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This dissertation focuses on the site of eighteenth-century Quaker texts – particularly the journals of traveling ministers – as they converge on the political and military crisis of late colonial Pennsylvania. In particular, the present study is concerned with the religious and ideological response to these events that triggered major reforms in the Society of Friends, including efforts to protect the land rights of the Delaware Indians and the abolition of slavery. One always writes in reference to power structures, and the foregrounding of Quaker life writings in the Seven Years' War (1756-63) elucidates a nascent critique of the British colonial modes of expansion and production (particularly dishonest land deals and slave labor), in which binaries such as self / Other, civilized / savage, us / them are complicated and challenged.

Chapter 1 examines the nature of the declension diagnosed by reformist ministers and the consequent redefinition of Quaker relations with the world in the face of secularization. Unlike earlier leaders of Pennsylvania, the ministerial elite saw material prosperity as detrimental to spiritual health, rather than an accompanying blessing.
Chapter 2 takes up the revitalization of pacifism by Quaker ministers in the 1750's, the "testimony" that typifies this newly constructed relationship of opposition with the world. Increasingly, they recognized the inextricable connection between material prosperity and the exigency of defense. Chapter 3 discusses Quaker-Indian relations during the Seven Years' War. The revitalization of pacifism involved an attempt to counter racialized violence in the colony, a position which Quaker leaders came to reluctantly because of their commitment to the myth of Pennsylvania as a uniquely peaceable space in British North America. Chapter 4 examines the issue of Quaker anti-slavery as it relates to pacifism and the advocacy of Indian land rights. Ministers denounced the inherent violence of slavery, emphasizing universal "love" which, when put into practice, de-mastered inequitable power relations and had the potential to "extirpate oppression" from the world.
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In the 1750's the spiritual elite of the Society of Friends witnessed in dismay the breakdown of Pennsylvania's long peace with the Indians on its frontier, as the mythical "peaceable kingdom" lapsed into the turmoil and bloodshed of the Seven Years' War.¹

Hostilities were sparked by the conflicting interests of the British and French in the Ohio Country, a region rich with natural resources and located west of the Alleghenies on the (ambiguously defined) western frontiers of Pennsylvania and Virginia. The competition over control of the Ohio intensified when the petition of the Ohio Company (of Virginia) was approved by the Crown on March 16, 1749, with the stipulation that the company plant a settlement of one hundred families in Ohio within seven years and build a fort for their protection.² Thomas Penn, chief proprietor of Pennsylvania, was alarmed by the plans of the Ohio Company, and in 1750 requested that the legislature provide one hundred pounds for the construction of a fort in Ohio, and another one hundred pounds annually for its maintenance. But the pacifist-led Assembly demurred, electing instead to lay out 1,250 pounds in 1750, and 1,260 in 1751, to purchase gifts for securing friendship with the colony's Native American neighbors.

However, in 1753, before the Virginian enterprise could establish a settlement, the French built forts at Presque Isle (on Lake Erie) and Le Beouf (present Watertown, Pennsylvania), and expelled all British traders from the region. In response, Virginian Governor Robert Dinwiddie sent Lieutenant-Colonel George Washington to Le Beouf in

---

¹ In Empires of Fortune: Crowns, Colonies, and Tribes in the Seven Years War in America (New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 1988), Francis Jennings makes the following observation about the nomenclature for this conflict: "The traditional name for the hostilities between France and England in America between 1754 and 1763 is 'The French and Indian War,' with a plain implication that Indians fought only as allies of the French" (xv). In keeping with Jennings' work and other recent scholarship, this dissertation will use the term "Seven Years War" to designate this conflict, in which some Native American groups were allied with the French, some were with the British, and others were neutral.

² Jennings, Empires of Fortune, 13.
November, with a letter demanding that the French withdraw from Ohio. This attempt
naturally failed, and the following summer Dinwiddie sent Washington and a contingent
of troops to oust the French from the region. But the hastily erected Fort Necessity was
no match for the main French force, and was surrendered on July 4. Expressing the fears
of many British colonists in Pennsylvania and Virginia, the July 9 issue of Benjamin
Franklin's *Pennsylvania Gazette* warned its readers of the French plans "to establish
themselves, settle their Indians, and build Forts just on the Back our Settlements . . . from
which . . . they may send out their Parties to kill and scalp the Inhabitants, and ruin the
Frontier Counties." Further north, English delegates at Albany renewed the Covenant
Chain with the Six Nations (Iroquois), fearing their defection to the French. But the
Albany Plan, a scheme spearheaded by Franklin for intercolonial defense, was
peremptorily rejected by the Pennsylvanian Assembly, despite the portents of
Washington's defeat at Fort Necessity.

Irritated by the inability of colonial governments to expel the French from Ohio,
the imperial Board of Trade decided to appoint a military commander to organize
offensive and defensive measures against the French. In January 1755, Britain sent
General Edward Braddock, along with two imperial regiments, to Virginia for this
purpose. The French, in turn, beefed up their military presence in the New World,
dispatching seventy-eight companies to Canada. After a road had been cut through the
densely forested and rugged terrain, Braddock began to move his forces of 2200 troops
towards Fort Duquesne in June. Determined to fight the war in his own fashion, he

---

3 Quoted in Timothy J. Shannon, *Indians and Colonists at the Crossroads of Empire: The Albany Congress*
of 1754 (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 2000), 83. Given the events of 1755-1757, this statement proved to be
prophetic.
dismissed warnings about the dangers of Indian warfare and rebuffed offers of assistance made by Shingas and other Delaware chiefs in Ohio. On July 9, he was ambushed by French and Indian forces some ten miles from the French fortress, near the Monongahela River. His numerically superior army was crushed and he himself perished in the attack. As a result, the backwoods of British America were undefended, and Pennsylvanian frontier settlements, especially, were vulnerable to French-led attacks.

In addition to years of trade and land acquisition abuses by Pennsylvanian settlers, the seeming superiority of the French and the pressing need for supplies, particularly ammunition (to hunt in a year plagued by drought), compelled the Ohio Delawares to ally themselves with New France. On October 15, 1755, Shingas, chief of the Ohio Delawares, organized a raid on Penn's Creek in which thirteen were killed and eleven captured. In early November, settlements at Tulpehacon, Bethel, and Heidelberg were attacked, and refugees poured into the Moravian settlement at Bethlehem, pleading with the Pennsylvania government to take military action. On November 5, Governor Robert Morris called a special session of the legislative body and, after several weeks of heated debate, the Assembly finally approved the Militia Act, appropriating 60,000 pounds in tax money for defense purposes, particularly the construction of a ring of forts along the Pennsylvania frontier. However, the legislation did not come in time to stop a bloody French-Indian attack on the Moravian mission at Gnadenhuetten, on November 24, in which ten were killed.

In the meantime, the Eastern (or Susquehanna) Delaware, eagerly awaited food and military aid from "Brother Onas" (the Pennsylvanian government), which had been stalled by the political wrangling between the proprietary party and the Quaker-led
assembly. But with the October and November frontier raids came rumors that the Pennsylvanian government intended to imprison all Delawares residing on the Susquehanna. In early December, Teedyuscung, a self-appointed Delaware leader at Wyoming, decided to join his Ohio brethren against the English, frustrated by the lack of support from Pennsylvania and afraid of reprisals for the earlier attacks. On December 11, he and his warriors participated in a raid against the Brodhead and Hoeth frontier settlements, which was part of a larger French-Indian assault against Northampton County. During these attacks, Indians took twenty-six prisoners and at least fifty scalps.4

Frontier settlers were outraged by the slow reaction of the Pennsylvanian government to the continued victimization of their settlements. So, on December 14, 1755, in an effort to bring the ravages of Indian warfare to Quaker Philadelphia, a group of German frontier settlers carted around the city several mutilated corpses of their loved ones to push public sentiment in their favor. During this time Quaker leaders were meeting in the city to discuss the Society's official stance on the sticky issue of paying taxes for defense, an apparent violation of their pacifist testimony. Three ministers – Samuel Fothergill, a British Friend, and two American Friends, John Woolman and John Churchman – recorded their reactions to the corpse spectacle. And their responses epitomize, in differing ways, the restructuring of Quakerism and reformation of Quaker race-relations during the late colonial period.

Samuel Fothergill (1715-1772), visiting fellow Friends during a two-year stay in the colonies (August 1754 to June 1756), noted his impressions of the event in a letter to his wife:

4 Anthony F. C. Wallace, King of the Delawares: Teedyuscung, 1700-1763 (Syracuse University Press, 1949), 80. However, not all Susquehanna Delawares joined Teedyuscung – some remained neutral.
The consternation in which this province hath been thrown by the Indians, is not diminished. The Assembly have sold their testimony as Friends to their 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; there were the bodies of two men, whom the Indians had killed and scalped, brought down in great parade to this city, from the back parts; multitudes went to see them, and seem loudly to clamour for war. The ancient methods of dealing with the Indians upon the principles of equity and justice seem neglected, the spirit of war and destruction endeavouring to break loose, in order to reduce this pleasant, populous province to its ancient wilderness condition.5

In this passage Fothergill argues that Quakers in the colonial assembly had "sold their testimony," a statement which reflects the growing position among the Society's leadership that political ambition and religious testimony were incompatible. Not only did political compromise violate Quaker beliefs, it also did not go far enough to satisfy non-Quakers in the province, as the corpse incident dramatically demonstrated. Remarkably, though, Fothergill does not castigate the Indians for the barbarities committed against the bodies on "parade." Instead, he moves incisively past epidermal appearances and the attendant emotionalism to the cause of the violent actions: that Indian complaints against English expansion were going unheeded. This position was in keeping with the consensus among Quaker leaders that the falling out between the

---

Pennsylvanian government and their long-time Delaware allies was caused by fraudulent land deals. In Fothergill's estimation, Pennsylvania-Indian relations were no longer characterized by "the ancient methods of equity and justice," established, in the view of most Quakers, at the time of Penn's auspicious first meeting with the Delawares in 1683. The amicable relationship that followed had been a special case in the generally bloody settlement of North America. But now, with this frenzied rage over the sight of blood, "the spirit of war and destruction [was] endeavouring to break loose," as if it had been held at bay for seventy years.

In his journal, John Woolman (1720-1772), a New Jersey Friend closely connected to the Quaker leaders of Philadelphia, comments more succinctly on the corpse incident:

The calamities of war were now increasing. The frontier inhabitants of Pennsylvania were frequently surprised, some slain and many taken captive by the Indians; and while these committees sat, the corpse of one so slain was brought in a wagon and taken through the streets of the city in his bloody garments to alarm the people and rouse them up to war.6

Like Fothergill, Woolman draws attention to the alarming intensification of violent exchanges and the apparent purpose of the grisly display. But unlike Fothergill (and Churchman), he speaks of only one corpse, attired in "his bloody garments." Woolman does not dwell on the event, however. From the context of this passage, it is clear that his focus is the outcome of the debate over taxation – the "Epistle of Tender Love and Caution," which advised Friends to avoid paying

---

the tax. But the corpse incident clearly complicates the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting's position, because settlers were being massacred for the lack of defensive measures, and if Quaker leaders opposed the Militia Act, they would appear to many as self-righteous ideologues calloused to the loss of human life.

It is John Churchman (1705-1775), however, who records the most extensive and intriguing response to the display of scalping victims, the incarnation of every colonist's fears. Like Fothergill and Woolman, Churchman discusses the purpose of this gruesome procession, noting that it was intended "to animate the people to unite in preparations of war to take vengeance on the Indians, and destroy them." He also remarks on the response of the crowds: "[The corpses] were carried along several of the streets, many people following, cursing the Indians, also the Quakers because they would not join in war for destruction of the Indians." According to Churchman there are two purposes for the grisly display: to create greater animosity towards the Indians and engender greater anger against pacifist Quakers. Churchman then writes about his own personal response to the spectacle:

The sight of the dead bodies and the outcry of the people, were very afflict ing and shocking to me: Standing at the door of a friend's house as they passed along, my mind was humbled and turned much inward when I was made secretly to cry; What will become of Pennsylvania? for it felt to me that many did not consider that the sins of the inhabitants, pride,

profane swearing, drunkenness with other wickedness were the cause, that
the Lord had suffered this calamity and scourge to come upon them. ⁸

As in the case of Samuel Fothergill, the sight of violence stirs Churchman to consider the
wider ramifications for the Society of Friends. He expresses concern for the integrity of
the Quaker "testimony," but in a different way, as he passionately inquires, "What will
become of Pennsylvania"? Unlike Fothergill, he is an American Quaker and, as such, has
more at stake in the success of the Quaker colony. For him, and for other Delaware
Valley Quakers, the seventy-year-old experiment called "Pennsylvania" – with all its
mythic connotations – was the Quaker testimony. If it failed, it reflected badly on
Quaker beliefs and ideals.

Initially, then, Churchman attributes the bloodshed to the immorality of
Pennsylvania's inhabitants, which, despite the colony's sectarian beginnings, were
seventy-five percent non-Quaker by this time. The outbreak of violence is viewed by
Churchman as God's retribution for an extensive range of sins. But the greatest sin of all
is the spilling of blood. And, upon further meditation, Churchman makes a fascinating
connection between the frontier violence (between settlers and Indians) and slavery:

[T]he weight of the exercise increasing as I walked along the street; at
length it was said in my soul, This land is polluted with blood, and in the
day of inquisition for blood, it will not only be required at the frontiers

---

⁸ In Churchman's discussion of the corpse incident, there is a chronological error. In his journal he states
that it took place during the General Spring Meeting in 1756. However, based on the accounts by
Fothergill, Woolman, and William Smith (A Brief State of the Province of Pennsylvania, 1756) it is clear
that the event occurred in mid-December 1755. Woolman records the event as having occurred when
Yearly Meeting committees were sitting in discussion of the proposed tax for defense purposes. The
conference produced "An Epistle of Tender Love and Caution to Friends in Pennsylvania," dated December
16, 1755, (one day before Fothergill's letter to his wife), and signed, among others, by Churchman,
Fothergill, and Woolman. Smith is the only one to give an actual date for the event: December 14, 1755.
and borders, but even in this place where these bodies are now seen. I said within myself, "How can this be? since this has been a land of peace, and as yet not much concerned in war"; but as it were in a moment mine eyes turned to the case of the poor enslaved Negroes. And however light a matter they who have been concerned with them may look upon the purchasing, selling, or keeping of those oppressed people in slavery, it then appeared plain to me, that such were partakers in iniquity, encouragers of war and the shedding of innocent blood, which is often the case, where those unhappy people are or have been captivated and brought away for slaves.  

