigned. “Understanding that the ministry have requested the Quakers, who from the first settlement of the Colony have been the majority of the Assemblies of this Province, to suffer their seats during the difficult situation of the affairs of the Colonies to be filled by members of other denominations in such manner as to perform without any scruples all such laws as may be necessary to be enacted for the defence of the Province in whatever manner they may judge best suited to the circumstances of it; and notwithstanding we think this has been pretty fully complied with at the last election, yet at the request of our friends, being willing to take off all possible objection, we who have (without any solicitation on our part) been returned as representatives in this Assembly, request we may be excused, and suffered to withdraw ourselves and vacate our seats in such manner as may be attended with the least trouble and most satisfactory to this honorable House.”†

* Votes of Assembly, Vol. IV., page 561.

† Votes of Assembly, Vol. IV., page 626.

The places of all these Friends were filled by members of other religious denominations, and Quaker control over and responsibility for the Pennsylvania Assembly closed with 1756 and was never resumed.

The circumstances which led up to this action within the Society of Friends will be detailed in the next chapter.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE LAST DAYS OF QUAKER CONTROL OF THE
ASSEMBLY.

So far as any records show there was only one opinion on the subject of war among those authorized to speak in the first century of the existence of the Society of Friends. There was nothing to call out any vigorous restatement of peace doctrine in Philadelphia during the early decades of the eighteenth century. Running through the history we find it accepted as an established fact not needing formal confirmation that Quakerism and peace were indispensably and logically associated.*

* One can only wonder what troubled the Burlington Friends so early as 1682.

“At our mens Monthly meeting held in Burlington in y^e House of Robt Young y^e 4th of y^e 10th month:

“In y^e behalf of truth & y^e Blessed name of y^e Lord y^e which we make a profession of thought meet to write to our friends of y^e monthly meeting of Upland. & marcus Hook y^t they together with William Penn would be pleased to give this meeting an Account Concerning y^e report of y^e preperation for War weh. God in his mercy hath Given us a Testimony a gainst y^t we may Know what Satisfaction they Can give y^e Meeting therein. Sam^l Jennings & Robt. Stacy to Draw up a paper to y^t meeting Con Cearnig it.”

In the fall of 1739 the Yearly Meeting saw the storm coming. A committee was appointed to draw up a paper exhorting Friends to continue in peace principles "and in no manner to join with such as may be for making warlike preparations, offensive or defensive, but on all occasions to demean themselves in a Christian and peaceable manner, thereby to demonstrate to the world that our practices, when we are put to the trial, correspond with our principles."

The next year, in view of the complaint made to the King by Governor Thomas and his friends, they appointed a committee "to state the occasions for it to the Friends of the Meeting for Sufferings* in London, and request their assistance as occasion may require."

An interesting minute of the Yearly Meeting occurs in 1741:

A letter from our friend, James Logan, directed to Robert Jordan and others, the Friends of this meeting, being offered, it was delivered to Samuel Beston, Robert Jordan, Anthony Morris, John Bringhurst, Jacob Howell and Caleb Raper, who were appointed a committee (as is usual in like cases) to peruse the same and report whether

*The Meeting for Sufferings, so called because it was originally formed to investigate and relieve the sufferings of Friends in times of persecution, was the executive body of the Yearly Meeting. A number of its members were influential at court, and on many occasions rendered invaluable service to their Philadelphia brethren.

it is fitting to be read here or not; who withdrew for some time, and being returned reported, that the subject matter of the letter related to the civil and military affairs of the government, and in their opinion was unfit to be read in this meeting. The meeting concurring in opinion with the committee, therefore, it was not read here, of which the clerk is desired to acquaint the Friend who sent the same.

We have a contemporary account of the same proceeding in a letter from Richard Peters to John Penn. The writer not being a Friend, got his information second-hand, and made a few errors. The names of the committee are not all correct, and the "expedient" to stifle the letter was but the common practice in all papers addressed to the meeting. Of course also no parliamentary motions were made. It is quite likely the coat-tail incident is true. If so it shows the smallness of the support James Logan had in the meeting.

The Yearly Meeting being held the week before the general election, Mr. Logan, by his son William, sent them a letter wherein he is said to enlarge on the defenceless state of the Province, and of the ill consequences that may ensue to men of their principles procuring themselves to be returned to the Assembly, but his good design was eluded by the following expedient. Some members moved that a committee might be appointed to peruse the letter and to report whether it contained matters proper to be communicated to the meeting at large: accordingly Robert Jordan, John Bringhouse, Ebenezer Large, John Dillwin and Robert Strethill were appointed to inspect the epistle and report whether it contained matters which were fit for the meeting to take into consideration. On examina-

tion, they reported that the letter contained matters of a military and geographical nature, it was by no means proper to be read to the general meeting, but some persons who understood those matters might be desired to consider and answer it. Robert Strethill singly declared that considering the letter came from one who was known to have had abundance of experience, was an old member, and had a sincere affection for the welfare of the Society, he was apprehensive, should this letter be refused a reading in the meeting, such a procedure would not only disgust him, but the body of Friends in England, especially as it might be supposed to contain several things that were intended for the good of the Society at these fickle and precarious times. But John Bringhouse plucked him by the coat and told him with a sharp tone of voice, "Sit thee down, Robert, thou art single in the opinion," etc.*

In the letter Logan says he has always held defensive, but not offensive, war to be lawful. But it is not his purpose in now speaking to prove this, for he recognizes that the unlawfulness of all war is an avowed and well-understood principle of Friends. All government is founded on force, and a militia is necessary to secure the country from attack. The whole system of judges, sheriffs, etc., implies force, and it must have drilled and armed backing to make it effective. The Friends of Pennsylvania, at a liberal estimate, do not include more than one-third of the people, and the others have a right to laws

* "Pennsylvania Magazine," Vol. VI., page 403. The whole of James Logan's letter is printed here.

by which they may properly protect themselves, and while Friends profess faith in Providence to protect them, they are not careful to observe Christ's other precepts, but lay up treasures on earth, and thus draw upon themselves the attacks of enemies. Hitherto Pennsylvania has been an inconsiderable colony, but is now a choice and easy prey to any enemy. War is not unlikely in the near future. The people are clamoring for defence, and he urges upon the meeting that those who for conscience' sake cannot join in the movement should decline to allow themselves to be used as candidates, and publicly announce they will not serve even if chosen.*

* "It is now several months since I received from my kind friend J. Logan a copy of his printed paper sent to your yearly meeting, at the reading of which I confess I was not a little troubled and surprised, not that I believed it would be of so much weight as to occasion any considerable embarrassment among yourselves only as it would be a public declaration of differing sentiments and a basis for your enemies to build a good deal of mischief upon as I observe has since happened. . . . The argument entirely turns on his assertion of all government being founded on force. If this is once cleared and it is demonstrated it is so, yet to prove his argument of any force in this case he must make it plain that there is no difference in the degrees of it but that the force exercised in the correction of a child is the same as in cutting the throat of an enemy."—Dr. Fothergill to Israel Pemberton, Second month 8th, 1742.

The position taken by James Logan,* while never having official recognition by the Meeting, was undoubtedly held by a considerable number of Friends for the coming forty years. They constituted the sort that made up Franklin's fire company; † that armed themselves against the "Paxton Boys" in 1764, that supported John Dickinson, Charles Thomson and their friends in urging the resistance which led to the Revolutionary war, and that finally separated and formed the Free Quakers. Many of those who did not separate acknowledged the

* Nevertheless Logan was able to give the Quaker argument quite forcibly.

"I always used the best argument I could, and when I pleaded that we were a peaceable people, had wholly renounced war and the spirit of it, that were willing to commit ourselves to the protection of God alone in an assurance that the sword could neither be drawn or sheathed but by his direction, that the desolations made by it are the declarations of his wrath alone; that the Christian dispensation is exclusively one of peace on earth and good will to men; that those who will not use the sword, but by an entire resignation commit themselves to his all-powerful Providence shall never need it, but be safe under a more sure defence than any worldly arm,—when I pleaded this I really spoke my sentiments, but this will not answer in English government."—2nd September, 1703.

† Franklin doubtless grossly exaggerates the number of such Friends. See Sparks's "Life of Franklin," Vol. I., page 151.

validity of the Quaker testimony, and their own errors. The most of them were young men, drawn away by the warlike excitements of the times and the seductive influences of Franklin and his associates. Those who had the most right to speak for the Meeting, with the great majority of the membership, stood unflinchingly by the views of Fox and Penn, not only through the French and Indian wars but in the more trying days of the Revolution. The Yearly Meeting never gave any uncertain sound.

Logan was out of sympathy with Friends not only on the question of war, but he also supported lotteries, which the Meeting condemned. In a remarkable letter introducing Franklin to Thomas Penn, written in 1749, he tells of his friend's abilities and judgment, "crowned with the utmost modesty." Among his good deeds he speaks of the establishment of the Philadelphia library, the raising of militia companies in 1747, notwithstanding that "one Sauer, a Dutch printer in Germantown, who publishes a weekly paper in his own language, is so much of a Quaker that he writes against bearing arms on any account," and of setting up two lotteries, from the proceeds of which a battery was erected.

Philadelphia Quarterly Meeting addressed the Meeting for Sufferings of London in 1742 in explanation of the political situation. This body contained a large number of members active in public life, and probably better represented the political aspirations of the Society than the Yearly Meeting, in which the country members from both Pennsylvania and New Jersey had the preponderating influence. Reference is made to the statements sent over by Governor Thomas's friends, and to the hold Friends had on the part of the community not affiliated with them religiously. Their reasons for retaining by proper means the power they had acquired, and the overwhelming support they received from the people, are clearly shown. The letter is a complete answer to the charges frequently made that by dubious methods for selfish purposes they thrust themselves into the Assembly.

We are truly thankful that it has pleased the Lord to dispose you to support us in the defence of our Christian privileges and civil rights, and though we are not covetous of power, yet being entrusted with many valuable privileges which induced our predecessors to transport themselves into this then wilderness country, and having by the Divine blessing on their endeavors cultivated and improved the same, and we now enjoying the fruits of their labours, believe it to be our indispensable duty as far as lies in our power to prevent our posterity's being deprived of these advantages, and notwithstanding a few un-

steady persons under our name were induced by the interest of some men in power to join with others (of whom some were persons not lawfully qualified or entitled to be concerned) in a petition to the King which contains unjust and groundless insinuations against us, we can assure you that the people in general, and especially the most religious and considerate of those not of our Society are very much dissatisfied with the conduct of those men, and so averse to any change of our Constitution, that they would readily join in any measures that may be necessary to disappoint the authors of this attempt on our privileges, and to shew their disposition to have the administration continued, as it has hitherto been, principally in the hands of Friends, of which we think a more plain proof need not be offered than that in the most remote county of this Province at the last Election, all the Representatives returned to serve in the Assembly were of our Society; and although those in the Opposition to Friends were very active, yet of 1150 Freeholders that voted (in which number were not above 20 Friends) they could prevail with scarce 200 to join with them.

As we are not willing to say anything more at present than we conceive absolutely necessary, we refer you to our Friend Richard Partridge, who is more particularly instructed in such matters as we suppose may be enquired into in the further consideration of these affairs. We shall conclude with observing that the situation and constitution of this Province is particularly adapted to the disposition of Friends and of many others of the religious inhabitants in like manner principled against bearing arms, and we are willing to depend on that good Providence which has hitherto protected us, and we trust will always preserve us, as we are patiently and humbly resigned to the Divine Will, in which disposition our worthy ancestors surmounted the many difficulties and exercises they were long engaged in. We have faith to believe our sincere concern to maintain their testimony will likewise be blessed with an happy issue, altho' we have with sorrow to observe that we meet with great opposition from the

immediate descendants of our first worthy Proprietor, whose zealous labours in defence of our principles were very eminent in times of the greatest danger.

London Friends promised aid as desired, and in 1742 the Yearly Meeting replies: "The kind assistance you have been pleased to afford in the affair to which your epistle alludes we gratefully acknowledge, and make no doubt of the continuance of the same beneficent disposition toward us as occasion may require. And we humbly trust that the same Almighty Power which supported our worthy ancients in much greater trials and hath hitherto favored us will make a way through the present difficulties and enable us as we abide faithful to maintain our Christian testimony for the gospel of peace."

In 1744 they strengthened their testimony by endorsing a minute adopted in London "against persons professing with us carrying of guns for defending their ships, persons and goods, and in being concerned in privateering or as owners of ships going with letters of Marque" . . . "Also to signify to them (subordinate meetings) the unanimous sense of this Meeting that all professing with us be cautioned and earnestly admonished against purchasing of prize goods, knowing them to be such, as a practice altogether inconsistent with our principles."

Little appears on the Meeting records bearing on the political situation till 1755, when war was already in operation and the pressure on peace practices and other Quaker rights and privileges was becoming stronger. In the spring of this year, just before Braddock's defeat, the Quarterly Meeting again addressed their English brethren. It will be noticed that this is a defence, in some respects an unanswerable one, justifying the attitude of the Quakers in the Assembly. Hints are thrown out that they may have to give up their places, but the sentiment on this subject was evidently not quite ripe. There was still hope that by judiciously following their past course of action their influence in the State might be preserved without a compromise of principle. Events soon to follow showed the fallacy of this hope.

From the Quarterly Meeting of Friends held at Philadelphia the fifth day of the fifth month, 1755.

To our Friends and Brethren of the Meeting for Sufferings in London:

Dear Friends:

The foundation of our dependence on and connection with each other being that brotherly love and fellowship by which our Lord and Master distinguished His disciples from the world, we trust nothing more is necessary from us to engage your concern and assistance than to make

you acquainted with the difficulties we are now under and the advantages we may reasonably expect from your exerting yourself for us at this juncture.

We have on some former occasions been obliged to inform you that the inclinations and views of our present Proprietaries seem to be so essentially changed from those which their truly honourable Father had, that they for some time past have appeared disposed to abridge, and we fear to deprive us of many of those liberties and privileges which we derive from the original concessions and charter on which this Government is founded. This we apprehend proceeds very much from their not bearing in mind that the first settlers of this Province were men of interest and reputation in their native country, and were principally induced to remove from thence with the prospect of enjoying and securing to their posterity that liberty of conscience which they preferred to every temporal consideration. For the sake of this they adventured with their families and substance to undertake a long and dangerous voyage and to cultivate this then a wilderness country, not without a large share of difficulty and hardship, to the diminution of their estates and the imminent danger of their lives. That they were not inconsiderate nor weak men nor such whom necessity or misconduct had forced from their former homes is very evident not only from the knowledge some yet living had of their conduct and characters, but from the circumspection, prudence and religious consideration, of which they have left valuable testimonials in the concessions, laws and first frame of government settled and agreed upon between them and our worthy Friend William Penn in England.

We are sensible that a great share of merit and esteem is due to the memory of that great good man whose benevolent and disinterested love of mankind has engaged the veneration of all wise and good men among us. Yet we are likewise desirous it should be frequently remembered that these advantages and immunities we enjoy were purchased at a considerable expense by our forefathers who, wisely considering the instability of human affairs

and the intoxicating effects of increasing wealth and power, made the most timely and effectual provisions they could then devise to prevent their posterity being deprived of these advantages.

On an impartial and calm review of the transactions of the government it will appear that in divers instances the Proprietaries and their deputies have extended their prerogatives and obtained concessions from the people, some, with their consent; others, by custom; and thereby made a large addition of power and treasure which the people did not originally intend to part with. But while the fundamentals of our Constitution remained unattacked, and there appeared no design to enervate the principles on which it was established, we thought it was prudent to submit to smaller inconveniences. We now think our circumstances are such that we have abundant cause to complain that the most unwearied endeavours are and have some time past been used, and various artifices attempted, to wrest from us our most valuable privileges, and the conduct and language of those whose duty it is to protect us in the enjoyment thereof, fully convince us of the pernicious tendency of their designs.

In these times the name of liberty is so highly regarded that few are in much esteem who do not profess to maintain and defend it. To succeed, therefore, in a scheme to deprive us of ours, it was necessary, first to represent us as being unworthy of it, and if possible to obtain a belief of our having forfeited it by wilful neglect or an obstinate refusal to do what was incumbent on us for the support and preservation of the Constitution we profess so much value for. The measures which some years past have been pursued by most of those appointed to preside over us evidently shew that this point hath been constantly kept in view and every opportunity watched to subject us to difficulties, and thereby furnish some appearance of grounds for the charges with which we were to be loaded.

Those who are conversant in the management of Public Affairs must know, that where many of various dispositions and sentiments are concerned, it is not easy, scarce

possible, to conduct every design and carry it into execution in the most unexceptionable way. Some allowance must therefore be made for human imperfections, and we hope it may with truth and justice be said small allowances are requisite to reconcile the conduct of the people of this Province so far as they have been concerned in the Legislature to these Christian principles of fearing God, honouring the King, and promoting peace and good will among men, and we hope the desire of pursuing measures consistent with these principles will still animate the sensible and judicious of our Society, and that they will freely resign the right we have in the government, whenever it may appear impracticable for us to preserve it and those principles.

We have the more just grounds for this hope, as it is well known that many have voluntarily declined acting in the executive powers of government, and some in the Legislature, as they found themselves incapable of preserving the peace and tranquility of their own minds and steadily maintaining our Christian testimony in all its branches. And were there a sufficient number of men of understanding, probity and moderate principles proposed for our Representatives in whose resolution we could confide to preserve our liberties inviolate, we should be well satisfied to have the members of our Society relieved from the disagreeable contests and controversies to which we are now subjected, but while arbitrary and oppressive measures are publicly avowed by those who desire to rule over us, and our country so heartily and unanimously calls upon us to maintain the trust committed to us, we cannot after the most deliberate consideration judge we should be faithful to them, to ourselves, or to our posterity, to desert our stations and relinquish the share we have in the legislation.

The increase of the number of the inhabitants of this Province is now very great, and the much greater part are not of our Society, and especially in the back counties. Yet such is the confidence reposed in us, that after the utmost efforts had been used, and the pulpit and press

exercised against us, our former Representatives were at our last election chosen throughout the Province by the greatest majority ever known, without accounting the freemen who are foreigners, on whose credulity and ignorance it has been unjustly asserted that we have industriously and artfully imposed. And this was done, not only without the solicitation, but in some instances without the privity or approbation of some that were chosen.

And it is remarkable that for sixteen years successively, more than half of which was a time of war, a sett of men conscientiously principled against warlike measures have been chosen by those, of whom the majority were not in that particular of the same principle; and this we apprehend may be chiefly attributed to the repeated testimonies we have constantly given of our sincere and ready disposition to provide for the exigencies of the Government, and to demonstrate our gratitude for the favours we enjoy under it by cheerfully contributing towards the support of it according to our circumstances in such manner as we can do with peace and satisfaction of mind. That this has been the constant practice of our assemblies, the records of their proceedings will evidently shew.

We cannot therefore be insensible of the injury done us, to have our principles and conduct represented in such manner as to render us odious to our neighbors and contemned by our superiors, to whom we think ourselves obliged by the strong ties of gratitude and interest. And this injustice is greatly aggravated by the consideration of the station of those by whom it is committed. Could our proprietaries be persuaded to put themselves in our station and duly to consider the principal inducements the first settlers of the Province had to improve a wilderness, and that it is by their industry, and the reputation they and their successors obtained for their justice, hospitality and benevolence, so great numbers of our countrymen and others have been induced to settle among us and advance the Proprietaries' Estate to its present value, we have no doubt they must assent to the reasonableness of what we desire, which is, that they would either exercise the

Government over us themselves, or according to the original contract [have] themselves fully represented by a person of integrity, candour, and a peaceable disposition; for while their Deputy is of a different disposition, and continues limited by instructions inconsistent with our rights and liberties, we cannot expect the Government will be conducted with prudence or supported with satisfaction.

We consider that in the present situation of public affairs, the exigencies being great, the supplies must be proportioned thereto; and we only desire that as we cannot be concerned in preparations for war, we may be permitted to serve the government by raising money and contributing towards the Publick Exegencies by such methods and in such manner as past experience has assured us are least burthensome to the industrious poor, and most consistent with our religious and civil rights and liberties, and which our present Proprietaries, when one of them was personally present, consented to and approved, and to which no reasonable or just objection hath ever since been made.

We apprehend the interest of the Proprietaries and people are united, and that they are not Friends to either who would separate them, and we heartily wish it were in our power to make the Proprietaries truly sensible of this, and to convince them that these are our inclinations and desires. We are not ignorant that very contrary sentiments have been artfully insinuated by some of those whom they have unhappily reposed confidence in, and thus the free intercourse which ought to be maintained between them and their people hath been obstructed, and occasions ministered for misunderstandings which, with more openness and freedom, might easily have been obviated.

One point we have therefore in view by laying our case so fully before you, is that, as there are some among you whose stations and circumstances will entitle them to a free conference with our Proprietaries; We earnestly desire your engaging such in this necessary service. The attempt must be allowed to be laudable, and if it succeeds, undoubtedly rewardable, the making of peace

having a blessing annexed to it by the Author of every blessing.

Were a sense of the satisfaction resulting from the hearty concurrence and union of their Friends in promoting their interest sufficiently impressed on the minds of our Proprietaries, we cannot but think they would remove from their Councils and favours all such who would separate them from us, and then whatever difference of sentiments might sometimes happen we should hope to find them really disposed to maintain the liberties and privileges we are justly entitled to, and to promote universal peace and good will among us.

The people of this Province in general, and Friends in a more particular manner, have interested themselves nearly, and exerted their interest vigorously in the support of the rights of the Proprietaries on several occasions, some of which your meeting has been acquainted with, and we doubt not the same affection and respect still subsists in the minds of Friends in general, to whom it will be extremely pleasing to see the harmony restored by which our mutual welfare might be promoted.

.

We shall conclude this with the salutation of true love and respect, and remain your Friends and Brethren.

Signed by appointment on behalf of our said Meeting.

The winter of 1755-6 was one of difference and perplexity among Philadelphia Friends. On the one side were the men of spiritual power, whose voices exercised the prevailing influence in the meetings for business. On the other were the disciples of Logan, who, being manifestly out of sympathy with well-established Quaker views,

urged the necessity of vigorous defence, caught the surrounding warlike spirit, and with personal service and money aided Franklin and the militia. Between the two stood the "Quaker governing class," who controlled the Assembly, who, while admitting and commending the peaceable doctrines of Friends, considered their own duty accomplished when they kept aloof from personal participation and supplied the means by which others carried on the war. This third section was the product of long experience in political activity. To these men and their predecessors was owing the successful administration for decades of the best governed colony in America. They were slow to admit any weakness in their position, but it was becoming increasingly evident that it was untenable. There was actual war, and they were, while not personally responsible for it, indeed while opposing vigorously the policy which had produced it, now a component part of the government which was carrying it on. Would they join their brethren in staunch adherence to peace principles, and thus give up their places in the state as John Bright did afterwards when Alexandria was bombarded? Would they join Franklin, their associate in resisting proprietary power, and

throw aside their allegiance to the principles of William Penn, whom they professed greatly to honor?

The question was answered differently by different ones as the winter and spring passed away. Pressure was strong on both sides. The Governor, writing to London, says: "The Quaker preachers and others of great weight were employed to show in their public sermons, and by going from house to house through the Province, the sin of taking up arms, and to persuade the people to be easy and adhere to their principles and privileges." This was an enemy's view of a conservative reaction which was going on within the Society, which was tired of compromises, was willing to suffer, and could not longer support the doubtful expediency of voting measures for others to carry out, of which they could not themselves approve.

We have seen how in the early winter the Assembly rebuked what they considered the impertinence of the protest of a number of important members of the Meeting against a war tax. The Meeting mildly emphasized the same difference in their London epistle of 1756:

The scene of our affairs is in many respects changed since we wrote to you, and our late peaceful land involved

in the desolations and calamities of war. Had all under our profession faithfully discharged their duty and maintained our peaceable testimony inviolate we have abundant sense to believe that divine counsel would have been afforded in a time of so great difficulty; by attending to which, great part of the present calamities might have been obviated. But it hath been manifest that human contrivances and policy have been too much depended on, and such measures pursued as have ministered cause of real sorrow to the faithful; so that we think it necessary that the same distinction may be made among you as is and ought to be here between the Acts and Resolutions of the Assembly of this Province, tho' the majority of them are our Brethren in profession, and our acts as a religious Society. We have nevertheless cause to admire and acknowledge the gracious condescension of infinite goodness towards us, by which a large number is preserved in a steady dependence on the dispensations of divine Providence; and we trust the faith and confidence of such will be supported through every difficulty which may be permitted to attend them, and their sincerity appear by freely resigning or parting with these temporal advantages and privileges we have heretofore enjoyed, if they cannot be preserved without violation of that testimony on the faithful maintaining of which our true peace and unity depend.

We have an excellent opportunity to view the internal condition of affairs among the Friends in the letters of Samuel Fothergill, brother of the noted Dr. John Fothergill. He was making a religious journey through the American colonies, having already traversed all the southern and northern provinces, and reached Philadelphia shortly after Braddock's defeat, where he

remained all through the following winter and spring. His letters were private, principally to his wife and sister, and are evidently the unstudied impressions made by his personal observation and experience.*

He first attended the Yearly Meeting, which was "very large and to great general satisfaction." He did not approve of the doings of the Assembly. "As the Assembly for the Province have in some respects, I think, acted very inconsistently with the principles they profess, I had a concern to have an opportunity with such of them as are members of our Society, being twenty-eight out of thirty-six; and they gave some Friends and me an opportunity this morning to relieve our spirits to them."

He is first inclined to think they have hopelessly compromised their principles. "All the hardships of last winter, though very great, were nothing in comparison with the anguish of spirit I feel for this backsliding people, though there are, and even in the Assembly, a number who remember with humble trust and confidence the everlasting Protector of His people."

* "Memoirs of Samuel Fothergill." By George Crosfield, page 214, et seq.

“Our epistle from Philadelphia to the monthly meetings meets with a different reception as the people differ; the libertines, worldly-minded and opposers of the reformation in themselves, cavil and rage, but the seed is relieved and the honest-hearted strengthened.”

Matters, however, improved during the winter. He writes in the spring: “The love of power, the ambition of superiority, the desire of exemption from suffering, strongly operate with many under our name to continue in stations wherein they sacrifice their testimony and are as salt which hath lost its savor. But as it now appears that we can scarcely keep the truth and its testimony inviolate and retain those places, many stand up on the Lord’s side and declare they have none on earth in comparison with the God of their fathers.”

He does not have any respect for the line of forts. “Many thousand pounds of the Province’s money have by the Assembly’s committee been laid out in erecting forts upon the frontiers and placing men in them; a step as prudent, and likely to be attended with as much success, as an attempt to hedge out birds or the deer. . . . In contempt and mockery of the attempt eleven people being destroyed a few days ago within a

mile of one of their forts." He also objects to the lack of respect in the tone of the Assembly's addresses to the Governor. "It is altogether imputed to B. Franklin, their principal penman, who I have sometimes thought intended to render the Assembly contemptible, and subject our religious Society to the imputation of want of respect for authority, as a factious sort of people; and I fear he has gained his point."

It is the injustice to the Indians to which the trouble is to be attributed. "The five Indian nations who conquered the Delawares sold some part of the ancient inheritance of these last to the Proprietors, some few years since, alleging the right of sale to be in them as conquerors, and the goods were divided amongst the five nations principally, to the discontent of the Delawares, who still judge themselves justly entitled to some equivalent for their land, which either the inattention of the Proprietors or their want of information induced them to disregard; and it is pretty much in this land, and land fraudulently obtained, that the barbarities are committed."

"The consternation in which this Province hath been thrown by the Indians is not diminished. The Assembly have sold their testimony as Friends to the people's fears, and not gone far

enough to satisfy them. The Indians have complained without redress, and are now up in arms and have destroyed many people. . . . The ancient methods of dealing with the Indians upon principles of equity and justice seem neglected, the spirit of war and destruction endeavoring to break loose, in order to reduce this pleasant populous Province to its ancient wilderness condition.”

“4th month 9th, 1756.—Had some labor amongst Friends to endeavor to prevent a cruel Indian war; and had also a conference with the present and late Governor along with J. P. (John Pemberton) upon the present position of affairs; they received us with candor, but our labor was ineffectual, for on the 10th, a day to be remembered through many generations with sorrow, the Governor agreed to proclaim war against the Delawares, and delivered the hatchet into the hands of some of the Indians.”

As the address of twenty Friends to the Assembly had predicted, a large number refused to pay the war tax of 1755. Others were quite willing to do so. The differences were evidently acute. “The Assembly here have passed a law imposing a tax upon the inhabitants of this Province; and as a great part of the money is to be

laid out for military purposes many solid Friends can not pay it, which is likely to bring such a breach and division as never happened among us since we were a people.”

The Friends who refused to pay the tax thought it peculiarly hard that they were forced to suffer heavy losses through the action of their fellow-members of the Assembly. These Assemblymen and their friends pointed out on the other hand that these taxes had been paid in the past, and that it was ultra-conscientiousness which prevented the willing support of the government in this hour of peril. The question was a difficult one. Quakers had hitherto refused a direct war tax and paid everything else, even when war expenditures were mingled with others. The stricter Friends considered that this tax, though disguised, was of the objectionable sort, while others did not so place it. The difference accentuated itself by condemnatory criticisms, and in 1757 the Yearly Meeting appointed a committee of thirty, who reported that it was a matter for individual consciences to determine, and not for the Meeting's decision.

“We are unanimously of the judgment that it is not proper to enter into a public discussion of the matter; and we are one in judgment that it

is highly necessary for the Yearly Meeting to recommend that Friends everywhere endeavor to have their minds covered with frequent charity towards one another." The Meeting unanimsly adopted this report. This appeal seems to have been successful, and we hear no more of the difference.*

The situation is explained in two letters from James Pemberton to Samuel Fothergill, one dated 11th mo., 1756, the other 1st mo., 1757:

Our situation is indeed such as affords cause of melancholy reflection that the first commencement of persecution in this Province should arise from our brethren in profession, and that such darkness should prevail as that they should be instruments of oppressing tender consciences which hath been the case. The tax in this county being pretty generally collected and many in this city particularly suffered by distraint of their goods and some being near cast into jail.

The number of us who could not be free to pay the tax is small compared with those who not only comply with it but censure those who do not.

Notwithstanding the feeling against the Proprietors, the Yearly Meeting insists on their having their just dues promptly. "It should be earnestly recommended to the several Quarterly and Monthly Meetings to use their utmost en-

* Further information on this matter will be found in John Woolman's Journal, Whittier's edition, pages 124, et seq.

deavors to excite the several members of their respective meetings to be punctual in the payment of quit-rents and other monies due from them to the Proprietors, to remove any just cause of reflection on us in this particular.”

The deliberations and differences among the Friends of Pennsylvania were helped to an ending by the action of their London brethren. They had been at all times willing to respond to the request of the Colonial Quakers for advice and assistance. The petition of the Philadelphians adverse to the Assembly's course of action, and the accounts true and false as to the defenceless condition of the Province which had been sent to London, had made many enemies, and measures were on foot to drive all Quakers from Government places. The London Friends got on the track of these movements and undertook to do what they could to neutralize them. The whole matter is explained in the report of Dr. Fothergill to the Meeting for Sufferings.

At a meeting for Sufferings the 9th of 4th month, 1756.

John Fothergill, from the Committee on the Pensilvania affair, brought in a report, which was read, and is as follows:

To the Meeting for Sufferings:

The Committee appointed to consider the present state of affairs in Pensilvania, Submit the following account of

their proceedings therein to the Meeting, and request their farther direction in the affair.

The Committee having received undoubted Information that measures were concerting by some persons of Influence here, which would very much affect our friends in Pensilvania, & occasion some material alterations in the present frame of Government in that Province, deputed several Friends to wait upon a Nobleman in high station, in order to request his advice & favourable Interposition.

He acquainted Friends who waited upon him that he discovered a general & strong prepossession excited against us as a people both here and in America, chiefly he believed from the repeated accounts transmitted hither of the distressing situation of affairs in that Province, which were too readily credited by all ranks and ascribed to the principles and Conduct of the Society. That even those in considerable Stations, who had been our firm Friends on various occasions now seemed to be so far influenced as to be either wavering in their opinion, or disposed to join in the popular cry against us; and that from the present appearance of things such seemed to be the temper of many that no measures however disadvantageous to us, could be offered to either house, which would not at least meet with a Strenuous support.

Nevertheless that he and a few more from a thorough knowledge & approbation of our principles and Conduct in divers particulars; and from a consideration of the injustice it would be, to exclude those from any share in the Legislature of a Province, who had so highly contributed to it's present value & reputation, were desirous that we ourselves if possible, should apply a remedy, rather than leave it to be done by the public, who from the disposition they were in, seemed inclined to the severest, a Clause for totally excluding our Friends in Pensilvania & other parts of America from having seats in any Provincial Assembly by imposing an Oath, having actually been part of a bill now before Parliament, That as the majority of the present Assembly were of our Profession who from their

known principles could not contribute to the defence of the Country now grievously harrassed by the Indians under French Influence in a manner that most people here and even many in Pensilvania thought necessary it seemed but common justice in our Friends to decline accepting a trust which under the present Circumstances they could not discharge, and therefore advised that we should use our utmost endeavours to prevail upon them neither to offer themselves as candidates nor to accept of seats in the Assembly during the present commotions in America.

That if we could give any reasonable hopes this advice would be complied with, he for one would endeavour to prevent any violent measures from being taken at the present.

But that as much depended on this compliance he earnestly recommended we should not trust to Letters only, or the most pressing advices, but that even some proper persons should be deputed to go over on this occasion.

For should any disaster befall the Province and our Friends continue to fill the Assembly, it would redound to the prejudice of the Society in general, and be the means perhaps of subverting a constitution under which the province had so happily flourished.

He farther recommended it to us, to wait upon some other principal persons in high stations, and endeavour to prevail upon them to join in suspending the resolutions which might have been formed either for a present or a total exclusion.

The Friends acknowledged their grateful sense of his regard & strenuous interposition on their behalf, and on making this report to the Committee it was agreed in pursuance of this advice to wait upon some other persons in high stations on the same account.

In conversation with those to whom the Committee applied they found it was the general opinion that either an immediate dissolution of the present assembly, or a Test to incapacitate any of our profession from setting therein, or both were absolutely necessary to preserve the

Province from inevitable ruin: and We also found that bills were already prepared for these purposes.

The friends appointed among other things represented that we were satisfied many of our Friends who now sat in that assembly, accepted the seats therein with some reluctance & would cheerfully resign them whenever the country thought other representatives could more effectually contribute to its benefit & security, for which reason we apprehended it would be no difficult matter to induce most if not all of our Society to resign their Stations especially as this might be the means of preventing so dangerous an innovation upon the present Frame of Government of that Province.

Upon the whole, we have reason to expect that thro' the kind interposition of Providence and the favourable disposition of those in power, nothing will be attempted in Parliament this Sessions.

But it is fully expected that our Friends will not suffer themselves to be chosen into assembly during the present disturbances in America.

And as the committee have engaged that our utmost endeavours shall be used with our Friends in America, to fulfil these expectations,—We are of opinion that an Epistle should be forthwith drawn up and sent to our Friends in Pensilvania, fully to inform them of the sentiments of the Publick concerning them of the danger they have so narrowly escaped, & the means pointed out for their avoiding it for the future.

And that in pursuance of the advice given us, two or more proper Friends should be engaged to go over to Pensilvania, in order the more fully to explain the present state of affairs, and what is expected from Friends in those parts.

And we are likewise of opinion that proper acknowledgements should be made in behalf of the Society to those persons in high stations, who have manifested so much lenity and regard to us on this occasion and the same time to acquaint them, that no endeavours on our part will be wanting, to influence our Friends in Pensilvania, to con-

duct themselves in such a manner as to merit the confidence reposed in the Society.

And farther the Committee is not without hopes, that their seasonable & diligent application to persons in power may have been the means of strengthening their favourable dispositions towards us, & has furnished various opportunities to remove many prejudices respecting the conduct of affairs in Pensilvania.

The Meeting for Sufferings and the Yearly Meeting adopted the recommendations of this report, and sent letters to Philadelphia practically recapitulating it. To insure its favorable reception, they sent over John Hunt and Christopher Wilson to use their personal influence in the same direction.

Prior to their arrival, the six members of the Assembly led by James Pemberton had resigned. These resignations were probably the result of conscientious conviction. Those which followed were influenced by a desire to satisfy the demands of London and Philadelphia Yearly Meetings.

Under date of Eleventh month, 1756, James Pemberton writes to Samuel Fothergill, who had returned to his home in England, a letter narrating the turn affairs had taken:

The business which detained me from accompanying thee on shipboard, I mean that of resigning in the Assembly, was completed pretty readily, though afterward

much disapproved of by Governor Morris and his friends when they found our successors were such as did not answer their purposes.

. . . Having mentioned thus far to public affairs, I may add something further with regard to our last election. Many Friends were under some anxiety to know the contents of the embassy from the Meeting for Sufferings in London, that we might be able to conduct in such a manner as should be consistent with the reputation of Truth, and the sentiments of our Friends on your side, the latter of which could be learned only from the intelligence received in private letters which it was not thought prudent at that time to make too generally known from divers considerations and particularly lest there should be any variation in what the Friends whom we expected might bring, and therefore such Friends who had most regard to the preserving our testimony inviolate, thought it best to decline interesting themselves in the election any further than to prevent a majority of those professing with us being returned as Representatives in the Assembly, and would have preferred that not one under the name should be chosen, and for this reason declined voting themselves, and many others influenced by their example acted in like manner; but notwithstanding this there were too many under our name active in the election, whom no arguments could prevail with to desist, and by this means, and the apprehensions of others of the inhabitants of the ill consequence of being inactive, there are in this county of eight members of the House, two called Quakers, and one that was owned last year, and another who comes to meeting, but not joined in membership. In the other counties several Friends were left out. However upon the whole of the 36 members who make up the House, there were 12 under the name of Quakers, and our adversaries reckoned them 16. J. H. and C. W. [John Hunt and Christopher Wilson] arrived 5 days after the election and on their communicating to the Committee appointed by the Yearly Meeting to constitute a Meeting

for Sufferings, it was agreed to be most proper that these friends should have an opportunity of conferring with all of the members chosen in the late election who went under our name, before they took their seats in the House, and intelligence was accordingly sent to them, and most of them came and much pains taken to convince them of the expediency of their declining to take their seats, to which some of them readily assented; the first was old Peter Dicks and Maylon Kirkbride who, and two others one from Bucks, and another from Chester were all that could be prevailed with to shake off their rags of imaginary honor . . . The House has been sitting most of the time since the election, and have as yet done little business; they have had under their consideration a militia law, which hath been long in the hands of a committee, and is likely to take up a great deal more of their time; also a bill for raising £100,000 by a land tax of the same kind as your's in England; if these pass it is likely Friends will be subjected to great inconvenience. As the former now stands, as I am told, the great patriot Frankin, who hath the principal direction of forming the bills, hath discovered very little regard to tender consciences, which perhaps may partly arise from the observations he must have made since he hath been in that House of the inconsistent conduct of many of our Friends. That it seems to me he hath almost persuaded himself there are few if any that are in earnest relating to their religious principles, and that he seems exceedingly studious of propagating a martial spirit all he can.*

The ten Assemblymen who resigned, as also those who refused re-election, were succeeded by members of other denominations.† The twelve

* "The Friend," Vol. XLVI., page 162.

† "The manner in which you had proceeded in the consideration of our affairs, and the engagements you had en-

nominal members of the Society who retained their seats were too few to commit their Church to any policy, and most of them had their actions practically disowned by the ecclesiastical au-

tered into on behalf of Friends here, appeared to be conducted with a real regard to our true interest, and so perfectly consistent with our sentiments that they were encouraged and assisted by those members of this meeting in doing everything in their power to render the service proposed effectual, in order to which those of our Society who were chosen representatives in the several counties were requested to give them [John Hunt and Christopher Wilson] a hearing before the usual time of meeting in the Assembly, which was readily complied with by all whom there was at that time any prospect of prevailing with to regard the advice and concern of their brethren, and in consequence of it four of them declined taking their seats in the house, and others not of our profession were soon after chosen in their stead, so that there are now but twelve of the members of the Assembly who make any pretensions of being called by our name, and several of these are not acknowledged by us as members of the Society. . . . As six of the friends chosen into the Assembly last year had resigned their seats, and some others since refused to be re-elected those who now remain say they should not think themselves excusable to their constituents if they should decline the service, but we think it may be truly said, they were most of them so clear of intermeddling in the elections and so many friends declined attending or voting in several of the counties, that they appear to be chosen by a majority of people not of our profession many of whom are very apprehensive of the danger from permitting those who have been endeavouring to subvert the constitution to have any considerable share in the legislature."—From Philadelphia Meeting for Sufferings to London Meeting for Sufferings, Twelfth month, 1756.

thorities, which year by year grew more urgent against any compromise of principle.

Three courses were open to the political Quakers in 1756.