The linkage between the violence of European expansion on the frontier and slavery might at first glance appear to be a non sequitur. What do Indian raids in Western Pennsylvania (and Western Virginia and Maryland, for that matter) have to do with the violence of the African slave trade? But the key value judgment made by Churchman is his statement: "The land is polluted with blood." Unlike Fothergill, he does not lay blame for the bloodshed on Euro-American's disregard of Indian grievances. Rather, his primary concern is that there is any violence at all. And because blood was shed, blood would be required, both on the frontier and in the seemingly safe streets of Philadelphia.

Churchman concludes by saying that the violence on the frontier is God's judgment for slavery, which stains with innocent blood all hands that are engaged in it. In this way (going back to the earlier question, "What will become of Pennsylvania"?), Churchman essentially acknowledges that Pennsylvania had never been a "land of

---

peace” — the aspect of constructed identity on which Quakers most prided themselves and which they used to justify their presence in the New World — because it was involved in slavery. He also affirms the basic humanity of the slaves and condemns the institution of slavery as “iniquity” because of its intrinsic violence. In his connection between the acute violence that was breaking out on the frontier and the chronic violence of slavery, Churchman suggests a kind of symbiosis, or interdependence of racial groups, related to the Quaker notion of “brotherhood” — in this case a tri-racial community existing among the English, the Africans, and the Indians in the New World. When violence is committed against one race it “pollutes” the land, and multiplies into more violence. But to what extent were Churchman and other Quaker leaders committed to affirming such a New World community? For Churchman, at least, the primary concern is the breakdown of peace rather than the victimization of marginalized peoples in the Pennsylvania colonial project.

The shock of seeing violence embodied on the streets of Philadelphia prompted Fothergill, Woolman, Churchman and other ministers to reconsider the role of the Society of Friends in colonial British North America. Their insights are significant because most Delaware Valley Quakers, given their pacifist ideals and seventy-year "peace" with the Indians, had difficulty coming to terms with the violence and injustice inherent in the colonial project. Because of the outbreak of war and the political crisis over the exigency of colonial defense that followed, Quakers were forced to face their complicity in the injustices done to the Indians and to African slaves. But there is little evidence to suggest a Society-wide conviction of wrongdoing, or, for that matter, any movement for the welfare or betterment of marginalized peoples. It was left to individuals to carry out
more practical reform. For the Quaker leaders of the Seven Years’ War period, the focus of reform was mostly within the Society itself.

**Methodology**

This dissertation focuses on the site of eighteenth-century Quaker writings – particularly the journals of traveling ministers – as they converge on the political and military crisis of late colonial Pennsylvania. In particular, the present study is concerned with the religious or ideological response to these events that triggered major reforms in the Society of Friends, including efforts to protect the land rights of the Delaware Indians and to abolish slavery. Because Philadelphia was the seat of Quaker power and influence in the New World, the events in Pennsylvania had ramifications for Quakers throughout the British colonies. This dissertation attempts to recover and resituate Quaker life writings in the complex discursive framework of British imperial expansion. It assumes that these texts, although couched in religious language, are not disinterested religious writings, but instead are rooted inevitably in the materiality of history, as seen in the passages just discussed. One always writes in reference to power structures, and the foregrounding of these writings in the Seven Years’ War elucidates a nascent critique of the colonial modes of expansion and production – particularly dishonest land deals and slave labor – in which binaries such as self / Other, civilized / savage, us / them are complicated and challenged.

Pennsylvania, along with other mid-Atlantic colonies and New England, typically has not been viewed as "colonial" in the usual post-colonial sense, where "colonial" denotes relations in which a majority of the population, either indigenous or forcibly
imported, is dominated by a minority of foreign invaders.\footnote{Robert Blair St. George, ed., Introduction, in \textit{Possible Pasts: Becoming Colonial in Early America} (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2000), 5.} As Michael Warner has noted, Anglo-American settlement does not look like colonialism in its usual sense and for that reason America was left off the map in the early years of post-colonial theory.\footnote{Michael Warner, "What's Colonial about Colonial America?" in \textit{Possible Pasts}, 50. Warner also notes that much greater attention has been given to the British empire of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries than that of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.} In the northern colonies white settlers almost never made use of a native labor force and made only sparing use of forcibly-imported workers. English settlers tended to displace rather than administer native peoples. Notions of race and nationalism gradually found expression in colonial practice, but did not drive it from the outset as was typical of later instances of European imperialism in Asia and Africa. In the case of colonial North America, moreover, military dominance was not as decisive a factor, since the French and British, confronting each other, were both dependent upon Indian alliances. Finally, any counterhegemonic discourse in eighteenth-century America is not "anticolonial" in the post colonial sense, but is itself produced by Europeans. Until the end of the eighteenth-century, Indian voices typically were textualized in treaty minutes and journals, doubly-mitigated through translation and the subjectivities of European writers. Similarly, slaves had no little or no voice, and only a handful of former slaves, such as Olaudah Equiano, wrote narratives before the nineteenth century.

However, despite differences with later manifestations of colonialism, colonial Pennsylvania does fit into the larger colonial pattern of domination and power imbalances.\footnote{Ibid., 49.} Indeed, from its inception Pennsylvania was constructed as a space of economic opportunity which would strengthen the position of the colonizer. Responding
to the objection that colonization "weakens" the mother country in Some Account of the Province of Pennsilvania (1681), William Penn argues that colonies instead have 
"inrich'd and so strengthened" England, because they are "the Seeds of Nations begun and nourished by the care of the wise and populous Countries; as conceiving them best for the increase of Human Stock; and beneficial for Commerce." Penn suggests a no- loser model of colonization here, but overlooks the economic inequalities that mercantile capitalism necessarily creates. Although envisioning a space for persecuted Christian sects, Penn places material concerns on a level with religious ideology, an admixture of priorities that would prove to be troublesome for Quakers in the mid-eighteenth century. John Woolman, speaking of the "situation" of Native Americans in Pennsylvania in 1763, laments in retrospect the commerce whose potential Penn had championed, because (being based on Old World notions of land tenure) it had in effect dispossessed the Indians. Similarly, slavery, although beneficial for commerce, was inconsistent with Quaker pacifism and the universal brotherhood of humanity.

Quaker life-writings have a peculiar and problematical relation to the colonial discourse of the British imperium. Frantz Fanon has argued that all discourse is "permeated by colonialism and all its ways of thinking," and American Quaker texts are not an exception to this rule. It is clear that they were written primarily for other members of the Society of Friends – whether published or circulated in manuscript format, although in some cases they were intended for non-Quakers. In this way, they fit the pattern of colonial discourse, which is "aimed less at the colonized population than at

---

shaping public opinion among the occupying population and at 'home' in the imperial state."¹⁵ However, colonialism is not monolithic but characterized by internal difference and fracturing. To be a pacifist in British America was unusual, particularly because European expansion was characteristically militaristic, justified ideologically by the colonizing tactic of Christian missionizing. A number of the Quaker texts under consideration here take up the voice of the dominated, particularly native Americans and slaves, and challenge hegemonic discourse. But any nascent critique of colonialism in these writings is not marked as such, but rather couched in a moral, religious framework. Still, the Quakers were not exempt from the kind of religious dogmatism that sets the speaker over and above the unconverted Other, so that, despite their advocacy for Indians and slaves, they seem mostly concerned about the purity of their own identity.¹⁶

One also can read the Quakers' interest in marginalized peoples as resulting from their own disenfranchisement within the larger colonial project, signaled most dramatically by their withdrawal from the Pennsylvania Assembly in June 1756. Because of their pacifism, they had themselves became casualties of imperialism and, as such, were more sensitive to others victimized by militaristic European expansion in North America. They challenged the binarisms of dominant colonial discourse – particularly the division between "us" and "them" – as evidenced by John Churchman's response to the outbreak of violence, which illustrates the instability of such representations. As Naomi Baker has noted, "The self-marginalizing impulse of Quaker subjectivities often entails the narrative selves within Quaker accounts being

¹⁵ St. George, Possible Pasts, 11.
¹⁶ As Edward Said has argued, "When you assert an identity, one identity is always going to infringe on others that also exist in the same or contiguous space" (Power, Politics, and Culture: Interviews with Edward Said, ed. Gauri Viswanathan [New York: Pantheon Books, 2001], 130.)
paradoxically cast as 'Other,' thus complicating the ostensibly fixed polarities of Orientalist discourse." And yet, although the subjectivities of the ministerial elite often align with objects of oppression and can thereby appear counterhegemonic, they necessarily remain Eurocentric, and as such, are essentially variant expressions of cultural imperialism. The interventions recorded in life-writings reflect first and foremost Quaker self-interests. In short, their narratives are problematic and liminal, simultaneously manifesting a complicity in and critique of British colonialism – they occupy a peculiar space as counter/affirmative narratives. Despite assiduous efforts to bring Indians and slaves to their egalitarian table, relations and dialogue were never (and could never be) truly equal. But the alternative Eurocentrism of reformative Quaker leaders is remarkable, nevertheless, as an early critique of dominant colonial discourse.

Although the subject of this dissertation is discussed in reference to British colonialism, the central place of Quaker spirituality must not be ignored or obscured, but rather understood through that context since ministers are responding to material conditions in colonial Pennsylvania. In addition, although the topic is wide in scope, the present study does not claim to cover thoroughly the political crisis of Pennsylvania. Many excellent studies have been done on the subject, such as Robert Davidson's *War Comes to Quaker Pennsylvania* (1957) and Francis Jennings' *Empire of Fortune* (1988). Nor does this study attempt to provide a comprehensive overview of the reform of Quakerism or Quaker life-writings during this period. Rather, it seeks to examine the ideological response of the Quaker ministerial elite to the crisis and how that response

18 Ibid., 6.
changed American Quakerism and challenged the British imperial hegemony of that time. Frederick B. Tolles's work in *Meeting House and Counting House: The Quaker Merchants of Colonial Philadelphia, 1682-1763* (1948) remains a standard study of the religious declension and materialism of the Society of Friends in Pennsylvania. Jack D. Marietta's study, *The Reformation of American Quakerism* (1984), is the most thorough and detailed history of the transformation of the Society, with its particularly careful analysis of Quaker meeting discipline minutes. Although scholars have paid relatively little attention to Quaker-Indian relations during this period, there have been numerous accounts of eighteenth-century Quaker abolitionism, most notably by Jean D. Soderlund in *Quakers & Slavery: A Divided Spirit* (1985). Francis Drake's *Quakers and Slavery in America* (1965) and Stephen B. Weeks's *Southern Quakers and Slavery: A Study in Institutional History* (1968) also remain important studies on the subject. More recently, considerable attention has been given to Quaker women ministers, particularly to Elizabeth Ashbridge and her singular autobiography. Although a number of women ministers will be considered in this study, it is apparent that, despite Quaker beliefs that women possessed spiritual parity with men, men dominated Quaker leadership in the late colonial period, and consequently, produced the bulk of textual responses to the Seven Years' War in Pennsylvania.

---

19 Sydney V. James (*A People Among Peoples*, 1963) and Richard Bauman (*For the Reputation of the Truth*, 1971) also discuss the reformation of Quakerism that occurred in late colonial Pennsylvania.

20 Margaret Hope Bacon has given considerable effort to the recovery of Quaker women narratives, as seen in her anthology, *Wilt Thou Go on My Errand: Three Eighteenth Century Journals of Quaker Women Ministers* (Pendle Hill, 1994), containing the journals of Susanna Morris (1682-1755), Elizabeth Hudson (1722-83), and Ann Moore (1710-1783). Rebecca Larson's *Daughters of Light: Quaker Women and Preaching and Prophesying in the Colonies and Abroad, 1700-1775* (Knopf, 1999) is an excellent, broad study of the improved status for women in the Society of Friends in the eighteenth century. Chapter Five, "In the Service of Truth: Impact of Women Ministers' Travels on the Transatlantic Quaker Community" (172-231), gives an excellent overview of women ministers' role during the Seven Years' War. Cristine Levenduski's study, *Peculiar Power: A Quaker Woman Preacher in Eighteenth-Century America*
The World of Quaker Meetings and Ministers

Before examining Quaker texts connected with the reform of race-relations, it is important to consider in more general terms the purpose and production of those texts within the Society of Friends. The present study focuses on the life-writings of ministers, the spiritual elite of the movement, and does not, therefore, represent all Quakers of the time. However, it was only the ministers whose journals were published, because each candidate publication had to be approved first by a Quaker committee of overseers of the Press. J. William Frost, who has researched American Quaker publication and literacy extensively, notes that except for Thomas Chalkley (1645-1741), no American Quaker published a journal before 1770. Published journals had the greater effect, then, on posterity, providing models for piety and practice. Cristine Levenduski, writing on the narrative of Elizabeth Ashbridge (1713-1755), published in 1774, has noted that ministers wrote narratives "to provide other Friends with encouragement and with examples to emulate." They were didactic, serving as a challenge to the more lax members of the religious community. Although highly individual, these accounts of pious Quakerism generally called for uniform behavior in order to counter anti-Quaker slander and make

---

(Smithsonian, 1996), is the only monograph-length study of Elizabeth Ashbridge, who, in many ways, epitomizes the challenges that Quaker women faced and the marginal space they occupied in British and American society in the 1700's.

21 J. William Frost, "Quaker Books in Colonial Pennsylvania," in Quaker History (Spring 1991), 4. Thomas Chalkley's *Journal or Historical Account* was published in 1749. Frost argues that there was little Quaker publication in the colonies because of the lack of Quaker publishers. There was an increase of titles after 1755, but he attributes this primarily to the arrival of Quaker printer James Chattin in Philadelphia in 1752. Although Frost does not make a conclusive argument, he does pose a suggestive question: "Why after 1770 did the [Philadelphia Yearly Meeting] start printing memorials and the journals of American Quakers? Did the loss of political power and the effective end of the Holy Experiment cause Quakers to become more cognizant of the need to recapture their history or reform the present?" (16). Certainly, Delaware Valley Quakers were more denominationally oriented after consolidating their ranks in the mid-eighteenth century, and likely saw the exemplary faith of journalists as a way to safeguard stricter Quaker discipline.

the movement more credible.23 Mid-century reforms in American Quakerism were
effected primarily by authoritative traveling ministers who, exposed to the breadth of the
British empire and Quakerism, more readily noticed inequalities and inconsistencies.
American ministers traveled the length of English settlement on the Atlantic, visiting
meetings from New England to South Carolina. And, between 1681 and 1776 (the years
when Pennsylvania was a colony) at least one hundred British Friends came to the
American colonies (many for multiple visits), encouraging and admonishing fellow
Quakers in their wide travels.24 This degree of visitation was made possible in part by
British naval dominance and the burgeoning prosperity of maritime commerce, with
Atlantic crossings tripling in the seventy-year period between 1670 and 1740, from 500
to 1500. Quakers would make a special effort to hear an overseas minister, or "Public
Friend," who was thought to have a special message to relay to the host congregation.
Often traveling ministers would participate in the normally scheduled meetings, but also
would schedule one-time meetings to "clear themselves" of their concerns for the local
Quaker community. This visitation served to consolidate the identity and preserve the
unity of Quakers on both sides of the Atlantic – as Rebecca Larson has noted, "By
hosting ministers visiting from elsewhere, Friends emphasized their participation in a
community of Quakers beyond their immediate neighborhoods, strengthening them in the

23 In Declarations of Independence in Eighteenth-Century American Autobiography (University of
Tennessee Press, 1988), Susan Clair Imbarrato attempts to trace how “spiritual act of self-examination
culminate[s] in the secular act of self-construction” (xiv). She connects the “individuality” of
autobiographies to a growing sense of “subjectivity” that removed the “self” from social identity:
“Eventually, writing about the self becomes less concerned with appeasing social norms and more
interested in setting the individual apart” (xiii). Although the life-writings of Quaker ministers during this
time were by definition individualized, particularly in their record of personal scruples, they are also clearly
written for the purpose of clarifying and consolidating the collective identity of the Society of Friends.
24 Although all Quakers would have regarded themselves as “British” to some degree, "British Friends" in
this context refers to ministers whose home was in the British Isles (including, of course, Ireland).
maintenance of their differences from those of other faiths." Although the London Yearly Meeting was regarded the first among equals (i.e., among other Yearly Meetings), there is no sense from Meeting epistles and personal writings that British ministers saw themselves as more authoritative than their American counterparts. Indeed, when John Churchman visited the British Isles in the early 1750's, he boldly castigated the London Meeting for its materialism and spiritual indifference, sparking a movement for reform that was contemporaneous with reforms among American Quakers.

In order to assess the role of traveling ministers and their life writings, it is important to understand the structure of "meetings" that produced those texts: the local, the Monthly, the Quarterly, and the Yearly. Although George Fox had emphasized the preeminence of individual conscience over institutionalism, a tight-knit community was created early among Friends because of the pressure of persecution, a pattern familiar among dissenters in general. Fox and other early Quakers established the local meetings in the 1660's and 1670's as a way to care for prisoners, the aged, and others in need in a hostile social environment. Because the Society of Friends was a lay religion with no professional or salaried clergy, ministers' expenses were paid by their meetings. In addition to ministers, there were "elders" who watched over the meetings, and "overseers," usually the most substantial farmers or merchants of a given community, who served as trustees of church property and supervised finances.

---

25 Larson, Daughters of Light, 185.
26 Accountability became paramount in early Quakerism. As Frederick Tolles has noted, "the corporate judgment . . . was regarded as having greater validity than the often imperfect and clouded light of an individual" (Meeting House and Counting House: The Quaker Merchants of Colonial Philadelphia, 1682-1763 [Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1948], 7).
Quakers typically congregated at least twice weekly at the "local meeting for worship," and "waited in silence for God to inspire someone" to speak.\textsuperscript{27} The next level was the "Monthly Meeting" for Business, composed of Friends from several local meetings for worship in the same township or group of adjacent townships. All adult Friends not under discipline could participate freely and were allowed to speak, but the opinions of ministers, elders, and Overseers were regarded as the most weighty. These meetings regulated funds and charity, supervised schools, and disciplined wayward members.\textsuperscript{28} The Monthly Meeting was required to report to its respective "Quarterly Meeting," which was attended by delegates from each Monthly Meeting. The Quarterly Meeting was the halfway point between the monthly meeting and the yearly meeting, and typically dealt with any problem that was too complex or contentious for the local meetings to solve. In the Delaware Valley, there were six Quarterly Meetings, until 1758 when the Chester Quarterly was divided into two separate meetings.

The highest level of the Quaker meeting structure was the "Yearly Meeting," of which there were six in eighteenth-century America: Pennsylvania and New Jersey (usually referred to as the "Philadelphia" or the "Delaware Valley" meeting), New York, New Jersey, and New York.


\textsuperscript{28} The most common problem in the mid-eighteenth century was the violation of the Society's policy on marriage (exogamy or fornication). Other typical offenses were drunkenness, assault, illegal trade, and military activity. Men and women met separately at the Monthly Meeting level. The women dealt with women's offences (marriage approval, slander, fornication, exogamy). However, despite ostensible spiritual equality, it was usually the men's meeting that officially disowned or expelled unrepentant members, male or female (Soderlund 189). If a Friend was living in error, usually an overseer would advise the meeting of that person's behavior, and two men would be appointed to visit the accused. If the person expressed sorrow for his or her mistake, he or she could remain in the meeting with an oral or written admission of the sin. If the same offense was repeated, the meeting was understandably less lenient.
Maryland (or "Baltimore"), Virginia, North Carolina, and New England. There were also Yearlies in London and Dublin. The Yearly Meeting would hear reports on the spiritual welfare of the Quarterly Meetings, as well as discuss problems or issues that could not be solved at the Quarterly Meeting level or that required wider discussion. Typically, these meetings would last several days, with several thousand in attendance. However, most business was performed before or after the meeting by ad hoc committees appointed to consider issues and draft reports to be discussed at the Yearly Meeting. Theoretically, any decision reached by the Yearly Meeting was binding on its Quarterly and Monthly meetings.30

In 1756, to ensure compliance with their decisions, the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting appointed a committee of thirty elders and ministers, including John Pemberton, John Woolman, Daniel Stanton, and Samuel Fothergill, to visit the Monthly and Quarterly Meetings. This corresponded with a dramatically tougher stance on discipline: between 1760 and 1777 twenty-two percent of members in meetings under Philadelphia's aegis were disowned.31 Leaders began to crack down on delinquencies from the Quaker testimony, as evidenced by the list of queries from the 1755 Yearly Meeting minutes: irregular attendance at meetings, slander, poor rearing of children, drunkenness, neglect.

---

29 The Philadelphia Yearly Meeting was created in 1685, with the location alternating between Philadelphia and Burlington, New Jersey. It began on the first Sunday in September, with the first three days devoted to public meetings for worship.

30 William J. Frost, The Quaker Family in Colonial America: A Portrait of the Society of Friends (New York: St. Martins' Press, 1973), 4. Although Yearly Meetings did not legislate policy for other Yearly Meetings, the Philadelphia Meeting was, by far, the most influential and powerful in America (in part because of its size: around 2250 members in 1760), whose policies, although not binding on the other five Yearly Meetings, did govern the tack of American Quakerism. The extent of Philadelphia's influence is seen, for example, in the visitation of Delaware Valley Friends to slave-owning Quakers in the southern colonies.

of the poor and widows, oaths, slavery, and debt. The most commonly disciplined offenses were violations of the marriage code, drunkenness, military activity, contempt of authority, profanity, fornication, and debt. In addition to the Yearly Meeting, there was the Meeting for Ministers and Elders, established by the Philadelphia Meeting, which convened three times annually (the first Sunday in June, the Saturday before the Yearly Meeting, and the first Saturday in March). They approved publications for the Society (through a committee of Overseers of the Press), and traveling ministers were required to report to them. In some cases, special meetings were established, such as the Meeting of Sufferings, appointed by the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting in 1756 to deal with problems connected with the outbreak of hostilities between Britain and France on the Pennsylvanian frontier.

Chapter Overviews

Chapter 1 will examine the character of the declension or secularization diagnosed by reformist ministers of the mid-eighteenth century, and the consequent redefinition of Quaker relations with the world. Following up on George Fox's plantation metaphor, ministers emphasized the "wildness" of the Society and constructed an ideal believing community which was defined in opposition the world, as it had been in interregnum England. Unlike earlier leaders of Pennsylvania, the ministerial elite saw material prosperity as detrimental to spiritual health, rather than an attendant blessing. The church was reproached for its "fatness," as ministers invoked the Old Testament motif of removal from the land for moral lassitude. In response to worldliness, they encouraged

coreligionists to approach business and possessions with restraint, prioritizing simplicity. John Woolman models the new approach to the world by his withdrawal from merchandising and his embrace of simplicity, countering burgeoning mercantile capitalism in the late colonial period with a strikingly individualist response. Joshua Evans, like Woolman, rejects the "harmful" practice of dying clothing because it was superfluous and perpetuated oppression. This consumer-based reaction represents a critique of the colonial modes of production and distribution of goods.

Chapter 2 takes up the revitalization of pacifism by Quaker ministers in the 1750's, the testimony that typifies their newly constructed relationship of opposition with the world, as they came to recognize the connection between material prosperity and the need for defense. The political struggle over defense came to a head with the November 1755 passage of the Militia Act and the April 1756 declaration of war against the Delaware nation, effectively putting orthodox Quakers in the Assembly in a morally untenable position. Samuel Fothergill emphasizes the danger of compromise, and is among the first leaders to recommend that Quakers withdraw from the colonial assembly. As an alternative to human-contrived defense measures, reformist ministers focus on God's sovereign protection, which, they argue, had been evident in Pennsylvania's history to that time and was permanently contingent on obedience to the doctrine of pacifism. This focus is dramatized most vividly in the dream-vision of Isaac Child, which employs the apocalyptic imagery of Revelation to illustrate Child's interpretation of the outbreak of war in Pennsylvania. For Quaker leaders, a revitalized pacifism was not merely an ethical or theological notion that effectively distinguished them from other Anglo-American settlers – it was also a pragmatic response to the threat of French and Indian
invasion. They were convinced that defensive action taken to counter potential violence would cause the Holy Experiment of Pennsylvania to implode.

Chapter 3 addresses the issue of Quaker relations with the Indians. The renewed pacifism involved an attempt to counter racialized violence in the colony, an effort which Quaker leaders backed reluctantly because of their commitment to the myth of Pennsylvania as a peaceable space in British North America. Their advocacy of marginalized peoples was based on a sense of Christian justice and egalitarianism, assumptions that appear earlier in George Fox's discussion of the Indians and in Thomas Chalkley's emphasis on Indian land rights. Quaker advocacy of Indian interests was complicated by actual violence committed against Pennsylvanian settlers, but the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting argued that this violence was uncharacteristic, and that the Indians had been provoked. This tack is also taken by Anthony Benezet, who, in Some Observations on the Situation, Disposition, and Character of the Indian Natives of This Continent, cites European injustices as the cause of the demise of Indian societies in the British colonies. His generalized statements about Native Americans derive, in part, from his acquaintance with the Christian Indian chief, Papunahung, who visited Philadelphia in 1760 and 1761, and whose professed pacifism impressed Benezet. This contact prompted John Woolman to visit Papunahung's settlement at Wyalusing in the summer of 1763. During his journey there, John Woolman laments the literally marginalized situation of the Indians, who had been pushed off their lands, contrasting it with the affluence of Anglo-American society.

Chapter 4 examines the issue of Quaker anti-slavery as it relates to pacifism and the advocacy of Indian land rights. Woolman is far and away the most ideologically
articulate of Quaker abolitionists, and his position was formulated during visits to the southern colonies in 1746 and 1757, where slavery was widely practiced by Quakers, and articulated in his two-part tract, *Some Considerations on the Keeping of Negroes* (1754, 1761). Whether the context is anti-slavery or justice to the Indians, Woolman is unusually self-reflexive in his desire to "keep clear from the gain of oppression." His critique of racism is insightful and his expansion of the Christian notion of "neighbor" represents an intensification of Christian moral responsibility, echoing John Churchman's hypothesis about the proliferation of violence in the British imperium.
CHAPTER 1

Re-cultivating the Inner Plantation: Quakers and the "World"

1755, the year of General Braddock's defeat near Fort Duquesne and the beginning of French-Indian raids on the Pennsylvania frontier, was also a landmark year in the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting, as measures were taken for stricter accountability and, concomitantly, qualifications for leadership were more sharply defined. This new structure of leadership became the vehicle for the enforcement of reforms. Slavery, for instance, was a controversial issue in the Society at mid-century, but once the majority of leaders supported abolitionism, the way was made smooth for the eradication of slavery from its local meetings. The minutes from the 1755 Meeting of Ministers and Elders (Philadelphia) detail a revision of the expectations of ministers.¹ Among other requirements, they must regularly attend meetings with an engaged spirit, "in humble waiting therein, not giving way to Drowsiness." They must be "sound in Word and Doctrine," faithful to the Quaker creed as preachers and teachers. Their lives are to be "blameless" and characterized by simplicity, evincing moderation in dress and language. They are to be peacemakers, "maintain the Discipline of the Church" without partiality,

¹ Quotations in this paragraph are from Haverford College Library. Haverford, Pennsylvania. Quaker Collection. Philadelphia Yearly Meeting Minutes, 9/20-26/1755. In Mothers of Feminism (San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1986, pp. 11ff.), Margaret Hope Bacon discusses in detail the process by which one became an approved traveling minister in the eighteenth century. Typically, it began when the individual would speak fittingly in the meeting, through the leading of the Holy Spirit. The ministry of that individual would then be "recognized" by the home meeting, and he or she would be appointed to a committee of ministers and elders. If the person desired to travel to nearby meetings to offer encouragement, insight, or greetings, a certificate would be obtained. Several additional factors would be considered, though, to determine suitability for this role: whether the person had a true call from God, the soundness or consistency of preaching, "conversation" (in the archaic sense – "manner of living; behavior), and the situation of spouse and children. The latter was a pragmatic concern, since the meeting was expected to assume responsibility for providing for the candidate's family members in the minister's absence.
and, as much as possible, be in a state of unity with other members. Finally, those who are older are to be watchful shepherds over younger ministers and members:

[T]o help those who are Young in the Ministry in the right Line; discouraging forward Spirits that run into Words without life and Power advising against Affectation of Tones and Gestures and everything which would hurt their Services, Yet encouraging the humbled careful Traveller, speaking a Word in due Season to them that are weary.

This notion of watchfulness is particularly important to the implementation and maintenance of reforms in the Society. The role of seasoned ministers was not limited to their local flocks: they were to regulate the behavior of one another, particularly of younger ministers, who might give into formalism, emotionalism, or discouragement. The particularly strong emphasis on this duty signals the shift towards stricter discipline, to be enforced not only between ministers and their members, but also between ministers themselves.

In addition to meeting minutes, Quaker journals and correspondence of the mid-eighteenth century set a high value on pastoral watchfulness. From the beginning, Friends had been concerned about the danger of religious complacency to the well-being of the Quaker flock. But at no time are the alarms sounded as in the 1750's, when "declension" became a byword in the religious society. Traveling ministers cast themselves as prophets, recognizing the unpopularity of their message. Initially, there was little grassroots enthusiasm for their proposed reforms (e.g., the abolition of slavery), but the stricter discipline structure (an organizational reform) enacted in the 1750's made the implementation of other behavioral reforms possible. This prophetic edge is also
expressed in dream-visions and the invocation of apocalyptic symbols, such as the church of Laodicea, the archetype of religious complacency whose prevalence among professors of Christianity signals the end of the age.