They might have given up their religious scruples and joined heartily in the defence of the Province; they might have stood rigidly by their principles, so long as their constituents would have returned them, and allowed the Indians on the one side and the English opponents on the other to do their worst, giving up their places when they had to; or they might have resigned as they did. The inconsistent position they held in the Assembly was no longer tenable. The first was the course of mere politicians, the second perhaps of impossible heroes, the third of honest men who valued consistency above power. One cannot but wish that in the spirit of the Pembertons, the Fothergills, the Woolnans of their day, they had kept their public places in absolute obedience to their religious principle. The Quakers triumphed in England by non-resistant faithfulness to conviction. Should they not have tried, not abandonment, but non-resistant adherence to place and responsibility, when place and responsibility were honorably in their hands? Has not the world

needed a more virile example of Quaker government to show the merits of unquailing, passive resistance to wrong and injustice? Would not the Providence upon whom they depended in case of military attack also prove their safeguard if in the line of duty in civil place and attacked by civil enemies? But probably the actual members of the Assembly were not the sort of men to present this brave, quiet front. John Woolman could have done it, but John Woolman would never have been elected, would not probably have made a very practical legislator, and besides, John Woolmans were rare. The Quaker legislators were not careless politicians, neither were they heroes, but they were conscientious men, who, when the issue came baldly, stood by their brethren who controlled the Yearly Meeting, and preserved unimpaired the principle of peace to their posterity.

There was growing up in the Society a belief which was vastly strengthened by the military experiences of the years between 1740 and 1780, that public life was unfavorable to the quiet, Divine communion which called for inwardness, not outwardness, and which was the basic principle of Quakerism.* Quakers had always had

* "That stillness and abstraction I desire does not ap-

strong mystical tendencies. William Penn represented one type of active, militant Quakerism, and Isaac Pennington another of passive, introversive Quakerism. In George Fox they were happily blended. The ease and prosperity and public responsibilities of Pennsylvania Friends had tended to develop the spirit of outward activity, useful but dangerous to the inner life. Ultimately it brought about the loss to the Society of many aggressive members, and a growing conviction that the place of Friends was not in political, but in religious and philanthropic work. In these directions their activities were more and more thrown, and the Yearly Meeting was strenuously engaged for several years after 1756 in pressing on its members the desirability of abstaining from civic business.

This was done under the plea that, as matters were, it was impossible to hold most official positions without administering oaths or voting war taxes. The former violated Quaker principles directly, and the latter enjoined on their breth-

pear at present to be allowed me, nor can I yet attain so deep inward silence and attention as I find necessary, but from wilful disobedience or transgression of duty I am I hope in a good degree preserved."—Israel Pemberton to Samuel Fothergill, Ninth month, 1757.

ren a service against which their consciences rebelled. In the interests, therefore, of liberty of conscience, the meetings urged on the members not to allow themselves to be candidates for judicial or legislative positions, and in time were largely successful.

In 1758 a report came in to the Yearly Meeting from a large and influential committee advising against furnishing wagons for the transport of military stores, and warning against allowing "the examples and injunctions of some members of our Society who are employed in offices and stations in civil government"* to influence anyone against a steady support of the truth. They also recommend that the Yearly Meeting should "advise and caution against any Friends accepting of or continuing in offices or stations whereby they are subjected to the necessity of enjoining or enforcing the compliance of their brethren or others with any act which they may conscientiously scruple to perform."

* The distinction between the ecclesiastical and political Quakers is further indicated in the following: "Thou knows that we could not in every case vindicate our Assembly who had so greatly deviated from our known principles and the testimony of our forefathers."—Israel Pemberton to Samuel Fothergill, Seventh month, 1757.

The Meeting adopted the report and issued a minute largely in its language. The holding of all civil offices is not advised against, only such as call for questionable proceedings in "these perilous times."

And as the maintaining inviolate that liberty of conscience which is essential to our union and well-being as a religious Society evidently appears to be our indispensable duty, this Meeting doth with fervent and sincere desires for the present and future prosperity of Truth among us, and the preservation of individuals on the true foundation of our Christian fellowship and communion, caution, advise and exhort Friends to beware of accepting of, or continuing in, the exercise of any office or station in civil society or government by which they may in any respect be engaged in or think themselves subjected to the necessity of enjoining or enforcing the compliance of their brethren and others with any act which they conscientiously scruple to perform; and if any professing with us should, after the advice and loving admonitions of their brethren, persist in a conduct so repugnant to that sincerity, uprightness and self-denial incumbent on us, it is the sense and judgment of this Meeting that such persons should not be allowed to sit in our Meetings for discipline, nor be employed in the affairs of Truth until they are brought to a sense and acknowledgment of their error.

The advice is strengthened in 1762. "It is likewise desired that all Friends may be particularly careful that they be not accessory in promoting or choosing their brethren to such offices which may subject them to the temptation of deviating from our Christian testimony in this

(administering oaths) or any other branch thereof."

In 1763 the Quarterly Meetings are asked to report the success of their "labours" in getting Friends out of compromising offices. Philadelphia Quarterly Meeting reports some success; Chester, "a comfortable account" from one monthly meeting, but "cannot say much" as to the rest; Western (Chester county), "little success, but has hopes of more if the concern continues."

Bucks remarks that as "There appears an uneasiness in several of their monthly meetings with the minute of the Yearly Meeting of 1758 as it now stands, respecting the treating with such as hold offices in the Government, they desire that the said minute may be returned to this Meeting for reconsideration."

Bucks gained from this appeal only the suspension of judgment respecting the last clause of the minute.

The matter went down through the monthly meetings, and in nearly all of them some records are found.

In Goshen, "Third month 11th, 1763, ——— were appointed to treat with such Friends within the Meeting's compass who hold

offices in Government which subject them to a violation of the fundamental privilege of liberty of conscience."

Fifth month 6th, 1763, they report that they have "taken an opportunity with one of the representatives of Assembly,* and that he do not apprehend himself culpable, and as to county commissioners and assessors there are none within the verge of this meeting."

The Friends of these days had a large list of civil delinquencies to trouble them. Bucks Quarterly Meeting, in 1763, reports, "That all are not clear of administering oaths, nor of military service"; nor "of purchasing negroes, and that a religious education of them is much neglected"; but they are "free from paying priests wages and being concerned in prize goods and lotteries." "That Friends should not purchase nor remove to settle on such lands as have not been fairly and openly purchased from the Indians"; that certificates should not be given to such as do, and they should be convinced "of the inconsistency of their conduct

* George Ashbridge, who entered the Assembly in 1743, and notwithstanding the pressure of his ecclesiastical superiors, retained his membership both in the Assembly and the meeting till 1773.

with our Christian profession." In addition to these they now had to see after those who held offices incompatible with the same Christian profession. Whatever Quaker political control was doing for the State, it was accumulating anxieties for "concerned Friends." It should be said, however, that in these moral questions they were pushing ahead of the community, and if some of their own members could not maintain the pace, it was not much a matter of wonder.

The withdrawal of the Quaker members of the Assembly did not change its political tendencies. In all things, save a greater willingness to vote money for defence, it showed the same hostility to proprietary encroachments as before. The new members, while not Friends, were of the same political party as their predecessors (indeed, there did not seem to be any proprietary party of consequence in the Assembly), and were elected by the same constituencies. They doubtless had the support of the Quaker voters, and the same machinery (whatever it was) which had hitherto been effective. It was still in popular language the Quaker Assembly, and so remained till 1776, when there was a sudden and radical change. It represented the "Quaker party" (of which probably a majority were non-Quakers) and carried

out its decrees. But the Society of Friends was in no sense responsible for its acts, any more than the Society was for the acts of Benjamin Franklin, who was largely politically affiliated with its members. Hence, while some writers, deceived by the popular language of the day, give the date 1776 as the downfall of Quaker ascendancy, they include twenty years which Quakers distinctly repudiate, and which were controlled by such as were not members nor fair representatives of the body. The Quaker control ended with 1756. In increasing numbers after this date they absented themselves from the polls, and though, after peace with the Indians was declared, some Friends were returned to the Assembly, they never exerted more than a modifying influence in it.

John Pemberton writes, in 1757, after the uprooting of the Quaker majority of the Assembly: "Our country people seem to repent Friends being out of the House of Assembly, and if we do not use much precaution it will be next to impossible to prevent a majority of them being chosen next year." He adds, when they find how expensive and how useless the forts are, costing £10,000 per month, and making the Indians "glory in doing mischief near them and the

men" in them, they will be still less likely to be satisfied.

The effect anticipated was produced. In 1760 "there is a majority of such who qualify by an affirmation." The next election, in the fall of 1761, "was the occasion of an addition to the number of the members of our Society, of whom there is now a majority in the House so termed, which, if the war continues, may occasion a revival of our troubles on that account."* It thus appears that the people wanted to elect Friends, and would do so with their consent, but that only such as stood somewhat fast and loose with the Society would allow themselves to be candidates against the expressed wishes of the Yearly Meeting.

A year later the situation has not changed.

"I wish they who are active in these matters could be persuaded to pay more regard to the engagement with respect to the number of those of our Society returned for Representatives, there being now, as last year, very nearly an equal number of our Society, and a large majority of such who do not qualify by an oath."

The "labours" were now, however, beginning to yield fruits. In the fall of 1763 the number

* James Pemberton is the authority for this statement. It does not necessarily mean that all were Friends who refused to swear.

of Quaker Assemblymen was greatly reduced. "I should be very glad if the number of members of Assembly under our name was less, and believe some in that station now heartily wish they had harkened to the advice of their brethren, dissuading them from accepting the trust, though there are but fourteen allowed members of our Society in the House, yet as divers others are termed such our adversaries take occasion of clamoring and abusing us on this account, and seem now bent upon attempting by violence what they cannot effect by free choice."

This quotation explains the general reference of the day to the Quaker Assembly. In popular estimation, every one who qualified by an affirmation, every one who sympathized with the past policy of the legislative body, every descendant or close relative of a Quaker family, was a Quaker. Thus was saddled upon the Society the responsibility which it diligently sought to avoid, of the conduct of the Government, in which its influence was still unquestionably a strong but not a controlling factor.

The withdrawal from public life of those best qualified to attend to it in the country districts, led inevitably to a weakening of the standard of government. In the same letter with the last

quotation, we have an account of "anarchy and confusion." "Vice of all kinds prevails in a lamentable degree; murder, highway robberies and house-breaking are committed, and the perpetrators have passed undiscovered; the minds of the people in general are agitated with great ferment, and the rulers of the people cause them to err; the few in public stations who have virtue enough to put the laws in execution have their hands weakened by mean and mercenary opposition, so that desolation appears almost inevitable."

James Pemberton rather apologetically explains to Dr. Fothergill his own resumption of political life in 1765. He was much pressed by his constituents, and with great reluctance consented. It was done with the approbation of Friends, and he hopes it will not be looked upon as a violation of the agreement the English Friends had made. He thinks he can do some good to good causes, and keep out objectionable competitors, and so on, all of which seems excellent, and induces one to wonder why the same reasons should not have prevailed on other Quakers to maintain a power so evidently for the good of the Province, now that the Indian wars were over. The probabilities are that they

preferred to be a minority in the Assembly sufficient to leaven its actions, yet also so small that they would not be responsible for acts of a war-like character.

It is possible Friends looked forward to a time when they might consistently resume their political activity and influence, when wars would be over, and a policy of equity and friendship with the Indians might be renewed? In the sixties there seemed such a possibility. But if they ever cherished the idea it does not show itself in the records of the times, and was rudely shattered by the Revolutionary war.

In this war they were in an embarrassing position. It was, politically speaking, the work of their party, which had always stood for civil liberty, and which plunged into it with ardor. It was, however, opposed to their anti-revolutionary and their anti-martial principles. "We cannot be instrumental in the setting up or pulling down of any government," they said, in 1778. This negative attitude brought much misrepresentation and much persecution, and left them more than ever convinced that the place of a Quaker was not in political life. From that day to this their corporate influence has been exerted against such participation.

It is sadly evident to anyone who, without prejudice, places himself in contact with the spirit and tendencies of the men who for seventy-four years controlled the destinies of the government of Pennsylvania, that the high ideals and buoyant hopes with which William Penn started were only imperfectly realized. The government in which the sober will of the people should prevail in all internal affairs, without factional or selfish strife; where all should be equal, every conscience should be unfettered, no man's word should need any confirmatory oath; where fraternal kindness and even justice should go out to the natives, and no force should be needed or employed except toward individual disturbers of the peace; where human life should be sacred and human rights preserved, and where over all and in all there should be the pervasive, restraining and directing influence of God's Holy Spirit, present because merited by holy lives and reverent hearts,—this government, which Penn saw in his imagination, never existed in fact. Unholy party spirit was at times strong, religious liberty was abridged, oaths were only partially abolished, capital punishment was extended, the Indians were abused and angered, and warlike passion and war itself invaded the

territory; and finally the effort apparently broke down before the influences exerted by seemingly insurmountable opposing forces. This partially unsatisfactory outcome is to some extent explained by these facts: (1) The English Crown, by its power of veto, its undefined authority, even over the charter, and by its frequent wars and consequent demands on the colony, was a continual interference with the plans of the Government; and (2), the Proprietors of the second generation were out of sympathy with the principles of their fathers. Yet one could not but expect obstacles, and there were many counterbalancing advantages. Perhaps at no other time or place in this defective world could the trial have been better made, and one has to admit that the noble dream, even when worked out by a man so practical, so resourceful, so skilful in adapting means to ends, of such an imposing personality as William Penn, was incapable of full accomplishment under any conditions likely to be realized. All of the actors in it were not pure and consecrated themselves, and nothing else could save it.

And yet it was not a failure. The world will return to it when times are riper. There will be another trial of the principles of a pure democ-

racy, with perfect civil and religious liberty, perfect justice to neighbors, never attacking, and without need or provision for armed defence, which will be permanently successful. The leaven is working, and one by one men are being convinced of the right and expediency of some or all of its features. Nations are adopting them, and with every advance there is an approximation to the experiment of Penn.

It must not be forgotten that notwithstanding all difficulties and imperfections there was for seventy years an efficient government in Pennsylvania, based largely on Penn's ideas. There were no wars or external troubles. The home affairs were quiet and orderly. Prosperity and contentment reigned, immigrants came in unprecedented numbers, and the public finances were so managed as to encourage trade, and lay no unnecessary burdens. Peace and justice were for two generations found available defences for a successful State.

The failures are as instructive as the successes. Had William Penn's Indian policy prevailed, there was no need of Pennsylvania's embroilment in the French and Indian wars. The policy of peace is closely interwoven with that of justice. If other powers are exasperated by un-

fair dealings it will not do to fold one's arms and cry for peace. The experiment, in order to be conclusive, must involve rigid uprightness on the part of the State that objects to war. When, therefore, the breakdown of Quaker policy, in 1756, is pointed to, it should also be stated that it was very largely due to the injection into the political situation of the non-Quaker management of the Proprietors. As long as exact justice prevailed peace existed, and this is the lesson of Pennsylvania.

A Quaker Experiment in Government

Part Two:

The Quakers in the Revolution

PREFACE.

THE purpose of this monograph is neither to defend nor to condemn the position taken by the Friends of Pennsylvania during the Revolutionary War; but as accurately as possible, in the light of contemporary writings found in the records of meetings, private letters and public documents, to state that position fairly.

It is not to be greatly wondered at that they have been misunderstood. They were friends of liberty, but opposed to war; desirous of maintaining their civil rights, but by other means than illegality and revolution, and unwilling to afford aid to the British; divided in their sympathies, but largely united in the stand that they could take no part in the strife of the day. Their attitude has thus been variously stated as one side or the other has been exclusively seen.

The question was at the time an important one. Up to this date they had been the most potent single political influence in the province, whose unequalled prosperity was largely due to the institutions and principles of their first great

leader, William Penn, and their own administration of affairs. It was felt by friend and foe alike that the attempt to draw unwilling Pennsylvania into the revolutionary movement would largely depend on the direction and extent of their influence. Unquestionably they, like most conservative and order-loving Philadelphians, opposed it in its early stages.

Whether this opposition would have been successful had Pennsylvania been left to itself is an open question, but when war and revolution became inevitable and their charter was cast aside, they issued a declaration of neutrality. They were neither Tories nor revolutionists. They did not seek protection within British lines nor join the American forces.

ISAAC SHARPLESS.

Haverford College,
1899.

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTORY,	1
-------------------------	---

CHAPTER II.

THE FRIENDLY ASSOCIATION,	21
-------------------------------------	----

CHAPTER III.

THE PAXTON RIOT,	42
----------------------------	----

CHAPTER IV.

THE CONTEST WITH THE PROPRIETORS, . .	64
---------------------------------------	----

CHAPTER V.

PREPARING FOR THE REVOLUTION,	75
---------------------------------------	----

CHAPTER VI.

THE EARLY YEARS OF THE REVOLUTION, .	120
--------------------------------------	-----

CHAPTER VII.

THE VIRGINIA EXILES,	145
--------------------------------	-----

CHAPTER VIII.

QUAKER SUFFERING,	172
-----------------------------	-----

CHAPTER IX.

THE FREE QUAKERS,	207
-----------------------------	-----

CHAPTER X.

FRIENDS AND SLAVERY,	224
--------------------------------	-----

“We have a just sense of the value of our religious and civil liberties, and have ever been and are desirous of preserving them by all such measures as are not inconsistent with our Christian profession and principles, and though we believe it to be our duty to submit to the powers which in the course of Divine Providence are set over us, where there hath been or is any oppression or cause of suffering, we are engaged with Christian meekness and firmness to petition and remonstrate against it and to endeavor by just reasoning and arguments to assert our rights and privileges in order to obtain relief.”

A FRIENDS' MINUTE OF 1775.

The Quakers in the Revolution.

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTORY.

The province of Pennsylvania, during the first three-quarters of a century of its existence, had made more rapid progress in numbers, wealth and internal peace and comfort than any other of the English colonies which lined the coast. At the end of this period, when our history begins, it contained perhaps two hundred thousand people, of whom one-eighth were in the city of Philadelphia. This city was, in number of inhabitants and in commerce, the chief city of America.

This rapid growth was due to the large immigration induced by religious liberty, peace with the Indians, and fertile and cheap land. Since 1701 the political institutions were governed by William Penn's last charter, with such modifications as the English Court chose to apply, with or without regard to previous promises.

The government included a lieutenant-governor (appointed by the Penns, who themselves

thus nominally held the post of Governor), who surrounded himself with a council of advisers. He had an unlimited veto over legislation, which he did not hesitate to exercise. The Assembly, which originated all laws, was a popularly-elected body. Every freeman owning fifty acres of land, or property worth fifty pounds, was entitled to vote. The judges were appointed by the Governor, and the other provincial officers were also appointed by him from twice the number of eligibles elected by the people.

Of religious bodies the Province possessed the greatest variety to be found in any part of the British possessions. The Friends, for perhaps twenty years after 1682, had a numerical ascendancy, which, by the increase of the other elements of the population, became a continually-decreasing minority. There may have been forty thousand in 1760.

The Germans began to come in immediately after the settlement of the Province. William Penn made particular efforts, through Benjamin Furly and others, to interest the dwellers along the Rhine holding sympathetic religious views with his own, and burdened with military exactions, in his new state. The stream once started, during the first half of the eighteenth

century they came in ever-increasing numbers. James Logan became alarmed. In 1717 he writes: "We have great numbers of Palatines poured in upon us, without any recommendation or notice, which gives the country some uneasiness, for foreigners do not so well among us as our own people." Still their numbers grew. Pennsylvania was their objective point, and they could not be prevailed upon to stop in New York. In one year (1749) as many as twelve thousand came to Philadelphia. They quickly pressed on into the country, leaving the city and its neighborhood undisturbed.

Of the Germans many were Mennonites, Dunkards and Schwenkfelders, who were at one with the Friends on the subjects of war and oaths, and simplicity of living and dress. Being quiet, unambitious farmers, they were content to allow the Quakers to govern them, and lived for two generations without material change in their habits of life or thought.

The Moravians came about 1740, and made Bethlehem the garden-spot of the Province. They lived almost an ideal life, devoted to righteousness and peace and the christianization of the Indians, in which last they were more successful than all other sects combined.

The German Reformed and the Lutherans, in numbers far exceeding any other German sects, came in during the years preceding the Revolution. Though to the Philadelphians they appeared, as they left their crowded boats in the Delaware River, to be boorish, uncleanly and uneducated, many of them were religious men of strong convictions and considerable learning. They added to the province an element of honesty, industry and conservatism, which, as a state, it has not lost.

The Church of England established itself in the very early days of the province, and maintained a steady growth, especially in the city of Philadelphia. Towards revolutionary times its members shared with Friends the commercial and social supremacy of the province.

The Presbyterians also became numerous in the city. Moreover, they were scattered widely through the country districts, and their energy resulted in many proselytes. Contemporaneous with the German immigration there was another of almost equal proportions from the north of Ireland, made up exclusively of Presbyterians. Some of these were well educated, and became the school teachers of the province. The most, however, were untaught, uncouth people, of rest-

less vigor, who sought the frontiers, making a fringe outside the German line. By their scorn of conciliation they rather invited Indian attacks, which no scruples prevented them from returning. Politically they were in the opposition through all the colonial days, but had their ascendancy during and after the Revolutionary war, which they largely supplied with soldiers, generals and statesmen.

Every Protestant Christian sect was politically the equal of every other. Catholics, Jews and Socinians could not hold office, but their numbers were small, and while provincial parties were often separated rather sharply by denominational boundaries, no tests gave one organization any advantage over the others. What was gained was by legitimate influence and honest public service.

The Friends had given up their control of the Pennsylvania Assembly in 1756. The war which the Governor and Council had declared against the Delaware Indians seemed to make it impracticable for uncompromising peace men to remain longer in the government. Their cautious brethren, whose influence was supreme in Philadelphia Yearly Meeting, urged them to sacrifice place to principle. Their co-religionists in Eng-

land had asked the Ministry not to drive them out by the imposition of an oath, and had sent over a deputation to use personal influence with all legislators who had a membership among Friends to resign or refuse reëlection.

This seemed the only way to get them out. Though bitterly attacked for their unwillingness to provide military provisions, an attack hardly justified in late years by their record, they were strong in the confidence of the voters. Even in the disastrous times immediately following the defeat of Braddock, twenty-eight of the thirty-six Assemblymen elected were Friends, and there seemed to be no abatement of their popular strength. Though they were by this time influential by virtue of numbers and of commercial and social standing, they were yet a considerable minority of the total population.

The German bodies, who sympathized with their ethical views and appreciated their economical administration of the finances of the Province, and their successful defence of popular rights against proprietary pretensions, voted for them almost to a man. There could be seen not infrequently the spectacle of a community of Germans solidly voting for one of a handful of Quakers in their midst.

The resignation of ten of the Quaker members of the Assembly in 1756, and the refusal of others to accept a reelection, reduced the membership to a small number. Yet for years it required the greatest efforts of the meetings, now thoroughly committed to a policy of non-participation in the exciting politics of the times, to keep out of civil office their less loyal members. There was always a Friendly minority up to the Revolutionary War,—a minority which, about 1763-4, amounted to nearly one-half of the Assembly; but in the main the church organization was effective. The spectacle of Quakers in the Assembly levying war taxes which Quakers outside of the Assembly refused to pay, was so unedifying that many, for the sake of harmony, refused to accept seats.

But while Quakers were thus in the minority, and the Yearly Meeting felt its skirts clear of responsibility for the actions of the Assembly, the "Quaker Party" was in full control, and the policy was shaped on the same lines as prior to 1756. The war taxes were levied perhaps a little more openly, but the struggle went on as resolutely as ever against the right of the Proprietors to interfere in the matter of raising money, against their right to bind the Governor

by secret instructions, and against their right to have their lands relieved from bearing a share of the public burdens.

The instincts developed in the ruling sect by three-quarters of a century of governmental control could not be suddenly rooted out. Pennsylvania was the glory of Quakerism. It was hard to yield to the force of adverse circumstances, but in their minds the vitality of the principle of peace was at stake, and after throes of internal conflict, the uncompromising spirit of ancient Quakerism triumphed even over the desire to perpetuate the "experiment," now no longer "holy," of the successors of William Penn.

The most of them, however, did not refuse to vote. It seems impossible to ascertain just what party devices existed for the purposes of nominating candidates and insuring unity of action, but whatever there were prior to 1756 were continued. The party, therefore, held together, and practically the only change was in the standard-bearers.

The opposition was drawn mainly on denominational lines, and consisted of Episcopalians and Presbyterians. The former gave their political support to the proprietors, who had now

joined their church, and thus controlled the Executive Council. Many of the latter were the Scotch-Irish of the frontiers, a resolute and militant body, who felt the brunt of Indian attack, and while caring but little for the welfare of the Penns, were driven into their support by the desire to pursue a vigorous warfare against the barbarians who were murdering and ravishing their families and destroying the fruits of their labors. They did not attempt to conceal their scorn for the Quaker policy of feeding and conciliating the Indians, and were ever urging upon the Government the necessity of strenuous measures for killing them. The Quakers in turn looked upon them as radical opponents of their whole scheme of government, and as representing their former persecutors of Old and New England. A little later, when the aggressions of the English Government became the issue, there was a somewhat different alignment of parties, but now the Quaker and Presbyterian represented the two hostile extremes. The great body of Germans, quiet and conservative, never disturbing the Indians—notwithstanding, on account of their exposed position, they suffered to some extent from them—gave their large support steadily to the Quaker side. The superior num-

•

bers, political strength and social influence of the three oldest counties, including Philadelphia, and their large representation in the Assembly, gave overwhelming power to the same cause. These conditions enabled the "Quaker party" to maintain its unquestioned ascendancy steadily until the year 1776, when it suddenly fell to pieces and forever disappeared.

The proprietorship was now vested in the sons of the founder by his second wife, Thomas and Richard Penn, Thomas owning the larger share. They had vast financial interests in Pennsylvania, and the right to appoint the Governor, and, through their instructions to him, to veto legislation. He surrounded himself with a Council of his own and their selection, whose church affiliations were in the main those of the Proprietors.

Notwithstanding the injunctions of the Yearly Meeting, several prominent Friends retained official position through these years. William Logan, the son of James Logan, William Penn's secretary, was a member of the Governor's Council from 1743 to 1776, when it was dissolved. He gave his lonely vote against Indian wars, and while probably holding his father's views as to the propriety of war in certain circumstances, retained the respect both of the

Penns, whose attorney he was, and of his ecclesiastical friends and relatives.

Isaac Norris, the "Speaker," as he is usually called, was the son of William Penn's confidential adviser, the sagacious, conscientious and wealthy Isaac Norris. He was elected a member of the Assembly, in 1734, from the city of Philadelphia, and served for thirty years. In early life he continually opposed all warlike measures, and the "Norris Party" had to encounter the violent opposition—amounting in one instance to a street riot—of those who advocated war with Spain, France and the Indians. He was uniformly successful at the polls, and in 1751 was made Speaker, which place he held by successive elections for fifteen years. It was he who suggested the inscription on the Liberty Bell, "Proclaim liberty throughout the land and to all the inhabitants thereof." He was a valiant opponent of proprietary claims, and was appointed with Franklin, in 1757, as agent of the colony to ask the Crown to remove the grievances, but declined on account of ill-health. He opposed, however, the transfer of the Proprietors' rights to the Crown, and resigned his speakership in 1764, when the Assembly passed resolutions demanding it. He was, however, re-elected. He died in 1766.

He did not deem it necessary to resign in 1756 with the other Quaker members. As Speaker it became his duty to sign all acts passed by the Assembly, and his name attached to the bills making appropriations for definite military measures indicates the character of his views on the morality of war when wars seemed necessary. He was, however, greatly esteemed both by Friends and the general public for his ability, his character, and his love of liberty, tempered by conservative views of the means to be used for its protection.

The Pemberton brothers had a commanding influence in the years preceding the Revolution. They were much esteemed and trusted in public affairs, and, unlike Logan and Norris, were also actively interested in the management of the meetings. Their father, Israel Pemberton, a wealthy merchant of Philadelphia, was for nineteen years a member of the Assembly. His son Israel was also an Assemblyman and a leader in supporting the peace principles of his sect against the efforts of the governors. Later in life he became so much opposed to the trend of political affairs that he declined even to vote. He was the head of the Friendly Association, whose object was to preserve peace with the Indians; and

he took a prominent part in all conferences and treaties. He was one of the founders of the Pennsylvania Hospital, which ever since has been largely managed by Friends. James, not less prominent in the church, was far more of a politician, and his letters betray the continual desire of an active and aggressive mind to take part in the politics of the day, for which he was eminently fitted. He went into the Assembly when about thirty years old, but resigned in 1756 on account of the Indian war. Ten years later, the troubles being largely blown over, he again accepted an election, against the advice of many of his friends, only to give it up when the commotions preceding the Revolution made a sacrifice of principle again apparently inevitable. John, the third brother, was a preacher, with no apparent interest in public matters—a type of the “consistent” Friend.

The three brothers were all members of a band of a score of influential Quakers, who were banished to Virginia, in 1777, without trial, on account of supposed sympathy with the British.*

* The Pembertons were in frequent correspondence with the Fothergills, the Barclays, and other prominent Friends of England, with Moses Brown, of Providence, and with the

William Denny was Lieutenant-Governor from 1756 to 1759. His career was one of continual conflict with the Assembly. He had given bonds to carry out the instructions of the Proprietors, which were in complete opposition to the popular wish as regards the financial measures which the colonial condition was thought to demand. He was not to consent to any bills for the emission of paper currency beyond a limited amount, or which did not place the expenditure of the proceeds in his own hands, and the grudging permission to tax proprietary estates was so coupled with difficult conditions as to render it unacceptable.

The French war was going on all the time of his administration, and while peace was made with some Indian tribes in 1758, chiefly through the agency of Friends and the "Friendly Association," the savages did not cease to ravage the frontier. The line of forts extending from Easton southwestwardly across the Province to the Maryland boundary was an inefficient pro-

active men of their own Yearly Meeting. This voluminous collection of letters is in existence, and contains reliable and graphic, though somewhat verbose, accounts of public affairs through the pre-Revolutionary and Revolutionary times from the standpoint of strict Friends. They will be frequently used in this book.

tection, and large sums were constantly needed for military defence. The Assembly did not seem averse to granting liberally for the purpose, but took advantage of the situation to make conditions strengthening their claims. Except the £600 voted him on his accession, in an outburst of hopeful loyalty, Governor Denny received no salary, and finally became convinced that his interests were more identified with the people than with the Proprietors. He assented to a bill taxing the proprietary estates, and was rewarded with £1,000. Another equal sum followed his assent to each of two other bills, and though he immediately lost his place, the £3,000 must have been a partial consolation.

Benjamin Franklin was at this time in England for the purpose of making terms with the Proprietors by treaty or pressure from the Crown, and very soon showed the diplomatic skill for which he afterwards became famous. His measures were not always scrupulous. In his endeavors to blacken the fame of the Proprietors, he wrote or issued the anonymous publication, the "Historical Review of the Constitution and Government of Pennsylvania," a tissue of misstatements and partisanship. The arrangements finally effected, in 1759, through his skilful management, wrested from the Proprie-

tors a consent to much that the Assembly had claimed.

The second administration of James Hamilton (1759-1763) followed the rather inglorious exit of Denny, and the struggle went on. A rising tide of resistance to proprietary claims covered the Province. The question most at issue was the right of the House, or the counter-right of the Executive, to control the expenditures. To be at the mercy of English owners, whose personal interests would, according to their construction, be in perpetual conflict with those of the Province—who, moreover, were not frank in their dealings with the representatives of the people, but tied down their agents with instructions under penal bonds, which it was difficult to ascertain, and which the agent had no authority to modify—would inevitably be productive of controversy. While the same power existed in earlier times, it was leniently exercised. Between 1710 and 1740 there was hardly a ripple of discontent, but every one thrived under and rejoiced in the beneficent charter. Immigration was active, trade grew, peace was secure, taxes were practically unfelt, and the powers of the Assembly were unquestioned. But during the latter year the first serious demands

were made for men and money for wars against England's enemies;—demands which grew greater with the succeeding years, causing great uneasiness among the peace men of the province, and stirring up disputes as to the methods to be employed in raising the money. These troubles gradually but manifestly changed Pennsylvania from a colony remarkably free, prosperous and unburdened, to one disunited and struggling under a heavy load of expenditure and consequent taxes.

The Assembly had been all these years the faithful conservators of the liberties of the people. Conscious that this condition had been forced upon them partly by the Crown and partly by the Proprietors, and that the warlike pressure was used to extort money by means destructive of liberty, they refused to make grants except when coupled with terms which secured popular rights. It were better to endure even the massacres on the frontiers than to have the Province brought more closely under the control of Proprietors who were using it as their private plantation for purposes of gain. “No man shall ever stand on my grave and say, ‘Curse him; here lies he who betrayed the liberties of his country!’” declared their Speaker, Norris.

And now, after twenty years of struggle, the people and the Assembly, incensed against the Proprietors, could see no other relief than an application to England to annul the charter granted by William Penn, and take from his sons the power to have any control over the government of the Province. They preferred to receive their Governor directly from the English Crown, and take their chances of royal as against proprietary encroachments. This was unquestionably the popular thing, and in 1764 the Assembly, by an almost unanimous vote, directed Franklin to press the matter to an issue.

They had a strong case against the Penns. Though as property-owners the Proprietors were entitled to no other consideration than other property-owners, yet they continually used their political authority to advance their personal interests. This was the cause of all the bickering and delay over legislation, and kept the colony embroiled in internal discord. To augment their revenue they had greatly increased the number of licensed drinking-houses, much to the detriment of public morals. Whenever a purchase was made of the Indians they would locate and survey the best lands, doing nothing to occupy them, but depending for their profits on the

increased value brought to them by surrounding settlers. This made frontier farms isolated, and exposed them to Indian attack. Under these circumstances their demands for relief of taxation on unoccupied lands were unreasonable, and manifestly sought to place upon the poor frontiersmen a double burden. Taxation upon the proprietary estates certainly never erred in the direction of excess.

But reverence for the old charter had not passed away. Norris opposed the movement, and many of the steadier Friends stood with him. Before Franklin had made much progress he received an intimation to go slowly, and very soon the Stamp Act and the growing disposition of the English government to assert its power over the colonies took away from the Pennsylvanians all desire to change masters, and the matter was allowed to drop.

In 1760 the French war was practically ended by the surrender of Montreal and the transportation of the French troops to their home, though peace was not declared till 1763. The whole of Canada and Louisiana were surrendered, and the ambitious attempt to confine England to a narrow strip along the coast, while to the north and west and south the great power

of France and her Indian allies should be supreme, was forever abandoned.

The Assembly hastily took advantage of the situation to disband all its troops, except one hundred and fifty men, while the Governor tried to pacify the discontented Indians by conferences and presents; and in 1763 a successful expedition to Fort Pitt seemed to break the power of the Indian confederacy of the west.

The colony now hoped for peace, but the Indian appetite for murder and plunder, whetted by custom and a sense of unjust treatment, was not easily controlled, and for several years the frontiers were subjected to the desolations of savage attack, causing great suffering to outlying settlers, increasing exasperation against the Quakers, who were held partly responsible for the conditions, and heavy burdens on the taxpayers for defence.

John Penn, the son of Richard Penn, and grandson of the founder, became Lieutenant-Governor in 1763. This place, or that of Governor, after he became a Proprietor on the death of his father, he retained till the Revolution, except during a two years' visit to England in 1771-73, when his brother Richard, the most popular of the family, filled the position.

CHAPTER II.

THE FRIENDLY ASSOCIATION.

The early Pennsylvanians had ample reward for their fair treatment of the Indians in the abundant peace and prosperity that ensued. It was not merely the fact of purchase, though William Penn probably paid the Indians liberally, that prepossessed them in his favor. In various other matters he impressed them with the idea of anxiety for their welfare and a desire to protect their interests.

He restricted the trade in skins to agents whom he thought trustworthy, and required the weighing to be done in public; he advocated mixed juries in cases where both races were concerned; he did not drive them from the lands he purchased unless settlers were ready to take possession, and he allowed the Indians to repurchase as his subjects; he did his best to keep rum from them. Some of these benevolent schemes proved impracticable and had short lives; but they proved to the Indians that Onas was their unselfish and trustworthy friend, and through generations of tradition nothing could shake

their belief in this fact. His brethren in religious profession seconded his efforts and shared the Indian confidence. The red man passed by them, even in the madness of border outrage; he sought their dwellings when in strange cities; he demanded their presence at conferences and treaties as a pledge of justice; he looked to them for the presents which, in the Indian mind, cemented friendship, and was duly grateful.

It became a recognized part of the Quaker policy of government to appropriate large sums for the maintenance of Indian good-will. Between 1733 and 1751, a period of perfect peace, we find record of over £8,000 expended for this purpose, besides the ordinary expenses of Indian affairs. And when we consider the narrowing of their hunting ground, the breaking up of all their cherished habits of life, and the havoc wrought by the vices and diseases of the whites, the grant may be defended on the grounds of justice, as well as of policy. The same practice has obtained in recent years in our national treatment of them, for it has been found cheaper, fairer, and better in every way, to feed the Indian than to fight him.

This policy was attacked on the ground that it gave the worthless, drinking savages money

which might better be appropriated to suffering settlers; that it pauperized them and destroyed their savage virility; and that when given after a war as the price of peace, it was an actual incentive soon to renew hostilities for the sake of another reward. There is some justice in this; but the history of the years prior to 1755, as compared with the score of years following, is emphatically in favor of the Quaker policy, whether we consider economy, white men's prosperity, or red men's welfare.

Up to 1751, Indian affairs were largely in the hands of James Logan, who had conducted them for almost half a century with prudence and success. He became greatly influential with the natives, and while not always quite able to restrain the Governor and Council, had a power by virtue of his character and services which no successor could wield.

The vestiges of the holy experiment disappeared when, in 1755, the Delaware Indians and their allies, the successors of those who had treated with William Penn, joined the French and attacked the border whites of Pennsylvania. As Quaker influence could no longer be exerted through the executive branch of the government, it seemed necessary to have a new organization

to deal directly with the troublesome Indian question, and in course of time "The Friendly Association for regaining and preserving peace with the Indians by pacific measures," was formed.

The Walking Purchase of 1737, and the subsequent forcible removal of the Minisink Indians; the Albany treaty of 1754, when all Western Pennsylvania was sold to the Penns by the Six Nations without the consent of the dwellers on the soil; the intrigues of the French to secure the alliance of the discontented under promise of recovery of their hunting grounds, and the impositions of traders, had made the Delawares and Shawnees the open enemies of the English, and the Indian war broke out on the northern and western borders of the white settlement. The records of the times are full of the harassing details. Petitions for protection came in from dwellers all along the line, and the province was worked up to an excitement never before known. As has been so often seen in our history, the natives, goaded by wrongs, had in desperation instituted their cruel warfare, to be met by stern denunciation and a fierce cry for their extermination.

The first effort of the new association, in which

Israel Pemberton took the leading part, was to make a final effort to avert the declaration of war on the part of the Governor. In the minutes of the Provincial Council, under date of April 12th, 1756, we find:

Several of the strict and reputable Quakers presented an address to the Governor, bearing their testimony against war, expressing their apprehensions at this declaration, and praying that amicable methods might be further tried. Mr. Logan [William Logan, son of James Logan] moved for a full council to be called this evening, and the summons served instantly.

The address appealed to the Governor to consider the very disastrous results of war, and to make yet further efforts for peace, and added:

We hope to demonstrate by our conduct that every occasion of assisting and relieving the distressed, and contributing towards the obtaining of peace in a manner consistent with our peaceable profession, will be cheerfully improved by us, and even though a much larger part of our estates should be necessary than the heaviest taxes of a war can be expected to require, we shall cheerfully, by voluntary presents, evidence our sincerity therein.

This offer was made in reply to the charge that the Quakers were indifferent to suffering on the frontiers, and were refusing the payment of the war tax just levied, under a false plea of conscience.

The attempt to influence the Council was not successful, as indeed, since nothing new was

presented, it was hardly expected to be, "and after full consideration and debate all the Council [except Mr. Logan, who desired his dissent might be entered on the minutes] agreed that the Governor ought not to delay declaring war against the enemy Indians. The bounties for prisoners and scalps were then considered and agreed to."*

The efforts to avert war being unavailing, the association made its next attempt to detach some of the northern Delawares under Tedyuscung from the French alliance, and to conclude a separate peace with them. Several thousand pounds were raised, mostly by Friends, but partly also by Schwenkfelders and other sympathetic German bodies, to purchase presents to be distributed on the conclusion of peace.

The first step taken was to send a delegation of friendly Indians to express a desire for a conference. "From the time of the first messengers arriving at Teaogan (Tioga)," Israel Pemberton says, "hostilities on our northern frontier ceased, and an acceptable respite being obtained for our distressed fellow-subjects, we enjoyed so much real pleasure and satisfaction in the happy

* Colonial Records, vol. viii p. 84.

event of our endeavors as to engage us cheerfully to pursue the business we had begun, though many malicious calumnies and aspersions were cast upon us by persons by whom we had a right to expect encouragement."

Then followed a series of conferences, in which was much scheming at cross purposes. The Governor and Secretary Peters were most insistent to prevent any blame being attached to the Proprietors in connection with fraudulent purchases of lands. But Tedyuscung would not be refused, and whether drunk or sober adhered to his story of wrong, and demanded reparation. The Friendly Association, acting merely by sufferance, with nothing to gain for themselves, endeavored to be mediators, so as to secure justice to the Indians, and also to act as loyal subjects of the Government. Unquestionably the success of Tedyuscung, who trusted them implicitly as the "Sons of Onas," was due to their advice and suggestions, though he himself proved to be no mean diplomat. The Five Nations constituted another factor. The desire of the Governor was to use their influence to choke off the Delaware claims, while the Association sought to gain their help in encouraging peace propositions.

The first of these conferences was at Easton, in 1756. The Indians appeared to desire peace, but Tedyuscung was not secure in his authority, and needed time to bring other tribes into the arrangements. He was dined, and left in a friendly humor. The presents of the Friendly Association were, by direction of the Governor, (who at one time refused permission to the Friends to deliver any present to the Indians), finally given, with those provided by the government.

Later in the same year a meeting of the Friends was held at the house of Israel Pember-ton, and they adopted the following address to Governor Denny, who had just come into office:

The address of a considerable number of the people called Quakers, in the city of Philadelphia, for themselves and their brethren in other parts of the said Province, showeth that the calamities and desolation of our fellow-subjects on the frontiers of the Province having been the painful subject of our frequent consideration, with desires to be instrumental towards their relief by every means in our power consistent with the peaceable principles we profess, some of us had, by the permission of Governor Morris, some conferences last spring with some Indian chiefs of the Six Nations, from whence we are confirmed in our apprehensions that there was a prospect of some good effect by further endeavors to promote pacific measures with the Delaware Indians, on the northern frontiers of this Province.

That immediately after the conference Governor Morris sent a message to the Indians, in which he particularly mentioned our earnest desires to interpose with the Gov-

ernment to receive their submission, and establish a firm and lasting peace with them.

That from the accounts given us by the Indians who delivered this message, we were informed that the Delawares reposed great confidence in the continuance of our endeavors to that purpose, and after the receipt of a second message, some of them were induced to meet Governor Morris at Easton, and there laid the foundation of a more general treaty. That a considerable number of us attended the said treaty at Easton, and, from the conduct and express declarations of the Indians were assured that our personal attendance was very acceptable to them and conducive to the general service.

That in confirmation of the sincerity of our desires to promote the restoration of peace, we had provided a present of such clothing for these Indians as they appeared to be immediately in want of, which Governor Morris was pleased to deliver them in our behalf.

That as we are now informed, a much larger number of Indians are waiting to meet the governor at Easton. Being still desirous of promoting the restoration and establishment of peace with them, we are ready and willing, by personally attending the treaty, to manifest the continuance of our care and concern herein, and our hearty disposition to regain and improve the friendship of the Indians to the general interest of our country; and if our furnishing a supply of clothing for them against the approaching winter, in addition to what is provided at the public expense, may in any measure tend to these purposes and be consistent with the Governor's pleasure, we shall cheerfully provide and send them to the place appointed for the treaty, to be delivered them by the Governor in such manner as will most effectually promote the public service, and express our friendly disposition towards them. All of which is with much respect submitted to the consideration of the Governor.

The treaty which followed was not conclusive, but tended to draw whites and Indians together.

The king complained of the forged deeds of 1686, and of the Walking Purchase which had robbed his people of the ground where they now stood, and Secretary Peters admitted in private that the "Walk" could not be vindicated. "The Proprietors always despised it," he said, "and it was unworthy of any government." He was, however, unwilling to open the question, and the meeting terminated with nothing definite established. The Commissioners appointed by the Assembly, however, sympathized with the Indians and with the Friendly Association, and the aggressive secretary to the Governor was induced to yield his contention that there were no real grievances, only French intrigue. Presents were exchanged, and Tedyuscung, following the Friends to the ferry, told them "he had endeavored to turn in his mind and look up to God for direction; that when he was alone in the woods and destitute of every other counsellor, he found by doing so he had the best direction; that he hoped God would bless our endeavors, and wanted Friends to remember him. He followed us to the boat, and was so much affected he could only by tears manifest his respect." It would not have been difficult to preserve peace with

such a man, if any respectable treatment had been accorded him.

Another conference followed in Lancaster, in 1757, thus described in a letter from James Pemberton to Samuel Fothergill:

In the Fifth month last a treaty was held at Lancaster with a number of the Five Nations Indians, who had come down in consequence of an invitation from the Government to attend the proposed treaty with the Delawares, which was expected could have been held early in the spring, but that the old king (Tedyuscung), had not been able to accomplish his business of collecting the several tribes who were interested in the matter. The views of our politicians were greatly frustrated in the issue of that treaty, as they fully expected the Five Nations would have undertaken to have confirmed the land purchases and challenged the Delawares for their complaints, but on the contrary they avoided this and acted with as much policy and more candor than ourselves (our politicians). These poor people, after being long detained, much to their loss, many of the principal men, and some of those we could place the most confidence in, being taken off with the small-pox, yet went home pretty well satisfied, and great numbers of Friends attended this treaty from various parts of the country.

A more important conference was held later in the same year at Easton, where Tedyuscung had collected representatives of a large number of tribes who owned his sway. The Governor at first refused to allow the Friends to participate, alleging that they were trying to persuade the Indians to attach themselves to their own

particular interest, and that subjects had no right to treat with foreign powers. In reply to this they sent him a long address, rehearsing how they had endeavored to have the Indian grievances inquired into instead of raising soldiers and building forts against them, which had only aggravated the conditions, and that they still believed a peaceful policy the best in treating with them, and finally that Tedyuscung refused to go into the treaty unless the Quakers were to be there. They reminded the Governor that the first settlers were men of standing and property, who bought the land of the Proprietor with the understanding that he should clear up all titles, Indian and other; which agreement the first Proprietor had kept. They therefore had some right to know that the bargain was still intact, and that the present Indian claims on the land were satisfied.

The Governor still persisted in his refusal to permit them to give goods to the Indians, or to attend the treaty as a body. They went, however, and had an important influence on the result, with their £500 of presents.

Tedyuscung made the unexpected demand for a private clerk to take note of the proceedings; as he evidently distrusted—not without

cause, as was afterwards proven—the notes of the Governor's agents. This demand was opposed by the Governor, who spent four days in protesting, intimating that the Quakers were at the bottom of this request, which, indeed, was not unlikely. When the Indian firmly announced that he would break up the conference if the demand was not complied with, the Governor yielded, and Charles Thomson, a young man, then master of the Friends' public school of Philadelphia, afterwards the secretary of the Continental Congress, was made clerk to the old king. The Quaker schoolmaster performed an important part in the treaty, and afterwards wrote up the whole history of the "Alienation of the Delaware and Shawnee Indians" in a little book, which is still our highest authority on the subject.

The flow of debate and oratory was kept up uninterruptedly for nearly three weeks, and a treaty of peace resulted. Tedyuscung apparently having carried his point that the old deeds should be examined and his tribe récompensed for injuries done them. He was, however, deceived by the Governor, who did not produce the deeds the Indians most desired to have referred to the arbitrament of the Crown,

but others of minor consequence. The Friends failed to call Tedyuscung's attention to this error, fearful of its effects upon him, and hoping to prevail on the Governor to forward the proper ones.

The transaction was hardly calculated to secure a lasting peace.

James Pemberton, in a letter to Samuel Fothergill, under date of Fifth month 25th, 1758, gives an idea of the Indian condition after this treaty:

I herewith send thee a copy of the conferences which have been held with Tedyuscung this spring, by which it appears there hath been a favorable prospect of an agreeable issue to the prosecution of pacific measures, and if our government were but as hearty in endeavors as the old king appears to be, and as some of their speeches to the Indians would insinuate, we might, through the continued blessing of Providence, obtain a more extensive alliance and friendship with the natives than ever before. Our frontiers remained unmolested all winter. . . . The Indians are acting on as politic views, as our most sagacious statemen can be; they find it their interest to be at peace with us in regard to trade, and seem to have a natural dislike to the French, but are determined to have justice done them by the English on account of their land. . . . They (the Governor and Council) want the Indians to retract the complaint of fraud against the Proprietor or his agent, which they look upon as dishonorable, and I believe are now conscious of the truth of it.

The next step of the Friendly Association was to attempt to promote peace with the West-

ern Indians, and finding the Assembly were short of funds to send commissioners offered to loan the money. The proposition was accepted with the thanks of the House "for their friendly and generous offer." Though the House was composed of a minority of Friends only, it was always in close accord with the Association in Indian matters.

Still another treaty was held at Easton, late in 1758. Tedyuscung had enlarged his following, having with him about five hundred Indians. The apparent object of the meeting was to bring against him accusations of unfaithfulness by his old enemies, the Five Nations, from whom he had freed himself, and to induce him to withdraw his charges against the Proprietors. The attempt was a failure. "Ted," as James Pemberton calls him, maintained his stand, and the conference ended rather ingloriously by getting the Indians drunk, and extracting from them signatures to deeds conveying lands far in excess of their knowledge, and only partially paid for. A member of the Friendly Association writes: "The time was spent in attempting Tedyuscung's downfall, and silencing or contradicting the complaints he had made; but he is really more of a politician than any of his oppo-

nents, whether in or out of our Proprietary Council, and if he could only be kept sober might probably soon become Emperor of all the neighboring nations.”

To a certain extent these treaties were a part of the political game of the times. The Governor and Council, agents for the Proprietors, were engaged in an attempt to shield the reputation of their employers, and in this were seconded by part of the Five Nations. Undeterred by the obloquy of the Walking Purchase and the Albany Treaty of 1754, they were adding to their discredit and increasing their wealth by new offences. On the other hand the Commissioners of the Assembly unquestionably were not disposed to lighten the opprobrium, and were delighted in the skill and firmness of the old Delaware king. The Friendly Association, composed of men who had voluntarily sacrificed political power, though undoubtedly sympathizing with the Assembly, were seeking to undo the evils let loose by the bad faith of the Proprietors, and to restore harmony on all sides.

The Governor, in the name of the Council, sent a report, in 1758, to the Proprietor, which contained this paragraph:

We can not but impute the said Tedyuscung's making the base charge of forgery against the Proprietaries to the

malicious suggestions and management of some wicked people, enemies to the Proprietaries, and perhaps it would not be unjust in us if we were to impute it to some of those busy, forward people, who, in disregard of the express injunctions of His Majesty's ministers, and your Honors repeated notices served on them, would nevertheless appear in such crowds at the late Indian treaties, and there show themselves so busy and active, in the management and support of the Indians in those complaints against the Proprietaries.

The English Friends secured information of this report, and advised their Philadelphia brethren; and upon this the Meeting for Sufferings addressed the Governor, denying any desire to damage the Proprietors, and urging a wish, previously preferred, to examine the minutes of the Council to obtain material to clear themselves. This the Governor refused.

The paper they especially desired to see was a report investigating the complaints of Tedyuscung, afterwards printed in the Records of the Council.* It is a long report, going over the various causes of dissatisfaction, and defends the "Walk" and other matters of controversy, containing also the paragraph above quoted. Benjamin Shoemaker and William Logan, of the Council, declared the report had been sent without their knowledge, and that the first information they had of it came by way of London. It

* Colonial Records, vol. viii, p. 246.

was now for the first time ordered to be placed on the minutes.

In 1759 the Friendly Association, through Israel Pemberton, sent to Pittsburg two thousand pounds' worth of goods to be equitably sold or given to the Indians. Later in the year the British Government desired it to forward to the same place at its expense another consignment for a similar purpose.

The minutes of the later years of the Association are lost. Its life was probably extended till 1764, or, as some say, to 1767. Its representatives attended two conferences in 1762:—one at Easton with Tedyuscung, in which he was induced to withdraw his charge of forgery against the Proprietors, but still insisted that the "Walk" was not properly performed, and received a satisfactory compensation for his mulcted lands; the other at Lancaster, where a general peace with the Northern and Western Indians was concluded. It could not, however, prevent the great conspiracy of Pontiac, which, in 1763, renewed the war all along the colonial frontier, and exasperated the borderers against all Indians everywhere. When, at Fort Stanwix, in 1768, the final treaty was made which quieted the Indian question for the Colonial

period, the Association was no longer in existence.

One cannot well attribute other than humane and well-meant intentions to this Association. Its undertakings cost too much in time and money, and there was too little to be gained personally by its promoters, to allow us to suppose that selfish considerations entered into their motives. That their presents were often of doubtful advantage to the Indian may be admitted. Indeed, the best thing for the Indian would have been to place an impassable barrier between himself and the whites. But this could not be done, and, like the weak barbarian he was, he desired the good things of the white, and would not be satisfied without them.

It was something more than the forms of justice that he so tenaciously appreciated in the Quakers,—it was their effort to conform to his own ideas of justice. It may have been true that in the Albany purchase of 1754 the Proprietors' plan of buying of the sovereign without regard to the rights of the subject dwellers on the land was in accord with the recognized principles of law. It was not in accord with Indian ideas of fairness; and even in legal strictness the suzerainty was rather too faintly recognized to jus-

tify the sale of vast tracts, covering the entire property of whole tribes. It was, at any rate in Indian eyes, gross injustice, to be resisted by all means. William Penn would never have forced this purchase upon them. Had it been necessary to have their land he would have satisfied them as well as their feudal lords. The Friendly Association meant to follow the methods of the founder, and the Indians knew it.

The gain to the Province by a consistent course of fair dealing would have been immense. The friendship of the Indian would have been an effective buffer against French attack. The whites might have reposed in safety behind their red defenders. The troubles of finance and taxation, which created the hard feeling of the people against the Proprietors, would never have arisen, and the reign of peace and security might have had another twenty years of existence. The Quaker experiment of peace succeeded while Quaker justice to the Indian prevailed. When the Proprietors departed from this, peace departed and Quaker rule terminated.

But, even granting all this, it may be plausibly maintained that in the end the Quaker policy would have defeated itself. The tremendous immigration induced by the free principles of

government, and the security from savage attack, filled up the country at a rapid rate. Lands were cleared and hunting grounds vanished. What were the Indians to do? Labor was irksome, civilization they did not want, and their country was emptied of game. A greater problem than even William Penn solved was the inheritance of his sons, and even had they attacked it in the spirit of their father they might have failed. But we have learned something of the Indians since that day; and while we know they are unspeakably cruel in war, we have also ascertained that they are trustworthy to friends, faithful to treaties, and reasonable in meeting half-way any advances made in good-will. Hence we may believe that there would have been found some feasible right way to settle the Indian question in Pennsylvania in the last century without fraud or war.

CHAPTER III.

THE PAXTON RIOT.

Before leaving the Indian subject we must relate one other episode which greatly disturbed the serenity of Pennsylvania Quakerism.

Governor John Penn came into office in October, 1763. On the 19th of December he laid before his Council an address of welcome he had received from the Conestoga Indians. This once powerful tribe, which had treated with William Penn on his first arrival and secured from him permission to reside on his manor in Lancaster County, had now dwindled down to twenty poor Indians, who lived by making brooms and baskets and peddling them among their neighbors. Their address congratulated the new Governor, complained of encroachment upon their reservation, and asked for the customary provisions and clothing as a recompense for the loss of their hunting grounds.

At the same meeting of the Council was read a letter stating that on the 14th inst. six of these Indians—three men, two women and a boy—had been murdered in their homes, their bodies

mutilated and burned, with their houses, by a party of fifty or sixty white rangers.

The other fourteen were out selling brooms. They were quickly apprised of the danger that awaited them, and were hurried for protection to the Lancaster jail. A few days later the same band of whites galloped into the town in broad daylight, without any attempt at concealment, broke into the jail, butchered all the Indians, and rapidly and quietly rode away. These fourteen consisted of three men with their wives and eight children. The tribe was exterminated.

The outlaws who committed this act were a body of settlers from the north of Ireland, who were fiercely exasperated against all Indians. They lived at Paxton and Donegal, south of Harrisburg, and with their friends became afterwards known as "Paxton Boys." They were actuated partly by religious motives, quoting the command to the Israelites to destroy utterly the heathens of Palestine, but mainly they were madly desirous to avenge the sufferings of their friends at the hands of Indian invaders. Their pastor, John Elder, though he preached a militant Christianity in the pulpit, with his loaded rifle by his side, endeavored to restrain them when he found who were to be the objects of

their wrath. Either they did not respect him, or did not believe in his sincerity, for they moved him aside with a gun at his breast and went on.

There seems to have been little excuse for this outrage, except the general one so often urged since, that the only good Indian is a dead Indian. It was suspected that these Indians had given information to their brethren on the war path. One of them had been accused of killing a man. But these charges were not proven; and the German neighbors usually considered them as harmless if improvident mendicants.

The province was thoroughly aroused. A lynching was a new thing in Pennsylvania, and excited vastly more indignation than it would at the present time. Franklin wrote a vigorous and denunciatory pamphlet. Governor Penn issued two proclamations calling on the local authorities to enforce the law and offering rewards. Philadelphia and the eastern counties in general were shocked and felt that the province was disgraced.

This was not, however, the feeling where the deed was committed. The Paxton Boys gloried in their acts, and made no secret of them. Nothing could be done, for along the frontier

there was full sympathy with them, and no officials would have dared to touch them.

Emboldened by this sympathy they decided to extend their operations. A company of Indians had embraced Christianity through the efforts of the Moravians at Bethlehem, but as their loyalty to the English was somewhat uncertain, and their safety in any exposed position decidedly precarious, it was concluded to move them—one hundred and forty in number—to Philadelphia. Fearful, however, that they still might fall a victim to the enmity of their white persecutors, they were further transported to New York. There the Governor refused to receive them, and under the control of two companies of soldiers they were returned to Philadelphia and placed in barracks in what was then the northern part of the city, near the corner of Third and Green Streets.

The Paxton Boys, reënforced by stronger and steadier men who were deputed by border meetings to carry their grievances to Philadelphia, concluded to treat these Moravian Indians as they had those at Lancaster. If the Quakers defended them they were also to be murdered. It was to be a war of sects, with the Presbyterian and the Quaker in hostile array.

The motley crowd of perhaps five hundred men at the start, enlarged by popular report to ten times the number, soon passed over the ground from Lancaster to Philadelphia, and finding the ferries near the latter city over the Schuylkill guarded, and a heavy rain swelling the stream, crossed at what is now Norristown, and marched down to Germantown, where they encamped. They had apparently expected aid from their co-religionists in the city, but the affair partook too much of the nature of a riot and rebellion to command much sympathy among property-owners.

Great was the excitement in the Quaker City. The Governor called for defenders for the Indians, and the response was liberal. In the cold February weather the improvised citizen soldiery drilled through the day, fortified the Indian barracks, and slept at night subject to sudden call. On the 4th undoubted information of the approach of the rioters was received. It was a rainy and stormy day, but the inhabitants camped at the barracks. On the 5th, at midnight, an alarm was sounded. As previously arranged, candles appeared in every window, but the expected enemy proved to be only a body of Germans coming to the aid of the defenders.

On the 6th the citizens were still under arms, but the Governor sent a committee, including Franklin, whose conduct during the whole proceeding met with the highest approval of the Friends, to arrange terms of peace. There proved to be only about two hundred of the invaders, and they evidently had no chance against a whole city in arms, so they willingly presented their grievances and agreed to go home. Thirty of them took advantage of their proximity to see the town, and rode in. Immediately the alarm was sounded, and the valiant defenders again sprang to arms. The matter ended as a farce, without the loss of a drop of blood.

The demands of the rioters on the Government were that the Moravian Indians should be banished, and no others allowed to live among the whites; that no attempt should be made to have the Paxton boys tried in Philadelphia; that the border counties should have a larger representation in the Assembly; that the Province, instead of voting money to propitiate hostile Indians, should take care of wounded and suffering white men; and lastly, that the bounties for Indian scalps, which had been withdrawn, should be restored. Some of these demands were not unreasonable, but it is a melancholy record to

have to make that the last was the only one acceded to; that the grandson of William Penn offered rewards for scalps of male and female Indians.

Not only the Indians, but also certain prominent Friends, notably Israel Pemberton, were to fall victims to the invaders; at least James Pemberton was called out of meeting on the 5th and so informed, and such was the general belief. It is hardly to be wondered at that many of the younger Friends, and some of the older, should have armed themselves, with other citizens, to defend their wards in the barracks and their venerable elders in their homes. In the hot pamphlet war which followed much was made of the insincerity of the Quakers in their testimony against war, and it was felt by the meetings that a serious inroad had been made into the disciplinary bulwarks of their faith.

James Pemberton writes, Third month 7th, 1764:

Although the minds of many Friends were, I believe, preserved in a state of calmness, and our Quarterly Meeting was held to satisfaction, yet it was a matter of sorrowful observation to behold many under our name (it is supposed about two hundred) acting so contrary to the ancient and well-grounded principle of our profession, the testimony whereof suffered greatly on this occasion, and furnished our

adversaries with a subject of rejoicing who will make no allowance in our favor for the instability of youth, they who take up arms being mostly such who could scarcely be expected to stand firm to the testimony upon a time of so sudden and uncommon a trial, or such who do not make much profession. It must be acknowledged there is weakness subsisting on many accounts amongst us. I wish this probation may have a tendency to unite and increase the strength of those who are engaged for the honor of truth, that they may become instruments afresh qualified for the help of the weak by example and precept. One circumstance I must not omit, in regard to the use of the meeting house which may be liable to be misrepresented: On the second day of the inhabitants' mustering a heavy rain came on about ten o'clock, to which being exposed, some of them, not of our Society, requested liberty to take shelter in the meeting [house], which on consultation with some Friends was allowed, and it would have appeared an act of unkindness to refuse it, as it faces the court house and market place, which were likewise filled by other companies, and it had before been agreed, for avoiding the noise, to hold the youth's meeting of that day at one of the other houses.

There was unquestionably a considerable sentiment, led by James Logan in the previous generation, and cropping out in the association of Free Quakers in the next, which made a distinction between defensive and offensive war, and, loyal in other respects to Quaker thought and policy, justified war in protection of worthy causes. There was without doubt a number of those who took up arms against the Paxton rioters who were simply youths, carried away by the excitement of the time and the natural sense of

indignation against murderers and rebels, who gave but little thought to the ethical questions involved. Many of these afterwards reconsidered their position. The Edward Penington who led the Quaker company in 1764 was a different man from the Edward Penington who was banished to Virginia in 1777. But, as the following events showed, there were probably not a few who justified their action through all the disciplinary proceedings which the meeting now entered upon.

The monthly meeting of Third month 30th adopted the following minute:

The meeting taking under consideration the conduct of some members of our religious Society in the time of the late commotion in the city, and being desirous of administering suitable advice for the conviction of those who deviated from our ancient testimony in taking up arms on that occasion, of the inconsistency of their conduct in that respect, in consequence of the request of the Overseers for assistance in a Christian labor with such, appoints . . . [eleven names] . . . to confer with the Overseers, and proceed in the service of visiting the youth or others on that account, in such manner as on consideration they may judge most likely to answer the intent of such brotherly endeavors.

Three months later the Committee reported that "upon the whole they have met with a favorable reception from most of those who have deviated from our religious testimony, . . .

though some appear rather in a disposition to vindicate their conduct." The Committee was continued.

The next month they are rather more explicit, but are again continued.

We have in the strength and wisdom afforded us generally gone through that service, and endeavored to convince them of the inconsistency of their conduct with our religious profession, most of whom acknowledge they have acted contrary thereto, and some appear in a good measure convinced of their error in that case; and a few acknowledge they felt convictions for their so acting at that time, and some vindicate their conduct therein.

And a religious exercise hath attended many of our minds in the course of the service, on considering the manifest breach they have made and the necessity there is of maintaining our peaceable testimony against all wars and fightings, together with the different circumstances of those whom we have visited, many of whom were in their minority and appeared much unacquainted with the grounds of Friends' testimony herein.

Laid over for consideration.

The next month the meeting concludes:

After some time spent in consideration of the report of the Committee respecting their visit to such who, by bearing of arms in Second month last, deviated from our ancient testimony, and the sentiment of Friends expressed thereon, and great tenderness and compassion appearing towards them under their different circumstances, it is recommended to the said Committee to repeat their visit to the several delinquents, and to administer such further admonition as may occur to them to be necessary; and where they find any plead the rectitude of their sentiments and persist to vindicate their conduct in opposition to our

Christian testimony, and labor is rejected or not likely to avail to convince them of their error, to produce their names to the meeting, in order that such further measures may be taken as the honor of the testimony of Truth requires, and to inform them in general of the concern with which the Meeting is affected on their account, and the earnest desire for their restoration, and that they may experience future stability and watchfulness wherein the preservation of us all depends, and the said Committee, on performing this service, are desired to make report of their proceedings.

The results of the Committee's labors began to manifest themselves in individual acknowledgments of error and consequent restoration to favor.* The names, however, were not reported by the Committee.

Again, in Second month, 1765, the Committee report, classifying the offenders. Thirty-two of them were under age, have been carefully in-

*— — attended this Meeting with a paper expressing sorrow for his taking up arms in Second month last, and that it proceeded from the hurry and commotion which then attended and prevented sufficient time for reflection or opportunity of consulting with Friends on the occasion, and that the call of the magistracy for the suppression of a riot, which threatened murder to innocent persons and general disturbance to the city, prevailed with him at that time to join in a military appearance, but on serious deliberation he finds his conduct was wrong, and that all wars and fightings are antichristian, which being read, and favorable accounts being given by the Friends who have visited him of his disposition of mind, there is ground to hope what he offers proceeds from a motive of sincerity.

structed, and their case may now be considered closed. Of the others a number acknowledge their mistake; a second company are "jealous of the Quaker profession, but do not yet see their inconsistency"; while a third "wholly justify defensive war, in opposition to our religious Society."

In Fourth month the meeting advised them to drop the cases of those who seem repentant, and again directs the names brought forward of those "who contend against our peaceable testimony." This is not done, however, and the "labour" goes on from month to month, and other Friends from Philadelphia and elsewhere are added to the Committee.

In Fourth month, 1766, the meeting again suggests bringing in the names of the refractory, but it is not done. So the matter goes on, each month bringing a new report, till Fifth month, 1767, when the Committee finally reports that some are still unconvinced, yet they express a willingness and hope to be more guarded and circumspect in the future, so it is concluded not to send in any names. The meeting hopes that Friends will still labor "at every seasonable opportunity," and finally discharges the Committee. No one is "disowned," but the three

and one-quarter years of quiet and loving personal intercourse between the participants and a large and influential Committee doubtless had its great effect in strengthening the position of the meeting, though there are frequent evidences that there was then considerable discord among Friends.

Samuel Wetherill, writing shortly after, says that during the disturbance "Not an individual in the Society appeared to discountenance the thing," and adds:

There were divers conferences held on the subject, in which the members of the Society were divided in opinion; some thought they should proceed as the discipline directs, which requires an acknowledgement for such conduct, or that the Society should bear a testimony against the violators of the rule. But there were other persons, men of virtue or superior understanding, who could not proceed to condemn men for doing that which at the time of trial was generally approbated. These Friends prevailed over the others, and the business ended; had the sentiments of the other Friends prevailed the Society would have merited the highest reproach.

This was written after the author had taken, during the Revolutionary War, decided grounds in favor of the armed support of the American cause.

The whole question is important, because it had considerable influence in formulating views

for and against the propriety of Friends joining the independence forces a dozen years later.

If ever war could be advocated, or even palliated, here was a case. Defenceless Indians and worthy citizens were to be slaughtered by a body of border rangers who had shown their temper at Conestoga and Lancaster. The laws of the land were defied, and the constituted authorities called for aid. It might be considered simply as doing police duty to stand between the rioters and their victims; and after all, no one was hurt, and only a show of force was necessary.

Yet to the Quaker mind of the time it meant war, and not police duty. The distinction between the two was pretty well threshed out in the controversy between the Assembly and Governor Thomas, in 1740-42. Had a continued resistance been made, there would have been drilling and fighting, murder and devastation, hatred and vindictive feeling; and these men, who had so enthusiastically rushed to arms, would have been soldiers and not policemen.

There is usually—at least on one side, and often on both—an excellent excuse; and if the Quakers had any special testimony against war in itself it was necessary to maintain it even when the right was manifestly with them, as in

this case. To them war was not wrong because it was inexpedient or the occasion insufficient, but because it involved the killing of innocent as well as guilty; stealing from non-combatants as well as the enemy; lying and deception, and the reverse of all the precepts of the Sermon on the Mount. Because the Quaker believed in the Christianity of Christ, and was willing to follow it even against the dictates of seeming necessity, he must condemn war and the warlike spirit even when every consideration of right was on his side. And so while these grave Committeemen may have felt much secret sympathy with their sons and younger members, for whom they opened the meeting-house in the February rain-storm, they saw also pretty clearly that the vitality of their testimony to peace depended on their winning back their erring youth, and setting themselves right before a very critical body of fellow-citizens.

The Yearly Meeting took up the question in the autumn of 1764. Evidently it was an exciting subject, and all the solemnity of such a meeting was necessary to a grave and quiet consideration of its various phases. We have no record of the discussion, but the minutes simply

call for a general support of the Monthly Meeting in dealing with the offenders.

After a solid and weighty deliberation on the affecting occasion mentioned in the report from Philadelphia Quarter in respect to the deviation from our ancient peaceable testimony manifested by the conduct of several members of our religious Society in the time of the hurry and commotion which happened in that city in the Second month last, and a fervent concern at this time prevailing for the support of our Christian testimony in all its branches and for the restoration of those who have erred therefrom; in order for a more full and close consideration of what is incumbent on this Meeting to do on this occasion, it is recommended to Friends to labor to continue under the calming influence with which this sitting has been attended, that in the further deliberation on this subject the Meeting may be able to come to such result thereon as the honor of Truth at this time requires.

In a long letter to their London brethren, written within three weeks of the excitement, the Meeting for Sufferings details the Indian massacres and the events in Germantown and Philadelphia, and concludes:

During these tumults a few members of our Society were hurried, under the apprehension of immediate danger, to appear in arms, contrary to our religious profession and principles, whose example was followed by some of our youth, which hath been and is a subject of real concern to those who experienced in this time of trial the calming influence of that spirit which preserves in a steady dependence on the alone protection of Divine Providence, and we hope endeavours will be extended by those in the meekness of true wisdom, for the help and restoration of those who have thus erred.

When we consider the ferments which were then excited and prevailed, and the members suddenly brought together from different places in this state of mind, we have abundant cause with deep and reverent thankfulness to acknowledge and remember the merciful interposition of Divine Favour extended towards us, that thro' these commotions no lives were lost, nor personal injury done to any that we have heard of, and that the mischiefs which seemed for some time inevitable are for the present at least averted.

This day of probation happened on the day appointed for holding the Quarterly Meeting of this city and county, which nevertheless was attended by a large number of Friends, and we believe was a time of confirmation and comfort to many.

With desires that we may be preserved through these difficulties in faith and patience to the honor of our Holy Profession, and in much brotherly love, we salute you, and remain,

Your loving Fr'ds & Brethren.

The general sentiment was probably expressed in the following extract from a private letter of an English Friend of the time:

It was very affecting to find that so many under our name departed in such a sorrowful manner from our Christian principles as to take up arms. To be sure it was a very singular and extraordinary case, it being to oppose the progress of horrid murderers; the view of this, together with the suddenness of their being surprised and many of them exampled into it, ought to be considered; yet it is of very great importance to the whole Society that our truly Christian testimony to the government of the Prince of Peace, and against all wars and fightings, should be maintained inviolate, and I greatly hope and much desire Friends on your side may be favored with true judgement and real discerning to act properly in so deplorable a case.

The papers presented by the frontiersmen containing reflections on the Quakers, and the whole matter being a subject of public controversy, it seemed desirable to the Meeting for Sufferings to offer a public defense of their conduct in relation to the Indians. This they did in the shape of a letter to Governor Penn, dated Second month 25th, 1764.

To John Penn, Esq., Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Pennsylvania, etc. :

The Addresses of the people called Quakers in the said Province:

May it please the Governor :—

We acknowledge thy kind reception of our application for copies of the two papers presented to thee by some of the frontier inhabitants on the sixth and thirteenth instant, which we have perused and considered, and find several parts thereof are evidently intended to render us odious to our superiors and to keep up a tumultuous spirit among the inconsiderate part of the people. We therefore request thy favorable attention to some observations which we apprehend necessary to offer, to assert our innocence of the false charges and unjust insinuations thus invidiously propagated against us.

Our religious Society hath been well known through the British dominions above an hundred years, and was never concerned in promoting or countenancing any plots or insurrections against the Government, but, on the contrary when ambitious men, thirsting for power, have embroiled the state in intestine commotions and bloodshed, subverting the order of Government, our forefathers, by their public declarations and peaceable conduct manifested their abhorrence of such traitorous proceedings. Notwithstand-

ing they were subjected to gross abuses in their characters and persons, and cruel imprisonments, persecutions and some of them the loss of their lives, through the instigation of wicked and unreasonable men, they steadily maintained their profession and acted agreeable to the principles of the true Disciples of Christ. By their innocent, peaceable conduct having approved themselves faithful and loyal subjects, they obtained the favour of the Government and were by royal authority entrusted with many valuable rights and privileges to be enjoyed by them and their successors with the property they purchased in the soil of this Province, which induced them to remove from their native land with some of their neighbors of other religious societies, and at their own expense, without any charge to the public, to encounter the difficulties of improving a wilderness in which the blessings of Divine Providence attended their endeavours beyond all human expectation. From the first settling of the Province till within a few years past both the framing and the administration of the laws were committed chiefly to men of our religious principles, under whom tranquility and peace were preserved among the inhabitants and with the natives, the land rejoiced, and the people of every denomination were protected in person and property and in the full enjoyment of religious and civil liberty; but with grief and sorrow of some years past we have observed the circumstances of the Province to be much changed, and that intestine animosities and the desolating calamities of man have taken the place of tranquility and peace.

We have as a religious Society ever carefully avoided admitting matters immediately relating to civil government into our deliberations further than to excite and engage each other to demean ourselves as dutiful subjects to the King, with due respect to those in authority under him, and to live agreeably to the religious principles we profess and to the uniform example of our ancestors, and to this end Meetings were instituted and are still maintained in which our care and concern are manifested to preserve

that discipline and good order among us which tend only to the promotion of piety and virtue.

Yet, as members of civil society, services sometimes occur which we do not judge expedient to become the subject of the consideration of our religious meetings, and of this nature is the association formed by a number of persons in religious profession with us, of which on this occasion it seems incumbent on us to give some account to the Governor, as their conduct is misrepresented in order to calumniate and reproach us as a religious Society, by the insinuations and slanders in the papers sent to the Governor, and particularly in the unsigned declaration on behalf of a number of armed men on the sixth instant, when approaching the city from distant parts of the Province to the disturbance of the public peace.

In the spring of the year 1756, the distress of the Province being very great and the desolating calamities of a general Indian war apprehended, at the instance of the Provincial Interpreter, Conrad Weiser, and with the approbation of Governor Morris, some members of our Society essayed to promote a reconciliation with the Indians. Their endeavors being blessed with success, the happy effects thereof were soon manifest and a real concern for the then deplorable situation of our fellow-subjects on the frontiers prevailing, in order that they might be capable of rendering some effectual service they freely contributed considerable sums of money and engaged others in like manner to contribute, so that about 5,000 pounds was raised in order to be employed for the service of the public. The chief part thereof hath been since expended in presents given at the public treaties (when they were sometimes delivered by the Governors of this Province, and at other times with their privity and permission) for promoting the salutary measures of gaining and confirming peace with the Indians and procuring the release of our countrymen in captivity, and thereby a considerable number have been restored to their friends. We find that the measures thus pursued being made known to the King's Generals, who from time to time were here, and having

been communicated by an address sent to the Proprietaries of this Province in England, appear, by their written answers and other testimonials, to have received their countenance and approbation. This being the case and the conduct of those concerned in these affairs evidently contrary to the intent and tendency of the assertion contained in the said unsigned declaration, pretended to be founded on the records of the county of Berks, we do not apprehend it necessary to say any more thereon than that we are (after proper enquiry) assured that nothing of that kind is to be found on those records, and that the private minute made by Conrad Weiser of a report he had received from two Indians of a story they had heard from another Indian pretending to be a messenger from the Ohio, does not mention any person whatever nor contain the charges expressed in the declaration. From the enquiry we have made we find them groundless and unjust and uttered with a view to amuse and inflame the credulous to vilify and calumniate us.

The insidious reflection against a sect, "that have got the political reins in their hands and tamely tyrannize over the good people of this Province," though evidently levelled against us, manifests the authors of these papers are egregiously ignorant of our conduct or wilfully bent on misrepresenting us, it being known that as a religious body we have by public advices and private admonition labored with and earnestly desired our brethren who have been elected or appointed to public offices in the Government for some years past to decline taking upon them a task so arduous under our late and present circumstances. That many have concurred with us in this resolution is evident by divers having voluntarily resigned their seats in the House of Assembly, and by others having by public advertisements signified their declining the service and requesting their countrymen to choose others in their places, and by many having refused to accept of places in the executive part of the Government. We are not conscious that as Englishmen and dutiful subjects we have ever forfeited our right of electing or

being elected; but because we could serve no longer in those stations with satisfaction to ourselves, many of us have chosen to forbear the exercise of these rights.

The accusation of our having been profuse to savages and carefully avoiding to contribute to the relief and support of the distressed families on the frontiers who have abandoned their possessions and fled for their lives, is equally invidious and mistaken. We very early and expeditiously promoted a subscription and contributed to the relief of the distresses of those who were plundered and fled from their habitations in the beginning of the Indian war, which was distributed among them in provisions and clothing and afforded a seasonable relief. Divers among us in the city of Philadelphia also contributed with others the last summer, and we are well assured that money was raised and sent up by the members of our Society in different parts of the country, and as soon as we were informed that the greatest part of what had been voluntarily raised by the citizens of Philadelphia was nearly expended, a subscription was set on foot to which several very generously contributed and a large sum might soon have been raised and was stopped only on account of the tumult which hath lately happened. It hath been from our regard to our fellow-subjects on the frontiers and sympathy with their afflicting distresses, and a concern for the general welfare of the Province, that engaged our brethren to raise the money they applied to promote a pacification with the Natives and no separate views of interest to ourselves; but thus unhappily our most upright and disinterested intentions are misconstrued and perverted to impose on the weak and answer the pernicious schemes of the enemies of peace.

* * * * *

CHAPTER IV.

THE CONTEST WITH THE PROPRIETORS.

The departure of the Paxton Rioters left matters in a strained position in Philadelphia. While no considerable portion of the people dared openly to sympathize with them, it was the general belief that secretly many were hoping that a change of political ascendancy would be the result of the movement. A flood of criticism and abuse was launched at Benjamin Franklin and the Quakers, and for a few years there was a close political alliance between these rather discordant elements. Franklin was defeated for the Assembly this fall by a majority of twenty-five for his opponent in a vote of four thousand; and against the bitterest opposition of the Proprietary party, which hoped he was now permanently retired, he was sent to England to secure the transfer of the power to appoint Governors from the Proprietors to the King.

James Pemberton writes to Dr. Fothergill:

Dear Friend :

Phila., 10th mo. 11, 1764.

I wrote to thee last on the third and fifth ults., when I gave some account of the great industry here using by

our proprietary politicians against the day of election which is now passed, and they have so far succeeded in their unwearied endeavors of calumniating Benj. Franklin as to prejudice the minds of the lower classes of the people against him, by which, together with scandalous artifices, by a very small majority he is excluded from a seat in the present House of Assembly.

Altho' they have fallen short of their intended scheme, a great majority of the old members being again returned, yet they exult on this occasion, their enmity having been of late principally vented upon him, knowing his great abilities and long experience in public affairs render him the most formidable opponent to their ambitious schemes. It is not unlikely some of the chief of his enemies may be prompted to proceed as much further as their influence may extend to injure him in character and interest on your side by representing this occurrence an instance of his loss of favor with the people here in general; but that is far from being the case. They who know him are well assured of his integrity and retain a proper sense of his past services. No man in this Province has been so instrumental in promoting the public good; the most useful institutions we have among us may be attributed in great measure to his great understanding and disinterested regard for the benefit of this Province. I have had some opportunity of observing his conduct in public consultations, and although have necessarily been obliged to dissent from him in sentiment on some occasions, yet am well persuaded he acted upon motives justifiable to himself and a spirit of patriotism free from views mercenary or self-interested.

Matters were in a curious condition in 1764. There was a great attack by the opposition on the Quakers for managing the Province and controlling its politics. The Quaker meetings were at the same time using their utmost endeavors to prevent their members being chosen by large

popular majorities to any elective positions. This year, by strenuous efforts, they kept their membership in the Assembly down to sixteen, but the others that were elected, while not members of the Society, were very much in harmony with it on all political questions except the one question of military defence.

John Penn had been cordially received a year before as likely to be freer in his actions than the preceding Governors, and consequently more open to encourage movements which would unite the conflicting parties. Either from necessity or choice he followed another policy, and was in continual opposition to the popular will. The people finally became tired, and concluded to give up the attempt to secure their privileges by harmonious agreement with the Proprietors. By a large majority in the Assembly they adopted a resolution requesting the king to take the government to himself. Franklin was sent abroad to conduct the negotiation. Petitions went around for signature and were signed by most Friends. James Pemberton writes to Samuel Fothergill:

There hath been a long contest between our Assembly and the Governor in relation to a Supply Bill this winter, and as they attribute the occasion of their difficulties to Proprietary views of encroaching on the liberties of the

people, they formed several resolves protesting against the same, and adjourned in Third month last in order to consult their constituents about applying to the King to take this government under his immediate care and protection; in consequence of which petitions to this purpose have been handed about and signed by a great number of the inhabitants, and as I have been informed pretty generally by the members of our religious Society. To this they have been induced from various considerations, on one hand being tired with the repeated disputations between the Proprietors and the Assembly, and on the other the riotous conduct of the Presbyterians and their fearful apprehensions of their getting the legislative as well as the executive part of government into their hands.