As Frederick Tolles has noted, there is sufficient evidence to suggest that the freedom found in the New World was a liability for religious fervor. Prosperity took the edge off Quaker radicalism. Formalism reached a new height in 1739, when the policy of birthright membership was adopted in Pennsylvania, granting full membership (not half-way, as earlier in New England) to children of acknowledged members of the Society of Friends. Detecting a creeping worldliness, pious Friends began to call for change. American-born minister John Churchman was the first to express a desire for reform in the Society, a vision which was crystallized during his four-year visit to Europe (1740-1744). After returning to Philadelphia he writes:

During my late travels in Europe, beholding the declension of many of the professors of truth from the ancient simplicity in habit and deportment, I sometimes was ready to cry out and say, O Pennsylvania! may thine inhabitants be forever strangers to the vanities of the world, and the professors of truth keep their garments clean from the spots thereof, pride and superfluity of every kind.

In this passage "declension" denotes secularization – a movement away from simplicity towards the "vanities of the world." Although Churchman identifies European declension, it is striking that his concern is directed primarily at Pennsylvania, reflecting his assumption that Pennsylvania represented a new start, an opportunity to strip oneself of the Old World's cultural and religious trappings. It is not coincidental that Churchman

---

2 Tolles, Meeting House and Counting House.
3 Churchman, Account of Gospel Labours, 168.
uses the biblical image of clean garments, since habits of dress were seen as one of the main regressions from the "ancient" ideals of the first Quakers.

Churchman's call for reform is contemporaneous with the Great Awakening, the surge of evangelicalism that touched the entire British Atlantic. However, unlike George Whitefield and Gilbert Tennant who both preached in the middle colonies, proselytizing the unchurched, Churchman had no message for non-Quakers. His journey to Europe was not for the purpose of evangelism, but to encourage and exhort fellow Quakers. Indeed Churchman distrusted eloquent and enthusiastic preaching, believing that only the Holy Spirit – who most often moves in a quiet, unseen fashion – could effect genuine change in the human heart. He clearly possessed a different spiritual sensibility from the mid-century revivalists, and, like Woolman, never mentions the revivals in his journal or correspondence. This position accords with the larger tendency in eighteenth-century Quakerism to "not define the prosperity of Christianity in an evangelical or democratic way." 4

During a later visit to the Middle Colonies in 1748, Churchman discusses reactions to his ministry, illustrating thereby his own definition of true religion. It is apparent that he is not looking for an enthusiastic response, as seen in other religious circles during the time, but quiet, humble piety. First, he mentions those who, though they receive him warmly, are more concerned with how they are perceived by others than with "truth" itself:

I observed some people would earnestly press me to go home with them, and would say they would not take it kind if I did not, and friends did not use to serve

them so, that is, pass by them; yet I thought there was not much of the innocent
sweetness of truth to be felt at their houses, or even about them; tho' they would
say, why! thou has hit the nail on the head, there is [sic] just such people among
us as thou has spoken of; and seem as to themselves, safe and easy, when perhaps
their religion lay much in thinking that good friends were familiar with them and
thought well of them.

Churchman then speaks of a second category of people, who are quick to judge others,
because they lack charity and humility:

I also took notice of another sort, who tho' they were not fond of having friends
go with them, would speak well of their service, and deal it out liberally to others
in a censorious manner and not look on themselves with a true prospect which
would have led them to smite on their own breasts, with a feeling, short prayer,
rather than apprehend themselves better than others, when perhaps covetousness
and a worldly spirit had almost destroyed charity, which is the sure product of the
religion.

The final category are those who exemplify true religion, as Churchman sees it. They
speak little and humbly acknowledge their own faults, while recognizing the
shortcomings of the society at large:

[A] third sort, I beheld humbled and bowed, whose words were few, and would
frequently if they said anything, lament the state of the society, and speak of their
own weakness, and fear lest they should not walk in the uprightness of truth
before their own families and the church, the dew rested on them in their humble situation.\textsuperscript{5}

This type is self-effacing, as seen in the semantic code implied by "humbled," "bowed," "lament," "weakness," and "fear." They acknowledge their own responsibility and stake in the health of the church. They do not fear others, but their own potential to not live according to Quaker principles. Churchman observes that this third type is particularly prominent among the rising generation who were "mostly modest and diffident of themselves, sincerely affectionate, not over forward or fondling, but lovers of truth in heart, to whom I felt great nearness of spirit, believing they would grow in the root of Life"\textsuperscript{6}

Like Churchman, John Woolman emphasized the fact of declension and the prospect of reform. Indeed in 1748, several years after Churchman's pivotal visit to Europe, Woolman noted that Delaware and Maryland Quakers "appeared . . . to be in a declining condition."\textsuperscript{7} Because of this moral deterioration, Woolman saw his ministry in terms of the ancient Hebrew prophets, who were given the difficult task of calling Israel back to God. While in Long Island in May 1756, he found that his message was unpopular with many of the ministers and elders, or "foremost rank" of the Society, and invoked the ministry of Jeremiah to understand his own:

Through the humbling dispensations of divine providence men are sometimes fitted for his service. The messages of the prophet Jeremiah were so disagreeable to the people and so reverse to the spirit they lived in that he

\textsuperscript{5} Churchman, \textit{Some Account of the Gospel Labours}, 75-76.
\textsuperscript{6} Ibid., 76.
\textsuperscript{7} Woolman, \textit{Journal}, 43.
became the object of their reproach and in the weakness of nature thought to desist from his prophetic office, but saith he: 'His word was in my heart as a burning fire shut up in my bones, and I was weary with forbearing and could not stay' (Jer. 20:9). I saw at this time that if I was honest to declare that which the Truth opened in me, I could not please all men, and laboured to be content in the way of my duty, however disagreeable to my own inclination.8

In this passage Woolman expresses the tension he felt as a minister: to offer pleasing encouragement to others, but also to "declare the truth." The truth must come first, however, even if it is unwelcome and inconsistent with the spirit of the age. This prophetic approach to ministry shaped Woolman's career, which was characterized by trenchant denunciations of spiritual apathy and the affluence that was often its cause. Woolman's appeal to the model of Jeremiah, the weeping prophet whose warnings came on the eve of the Babylonian captivity of Judah, indicates not only his commitment to speak the fiery words of the heart, however unpopular, but also the great moral responsibility he felt as one entrusted with the "truth." For Woolman, and other Quaker ministers, the Kingdom of Peace, like the kingdom of Judah, was at stake.

The Quaker jeremiahd articulated by Churchman, Woolman, and others derived, in part, from the conviction that the outbreak of war was the direct result of disobedience to God. As Richard Bauman has noted, "Those who deplored the spiritual lassitude which had become widespread within the church proclaimed emphatically that the holocaust which threatened to engulf the colony was a visitation from God to arouse a backslidden..."
and degenerate people." However, these jeremiads did not merely castigate – there was also a silver lining in the thunderous clouds of divine judgment. What Sacvan Bercovitch notes of seventeenth-century New England ministers can also be applied to mid-eighteenth-century Quaker ministers – that "they believed God's punishments were corrective, not destructive. Here, as nowhere else, His vengeance was a sign of love, a father's rod used to improve the errant child." Quaker ministers, like their Puritan counterparts, made dire pronouncements of impending calamity, particularly in reference to the intensifying political crisis in Pennsylvania. On December 19, 1756, John Churchman recorded his impressions of a visit to the Meeting in East Nottingham, Pennsylvania. Disturbed by the "spirit" of the worshippers, he assumes the voice of divine authority, declaring that "a day of calamity and sore distress . . . was approaching, in which the careless and stupid professors, who are easy, and not concerned to properly worship and adore the almighty . . . will be greatly surprised with fearfulness." Clearly, this was not a popular message in a society that had enjoyed peace and prosperity since the beginnings of settlement. Again, prophetic watchfulness figures prominently: a strong, potentially offensive warning is given to casual believers who do not worship in spirit and truth. Responding to this spiritual apathy, Churchman quotes Haggai 2:6: "God will shake the heavens and the earth," a pronouncement which could be verified by the tremors and rumors of war in the colonies.

When calamities did occur, the opportunity was not lost on ministers to expound their portents. Samuel Fothergill interpreted the Pennsylvania earthquake of November 9 Bauman, For the Reputation of the Truth, 42. 10 Bercovitch, The American Jeremiad (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1978), 8. 11 Churchman, Account of Gospel Labours, 187. 12 Ibid, 187-8.
18, 1755, which occurred during the initial wave of Indian attacks, as an "awful
visitation," pointing out the "unprofitable professions many have made of religion" and
the "fear and horror" under which they lived because they lacked "a good foundation."\textsuperscript{13}
This apocalyptic sensibility is also seen in a dream-vision which Woolman records, from
February 7, 1754. In it he is walking in an orchard on a mid-afternoon, and in the east
notices two lights resembling suns, but "of a dull and gloomy aspect." Then he sees a
"terrible storm coming westward," which he and his companions sense as death. At this
point there comes a "great multitude of men in a military posture," scoffing and arrogant,
"assembled to improve the discipline of war."\textsuperscript{14} For pious Quakers the coming of war
meant the end of all they had hoped and envisioned for Pennsylvania. Although Quakers
had been outnumbered in the colony since 1720 (representing only around 25% of the
population by 1750), Woolman and other ministers faulted fellow members for the
outbreak of war, citing their God-given responsibility as watchmen against spiritual
laxity.

Apocalyptic foreboding is also evidenced by the commonly used metaphor of
lukewarmness. John Churchman, recording his impressions of a meeting held in a
schoolhouse near Burlington towards the end of February 1758, speaks of the laxity of
the Quakers there and his consequent reiteration of Christ's message to the church at
Laodicea: "[I]t became my concern to shew how disagreeable and loathsome that state
was, from Rev. iii. 15 \textit{I know thy works, that thou are neither cold nor hot; so then},

\textsuperscript{13} Fothergill, Letter to his wife, 11/24/1755, in \textit{Memoir and Letters}, 168; Marietta, \textit{Reformation of
American Quakerism}, 87.
\textsuperscript{14} Woolman, \textit{Journal}, 46-47.
because thou are lukewarm and neither cold nor hot, I will spue thee out of my mouth.”

He then relates his "opening" regarding the application of this passage to the Burlington meeting:

[T]o hold a profession of religion so as to take it ill not to be thought a christian, but at the same time to remain easy and not in earnest to experience the life, virtue, and power of Christianity; not so cold as to forget the name, nor so hot or zealous as to witness the life of true religion, was very displeasing to the Almighty.

Here Churchman attempts to steer fellow Quakers back to the radical, all-or-nothing, faith of their spiritual forbears. He and other ministers consistently appealed to the faith of early Quakers, who were necessarily "hot and zealous" because of the adverse reaction of seventeenth-century English society to them. Thomas Nicholson (1715-1780), a North Carolina Friend closely connected to the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting, wrote an epistle to Friends in Great Britain in 1762, in which he admonishes them to be "lights in the world" by seeking a purity like that of the founders of Quakerism:

[L]et us with one heart and mind, look with a single eye to the rock that begat us, that we may be preserved from ever entering again into the Pit from whence our Fathers were digged: It was the concern of their minds, in great Humiliation to be found in the practice of true Patience, Resignation, and Plainness, as became such who professed themselves to be seekers of that City which hath Foundations, whose builder and maker is God; let us not sit down short of the same Engagement of heart, lest the love of this world, and the present
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16 Ibid., 195-96.
Enjoyments thereof, should so far prevail in any of us, to cause us to become
careless in our minds; from whence a Laodicean lukewarmness will proceed,
and we shall be in danger of becoming conformed to this world, instead of being
transformed by the renewing of our minds.\textsuperscript{17}

In this passage Nicholson calls Quakers away from materialism and lukewarmness, to
simplicity, appealing to the examples of early Quakers. His construction metaphor
echoes the New Testament imagery for the church, connoting ineluctable progression.
The foundation had been laid. How, then, could mid-eighteenth-century Quakers return
to a pre-quarried condition?

Since George Fox, Quaker spiritual leaders had warned coreligionists of the
dangers of worldliness. However, in John Churchman, John Woolman, Thomas
Nicholson, and other ministers, there is a striking urgency in the calls for reform because,
in part, they viewed the impending war in apocalyptic terms, as the "hour of
temptation."\textsuperscript{18} This is evident in the years preceding the Seven Years' War, when the
outbreak of violence was imminent, given the tensions between France and England in
the Ohio Country. In a letter to Israel Pemberton, Jr. (1715-79), a prominent Quaker
businessman from Philadelphia, Churchman borrows the Pauline language of day and
night to express his own sense that the peaceful Quaker summer was coming to an end:

\textsuperscript{17}Thomas Nicholson, \textit{Journal} (MS), 35. Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College.
\textsuperscript{18}Abraham Farrington (d. 1758) uses this phrase in a letter to Churchman (in "Memoirs and Letters of
quoting Revelation 3:10, part of Christ's address to the ancient church in Philadelphia (in Asia Minor):
"Because thou hast kept the word of my patience, I also will keep thee from the hour of temptation, which
shall come upon all the world, to try them that dwell upon the earth." This address precedes the one to
Laodicea and is strikingly different in tone. Philadelphia is given an "open door" which no one can shut
(v.8) and is praised for its perseverance and commitment to the truth in the midst of testing. Laodicea, on
the other hand, is harshly criticized for its affluence and worldliness. The invocation of both these
apocalyptic churches has intriguing implications for Quakerism in late colonial America. Indeed, with the
ministers there is a sometimes a dual notion of the crisis as testing and punishment.
[W]e should Imply the Time & Remember winter will come when we can't provide, we should work while 'tis Day according to his Tender Exhortation, for behold the Night cometh wherein no man can work, there are seasons in which we cannot so much as move or travel with safety.\footnote{Letter dated 10/2/1748. Pemberton Papers, 4:171. Historical Society of Pennsylvania.}

This imagery of day passing into night and of impending winter corresponds with Churchman's growing realization that "Pennsylvania" – both the political and spiritual entity – was slipping away from Quaker ideals and control. Once again, as in the early days of the movement, the Society of Friends was finding itself in a more marginalized space, in this case because of its opposition to defensive measures.

**The Pilgrim Motif in George Fox's *Journal***

The life-writings of the ministerial elite not only recount the denunciation of declension, but also detail the restructuring of Quaker-world relations. While serving an affirming role by buttressing Societal faith and praxis, they also are counterhegemonic in that they define the self in opposition to larger society (“the world”), although framed in the context of the religious community. This is often overlooked by critics, as if the narrative does not reach beyond the religious community of the individual who produced it. The character of the writer's relationship with the culture at large, unlike that with the community, is obviously antagonistic, involving both disidentification with the "world" and the formation of an alternate subject position. In the Christian life-writing tradition, beginning with Augustine, the individuals who make up the church, which is regarded as eternal, are always already antagonistic to the “world,” which is temporal. This
assumption is inherent to the New Testament idea of the "ekklesia," or church, and is related to the notion of pilgrimage, or sojourning in the world, which consistently appears in conversion narratives.