Upon second thought there came doubts into the minds of many Friends whether after all it would be wise to run the risks attending the life of a Crown Colony. It would mean, in the first place, the loss of their venerable charter of 1701, under which they had so signally prospered, and which had been the object of so many encumbrances.

The Meeting for Sufferings, as the representatives of Friends, began to investigate the probable condition of their religious rights under the Crown. The prospect of an established Episcopal Church was only one grade if any better than the Presbyterian rule. They deputed a committee to interview the Speaker of the Assembly. By this time this body was becoming perhaps a little doubtful of its wisdom in press-

ing the change, though it had gone too far to draw back.

Two of the Committee appointed to apply to the speaker of Assembly of Pensilvania for information respecting their late proceedings, in the application they have made for a change of government, report that they were received kindly by him, and informed that directions were given to their agent to proceed cautiously in the matter, and if there appeared any danger of not retaining the religious and civil privileges the inhabitants now enjoy, to decline presenting the petition until he received further instructions from the Assembly, but that there appeared no likelihood of anything being done before the session of Parliament next winter.

One can sympathize with the desire of the people to be free from a system which gave to non-residents, whose pecuniary interests were not always identical with the civil interests of the people, the power to appoint and control the influential position of Lieutenant-Governor. On the other hand, the Friends were hardly prepared to sink into the political insignificance and precarious religious freedom of their English fellow-members. The Yearly Meeting, in which the drift evidently was towards entire non-participation in political affairs, advised that "this meeting doth not find freedom to join therewith [in the movement to dispossess the Proprietors], believing it to be most expedient for us in this

time of probation as much as may be to be still and quiet.”

If, however, the movement is to prevail, they desire their influential friends in London to see that their rights are protected, and the Meeting for Sufferings writes:

Matters appearing now to be advancing nearer to a crisis than heretofore, we think it necessary to acquaint you that the Assembly have lately addressed the King to take the government of this Province into his own hands and therewith have forwarded to London divers petitions to the same effect signed by many of the inhabitants, with instructions to their agent to proceed with prudence and caution in so important a matter.

This measure has not become a subject of deliberation in any of our meetings until now, when we find that many of our brethren have previously signed these petitions, and many others have not been free to do it.

After consideration of an affair of so great importance, the event of which being uncertain and unforeseen how nearly we may be affected thereby, we think it most advisable and safest for us to decline appearing in support thereof, nor do we choose to interfere further than our duty and interest appear to require, that in case this measure is likely to be carried into execution, to request and desire the continuance of your brotherly care and attention, to interpose with your influence, and as there may be occasion to represent our circumstances in such manner as you may judge most conducive for the preservation of those inestimable privileges which our ancestors obtained for themselves and successors, and which were a principal inducement to their removal from their native land, to encounter the danger, toil, and expense of improving a wilderness wherein their honest endeavors have been so signally blessed by Divine Providence, that the Province has engaged the admiration of strangers, and has been a retreat

to many, from the oppression and arbitrary power of foreign princes, whereby a great addition is made to the number of British-American subjects, nor are we conscious that by any conduct of ours we have forfeited our right to the enjoyment of them."

In a future letter they convey £100 "towards defraying such expenses as you may be subject to on account of any application on our behalf, to prevent our being deprived of our religious liberties."

Israel Pemberton gives his views on the subject in a letter to David Barclay on the 6th of Eleventh month, 1764.

Thou hast some years since had my sentiments of the leaders of the parties and their measures, and I wish I could on further experience think more favorably of most of them. The Proprietors have certainly been very unhappy in forming a wrong judgement of their real friends, and in rejecting the reasonable proposals of contributing toward the expense of cultivating friendship with the Indians before any rupture with them, and since, in contending first for an exemption from paying their proportion of the public taxes, and afterwards for the tax being laid on their estate in an unequal manner. Notwithstanding, the disposition of people of all denominations to renew a good understanding with their family was very evident on our present governor's arrival, and it would then have been in his power (if his disposition and capacity had concurred) to improve the opportunity of putting an end to all those controversies, but either through his weakness or the advice of evil counsellors, or both, this was omitted, and contrary measures pursued. The smallness of the Proprietaries' quotas toward the public taxes evinced that the mode of assessing was much in their favor, yet as soon as

new supplies were called for the fatal resolution again appeared of screening their estate from sharing an equal part of the burden. This, added to the resentment raised by omitting and evading a due inquiry into the conduct of the authors and perpetrators of the late inhuman massacres, and conniving at the continuance of their further wicked attempts, embittered the minds of people in general, and rendered the government so contemptible that all hope seemed to be lost of any alteration for the better, but by its being taken out of the hands of the Proprietaries. Those who had long wished for it were so industrious in laying hold of the occasion that while the ferment lasted numbers were drawn in to sign petitions to the king to take the government into his own hands, with whom many friends of this city were so imprudent as to join, and those who kept out of the snare had not time and strength sufficient to prevent others from being taken in. The exercise and close trial this brought on many friends hath been, and is, very great; yet it hath afforded a full opportunity to the Proprietaries and their agents to see that there are some of us whom no resentment of the most injurious treatment could sway to retaliate by joining in these measures. A redress of grievances was so necessary that we could not blame those who from the duty of their station sought it, but in doing it to endanger the loss of those liberties and privileges by which we had been distinguished appeared to us imprudent.

* * * * *

We expected the advice and conduct of Isaac Norris, who had many years been speaker of our assembly, would have had some effect, but in this we were also disappointed. Last summer, being in a weak state of body, and tired out with the tedious controversies with the governor, when he found the assembly in general determined in pursuing those measures, which he apprehended it unsafe to be accessory to, he chose to resign his seat. Some change being this year made in the assembly, and his state of health much recovered, as it was said the governor had instructions to make some concessions, he entertained hopes of promoting

a reconciliation, and restraining from precipitate measures. He then was induced to consent to accept of the speaker's seat again, but when he found the governor declined communicating anything toward a reconciliation, and that the majority of the present assembly were bent on pursuing the measures he had before disapproved, after giving the house his sentiments thereon, he again resigned his seat, and retired home heartily concerned for the unhappy circumstances of his country, which he could neither redress nor prevent, his salutary advice being rejected with contempt by those who formerly revered it.

Thus Benjamin Franklin is again employed on another negotiation. It is alleged by those who have urged it most that his knowledge and interest will do great service to the colonies by obtaining some alleviation of those inconveniences we are subjected to by some late acts of parliament; and the prevention of others with which we are threatened.

Nothing, I think, should be omitted which can be done to prevent Richard Jackson (the other agent), being misled by a notion that the prosecution of these measures is agreeable to the people of the Province in general, for tho' the dissatisfaction of the people with the conduct of the Proprietary agents is very general, yet the desire of preserving our constitution on its original basis is so deeply fixed that they would rather submit a little longer to these inconveniences, still being in hopes of redress; and they will not think those, their friends, who at this juncture risk the loss of it; and it was owing to a confidence in the majority of the present assembly having more deliberation on this important subject that numbers were induced to decline pushing for a greater change than was made, and many of us omitted voting, as we have done for several years past; it is ten years since I voted at all.

The aversion the Proprietaries and Franklin have to each other I am sensible will render the measures necessary for an amicable accommodation—difficult, yet, I hope, not impracticable, by the united assistance of such friends who may have some interest with them, if such who can influence the agent could prevail with them in a proper man-

ner to make such proposals as they think reasonable, and those, with such other friends as have weight with the Proprietaries, would engage them favorably to receive and calmly to consider what they may offer, and seriously to reflect on the importance of this crisis, by which the connection between them and the people seems likely to be determined.

When Franklin reached England, in December, 1764, he found no encouragement in the special mission to which he had been deputed, but much to do to protect his province and other provinces from the encroachments of King and Parliament. The movement that sent him was rather short-sighted and impulsive, and both he and his constituents were soon willing to cease to press it. Its main advantage was to secure at the English court an unrivaled diplomat to look after his country's interest in the trying pre-revolutionary days.

In a letter under date of April 22d, 1765, Israel Pemberton says: "Franklin has never presented his petition for change of government, and writes little about it." Richard Jackson, in a letter to the Speaker, says: "Dr. Fothergill and Mr. Brown have had several conferences with Mr. Penn, which will, I hope, have good consequences, but the attention to matters of general concern at present engage all our care

and vigilance so much that we do not think it prudent to do anything relative to the particular affairs of the Province.”

CHAPTER V.

PREPARING FOR THE REVOLUTION.

The series of events which immediately precipitated the Revolution began about the year 1764. The English Government felt that the losses incurred by the protection of colonial frontiers and expenses of colonial management justified an attempt to replenish the national treasury by colonial taxes. With the American opposition to this claim the Pennsylvania Quakers sympathized, and yet their opposition was tempered by their traditional attitude of obedience to the constituted government.

Being the leading merchants of Philadelphia, the Navigation Acts, limiting their trade to English countries and by English ships, were a great blow to their prosperity, yet they did not, nor did others, seriously protest. The prohibition of the exportation and manufacture of certain articles was also submitted to as properly within the range of English control. They would have nothing to do with smuggling, even objecting to their members purchasing goods so imported.

“ Are Friends careful not to defraud the King

of his dues?" was regularly queried in every Monthly Meeting, and a negative answer brought down the disfavor of the church upon the offending parties. The early years of English suffering, with the triumphant result of privileges gained by passive resistance to objectionable laws and active obedience to others, had not been forgotten. The ruling spirit, developed by almost a century of control, had made the Pennsylvania Friends more militant than their forefathers, but in their most representative members was the same deeply-rooted idea of obedience to every law which did not touch their consciences. They had none of the qualities of revolutionists.

When in 1765, the Stamp Act was passed, Philadelphia vigorously entered into the movement against its enforcement. She drove away the officers, and agreed to absolute non-importation of British goods as most likely to bring the home government to terms. Franklin, from England, counselled submission, but his voice was not heeded in the outbreak.

Many Friends were in the movement. The names of over fifty of them were on the non-importation agreement, including Israel and James Pemberton, and other prominent members in the

meeting. There they naturally belonged. For nearly a century they had been supporting the cause of liberty against King and Proprietor. They held to a large extent the confidence of the people, and their merchants were in the best position to take an effective part. Moreover, an agreement not to import did not necessarily involve any disobedience to law, and was quite a Quaker method of resistance. So far as this was concerned there seems to have been general unanimity.

They thought it necessary to explain to their London Friends how far they would go in the matter of resistance, and wrote as follows:

To the Friends of the Meeting for Sufferings in London:

The general discontent which hath appeared in several colonies on the imposition of duties for the purpose of raising a revenue, hath sometime past been publicly known, and that the people have been uniting by various methods to avert the consequences of being thus taxed without their own consent. In Pennsylvania so large a number of the people are inclined to moderation that the public deliberations and measures have been concluded in such manner as to evidence our desires to convince our superiors of our resolutions to sue for redress in a manner becoming our inferior stations; but it was not without much difficulty a steady perseverance in these moderate measures was maintained, and when it appeared that the Parliament, in their last sessions, were not likely to repeal the laws which occasioned such discontent here, the earnest importunity raised by many in Philadelphia to have some further steps taken so far prevailed that many of the merchants and tra-

ders in this city were induced to enter into an agreement not to import most kinds of the English manufactures until these laws are repealed. This was thought by many a measure which the circumstances of the people rendered necessary, as they were already too deeply indebted, and that by it more frugality and economy might be enforced and observed among us. The expediency of the measure being generally allowed, the particular terms of the agreement were not attended to with so much deliberation as it now appears was necessary; and thus numbers subscribed to them without considering the force and tendency of some of the articles; and a committee being necessary to conduct this business, and many of the parties, having more confidence in Friends than in others, nominated some of our brethren to be of that committee, and even went so far as to name some that were not there nor have since entered into their agreement, and some of those Friends who consented to it have declared their views to be the hope of prevailing by their advice to have such measures pursued as would be consistent with the public interest without violating the rights of individuals. Some months passed before anything occurred to show them the difficulty they had thus subjected themselves to; but by the arrival of a vessel here lately from Yarmouth, laden with malt, they have been brought to see and feel it. And the apprehensions we have that the conduct of our brethren may be misrepresented induces us, after weighty and deliberate consideration, had at several meetings, and enquiry into the affair, to acquaint you. It appears that when this vessel arrived, and the merchant to whom she was consigned applied to several of the committee for advice respecting the landing of the cargo, they informed him they thought he might without offense land it, but in a general meeting of the committee such a difficulty ensued that, contrary to the opinion of some of the Friends who were present, as they have informed us, it was decided to call a meeting of the inhabitants of the city in the State-house; at which meeting such resolutions were hastily taken as determined the captain to take his cargo from hence to

Ireland. Our monthly meeting happened before the captain sailed, and the Friends who attended it, being deeply affected on the consideration of this afflicting case, and desirous of preventing if possible the evil consequences of it, appointed several of us to confer with our brethren who were of that committee, and afterwards to converse with the captain and merchant. The Friends of the committee appeared fully convinced of the imprudence of thus assuming the authority to call together the people, the greater part of whom were incapable of judging prudently on a matter of so great importance; and, therefore, they have been determined not to be drawn in again to assent to such a proposal. Our conference with the captain, we hoped, tended in some measure to remove the prejudice he might go away with against the people in general, as we assured him of the anxiety and pain Friends in general and the more considerate and judicious of all denominations were under on his account, and as we thought it not impracticable for him still to land his cargo he so far followed our advice as to apply again to the committee of merchants who met in pursuance of his desire, but, after receiving their answer and consulting with his merchant, he thought proper to go from hence with his cargo for Cork in Ireland. There have been several meetings of the committee, and a general meeting of the parties to the agreement, at which resolutions have been taken which manifest the dangerous tendency of contributing to the support of such associations, and, as some of those Friends who were on the committee have declared their disapprobation of these measures, and Friends at the monthly meeting of Philadelphia generally united to advise their members wholly to withdraw from and keep out of them, we are in hopes such further occasion will be avoided as may subject us as a religious society to any censure from our superiors, as we desire to approve ourselves both in principle and practice dutiful, affectionate and loyal subjects to the King, and peaceable members of civil society, firmly believing that as we live in that love which is graciously shed "abroad in our hearts through Jesus Christ," and renewed in us in

these times of probation, we shall be preserved on the true foundation and experience, "all things to work together for our good."

To the influence of Friends is doubtless due the fact that the remonstrance of Pennsylvania was a moderate though firm protest against the Stamp Act, unaccompanied by any of the rioting which prevailed in most of the other colonies. The merchants of Philadelphia united in an appeal to their fellow merchants of London to use their influence to secure its repeal. This attitude probably counted for more than the frantic attacks of New England. Indeed, as Dr. Fothergill writes, "Nothing has created so great difficulties to your friends or furnished your opponents with so many arguments against you as the tumultuous behavior of too many on your side of all ranks. The Parliament saw its authority not only rejected, but despised, opposed and insulted. What difficulties has not this madness occasioned to all who endeavored to serve you?" Men of Anglo-Saxon blood find it difficult to retreat from an untenable position in the face of bluster, but are often open to fair and reasonable expostulation. It may be an interesting speculation to consider the results which would have followed if instead of hot

words and armed resistance, the encroachments of Britain had been met with passive refusal and dignified remonstrance. This method is successful in private life, and better achieves its results than brag and threatenings. Perhaps it would be so in public affairs also.

The American people were very determined. "Many of the people here and generally in the eastern provinces declare they will be content with nothing less than a repeal of the Act, or a suspension of its execution, and some foolishly boast of their ability and determination to oppose any force that may be sent to enforce it; to such a height of infatuation are they already advanced," writes James Pemberton, then just elected to the Assembly by the city of Philadelphia. It was the Presbyterian element which most thoroughly sympathized with the spirit of New England resistance, and against which Pemberton had carried the election. His success in such a trying time was a pledge of the conservatism of Philadelphia.

The "Stamp Act Congress," which met in New York just after the passage of the obnoxious measure, issued most able addresses to King and Parliament, and a Declaration of Rights. None of these suggested disloyalty, and yet ten

years before the outbreak of hostilities, the violent men were threatening forcible resistance and growing confident of its success. James Pemberton was not exactly satisfied with the doings of the Congress. "The business of the late Congress in New York was not concluded with that concord and unanimity which the occasion required, and therefore I do not find much dependence is placed on the issue of their proceedings."

While Friends joined in the non-importation movement, the forcible ejection of the King's officers was too great a stretch of disobedience to be encouraged. The responsible members publicly and privately advised their younger friends to keep out of the commotion, and the Yearly Meeting thought it a suitable time to revive George Fox's counsel of 1685:

Whatever bustlings or troubles or tumults or outrages should rise in the world keep out of them; but keep in the Lord's power and in the peaceable truth that is over all, in which power you seek the peace and good of all men, and live in the love which God has shed abroad in your hearts through Jesus Christ, in which love nothing is able to separate you from God and Christ.

The resistance of the Americans of all sorts prevailed, and the Stamp Act, after a life of about a year, was repealed. Pitt thundered

from his sick bed in the House of Commons, "I rejoice America has resisted."

The London merchants were strenuous for repeal, fearing not only the temporary destruction of their trade, but the industrial independence of America, and with a majority of over one hundred the Act went down. Great was the rejoicing in the colonies. William Pitt was the hero of the day, and many a statue was proposed in his honor. Even the King enjoyed a little brief popularity.

Dr. Fothergill sent over to James Pemberton advance intelligence of the good news.

By the clemency of the King, the steadiness, ability and application of the present ministry, the moderation and humanity of the House of Commons, I hope the Stamp Act is in a fair way to be repealed, your other difficulties removed, and your commerce restored to a better footing than ever.

Yet he foresaw that the triumph of the Americans would not make for good feeling if they did not restrain themselves.

From the prompt impetuous temper of the Americans much is to be feared, unless those amongst them who are guided by reason and reflection immediately interpose. Demonstrations of joy carried beyond a certain point will be most certainly fatal to both countries, and no person can better serve them than by repressing them.

If P[itt] has pleaded your cause most strenuously, don't therefore crown him King of America. If G[eorge]

G[renville] has opposed you to the utmost stretch of his abilities, don't consign him to be hanged in effigy at every town's end.

So, forewarned, Pemberton and his friends set themselves to work to moderate the expressions of joy of the people. The Assembly sent a dignified declaration of their gratification to the King. The exuberance of the popular demonstrations of New England and New York was very much toned down in Philadelphia, and the Assemblyman could write:

The minds of the people of this Province are greatly settled, and a favorable prospect offers of a more firm union between us and the mother-country than heretofore. Many essays were making towards erecting manufactures of different kinds to which necessity seemed likely to compel. The spirit for it abates, and improvements in agriculture will take place, being most natural to the genius and situation of the inhabitants where the price of labor is so high as with us.

The Quaker method of resistance to the Stamp Act embraced quiet and legal opposition, dignified protest, and moderate expressions of gratification.

Three men wrought together most unitedly in this matter, and in several similar ones in the ten years to come,—Franklin, Fothergill and Pemberton. Franklin was considered by all to be extremely judicious and conservative. His sci-

entific attainments were the wonder of the world; his diplomatic skill was unquestioned, and his qualities as a municipal and provincial legislator were unexcelled by any one since the death of Isaac Norris. He was bitterly hated by the proprietary party, and everything to his discredit was made the most of. It was even reported that he had betrayed his country, and had advised the passage of the Stamp Act. He counselled submission, and secured a place as collector for a friend, but the charges of disloyalty are manifestly untrue.

Pemberton wrote to his English friends, enclosing a memorial from "a number of sober and religious disposed Germans of the Society called Swingfelders," which appears to have been a testimony to Franklin's character, and asking his correspondents, Dr. Fothergill and Henton Brown, to give information of Franklin's assiduity in serving his constituents. They reply a few months later:

We can safely aver, from our own knowledge as well as from the testimony of many persons here of undoubted character and reputation, that Benjamin Franklin was so far from proposing the stamp act, or joining with it in any manner, that he at all times opposed it, both in word and writing, tho' in vain, as neither his nor any other endeavor could influence the then ministry to relinquish the design.

But if any doubt of his diligence or sincerity in this respect had remained, the evidence he gave before the House of Commons on the occasion of the bill for repealing this act was such as to remove every scruple of the kind. For the information he gave the House, the distinct, judicious and convincing proofs he laid before them of the impropriety of the stamp act, we believe, had considerable influence with the Parliament.

In respect to the commission with which he was charged from the Province of Pennsylvania, we can assert of our own knowledge that he has endeavored, both by admitting friendly mediations and by pursuing more vigorous measures when these proved unsuccessful, to discharge his duty most uprightly to his constituents.

And it should rather be attributed to the singularly unfavorable position of affairs both at home and in America, than to the want of industry and address, that he has not hitherto succeeded in his negotiations.

We hope this attestation will fully satisfy Dr. Franklin's friends, and enable them to do his character that justice which we think his steady attachment to the interests of America in general, and of his own province in particular, deserves.

We also find Pemberton in a friendly way advising Franklin to write more frequently to the Committee on Correspondence of the Assembly, even if there is nothing to say, in order to show his activity and interest in his commission and to stop criticism.

Dr. John Fothergill was a man to whom America owes a strong debt of gratitude for the work he attempted and partly accomplished in her cause. He was a Yorkshireman, a Quaker

by birthright, a graduate in medicine of the University of Edinburgh, who began practice in a humble way in London. His great abilities, his courtly manners, his fidelity to his profession, brought to him a most lucrative practice from the nobility and wealth of the capital. Though chronically overworked in his profession, his large public spirit kept him continually engaged in a variety of philanthropic and political movements of an unsectarian character. His access to the influential men of England, many of whom were his patients, gave him great opportunities for advancing anything he had at heart.

As one of the great botanists of his day he was brought into association with many Americans of note. John Bartram and Humphrey Marshall were his collectors. Owing the best stocked botanical gardens in the world, except only the Royal Gardens at Kew, he sought to introduce into his country every valuable plant from all over the world. His botanical interests constituted a strong tie with America. Another was his Quaker acquaintance, gained by the religious travels of his father and brother, both ministers, in the colonies. Then he was for a long time a clerk of the Yearly Meeting, and a prominent member of the Meeting for Suffer-

ings. In this way he had abundant opportunities for intimate acquaintance with American conditions and with English political tendencies, and used all for the furtherance of good understanding and good will. With James Pemberton as an ally in Philadelphia, and Franklin as a diplomatic go-between, the trio wrought at many an international problem, and essayed some that were too difficult for their solution.

His most useful co-laborer was David Barclay, the grandson of the Apologist, and the two, with Franklin, as we shall see later, made an attempt, which for a time seemed hopeful, to settle the difficulties between the mother-country and the colonies. Franklin says of him: "I doubt whether there has ever existed a man more worthy than Dr. Fothergill of universal esteem and veneration." And again: "If we may estimate the goodness of a man by his disposition to do good, and his constant endeavors and success in doing it, I can hardly conceive that a better man has ever existed." Upon hearing of Dr. Fothergill's death, in 1781, he wrote to David Barclay: "I condole with you most sincerely on the loss of our dear friend, Dr. Fothergill. I hope that some one who knew him well will do justice to his memory by an account of his life

and character. He was a great doer of good. How much might have been done, and how much mischief prevented, if his, your and my joint endeavors in a certain melancholy affair had been attended to." * It is one of the best testimonials to Franklin's character at this time that the esteem was reciprocated.

The following letter of James Pemberton to Dr. Fothergill will give an idea of the political condition of the Province after the repeal of the Stamp Act, and of the rivalry of the sects. It shows evidence of the growing *rapprochement* of the Friends and Episcopalians, which became pronounced in the few years immediately preceding the Revolution:

I am unwilling to neglect this opportunity of transmitting thee some account of our present circumstances, though a minute detail of occurrences relating to our public affairs may be rather tedious than interesting.

* The standing of Fothergill in Pennsylvania is shown by an abstract from a letter of Samuel Purviance, Jr., September 10th, 1764. He says in reference to the activity of Friends in urging the abolition of proprietary government: "Last night, John Hunt, a famous Quaker preacher, arrived from London in order, it is believed, to give Friends a rap on the knuckles for their late proceedings; and it is said a brother of the famous Fothergill will immediately follow on the same errand, tho' their great sticklers have, by numerous falsehoods, propagated a belief that their friends at home highly approve of their measures." —Shippen Letters, p. 206.

It gives the true friends to the Province much satisfaction to find our address, and those from the other colonies, on the repeal of the stamp act, were approved and well received, and that the conduct of the people has not furnished occasion of uneasiness to our friends or triumph to our opponents on your side, from which we flatter ourselves the ensuing session of Parliament may produce a further redress of our grievances; a repeal of the act prohibiting an emission of paper currency is an object of our particular attention. Long experience has given the most undeniable proofs of the advantage of that currency to the people of this Province in promoting cultivation, commerce, and defraying the exigencies of government, the want of which medium reduces the people to extreme difficulties to fulfill their contracts; the business of the lawyers is greatly increasing, plantations frequently selling by execution at less than one-half the value which they brought a few years past, and the complaints from all quarters daily increasing; the public debt accumulating to a great sum and no means to discharge it, but by adding to the taxes, which are already very burdensome to the laborious part of the people; so that unless we are relieved in this matter our situation must inevitably be very distressing, and those of inferior circumstances fall under subjection to the power of the rich. Our assembly of this year have renewed their instructions to the agents, warmly to solicit this matter to the Parliament, in which we hope they will be supported by the respectable merchants of your city, whose interest is intimately concerned therein.

The sessions of the assembly of last year concluded satisfactorily. I have sent thee, per John Morton, a young man passenger in this ship, the minutes for thy amusement at a leisure hour. Our late election approached without much previous stirring on the part of the Presbyterian party, until a few weeks before the day, when some letters written by the stamp master of this city to London, said to be sent from thence, appeared in one of our public papers, in order to excite a clamor and rouse them on the occasion, but failed of answering all the purposes intended by the

publishers; the most considerate of the party, despairing of success, had given over an intention of moving, the falsehoods propagated against Franklin being cleared away, and the conduct of the assembly furnishing no fresh occasion for clamor. They at length concluded to attempt the change of one member in this country, Jos. Galloway, concerning whom they alleged he had written in favor of the stamp act; in opposition they set up Dickinson, his former opponent, which, it is said, was encouraged by a few of our friends, but in this scheme they failed much beyond their expectation, and my colleague of last year, who I thought a valuable member in the house, tho' accounted to be of the proprietary part, refusing to serve, they prepared to keep Dickinson for a burgess in opposition to another, Lawyer Ross, but again failed, the latter being elected after a smart struggle, which may be attributed in some measure to the serviceable law we obtained last winter, which I wish to see confirmed by royal authority, as it will prevent a great deal of swearing and foreswearing and the shameful impositions to which our elections have been heretofore subject.

The present assembly being, all but three, the same members as last year, met, pursuant to charter, on the 14th ulto., and proceeded on the business appearing necessary at that time, having first chosen a new speaker (Galloway), whose qualifications must be allowed superior to the former speaker (Fox), but as there appeared too much of a spirit of party, as I apprehended, I could not join therein; the choice has been an occasion of speculation among the people, but I hope will not be attended with much ill consequence; tho' I avoid mixing with the multitude in their discussion of political points, thinking it safest to remain unbiased in my judgment and endeavoring to pursue what I apprehend will promote the general good as far as I am capable to determine and may be assisted by wisdom superior to my own, which I find as necessary to be attended to in that station as in business which may be looked upon as of a more religious nature.

The people of the increasing society (Presbyterians) who

have been of late very active in our political affairs, finding their forcible measures fail of success, begin now to make professions of regard and friendship, urging moderation and a union of the dissenters in opposition to the power of the established church, being greatly alarmed at the apprehension of a bishop being fixed in America, which they foresee must tend to lessen their power and number, there being the utmost reason to expect many of their preachers will gladly embrace an opportunity of accepting a benefit at the expense of others or the public.

The vast increase of these people upon the continent must in great measure be attributed to the too apparent neglect of the Church of England, who, to the dishonor of their profession, have so little regard to the morals of the persons they appoint to the office of clergymen. Had they been careful to send over men who had a due regard to the cause of religion, or at least such who are careful to support a moral character, and promoted the erecting of worship houses as the country increased in inhabitants, many of the present generation, whose fathers were of the Church of England, might have been prevented from being educated in the bigotry of Presbyterianism, and until the bishops are more in earnest to promote their society in these parts it will continue to make a poor figure; on the contrary a moderate care to employ men of sobriety and exemplary conversation will be the most rational human means of retarding the rapid progress of the others, who are indefatigable in promoting the cause of their sect, watching all opportunities of sending out the young preachers from the college of this city, New Jersey, and an academy in the lower counties, providing places for them to erect schools and meeting houses in all parts of the several provinces where they can hear they are wanted; and it must be allowed the synods are careful to promote such men who are at least careful in their moral conduct, by which means they obtain an influence in their neighborhood, and draw numbers to them who would prefer the Church of England as a more fashionable profession had they the opportunity; others, again, are filled with zeal or passion,

thundering out anathemas, by which they captivate some and frighten others to believe them to be true ministers of the Gospel.

When the Stamp Act was repealed, it was accompanied by a declaration of right to lay further taxes of a similar nature. In the great joy and triumph of the repeal this was overlooked. But the ministry were determined not to allow America to forget that she was a subject bound by any laws which the parent country might choose to enact. Evidently there was no sympathy or aid to be looked for, and the best to be expected was neglect. William Logan, writing from London, Sixth month 21st, 1768, says:

You may conquer the Indians, but that conquest which accompanies carnage and the ruin of a few helpless savages is inconsistent with the humanity which is the characteristic of a British soldier. Whatever misfortune you are involved in, you will find no country less ready to assist you than the English; they despise and hate you, and I am apt to think that they would see your country depopulated, your trade ruined and themselves reduced to the greatest extremity rather than try to avert the misfortune. The Boston papers have been foolishly irritating, and have greatly hurt you, for the greatest number of the people in this metropolis are so ignorant of common geography that they often jumble Philadelphia, New York and Boston into towns of the same country, or else separate them into islands as far distant from each other as Minorca from Jamaica.

Hence followed a succession of irritating and futile efforts to squeeze a little revenue from

America during the succeeding ten years, till America was brought to the point of fighting. The Philadelphia Friends were too clear-sighted not to be aware of the inevitable drift. Again and again Pemberton and Fothergill, in perfect sympathy with each other, urged the objections to the foolish course of the English Ministry, and the hot-headed and illegal resistance of many of the colonists. The meetings were insistent in advising obedience to laws which did not touch conscience, and restraint and moderation in protest. They had all they could do to keep their younger members in line, and many broke away. Nor do the Friends seem to have lost their political influence in the state, but down to the very dissolution of the Assembly, in 1776, their spirit was felt in its conservative course.

Through these pre-Revolutionary days no man's influence was more important than that of John Dickinson. He was the son of a planter whose home was on the eastern shore of Maryland, a Quaker by several generations of inheritance. The father was ambitious that his boys should be well educated, and, apparently for this purpose, bought a large estate near Dover, in Delaware, and removed there in 1740, when John was eight years old. Here he became

judge of the county court and a man of prominence. For the next ten years the boy was under the care of a tutor, who filled his mind with high ideals and aided him to secure an English style remarkably simple and elegant and effective, which no one of that day of involved phrases, except perhaps Franklin, equalled, and which made him easily "the Penman of the Revolution."

Ten years then followed of close historical and legal study, in the Philadelphia office of the first lawyer of his day, in the Inns of Court in London, and again in Philadelphia in his own modest start at practice. His well-trained, logical mind, his conservative and orderly tendencies, his Quaker associations, made him a valuable recruit to the cause of moderate resistance which distinguished the Pennsylvania colonists. There is a basis of legality in the efforts of the Quaker colony, easily distinguishable from this time forward, which is due to his training and natural proclivities, which especially marks it when contrasted with the more impetuous appeals to the rights of man which the New Englanders made the grounds of opposition to English encroachments.

His association with Friends was probably, at least in early life, not much more than nominal.

We do not find him interested even in the business affairs of the Society, and, what was something of a test in those days, his letters even to his mother were not written in Quaker language. He was a soldier through the Revolution, yet there is apparently no record of his "disownment," though that fate befell many of his fellows, nor did he apparently have anything to do with the "Free Quakers." Yet in his later life he was closely associated with Friends, and was probably a member. The son of his friend, Chief Justice Read, writes of him: "I have a vivid impression of the man, tall and spare, his hair white as snow, his face uniting with the severe simplicity of his sect, a neatness and elegance peculiarly in keeping with it; his manners a beautiful emanation of the great Christian principle of love, with that gentleness and affectionateness which, whatever may be the cause, the Friends, or at least individuals among them, exhibit more than others, combining the politeness of a man of the world familiar with society in its most polished forms with conventional canons of behavior. Truly he lives in my memory as the realization of my beau-ideal of a gentleman." *

* Stillé's "Life of John Dickinson."

John Dickinson's main interests were political rather than legal, and for a political career he had equipped himself by a painstaking preparation in historical and logical study. In 1760 he was made a member of the Delaware Assembly, and two years later, at the age of 30, of the Pennsylvania Assembly.

The great question then agitating the people was the conduct of the Proprietors. In a spirit of disgust at their haggling policy the Assembly had brought in resolutions petitioning the King to take the government upon himself. The people appeared nearly unanimous for this measure. The Quakers were generally in their favor. The Presbyterians for once sided with their peaceful opponents, because they felt the difficulties of defending the frontiers while the Proprietary estates were exempt from taxation. It required some courage for even the veteran Isaac Norris to stem the tide. But to the young student of history and law, with his place to make with the people, there was not a little fortitude needed to espouse the unpopular cause. In an elegant and cogent speech he made, not a defence of the Proprietors, whose conduct he admitted to be indefensible, but a plea against the worse evils of royal government to which they were exposing

themselves. He pleaded for the old charter and the liberties it gave them, and asked if in any of the royal colonies there was more real freedom. He hinted at a possible church establishment and a standing army, and pertinently asked whether the Crown had not supported the Proprietors in their worst claims. "In seeking a precarious, hasty, violent remedy for the present partial disorder we are sure of exposing the whole body to danger."

Few would say in the light of following events that Dickinson was wrong. The Proprietors were better masters than the King would have been. So far, however, as immediate effect was concerned, the virtues of Norris and the argument of Dickinson, who afterwards became his son-in-law, were futile. The Assembly adopted the resolutions by an overwhelming vote, and sent Franklin to England. Dickinson lost his place in the subsequent election, and did not regain it till 1770, when the people began to appreciate the wisdom of his position.

When the attempt was made to impose the Stamp Act upon America, John Dickinson found himself in close accord with popular sentiment. He framed the plan of protest which was adopted by the Stamp Act Congress in 1765, appears to

have been the author of its "Declaration of Rights" and "Petition to the King," and also a draft from which the resolutions adopted by the Assembly of Pennsylvania were largely taken. A few weeks later he aroused public sentiment by a vigorous protest, published anonymously. "Rouse yourselves, therefore, my dear countrymen. Think, oh! think of the endless miseries you must entail upon yourselves and your country by touching the pestilential cargoes that have been sent to you. Destruction lurks within them. To receive them is death: it is worse than death—it is slavery. If you do not—and I trust heaven you will not—use the stamped papers, it will be necessary to consider how you are to act." He wrote the Liberty Song, which went over the country like fire, and which contains at least one line that will never be forgotten, the watchword of the Revolution—"By uniting we stand, by dividing we fall."

During the ten years to come his pen was not idle. No other person in America gave a greater stimulus to resistance, and no other person showed so clearly the lines on which resistance was justifiable, and likely to be successful. The crown of his reputation and influence was reached by the publication of the "Farmer's Let-

ters" in 1768. These are the appeals of a statesman, not a demagogue, to conserve the liberties which Englishmen have always considered their due, by methods which Englishmen have found successful in the past. Unqualifiedly rebuking the tyranny which had attempted to impose on America the duties on paper, glass and tea, he appeals to England to meet the colonies in a conciliatory spirit, and remove the obnoxious taxes. With a veiled hint at the possibility of ultimate armed resistance, he yet counsels his brethren to carry on their opposition by legal and moderate, if firm measures. "The cause of liberty is a cause of too much dignity to be sullied by turbulence and tumult. It ought to be maintained in a manner suitable to her nature. Those who engage in it should breathe a sedate yet fervent spirit, animating them to actions of prudence, justice, modesty, bravery, humanity and magnanimity."

The letters were the legal justification of American resistance, and ultimately of the Revolution. Dickinson was not prepared for independence in 1776, and refused to sign the Declaration. He did not believe that the resources of constitutional resistance were exhausted, and his conservative nature shrank from this first dis-

loyal act to the mother country. This hesitation, due to his legal studies and Quaker habits, has been the occasion of serious charges against his courage and sincerity. It has obscured the fact that for the preceding eight years he had been the acknowledged patriot leader, the most important man in America, and that "in the literature of that struggle his position is as prominent as Washington in war, Franklin in diplomacy, and Morris in finance." * He was only thirty-five when the letters were written.

They were translated into French, and helped to mould the thought of that rapidly-fermenting country. They were reprinted in England and had a marked effect on ministry and people alike. They were the guides of American freedom, and brought down upon their author the thanks of all the leaders in the cause, and Hancock, Adams and Warren were appointed by the Bostonians a committee to express the obligations of Boston to him. During those days no serious movement was made in the colonies without consultation with him. He probably conceived the opinion that his influence could steer the whole

* Paul Leicester Ford in the Preface to Dickinson's Writings.

revolutionary movement by legal and peaceful means to ultimate success.

While not much of a Quaker he undoubtedly represented and dignified the Quaker idea of the preservation of liberty. He represented also their absolute loss of influence and power which coincided with the Declaration.

The Boston Tea Party had its counterpart in Philadelphia. The firm to which the East India Company had consigned their tea was a firm of Friends, Thomas and Isaac Wharton. They write:

At ten o'clock on the morning of the 27th (December, 1773) a very numerous meeting of the inhabitants determined that the tea should not be landed, and allowed Captain Ayres till next day to furnish himself with provisions, etc., on condition that his ship should depart from his then situation, and proceed down the river, some of the committee going down to the ship with Captain Ayres, in order to see the first step performed. . . . T. and I. W. with I. B. offered to advance Captain Ayres such a sum of money as he should need. . . . Thou wilt observe as the ship was not entered in our port the cargo was not unloaded, either the property of the Honorable East India Company or that of any private person.

In Boston they resented the suggestion of Dickinson that as a matter of conciliation they should pay for the tea. In Philadelphia, equally unwilling to land it, they sent it back, loaning the captain sufficient to see him through.

The Friends had been previously advised to keep out of the excitement. James Pemberton writes on Tenth month 30th, 1773, to several London correspondents:

By the ships now about sailing for London you will doubtless have intelligence of the uneasiness raised in the minds of the people here, and the measures they have taken to manifest it, on an account being received of the intentions of the East India Company to import a quantity of tea to this and some others of the colonies, and I apprehend it will give you some satisfaction and may not be improper to inform you of the part our Society has acted on this occasion, there being many among us concerned in trade, and some not sufficiently on their guard to act consistent with our religious professions, and, therefore, too liable sometimes to fall in with the popular outcry. It, therefore, became our concern, as soon as there was an appearance of ferment rising among the people, to collect the overseers of our three monthly meetings in order to confer on the measures most prudent and seasonable, to communicate suitable advice to our members, who all concurring in sentiment, they agreed to call in to a further conference an additional number of Friends. For this purpose they adjourned to meet the next evening, when, unanimity prevailing, it was concluded to give an invitation to all the members of our Society to collect at one of our meeting houses, and that such advice as had heretofore been given should be revived and such endeavors used as might be likely to unite us in judgment and produce consistency of conduct.

This meeting, which consisted of the greatest part of Friends of this city, happened on the evening before the day appointed for the citizens to collect at the State house, and on that account was the more seasonable. When Friends came together, the occasion of their being called was briefly opened. The advice of our ancient friend,

George Fox, was read, also the epistle from your Meeting of Sufferings in the year 1769, also the cautionary minute of our last yearly meeting. These were enforced by some judicious observations of divers Friends exciting to a due consideration of the nature of our religious profession, which requires us to keep quiet and still, both in respect to conversation and conduct, on such public occasions, which tended to unite us in sentiment in such manner that Friends separated well satisfied with their coming together, and manifested it by their conduct next day, there not being one, that I have heard, of any account in the Society who assembled at the State house, and the number there collected was much less than was expected.

Although we are not insensible of the encroachments of powers, and of the value of our civil rights, yet in matters contestable we can neither join with nor approve the measures which have been too often proposed by particular persons, and adopted by others, for asserting and defending them, and such is the agitation of the minds of those who are foremost in these matters it appears in vain to interfere.

The first Continental Congress met in Carpenters' Hall, Philadelphia, in September, 1774. It was a body which breathed resistance to demands which almost every one considered unreasonable and oppressive, but it was not a revolutionary body. "No such thing as independence is desired by any thinking man in America," wrote Washington, and John Adams had pledged even refractory Massachusetts to a similar idea. "That there are any who pant after independence is the greatest slander on the Province."

The man who had most to do in preparing

Pennsylvania for this Congress was Charles Thomson. He had been the head of the Quaker school, "the-man-who-tells-the-truth" of the Indians; and now began that Revolutionary career which, as Secretary of the Continental Congress, made him almost invaluable to the patriot cause. He knew the Friends well, though not himself a member with them. He knew that some of them could not be touched by any revolutionary impulses, but others, who were men of influence in politics and society, were almost essential to the success of the cause into which, with impulsive energy, he had thrown himself. Paul Revere had come on from Boston to enlist the aid of Pennsylvania in a radical movement. The New York "Sons of Liberty" had invited correspondence, and a meeting was to be held in reply to it. Thomson had the vigorous aid of Thomas Mifflin, who, though a well-to-do Quaker merchant of Philadelphia, afterwards won distinction as a general in the war and as Governor of Pennsylvania. The moderate and philosophical Dickinson must of course be secured, and Thomson tells, in a letter * still in existence, how he used Dickinson's influence to bring the Quakers

* This may be seen in the appendix to Dr. Stillé's "Life of John Dickinson."

into line. It was arranged that Thomson and Mifflin should make fiery and radical speeches in favor of aiding Boston, and that Dickinson should then follow in his favorite role of moderator and originator of policy. The plan worked perfectly, the more so perhaps as Thomson fainted in the midst of his fervent oration, and so could not tell afterwards what Dickinson had said. However, the sympathetic answer to Boston was carried in confusion, and the scheme worked out as desired.

By further plotting, a delegation of Pennsylvanians was sent to the Continental Congress. But still Pennsylvania was conservative, and the Assembly, not under the influence of Thomson and his friends, sent their speaker, Galloway, a loyalist, as the head of the delegation, with Dickinson, Mifflin, Samuel Rhoads and four others. Dickinson wrote all the important addresses.

Much was said by Thomson of the desirability of taking such a prudent course as to carry the Quaker influence with the revolutionists, for this influence would also bring the Germans into line and make the Province unanimous for liberty. Nothing, however, could move the serious

Friends who controlled the Yearly Meeting, and Thomson must have known it.

The movement was too evidently leading on to anarchy and war, and they would have nothing to do with it. The following minute shows the rigidity of their position:

At a Meeting for Sufferings, held at Philadelphia, the 15th day of the Twelfth month, 1774:

After a considerable time spent in a weighty consideration of the afflicting state of affairs and the late proceedings of the assembly of Pennsylvania in approving the resolves and conclusions of the Congress held in this city in the Ninth and Tenth months last, which contain divers resolutions very contrary to our Christian profession and principles, and as there are several members of our religious society who are members of that assembly, some of whom, we have reason to apprehend, have either agreed to the late resolves, which are declared to be unanimous, or not manifested their dissent in such a manner as a regard to our Christian testimony would require of them, being a danger of such being drawn into further inconsistencies of conduct in their public stations, the following Friends are desired to take an opportunity of informing them of the trouble and sorrow they brought on their brethren, who are concerned to maintain our principles on the ancient foundation, and to excite them to greater watchfulness, etc., to avoid agreeing to proposals, resolutions or measures so inconsistent with the testimony of truth.

James Pemberton, in a private letter, also emphasizes the same view:

Philadelphia, Eleventh month 6th, 1774.

American affairs are, I conclude, now become the subject of general attention in Great Britain, and I have no

doubt that many of our brethren are anxiously concerned for the preservation of Friends in a conduct consistent with our Christian profession and principles amidst the commotions which prevail among the people. The troubles which had begun while thou wast among us have been gradually increasing, until they are now come to a very alarming and serious crisis; the unwarrantable conduct of the people in Boston last fall has brought upon them a severe chastisement in consequence of the measures adopted by the Parliament of Great Britain; this has alarmed all the colonies, who apprehend their civil privileges invaded; a Congress of deputies from all the provinces between Nova Scotia and Georgia has been lately held in this city, which, after sitting more than six weeks, have formed such resolves and conclusions as, some of us fear, will be likely to increase our difficulties, unless, by the interposition of Providence, some way should be opened for a reconciliation. The people in New England have taken recourse to arms, and seem only to be waiting for a plausible opportunity of making use of them; hitherto the inhabitants of Boston have conducted themselves as peaceably as could be expected under the circumstances, and considering the temper of the people.

The conduct of the people in this and some of the other provinces can not be vindicated, but such is the spirit prevailing that all endeavors to bring them to a cool, dispassionate way of thinking and acting have been unavailable; so that Friends can do little more than exert their influence to persuade the members of our Society to keep out of these bustles and commotions, and this has occasioned no small care and labor, but has been so far of service that I hope it may be said we are generally clear; tho' there have been instances of some few who claim a right of membership with us that have not kept within such limits and bounds as we could wish.

On the other hand, it would be a proof of wisdom in those concerned in government on your side at least to suspend the exercise of a power, the right of which is not admitted by the colonists and is at least doubtful. Should

the administration pursue further rigorous measures it seems too likely that there will be much bloodshed in these colonies.

But there is no doubt that there were other Friends, how many it is probably impossible to ascertain, who, while not willing to join Mifflin and Dickinson in armed resistance, were in hearty sympathy with the Continental Congress, and in the eyes of the public represented the Quaker political influence. They were in the Assembly, and in the official stations through the counties. Government was theirs by the inheritance of nearly a century. They swayed the habits of thought of their constituents, and were greatly respected in every social and civil function. Many of them were of that class which modern writers call Quaker—the class which, after 1756, had filled the Assembly, and managed public affairs, except in the matter of war, on Quaker lines, but who were not members of the Society of Friends. These were the people that Thomson hoped to carry with him into the Revolution, and which the precipitancy of Massachusetts seemed in danger of estranging. They were patriotically attached to liberty, and had wrought for it effectually in the past against the encroachments of Proprietor as well as King, but

rebellion was to them a dangerous word, and respect for existing authority was deeply ingrained in their nature.

They could not see their duty quite as the meeting advised, but they wished temperately to bring the King to his senses, and abate the excitement of the people. The patriots were too precipitate. They, in 1776, without good reason, destroyed Penn's Charter of 1701, and set up, against the advice of Dickinson, Thomson and Mifflin, a revolutionary government, of which Franklin was the controlling spirit, and a certain amount of Quaker sympathy was lost to the side of independence.

While the Philadelphia Friends were striving in 1774 to be a calming influence in the affairs of the Province and of the Continental Congress, some of their English brethren were working with their ministry to avert the threatened war by timely concession.

Before the results of the Congress had reached England, David Barclay and Dr. Fothergill had asked Franklin to prepare a list of American demands, making it as moderate as possible, which they would present to men influential in the Ministry as a basis for reconciliation. As a result of this request Franklin made out seventeen

conditions as a possible basis for the restoration of good feeling. The first one was, "The tea destroyed to be paid for," and the seventeenth, "All powers of internal legislation in the colonies to be disclaimed by Parliament." The "Hints," as they were called, were the groundwork of a series of discussions, first within the trio of peacemakers, and then gradually extending the circle of those interested, until they included the moderate men of influence in the government, like Lord Howe. Franklin says:

The doctor [Fothergill] called on me and told me he had communicated them, and with them had verbally given my arguments in support of them, to Lord Dartmouth, who after consideration had told him some of them appeared reasonable, but others were inadmissible or impracticable; that having occasion to frequently see the Speaker, he had also communicated them to him, as he found him very anxious for a reconciliation; that the Speaker had said that it would be very humiliating to Britain to be obliged to submit to such terms; but the doctor told him she had been unjust and ought to bear the consequences and alter her conduct; that the pill might be bitter, but it would be salutary, and must be swallowed; that these were the sentiments of impartial men after thorough consideration and full information of all circumstances; and that sooner or later these or similar measures must be followed, or the empire would be divided and ruined.

Having thus committed himself to the "Hints" in speaking to officials, Dr. Fothergill was anxious to have Franklin abate some of the

most objectionable demands. "The good doctor, with his usual philanthropy, expatiated on the miseries of war; that even a bad peace was preferable to the most successful war; that America was growing in strength, and whatever she might be obliged to submit to at present, she would in a few years be in a condition to make her own terms." But Franklin says he told them his own property was in a seaport town, and the British might burn it when they pleased; that America had no intention to abate her terms; that England must be careful of the mischief she did, for "sooner or later she would be obliged to make good all damages with interest. The doctor smiled, as I thought, with some approbation of my discourse, passionate as it was, and said he would certainly repeat it to-morrow to Lord Dartmouth."

The ministry was foolishly inflexible, and Fothergill and Barclay finally gave it up. Franklin was about to leave for America. He says: "I met them by their desire at the doctor's house, when they desired me to assure their friends from them that it was now their fixed opinion that nothing could secure the privileges of America but a firm, sober adherence to the terms of the association made at the Congress, and that

the salvation of English liberty depended now on the perseverance and virtue of America.”

In the midst of the negotiations Dr. Fothergill writes to his friend, James Pemberton :

London, First month 3d, 1775.

I am afraid they will pursue, in one shape or other, the same destructive plan,—at least it appears so to me,—that no abatement of any consequence will be made—no material alterations or concessions; of course, if you are as resolute as we seem, unhappily, to be firm, dissolution must follow. It will not be long before this will be manifest; America will then know what she has to expect. For my own part, having from my early infancy been attentive to America, more than many others,—the several visits of my father to that extensive country, of my brother, of my most valued friends—the acquaintance I have had with some of the most sensible, intelligent, judicious persons in that country, of every party, denomination, province and situation,—I cannot give up on slight grounds the opinions I have formed of them, of their rights, and of their power likewise. To say what these opinions are is unnecessary, because they are unavailing, as they are opposite to the sentiments of the generality, who, being ignorant of what America is, or by whom inhabited—looking no higher, no further, than the confined limits of a decaying empire, think with contempt of every one who pleads for freedom.

But we know not what is for the best. We should not, perhaps, be better if we grew greater; it seems to be the will of Providence that after we have humbled the pride of the most potent houses in Europe, we should be humbled likewise by our own selves in our turn. Had our greatest enemies the direction of our counsels they could not drive us to a more dangerous precipice than that to which we seem hastening with a judicial blindness.

David Barclay sent advance accounts of the negotiations to James Pemberton. He went,

over the whole series of efforts to find a basis for reconciliation, and his account closely agrees with Franklin's. He also practically gives up the case, and hopes America will unitedly continue her resistance by peaceful measures. He warns Philadelphia Friends not to lay much stress on a few concessions granted by Lord North, which are, he says, for the purpose of dividing the Americans, and on behalf of "your best friend's love" rather chides them for showing a disposition to parade their loyalty at the expense of others, in an address of their Meeting for Sufferings of First month 24th, 1775: "The declaration of our religious and peaceable principles everybody must approve, and there on that ground your best friends wish you to remain."

The address hardly seems open to the objection he makes. It is a radical declaration of opposition to the whole revolutionary movement. Fothergill and Barclay seem to have favored this movement while it adopted only peaceful methods, and so, we apprehend, did a great many of the Friends of Philadelphia, but the Meeting for Sufferings objected to the illegalities and excitements which Thomson was nursing, as unnecessary, for was there not the Assembly, elected yearly, and expressing the popular will, through

which all remonstrances could be made in proper order? They knew, and the revolutionary party knew as well, that Pennsylvania was not at this time ready for radical actions, and that only by irregular and non-representative bodies could it be brought into the column for independence.

They stood their ground against illegality, as afterwards they did against war, and expressed it plainly as follows:

Having considered with real sorrow the unhappy contest between the legislature of Great Britain and the people of these colonies, and the animosities consequent thereon, we have, by repeated public advice and private admonitions, used our endeavors to dissuade the members of our religious society from joining with the public resolutions promoted and entered into by some of the people, which, as we apprehended, so we now find, have increased contention and produced great discord and confusion.

The divine principle of grace and truth which we profess leads all who attend to its dictates to demean ourselves as peaceable subjects, and to discountenance and avoid every measure tending to excite disaffection to the King as supreme magistrate, or to the legal authority of his government, to which purpose many of the late political writings and addresses to the people appear to be calculated. We are led by a sense of duty to declare our entire disapprobation of them, their spirit and temper, being not only contrary to the nature and principles of the gospel, but destructive of the peace and harmony of civil society, disqualifying men in these times of difficulty for the wise and judicious consideration and promotion of such measures as would be most effectual for reconciling differences or obtaining the redress of grievances.

From our past experience of the clemency of the King and his royal ancestors, we have ground to hope and believe

that decent and respectful addresses from those who are vested with legal authority, representing the prevailing dissatisfactions and the cause of them, would avail towards obtaining relief, ascertaining and establishing the just rights of the people, and restoring the public tranquillity; and we deeply lament that contrary modes of proceeding have been pursued, which have involved the colonies in confusion, appear likely to produce violence and bloodshed, and threaten the subversion of the constitutional government, and so that liberty of conscience, for the enjoyment of which our ancestors were induced to encounter the manifold dangers and difficulties of crossing the seas and of settling in the wilderness.

We, therefore, incited by a sincere concern for the peace and welfare of the country publicly declare against every usurpation of power and authority in the opposition of laws and government, and against the combinations, insurrections, conspiracies and illegal assemblies, and as we are restrained from them by conscientious discharge of our duty to Almighty God, by whom kings reign and princes decree justice, we hope through His assistance and favor to be enabled to maintain our testimony against any requisitions which may be made of us, inconsistent with our religious principles and the fidelity we owe to the king and his government as by law established, earnestly desiring the restoration of that harmony and concord which have hitherto united the people of these provinces and been attended by the divine blessing on their labors.

If this address seems unnecessarily loyal, we have only to compare it with another issued six months later by the Continental Congress: "Attached as we are to your Majesty's person and government with all the devotion that principle and affection can inspire, connected with Great Britain with the strongest ties which can unite

societies, and deploring every event that tends in any degree to weaken them, we solemnly assure your Majesty that we most ardently desire that the former happiness between her and these colonies may be restored," etc. In fact, at this stage of proceedings everybody, except a few of the most hot-headed, professed, most of them honestly, perfect loyalty. Events came to a crisis very rapidly immediately after this.

Notice also the following letter, signed by a great fighter, and representing the views of a military company:

Chester County, September 25th, 1775.

Whereas, some persons, evidently inimical to the liberty of America, have industriously propagated a report that the military associations of this county, in conjunction with the military associations in general, intend to overturn the Constitution by declaring an independency, in connection with which they are aided by this committee and the board of commissioners and assessors with the arms now making for this county, and as such a report could not originate but among the worst of men, for the worst of purposes, this committee have, therefore, thought proper to declare, and they do hereby declare, their abhorrence even of an idea so pernicious in its nature, as they ardently wish for nothing more than a happy and speedy reconciliation, on constitutional principles, with that state from whom they derive their origin.

By order of the Committee,

ANTHONY WAYNE, Chairman.

Dr. Fothergill gives them the following advice, wise from their standpoint:

“We need not suggest the necessity Friends are under on your side, to act with the greatest circumspection, neither to incline so far to the fiery popular side which like many amongst us led by those unfit directors, Pride and Passion, would sacrifice every substantial benefit in life, nor on the other hand, lean so much to the inflated vapors of arbitrary dictates as to yield assent to its encroachments on everything that is valuable to mankind.” “I think it will be your greatest safety and wisdom to keep close to one another—neither to relax your care one over another, nor lean to the violent, nor to join the obsequious. For all in this life is at stake, life, liberty and property.” “If America relaxes both you and we are all undone. I wish Friends would studiously avoid everything adverse either to administration here on one side or Congress on the other. Submission to the prevailing power must be your duty. The prevailing power is the general voice of America.” “Mind your own business, and neither court unworthily the favor of your superiors on this side, nor oppose with vehemence the party which steps forward in the protection of your liberties, which are all at stake.”

Dr. Fothergill was more American than the conservative American Friends themselves.

It would probably have been wiser, in the light of subsequent events, had they adopted his policy, alike dignified and liberal. They, however, had a testimony which they felt they must bear against revolution, and allowed an estrangement to grow up against the liberal party, based not only on war, but also on the unhealthy means

used to inflame the people. It must also be remembered that at this time even the popular leaders were expecting some other solution of the difficulty than war and independence.

CHAPTER VI.

THE EARLY YEARS OF THE REVOLUTION.

The efforts of the peace men on both sides of the Atlantic were futile. The British pursued their policy of foolish consistency, determined to force the taxes down American throats. Lexington and Concord were fought, and a tremor of sympathetic response ran down and up the Atlantic coast. The continent set itself to learn the art of war to defend its liberties. While conservative people still hoped for an accommodation, the youth and the vigor of America felt that war was at hand, and began to prepare for it.

James Pemberton writes to Dr. Fothergill :

Philadelphia, Fifth month 6th, 1775.

Dear Friend:

The account lately received of the proceedings of Parliament on American affairs, and the intention of sending a further armament to Boston, have raised such a resentment in the colonies that the people are become more than ever united in a determination to defend their liberties by resistance. Surprising it is that the administration should persist in enforcing measures which must evidently tend to increase our calamities and threaten ruin to both countries. It is too sorrowful and arduous a task to describe our present situation; a military spirit prevails, the people are taken off from employment, intent on instructing

themselves in the art of war, and many younger members of our Society are daily joining with them, so that the distresses of this province are hastening fast; but when we consider the still more calamitous state of Boston, it not only excites the greatest compassion but brings into view the most gloomy prospect of future lamentable consequences, unless some unforeseen interposition of Providence should avert the storm.

When the M—y receive account of the late military action near Boston they must be convinced that the New England men will fight; a vein of blood is now opened, how far it may be permitted to extend we must leave. Although the accounts so far received of the transaction are somewhat imperfect, yet it is generally agreed that the king's troops are the aggressors, and narrowly escaped being wholly cut off; by last advices the town of Boston was surrounded by an army of 20,000, and though the vessels of war intercept all provisions sent there from the Southern colonies, it is said they may be supplied by land from Connecticut.

Since I began this letter I have received thy acceptable letters by our mutual friend, Dr. Franklin, whose seasonable, unexpected return among us has dispensed general pleasure among all classes of people, hoping some good effect at this very critical time from his experience and cool judgment. The Congress meets on the 10th inst.

* * * * *

Amidst these agitations it appears most prudent and safe for Friends to remain quiet. The minds of the people are too inflamed for any interposition by us to be useful.

* * * * *

Your administration must soon be convinced of their mistaken policy in the management of this unhappy contest. They may be assured the non-importation will be strictly observed, and it is expected all mercantile trade will be stopped by the Congress, so that the favor intended for New York, Nantucket, etc., will avail them nothing, nor will any other than the most lenient measures stop the ef-

fusion of blood and an increase of calamity to our and your country.

The return of Franklin did not prove so calming as Pemberton had hoped, for, throwing aside his wonted moderation, he plunged with vigor into the movement for armed resistance and independence.

Fothergill replies, three months later :

I will not fill up this letter with forebodings to America first, and then to the whole empire of Great Britain. It is more than probable we shall never subdue you (when I say we I mean those above), but we shall struggle hard and run the risk of sending ourselves to the bottom if you are first plunged there. Fatal, fatal error! The revenge of a few discontented officials: what dreadful havoc it will make. But it is indeed, to you first and next to us, a time of great sifting, and those who look forward, even amongst us, can not but be alarmed for the public safety. You, our brethren as a Society, I lament every day. Oh! that the weight of Sacred Wisdom may press all to that foundation on which alone they may stand securely, and extend a hand of help to those who are in danger of drifting with the tide of confusion till they perish.

And again a little later :

Be it known, that many amongst us deeply sympathize with you under your afflicted situation. America has nothing to expect henceforth but severity. If one might reason upon the righteousness of a cause by the temper of those who are engaged in it, ours can not be a good one. I believe there is no scheme however contrary to the principles of religion and humanity that should be offered as likely to subdue America that would not be adopted.

In the meantime the Meeting for Sufferings was attending to the general interests of the Society. They first addressed their members to be liberal in raising money for the sufferers in New England:

To our friends and brethren of the several meetings in Pennsylvania and New Jersey:

Dear Friends.—The afflictions and distresses attending the inhabitants of Massachusetts and other parts of New England have often engaged our pity and commiseration, with a desire to be instrumental for their relief as favorable opportunities should offer, and having more particular information since the yearly meeting, held last month at Rhode Island, than we before had of the situation of our brethren and others in those parts, since which the deprivations of War have greatly increased, we are united by a spirit of sympathy and Christian tenderness to recommend to your serious and benevolent consideration the sorrowful calamities now prevailing among those people, earnestly desiring that we may encourage each other freely to contribute to the relief of the necessities of every religious denomination; to promote which we have agreed upon, and herewith send you printed subscription papers requesting that some suitable active Friends may be appointed in each of your monthly and preparative meetings to apply for the donations of Friends for this charitable purpose.

A little later they forwarded to the Pennsylvania Assembly, a long address, recounting the privileges belonging to all inhabitants of the Province as the result of Penn's liberal charter, and asking that those liberties, especially liberty

of conscience, be secured to all in the perilous times which were evidently at hand.

We have a just sense of the value of our religious and civil liberties, and have ever been and are desirous of preserving them by all such measures as are not inconsistent with our Christian profession and principles, and though we believe it to be our duty to submit to the powers which in the course of Divine Providence are set over us, where there hath been or is any oppression or cause of suffering, we are engaged with Christian meekness and firmness to petition and remonstrate against it, and to endeavor by just reasoning and arguments to assert our rights and privileges in order to obtain relief.

We, therefore, earnestly entreat you carefully to guard against any proposal or attempt to deprive us and others of the full enjoyment of liberty of conscience, and that the solemn assurance given us in the charter that we shall not be obliged to do or suffer any act or thing contrary to our religious persuasion may not be infringed: the power of judging respecting our sincerity belongeth only to the Lord of our consciences, and we hope in a province heretofore remarkable for the preservation of religious and civil liberty, the representatives of the people will still be conscientiously careful that it may remain inviolate.

We firmly desire that the most conciliatory measure for removing the impending calamities, and for restoring peace to the colonies in general, may be pursued, and that all such may be avoided as are likely to widen or perpetuate the breach with our parent state, or tend to introduce persecution or suffering among us.

Furthermore, on First month 20th, 1776, they issued a general address to define their position. This afterwards gave great offence to the revolutionary party. It was an open statement of their opposition to extreme measures, and was no

doubt intended to influence any who were within reach of their influence to avoid joining with them. The Germans had sent delegations to Philadelphia to find out how their friends, the Quakers, with whom they had been politically allied ever since they had been in the Province, intended to act in the emergency. Many young Friends had joined the military companies, and many more, of all ages, undoubtedly sympathized with the American cause. Apparently these older Friends, whose weight ruled the official organizations, were not ready to throw off their ancient allegiance, and their voice was still for peace, remonstrance and submission.

The ancient testimony and principles of the people called Quakers, renewed with respect to the king and government, and touching the commotions now prevailing in these and other parts of America, addressed to the people in general.

A religious concern for Friends and fellow subjects of every denomination, and more especially for those of all ranks who in the present commotions are engaged in public employments and stations, induces us earnestly to beseech every individual in the most solemn manner to consider the end and tendency of the measures they are promoting, and on the most impartial inquiry into the state of their minds, carefully to examine whether they are acting in the fear of God and in conformity to the precepts and doctrines of our Lord Jesus Christ, whom we profess to believe in, and by whom alone we expect to be saved from our sins.

The inhabitants of these provinces were long signally favored with peace and plenty. Have the returns of true

thankfulness been generally manifest? Have integrity and godly simplicity been maintained and religiously guarded? Have a religious care to do justly, love mercy, and walk humbly, been evident? Hath the precept of Christ to do unto others as we would they should do to us been the governing rule of our conduct? Hath an upright, impartial desire to prevent the slavery and oppression of our fellow-men, and to restore them to their natural right, to true Christian liberty, been cherished and encouraged? Or have pride, wantonness, luxury and profaneness, a partial spirit, and forgetfulness of the goodness and mercies of God, become lamentably prevalent? Have we not therefore abundant occasion to break off from our sins by righteousness, and our iniquities by shewing mercy to the poor, and with true contrition and abasement of soul to humble ourselves and supplicate the Almighty Preserver of men to show favor, and to renew unto us a state of tranquility and peace?

* * * * *

We are so fully assured that these principles are the most certain and effectual means of preventing the extreme misery and desolations of wars and bloodshed that we are constrained to entreat all who profess faith in Christ, to manifest that they really believe in Him and desire to obtain the blessing He promised to the makers of peace.

This spirit ever leads for and seeks to improve every opportunity of promoting peace and reconciliation, and constantly to remember that as we really confide in Him, He can in His own time change the hearts of all men in such manner, that the way to obtain it can often be opened contrary to every human prospect or expectation.

May we therefore heartily and sincerely unite in supplication to the Father of Mercies, to grant the plentiful effusions of his spirit to all, and in an especial manner to those in superior stations that they may with sincerity guard against, and reject all such measures and councils as may increase and perpetuate discord, animosities and unhappy conditions which now sorrowfully abound.

The peculiar evidence of divine regard manifested to our

ancestors in the founding and settlement of these provinces, we have often commemorated, and desire ever to remember with true thankfulness and reverent admiration.

When we consider that at the time they were persecuted and subjected to severe sufferings as a people unworthy of the benefits of religious or civil society, the hearts of the kings and rulers under whom they thus suffered were inclined to grant them these fruitful lands, and entrust them with charters of very extensive powers and privileges; that on their arrival here the minds of the natives were inclined to receive them with great hospitality and friendship, and to cede to them the most valuable part of their land on very easy terms; that while the principles of justice and mercy continued to preside they were preserved in tranquility and peace free from the desolating calamities of war, and their endeavors were wonderfully blessed and prospered, so that the saying of the wisest king was signally verified to them, "When a man's ways please the Lord he maketh even his enemies to be at peace with him."

The benefits, advantages and favors we have experienced from our dependence and connection with the kings and government, under which we have enjoyed this happy state, appear to us to demand the greatest circumspection, care and constant endeavors to guard against every attempt to alter or subvert that dependence or connection.

The scenes lately presented to our view, and the prospect before us, we are sensible are very distressing and discouraging; and though we lament that such amicable measures as have been proposed, both here and in England, for the adjustment of the unhappy contests subsisting, have not yet been effectual, nevertheless we should rejoice to observe the continuance of mutual peaceable endeavors for effecting a reconciliation, having grounds to hope the divine favor and blessing will attend them.

"It hath ever been our judgment and principle, since we were called to profess the light of Christ Jesus manifested in our consciences unto this day that the setting up and putting down kings and governments, is God's peculiar pre-

rogative, for causes best known to himself; and that it is not our business to have any hand or continuance therein, nor to be busybodies above our station, much less to plot or contrive the ruin or overthrow of any of them, but to pray for the king and for the safety of our nation, and the good of all men; that we may live a peaceable and quiet life, in all godliness and honesty, under the government which God is pleased to set over us."—Ancient Testimony, 1696, in Sewel's History.

May we therefore firmly unite in the abhorrence of all such writings and measures, as evidence a design to break off the happy connection we have heretofore enjoyed with the kingdom of Great Britain, and our just and necessary subordination to the king and those who are lawfully placed in authority under him, that thus the repeated solemn declarations made on this subject in the addresses sent to the king, on the behalf of the people of America in general, may be confirmed, and remain to be our firm and sincere intentions to observe and fulfill.

JOHN PEMBERTON, Clerk.

When the reports from the various Quarterly Meetings came up to the Yearly Meeting in the fall of 1775, it was evident that a large number had already violated the pacific principles of their Society. The clerk summarized the reports :

All the accounts except that from Shrewsbury lament the sorrowful deviation which has lately appeared in many members from our peaceable profession and principles in joining with the multitude in warlike exercise, and instructing themselves in the art of war which has occasioned painful labor to the faithful among us whose care has been extended to advise and admonish those who are concerned therein.

The Yearly Meeting therefore advised as follows :

We have taken under weighty consideration the sorrowful account given of the public deviation of many professors of the truth among us from our ancient testimony against war, and being favored in our deliberations on this affecting subject with the calming influences of that love which desires and seeks for their convincement of their error and restoration, in order that our union and fellowship may be preserved, and a faithful testimony maintained to the excellency of the Gospel dispensation which breathes "Peace on earth and good will to men," it is our united concern and desire that faithful friends in their respective meetings may speedily and earnestly labor in the strength of this love for the reclaiming of those who have thus deviated, and where it is necessary that Quarterly Meetings should appoint suitable friends to join their assistance in the performance of this weighty service, and where such brotherly labor is so slighted and disregarded, that by persisting in this violation, they manifest that they are not convinced of our Christian principles, or are actuated by a spirit and temper in opposition thereto, it is our duty to testify our disunion with them.

And we also desire that all friends in this time of close probation would be careful in no part of their conduct to manifest an approbation or countenance to such things as are obviously contrary to our peaceable profession and principles, either as spectators or otherwise, at the same time avoiding to give just occasion of offence to any who do not make religious profession with us, manifesting that we are actuated solely by a conscientious principle and Christian spirit, agreeable to the repeated cautions and advice heretofore given forth by this meeting, our meeting for sufferings and the epistles from our brethren in Great Britain since the commencement of the troubles which have lately arisen, and continue to prevail in these colonies.

Many friends have expressed that a religious objection

is raised in their minds against receiving or paying certain paper bills of credit lately issued expressly for the purpose of carrying on war, apprehending that it is a duty required of them to guard carefully against contributing thereto in any manner.

We therefore fervently desire that such who are not convinced that it is their duty to refuse those bills, may be watchful over their own spirits, and abide in true love and charity so that no expressions or conduct tending to the oppression of tender consciences may appear among us; and we likewise affectionately exhort those who have this religious scruple that they do not admit nor indulge censure in their minds against their brethren who have not the same, carefully manifesting by the whole tenor of their conduct that nothing is done through strife or contention, but that they act from the clear convictions of truth in their own minds, showing forth by their meekness, humility and patient suffering that they are the followers of the Prince of Peace.

The attitude taken by the Friends whose voices controlled the official conclusions of the body seems, as nearly as can be ascertained, to have been as follows: "We did not approve the proceedings of the British ministry, which irritated the Americans; we thought them ill-advised, and, in view of their certain effects, wicked; we would have joined with our fellow-citizens in peaceful legal resistance to them and have suffered, as we have proven we are able to suffer, for the principles of liberty and justice. But we do not believe in revolutions, and we do not believe in war; we will not be a party to overturning the

beneficent charter of William Penn, nor will we aid in throwing off our ultimate allegiance to the king of Great Britain. We, who largely made this Province what it is, and who have shown in the past our capacity for the peaceful maintenance of rights, are utterly opposed to the measures now taken, and disavow all responsibility for them. We cannot take any part in the war, on one side or the other; we cannot recognize the revolutionary government, set up by illegal means, by holding office under it or by affirming allegiance to it; nor will we assist Britain in the unrighteous means taken to conquer rebellious Provinces; we are out of the whole business, and will give aid and comfort to neither party." In one sense they were loyalists, and it is quite probable that the personal sympathies of many of them were with the British cause. But they were innocuous loyalists; they were neither spies on American movements nor did they flee for protection to British headquarters. They remained in their houses, asked to be considered as neutrals, and to have nothing to do with the "commotions" (a favorite word with them) existing. Something like this seems to have been the position taken by the meetings in their collective capacity, and this they undertook by

all ecclesiastical means to enforce on their membership.

This was, however, no easy task. There were a few active British abettors. They were promptly disowned. There were a great many who joined heartily with the American cause; and they shared the same fate. The monthly meetings were very busy during the whole period of the war in the proceedings against Friends who were unfaithful to their principles. At least one hundred and forty were "dealt with" and "disowned" by two monthly meetings in the city of Philadelphia. The causes given were various:—"Assuming a military appearance"; "Associating with others in training and exercising to learn the art of war"; "Acting as soldiers in the American army"; "Making a voyage in a ship of war, fitted out from this place, in the course of which he had been concerned in seizing and taking away from English subjects their property"; "Taking money for warlike services of slaves"; "Joining the British army"*; "Joining the American army, and attending a play"; "Accepting offices in the American army"; "Associating in warlike exercise, and

* One case only, so far as known.

accepting an employment to build a fort in South Carolina ” ; “ Fitting out a vessel for trade, provided to repel in a warlike way any attack which might be made upon it, which has been attended with sorrowful consequences in shedding human blood and loss of life ” ; “ Being concerned with others in carrying on a trade in the river Delaware with a vessel fitted in a warlike manner ” ; “ Fitting out an armed vessel, which may prove the cause of shedding human blood ” ; “ Paying fines in lieu of personal military service ” ; “ Purposely placing money before a person who was about seizing his effects to satisfy a fine imposed on him in lieu of military service ” ; “ Dealing in prize goods, and fighting in the public streets ” ; “ Making weapons of war formed for the destruction of his fellow-men ” ; “ Associating with others to encourage informations and accusations against such fellow-citizens as, through the heats and animosities subsisting, were become the objects of party resentment, and by serving as a juryman in the trial and condemnation of a fellow-member in religious profession, who suffered death in this city under a law which appears to us adapted to the views and temper of men actuated by the spirit of war rather than founded on true

justice and the principles of Christianity” ; “Uniting himself by a test or declaration of allegiance to one of the contending parties now at war” ; “Taking a test of allegiance to one and an abjuration of the other of the contending parties now at war” ; “Enlisting as an artificer in a military employ” ; “Being in an engagement where many were slain” ; “Holding a commission for furnishing supplies to one of the parties engaged in strife and war” ; “Engaging in military employment on board a ship of war” ; “Appearing with arms, and assisting in taking several persons from their dwellings in a warlike manner” ; “Purchasing a horse that was taken as a prize” ; “Assisting in laying a tax for military purposes” ; “Countenancing the fine gatherers by taking some receipts which had been given for forage taken by the army in lieu of personal military service” ; “Offering duplicates in order for the collection of taxes, part of which is a fine for not taking the test (so-called)” ; “Countenancing the payment of a demand for the releasing of his cow that was seized for a substitute fine” ; “Selling prize rum which his son got by privateering” ; “Paying a fine for refusing to collect taxes for military purposes” ; “Meeting militia on mus-

ter days” ; “Paying taxes for hiring men to go to war.”

The difficulty was greatest in 1775 when war first broke out. The monthly meetings reported in many cases in substance as follows :

A sorrowful defection lately appears in a number of our young people who, disregarding our ancient testimony and the peaceable spirit of the Gospel, have in the present time of outward commotion associated with others in training to learn the military exercises. Their cases are mostly under care.

One of the first cases taken up was Thomas Mifflin's. In March, 1775, he was reported to the Monthly Meeting of Philadelphia “for joining with and promoting measures pursued by the people for arresting their civil privileges in such a manner as is inconsistent with our peaceable profession and principles.” Four months later, when judgment was reached, he had added other causes. He was aide-de-camp to General Washington, and the meeting testified:

Thomas Mifflin, of this city, merchant, who hath professed to be a member of our religious Society, having for a considerable time past been active in the promotion of military measures, it became our concern and care to endeavor to convince him of the inconsistency of his conduct with our peaceable principles, but he declaring himself not convinced of our Christian testimony against wars and fightings, and persisting therein, whereby he hath separated himself from religious fellowship with us, we are under

a necessity to declare that we cannot esteem him to be a member of our religious society until by the illumination of Divine Grace he is further convinced and becomes desirous of being truly united in religious fellowship with us, to which state we desire he may attain.

These hopes were never fulfilled. Mifflin served with distinction on Long Island and at Trenton, and became Major-General in 1777. In 1788 he was made President of Pennsylvania, and was a member of the Convention which framed the Constitution of the United States. From 1790 to 1799 he was Governor of Pennsylvania. Except for a loss of prestige arising from his supposed sympathy with Conway's Cabal he had a distinguished career, which, however, showed but little trace of his Quaker education.

As in this case, the assumption usually was that the offender against the rules of Society had separated himself by his own actions, and the minute was simply a public record of the fact, coupled with a hope for his future restoration.

There were the usual number of other offences, moral and ecclesiastical, which also had to be attended to, so that the diminution in numbers between 1775 and 1781 must have been considerable, and the sufferers being mainly young men, the loss to the future was serious. Some of them became penitent and returned, making

due acknowledgments, in years to come, but many were permanently lost.

It was undoubtedly a serious matter to be banned in this way. There was not in those days the easy passage from sect to sect we now have, and the marked peculiarities of the Friends in beliefs and customs, many of which they would adhere to after disownment, made them feel as strangers in any other church habitation. When the war was over they would naturally look back longingly to their old friends, to whom they were drawn by many intellectual and social ties.

In addition, the question of slavery was being now forced to an issue with the individual members. While the Revolutionary War was raging the last slaves were disappearing among Friends. After years of advice and entreaty, which had been largely successful, the yearly meeting had concluded, in 1776, to force the issue with the few remaining slave-holders. They had wilfully stood out against the prolonged labors of their friends and the directions of their meetings, and one by one their cases were considered and they, if still obdurate, disowned. Hence we find such minutes as this almost the last on record :

In the course of our labors for restoring the oppressed negroes to the possession of that liberty to which they are entitled equally with ourselves, and which we are fully sensible is their just due agreeable to the conclusion of our Yearly Meeting, it became our concern to treat with——
 —— on account of a negro woman which he persists to retain in thralldom in order to make him sensible of the duty which is incumbent on him to restore her to that natural right of freedom which through the prevalence of unrighteous custom she has hitherto been deprived of, but our repeated labors of love not availing, and he continuing to withhold from her her just right from a mistaken apprehension that it is more for her advantage as well as for her own security that she should remain in subjection to him, after long and repeated treating with him on this important subject we find ourselves constrained on the behalf of truth and justice to declare that we cannot hold the said —— —— in religious fellowship with us until he consents to restore the said negro woman to her just and natural right which we must desire for his own sake (as his time in this world cannot be long), and also for the reputation of truth he may speedily be induced to do.

The Yearly Meeting could report, in the fall of 1776 :

That labor has been extended to such who have violated our Christian testimony against war, by associating to exercise and learn the use of warlike weapons, many of whom have been declared to have separated themselves from religious fellowship with us, and others in this practice are under the care and dealing of the respective Monthly Meetings.

In 1776 the Yearly Meeting sent out some general advices :

Being by the continued mercy of the Almighty Preserver of men favored with another opportunity of meeting to-

gether in peace and quietness, our minds are impressed with reverent thankfulness to him, (and) engaged in much brotherly love and sympathy to salute you; earnestly desiring that, in this time of affliction and adversity, we may be fervently concerned to improve so great a blessing with humble and thankful hearts, and to manifest our constant care for the building up each other in that faith which works by love.

Under this exercise, we are constrained to entreat and exhort all to keep near to the divine principle which will lead us from the love of the world, its spirits and maxims, into a life of self-denial and humility, in conformity to the precepts and example of our Lord Jesus Christ by whom we are taught that wrath, contention, wars and fighting are unlawful, and that meekness, patience and universal love to mankind will be rewarded with peace, passing the understanding of the carnal mind which is not subject to the law of God, and in which those who abide, cannot please him.

* * * * *

And, dear friends, as we profess to be followers of the Prince of Peace, and our principles have led us to declare, that we place no confidence nor dependence in the arm of flesh, we earnestly exhort each individual to cease from man, whose breath is in his nostrils; for wherein is he to be accounted of? And as deep trials, sufferings and revilings may be permitted to come upon us, let us bear the rod and him who hath appointed it, and not seek for or expect deliverance by the hand of man, but endeavor to get into that humble, meek, quiet, peaceable spirit, which beareth all things, and when it is reviled, revileth not again, but suffereth patiently; and have our eye single to Christ, the Captain of our salvation, who is alone able to work deliverance for us in his own time.

Under the affliction and sorrow we painfully feel for the deviation of some, who have made profession with us, from our peaceable principles, we have renewed cause with thankfulness to acknowledge that a large number of hopeful youth, appear united with us in a living concern for the

cause and testimony of truth, and the keeping to the good order of that excellent discipline which our ancestors were enabled to establish, and which as it is rightly administered, we have found to be as a hedge about us. We fervently desire all such may be strengthened and confirmed in holy resolutions to wait for that wisdom which is profitable to direct in the maintaining of it, over all backsliders and transgressors, who after being treated with in the spirit of meekness, cannot be reclaimed.

Many seasonable admonitions, exhortations and cautions suitable to the circumstances of these perilous times, having been given forth by our brethren in G. Britain last year and since by our Meeting for Sufferings, we affectionately recommend to the renewed consideration of them and of the minutes of this meeting last year. As the lust of worldly honor and power hath been productive of the calamities and distresses to which we are now subjected, we are incited by a sincere concern for the welfare of our brethren, and their prosperity in the truth, to intreat them, during the present commotions and unsettled state of affairs, to decline from having any share in the authority and powers of government; and to circumscribe themselves within plain and narrow bounds, it being our united sense and judgment that none of our brethren in religious profession should be concerned in electing or being elected to public places of honor, trust or profit, believing that such who disregard our counsel and advice herein, are in danger of being ensnared and suffering loss, and may become instruments of misleading others from that quiet and peaceable life we should endeavor to lead in Godliness and honesty agreeable to the exhortation of the apostle.

And as the distresses of many in divers parts of this continent are now very great and daily increasing, we earnestly recommend to friends in general, and particularly to those who have received the increase of earthly possessions, to be religiously careful to avoid all unnecessary expenses, and to be ready to distribute and communicate towards the relief of their suffering brethren, not only of our own, but to every other society and denomination; and that a spirit

of benevolence and true charity with a desire and care to be faithful stewards of the manifold blessings and favors conferred upon us, may increase and prevail among us.