An example of this is the prototypical Quaker journal, by George Fox. It was clearly written in opposition to the larger cultural ideology of Interregnum and Restoration England, as it expresses the marginalization that Quakers suffered because of the “cultural mythology” of Quakerism in England. From the beginning, Fox, a leather-worker and shepherd with little formal education, records his struggle with formal religion and the mystical experiences that shaped his response. Larry Ingle argues that although Fox’s concerns were theological (i.e., concerning his rejection of Anglicanism), he also “stressed the secular needs of those left behind by the changing social order.”

This concern for social and economic justice is apparent in his journal. He advocates a classless society, for example, addressing others as thee “without respect to rich or poor, great or small.” While in a Derby prison, he wrote a letter to the local judges, admonishing them not to execute thieves and to avoid bribery. And in Carlisle, he warned the soldiers posted at the castle not to do violence to anyone. But the solitary character of Fox's faith, particularly the pilgrim motif, figures prominently: one finds him wandering (most often alone) from town to town, without any connection to society. He constructs himself as a “stranger in the earth,” and as one who received “heavenly wisdom” directly from God, rather than through the mediation of formal religion.

20Larry H. Ingle, First Among Friends: George Fox and the Creation of Quakerism (New York: Oxford Press, 1994), 3. Fox was concerned a range of ethical issues: temperance, sports (which “trained up people to vanity and looseness”), cheating in business, music, and the stage.
22 Ibid., 65-66.
23 Ibid., 157.
Throughout his journal, he struggles with religious pretension in his quest for a purer, more individual and personal faith. One event in this process occurred when he was nineteen and consorted with several "professors" who were trying to persuade him to get drunk with them. Shocked at their hypocrisy, he abruptly took leave of them. Afterwards, when he could not sleep, he decided to pray, and reported that the Lord spoke to him the following: "Thou seest how young people go together into vanity, and old people into the earth; and thou must forsake all, young and old, keep out of all, and be as a stranger unto all."24

This notion of being a "stranger" in the world, a sojourner who has no place to lay his head, characterized the next phase of Fox's life. Taking leave of his family on July 9, 1643, he traveled to Lutterworth, Northampton, and Barnet. From this point Fox was a loner: "I left my relations and broke off all familiarity with young or old." In Barnet, he "walked solitary in the Chase [an unenclosed game preserve] there to wait upon the Lord." This isolation from human society increasingly led him to oppose the Calvinistic emphases of the English religious establishment: instead of being concerned about God's sovereignty, human depravity, and God's revealed law, he began to focus on human choice, the possibility of perfectionism, and the Christ within. Increasingly, Fox embraced direct, unmediated religion. He returned to his home, but stopped going to church all together, spending time with his Bible in solitary places instead. Fox eventually came to the conclusion that "God did not dwell in temples made with hands" (i.e., the Anglican steeple house), but rather "people were his temple, and he dwelt in them." Therefore, there was no need for priests or other intermediaries – as Fox told his
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24 Ibid., 3.
family, "[T]here was an anointing within man to teach him, and . . . the Lord would teach his people himself." He could not join with the Anglicans or Dissenters, becoming, as he put it, a "stranger to all, relying wholly upon the Lord Jesus Christ." He was a pilgrim and separate from the world. 25

**Fox's Inner and Outer Plantations**

The radical individualism of George Fox determined the tack of the early Quaker community, which, as a whole, was severely persecuted by English authorities. And yet, despite this relationship of antagonism with those outside their community, Friends believed in a level of perfection that could be attained in this life by those who fully realized the workings of the inner light. These enlightened ones, in turn, could transform the world into a space amenable to Christian ideals. This possibility was part of the motivation Quakers had for settling in Pennsylvania in 1682. Quakers had of course emigrated to the New World before, but now, for the first time, they were coming to a colony administered and owned by a devout Quaker and founded upon Quaker principles. Their "Kingdom of Peace" had a chance in Pennsylvania.

On March 4, 1681, when William Penn received the tract of land west of the Delaware (between 40 and 43 degrees north) as payment for an outstanding debt of 16,000 pounds, he was not a novice to colonial ventures, having previously been involved with the establishment of West Jersey. But Pennsylvania was entirely under his ownership, and he was able to promote the project, spending some 10,000 pounds over several years, because he was extremely well-connected in the Quaker community. He
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25 Ibid., 4, 8
was on familiar terms with religious leaders like George Fox and Robert Barclay, and wealthy Quaker merchants in Dublin, Cork, Bristol, London, as well as the country gentry.26 In Some Account of the Province of Pennsilvania in America (1681), Penn lays out practical information and considerations for settlement in his colonial enterprise. He focuses on the benefits that a colony like his could bring to England, listing the kinds of trade that would prosper and the kinds of people (in economic, class terms) who would be most suited to settlement.27 Penn is also careful to include an enticing list of the abundant natural resources available in the colony, which all would be "profitable Commodities" in the Old World.28 In contrast to Penn, who saw his colony as a land of political and economic opportunity, George Fox, the aged founder of the Society of Friends, was more cautious. In his Epistle to all Planters and Such Who are Transporting Themselves into Foreign Plantations in America (1682), he warns fellow Quakers against allowing the physical business of building a colony to choke out the vitality of their inner faith: "My Friends, That are gone and are going over to Plant, and make outward Plantations in America, keep your own Plantations in your Hearts, with the Spirit and Power of God, that your own Vines and Lillies be not hurt."29 Fox expresses great enthusiasm for the colonial venture, not primarily for its economic potential, but for the opportunity it affords to spread the "Light" of the Christian gospel.

26 Gary B. Nash, Race, Class, and Politics: Essays on American Colonial and Revolutionary Society (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1986), 66. Indeed, as Nash has suggested, the colony was not truly egalitarian from its inception, given the base of support that Penn sought for the venture: "Like any prudent manager of a large enterprise he sought support in the wealthiest and most experienced sector of his constituency" (71). "First Purchasers" of 5000 acres or more received, in return, a place in the government seat of power.
27 William Penn, Some Account of the Province of Pennsilvania in America (London: Benjamin Clark, 1681), 2-3, 6-7.
28 Ibid., 5.
29 George Fox, An Epistle to All Planters and Such who are Transporting Themselves into Foreign Plantations in America (London, Printed for Ben. Clark in George-Yard in Lombard-street, 1682), [broadside].
Thomas Chalkley (1675-1741), an influential British-American minister and merchant, visited Philadelphia a decade after its founding and decided to move there in 1701. A year later, on the twentieth-anniversary of the settlement of Pennsylvania, Chalkley remarks in his journal on the growth and potential of the colony:

Since my settling in this Province, which is now about a Year, some Hundreds of People are come here to settle, and divers Meeting-houses are built; and I do certainly know from above that this Province of Pennsilvania, and city of Philadelphia, will flourish both spiritually and temporally if the Inhabitants will love (and live in) Righteousness, and in the Fear of God; otherwise the Hand that planted them can soon pluck them up.30

In this passage Chalkley asserts the possibility for spiritual and temporal prosperity for Pennsylvania. However, as in John Winthrop's "Model of Christian Charitee," material blessings were assumed to be contingent upon spiritual well-being. If, in their prosperity, Quakers forgot the one who had blessed them, they would be "plucked" out of the land violently.

Material Blessing Becomes a Curse

Seventy years into settlement, it was clear that Penn had not overstated his colony's potential fertility – Pennsylvania was the most economically prosperous colony in British North America.31 With its rich alluvial soil it was ideal for grain production, inviting opportunists of every Protestant stripe. However, at this juncture, there was considerably

little optimism on the part of Quaker ministers for the potential of material and spiritual blessings to coexist in harmony. John Woolman, commenting on the events of 1755 and the Quaker debate over payment of war taxes, gives his own overview of the colony's movement away from a spiritual to a "carnal" mind:

The profession which for a time was accounted reproachful, at length the uprightness of our predecessors being understood by the rulers and their innocent sufferings moving them, the way of worship was tolerated, and many of our members in these colonies became active in civil government. Being thus tried with favour and prosperity, this world hath appeared inviting. . . . [B]ut in our present condition, that a carnal mind is gaining upon us I believe will not be denied.32

Here Woolman presents a fascinating dilemma: while Quakers were considered "reproachful," they were persecuted and excluded from involvement in civic affairs. But, when their "uprightness" became widely recognized, many Quakers became involved in government and business. Instead of speaking of "favour and prosperity" as blessings accompanying spiritual progress, however, Woolman refers to it as a trial or test. That economic success would be a liability is ironic, as Rebecca Larson notes, because this very success derived from the Quaker moral code:

A community that had grown rich, successful, and powerful, in part by following the principles preached by the ministers: diligence in the productive use of one’s

32 Woolman, Journal, 83.
talents, with little dissipation of fortune or time spent gratifying appetites, now faced problems arising from the effectiveness of these principles.33

For Woolman, then, striking a balance between the inner and outer plantations was extremely difficult, if not impossible.

William Reckitt, on a 1757 visit to Pennsylvania, also remarks on worldly-mindedness, but specifically in reference to the leaders of the Quaker community:

> Here is a large body of people in this province of Pennsylvania, the elders of which are too much in the outward court, which is only trodden by the Gentiles, or as such as are in the spirit of the world; yet a young and rising generation is here, as well as in several other places where my lot had been cast, since I came into this land, whom the Lord hath visited by his power and good spirit in their hearts, which, as they take good heed in yielding obedience to, and bring all things into the obedience of Christ, will crucify all their inordinate desires, evil thoughts and imaginations, and enable them to bring forth the fruits of the spirit.34

Again, we see a denunciation of over-attentiveness to the things of the world, or the "outer court," a metaphor not only evocative of the biblical Temple of Jerusalem, but also analogous to Fox's outward plantation. The agricultural metaphor is here, though: Reckitt expresses his hope that Pennsylvanian Quakers would bear the "fruits of the spirit." But he also notes his fear of "wild grapes, the fruit of the flesh" which would "provoke [God] to take away the hedge of protection and thus be trodden down and laid
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33 Rebecca Larson, *Daughters of Light*, 198.
waste by the devourer.\textsuperscript{35} The hedge, which functions like a fence around an orchard or
garden, is not maintained by human contrivances in the case of Pennsylvania, but by
God's sovereign protection.\textsuperscript{36} Samuel Fothergill, in a letter to James Wilson written after
his return to England, also diagnoses a laxity or declension in Pennsylvania in terms of
Fox's horticultural metaphor:

They settled in ease and affluence, and whilst they made the barren wilderness as
a fruitful field, suffered the plantation of God to be as a field uncultivated, and a
desert. Thus decay of discipline and other weakening things prevailed, to the
eclipsing of Zion's beauty.\textsuperscript{37}

Ironically, in the midst of their success with the physical world the more important
spiritual landscape had become fruitless.\textsuperscript{38} Like the Laodiceans in Revelation 3, they
might say to themselves, "We are rich, and increased with goods, and have need of
nothing" but in fact were "wretched, and miserable, and poor, and blind, and naked."
Fothergill's use of the trope of wilderness also resembles its metaphorical significance for
seventeenth-century New England Puritans: it was a rhetorical device, providing a
narrative for interpreting New World experience.\textsuperscript{39} For both Massachusetts Puritans and

\textsuperscript{35} Ibid., 71.
\textsuperscript{36} Although borrowed from the Old Testament, the notion of a "hedge" is also apparent in the Anglo-
American practice of land enclosure. That which William Cronon has noted of Massachusetts settlement is
also characteristic of Pennsylvania: English settlers established European relations of production in the
New World, reproducing the agricultural cycles of Europe (Changes in the Land, 36).
\textsuperscript{37} Fothergill, Memoir and Letters, 189. The letter is dated 11/9/1756. Fothergill's language also reflects his
Eurocentric view of agricultural development and land tenure. However, the Delaware and other Indian
groups in the region had successfully produced crops of corn and other staples before the English crossed
the Atlantic. Therefore, in ecological terms at least, the land had not been "barren" or a "wilderness."
\textsuperscript{38} Seventeenth-century Puritan settlers in New England had viewed the wilderness as a "scriptural inscape
and civil landscape" (Cecilia Tichi, "Edward Johnson and the Puritan Territorial Imperative." In
Discoveries and Considerations: Essays on Early American Literature and Aesthetics. Calvin Israel, ed.
[Albany: State University of New York, 1976], 172). This double meaning of wilderness corresponds
conceptually, in some ways, with Fox's "inner" and "outer" plantation.
\textsuperscript{39} Roderick Nash, Wilderness and the American Mind (Yale University Press, 1967), 33.
Delaware Valley Quakers, the wilderness was to be subdued (in obedience to Genesis 1:28), transformed, and controlled in order to be a place of fruitfulness.

John Griffith (1713-1776), a British Friend who visited the American colonies in mid-century, remarked on the seductive danger of the outward "fruitfulness" of Pennsylvania:

Thou traveller Sion-ward, look forward to the joy set before thee, not suffering thine eyes to wander about thee, lest they convey such delight to the heart, as may infect the soul with pernicious tempers, by which thou mayest be rendered unable to proceed on thy journey towards the holy city; and though the defect occasioned thereby to thy sight, thou mayest, in a great measure, lose the glorious prospect of its beautiful situation, and the splendour of its structures. Beware thou do not load thyself with the seeming pleasant fruit of that country through which thou travellest: although they may appear to hang plentifully on each hand, they will neither be of any use to thee in that heavenly country whither thou art going, nor for refreshment on the way thither." 40

Griffith uses the pilgrim motif here (indeed, the passage seems to be lifted from John Bunyan's Pilgrims' Progress), emphasizing a single-minded focus on the goal of the "holy city." The pilgrim is to travel lightly, not laden down with the "seeming pleasant fruit" of the surrounding country, which, like all that belongs to the world, is of passing value. On a subsequent visit to Pennsylvania from 1765 to 1766, Griffith speaks more directly of the world's fatal attractions. Of his ministry among the Quarterly Meeting of London-Grove, he notes, "[M]y public service amongst them was in much close plain-

dealing shewing that to be carnally-minded is death; and that the natural man understandeth not the things of the spirit of God."\(^{41}\) And, in his estimation, many were worldly-minded. While visiting the Goshen Monthly Meeting, Griffith was oppressed by a "cloud,"

occasioned by the lukewarm careless state of many members . . . . [M]any of them seemed to be far gone into the spirit of the world, and at ease in a profession: so that instead of Goshen being a land of light, darkness hath prevailed in a sorrowful degree, and many are not sensible to lament it.\(^{42}\)

In the 1750's, then, there was a clear movement away from worldly pursuits and pleasures towards a more antagonistic view of the world, which lay outside the hedged-in "fold." John Woolman, on a visit to Long Island in 1756, comments:

The Lord I believe hath a people in those parts who are honestly concerned to serve him, but many I fear are too much clogged with the things of this life and do not come forward bearing the cross in such faithfulness as the Almighty calls for.\(^{43}\)

For Woolman, "this life," with its comforts and commodities, was antithetical to Christian discipleship, a position recalling the principles that informed the monastic movements of ancient and medieval Christianity.