* * * * *

And as our forefathers were often led to commemorate the many instances of divine favor conferred upon them through the difficulties they encountered in settling in the wilderness, let us be like minded with them, and if after a long time of enjoying the fruits of their labors and partaking of the blessings of peace and plenty we should be restrained or deprived of some of our rights and privileges, let us carefully guard against being drawn into the vindication of them, and seeking redress by any measures which are not consistent with our religious profession and principles nor with the Christian patience manifested by our ancestors in such times of trial; and we fervently desire all may impartially consider whether we have manifested that firmness in our love to the cause of truth and universal righteousness which is required of us, and that we may unite in holy resolutions to seek the Lord in sincerity and to wait upon him daily for wisdom to order our conduct hereafter in all things to his praise.

And beloved friends, we beseech you in brotherly affection, to remember that as under divine providence we are indebted to the king and his royal ancestors for the continued favor of enjoying our religious liberty, we are under deep obligations to manifest our loyalty and fidelity, and that we should discourage every attempt which may be made by any to excite disaffection or disrespect to him, and particularly to manifest our dislike to all such writings as are or may be published of that tendency.

And as it hath ever been our practice since we were a people to advise all professing with us to be careful not to defraud the king of his customs and duties nor to be concerned in dealing in goods unlawfully imported, we find it necessary now most earnestly to exhort that the same care may be continued with faithfulness and diligence, and that friends keep clear of purchasing any such goods either

for sale or private use; that so we may not be in any way instrumental in countenancing or promoting the iniquity, false swearing and violence which are the common consequences of an unlawful and clandestine trade.

The Meeting for Sufferings, under date of Twelfth month 20th, 1776, issued an address to Friends, upon which serious charges of disaffection to the American cause were afterwards based, resulting disastrously to a number of important members. The old Constitution of Penn had first been annulled, and the advice was practically to disobey the new one, under authority of which subscription to tests of allegiance was demanded. It would have been most remarkable had the government passed over such an issue.

Thus we may with Christian firmness withstand and refuse to submit to the arbitrary injunctions and ordinances of men, who assume to themselves the power of compelling others, either in person or by other assistance, to join in carrying on war and of prescribing modes of determining concerning our religious principles, by imposing tests not warranted by the precepts of Christ, or the laws of the happy constitution under which we and others long enjoyed tranquility and peace.

The issue was definitely joined. By all the authority possessed by the representative bodies, Friends were admonished not only to avoid taking up arms, but also not to recognize the gov-

ernment formed on the ruins of the old charter, by accepting any office under it or making any promises of allegiance to it. We are now sure that this refusal was based on conscientious objections to being forced to declare themselves by a power, the legality of which they were not willing to accept, and was unaccompanied by any treasonable connection with the British army. These facts must have been known by some of the Pennsylvanians, but hardly by other members of the Continental Congress, and it is not to be wondered at that the leaders of Friends were classed with the dangerous Tories and treated accordingly.

The meetings, however, so far as appears from their minutes, were practically agreed on this policy, and Philadelphia Monthly Meeting was able to report in 1777, "We hope love and unity are on the increase among us."

The country meetings did not fail to respond to the action of their Philadelphia brethren. Chester Monthly Meeting, which embraced the larger part of what is now Delaware County, which afterwards lost about seventy members by disownment for military or political offences during the war, agreed to carry out the policy

in its entirety. In 1775 they adopted this advice :

An epistle from the Meeting for Sufferings was read, containing some good advice respecting the present situation of public affairs, and a testimony from said meeting against every usurpation of power and authority in opposition to the laws and government, and against all combinations, insurrections, conspiracies and illegal assemblies; which this meeting taking with solid consideration doth conclude that all members belonging to this meeting that do in any measure countenance or abet anything contrary to our religious principles ought speedily to be treated with by overseers and preparative meetings.

CHAPTER VII.

THE VIRGINIA EXILES.

Late in 1776 the war, which had hitherto been mainly confined to New England and New York, approached Philadelphia. "These are the times that try men's souls," wrote Thomas Paine. Washington, with the wreck of an army, retreated across Jersey, closely followed by the British under Sir William Howe.

In Philadelphia there was great excitement. Galloway and other loyalists joined the British. The roads leading from the city were crowded with fugitives seeking places of safety. The sick of Washington's army were brought into the city almost naked, and were lodged in the vacated houses. Every effort was made to arouse the spirit of resistance by accounts of the barbarities practised by the British troops in the march through the Jerseys. Congress, then sitting in Philadelphia, adjourned to Baltimore.

The daring and successful night attack of Washington on the Hessians at Trenton, and his magnificent campaign following, when, with a raw and inefficient army, he outgeneraled

Howe and drove him back to New York, removed for a time the danger to the Quaker City. The American army hovered about between Philadelphia and New York during the early half of 1777, uncertain of the plans of the British general. On the 25th of August, he revealed his purpose by landing at Elk Ferry, in the Chesapeake, with the evident intention of attacking Philadelphia from the south. Washington marched through the city, making the best show he could with his poorly-armed and ragged troops, and on the 11th of September met the British army under Cornwallis, at Chadd's Ford, on the Brandywine. In this quiet farming country, settled almost exclusively by Friends, around the old Birmingham Meeting-House, was fought one of the bloodiest battles of the war. Washington was defeated by a flank attack, led by Cornwallis, who crossed the stream about five miles above the Ford, and met the American army hastily drawn up to face them at the meeting-house. The Americans lost 1,000 men, the British about half as many. The latter followed the retreating, but not demoralized, Americans to the Schuylkill. After two weeks' manœuvring Howe's army suc-

ceeded in crossing the stream, and on the 25th encamped at Germantown.

Congress departed in haste to Lancaster, and a detachment of British troops took possession of the city. The people, an old account states, generally "appeared sad and serious." This may be partly accounted for by the following minute of Philadelphia Monthly Meeting :

The 26th Day of the 9 month 1777 being the day in course for holding our monthly meeting a number of friends met when the present situation of things being considered and it appearing that the Kings Army are near entering the city, at which time it may be proper the inhabitants should generally be at their habitations, in order to preserve as much as possible peace and good order on this solemn occasion it is therefore proposed to adjourn the mo. mtg. &c.

The attack on Germantown, where the main body of the British were encamped, showed the world that the spirit of the Americans was not quelled. This was only temporarily successful, and the two armies settled down in winter quarters, Washington and his troops to endure the sufferings of Valley Forge, while Howe and his officers held high revel in Philadelphia; his men being comfortably quartered in the numerous unoccupied houses and stores. The capture of the forts on the Delaware made them largely independent of the neighboring country, where

foraging parties of the Americans greatly interfered with their supplies and a winter of gaiety and revelry followed. If the Friends had any disposition to look upon the king's troops on their entrance as settling their allegiance on a stronger basis, they changed their minds before the winter was over. Their influence hitherto had kept the city decorous and reasonably moral, and they were shocked at the laxity which now for the first time invaded the city of Penn. Drunken soldiers destroyed the quiet of the nights, cock-fighting and gambling were openly sanctioned by Sir William Howe, and the young Philadelphians, making common cause with the dissipated British officers, were ruined in morals and purses, while stage-plays and balls, club-meetings and horse-races, followed each other in rapid succession. It was a difficult time for the Friends, who were probably one-fifth of the population, and who were in general in fairly comfortable circumstances, to maintain their standards of living among their young men.

The probability of a French army of attack coming to America made the permanent occupation of Philadelphia impossible, and on the 18th of June, 1778, Sir Henry Clinton, who had superseded Howe, evacuated the city and marched

across Jersey. Washington promptly started in pursuit, fought the battles of Princeton and Monmouth, and had the satisfaction of accelerating the retreat and finally seeing the British army embark for New York city.

The out-and-out Tories left the city with the British. The Friends remained in their houses, as they had done when the invaders entered. They suffered from both parties—the most, however, from the Americans for their unwillingness to join in the national defence. Their policy was to remain quiet and take what came to them without giving military aid to either party or acting as spies upon either.

When the American army regained possession of the city it was placed in command of Benedict Arnold, who proceeded to enrich himself by confiscating the property of the Tories, and by his marriage with Peggy Shippen, the daughter of a prominent loyalist. The National and State Congresses resumed their sessions. Wild speculation and gross extravagance, to which the depreciated condition of the paper currency was a stimulus, pervaded the city. The State Government, under the new Constitution, was in the hands of new men, who did not receive the confidence of the more substantial people. The

town was full of desperate characters. Its beauty was destroyed, its trees cut down for firewood, its suburbs burned, its streets filthy, its houses denuded of furniture. There were the bitterest feelings against Tories of all grades, and two victims, of whom more presently, were hung to appease the popular fury. A mob which threatened to hang all Quakers, Tories and speculators was for a time in possession of the city. The "Constitutionalists," as the extreme revolutionists were called, resolved to drive out every vestige of loyalism. The college founded by Franklin—now the University of Pennsylvania—had its charter annulled, and a new one, supposed to be more favorable to the prevailing powers, was created in its place, which had only the effect of bringing into existence two rival weaklings and destroying the medical school, then just establishing its great history.

In this disturbed, unhealthy state, Philadelphia remained until the end of the war. It was no time for the Quakers to have anything to do with government, and they wisely refrained from making any attempt.

The city Friends had to bear the brunt of the trouble. Those in the country were disturbed by the actual passage of the armies and of forag-

ing parties in 1777 and 1778, but at other times they tilled their fields in personal security.

About one-fifth of the adult male Friends in Philadelphia had joined the American army, or taken places under the revolutionary government. A very small number had as openly espoused the cause of the King. The large majority, including the more representative Friends, with varying sympathies, had kept straight to the advice of their Yearly Meeting in favor of neutrality and non-participation. Dr. Fothergill wrote :

Be quiet and mind your own business; promote every good work. Show yourselves subject to that overruling Providence which guides all things for the good of that immortal part which is made to subsist not only after all these transient outrages are at an end but through endless ages.

When news arrived of the landing of the English army on the Chesapeake, Congress, then in session at Philadelphia, recommended :

That the Executive officers of the State of Pennsylvania be requested to cause all persons notoriously disaffected forthwith to be disarmed and secured until such time as they may be released without injury to the common cause. That it be recommended to the Supreme Executive Council of the State of Pennsylvania to cause diligent search to be made in the houses of all inhabitants of the city of Philadelphia, who have not manifested their attachment to the American cause, for firearms, swords, bayonets, etc.

Three days later they further advise :

That the several testimonies which have been published since the commencement of the present contest betwixt G. Britain and America, and the uniform tenor of the conduct, and conversation of a number of persons of considerable wealth, who profess themselves to belong to the society of people commonly called Quakers, render it certain and notorious that those persons are, with much rancor and bitterness, disaffected to the American cause; that, as these persons will have it in their power, so there is no doubt it will be their inclination, to communicate intelligence to the enemy, and, in various other ways, to injure the counsels and arms of America:

That when the enemy, in the month of December, 1776, were bending their progress towards the city of Philadelphia, a certain seditious publication, addressed "To our friends and brethren in religious profession in these and the adjacent provinces," signed John Pemberton, in and on behalf of the meeting of sufferings held at Philadelphia for Pennsylvania and New Jersey, the 26th of the 12th month, 1776, was published, and, as your committee is credibly informed, circulated amongst many members of the society called Quakers, throughout the different states:

That, as the seditious paper aforesaid originated in the city of Philadelphia, and as the persons whose names are under-mentioned, have uniformly manifested a disposition highly inimical to the cause of America, therefore,

Resolved, That it be earnestly recommended to the supreme executive council of the state of Pennsylvania, forthwith to apprehend and secure the persons of Joshua Fisher, Abel James, James Pemberton, Henry Drinker, Israel Pemberton, John James, Samuel Pleasants, Thomas Wharton, sen., Thomas Fisher, son of Joshua, and Samuel Fisher, son of Joshua, together with all such papers in their possession as may be of a political nature.

And whereas, there is strong reason to apprehend that these persons maintain a correspondence and connexion

highly prejudicial to the public safety, not only in this state but in the several states of America.

Resolved. That it be recommended to the executive powers of the respective states, forthwith to apprehend and secure all persons, as well among the people called Quakers as others, who have, in their general conduct and conversation, evidenced a disposition inimical to the cause of America; and that the persons so seized, be confined in such places, and treated in such manner, as shall be consistent with their respective characters and security of their persons:

That the records and papers of the meetings of sufferers in the respective states be forthwith secured and carefully examined, and that such parts of them as may be of a political nature, be forthwith transmitted to Congress.

Under cover of these resolutions the Council proceeded to arrest about forty people, more for the purpose of striking terror into British sympathizers than anything else. There was no trial, or even hearing. They were merely hurried into confinement, their houses searched, their desks broken open in a search for compromising papers, and a parole, including a promise to remain in their houses demanded of them. Some of them gave it, others, including all the Quakers, refused.

The authorities, therefore, had on their hands a company of about twenty people of irreproachable character, highly respected in all the relations of private life, against whom no definite charges could be preferred, but who refused even

to promise good behavior if allowed to remain at their homes. They said they had committed no offences, and that it was an outrage to throw citizens into jail without a charge, and present a test to them, as if they had ever been guilty of misconduct, and could be suspected for the future.

There was undoubtedly considerable popular outcry against them, due in part to general suspicions, in part to the epistles of the meetings, more especially that of the Meeting for Sufferings, the objectionable paragraph of which has already been given in a previous page, and in part to the publication of a curious paper said to have been captured by General Sullivan on Staten Island with the British baggage, which was considered evidence of treasonable correspondence with the enemy.

This paper began with eight questions relating to the position of the American troops, and under the head of "Information from Jersey, 19 August, 1777," gave as a partial answer to them :

It is said General Howe landed near the head of Chesapeake Bay but can not learn the particular spot or when.

Washington lays in Pennsylvania about twelve miles from Coryell's Ferry.

Sullivan lays about six miles north of Morristown with about 2,000 men.

Spanktown Yearly Meeting.

Then, in a postscript dated nine days later, was added information of the southward march of the various divisions of the army, with the number of each.

The only circumstance connecting the Quakers with the matter was the subscription "Spanktown Yearly Meeting." There was, of course, no such yearly meeting, but Spanktown was a name sometimes applied to Rahway, where there was a Quarterly Meeting. The absurdity of an organized meeting being engaged in spying out the proceedings of the American army and signing its name did not save the report from receiving considerable credence. It was quickly pointed out that the 19th of August was several days before the landing, as was also the 22d, the date of the capture by Sullivan, and that the signature of a mythical yearly meeting to an otherwise unrecognizable letter was no proof of Quaker origin. Indeed, so far as the authorities were concerned, after a little investigation the matter was apparently allowed to drop, and the charges were based on the general belief in the English sympathies of the prisoners and the de-

liverances of the meetings. Spanktown, however, had a prominent place in the ephemeral literature of the day, and the incident undoubtedly intensified the anti-Quaker feeling of the people, who apparently believed that every Quaker meeting was a centre of treasonable plotting and correspondence.

The searching of the prisoners' desks produced nothing except the minutes of the meetings, which were taken and printed by order of Congress and were with some difficulty regained. They contained only what the reader has already seen—nothing more compromising than the general advice to take no part in the revolution. There were no evidences of correspondence with the enemy, and we must believe James Pemberton when he writes to Robert Morris from Virginia :

I can with much firmness and truth assert my innocence of having given any occasion for the hard treatment I have received from this unnatural banishment. . . . From a mind conscious of integrity and innocence I can unreservedly declare that I have never had at any time the least correspondence with General Howe or any British commander or others concerned in the military operations against America nor do I intend to have; I hope my general conduct and conversation have evidenced me a friend to mankind and my country, and I am restrained from a pure principle of conscience in doing anything to promote contention, war & bloodshed among men whose universal welfare I much desire.

The prisoners were allowed to receive their friends with great freedom, and made the most use of their few days of captivity to remonstrate on all sides against their arrest. The first protest was addressed to the Supreme Executive Council of Pennsylvania, by whose order they were imprisoned: "We are advised, and from our own knowledge of our rights and privileges as freemen are assured, that your issuing of this order is arbitrary, unjust and illegal, and therefore we believe it is our duty, in clear and express terms, to remonstrate against it." A more lengthy and formal protest, signed by all the prisoners, followed a little later, ending with the paragraphs:

In the name therefore of the whole body of the freemen of Pennsylvania, whose liberties are radically struck at, by this arbitrary imprisonment of us their unoffending fellow citizens we demand an audience that so our innocence may appear and persecution give place to justice.

But if regardless of every sacred obligation by which men are bound to each other in society, and by that Constitution by which you profess to govern, which you have so loudly magnified for the free spirit it breathes you are still determined to proceed, be the appeal to the righteous people of all the earth for the integrity of our hearts and the unparalleled tyranny of your measures.

These papers produced no effect on the Council, even to the extent of granting a public hearing, so the prisoners addressed Congress in a similar vein, asseverating their innocence of any

treasonable actions, their unshaken conviction that all wars are unlawful for Christians, and a willingness to suffer anything in support of this testimony.

Following this they issued a printed "Address to the Inhabitants of Pennsylvania," in which they recapitulated the history of their arrest and detention :

But a few days since the scene opened and we the subscribers were called upon by persons, not known as public officers of justice to put our names to a paper "promising not to depart from our dwelling houses, and to be ready to appear on the demand of the President and Council of the State of Pennsylvania and to engage to refrain from doing anything injurious to the United free states of North America by speaking, writing or otherwise, and from giving intelligence to the commander of the British forces, or any other person whatever concerning public affairs."

Conscious of our innocence in respect to the charges insinuated in this paper against us, and unwilling to part with the liberty of breathing the free air, and following our lawful business beyond the narrow limits of our houses, disclaiming to be considered in so odious a light as men who by crimes had forfeited our common and inherent rights, we refused to become voluntary prisoners and rejected the proposal.

The Council's answer to these various appeals was to resolve :

That such of the persons now confined in the Lodge as shall take & subscribe the oath or affirmation to wit:

"I do swear (or affirm) that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania as a free and independent State" shall be discharged.

To this suggestion they replied :

If you had a right to make such a proposition we think it very improper to be made to men in our situation. You have first deprived us of our liberty on one pretence which finding you are not able to justify you waive and require of us as a condition of our enlargement that we should confess ourselves men of suspicious characters by doing what ought not to be expected by innocent persons.

After another solemn declaration of innocence, signed alike by Friends and Episcopalians, of any correspondence with the British forces, they could do nothing more than to accept the decision of the Council, which was:

That the persons whose names are mentioned above be without further delay removed to Staunton in Virginia there to be treated according to their characters and stations so far as may be consistent with the security of their persons.

With the exception of the substitution of Winchester for Staunton, this sentence was carried out, notwithstanding that a writ of habeas corpus was allowed by Chief Justice McKean, which the State authorities chose to disregard.

The whole proceeding was, of course, grossly illegal, but Sir William Howe and his army were approaching the city, and the measure was justified in the opinion of Congress and the Council by military necessity.

It is difficult to see what was gained. The

arrest certainly did not conciliate or intimidate other Quakers; it did not interfere in the slightest degree with the plans of the British. It did please the enemies of the Quakers, long in a hopeless minority in the Province, and again and again defeated, but now in power. It satisfied a body of extreme "Constitutionalists," which not only had old grudges to pay against Quakers and churchmen, the Pembertons and Provost Smith, but were striving also to discredit positive revolutionists of a moderate class like Robert Morris and James Wilson. It sent into banishment for eight months a company of the best men of Philadelphia, whose fault was that they had urged their fellow-members not to violate the long-established principles of their church against war and revolution, and they must be slow to appreciate Quaker character and Quaker history who could believe that persecution would weaken their hold on these principles. It only induced them to close up their ranks and trust their dogmas more implicitly.

By the time the involuntary emigrants were ready to start the number had simmered down to twenty, of whom seventeen were Friends. Some had declared their allegiance and been discharged. The twenty were Israel, James and

John Pemberton, Thomas Wharton, Thomas Miers, and Samuel Fisher, John Hunt, Edward Penington, Henry Drinker, Samuel Jervis, Thomas Affleck, William Drewett Smith, Charles Pleasants, Owen Jones, Jr., Thomas Gilpin, Thomas Pike, William Smith, Elijah Brown and Charles Eddy. They were loaded into wagons and conveyed through Reading and Carlisle to Winchester, where they were retained in a very loose confinement, and allowed to select their own boarding houses, for the State refused any appropriation for the expenses. Indeed, upon their release in the spring the Council ordered.

That the whole expenses of arresting and confining the prisoners sent to Virginia, the expenses of their journey and all other incidental charges be paid by the said prisoners.

The prisoners refused to give any promises, but soon gained the confidence of their keepers and were told that they might go where they pleased within six miles of Winchester. They attended meetings, strengthened their brethren, received their friends and wrote abundant letters. They kept a joint journal, which has been published. They softened the harsh feelings with which they were received by the people, and were accused of influencing the neighbor-

hood against the acceptance of Continental money. The country afforded few comforts, and some of them were men who were hardly able to afford the expenses of transportation—a great matter in those days. Their families were within the lines of two armies, and were seldom heard from, and some were sick. The affair—while it might have been worse—was a serious deprivation to all of them.

The haste with which their banishment was decreed, and the uncertainty as to its duration, prevented a sufficient supply of clothing being taken by some of them, and that inclement winter, which caused such suffering at Valley Forge, did not leave untouched the Virginia exiles, used, as many of them were, to the solace of Philadelphia homes—then the most comfortable, if not the most luxurious, of the continent. In Third month, 1778, Thomas Gilpin died of acute lung trouble, and was buried in Virginia, advising his companions to be faithful to their convictions. Shortly afterward John Hunt followed him to the grave. He was an elderly man, and had made his first acquaintances in America when he came over in 1756, appointed by London Yearly Meeting to advise Friends to resign their places in the Assembly during the trying days of the

French and Indian wars. His leg mortified and had to be amputated. The doctor told him he bore the operation like a hero. "Rather, I hope, like a Christian," said the doomed man.

In the meantime their friends at home were not idle. The Yearly Meeting, which occurred shortly after the banishment, issued an address in explanation of its position:

A number of our friends having been imprisoned and banished unheard from their families under a charge and insinuation that they have in their general conduct and conversation evidenced a disposition inimical to the cause of America, and from some publications intimating that there is strong reason to apprehend that these persons maintain a correspondence highly prejudicial to the public safety, may induce a belief that we have in our conduct departed from the peaceable principles which we profess; and apprehending that the minds of some may hereby be misled, for the clearing of truth, we think it necessary publicly to declare that we are led out of all wars and fightings by the principles of grace and truth in our own minds by which we are restrained either as private members of society, or in any of our meetings with holding a correspondence with either army, but are concerned to spread the testimony of truth and peaceable doctrines of Christ, to seek the good of all, to keep a conscience void of offence towards God and man, to promote the kingdom of the Messiah which we pray may come and be experienced in individuals, in kingdoms and nations, that they may beat their swords into plow shares, and their spears into pruning hooks, and nation not lift sword against nation neither learn war any more. And we deny in general terms all charges and insinuations which in any degree clash with this our profession.

As to a nameless paper lately published said to be dated

at Spanktown yearly meeting and found among the baggage on Staten Island every person who is acquainted with our stile may be convinced it was never wrote at any of our meetings or by any of our friends. Besides there is no meeting throughout our whole society of that name nor was that letter or any one like it, ever wrote in any of our meetings since we were a people.

We therefore solemnly deny the said letter and wish that those who have assumed a fictitious character to write under whether with a view to injure us or cover themselves might find it their place to clear us of this charge by stating the truth.

As from the knowledge we have from our banished friends and the best information we have been able to obtain we are convinced they have done nothing to forfeit their just right to liberty; we fervently desire that all those who have any hand in sending them into banishment might weightily consider the tendency of their own conduct and how contrary it is to the doctrines and example of our Lord and Law Giver Jesus Christ and do them that justice which their case requires by restoring them to their afflicted families and friends. And this we are well assured will conduce more to their peace than keeping them in exile. We give forth this admonition in the fear of God and not only with a view to the relief of our friends but also to the real interest of those concerned in their banishment.

Having been favored to meet to transact the affairs of our religious society which relate to the promotion of the cause of truth and righteousness we have felt a renewed concern for the good and happiness of mankind in general, and in the love of the gospel have issued forth this testimony for the clearing ourselves and our friends and the warning of those who from groundless suspicions and mistaken notions concerning us may be persuaded to seek our hurt to the wounding of their own souls and the loss of the community.

The Meeting for Sufferings was concerned about the seizure of the minutes of various meet-

ings, and appointed a committee to secure their return. They reported that they called on their erstwhile fellow-member, now Secretary of the Council, Timothy Matlack, through whom all the proceedings, both as to the capture of papers and arrest and banishment of the Friends had passed, and procured all but three, "which Timothy alleged were in possession of Congress." These three were "the rough draft of the epistle of the 21st day of Twelfth month last; report from the Quarterly Meeting held at Rahway the 18th of last month, setting forth the sufferings of Friends on account of our religious testimonies and principles, and the sheet of the rough minutes of this meeting." Congress, no doubt, received some enlightenment from these as to the stand Friends had taken, but the belief must have been dispelled from their minds that the meetings were plotting to aid the cause of the King, and they soon returned all the papers.

The death of two of the exiles and the sickness of others renewed the efforts of their friends at home for their release, and seems also to have touched the hearts of the Executive Council. A committee from Chester County went to Lancaster to attempt to influence the Assembly, then

sitting there, to aid in the cause. Before hearing them that body propounded two questions, to which they demanded formal answers:

Whether you acknowledge the present Assembly to be the representatives of the people of this State, chosen for the purpose of legislation?

Whether you believe the people of this state are bound to a due observance of the laws made by this Assembly?

Their answers were cautious, and probably did not aid in the immediate object they had in view:

We believe the present assembly to be representatives of a body of the people of Pennsylvania chosen for the purpose of legislation.

We believe it our duty to obey the principle of Grace and Truth in our own hearts, which is the fulfilling of all laws established on justice and righteousness. Where any decrees are made not having their foundation thereon they operate against the virtuous and give liberty to the licentious which unavoidably brings on general calamity. Although we think it our duty to bear testimony against all unrighteousness yet it hath ever been our principle and practice either actively or passively to submit to the power which in the course of Providence we live under.

More effective proved to be the visit of four of the wives of the exiles to Lancaster. The result was the minute of Congress, sent by Charles Thomson to James Pemberton:

In Congress 16 March 1778.

Resolved that the Board of War be directed to deliver over to the President and Council of Pennsylvania the prisoners sent from that State to Virginia.

After a leisurely consideration of twenty-three days the Council ordered that the prisoners should be released. The orders, when they came, were couched in most respectful language:

It is reported that several of these gentlemen are in a bad state of health and unfit to travel; if you find this to be the case, they must be left where they are for the present. Those of them who are in health you are to bring with you treating them on the road with that polite attention and care which is due to men who act on the purest motives, to gentlemen whose stations in life entitle them to respect however they may differ in political sentiments from those in whose power they are. You will please to give them every aid in your power by procuring the necessary means of traveling in wagons or otherwise, with such baggage as may be convenient for them on the road.

Here was a long-delayed acknowledgment of the honesty and sincerity of the motives of the prisoners, and a practical withdrawal of the charges against them.

The prisoners' wives had sent a preliminary letter to General Washington, dated Third month 31st:

Esteemed Friend

The pressing necessity of an application to thee when perhaps thy other engagements of importance may by it be interrupted I hope will plead my excuse. It is on behalf of myself and the rest of the suffering and afflicted parents wives and near connections of our beloved husbands now in banishment at Winchester. What adds to our distress in this sorrowful circumstance is the word we have lately received of the removal of one of them by death and that

divers of them are much indisposed; and as we find they are in want of necessaries for sick people we desire the favor of General Washington to grant a protection to one or more wagons, and for the persons we may employ to go with them, in order that they may be accommodated with what is suitable for which we shall be much obliged.

Signed on behalf of the whole,

MARY PEMBERTON.

Washington sent the letter to Governor Wharton, at Lancaster, with a favorable recommendation, and followed it the next day with another letter, passing on the four wives of the prisoners, who had called on him at Valley Forge for permission to pass the lines:

You will judge of the propriety of permitting them to proceed further than Lancaster but from appearances I imagine their request may safely be granted, as they seem much distressed—humanity pleads strongly in their behalf.

When the prisoners reached the neighborhood of Philadelphia, General Washington kindly sent them a pass to go though his lines, and they reached their homes without further mishap. In all the relations of the General with the Friends we find the greatest courtesy on his part, and the most respectful language, whether in minutes of meetings or in private letters on theirs. He understood their scruples and respected them, and they felt the reality of his politeness and sense of justice. Some Friends from Virginia,

about this time, were arrested for not entering the army,—had their muskets tied to them and were otherwise severely treated. When they reached Washington's camp he immediately had them discharged.

As further illustrating the courtesy shown by Washington to Friends, his treatment of a committee sent to convey to him and General Howe their testimony against war is abundant proof. It was just after the battle of Germantown, when the American cause was not in the least promising, and needed all the positive aid it could possibly receive. Their brethren had gone off to Virginia under a serious cloud, and many a military commander would have treated them with scant forbearance. His own consideration, and their reciprocal care to give neither party any advantage by the visit, are strikingly shown by their report:

We, the committee appointed by our last yearly meeting to visit the generals of the two contending armies on the second day of the week following our said meeting proceeded to General Howe's headquarters near Germantown and had a seasonable opportunity of a conference with him and delivered him one of the testimonies issued by the yearly meeting and then proceeded on our way to General Washington's camp at which we arrived the next day without meeting with any interruption, and being conducted to headquarters where the principal officers were assembled in Council after waiting some time we were admitted and

had a very full opportunity of clearing the society from the aspersions which had been invidiously raised against them and distributed a number of the testimonies amongst the officers, who received and read them and made no objections.

We were much favored and mercifully helped with the seasoning virtue of truth and the presence of the master was very sensibly felt who made way for us beyond expectation, it being a critical and dangerous season. We may further add that we were kindly entertained by General Washington and his officers, but lest on our return, we should be examined as to intelligence, we were desired to go to Pottsgrove for a few days within which time such alterations might take place as to render our return less exceptionable to them, where we were accordingly sent under the guard or care of a single officer & hospitably entertained by Thomas Rutter a very kind man and others of our friends; in this town we had some good service for truth. Two of the committee were discharged on sixth day afternoon and the other four on seventh day having been detained between 3 and 4 days. Two of the Friends upon coming within the English lines were stopped and questioned respecting intelligence about the Americans, which they declined to give. They were sent under a guard to the Hessian Colonel who commanded at that post, and he proposed several questions respecting the American Army, which the friends declining to answer, he grew very angry rough and uncivil using some harsh reflecting language and ordered a guard to conduct them to the Hessian General Kniphausen who appeared more friendly, but he not understanding the English language sent them under the conduct of a light horseman or trooper to General Howe's head quarters at Germantown but upon the two friends informing his aide de camps who they were, they were dismissed without being further interrogated, so that no kind of intelligence was obtained from them, nor any departure from the language of the testimony they had delivered. We believe the Lord's hand was in it guarding us from improper compliances and bringing us through this

weighty service though it was a time of close humbling baptism.

As to the charge respecting the intelligence said to have been given by Spank Town yearly meeting, we believe General Washington and all the officers there present, being a pretty many were fully satisfied as to Friends' clearness and we hope and believe through the Lords blessing, the opportunity we had was useful many ways, there having been great openness and many observations upon various subjects to edification and tending to remove and clear up some prejudices which had been imbibed.

Samuel Emlen, Jr., Joshua Morris, Warner Mifflin, Wm. Brown, James Thornton, Nicholas Waln.

Phila 1, 10th mo. 1778.

An interesting sequel to this visit is related. When Washington was President, one of the committee—Warner Mifflin, a cousin of the General's—called upon him. The President remembered him, and adverted to their former interview. "Mr. Mifflin," he said, "will you now please tell me on what principle you were opposed to the Revolution?" "Yes, Friend Washington; upon the principle that I should be opposed to a change in the present government. All that was ever secured by revolution is not an adequate compensation for the poor mangled soldiers and for the loss of life and limb." "I honor your sentiments," replied the President, "for there is more in them than mankind has generally considered."

CHAPTER VIII.

QUAKER SUFFERING.

Whatever inclinations towards British interests may have been stirred up in Quaker breasts by the banishment of their Friends were effectually checked by the behavior of the British soldiery in and around Philadelphia during the disastrous winter of 1777-78. The revels, in high places and low, into which some young Friends were drawn, the ruthless disregard of personal and property rights, the abuse of their fair city, soon alienated the minds of Friends, and confirmed them in their view that if they could not aid revolution, neither could they aid in its active suppression.

On First month 8th, 1778, the Meeting for Sufferings says:

The violence, plunderings, and devastations of some of the soldiers and others attendant upon the British army committed in this city and its environs, and more particularly in their excursions into and marchings through the country in contradiction to the proclamations issued out by General Howe coming under the solid consideration of this meeting, and our minds being dipped into a sympathy with the sufferers, and feeling a desire that the same may be represented to and laid before the General in a weighty manner the following friends are appointed, etc.

And again, later:

The spirit of dissipation, levity and profaneness which sorrowfully has spread and is spreading, principally promoted by the military among us in and near the city at this time of calamity and distress affecting the minds of friends with pain and deep distress, our friends John Pemberton at the High street meeting Samuel Smith at the Bank and Nicholas Waln at Pine Street on first-day morning next are desired to declare our disunity there with and to warn and caution our youth and others as truth may open the way against going to the entertainments and other vain and wanton exhibitions proposed to be made so highly inconsistent with our profession and to shun the many snares into which they may be liable to fall unless they keep upon their watch.

In a general report to London Friends of the condition of things, dated Second month 26th, they further say, charging both sides impartially:

This city and its environs are at present under military government and the intercourse between us and the country much interrupted; but Country friends sometimes are favored to get to our meetings, whereby we have some opportunities of conference upon matters respecting our religious testimony to the edification and encouragement of one another. Our Quarterly Meeting held in the early part of this month was large considering our present circumstances and some Friends from every Monthly Meeting belonging to it attended, some of whom live about sixty miles from hence.

In this city we have not lately suffered any personal injuries but many friends and others have sustained losses to a very considerable amount in their properties. In the country over which the Government lately set up instead of our late excellent constitution, exercise power, great finings,

imprisonments and various other distresses have been inflicted upon many, who cannot for conscience sake join in their measures.

Friends very generally have kept their habitations under all the prevailing commotions, some few upon strong motives have taken refuge within the English lines and a few from apprehensions of difficulties in procuring the necessaries for supporting their families have removed out of this city into the country.

The friends who were banished from hence to Virginia are well accommodated and supplied at their own charge at private houses and some of them at friends houses near Winchester, they are suffered to ride six miles, within the compass of which there are two meetings besides which they keep meetings on first-day and also a week-day meeting which is attended by some not professing with us, and many of the inhabitants lately seem favourably disposed towards them. It was expected they would have been removed near 100 miles further from hence to Staunton, the place of their original destination but the order for their removal is at present suspended. Endeavours have been used to obtain their release but without the desired effect. The keeping them in exile is severe and unjust, but patience must be exercised till the Lord make way for their deliverance in his own time.

By laws lately made in New Jersey, the male inhabitants are forbid under pain of death and women under the penalty of £300 fine or 12 months imprisonment from coming within the English lines without a special license which is seldom granted so that Friends are prevented from coming to this city from thence, but we are well informed they have been subjected to very great sufferings both in person and estate in that province.

The opposition of the Friends, as we have seen, extended not only to actual participation in war, but to paying war taxes, subscribing to tests

of allegiance, and supplying provisions to the army, except where the purpose was to relieve suffering and not to advance the national cause. They were very radical, and could see no distinction between taking part themselves and paying someone else to do their work. They had probably gone beyond the stage wherein they could say, in the favorite words of the Quaker assemblymen of thirty years before, "While we do not, as the world is now circumstanced, condemn the use of arms by others, we are principled against bearing arms ourselves." Their attitude, however, cannot be fully understood if we look upon them as testifying merely against war. They had always claimed, in the old English days of suffering, that they were different from most other dissenters, because under no circumstances could they plot against the king. They would suffer indefinitely rather than obey an unrighteous law, but no Quaker, no matter how outrageously he was treated, was ever in any conspiracy against the existing government. The revolutionary movement was a plot against the recognized English authority. It was not their method of resistance to tyranny, and they would not touch it nor support it. When peace was declared, all their sense of unwavering alle-

giance was transferred to the new government, and they had no rancor stored up against its exponents, though it required years to live down the reciprocal feeling towards themselves.

Unquestionably, they were very unpopular with the mass of the people of strong American sympathies during the war, and those who controlled the political destinies of the State of Pennsylvania did nothing to shield them. On the contrary, they turned upon a number of men, who were undoubtedly honest and conscientious, the terrors of jails, fines and serious distraint of goods, for their unwillingness to take part in the revolutionary proceedings. The Meeting for Sufferings reported distraints amounting to £9,500 in 1778. By the end of the war, the aggregate reached at least £35,000. The demand to subscribe to the test of allegiance to the State of Pennsylvania was followed at first by imprisonment, which served to show that some Quakers at least were made of the same unconquerable stuff as their ancestors of a century before. Three of them were kept in Lancaster jail for fifteen months for this cause, and when finally ordered to be released they refused to pay the jailer's fees, for they said they were convicted neither by their consciences nor by

any fair trial, so they would not contribute to the expenses of the iniquitous imprisonment. They were, however, released.

The law, which filled the prisons and yet added nothing to the coffers of the government, was unsatisfactory, so it was abolished, and fines imposed to be collected by distraint. In one Quarterly Meeting (Western) over \$68,000 was in this way levied between 1778 and 1786, for the collections went on long after the war was over. In 1781 the Yearly Meeting could say: "The sufferings of Friends in these parts have much increased, and continue increasing in a manner which to outward prospect looks ruinous."

If the State government had thought to intimidate the Friends by their imprisonments at Lancaster and elsewhere, and their banishment to Virginia, or to stop the mouth of the meetings in their advices to take no part in the American cause, they were greatly disappointed.

Shortly after the return of the exiles, they themselves largely participating, the Meeting for Sufferings issued another minute, not less objectionable from the patriot standpoint than any which had preceded it, urging Friends to subscribe to no tests, and to give no aid to the war. There was also formed at this time a committee

to collect all cases of sufferings throughout the Yearly Meeting; from the minutes of which can be gained a very detailed account of the peculiar difficulties of the country Friends.* The minute was as follows :

The committee having considered the cases of the six friends now imprisoned in the common jail at Lancaster, and being fully convinced that they are suffering for the testimony of a good conscience, being by religious considerations restrained from complying with the injunctions prescribed by some of the laws lately enacted in Pennsylvania we are united in believing that it is our duty to lay their cases and the weight of their sufferings before those who have committed them to prison and should likewise apply to the Executive Council of Pennsylvania and endeavor to obtain their release, and we therefore propose that some judicious friends should be desired to apply to the Magistrate who committed them to prison and some others should attend the said Council and in such manner as they may be enabled in the wisdom of truth perform this service either in person or writing as on consideration they may judge most expedient.

And on consideration of what is necessary to be proposed to Friends in general on the subject of the declaration of

* For instance:

“From John Ferree four horse creatures, thirteen cattle, seven and a half bushels of wheat, twenty of clean rye, one stack of do., forty bushels of corn, two stacks of oats and one of hay. £187 7 0.”

“They also took from Joshua Sharpless one blanket worth 10s. and left money with his son a lad; but Joshua afterwards sent the money to them.” This was in 1777, when the army was scouring the country for blankets. There are many similar records. The Friends uniformly refused to sell to the army.

allegiance and abjuration required by some late laws passed by the legislatures who now preside in Pennsylvania and New Jersey, having several times met and deliberated thereon, we have the satisfaction to find we are united in judgment that consistent with our religious principles we cannot comply with the requisitions of those laws, as we cannot be instrumental in setting up or pulling down of any government but it becomes us to shew forth a peaceable and meek behaviour to all men, seeking their good, and to live a useful sober and religious life without joining ourselves with any parties in war or with the spirit of strife and contention now prevailing and believe that if our conduct is thus uniform and steady and our hopes fixed on the omnipotent arm for relief, that in time he will amply reward us with lasting peace which hath been the experience of our friends in time past and we hope is of some who are now under sufferings. In order to communicate this union of sentiment on so important a subject and to preserve our brethren in religious profession from wounding their own minds and bringing burthens upon themselves and others, we think it expedient to recommend to the committees appointed in the several Monthly Meetings to assist in suffering cases in pursuance of the advice of our Yearly Meeting; with other faithful Friends speedily to appoint a solid meeting or meetings of conference with each other in the several Quarters, in which the grounds of our principles on this head may be opened and our objections against complying with those laws fully explained and a united concern maintained to strengthen each other in the way of truth and righteousness and to warn and caution in the spirit of love and meekness those who may be in danger of deviating.

This was followed up by an appeal to the Assembly to respect the consciences of that people who, in the day of their power, had been so tolerant of others:

The government of the consciences of men is the prerogative of the almighty God who will not give his glory to another. Every encroachment upon this his prerogative is offensive to his spirit, and he will not hold them guiltless who invade it but will sooner or later manifest his displeasure to all who persist therein.

These truths we doubt not will obtain the assent of every considerate mind.

The immediate occasion of our now applying to you is, we have received accounts from different places that a number of our friends have been and are imprisoned, some for refusing to pay the fines imposed in lieu of personal services in the present war and others for refusing to take the test prescribed by some laws lately made. The ground of our refusal is a religious scruple in our minds against such compliance not from obstinacy or any other motive than a desire of keeping a conscience void of offence towards God, which we cannot without a steady adherence to our peaceable principles and testimony against wars and fightings founded on the precepts and example of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Prince of Peace by a conformity to which we are bound to live a peaceable and quiet life and restrained from making any declarations or entering into any engagements as parties in the present unsettled state of public affairs.