\(^{41}\) Ibid., 368.
\(^{42}\) Ibid., 383.
\(^{43}\) Ibid., 52.
"Waxing Fat" in Pennsylvania

British Friend David Hall, in the preface to *A Mite into the Treasury* (1758), also denounces the affluence of American Quakers, comparing them to the generation of Hebrews after Joshua and the elders:

> Yet too many of the succeeding Generation took undue Liberties, and Jeshurun waxed fat, and kicked. Have not we just cause to fear, that this is too much the case with many of the Professors of the blessed Truth in these Days, wherein so great a Calm and Quiet, I say in so gracious a Toleration as is now mercifully enjoyed by us?44

The metaphor of "waxing fat" is peculiarly appropriate, given the burgeoning prosperity of Philadelphia, the wealthiest city in the British colonies. But the reference also connotes an apostasy, or falling away, because of prosperity. Hall quotes here from Deuteronomy 32:15: "But Jeshurun waxed fat, and kicked: thou art waxen fat, thou art grown thick, thou art covered with fatness; then he forsook God which made him, and lightly esteemed the Rock of his salvation."45 In the passage Hall also suggests that the "Calm and Quiet" toleration which Quakers enjoyed would be their undoing. Indeed, he states that the people are "growing evil in these Times of Liberty and Ease from Persecution," being given over to intemperance, mixed marriages, and contentions.46

Hall then directs his comments to the rising generation, which, trusting to much in the spiritual laurels of their ancestors, lacks spiritual stature:

---

44 David Hall, *A mite into the treasury, or, Some serious remarks on that solemn and indispensable duty of duly attending assemblies for divine worship, incumbent upon all persons come to years of understanding (especially the professors of truth) whilst favoured with health, strength and liberty* (Philadelphia: B. Franklin and D. Hall, 1758), iv.

45 This is part of the "Song of Moses," his last sermon to the people of Israel, given as a prophetic warning. "Jeshurun" (Hebrew, "upright one") is an appellative for Israel.

46 Ibid., vii.
We have now a large succeeding Generation coming up in our Society but too few of them growing up in the real work of Regeneration, and Obedience to the holy Spirit, their professed Principle, whence divers undue Liberties in Speech, Habit, and Deportment quite inconsistent with our said Principle, are run into.\textsuperscript{47} Because many in the Society of Friends lacked spiritual fitness, they were succumbing to "undue Liberties," moving away from the radical faith that characterized the movement in its first fifty years. For Hall, then, there are two kinds of Quakers. First, there is the "honest Primitive Quaker," whose "Dress, Address, and whole Conduct, agree to what he or she professeth." But, there are also the "modern, fashionable Quakers," who "profess the Spirit, yet it is plain they live after the Flesh, so they are but Nominal Quakers."\textsuperscript{48}

The world did have many attractions, as Hall notes:

"Tis admirable to observe what Difficulties, even through Hail, Rain, and Snow, up early, and down late, will some Professors wade though in order to attend Markets and Fairs, but what small Matters will sometimes deter them from setting out to a religious Meeting."\textsuperscript{49}

One has to smile at the irony of this judgment, and yet it does reveal the threat that the burgeoning merchant market of colonial America posed for the ideal, "primitive" Quaker faith. Hall notes that the pressing concerns of business tended to drown out the still small voice of "the Spirit," but expresses the hope that merchants would make "Room" for "pure Religion":

\begin{footnotes}
\item\textsuperscript{47} Ibid., iv.
\item\textsuperscript{48} Ibid.
\item\textsuperscript{49} Ibid., 32-33.
\end{footnotes}
I hope, some, though too few, extensive tradesmen, who are very careful that their Hearts may have Room in them for the pure Religion and undefiled before God and the Father, and that the Temple may not be unsuitably crowded with moneychangers and their Tables; but that their Hearts (though sometimes necessarily busy in Commerce) may be preserved really a House of Prayer.\footnote{Ibid., vi.}

Elizabeth Wilkinson, visiting Friends in the colonies from 1761 to 1763, recorded a similar impression of the general state of spiritual affairs in American Quakerism. For her, the church had become too tribalistic. Writing of her visit to the Cedar Creek Meeting in Virginia (just south of the Potomac), she notes: "I had to desire they might not trust to former Experience which would not do, instancing the children of Israel's not being permitted to gather Manna for two days, but to gather it fresh every day." Retaining the Old Testament motif of Israel in the wilderness, Wilkinson calls for fast days to set their spirits aright, observing that Israel's neglect of religious feasts resulted in "Declension, Captivity, and Servitude."\footnote{Haverford College Library. Haverford, Pennsylvania. Quaker Collection. Elizabeth Wilkinson, Journal of a Religious Visit to Friends in America, ca. 1761-1763 (Coll. no. 975B), 4.} She also warns against various enemies of the faith: lukewarmness, the cares of this world, and the deceitfulness of riches.\footnote{Ibid., 16. Wilkinson writes all four items in caps.} And like Hall, Wilkinson points out the danger of being tolerated to death – the double-edged sword of "Clemency of the mild Government we live under" and its "gracious Toleration."\footnote{Ibid., 35.}

Thomas Nicholson writes much about the nature of the believer's relationship with the world in his unpublished journal, intended for the intimate circle of his children,
grandchildren, and friends. Significantly, he opens up journal by quoting Matthew 6:24:

"No Man can serve two Masters; for either he will hate the one, and love the other; or else he will hold to the one and despise the other, ye cannot serve God and mammon."54

He then continues with his gloss of the passage:

The word mammon . . . signifies the God of Plenty or Riches; Now the question of great Importance is, which of the two, God or Mammon, is our Master? The answer is clear he to whom we obey [sic], and here lies a narrow passage through this world, to use it as a servant, and be preserved from being glued to the love of cares of this world and the things that are in it, so as to witness the love of the Father shed abroad in our Hearts.55

For Nicholson, there is no room for middle ground – the world is to be subservient to the things of God. This binary of God and "mammon" encapsulates the dilemma that Quaker leaders were facing in mid-century. Would they live up to their ideals, the light of Christ in them, or give themselves over to the temporal pleasures of "mammon" that came of the British colonial venture in the New World? The world is dangerous according to Nicholson, and for that reason one must take up "that cross . . . which crucifies the world."56 There is also the promise of God's enabling grace:

54 Thomas Nicholson, Journal (MS), 32. Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College. Nicholson also quotes two other key New Testament passages that deal with church-world relations. 1 John 2:15: "Love not the world, neither the things that are in the world, if any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him," And James 4:4, "Whosoever therefore will be a friend of the World, is the Enemy of God" (Journal, 33). The latter passage, like Matthew 6:24, delineates an either/or binarism between the world and God.
55 Ibid., 33.
56 Ibid. In a 1762 epistle to British Friends (written from Little River, North Carolina), Nicholson emphasizes again the important role of the cross in maintaining a righteous distance from the world: "[B]e careful not to cast off the Cross, which crucifies to the world, and the world to us; that we may be preserved from ever attempting to build again, that which our predecessors found themselves under a necessity to destroy" (Journal, 35).
[W]e are so far entangled in the cares of this world that we are not qualified to use them aright. Whereas if we were truly careful to keep our eyes single to the Lord our helper, he would enable us, by his grace, to keep this world a servant to us, and we servants to him.  

This assessment of worldliness and wealth is echoed by John Churchman, who, speaking out against the "dimness" that strong drink effects, uses the criticism as a platform for a larger grievance against worldliness:

Alas! how dimness has overtaken us, when we compare ourselves, and our practices with the temperance and moderation of our forefathers, and the early settlers of this Province! How sumptuous now are the tables, how rich and costly the apparel, the diet, and the furniture, of many of our friends even in the country; but more especially in the city! How is the simplicity and plainness of Truth departed from, and pomp and splendid appearances taken from their place?  

While making this general critique, he also expresses a personal desire: that his grandchildren be "brought up in a plain simple way." "Industry," or "useful business," was better applied to uncluttered rural living, "in a plain calling . . . in the country," than to city living characterized by a frenzied pursuit of the "ways of merchandize." For Churchman, it was better to live "mean and homely" in order to be "rich in the best sense."  

57 Ibid.
58 Churchman, Account of Gospel Labours, 211-12.
59 Ibid., 212.
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The Intensified Denunciation of Worldliness in London Yearly Meeting Epistles

Further testimony to an increasingly emphatic antagonism towards the world can be found in the epistles from the London Yearly Meeting to other meetings in the British Isles and North America, particularly those written in the 1750's. Typically, epistles were sent from a Yearly Meeting to its Quarterly and Monthly Meetings, but there were also exchanges on encouragement and admonition between Yearly Meetings, such as Philadelphia and London. Such letters had a typical structure: a salutation, followed by an account of the state of the meeting, an account of the reading of epistles from foreign parts, accounts of "truth's prosperity," accounts of sufferings (including those imprisoned for their faith), and exhortations and advice (mostly derived from Scripture) on subjects from family life to business practices. If one peruses the epistles of the London Yearly Meeting, beginning with 1695, and on into the 1740's, one would find only an occasional warning, usually brief, against worldliness. However, by 1750 there is a marked intensification of cautions against declension and temporality, contemporaneous with the defense crisis that Quakers faced in Pennsylvania. The 1750 Epistle, for instance, makes the following remark about the spiritual state of the Society:

But, alas! it is a matter of exceeding grief to the sincere and wise-hearted now among us, to observe that manifest lukewarmness and indifferency, which too many under our profession discover by their deportment in our religious

---

61 Epistles from the yearly-meeting of the people called Quakers, held in London, to the Quarterly and Monthly-meetings in Great Britain, Ireland, and elsewhere; from the Year 1695, to 1759, inclusive. (London: 1760). Library Company of Philadelphia.
assemblies, in a manner void of that gravity, devotion, and reverence which necessarily attend the worshippers of God in Spirit and truth.62

There are also frequent and repeated warnings in this epistle against being drawn aside from "purity of the faith," and an expressed fear, "that we have been too comfortable to the customs and manners of the world [sic], and have not walked according to the plainness and purity of our profession."63

The 1753 Epistle begins with a declarative statement about the character of the believer's relationship to world. It affirms a belief in the God "who in the aboundings of his Grace, hath called us out of this present evil world, to bear among the children of men a public profession of our faith in, and subjection to, the light and Spirit of his Son."64 However, many were not living according to that "call":

It is a matter of exceeding grief and concern to many of the faithful among us, to observe how far that exemplary plainness of habit, speech, and deportment, which distinguished our forefathers, and for which they patiently underwent the reproach and contradiction of sinners, are now departed from by too many under our name, and who frequent our religious assemblies.65

This commentary is essentially a restatement of the 1750 Epistle's concern about declension from the exemplary faith of early Quakers. But a hopeful change was in the air, and in this epistle there is also an endorsement of the reformers' ministry across the Society:

---

62 Ibid., 236.
63 Ibid., 244-45.
64 Ibid., 247.
65 Ibid., 248.
It is with a degree of comfort and satisfaction that we observe in divers places a commendable zeal and fervency in some, to cleanse the church from pollutions; to restore the discipline thereof where decayed or disused; to assist and bring back the scattered and dispersed of the flock; and to recover those who have gone astray and declined from the testimony of the Truth and footsteps of the faithful; of which declension too many instances appear among us.66

This statement summarizes the mission of the reformist ministers on both sides of the Atlantic (and, again, there is considerable interchange): to restore the integrity of the Quaker testimony and to recover those who had fallen away.

In the 1754 epistle, warnings against the distractions of the world continue. Adherents are encouraged to faithfully attend weekly meetings, reminded of their usefulness "as suitable opportunities of abstracting [one's] thoughts from the hurries and encumbrances of worldly affairs, and of habituating [one's] minds to a ferocious meditation on heavenly things."67 The "chiefest care" was to "lay up treasure in heaven, secure from the reach of corruption and disappointment."68 At the same time, the writers of the Epistle are not entirely opposed to material prosperity. Those with an economic surplus are told they should "freely and liberally administer [their] abundance to the relief and assistance of [their] brethren who stand in need." But the advice is reiterated to them

66 Ibid., 249. The Epistle also identifies the duty of the minister "to direct the minds of all to the divine teachings of the Holy Spirit, and to wait upon, and have their whole trust and expectation on the Lord alone." In addition, as with David Hall, a concern is expressed about too much freedom: "And let us in an especial manner beware, lest any of us, under the present blessings of outward ease and liberty in religion, be found using that liberty for a cloak of licentiousness, and, instead of serving God, serve ourselves, and our own vicious inclinations."

67 Ibid., 253.

68 Ibid., 254.
to "guard against the love of this world, and the deceitfulness of riches; the nature of which is to choak the good seed, and to render men unfruitful."69

The Epistle of 1755, the year of the commencement of hostilities in the New World, expresses even more severe warnings against complacency and worldliness:

Beware of indulging ourselves, and of sitting down at rest, or falling asleep, in a state of indolence and carnal security. But let us rather consider this day of outward freedom and tranquility as a day of imminent danger, wherein our adversary the devil, restrained from devouring as a roaring lion, is incessantly exercising his wiles and subtlety as serpent, to beguile and seduce us into lukewarm and indifferent condition in matters of religion, and a supine and negligence in that great and most important concern of our souls salvation.70

To counter the lethal enemy of their faith, Quakers are encouraged to find security in God, not in human contrivances.

In the 1756 Epistle, there is again a lament over declension: "[W]e have gone astray, and been too remiss in our conduct and conversation; that we have been too comfortable to the customs and manners of the world, and have not walked according to the plainness and purity of our profession."71 And, in 1757, there is, for the first time, a clear reference to the Seven Years' War and a clarification of the British Quaker position:

And as we are called out of wars and fightings, so let them be as seldom as possible the subjects of our conversation; but let a holy care rest upon us, to abide in that Power which gives dominion over the hopes and fears that arise from the

---

69 Ibid. Again, the metaphor of fruitfulness is used, is this paraphrase of the Parable of the Sower (Matthew 13).
70 Ibid., 256-7.
71 Ibid., 263.
concerns of an unstable world, and tend, as they are admitted into the mind, to lessen the trust on that Rock which is Immovable. Let us keep in mind the declaration of our Lord, 'My kingdom is not of this world'; for they whose kingdom is of this world, will only strive for the things thereof.  