We fervently desire you may consider the generous and liberal foundation of the charter and laws agreed upon in England between our first worthy Proprietary William Penn and our ancestors whereby they apprehended religious and civil liberty would be secured inviolate to themselves and their posterity, so that Pennsylvania hath since been considered an asylum for men of tender consciences and many of the most useful people have resorted hither in expectation of enjoying freedom from the persecution they suffered in their native countries.

We believe every attempt to abridge us of that liberty will be a departure from the true spirit of government which ought to influence all well regulated legislatures and also destructive of the real interest and good of the com-

munity and therefore desire the laws which have a tendency to oppress tender consciences may be repealed so that those who live peaceably may not be further disturbed or molested but permitted to enjoy the rights and immunities which their forefathers purchased through much suffering and difficulty and to continue in the careful observation of the great duty of the religious instruction and education of the youth from which by one part of the said laws they are liable to be restrained.

We hope, on due consideration of what we now offer, you will provide for the discharge of such who are in bonds for the testimony of a good conscience which may prevent others hereafter from suffering in like manner.

Signed in and by the desire of our said Meeting held at Philadelphia the 5th day of the 8th mo., 1778.

by Nicholas Waln, Clerk.

There was also considerable inconvenience and loss in the use of the various meeting-houses for barracks and hospitals. Fairhill, in the city, was occupied by the British troops through the winter of 1777-8. Birmingham house was a hospital for the American sick before the battle of Brandywine, and for the British wounded afterwards. Radnor was an American barracks for some time, and Reading, Valley, Gwynedd, Uwchlan and Plymouth all performed their service in sheltering the American soldiery. At Kennett, near the Brandywine battlefield, we find a committee appointed seven days after the battle to distribute aid, "a concern arising in this meeting for the distressed inhabitants

among us who have suffered by the armies, therefore it is recommended to Friends in general to encourage benevolence and charity by distributing of their sustenance to such as they think are in want." The committee did not find any extreme cases: "They generally appear to bear their sufferings with a good degree of cheerfulness."

Chester Monthly Meeting, through whose limits the two armies had passed, and whose members had felt the ravages more particularly of the British soldiery, on Tenth month 27th, 1777, records that "Preparative Meetings are desired to endeavor to raise subscriptions to be applied for the relief of such as are or may be hereafter in necessitous circumstances in this time of trial and suffering."

When Howe's army passed through the highly-tilled fields of the Quaker counties, just at the end of a productive harvest, with the barns well stored with grain and the houses full of every comfort, they made the most of their short stay. The irresponsible freebooters seized not only such things as might be useful, but recklessly destroyed the furniture and carried away the female apparel unchecked by their superior officers.

In the winter the Americans followed, for Congressional orders had been given that all supplies within seventy miles of Valley Forge should be used by the army if needed. These were paid for in the depreciated currency of the times, but all payment the Quakers refused. Their refusal to take the oath of allegiance and abjuration increased their chances of being the victims of the operations of the American foraging parties.

Up to the middle of 1778 no part of the country had suffered by the ravages of war so much as Philadelphia and its neighborhood, and no part of this had been so thoroughly ransacked as the strip between the Chesapeake and Philadelphia, over which Howe's army had passed.

While the British were in the city, an American order was issued to prevent the attendance of Friends at the Yearly Meeting, on the plea that these meetings were centres of plotting against the government. This was just after the Spanktown affair, and even Washington seemed to have entertained some suspicion. General Lacey, to whom the orders were given, passed them on with the injunction "to fire into those who refused to stop when hailed, and leave their dead bodies lying in the road." It may have

been well to stop intercourse on military grounds, but the Yearly Meetings were very harmless, and no treasonable plots were ever hatched in them.

Another serious difficulty arose from a law that all school teachers should take the test, under heavy penalties. There were at this time a considerable number of Quaker schools and school teachers. Some closed and some went on till thrown into jail for a refusal to pay the fine.* This trouble led to another protest to the Assembly dated Eleventh month 3d, 1779:

To the General Assembly of Pennsylvania: The memorial and address of the religious Society called Quakers respectfully sheweth:

That divers laws have been lately enacted which are very injurious in their nature, oppressive in the manner of execution, and greatly affect us in our religious and civil liberties and privileges, particularly a law passed by the last Assembly entitled "A further supplement to the test laws of this State," in the operation whereof the present and succeeding generations are materially interested. We therefore apprehend it a duty owing to ourselves and our posterity to lay before you the grievances to which we are subjected by these laws.

* Joshua Bennett was committed to Lancaster jail, "he having been convicted of having kept school, **not** having taken the oath or affirmation of allegiance to the State, according to law." He was fined £100, but the State got no fine and the jailor no fees.

Our predecessors on their early settlement in this part of America, being piously concerned for the prosperity of the colony and the real welfare of their posterity, among other salutary institutions promoted at their own expence the establishment of schools for the instruction of their Youth in useful and necessary learning and their education in piety and virtue, the practice of which forms the most sure basis for perpetuating the enjoyment of Christian liberty and essential happiness.

By the voluntary contributions by the members of our religious Society, Schools were set up in which not only their children were taught but their liberality hath been extended to poor children of other religious denominations generally, great numbers of whom have partaken thereof; and these schools have been in like manner continued and maintained for a long course of years.

Duty to Almighty God made known in the consciences of men and confirmed by the holy Scriptures is an invariable rule which should govern their judgment and actions. He is the only Lord and Sovereign of Conscience, and to him we are accountable for our conduct, as by him all men are to be finally judged. By conscience we mean the apprehension and persuasion a man has of his duty to God and the liberty of conscience we plead for is a free open profession and unmolested exercise of that duty, such a conscience as under the influence of divine grace keeps within the bounds of morality in all the affairs of human life and teacheth to live soberly righteously and godly in the world.

As a religious Society, we have ever held forth the Gospel dispensation was introduced for completing the happiness of mankind by taking away the occasion of strife contention and bloodshed and therefore we all conscientiously restrained from promoting or joining in wars and fightings: and when laws have been made to enforce our compliance contrary to the conviction of our consciences, we have thought it our duty patiently to suffer though we have often been grievously oppressed. Principle we hold in this respect requires us to be a peaceable people and

through the various changes and revolutions which have occurred since our religious Society has existed, we have never been concerned in promoting or abetting any combinations insurrections or parties to endanger the public peace or by violence to oppose the authority of government apprehending it our duty quietly to submit and peaceably to demean ourselves under every government which Divine Providence in his unerring wisdom may permit to be placed over us; so that no government can have just occasion for entertaining fears or jealousies of disturbance or danger from us. But if any professing with us deviate from this peaceable principle into a contrary conduct and foment discords, feuds or animosities, giving just occasion of uneasiness and disquiet, we think it our duty, to declare against their proceeding.

By the same divine principle, we are restrained from complying with the injunctions and requisitions made on us of tests and declarations of fidelity to either party who are engaged in actual war lest we contradict by our conduct the profession of our faith.

It is obvious that in these days of depravity, as in former times, because of oaths the land mourns and the multiplying the use of them and such solemn engagements renders them familiar, debases the mind of the people and adds to the number of those gross evils already lamentably prevalent which have drawn down the chastisement of heaven on our guilty country.

We are not actuated by political or party motives; we are real friends to our country, who wish its prosperity and think a solicitude for the enjoyments of our equitable rights, and that invaluable privilege, Liberty of Conscience, free from coercion, cannot be justly deemed unreasonable. Many of us and other industrious inhabitants being exposed to heavy penalties and sufferings, which are abundantly increased by the rigour of mistaken and unreasonable men under the sanction of law, whereby many are allready reduced to great straits and threatened with total ruin, the effects of whose imprisonment must at length be very

sensibly felt by the community at large through the decline of cultivation and the necessary employments.

We have been much abused and vilified by many anonymous publications and our conduct greatly perverted and misrepresented by groundless reports and the errors of individuals charged upon us as a body in order to render us odious to the people and prepossess the minds of persons in power against us; being conscious of our innocence and "submitting our cause to the Lord who judgeth righteously" we have preferred patience in bearing the reproach to public contest, not doubting that as the minds of the people became more settled and composed, our peaceable demeanour would manifest the injustice we suffered, and being persuaded that on a cool dispassionate hearing we should be able to invalidate or remove the mistaken suggestions and reports prevailing to our prejudice.

The matters we have now freely laid before you are serious and important, which we wish you to consider wisely as men and religiously as Christians manifesting yourselves friends to true liberty and enemies to persecution, by repealing the several penal laws affecting tender consciences and restoring to us our equitable rights that the means of education and instruction of our youth which we conceive to be our reasonable and religious duty, may not be obstructed and that the oppressed may be relieved. In your consideration whereof, we sincerely desire that you may seek for and be directed by that supreme "wisdom which is pure, peaceable, gentle and easy to be entreated, full of mercy and good fruits" and are your real friends.

Signed on behalf of a meeting of the Representatives of the said people held in Philadelphia the 4th Day of the 11 mo 1779.

JOHN DRINKER, Clerk.

In other respects also the Friends seemed to have fallen upon evil times. The windows of their

houses and shops were broken, and other injuries were perpetrated by the mob "for following their lawful occupations on days appointed by Congress on pretence of fasting and humiliation." They would neither weep with those who wept nor rejoice with those who rejoiced at the command of government.

On the evening of the 4th of the Seventh month, 1777, which day was set apart for the purpose of public feasting and rejoicing, to commemorate the anniversary of declaring these colonies independent of the authority and government of Great Britain, the like abuse was committed on the houses of divers friends for declining to illuminate them with candles in the windows, a vain practice which our religious Society has ever held forth a testimony against.

Then there seemed to be a persistent purpose to elect or appoint Friends to offices which it was known they would not fill, and fine them for non-compliance. All offices were demurred to by those in harmony with the Yearly Meeting, but places as tax-gatherers were peculiarly objectionable, for the taxes went to the support of the war, and must be forced from conscientious people.

Some of them also disapproved of handling the paper money of the day. The Meeting apparently went no further than to advise against paying off debts in depreciated currency on ac-

count of injustice to the creditor, but individuals argued that as this money was issued to aid the war it was wrong to touch it. When, however, one Friend, after carefully settling a debt in hard money at considerable loss to himself, found that it was immediately seized by the government as a great addition to its resources, he began to question whether his refusal to handle the prevailing currency had any virtue in it.

As an illustration of the great carefulness of Friends not to take even an indirect part in war, we have the following account of Joseph Townsend, a young man, who out of curiosity followed the British army as it marched past his home towards the Brandywine battle:

I arrived at the bars on the road where I was met by several companies of soldiers who were ordered into the field to form and prepare for the approaching engagement. The openings of the bars not being of sufficient width to admit them to pass with that expedition which the emergency of the case required, a German officer on horseback ordered the fence to be taken down, and as I was near to the spot had to be subject to his requiring as he flourished a drawn sword over my head with others who stood by. On a removal of the second rail I was forcibly struck with the impropriety of being active in assisting to take the lives of my fellow beings and therefore desisted in proceeding any further in obedience to his commands.

The Yearly Meeting also advised against fur-

nishing supplies to the army by grinding grain, feeding cattle, making weapons, or otherwise procuring any profit from traffic with it; also against allowing any of their goods to be shipped in armed vessels. Truly the way of a conscientious Quaker in the midst of war is a narrow one, and the wonder is that so large a proportion were able, in a time of excitement and bitter partisanship, to agree to recommend to their brethren, and practice themselves, the advice of the following minute:

So that we may by Divine assistance be mutually helpful in maintaining a conduct uniformly consistent with our religious principles, which do not allow of our accepting of or continuing in any public office or being anyways active under the power and authority exercised at this time as they appear to be founded in the spirit of war and fightings. Friends are therefore exhorted and cautioned against being concerned in electing or being elected to any place of profit or trust under the present commotion, nor to pay any fine penalty or tax in lieu of personal service for carrying on the present war or to consent to or allow of our apprentices children or servants acting therein, and carefully to avoid all trade and business tending to promote war and particularly against partaking of the spoils of war by buying or vending prize goods of any kind.

A little body of Friends had settled on the frontiers at Catawissa, and built a meeting-house. In this position they were in much more difficulty than if in the Quaker counties, be-

cause of the long-standing hostile feelings of the frontiersmen. They were in the midst of Indian ravages, and many of their neighbors had sought safety by flight. They, however, remained unarmed, and their confidence was justified. No red man disturbed them. When Moses Roberts, a minister, was approaching the meeting-house as usual on the first day of the week for their quiet worship, he and other leaders of the meeting were arrested, placed in jail, and without accusation or trial informed that their liberation could only be secured by offering bail to the extent of £10,000. Two of them were sent down the Susquehanna in a canoe, and without trial were kept in Lancaster jail for eleven months. Two months after their arrest a body of armed men drove their families out of their houses, leaving them without any means of support, and seized their property. They were financially ruined. The supposition was that they were aiding the Indians by giving information, a suspicion excited by their immunity from molestation in the Indian raids. As they were denied a trial then or afterwards, no proof on either side can now be adduced, but it is almost certain that men of their character would not even indirectly assist in the cruel

Indian attacks on their white brethren. It was probably some of the same spirit which animated the Paxton boys of 1764 which caused their imprisonment and the spoliation of their goods.

A still sadder narrative is that of the trial and execution of two Friends in Philadelphia in the latter part of 1778. When the city was evacuated by the British, most of the Tories, anticipating danger from the temper of the Americans, placed themselves safely within the British lines. The Quakers, however, remained at their homes. The most of them had been passive in their actions, even when loyalists at heart, and nothing could be laid to their charge. The excited populace, however, demanded victims, and they were found in two men who had disregarded the advice of their meetings and given active aid to the royal cause.

Abraham Carlisle was a carpenter in Philadelphia. During the British occupancy he had accepted a commission to superintend passes through the British lines. Having large acquaintance and a good character, he undertook this, probably in no mercenary spirit, and, as many witnesses testified, with a desire to alleviate distress, which he succeeded in doing in a number of cases.

John Roberts was a miller. His mill is still standing on Mill Creek, in Lower Merion Township, Montgomery County, about ten miles from the centre of Philadelphia. He was now nearly sixty years old, of perfect integrity, and a benevolent disposition. These were certified to by willing witnesses of the highest character, who gave many instances of his goodness of heart. He was in good standing among Friends and socially connected with cultivated families within the Society. His sympathies were British, and when his friends were banished to Virginia he became greatly excited at the injustice. He visited Howe, then marching across Chester County, and offered to conduct a body of troops to intercept the convoy and release the prisoners. Finding himself an object of dislike to his neighbors, and fearing molestation, he took refuge within the lines of the British army. Thence he would appear at intervals as guide to a party of foragers in their excursions among the farms of his locality. His friends claimed this to be involuntary, and that he used his influence to shield poor people who he knew could not afford to part with their goods. His enemies considered him the willing agent of the invading army in pointing out the houses of the friends of the

American cause. With the records before us it is impossible to determine which view was correct.

The two men were tried before Chief Justice McKean, and were convicted of high treason.

Their age and high standing, their large families, the prevailing opinion that while technically guilty they were sacrificed to an ignoble demand for vengeance on many who were far more culpable, created great interest in their case. Petitions showered into the Executive Council in great numbers, asking reprieves. The most of the members of the grand and petit juries, fortified by the signatures of the justices of the court, nearly four hundred other signers in the case of Carlisle and nearly one thousand in that of Roberts, embracing eminent men in the American army and in civil and social positions, sent in their urgent appeals. But the attempt was futile, and in a public conveyance, with their coffins before them and ropes about their necks, they were carried to their execution.

There was the deepest sympathy among Friends for the sufferers. The letters of the times, when they refer to the case, speak as if the Friends had endured an unmerited penalty, by an unnecessary, if legal, stretch of authority.

Inasmuch as the Yearly Meeting had advised strongly against the course of action which had brought them into the court, no official protest was made. The Meeting for Sufferings appointed a committee to write their views of the case, but their report does not appear on the minutes till 1785, though it bears the date of Eighth month 4th, 1779, and is referred to in contemporary letters.

After a general introduction, it describes the cases as follows:

One of them was an Inhabitant of this City of a reputable moral character, who after the British army took possession thereof in the Fall of the year 1777 was prevailed upon to accept of an office to grant permits or persons to pass in and out; his acceptance of which station and acting therein giving concern to Friends, they expressed their uneasiness to him, but their endeavors to convince him of his error did not prevail with him to decline or withdraw executing it.

The other being a member of a neighbouring Mo. Meeting in the country, we have not learned that any religious care or advice was seasonably extended to him; he resided at Merion, maintained a reputable character among men, well respected for his hospitality, benevolent disposition and readiness to serve his neighbors and friends, and to administer relief to the afflicted or distressed.

In the 9th mo. 1777, several Friends and others of their fellow citizens being unjustly apprehended and imprisoned, and afterwards sent into banishment without an examination or hearing; suffering his mind to be too much moved by this arbitrary violation of civil and religious liberty, he hastened away without previously

consulting with them, to give intelligence thereof to the General of the British Army then on their march towards this city, in hope to frustrate the intention of sending them into exile; which proceeding of his, when it became known, gave sensible pain and concern to Friends. Some time after his return from this journey he was seen in company with the English Army, or parties of them, in some of their marches or enterprizes not far distant from the city, but he allways insisted this was against his will, and that he was forcibly compelled to it, which also appears by the evidence given at his trial; but these parts of his conduct furnished occasion for the prosecution against him.

After the British Army evacuated this city in the Sixth month, 1778, their opponents returned, and resuming their power, these two members were in a short time arraigned with divers other persons, for high Treason, and after a trial were by a jury declared guilty, sentenced to be executed and their estates confiscated to the Government.

Having perused a copy of the evidence taken at their trial, we find it to be a very contradictory, and discover clear indications of a party spirit, and that they were prosecuted with great severity and rigour is also apparent, the punishment inflicted far exceeding the nature of their offence; and that this was the general sense of the people was demonstrated by great numbers of all rank uniting their interests and influence for saving their lives by petitions and divers personal applications to the persons in power who held the authority over them; but they proved inexorable, alledging political reasons for rejecting those ardent solicitations. Notwithstanding they were members of our religious Society whom we respected and commiserated in their distressed situation yet as through their inadvertence to the principles of Divine Grace, and overlooking the repeated advice and caution given forth by Friends they were suffered to fall into such error and deviation, which occasioned great trouble of mind and affliction to their brethren, and affected the reputation of truth, this meeting or any other

was restrained from interposing in their favour or vindication, as is our duty and usual care when our brethren are subjected to suffering or persecution for righteousness sake and the testimony of a good conscience; nevertheless we were sensibly touched with much sympathy toward them, which was manifested by the repeated visits of divers Friends who were religiously concerned for their welfare, some of whom have informed us that through the merciful visitation of Divine Kindness they were favoured with a sense of their deviation from that rectitude and stability of conduct which our peaceable Christian principles require; and John Roberts at one time with earnestness expressed, "that he had gone beyond the line, and seen his deviation, and if his life was spared he should spend it differently."

And Abraham Carlisle said, "that he saw the station he had filled and acted in, in a different light, and that he had been under a cloud when he thought he was doing right"; and on some further conversation respecting the concern and burthen he had brought on Friends by omitting to give attention to some early hints and advice, he appeared disposed to acknowledge his error in writing; and at another time expressed "that he was very sorry he had given any uneasiness to Friends, as he always had a regard to the Society." It also appears that near the close of their time, from the disposition of mind attending them, there is grounds to hope and believe they were, through Divine Mercy, prepared for their awful, solemn change, expressing their resignation thereto, forgiveness of those who sought their destruction, and their desire that all men might timely and happily experience redemption from the evils of the world, evidencing by their sentiments and the tranquil state of their minds, that they were not left comfortless in the hour of extremity.

In reply to an address of Friends to the Pennsylvania Assembly, asking protection against persecutions for conscience' sake, that body de-

siring a strict definition of their principles and intentions with regard to the new government, sent a set of questions to which they desired categorical answers in writing:

1. Do you acknowledge the Supreme Legislative Power of the State rightfully and lawfully vested in the present House of Representatives met in Assembly?

2. Do you acknowledge the Supreme Executive Power of the State to be lawfully and rightfully vested in the present President and Council?

3. Do you acknowledge and agree that the same obedience and respect is due to these bodies respectively that you formerly paid and acknowledged to the Governor and Assembly respectively while Pennsylvania was dependent on Great Britain?

4. Are you willing and do you agree to render the same respect and obedience you rendered Governor and Assembly in Pa. before the present war between Great Britain and America?

5. Do you consider yourselves now living under the laws of the State with regard to your personal liberty and property?

6. Do you admit it to be the right of the governed to resist the Governors when the powers of Government are used to the oppression and destruction of the governed?

7. Do you or do you not deem the laws passed by the King and Parliament of Gt. Britain for taxing this country, prohibiting its trade, sending its inhabitants to Gt. Britain for trial, oppressive and destructive to the people of America?

They also asked why they would not use Continental money, and why they made a distinction between it and other paper money previously issued for war purposes; and finally requested

copies of all minutes and addresses to the members and to other Yearly Meetings bearing on the question of allegiance.

To these requests the Meeting for Sufferings replied that they were a religious, not a political, body, and that the inquisition into their opinions was entirely without precedent in America. Individually they had political opinions, but collectively they had only moral and religious opinions, to which the world was welcome.

They had always believed government to be a Divine ordinance, and Governors who ruled well worthy of all honor, nevertheless that conscience must be respected as supreme over all human laws. They were opposed to war, and their opposition was founded on the Gospel, which pointed to the approaching reign of universal peace, love and harmony.

They had declined to take any part on either side of the existing contest or to join in any way to promote disturbance, and many had refused the payment of war taxes for a long time before the Revolution.

Their papers had been seized in 1777, and returned because nothing seditious was found in them.

Finally, they said their desire was to develop

such a temper of mind as would enable them to forgive all injuries and to prove they are friends to all men.

The Assembly failed in bringing them to declare themselves, as, owing to the diversity among them, it would have been manifestly impossible to do. As many in state authority were disowned Friends, who knew exactly the situation, it is probable that the questions were really intended to foster division or increase popular disapproval rather than to elicit information, and a general answer was all that could safely be given.

The dislike of the Quakers showed itself in a violent outbreak in Philadelphia. The more extreme of the revolutionaries, under Joseph Reed, were in general control during the latter years of the war, but at times they could not restrain the mob of their own partisans in the streets. A general like Mifflin, and signers of the Declaration of Independence like Morris and Wilson, were hardly safe in their own city. They were too moderate, and hence had their doors battered in by the rioters, and were in danger of their lives. Under such circumstances it is hardly to be expected that the Quakers, who had never approved of

the Revolution, should be unmolested. The feeling came out strongly when they refused to illuminate their houses "on the occasion of a victory of one of the parties of war over the other," in which general manner they characterized the defeat of Cornwallis at Yorktown in 1781. Their general unpopularity seemed to have weighed on them when they contrasted it with their former strength. They were conscious that while never professing to approve of the Revolution as a body, they had never opposed it or attempted to resist, nor even to escape from its government. They had lived quietly at their homes, under American and British occupancy, under the rule of moderates and radicals, opposing no one, and always good and peaceable citizens. Their faults, if their actions were faults, were negative. Under these circumstances it seemed good to them as a matter of defence to issue, now that the war was practically over, one more address in explanation of their course:

Eleventh mo. 22nd, 1781.

To the President and Executive Council, the General Assembly of Pennsylvania and others whom it may concern the following representation on behalf of the people called Quakers sheweth:

That the outrages and violences committed on the property and on divers of the persons of the inhabitants

of Philadelphia of our religious Society by companies of licentious people parading the streets, destroying the windows and doors of our houses, breaking into and plundering some of them on the evening of the 24th of last month increases the occasion of our present address to you who are in the exercise of the power of civil government, which is in itself honourable and originally instituted for the support of public peace and good order and the preservation of the just rights of the people.

* * * * *

It must therefore appear strange and extraordinary in the view of candid enquirers that so evident a change and contrast have taken place, and that many who are the descendants of the first settlers professing the same religious principles and connected in interest affection and duty to the real good and welfare of our country who have never forfeited our birthright should now be vilified persecuted and excluded from our just liberties and privileges not only by laws calculated to oppress us but the execution of them in some places committed to men of avaricious profligate principles who have made a prey of the innocent and industrious to the great loss and damage of some and the almost ruin of others; scurrilous publications and other invidious means have been used by our adversaries to calumniate and reproach us with opprobrious names in order to inflame the minds of the ignorant and impose on the credulous to our prejudice, when upon an impartial candid examination we trust it will appear that in the course of the commotions which have unhappily prevailed no just cause of offence will be found against us but that we have endeavored to maintain our peaceable religious principles to preserve a good conscience toward God and to manifest our good will to all men.

* * * * *

The dispensation of war bloodshed and calamity which hath been permitted to prevail on the Continent is very solemn and awful demanding the most serious and heart-felt attention of all ranks and denominations among the

people individually to consider and examine how far we are each of us really and sincerely engaged to bring forth fruits of true repentance and amendment of life agreeable to the spirit and doctrine of the gospel. And although we have been exposed to great abuse and unchristian treatment we wish to be enabled through the assistance of Divine Grace to cherish in ourselves and inculcate in others with whom we have an influence that disposition to forgiveness of injuries enjoined by the precept and example of Christ our Holy Lawgiver and to manifest our desires and endeavors to promote the real good of our country and that we are

Your Friends.

Notwithstanding their unpopularity they were able to report, in 1780, that “divers persons of sober conduct, professing to be convinced of our religious principles, have on their application been received into membership.” In the same year they could also announce the practical success of their efforts to support their peaceable testimony; “Care is maintained to preserve our ancient testimony against bearing arms or being engaged in military services, and many have deeply suffered in the distraint of their goods and effects on this account.”

They undoubtedly felt that though they had suffered much in popular esteem, they had steered through a very troubled sea of war and confusion on a straight line of principle. Their testimony against war was kept vital under con-

ditions where any weakness or compromise would have destroyed it. They had suffered for it, and had been preserved, and they felt no temptation to make any apologies, or look back with any regrets. With abundant confidence in the solidity of the ground on which they stood, they looked confidently forward to the better days of peace. Though their ranks were decimated by the "disownment" of unfaithful brethren, the testimony of the Society as a whole had been given without fear or equivocation, and already some who had left them in the moment of excitement were honestly regretful of their course, and were asking to be reunited. The years following the war were the years of the greatest increase in the number of meetings, and probably of members, which had been seen in Pennsylvania since the early years of the settlement.

On which side were Quaker sympathies during the Revolutionary war? is a question often asked. It is impossible to give a definite answer, but there are several guides on which something of a judgment may be based. About four hundred, perhaps, actively espoused the American side by joining the army, accepting positions under the revolutionary government, or taking an affirma-

tion of allegiance to it, and lost their birthright among Friends as a result. Perhaps a score in a similar way openly espoused the British cause, and also were disowned by their brethren. These numbers very likely represented proportions of silent sympathizers. The official position was one of neutrality, but individually the Friends could hardly be neutral. It seems almost certain that the men of property and social standing in Philadelphia, the Virginia exiles and their close associates, like the wealthy merchants of New York and Boston, were loyalists, though in their case passively so.* One gets this impression from such sources as Elizabeth Drinker's Diary and certain Pemberton letters. The husband of Elizabeth Drinker was one of the exiles, and, while she writes cautiously, a careful reader can hardly doubt her bias. Many of the country

*In this Province—Pennsylvania—indeed, in Philadelphia, there are three persons, a Mr. W—, who is very rich and very timid; the Provost of the College, Dr. Smith, who is supposed to be distracted between a strong passion for lawn sleeves and a stronger passion for popularity, which is very necessary to support the reputation of his Episcopal College, and one Israel Pemberton, who is at the head of the Quaker interest. These three make an interest here which is lukewarm, but they are all obliged to lie low for the present.”—John Adams' Diary, Vol. I., pp. 173-174. June, 1775.

Friends were probably American in their sympathies. It is very difficult to show this conclusively, and only by slight allusions here and there is the idea gained. We do not know of any attacks upon them by the patriots, and it is likely that many of them, while too conscientious to go with their sons and brothers into the American army, held the same general opinions in favor of the cause of liberty for which they had contended so consistently since the days when David Lloyd mustered them against William Penn.

There were, therefore, a few radical Tories, a much larger number of radical Friends of the Revolution, and the rest were quiet sympathizers with one or the other party. In this diversity all the moderate men who were really desirous to be faithful to the traditional beliefs of their fathers could unite on a platform of perfect neutrality of action for conscience' sake.

CHAPTER IX.

THE FREE QUAKERS.

MANY of those disowned by the Society for espousing actively and sincerely the American cause were unable to ally themselves with any other religious organization. Quakerism in many essential features was so instilled into them that they took no satisfaction in the more elaborate forms which characterized other modes of formal worship.

Others were simply irreligious people who cared nothing for membership in any denomination. In a large number of cases other offences were charged against them. They were disowned for taking up arms and also for non-attendance at meetings or for improper or immoral conduct. The Society took advantage of the opportunity to separate from membership those who had not been for a long time up to its standard of life. All those who were reckless, indifferent or unfortunate, as in all times of excitement, flocked to one or the other standard, and were unceremoniously disowned. It required some self-denial and more or less of moral

courage to withstand the general unpopularity, and adhere to the policy the meeting had laid down. It will not do, therefore, to assume that all or nearly all of the separated members braved their ecclesiastical penalties in a spirit of unselfish dedication to a great cause.

There was also, especially in the beginning of the war, a number of young men who, without very profound convictions, were carried away with the contagious enthusiasm of the times, and almost before having time for second thought found themselves outside the Society.

When the war ended some of all classes, finding that their affections were still with Friends, sought to return into membership. This could only be effected by condemning the violations for which disownment had been meted out to them. Some found it possible to do this in all sincerity.

Owen Biddle was a vehement patriot, and lost his membership in 1775 for military services. Early the next year he became a member of the Board of War appointed by the Executive Council of Pennsylvania, and served till the Board was disbanded, seventeen months later. Three of his eight associates were also disowned Friends. Having wealth, learning and position, he was an important aid to the patriots through

the whole war. When it was over, and his cause triumphant, his thoughts underwent a revolution. James Pemberton writes of it:

However, in the midst of troubles, it is comfortable to find that some have become weary and find no rest but in returning. The instance of O. Biddle shows that miracles are not ceased. I was sensible he had long dwelt in a painful state of mind but unwilling to bow or confess; it is comfortable to hear that he hath at last; and with his stability believe he will find it better to be a door-keeper in the house of his Lord than dwell in the tents of wickedness.

Others had no inclination to apologize and return. They were perfectly satisfied with their course in serving the American cause in civil and military places, and felt that their Quakerism was not to be impeached on this account. They therefore undertook to form a new society, "The Religious Society of Friends," by some styled the "Free Quakers," as their first minute book records in February, 1781.

The central figure in the movement was Samuel Wetherill, a minister and clerk of the meeting for many years. With him were associated Timothy Matlack, a colonel in the army, and during the whole war secretary to the Executive Council of Pennsylvania; Clement Biddle, also a colonel, and quartermaster of the Revolutionary army; Christopher Marshall, whose diary

has been published, and two women, Lydia Darrach and Elizabeth Griscom, who performed peculiar services to the American cause, with a hundred or more others.

Lydia Darrach conveyed to Washington information of a plan to surprise his army. During the British occupation a company of officers were quartered at her house. She was cautioned to have all her family in bed on a certain evening, as an important conference was to be held. The injunction was observed, but she herself, quietly listening at the keyhole, heard the plans discussed for an attack on Washington the following night. Under plea of going to Frankford for flour she went on to White Marsh, where the American army was encamped, and gave timely notice. The attack was foiled, and the general, in his disappointment, strove in vain to ascertain from Lydia how the scheme reached the American general.

Elizabeth Griscom, afterwards Ross, afterwards Claypoole, lived near Second and Arch Streets, and supported herself by her needle. She made flags for the Continental Congress, and tradition says the first Stars and Stripes were made by her just before the Declaration of Independence in 1776. The order of Congress

directing her to be paid has been found. She lived till 1836, and was the last of the original Free Quakers.

The new Society in two respects was in striking contrast to the body from which its members had been ejected. No one was to be disowned for any cause. If he were erring there was so much more need for labor to restore him. He was to be encouraged in the performance of all civil and military duties for the defence of his country. The "discipline" was very brief. It allowed the largest liberty of individual thought and action, abolished all "offences" like irregular marriage, and other formalities; in case of actual immorality recognized only the responsibility to reform, and encouraged reference to the civil tribunals in case of controversies. The meetings for worship and business were to be conducted as in ancient Quaker fashion, and the general doctrines, organization and habits of living were supposed to include all that was best in Quakerism, adapted to the changes which a century had wrought in the environment of the Society. Even less prominent, however, than in the regular body, was any statement of belief, and every man was permitted to be his own creed maker.

One of their early demands was for the use of

one of the meeting-houses in the city. "We think it proper for us to use, apart from you, one of the houses built by Friends in this city. . . . We also mean to use the burial ground whenever the occasion shall require it." This paper was presented to the Monthly Meeting of Friends in Philadelphia, on the 27th of July, 1781, and was not even read. This being equivalent to a refusal, the Free Quakers carried the case to the Legislature of the State in a form which would be likely to ensure their success.

The sympathies of the Legislature and of the people in general were naturally with them. However, after carrying the question over for two sessions, the Assembly wisely decided not to interfere.

On the one hand it was claimed that the regular Society had no right to disown for actions sanctioned by the law of the land, and that those disowned were still in all essentials Friends, and hence entitled to a share in Quaker property; on the other hand, the right of every Society to make its own rules and enforce them when the conditions of membership were plainly stated, was strongly urged. It was claimed that in violating the known order of the church, members practically severed the bonds which attached

them to it, and by their own action excluded themselves from its benefits. The State had no right to interfere between a church organization and a member, for while liberty of conscience was a right of the individual, so freedom to make and enforce regulations was a prerogative of a society, and no individual could impose himself upon it except with its consent.

The whole controversy was not conducted in the best of temper. The official papers were faultless, but the letters of the time show the bitterness of partisan spirit so characteristic of religious differences in general.

Popular sympathy was with the new body, and the case was argued before the committee of the Assembly in the presence of a great company of interested listeners. James Pemberton describes the occasion under date of Ninth month 20th, 1782:

The committee intending to proceed on the business, first asked each party whether they were prepared; on our part they were answered that our Meeting for Sufferings, which represented our religious Society in the interval of our Yearly Meeting had appointed us a committee to attend on the occasion and having a minute of our appointment we were ready to produce it, and we requested that Howell and Matlack* should be required to shew to the satisfaction of their committee their authority for

* Isaac Howell and White Matlack.

complaining and by whom they were deputed; upon which some argument ensued and S. Delany the chairman then mentioned that two petitions signed by 75 persons who had been disowned by the people called Quakers for bearing of arms had been presented to the House a few days past, and by special order was referred to the consideration of the committee, one of which he read importing "that they utterly disclaimed the proceedings of the remonstrants, were well content that the estate of friends might continue under their own direction and praying that the request of the remonstrants might not be granted and that they looked upon the attempt thus to arraign and disturb us an invasion of the rights of toleration and religious liberty; which being the vo'luntary act of the petitioners unsolicited by us or any of us that I know of was not unfavorable to our cause. T. M.,* on hearing these petitions and fearing their effect made reply that if two persons only thought themselves aggrieved they had an undoubted right to redress but that he could procure many hundred to support them and that the signers to these opposite petitions might have their names inserted in the intended law to exclude them if they chose it. On our part it was further urged that the complainants ought also to make proof of the legality and justice of their claim and wherein they were aggrieved and some points of law being stated by N. W.† on the rectitude of this proceeding occasioned a debate in the committee which being in public was some disadvantage to us as they had not the opportunity of so fully discussing the matter as the nature and importance of it required, and they should therefore have considered it among themselves; however they concluded to take the opinion of the House therefore but to proceed in hearing the complainants, when we also pleaded that T. M. should show in what capacity he appeared there, whether as counsellor or advocate for the remonstrants; whether being Secretary by order of the

* Timothy Matlack.

† Nicholas Waln.

Executive Council or as a party, having at our last interview acknowledged before our committee that his case did not come within the meaning or intent of the bill proposed to be brought before the House when liberty for it was granted.

The committee proceeded to hear the complainants who produced several testimonies of divers monthly meetings against members disowned and some witnesses in support of the four first charges in their remonstrance, viz.: " of persons being disowned for taking the Test of Allegiance, holding of offices, bearing of arms and the payment of taxes; as the testimonies were separately read and appeared to be genuine we did not disallow them, and in general being cautiously expressed they will do us no discredit in the view of religious considerate men. On the last charge in respect to the payment of taxes their evidences were few and very feeble, the testimonies being an account of the payments of fines in lieu of personal service and are instances of a double tax and fine. They also attempted, but ineffectually to prove that some members had been urged to renounce their allegiance before a magistrate as a condition of their being reinstated in which they will appear to have failed when the case is properly stated.

The committee adjourned to meet again on Fourth-day afternoon. In the meantime they reported to the House how far they had proceeded and desired their opinion and direction of the questions proposed as before mentioned that H. and M. should prove their constituents and on what they founded their claims upon which the House determined to give no further instructions to their committee. A debate ensued again on Fourth-day morning concerning the business which held late and I suppose was earnest. In the afternoon at the time appointed our committee went up to the chamber where we found the Clerk of the Assembly only except a crowd of people who followed us. He delivered us a copy of a minute of the House notifying us that there would be no further hearing before the committee on that day and told us he had orders to deliver a like copy to the remonstrants but that the business would be again taken up by the

Assembly the same afternoon as it was accordingly and concluded to be referred over to the succeeding Assembly so that we have hereby obtained a respite unexpectedly and shall have leisure to attend to the weighty concerns of our approaching Yearly Meeting.

Several points brought out in this letter may deserve further notice.

The petition signed by seventy-five disowned Friends against disturbing the property rights of the main body is an indication that at least that many did not desire a permanent separation, which would break up the integrity of the Society; and though it was stated that a counter petition could be procured, signed by "hundreds," it is probable that not more than one hundred were actually associated in the movement. A private contemporary letter states that of the disowned Friends a majority were opposed to the action, and justified their own disownment.

From an examination of many minute books it seems probable that James Pemberton was right when he said that members were not disowned for the simple payment of taxes to the revolutionary government unless they were specifically war taxes, or were exacted in lieu of personal service. He could not be certain of this, for each Monthly Meeting all over the province was to a certain extent a law unto itself in these matters.

The case of the regular Friends was much aided by the legal knowledge and acumen of Nicholas Waln. Before his active interest in Friendly matters he had been one of the shrewdest, the wittiest and the most successful members of the Philadelphia bar. In a public meeting he had uttered a remarkable prayer of renunciation of his past ambitions, and gave himself over to the service of his church.*

He became exceedingly useful. It is related of him that on a certain occasion, during the Free Quaker controversy, after a statement from certain of the ejected members as to the patriotic causes of their disownment, he turned to one of them whose well-known cause of stumbling was cock-fighting, and, pointing prominently to him in silence until the attention of the whole room was obtained, said impressively, "What wast thou disowned for?" A second and a third who happened to be present, whose cases were also public, were treated in a similar way, and a marked impression was left that some at least of the complainants were not martyrs for the sake of freedom.

* A mutilated edition of this prayer is, in Dr. Mitchell's novel, "Hugh Wynne," placed in the mouth of a mythical personage named Israel Sharpless.

The Assembly took no final action, but referred the matter to the succeeding session. In the meantime something of a conservative reaction had come over the country. John Dickinson was elected President of Pennsylvania after his period of unpopularity and practical banishment to Delaware, and the new Assembly was moderate. Timothy Matlack had lost his political influence. The question was evidently one over which a legislative body found it very inconvenient to exercise jurisdiction, for a decision would have far-reaching consequences, and the matter was allowed to drop.

The Free Quakers had to look to their own exertions to provide a meeting-house. A lot was purchased at the southwest corner of Arch and Fifth Streets, and a building erected, which is still standing, and which bears upon it the inscription:

By general Subscription
For the Free Quakers, erected
In the year of our Lord 1783
Of the Empire 8.

It is said that when asked the meaning of the last line one of them replied, "I tell thee, Friend, it is because our country is destined to be the great empire over all this world."

The subscription did not cause much difficulty. There was general sympathy with the patriotic Quakers, and Washington and Franklin, with many other prominent sympathizers, contributed to the building. Meetings for worship were held in it till 1836. It is now rented, and the proceeds used for charitable purposes.

Many of those who in the days of military excitement joined in the movement, afterwards returned to their original fold. Some joined other religious bodies. The Free Quakers gradually diminished in numbers, and when the meeting-house closed, practically ceased to exist as a religious body. The descendants of the original members, perhaps one hundred and fifty in number, still maintain their organization, hold a Yearly Meeting, and quietly distribute the income in educational and charitable work.