Stressing this theme of an otherworldly kingdom, the ministers of the epistle quote Hebrews 11:10, saying that Quakers should "not [be] seeking a city here, but one to come, 'which hath everlasting foundations, whose builder and maker is God'." Since most of the battles of the Seven Years War were fought in the North American theatre, this advice is particularly relevant to Quakers there. As great empires clashed and the holy experiment of Pennsylvania seemingly faltered, Quakers on both sides of the Atlantic renewed their hopes in an everlasting, immaterial city constructed by God.

**Renouncing Materialism**

To counteract the secularization of the Society of Friends, many ministers embraced the simplicity and quietness which, they argued, led to heavenly reward. This was part of their agenda to formulate a more distinctive collective identity for the Society, with a more sharply-defined relationship to the world. Reformist ministers wished to recover

---

72 Ibid., 266. This idea of not being concerned in the affairs of the war in seen in Samuel Fothergill's own position while visiting Pennsylvania during the first years of the Seven Years' War. In the 1758 epistle, there is similar advice: "And as we are called out of wars and fightings, so let them be, as seldom as possible, the subjects of our conversation" (269).

73 Ibid. Like the Epistles from the 1750's, the London Yearly Meeting Epistles from 1760-1763 continue warnings against worldliness, also evincing a growing antagonism towards the world. In the 1760 Epistle, Quakers are admonished to "shake yourselves from the Dust of the Earth, and put on those beautiful Garments of Righteousness, Purity, and Heavenly-mindedness, wherein our worthy Ancestors were cloathed, and made instrumental to turn many to God" (General Epistles from the London Yearly Meeting, 1760-1763 [London, 1763], 2). Again, there is an invocation of pristine, early Quakerism. The 1762 epistle quotes Romans 12:2: "[Do] not to be conformed to this World, but to be transformed by the Renewing of the Mind, that we may prove what is that good, and acceptable, and perfect Will of God." As a gloss on this verse, the hope is expressed that "being loosned from the Pursuit of perishing Things, we may more and more experience the glorious Liberty of the Truth" (General Epistles, 3).
the kind of peculiarity that had characterized early Quakerism, and yet were responding
to political, social, and economic conditions that were different from those which existed
in Interregnum and early Restoration England. Materialism, for instance, had not been
an issue among early Quakers since many had been stripped of their worldly possessions,
because of the illegality of their beliefs (e.g., regarding oath taking). In the mid-
eighteenth century, however, Quakers were among the most wealthy denizens of the
British empire, and reformist ministers began to advocate voluntary material restraint,
"launch[ing] a spiritual assault on worship of wealth and luxurious living." The
particular goal of this measure, as Richard Bauman has put it, was to "turn all their
backslidden co-religionists away from their fixation on earthly things and induce them to
pursue the course of personal reformation by opening and submitting themselves to God's
word." And, so, there was a sort of homecoming to the values embraced by George Fox
in his journal, particularly in reference to early mercantile capitalism. Fox had spoken at
markets "against all their deceitful merchandise," and, in protest, threw silver pieces on
the ground (in ironic reference to Judas Iscariot's betrayal, or selling, of Christ for thirty
pieces of silver). Similarly, Fox preached at the market in Carlisle, remonstrating
against the people's devotion to worldly business, and remarking that God's judgment was

---

74 In his discussion of the Puritan jeremaid, Sacvan Bercovitch notes that it "was a ritual designed to join
social criticism to spiritual renewal" (The American Jeremiad, x). This double-aim is also apparent in the
reformist rhetoric of mid-eighteenth century Quaker ministers.
75 David E. Shi, The Simple Life: Plain Living and High Thinking in American Culture (New York: Oxford
University Press, 1985), 37.
76 Richard Bauman, For the Reputation of the Truth: Politics, Religion, and Conflict Among Pennsylvania
77 Fox, Journal, 120.
hanging over their heads: “The day of the Lord was coming upon all their deceitful ways and doings and deceitful merchandise.”

This kind of denunciation of business is seen in the mid-eighteenth century in the poetic sermon, *A Little Looking-Glass for the Times* (1764), by George Churchman (the son of John Churchman). In the closing prayer or supplication of the piece, Churchman is particularly emphatic in his declamation against "filthy lucre":

The Love of Money: bane to the Youth!

Makes old Men stupid; yea doth set on fire,

Both Male and Female, who reject thy Truth,

A dang'rous Choice, which none but Fools admire.

LORD! let all see, the many subtile Snares,

Which by the Prince of Darkness deep are laid,

To catch the Feet of him that perseveres

In Mammon's Traffick, bent to this World's Trade;

Whose busy Mind, still cumber'd in the World,

Neglects the Noble End of his Creation;

For Numbers thus, are into Ruin hurl'd

When Perils come, are not in Preparation:

---

78 Ibid., 157.
Who, either drunken with voluptuous Pleasure,
  Reel in the broad Way; miss the narrow Path;
Or caught with gilded Baits of Mammon's Treasure,
  Run on, forgetful of eternal Wrath;

Who all despising (as a Thing too mean
  For the Attention of their foolish Eyes)
Thy precious Pearl of Truth, which would have been
  The Way to make them happy, great and wise.\(^79\)

For George Churchman, and other ministers of the time, devotion to business and wealth preoccupied the mind with the temporal, making it unprepared for spiritual challenges and difficulties. For most of the history of Pennsylvania, weighty Quakers had seen business as a noble pursuit, but with the declension of Quaker piety in the mid-eighteenth century, ministers increasingly came to view "merchandizing" as a sinister, "subtile" scheme of the "Prince of Darkness" that would ensnare those who pursued it.

A reaction against the marketplace in favor of simplicity is particularly apparent in the life of John Woolman, who voluntarily relinquished superfluous possessions and pursuits. At the age of twenty, Woolman went into business as a tailor and dry goods merchant. He came from an industrious family – his father was a successful farmer (owning some one thousand acres of land) and a weaver. However, from 1743 to 1745 he moved away from shop-keeping because it was driven by profit:

My mind through the power of Truth was in a good degree weaned from the desire of outward greatness, and I was learning to be content with real conveniences that were not costly, so that a way of life free from much entanglements appeared best for me, though income was small.80

Under this inspiration Woolman began to focus exclusively on his tailoring business. However, by 1756, Woolman felt that it too had grown "cumbersome" and decided against expansion. "I felt a stop in my mind," he said, and was increasingly drawn towards a "plain way of living." The result was that he lessened his business and directed his clientele elsewhere.81 This decision placed Woolman in a more oppositional relationship to the world, as a letter to a friend reveals:

I find that to be a fool as to worldly wisdom and commit my cause to God, not fearing to offend men who take offense at the simplicity of Truth, is the only way to remain unmoved at the sentiments of others. The fear of man brings a snare; by halting in our duty and giving back in the time of trial, our hands grow weaker, our spirits get mingled with the people, our ear grows full as to hearing the language of the True Shepherd, that when we look at the way of the righteous, it seems as though it was not for as to follow them.82

The measures that Woolman took in his career probably appeared foolish to many, as he notes, but, for him, cutting back was the best way to squelch worldly voices so as to amplify the "language of the True Shepherd."

80 Woolman, Journal, 35.
81 Ibid., 53.
82 Ibid., 57. The letter is included in the journal, although the addressee is not specified.
Woolman's position against the world is also evident in his approach to technological advance: "Our minds have been turned to the improvement of our country, to merchandise and sciences, amongst which are many things useful, being followed in pure wisdom." Although acknowledging the usefulness of material "improvements" in government, business, and science, Woolman questions their utility for the inward Plantation, because, like weeds, these pursuits tend to take over the mind. He notes that they can come from God, but could be a snare as well. Therefore, one needs to "constantly attend on the heavenly gift to be qualified to use rightly the good things in this life amidst great improvements."

One improvement which Woolman clearly opposed because of its unsuitability for the life of simplicity was the fashion of dying material used for clothing. In 1761, Woolman became troubled by the extravagance of dress in colonial society, a "superfluity" that often led to the "desire of gain" (i.e., it created an unnecessary market), which, in turn, was often the cause of "oppression" and wars. Not only did Woolman object to dying clothing for moral reasons, but he also, as a tailor by trade, saw it as harmful to the cloth itself and therefore not founded "in pure wisdom." After he became ill with a fever in May 1761, Woolman, in a introspective state, resolved to not wear clothing with "hurtful dyes." At first he was apprehensive about the "singularity" of this practice, but, despite the objections of fellow Quakers, came to the conclusion that it was God's will, not his own.

---

83 Ibid., 83.
84 Ibid., 73.
85 Ibid. 119-121.
Joshua Evans (1731-1798), like Woolman, had scruples about the use of dyes. In the introduction to Evan's journal, George Churchman states that its author "exhibited a commendable and very uncommon degree of mortification, patience and self-denial" and showed a "remarkable simplicity of dress and demeanor." In 1762, Evans became concerned about "vanity and loss of time" taken up in the dyeing of clothes, and in his journal argues that those who buy dyed clothing do so to hide their dirtiness. So, for him, the aesthetic practice of dyeing material becomes a spiritual issue. Natural material symbolizes sincerity and purity, whereas dyed material illustrates uncleanness and the attempt to cover it up through human contrivances. Evans, therefore, spends countless hours locating and purchasing a white hat, and in the end recognizes his own peculiarity in wearing it: "[S]ometimes, I am ready to compare myself to a simple shrub among many tall cedars, whose appearance seemed comely and topping."

The simplicity embraced by Woolman and Evans might have seemed rather extreme to fellow Quakers, but nevertheless serves to illustrate the ideology that reformist ministers developed in response to the secularization of fellow Friends. But it is clear that Woolman's protest against dyed clothing did not merely represent his attempt to formulate a more distinctive identity by distancing himself from one instance of worldly vanity. The primary reason Woolman (and Evans) embraced the singular custom of wearing undyed clothing was ethical. For him, clothing was much more than bodily covering, or even a fashion statement. The consumption of dyed clothing perpetuated a

---

87 Ibid. Because of the great expense of transport from Asia, Evans also rejects East India tea, which, along dyed clothing, fits into a larger protest against the dominant culture: "I have indeed mourned, I believe in the bounds of love, on account of the captivity of those who seem blinded, and bound to prevailing customs" (Journal, 26).
business of oppression, because it encouraged the pursuit of "gain" (by merchants and those who needed money to buy their products), which was, by nature, competitive and often led to wars. One had to approach material possessions with restraint, lest they overtake the inner plantation. But one also had to be circumspect about what one consumed. If the production and distribution of a given commodity derived from injustice in any way, consumption made one a participant in that oppression.

Writing in 1963 from his own experience of European colonialism in Northern Africa, Frantz Fanon explicates the rule of imperialism that the colonizer gets rich at the expense of the colonized:

Confronting this world, the European nations sprawl ostentatiously opulent. This European opulence is literally scandalous, for it has been founded on slavery, it has been nourished with the blood of slaves and it comes directly from the soil and from the subsoil of that underdeveloped world. The well-being and progress of Europe have been built up with the sweat and the dead bodies of Negroes, Arabs, Indians, and the yellow races.88

The Quaker ministerial elite, who came to view material prosperity as a liability to their spirituality, also, like Fanon, began to settle in their minds that much of the wealth around them was generated by injustice. The spiritual elite may not have been directly involved

---

in acts of violence, such as capturing slaves in Western Africa, but many had close ties to slave owners and benefited from the market culture of the British imperium.\(^{89}\)

The political crisis in Pennsylvania caused by the debate over defensive measures against Indian attack corresponded with a deepening conviction among British and American Quakers that the world was an antagonistic, hostile space. The ethical complications of prosperity itself – including the necessity of protecting the fruit of that prosperity against invaders – was concomitant with a belated coming to terms with the inherent economic injustices of European colonial expansion in North America. Quaker leaders realized that Pennsylvania was a space of contestation, not a peaceable kingdom, as war loomed ever closer. This sense of contestation accords with Edward Saïd's interpretation of Gramsci on history – that it "is essentially geographical or territorial, a history made up of several overlapping terrains, so that society is viewed as a territory in which a number of competing movements are occurring."\(^{90}\) Pennsylvania's competition with Virginia and New France over the Ohio Valley is only one instance of such contestation. For Quaker leaders there was a simultaneous awareness of the Society's complicity in a British imperial project that was both bloody and global. Economic success had a high moral price: Quaker affluence was made possible by imbalances of power and resource distribution. Their rosy, mythic perception of equitable relations with the Indians was simply naive, based as it was on a gross ignorance of fraudulent land deals. However, it took the collapse of their much-treasured peace and a renewed

\(^{89}\) As Michael Warner has noted, "Of all the mediating forms of Anglo-American colonialism, the market culture of the Atlantic may have been more responsible than anything else for the practical sense of belonging to an imperium" ("What's Colonial about Colonial America?" in Possible Pasts: Becoming Colonial in Early America, ed. Robert Blair St. George [Ithaca: Cornell UP, 2000], 59).

\(^{90}\) Said, Interviews, 58.
emphasis on their testimony of pacifism, to compel them to consider the case of those victimized by European settlement in the New World.
CHAPTER 2

Pacifism Reclaimed: Withdrawing from the Legislation of Violence

As historians have noted, colonial Pennsylvania was unique among British colonies for the absence of open conflict with Native Americans for most of its history. Various reasons have been suggested. Robert Davidson argues that the colony was "unmolested because, from its founding in 1682 until 1730, it did not occupy a geographically strategic spot in the colonial contest." He understands the breakdown of the "Holy Experiment" as the inevitable sequel to the French-English struggle for world-wide colonial dominion.¹ Alan Taylor, on the other hand, argues that peace in the region was possible because few Indians actually lived in Pennsylvania when settlement began at the end of the seventeenth century. The Native American presence had been weakened when epidemics were introduced by Dutch and Swedes colonists earlier in the century. After 1680 it was principally Lenni Lenape (Delaware) who lived in the area, but they only numbered around five thousand.²

Quakers leaders attributed the long peace of the colony to God's sovereign protection, and for that reason were reluctant to come to terms with their own stake in colonialism, which is inherently violent. On September 22, 1741, James Logan (1674-1751), a moderate Quaker who was closely connected to the Penn family, wrote to the Yearly Meeting of Business in Philadelphia regarding colonial defense.³ He argued that

---

administrative duties and religious pacifism were irreconcilable, citing the example of William Penn himself:

I am a Witness that in those two years or somewhat less that the Proprietor took the Administration on himself when last here, He found himself so embarrassed between the indispensable Duties of Government on the one Hand, and his Profession on the other, that he was determined if he had staid to act by Deputy.\textsuperscript{4}

However, Logan’s case for a more robust defense policy lay with his argument that Pennsylvania was, as of 1741, no longer a Quaker colony as such, and, therefore, conservative Quakers should not impose their religious convictions on the non-pacifist majority:

That ’tis true our Friends at first made a large Majority in the Province, yet they are said now to make upon a moderate Computation not above a third of the Inhabitants – That altho’ they alledge they cannot for Conscience Sake bear Arms as being contrary to the peaceable Doctrine of Jesus Christ (whose own Disciples nevertheless are known to have carried Weapons). Yet without Regard to others of Christ’s Precepts, full as express against Laying up Treasure in this World, and not caring for Tomorrow, they are as intent, as any others whatever, in amassing Riches, the great Bait and Temptation to our Enemies to come and plunder the Place.\textsuperscript{5}

The argument is carefully constructed. First, he points to the demographics of the colony as a way of diffusing the Quaker belief that Pennsylvania, being their colony, should follow a pacifist path. Next, he questions whether pacifism actually has all the scriptural

\textsuperscript{4} Ibid., B21.
\textsuperscript{5} Ibid., B23.
basis Quakers are accustomed to claim for it. More importantly, he calls attention to an apparent inconsistency in the Quaker testimony – that if they mean to "Lay up Treasures in this World," as they show every sign of doing, logically they are bound to adopt measures of protection. 6 Certainly it was a peculiar state of affairs that Philadelphia was the wealthiest city in North America but remained unfortified, as Logan points out: "Philadelphia has the name of a rich City, [but] is known to have no manner of Fortification, and is . . . a tempting Bait."