As a peaceful government extended its sway over the independent United States, the asperities of feeling which had belonged to the revolutionary era subsided. The conscientiousness which had characterized many Friends in their refusal to bear arms for the American cause was more and more recognized. Their faithfulness as members of society in the performance of their civic duties, their justice and kindness,

their quiet attention to duty and lack of desire for selfish preferment, made their rulers feel that if they would not fight for or against government, they possessed other qualities which made them valuable citizens. When Washington—of whom they always spoke with great respect, and who appreciated them far better than did those militant civilians, the Adamses of Massachusetts—became President, in 1789, they sent to him a deputation with the following address:

Being met in our annual assembly for the well ordering of the affairs of our religious Society and the promotion of universal righteousness our minds have been drawn to consider that the Almighty who ruleth in Heaven and in the kingdoms of men having permitted a great revolution to take place in the government of this country, we are fervently concerned that the rulers of the people may be favored with the council of God; the only sure means to enable them to fill the important trust committed to their charge and in an especial manner that Divine wisdom and grace vouchsafed from above may qualify thee to fill up the duties of the exalted station to which thou art appointed.

We are sensible thou hast obtained a great place in the esteem and affection of people of all denominations over whom thou presidest, and many eminent talents being committed to thy trust we much desire they may be fully devoted to the Lord's honor and service, that thus thou mayst be a happy instrument in his hands for the suppression of vice infidelity and irreligion and every species of oppression on the persons or concerns of men, so that righteousness and peace which truly exalt a nation may prevail throughout the land as the only solid foundation that can be laid for prosperity and happiness.

The free toleration which the citizens of these States enjoy, in the public worship of the Almighty agreeably to the dictates of their consciences, we esteem among the choicest of blessings and we desire to be filled with fervent charity for those who differ from us in matters of faith and practice, believing that the general assembly of saints is composed of the sincere and upright-hearted of all nations, kingdoms and peoples so we trust we may justly claim it from others;—with a full persuasion that the Divine principle we profess leads into harmony and concord we can take no part in warlike measures on any occasion or under any power, but we are bound in conscience to lead quiet and peaceable lives in godliness and honesty among men, contributing freely our proportion to the indigencies of the poor, and to the necessary support of civil government; acknowledging those that rule well to be worthy of double honor—having never been chargeable from our first establishment as a religious Society with fomenting or countenancing tumults or conspiracies, or disrespect to those who are placed in authority over us.

We wish not improperly to intrude on thy time or patience nor is it our practice to offer adulation to any. But as we are a people whose principles and conduct have been misrepresented and traduced we take the liberty to assure thee that we feel our hearts affectionately drawn towards thee and those in authority over us with prayers that thy presidency may under the blessing of Heaven be productive of morality and true religion and that Divine Providence may condescend to look down upon our land with a propitious eye, and bless the inhabitants with the continuance of peace, the dew of heaven, and the fatness of the earth and enable us gratefully to acknowledge these manifold mercies.

And it is our earnest concern that he may be pleased to grant thee every necessary qualification to fill thy weighty and important station to his glory, and that finally when all terrestrial honors shall pass away thou and thy respectable consort may be found worthy to receive a

crown of unfading righteousness in the mansions of peace and joy forever.

NICHOLAS WALN, Clerk.

To this Washington replied:

Gentlemen:

I received with pleasure your affectionate address, and thank you for the friendly sentiments and good wishes which you express for the success of my administration and for my personal happiness. We have reason to rejoice in the prospect that the national government, which by the power of Divine Providence was formed by the common councils and peaceably established by the common consent of the people will prove a blessing to every denomination of them; to render it such my best endeavors will not be wanting. Government being among other purposes instituted to protect the persons and consciences of men from oppression it certainly is the duty of rulers not only to abstain from it themselves but according to their stations to prevent it in others.

The liberty enjoyed by the people of these States of worshipping Almighty God agreeably to their consciences is not only among the choicest of their blessings but also of their rights. While men perform their social duties faithfully they do all that society or the State can with propriety expect or demand and remain responsible only to their Maker for the religion or mode of faith which they may prefer or profess. Your principles and conduct are well known to me, and it is doing the people called Quakers no more than justice to say that (except their declining to share with others in the burthens of common defence) there is no denomination among us who are more exemplary and useful citizens. I assure you very especially that in my opinion the conscientious scruples of all men should be treated with great delicacy and tenderness; and it is my wish and desire that the laws may always be extensively accommodated to them as a due regard to the protection and essential interest of the nation may justify and permit.

GEORGE WASHINGTON.

With this exchange of letters—on the one hand attesting fidelity to the existing administration, and on the other carrying a strong endorsement of the principles which had guided the past—the reconciliation between the Quakers and the government, which revolutionary events had somewhat strained, may be considered to have been perfectly accomplished.

CHAPTER X.

FRIENDS AND SLAVERY.

The Revolutionary War had for the time being almost destroyed the influence of Friends over the politics of the State they had founded and so long controlled. They had opposed a war which was waged in support of independence and which had been successful. It is true that the principles upon which they based their conduct had not been especially devised for the emergency, but had been firmly and clearly enunciated through one hundred years of history. The course they took might properly have been expected of them by those who had been familiar with the record of their past. But to many in the nation these principles came as revelations of a new and dangerous tendency, developing a course of action entirely unequal to the emergencies to which any government might be exposed. To others the Quakers seemed to be cowards or fanatics or hypocrites, or seekers after wealth and ease.

None of these cared to see the Quakers restored to the position of influence they had held before

the war. Many felt that they had an unsettled grudge against them for their refusal to aid in the great struggle. The heroes of the war took, by virtue of the popular voice, the positions of honor and profit.

Nor did the Quakers seem to wish it otherwise. They had had enough of government. The movement which began in 1756 against holding compromising offices gradually extended itself to avoid official connection with the State. This tendency was strengthened in the minds of the more strenuous Friends by the events of the war, and when, after a decade of peace, there seemed a disposition to turn again to Friends to find representatives in the Pennsylvania legislature, the Yearly Meeting, in 1791, advised:

The concern and exercise which formerly attended the minds of Friends of this meeting respecting accepting of posts either in legislative or executive government or promoting the choice of members of our religious Society to such stations or mixing with others in their human policy and contrivance, being now revived, and the minutes and advices of the Yearly Meeting in 1758, '62, '63, '64 and '70 being read, they were recommended to the observance of Quarterly and Monthly Meetings and of Friends in general, and it is directed that the said advices be read in said meetings.

In one direction, however, they felt they had an especial duty to the State and the nation.

The last slaves held by Pennsylvania Quakers were manumitted, wherever legally possible, about the time of the battle of Yorktown.

It had taken one hundred years of agitation to bring about this result. The German Quakers of Germantown had protested in 1688: "There is a liberty of conscience here which is right and reasonable, and there ought to be likewise liberty of the body, except for evil doers, which is another case. But to bring men hither, or to rob and sell them against their will, we stand against." From that time on the movement for abolition had advanced.* In 1696 the Yearly Meeting advised not "to encourage the bringing in of any more negroes, and that such as have negroes be careful of them."

The Friends of Chester County were particularly urgent, and ceased not to press the matter on the attention of the Yearly Meeting. In 1711 they reported that "their meeting was dissatisfied with Friends buying and encouraging the bringing of negroes." The next year they asked that London Yearly Meeting, as the cen-

*A full history of this movement among Friends over the continent will be found in detail in the publications of the American Society of Church History, vol. viii., written by Allen Clapp Thomas.

tral body, do something to bring about some concerted action of all Friends the world over. But London was not ready, and in 1714 Philadelphia returns to the matter:

We also kindly received your advice about negro slaves, and we are one with you that the multiplying of them may be of a dangerous consequence, and therefore a law was made in Pennsylvania, laying twenty pounds duty upon every one imported there, which law the Queen was pleased to disannul. We could heartily wish that a way might be found to stop the bringing in more here; or at least, that Friends may be less concerned in buying or selling of any that may be brought in; and hope for your assistance with the government if any farther law should be made discouraging the importation. We know not of any Friend amongst us that has any hand or concern in bringing any out of their own country; and we are of the same mind with you, that the practice is not commendable nor allowable amongst Friends; and we take the freedom to acquaint you, that our request unto you was, that you would be pleased to consult or advise with Friends in other plantations, where they are more numerous than with us; because they hold a correspondence with you but not with us, and your meeting may better prevail with them, and your advice prove more effectual.

In 1715, and again in 1716, the Chester Friends return to the charge: "The buying and selling of negroes gives great encouragement for bringing them in." To this the Yearly Meeting would only reply advising its members to avoid such purchases, and added: "This is only caution, not censure."

Matters stood until 1729, when again, in response to another request from Chester, the meeting minuted "that Friends ought to be very cautious of making any such purchase for the future, it being disagreeable to the sense of this meeting." Advices to this effect were now given almost yearly, and in 1743 the following was added to the Queries: "Do Friends observe the former advice of our Yearly Meeting not to encourage the importation of negroes nor to buy them after imported?" which, a few years later was strengthened into "Are Friends clear of importing or buying negroes, and do they use those well which they are possessed of by inheritance or otherwise, endeavoring to train them up in the principles of the Christian religion?"

Thus the sentiment against slavery was fostered, and in 1758 the Yearly Meeting was brought to decisive action. After rejecting several compromises, tending to limit the advice as heretofore to the slave trade, the adopted minute stood: "This meeting fervently desires . . . that we would steadily observe the injunction of our Lord and Master to do unto others as we would they should do unto us, which it now appears unto this meeting would induce such Friends who have slaves to set them at liberty,

making a Christian provision for them according to their ages." A committee was appointed, with John Woolman at its head, to extend Christian advice to slaveholders and persuade them to release their slaves.

For twenty years after this date there are many records on the minutes of monthly meeting of voluntary or persuaded manumissions. They were made individually matters of record, to prevent the same negro ever again being seized.

Some, however, held out, and in 1775, in the midst of the throes of the outbreaking war, the meeting decided it had waited long enough: "Such members as continued to hold slaves are to be testified against as other transgressors are by the rules of our Discipline for other immoral, unjust and reproachful conduct." This was an instruction to the monthly meetings to take up each case individually, and, after careful labor and much persuasion, if he still remained recalcitrant, to disown him from the Society. This was done in some refractory cases. Others were complicated. Slaves were owned by minors; or husband and wife were not both members, and legal manumission could not be obtained, or other perplexing questions had to be settled:

Most of the Friends appointed to inquire into the circumstances of several negro slaves on whom it is thought J—— M—— had a claim, report they have done accordingly, and are informed that his brother S—— M——, deceased, by his last will gave the remainder of his estate to him after the bills and legacies were paid and appointed him executor of his will, and that his said brother had two negro men and one negro boy slaves, but that he had not taken upon him the administration of the estate, and did not intend to do it on account of the negroes. They advised him that in case administration should be granted to another person and there should be other estate enough to pay the debts and legacies (which he seemed not to doubt of) that he should discharge the administrator from the negroes and set them free, otherwise if they should be sold to pay debts and legacies, and he receive the remainder of the estate he would be the cause of their continuation in bondage, which advice being considered is approved of.

Faithfully and patiently the work was performed, and the end of the war saw the end of slavery in Philadelphia Yearly Meeting, and the voluntary compensation of many slaves for their labor while in bondage. This was advised in 1779: "The state of the oppressed people who have been held by any of us in captivity and slavery, calls for a deep inquiry and close examination how far we are clear of withholding from them what, under such an exercise, may open to view as their just right." Arbitrators decided the amount, and the former slaveholders liquidated an undemanded debt.

The work was going on contemporaneously,

and at about the same rate, in the other Yearly Meetings. In the South the difficulties were far greater, mainly because the local laws forbade manumission. In some cases the expedient was resorted to of transferring them to the meetings, which arranged for their collective migration. Thousands of Southern Quakers removed to Ohio and Indiana to escape the blight of slavery. By 1790 slavery was at an end among the Friends of the United States, except in the few exceptional cases described above, and every Quaker was an abolitionist.

They had not waited till this time, however, to urge upon legislative bodies the duty of abolishing first the slave trade, then slavery.

William Penn was somewhat chagrined that when, in 1700, he and the Council proposed a law "for regulating negroes in their morals and mariages," it was rejected by the Assembly. This was at the time when anti-Proprietary feeling was strong, and the Delaware assemblymen were members of the body.

In 1705 the House again showed its animus by passing severe laws inflicting capital punishment against negroes guilty of certain heinous crimes, which were not capital crimes when committed by the whites. In the same year they

taxed the owners of imported negroes forty shillings per head. This tax was again levied in 1710, but repealed by the Queen in Council in 1714.

In 1712, William Southeby, a Friend, prayed the legislature to abolish slavery in Pennsylvania. The House decided that this could not be granted. The same year, in response to many demands, they passed a bill levying the prohibitory duty of twenty pounds on every negro imported. This was also repealed by the Queen in Council.

Various similar attempts at restrictive duties were made, to be met by the English veto, until, in 1729, one of two pounds was allowed to stand. This existed to 1761, when Friends secured its increase to ten pounds, against the petition of Philadelphia merchants, who declared that the trade of the Province was greatly hindered by the scarcity of laborers, and who wished to encourage the importation of negroes. This nearly stopped the trade, and as Friends were all the time freeing their own negroes, the number of slaves in the Province was greatly decreased. In 1773 the duty was made twenty pounds, and in 1780 "an act for the gradual abolition of slavery" was passed.

President Reed said, in commending the law to the Assembly: "Honored will that state be, in the annals of history, which shall first abolish this violation of the rights of mankind, and the memories of those will be held in grateful and everlasting remembrance who shall pass the law to restore and establish the rights of human nature in Pennsylvania."

This, the first abolition act of America, probably drawn up by George Bryan, decreed that all negro children born after the first of March, 1780, might be held to service until the age of twenty-one years, and no longer. There never were many slaves in Pennsylvania. Under the effect of the law the number decreased from about four thousand to about two hundred in 1820.

While the educative influence of Friends had had much effect in shaping public opinion in Pennsylvania, and their past efforts had reduced greatly the pro-slavery interest of the Province, they were hardly in a condition to exert much weight directly for this act. They were at their lowest point in popular estimation, and their advocacy of a measure would not be any great aid to its passage. It must have been with great

satisfaction, however, that they viewed this triumph of the principles of freedom.

Having extinguished slavery among themselves, and seen the slave trade dead and slavery dying in their own state, the Friends of Pennsylvania turned their attention to the nation at large, and in 1783 addressed the impotent Congress of the Confederation:

To the United States in Congress Assembled. The Address of the People called Quakers:

Being through the favor of Divine providence met as usual at this season in our annual assembly, to promote the cause of piety and virtue we find with great satisfaction our well meant endeavors for the relief of an oppressed part of our fellow men have been so far blessed, that those of them who have been held in bondage by members of our religious Society are generally restored to freedom, their natural and just right.

Commiserating the afflicted state with which the inhabitants of Africa are very deeply involved by many professors of the mild and benign doctrines of the Gospel, and afflicted with a sincere concern for the essential good of our country, we conceive it our indispensable duty to revive in your view the lamentable grievance of that oppressed people as an interesting subject, evidently claiming the serious attention of those who are entrusted with the powers of government as guardians of the common rights of mankind and advocates for liberty.

We have long beheld with sorrow the complicated evils produced by an unrighteous commerce which subjects many thousands of the human species to the deplorable state of slavery.

The restoration of peace and restraint to the effusion of human blood, we are persuaded excite in the minds of many of all the Christian denominations gratitude and thank-

fulness to the all-wise Controller of human events, but we have ground to fear that some, forgetful of the days of distress are prompted by an avaricious motive to renew the trade for slaves to the African coast, contrary to every humane and righteous consideration, and in opposition to the solemn declarations often repeated in favor of universal liberty; thereby increasing the too general torrent of corruption and licentiousness, and laying a foundation for future calamities.

We therefore earnestly solicit your Christian interposition to discourage and prevent so obscene an evil, in such manner as under the influence of Divine wisdom you shall see meet.

Signed in and on behalf of our Yearly Meeting held in Philadelphia, Fourth-day of Tenth month, 1783, by five hundred and thirty-five Friends.

Nothing, however, could be expected from the Continental Congress, which had outlived its best days, and had never had any real power. But when the administration of Washington was securely seated, on the 3d of October, 1789, they sent an urgent address, signed by Nicholas Waln, clerk. In this they reiterated their belief that the Golden Rule was the only safe guide in national affairs; they called attention to their address of six years before, which, though it had apparently slumbered in Congress, had been followed by action in a number of states; they expressed the opinion that the enormities of the slave trade called for its abolition at the earliest possible moment.

This address was taken to New York, where Congress was then in session, by a large committee, and was reinforced by another from New York Yearly Meeting of Friends. The report the next year tells the story, so far as the actions of the committee were concerned:

Eleven of our number, joined by our Friend John Parish, met at New York about the time prefixed by the Meeting for Sufferings and previous to our presenting the same, took opportunities with divers members of that body, in order to prepare their minds, also attended the Meetings for Sufferings there, and opened our business, which meeting uniting therein, drew up a short address on the same subject, acknowledging their concurrence with us, and appointed a committee to join. We then in conjunction, presented the two addresses, which were read, and a committee appointed out of the House of Representatives, to consider them, after which we proceeded to visit the members generally, both Senators and Representatives, and were by many respectfully received, and had very free and full opportunities with them, and were also notified by the Committee of Congress of the time of their meeting with liberty to attend and open before them what to us appeared necessary. This we did at different times and found them very open, and notwithstanding from the first introduction of those addresses there were some members much opposed throughout, yet on the whole we were satisfied that a large majority were favorably disposed toward this business. This evidently appeared by the votes of the House, which some of our number found themselves engaged to attend, till the subject was more fully investigated, and the report of their select committee with the alterations of the committee of the whole House were entered on the journals of Congress, when way appeared open to leave the subject for the present in a state ready to be called up at any future time, and which subject we

apprehend to be weighty requiring the further continued care and concern of the Yearly Meeting.

PHILADELPHIA, Ninth Month 30th, 1790.

The reception of this address opened the first of the long line of acrimonious slavery debates, which lasted for seventy years. The arguments on either side of the great question which afterwards so emphatically divided the Union were enumerated in embryo, and the hot feeling which accompanied the discussion of the subject in later years here shows its dawning. As a side light we have evidence both of the enmity and the respect felt towards the Quakers by the different elements of the population eight years after the close of the war.

The debate began by the usual motion, made by Hartley, of Pennsylvania, to refer the address to a committee; he thought it a mark of respect due to so numerous and respectable a part of the community.

The Southern members, Smith, of South Carolina, and Jackson, of Georgia, opposed this unusual proceeding. Madison, of Virginia, called attention to the fact that the Constitution forbade all interference with the slave trade prior to 1808; and argued that no commitment could possibly affect the question, and he was therefore in

favor of it. Stone, of Maryland, and Burke, of South Carolina, while respecting the Quakers, did not think they possessed more virtue than other people, and thought that the other side should be presented, and then all referred together. It would injure the value of slave property to have it made the subject of special inquiry in this way.

Other Southern members saw in this movement but a prelude to an attack on slavery itself. Nor did the Quakers deserve any special consideration. "Is the whole morality of the United States confined to the Quakers?" asked Jackson. "Are they the only people whose feelings are to be consulted on the present occasion? Is it to them we owe our present happiness? Was it they who formed the Constitution? Did they by their arms or contributions establish our independence? I believe they were generally opposed to that measure."

The matter went over. The next day the address was reinforced by a petition from the Pennsylvania Society for Promoting the Abolition of Slavery, signed by the venerable Dr. Franklin, as President. The debate went on, however, on the commitment of the Quaker address.

Scott, of Pennsylvania, regretted that the abolition of the slave trade was prohibited by the Constitution; he looked upon it as one of the most abominable things on earth, nor could he conceive how one person could have a right of property in another. If he were a judge he did not know how far he could go in the direction of emancipation, but he would go as far as he could.

Jackson found a warrant for slavery in the Bible from Genesis to Revelation, and in all history. If he (Scott) were a Federal judge he might not know how far he could go, but his judgment would be of short duration in Georgia. Perhaps even the existence of such a judge might be in danger.

Much stress was laid by the Southerners on the constitutional inability to grant the petition, and the consequent folly of committing it, to which it was replied that the commitment was only for purposes of discussion, and that from the Southern standpoint a quiet acquiescence would have saved all the discussion, which they deprecated. The motion to commit was carried, 43 to 14.

Five weeks later the House resolved itself into

a committee of the whole to discuss the report of the committee.

The report stated the limited power of Congress in dealing with the traffic; that it could not prohibit the trade prior to 1808; that it could not decree emancipation, nor interfere in the general treatment of slaves in the States; that it had a right to lay a tax of ten dollars on importations and to regulate the African trade so as to secure humane treatment of the negroes; and finally it assured the memorialists that so far as its powers could go, it would endeavor to exercise them in the interests of justice, humanity and good policy.

A fierce debate immediately ensued. White and Brown, of Virginia, were opposed to some parts of the report as unnecessary, to other parts as mischievous. The interposition of the Quakers in the affairs of the Southern States had made slave property very precarious, and they hoped that Congress would not precipitate this great injury in order to gratify people who had never been friendly to the independence of America.

The Quakers, said Burke, of South Carolina, were not the friends of freedom; in the late war they favored bringing this country under a

foreign yoke; they descended to the character of spies; they supplied the enemy with provisions; they were guides and conductors to the British armies; and whenever the American army came into their neighborhood they found themselves in the enemy's country. Here Burke was called to order.

His colleague, Smith, took up his parable, and called attention to the publication of 1775, "The Ancient Testimony and Principles of the Quakers," in which they said that it was not their province to set up and pull down governments—that was God's prerogative; they were to pray for those in authority and live a peaceable life under them. Why did they not leave this matter also to God? They evidently did not believe what they professed, or else they had not virtue to practice what they believed. It was difficult to credit their pretended scruples, because while they were exclaiming against the mammon of this world they were hunting after it with a step as steady as time and an appetite as keen as the grave.

He appealed to Congress to allow each section to attend to its own abuses. The Southern people saw many evils in the North, but they let them alone. Each was aware of the existence

of weaknesses in the other when they formed the Union. The wise men of the North knew that slavery was ineradicably ingrafted upon the South, and the Southerners knew that Quaker doctrines had taken such deep root that resistance to them would be useless. "We took each other with our mutual bad habits and respective evils, for better, for worse; the Northern States adopted us with our slaves, and we adopted them with their Quakers." He argued that slavery was a necessity to South Carolina; no other form of labor was possible. The slaves would leave all the low land as soon as emancipated, and rice and indigo would no more be raised. Commerce and manufactures would suffer the country over.

The slave trade was too valuable to be abused. Men would not destroy their own property, nor did slavery debase the owners. Witness the noble hospitality, the art, enterprise and ingenuity, the genuine love of freedom, which prompted all the sacrifices of the war, of South Carolina.

The Quakers found a defender in Boudinot, of New Jersey. He was in favor of the resolutions, and thought an explicit declaration of the powers of Congress ought to allay rather than

excite fears. The ill treatment of the poor negroes on shipboard was no fiction. He quoted Anthony Benezet's writings, and said he himself had verified them by personal inquiry. He had little respect for the Biblical and historical arguments adduced. It is true the Egyptians held the Israelites in bondage, and he supposed supported the practice by the same arguments as the Southerners to-day. But God delivered them, and He is the same. He knew the Quakers. He was Commissary-General during the war, and he knew how much their voluntary care of the suffering had relieved the situation. Some of them opposed the Revolution—so did individual Presbyterians, Episcopalians, and members of almost every other body; while the Quakers gave the patriot cause a Greene and a Mifflin.

The resolutions, after being amended by large omissions, were carried against the Southerners by a vote of twenty-nine to twenty-five. The signing of the memorial of the Pennsylvania Society was almost the last act of the life of Dr. Franklin. He died very soon after the vote. His Society, having received the answer "that Congress had no right to interfere in the emancipation of slaves or their treatment in any

of the States," sent in no more petitions, confining its efforts to purely philanthropic labors.

In the second Congress, the declaration made in 1790 that the Government had power to mitigate the evils of the slave trade, brought in a multitude of petitions from the North. They were, however, all smothered without debate, except one from Warner Mifflin. He had freed his own slaves on his Delaware plantation, and had made ample provision for their maintenance. He now sent a memorial to Congress asking the United States to do likewise. It was presented by Fisher Ames, of Massachusetts, who disavowed any sympathy with the petition, and considered it inexpedient to bring the subject up. But he recognized the right of the memorialist to be heard. The Southerners were immediately in arms. Such things did immense mischief in the South, and did not ameliorate the condition of the negroes. They should not be presented to the House, and such summary action should be taken as to convince all enthusiasts that the subject would never be considered. To this the House apparently agreed. On motion it was resolved "that the paper purporting

to be a petition from Warner Mifflin be returned to him by the clerk of the House.”

Spurred by the Haytien revolution, Congress acted favorably on a Quaker petition to prohibit the carrying of slaves from the United States to the West Indies, with large penalties for its evasion. But when Philadelphia Yearly Meeting, in 1797, again appealed to them, the discussion opened as fiercely as ever. The memorial itself, like all Quaker papers, was quiet and moderate:

To the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:—

The memorial and address of the people called Quakers from their Yearly Meeting held in Philadelphia by adjournments from the 25th of the Ninth Month to the 29th of the same inclusive, 1797.

Respectfully sheweth:

That being concerned at this our Annual Solemnity for the promotion of the cause of truth and righteousness, we have been favored to experience religious weight to attend our minds, and an anxious desire to follow after those things which make for peace; among other investigations, the oppressed state of our brethren of the African race has been brought into view and particularly the circumstances of one hundred and thirty-four in North Carolina, and many others whose cases have not so fully come to our knowledge, who were set free by members of our religious Society and again reduced to cruel bondage, under the authority of existing or retrospective laws. Husbands and wives and children separated one from another, which we apprehend to be an abominable tragedy; and with other

acts of a similar nature practised in other States has a tendency to bring down the judgments of a righteous God upon our land.

This city and neighborhood and some other parts have been visited with an awful calamity, which ought to excite an inquiry into the cause and endeavors to do away those things which occasion the heavy clouds that hang over us. It is easy with the Almighty to bring down the loftiness of men by diversified judgments and to make them bear the Rod and Him that hath appointed it.

We wish to revive in your view the solemn engagement of Congress, made in the year 1774, as follows:

“And therefore we do for ourselves and the inhabitants of the several Colonies whom we represent, firmly agree and associate under the sacred ties of virtue, honor and love of our country, as follows:

“Second Article. We will neither import nor purchase any slaves imported after the first day of December next, after which time we will wholly discontinue the slave trade, and will neither be concerned in it ourselves nor will we hire our vessels, nor sell our commodities or manufactures to those who are concerned in it.

“Third Article. And will discountenance and discourage every species of extravagance and dissipation, especially all horse-racing and a'l kinds of gambling, cock-fighting, exhibitions of shows, plays and other expensive diversions and entertainments.”

This was a solemn league and covenant made with the Almighty in an hour of distress, and He is now calling upon you to perform and fulfill it, but how has this solemn covenant been contravened by the wrongs and cruelties practised upon the poor African race,—the increase of dissipation and luxury, the countenance and encouragement given to play-houses and other vain amusements, and how grossly is the Almighty affronted on the day of the celebration of Independence! What rioting and drunkenness, chambering and wantonness! to the great grief of sober inhabitants and the disgrace of our national character.

National evils produce national judgments. We there-

fore fervently pray the Governor of the universe may enlighten your understanding and influence your minds so as to engage you to use every exertion in your power to have these things redressed.

With sincere desires for your happiness here and hereafter, and that when you come to close this life, you may individually be able to appeal as a Ruler did formerly, "Remember now O Lord I beseech thee how I have walked before thee in truth and with a perfect heart, and have done that which is good in thy sight," we remain your friends and fellow citizens.

Signed in and on behalf of the said Meeting.

JONATHAN EVANS,

Clerk to the Meeting this year.

The Memorial was presented by Albert Galatin, of Pennsylvania, who, after its reading by the clerk moved its second reading. Harper, of South Carolina, hoped not. This was not the first, second or third time the House had been troubled with similar petitions, which tended to incite the slaves to freedom; this and all other legislatures ought to set their faces strongly against such remonstrances.

Thatcher, of Massachusetts, took the opposite view. If the Quakers thought themselves aggrieved it was their duty to present the petition seventy times, or until it was attended to.

Rutledge, of South Carolina, would not object to the commitment of the petition if the committee would properly censure it. The body

which sent this petition should be censured. They had attempted to seduce the servants of gentlemen traveling to the seat of government. They were importuning Congress to interfere in a business which was none of their concern. But, not believing that such a censure would result, he would be in favor of laying the petition on the table, or under the table, to have done with the business to-day and forever. When other nations were plunging in blood, here were these people trying to stir up a servile insurrection.

To this Gallatin replied that the memorial was only taking the ordinary course. It called attention to certain free blacks afterwards enslaved in North Carolina. He did not think this was of a tendency dangerous to property or civil order. The moral character of the memorialists was such that he believed they were not friends to any kind of disorder. The uncertainty as to what could be done was the very reason for commitment.

Macon, of North Carolina, wished that all blacks were out of the country, and so did every gentleman in his State. He considered the Quakers not peacemakers, but thought they were continually endeavoring in the Southern

States to stir up insurrection among the negroes. They were Tories in the war, and only began to set their negroes free when the State law prohibited it. The petition was only to sow dissension.

The Friends found a defender in Bayard, of Delaware. He believed they were respectable and obedient, and contributed cheerfully to the support of government. The petition ought to be committed out of respect to them, though he believed the Congress had, contrary to the claims of other gentlemen, authority over the case of these free negroes relegated to slavery.

Nicholas, of Virginia, would be glad to have slavery investigated. He thought it would help it. The Southerners were unfortunate in having to hold slaves, but they did not wish to cover up any evils. He was in favor of commitment.

Blount, of North Carolina, explained how the freed negroes had been re-enslaved in a perfectly legal and proper way.

So the debate continued, a general disposition appearing in the Virginia representatives and all further North to admit the iniquity of slavery, the desirability of inquiring into its operations, and of abolishing the foreign trade as soon as they constitutionally could. Georgia and the two Carolinas were violently opposed to all action

except summary dismissal of the memorial, and could feel no respect for the memorialists, who were sitting in the gallery in a body while the debate went on.

At the final vote no opposition appeared to the commitment.

It is not the purpose of this chapter to carry the history of the relation of Friends to slavery into the present century. They were constant in their opposition to it, and the ranks of the Pennsylvania abolitionists were largely filled with them. As violence increased on both sides and war loomed up in the foreground, many of them began to deprecate the radical views of the extremists as to the proper methods to employ, but to a man they opposed slavery. And when war came, a war on an evil against which they were committed by every item of their history and every instinct of their religion, they could not join in it, but they could thankfully say, in the spirit of Southeby, Woolman, Benezet and Mifflin, and in the words of their own poet,

LAUS DEO.

It is done!

Clang of bell and roar of gun,
Send the tidings up and down.

How the belfries rock and reel;

How the great guns, peal on peal,
Fling the joy from town to town!

Ring, O, bells!
Every stroke exultant tells
Of the burial hour of crime.
Loud and long, that all may hear;
Ring, for every listening ear,
Of eternity and time!

Let us kneel;
God's own voice is in that peal,
And this spot is holy ground.
Lord forgive us! What are we
That our eyes this glory see,
That our ears have heard the sound!

INDEX.

Adams, John, Diary of, quoted	II., 280
Address of Quarterly Meeting	I., 231 et seq., 234 et seq.
Arnold, Benedict	II., 149
Ashbridge, George	I., 264
Assembly	I., 56, 62, 64, 72, 140, 150, 187, 197, 200 et seq., 213, 244
Attorney-General vetoes bills	I., 127
Baily, Joshua L.	II., 292
Bancroft's History U. S. ..	I., 63, 67
Barelay, David	II., 88, 110
Biddle, Owen	II., 208
Blackwell, John	I., 68, 78
Braddock.....	I., 177, 213, 214
Brandywine, Battle of	II., 146
Brissot, J. P., "Nouveau Voyage dans les Etats- unis," etc., quoted	II., 253
Broomall, John M.	II., 284
Bryan, George	II., 233
Burlington	I., 22, 224
Butler, Thomas S.	II., 284
Butler, William	II., 285
Campaigns About Philadelphia	II., 145
Capital Punishment	I., 148
Carlisle, Abraham	II., 192
Carpenter, Samuel	I., 84, 193
Catholics	I., 126
Charity, Quaker	I., 34
Charter of 1701	I., 64, 105, 120 ; II., 1
Coates, Samuel	II., 269 et seq.
Cole, Josiah	I., 130
Conestoga Indians	II., 42
Congress, Debate on Slavery in.....	II., 237, 244, 247
Conscience	I., 117, 261
Contest of Assembly With Proprietors	II., 18, 64, 97
Continental Congress, First	II., 104
Conventicle Act	I., 16

Index.

- Cope, Thomas P.II., 275 et seq.
CouncilI., 60-62, 71, 140, 197
Darlington, IsaacII., 284
Darlington, SmedleyII., 284
Darlington, Dr. WilliamII., 285
Darragh, LydiaII., 210
Denny, WilliamII., 14
Dickinson, JohnII., 94, 105
Discipline, QuakerI., 22 et seq.
DisownmentII., 132
Disputes Among QuakersI., 23 et seq.
Education, QuakerI., 35 et seq.
Emlen, Dr. SamuelII., 282
EpiscopaliansI., 89, 134, 142
Evans, CadwaladerII., 271
Evans, JohnI., 90, 94
Fisher, MiersII., 280
Fletcher, ColonelI., 69, 78, 193
Flower, EnochI., 37
FortsI., 217, 245
Fothergill, Dr. JohnI., 207, 228, 250 ; II., 80,
83, 86, 110, 113, 118, 122
Fothergill, SamuelI., 243 et seq.
Fox, GeorgeI., 9, 10, 130, 153
Frames of GovernmentI., 48, 62, 64
Franklin, BenjaminI., 105, 110, 211, 230 ;
II., 15, 44, 54, 73, 84, 110
Free Quakers207
Friendly AssociationI., 179 ; II., 14, 21, 38
Fundamental ConstitutionsI., 58
Furly, BenjaminI., 57
Gallatin, AlbertII., 247
Garrett, Philip C.II., 291
Garrett, ThomasII., 289
GermansI., 102 ; II., 2
Germantown, Battle ofII., 147
Gilpin, ThomasII., 162
Gookin, GovernorI., 94, 197, 199
Government of PennsylvaniaII., 1
Government, Quaker Relation toI., 15, 134, 202,
208, 241, 258
Governors, List of DeputyI., 70

History of Quaker Government.

Griffitts, Dr. Samuel Powel	II., 282
Griscom, Elizabeth	II., 210
Hamilton, Andrew	I., 88
Hamilton, James	II., 16
Hartshorn, Dr. Joseph	II., 282
Hat Honor	I., 12
Hayes, Jonathan	I., 149
Hierarchy, No	I., 40
Humphreys, Charles	II., 284
Hunt, John	I., 254 ; II., 162
Indian Conference	I., 173
Indian Trade	I., 155
Indian Treaties	II., 28, 31
Indian War	II., 24
Indians	I., 152
James, Dr. Thomas Chalkley	II., 281
Jersey, Purchase of	I., 131
Jones, Dr. John	II., 281
Jury Service	I., 132
Keith, George	I., 79-81
Keith, Governor	I., 149
Kirkbride, Dr. Thomas S.	II., 282
Lancaster	II., 43
Lewis, Evan	II., 286
Liberty, Religious	I., 1, 116
Lloyd, David	I., 80, 85, 87, 92, 197, 200
Lloyd, Thomas	I., 35, 68, 69, 80
Locke, John	I., 63
Loe, Thomas	I., 8
Logan, Dr. George	II., 259 et seq.
Logan, James	I., 35, 49, 70, 85, 91, 170, 185, 225, 229 ; II., 23
Logan, William	II., 10, 37, 93
Lundy, Benjamin	II., 286
Magna Charta	I., 52, 128
Markham, William	I., 69, 78, 80, 159
Marshall, Humphrey	II., 263 et seq.
Masson's Life of Milton	I., 17
McKean, Chief Justice	II., 159
Meeting for Sufferings	II., 57, 59, 69, 77, 107, 123, 195
Meeting Houses	II., 181
Mifflin, Thomas	II., 105, 135

Index.

- Mifflin, WarnerII., 244, 255 et seq.
Military MattersI., 183
Militia LawI., 216
Minisink IndiansI., 171
Minutes of CouncilII., 25
Minutes of Meetings....I., 23-28, 34, 35, 44, 46, 144-146,
231, 233, 243, 256, 261, 262
Morality, QuakerI., 27 et seq.
MoraviansII., 345
Morris, GovernorI., 110
Morton, Dr. Samuel GeorgeII., 282
Non-importationII., 76
Norris, IsaacI., 91
Norris, Isaac 2dII., 11
OathsI., 2, 14, 133, 136 et seq.
Paper MoneyI., 103
Parrish, Dr. JosephII., 282
Parties, in 1710I., 85 ; in 1740, I., 101
Paxton DemandsII., 47
Paxton RiotII., 42
Pemberton, IsraelI., 180, 261; II., 12, 26, 38, 48, 70
Pemberton, James....I., 110, 249, 254, 269 ; II., 13, 34,
48, 64, 66, 89, 103, 107, 120, 213
Pemberton, JohnI., 266 ; II., 13
Penington, EdwardII., 50
Penn, JohnII., 20, 44, 59, 66
Penn, RichardII., 10
Penn, ThomasI., 171, 211 ; II., 10
Penn, WilliamI., 3, 4, 42
 Early LifeI., 7 et seq.
 ConstitutionsI., 47, 51, 53, 56 et seq., 63 et seq.
 Visits AmericaI., 67
 Letter of 1710I., 96 et seq.
 On Religious LibertyI., 119, 120, 128
 Purchase of New JerseyI., 131
 Advises Judges to ResistI., 139
 Writes to IndiansI., 153
 On WarI., 184
 Diet of NationsI., 185
 Union of ColoniesI., 186
 Commends ForceI., 188
 Before Committee of TradeI., 191

History of Quaker Government.

Penn, William, Jr.	I., 90
Persecution of Quakers	I., 16, 19
Petition to King	I., 219
“Philopolites,”	I., 54
Position of Friends in the War.....	II., 130, 175, 204
Preparing for the Revolution	II., 75
Presbyterians	II., 4
Price, Eli K.	II., 281
Principles of Government	I., 1
Proprietary Instructions	I., 106
Purchase of Indian Lands	I., 157, 158, 162, 176
Puritans	I., 117
Quaker Control of Elections	I., 75
Quaker Delinquents	II., 49
Quaker Discipline	I., 22 et seq.
Quaker Doctrine	I., 9 et seq.
Quaker Education	I., 35 et seq.
Quaker Morality	I., 27 et seq.
Quaker Organization	I., 21, 134
Quaker Party	I., 265 ; II., 7
Quaker Persecution	I., 16, 19
Quaker Remonstrance to Assembly	I., 217
Quaker Suffering	II., 172, 177
Quakers, No Special Favors	I., 129 et seq.
Quakers, Number in Pennsylvania	I., 74
Quarry, Colonel	I., 79
Reed, Joseph	II., 200, 233
Representation in Assembly	I., 73
Resignation of Quakers	I., 221, 222
Revere, Paul	II., 105
Roberts, John	II., 193
Roberts, Jonathan	II., 266 et seq., 286
Roberts, Moses	II., 191
Rum, Sale of to the Indians	I., 164 et seq.
School, William Penn Charter	I., 37
Scotch-Irish	II., 9
Shepherd’s History of Proprietary Government...I.,75, 134	
Shiple, Thomas	II., 288
Shippen, Edward	I., 70
Shoemaker, Benjamin	II., 37
Sidney, Algernon	I., 57
Simcock, John	I., 192

Index.

- SlaveryI., 31 et seq.; II., 137, 224
Smith, Dr. GeorgeII., 285
SorceryI., 40
Southeby, WilliamII., 232
Spanktown Yearly MeetingII., 155
Stamp ActII., 76
Stamp Act CongressII., 81, 98
Taxation of Proprietary EstatesI., 108 ; II., 15
TeaII., 102
Teachers FinedII., 184
TedyuscungI., 180 ; II., 26, 27, 30, 35
Tests for OfficeI., 121 et seq., 124
Thomas, GovernorI., 105, 204 et seq.
Thomas, RichardII., 284
Thomson, CharlesI., 169 ; II., 33, 35, 105, 166
Townsend, JosephII., 189
Townsend, WashingtonII., 284
Treaties, IndianI., 152, 160, 180 ; II., 28 et seq., 38
Treaty, Penn'sI., 152, 160
Vaux, RobertsII., 271 et seq.
Virginia ExilesII., 145, 151
Walking PurchaseI., 170 et seq.
Waln, NicholasII., 217
Waln, RobertII., 267 et seq.
War Aganst Indians, 1756.....I., 178, 220, 247
War, Quaker Views on.....I., 2, 14, 184, 189, 201, 208, 210
War TaxesI., 194 et seq., 200, 204, 216, 247
Washington, GeorgeII., 167, 170, 171, 220, 222
Wayne, AnthonyII., 117
Wetherill, SamuelII., 54, 209
White, JosiahII., 278 et seq.
Wilson, ChristopherI., 254
Wistar, Dr. CasparII., 282 et seq.
WitchcraftI., 39
Wood, Dr. George B.II., 282
WorshipI., 12
Yearly Meeting Epistles, etc. .I., 41, 143, 144 ; II., 57,
115, 129, 138, 163, 173, 180, 184, 201, 234, 236, 245





LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 014 311 088 6