Following this discussion, Logan makes a radical suggestion: that Quakers who hold a position in the Assembly, but are opposed to defensive measures, step down at the next election – "that all such who for Conscience sake cannot joyn in any Law for Self-Defence, should not only decline standing Candidates at the ensuing Election of Representatives, themselves, but also advise all others who are equally scrupulous to do the same."7 In 1741 this idea could not have been entertained by Quakers in the Assembly. The spiritual elite was likewise unreceptive – the Yearly Meeting of Business found Logan's letter "unfit" to be read precisely on the ground that it dealt with "civil and military affairs of the government."8 However, the notion of withdrawal from government offices would be taken up again by ministers in the mid-1750's, who

6 Ibid., B23-24. In "A Plea for the Poor, or, A Word of Remembrance and Caution to the Rich," John Woolman raises similar point. Commenting on "the way of carrying on wars," he says: But where that spirit which loves riches works, and in its working gathers wealth and cleaves to customs which have their root in self-pleasing, this spirit, thus separating from universal love, seeks help from that power which stands in the separation; and whatever name it hath, it still desires to defend the treasures thus gotten. This is like a chain where the end of one link encloses the end of another. The rising up of a desire to attain wealth is the beginning. This desire being cherished moves to action, and riches thus gotten please self, and while self hath a life in them it desires to have them defended (In Journals and Major Essays, Moulton, ed., pp. 254-55).

7 Ibid., B29.

8 Ibid., B31.
recognized that Quakers could not hold positions in the Assembly without staining their hands with innocent blood.

**Quaker Pacifism Contrasted with Militarism**

With the intensified calls for defense in the 1740's and early 1750's, there was also a compensating emphasis on the peaceable testimony. Pacifism had been basic to Quakerism from the beginning, but in the decades before the war, as Jack Marietta notes, "Friends in England and America increasingly came to regard their pacifist ethic like an article of law, to be followed in a precise way, yet with an indifferent spirit."9 Consequently, an effort arose to revitalize that doctrine, with a particular emphasis on its biblical justification. However, the pacifism of the 1750's was a construct of its time and environment – as Meredith Weddle notes, pacifism "is organically connected to its historical setting and to inspiited individuals arising within a specific social culture, political system, legal and economic structure, and religious outlook."10 George Fox developed his pacifist position in reaction to the English Civil War. While imprisoned in Derby, he was asked to serve as captain in the war against the Tories, but refused, saying that he "was come into the covenant of peace, which was before wars and strifes were."

Because of his refusal to fight, Fox was jailed an additional six months. When asked

---

10 Meredith Baldwin Weddle, *Walking in the Way of Peace: Quaker Pacifism in the Seventeenth Century* (New York: Oxford UP, 2001): 4. Weddle focuses her discussion on Quaker policy in Rhode Island and New England during Metacom's War (1675-76), the context, she argues, where "Quaker peace principles would, for the first time anywhere in the world, be juxtaposed with the inherent demands of political office [to provide for common defense]" (6). As she demonstrates, Quaker leaders were active in providing defensive measures for their citizens, but also made a proviso (the 1673 Exemption) for those who objected to military action for reasons of conscience. In Appendix 4, Weddle also addresses problems of the historical interpretation of pacifism. Among other points, she argues that seventeenth-century Quakers generally saw violence as a problem of the individual heart. "Not until well into the eighteenth century," she continues, "did Quakers focus more on earthly justice than the 'lusts of the heart' removing the cause of war" (249).
again whether he would fight, he again declined, noting that he "was brought off from outward wars."  Finally he was released in the winter of 1651, after a one-year imprisonment. From that point, pacifism was a distinctive testimony for him. On March 6, 1655, when he appeared before Oliver Cromwell, Fox defended his ministry despite its controversial character, claiming that he did not carry a "carnal sword," but rather that his weapons were "spiritual."

By the time of the Seven Years' War pacifism was still integral to Quaker belief, and still unpopular. While traveling from England to America in late 1756, William Reckitt was captured by the French navy and taken to Morlaix, France, where he was asked about his purposes for traveling to America. An admiralty officer discovered that he was a Quaker, and Reckitt writes,

He then asked me whether or no the Quakers would fight if they were attacked by an enemy? I said it was not my business then to tell him whether they would or not; it was enough for me to answer for myself. 'Then,' said he, 'if you were smitten on one cheek, would you not turn the other? Or, if they took away your coat, would not you give them your cloak also?' I said it was so declared in Scripture, but I had not freedom at that time to answer those questions.

In this situation William Reckitt does not feel the need to cooperate with his captors, announce his own position, or pretend to speak for all Quakers. He merely affirms that the official had quoted correctly the words of Christ, from Matthew 6:39-40. But later,

---

12 Ibid., 198.
13 Reckitt, Some Account, 54.
while under arrest and confined to a tavern, he appeared "somewhat singular" to those around him, and, consequently, an individual asked about his pacifism. He responded,

I told him the weapons of the primitive believers were not carnal, but spiritual, and mighty through God, to the pulling down of sin and the strong holds of Satan; and such as now come under the peaceable government of the great king of kings, who said, if his kingdom had been of this world, then his servants would have fought, cannot fight with carnal weapons, though there should seem as great a necessity as there was when our Lord was like to be delivered to the Jews. I had to open several passages of Scripture, which set forth the peaceable government of Christ, who came not to destroy men's lives, but to save them; and that it was not the lamb's nature to tear and devour, but the wolf's.14

Reckitt reiterates Fox's contention that "carnal weapons" have no place in the kingdom of Christ, which is "not of this world." If Christ did not need them to fend off those who wished to kill him, neither do present-day followers, who are commanded to bring life to others, not take it away. They are lambs, protected by the Good Shepherd from those who are destructive and violent.15 And yet, spiritual warfare remains an important rhetorical trope in Quaker spirituality, borrowing directly from New Testament imagery.

Although Quakers like William Reckitt justified their pacifist beliefs from the New Testament, others used the same body of texts to justify war. The response of

---

14 Ibid., 55.
15 Shortly afterward, Reckitt and other English prisoners were taken into the country, some thirty miles away (near Carlaix). After five-month's confinement, Reckitt was released.

In Discourse IV, "The Christian Soldiers duty; The Lawfulness and dignity of his office, and the importance of the Protestant Cause in the British Colonies," Smith develops a complex argument based on Luke 3:14 ("Do violence to no man, neither accuse any falsely, and be content with your wages"), the advice that John the Baptist gave to Roman soldiers.\footnote{"Preached in Christ-Church, Philadelphia, April 5, 1757; at the desire of Brigadier-General Stanwix, to the forces under his command, before the march to the frontiers."} In short, Smith understands the command as only applying to violence committed against fellow citizens, otherwise, he argues, soldiers could not fulfill their duties. Smith then addresses the orthodox Quaker interpretation of the Matthew passage:

I know there are some who affect to understand [this passage] in a more unlimited sense; as containing a general prohibition of all Force and Arms whatsoever. But, in this, they are neither warranted by Scripture nor reason. Nay, the very reverse is evidenced from the text itself.

The Soldiers, whom Saint John addresses, received wages for fighting and bearing arms against the enemies of their country. He expressly enjoins them to be content with those wages. But this he never would have done, if the service, which they performed as the condition of the wages, had been that identical violence, which he so strongly prohibits in the former part of the verse. They must indeed be very bold, who can charge the Spirit of God with such an absurdity!\footnote{Ibid., 105-6.}
For Smith, then, violence directed towards "enemies" is legitimate. It is evident that he, like Logan before him, understands war in terms of imperial wealth: "But how shall Society subsist, if we are to submit to the unrighteous encroachments of every restless Invader? If we are tamely to be plundered, tortured, massacred and destroy'd by those who covet our possessions?" 19 To punish thieves and "lawless Invaders" is just, not immoral, and cooperates in God's larger design to rid the earth of evil:

But the fact is that – to support Justice, to maintain truth, to defend the goods of Providence, to repress the wild fury of lawless Invaders, and by main force, if possible, to extirpate oppression and wickedness from the earth, has never been accounted Violence in any language. 20

Because war against evildoers is a Christian's duty, Smith charges that Quakers and others who refuse to do their righteous duty will be held accountable for the innocent blood preventably shed by evildoers:

If the barbarities that have been committed around them; if the cries of their murdered and suffering brethren; if their country swimming in blood and involved in an expensive war – if these things have not already pierced their stony hearts and convinced their deluded reason, that their principles are absurd in idea and criminal in practice, I am sure any things I might say further, would have but little weight. I shall only beg leave to remind them, that they will have this cause to plead one day more before a tribunal, where subterfuges will stand them in no

19 Ibid., 107.
20 Ibid., 110.
stead; and where it will be well if they are acquitted, and no part of the blood that has been spilt is required at their hands.  

In a direct address to soldiers, Smith also invokes the rhetoric of imperialism, particularly the colonizing tactic of the Christian mission:

"Look round you! behold a country, vast in extent, merciful in its climate, exuberant in its soil, the seat of plenty, the garden of the Lord: behold it given to us and to our posterity, to propagate virtue, to cultivate useful arts, and to spread abroad the pure Evangelical Religion of Jesus! behold colonies founded in it! Protestant Colonies! Free Colonies! British Colonies!"

As "the garden of the Lord," Pennsylvania was intended for the cultivation of virtue, progress, and the gospel, and must, therefore, be protected from "barbarians" and "savages." New France was characterized by "Popish Perfidy, French Tyranny, and Savage Barbarity, leagued in triple combination, advancing to deprive us of those exalted Blessings." And the Indians in league with them were "a set of fierce Savages hounded forth against us, from their dark lurking places; brandishing their murderous Knives; sparing neither age nor sex." 

The Moral Dilemma of the 1755 Militia Act

In their opposition to defensive measures, pacifist Quakers, in effect, countered the dominant colonialist discourse of which Smith was clearly a spokesman. Although Pennsylvania represented only one space in the British Atlantic, it was the central theatre

---

21 Ibid.
22 Ibid., 118.
23 Ibid. To conclude, Smith stirs his audience, primarily consisting of British soldiers, to a sense of patriotism: "Was a body of Britons engaged in a more glorious cause than you are at present?" (119).
of the Seven Years' War – the Ohio Country essentially corresponded with, what is today, western Pennsylvania and eastern Ohio. Quaker leaders negotiated extensively with the British imperial hegemony (in its labyrinthine complexity in the New World), but were unable to stop colonialism's advance in the end. Part of the drama of the Quaker struggle with this hegemony was played out in the colonial assembly, over the issue of defense. Pennsylvania's colonial government was a tripartite system, with a governor, council, and popular assembly. Because it was a proprietary colony, power was vested in the Penn family who appointed governors. From the beginning of settlement in the Delaware Valley, the issue of defense was hotly debated, as in 1689, for example, with the outbreak of King Williams' War. The proximity of Pennsylvania's frontier with New France made it a potential target for invasion. By 1710, the minority of Pennsylvania Quakers were able to maintain political power by an outdated system of representation, which gave the three oldest counties of Pennsylvania (Philadelphia, Chester, and Bucks) eight representatives apiece, or 24 out of a total of 36. In 1739, with the beginning of the War of Jenkins' Ear between England and France, Governor George Thomas requested that the assembly make provisions for defense – including a militia – but the Assembly thwarted his plans, a move that sparked an anti-Quaker backlash. Controversy over defense emerged again in 1744, with another Anglo-French conflict, King George's War (March 1744 to October 1748).

In November 1755, following the first Indian raids on the frontier and after nearly five years of struggle with Thomas Penn and his agents, the colonial assembly passed a measure allowing 60,000 pounds in taxes to be appropriated for "the king's use" (a euphemism for defensive purposes, intended to mollify pacifists). John Woolman writes
in detail about this political crisis, but does not so much chronicle the events as record his own personal struggle, or "exercise," over the issue of taxation. Initially, Woolman was "easy" about the issue since several "noted" Friends did not oppose the tax. And yet, he notes, "there was in the deeps of my mind a scruple which I never could get over, and at certain times I was greatly distressed on that account."24 After considering the issue for some time, Woolman decided he could not, in good conscience, pay the tax: "I believed that the spirit of Truth required of me as an individual to suffer patiently the distress of goods rather than pay actively."25 In taking this position, Woolman appeals to the examples of other Christians who had suffered for conscience's sake, citing Thomas a Kempis and Jan Huss, who had contended against error in the medieval church and been martyred. In Woolman's mind, the conscience was the preeminent authority for the believer, and Kempis and Huss epitomize this principle as "sincere-hearted followers of Christ." Applying their example, Woolman concludes: "To refuse the active payment of a tax which our Society generally paid was exceeding disagreeable, but to do a thing contrary to my conscience appeared yet more dreadful."26

In this discussion Woolman acknowledges the novelty of "scrupling to pay a tax on account of the application," and consequently details the process of his "inward exercise" over the issue:

From the steady opposition which faithful Friends in early times made to wrong things then approved of, they were hated and persecuted by men living in the spirit of this world, and suffering with firmness they were made a blessing to the

---

24 Woolman, Journal, 75.
25 Ibid.
26 Ibid., 77.
church, and the work prospered. It equally concerns men in every age to take heed to their own spirit, and in comparing their situation with ours, it looks to me there was less danger of their being infected with the spirit of this world, in paying their taxes, than there is of us now. They had little or no share in civil government, and many of them declared they were through the power of God separated from the spirit in which wars were; and being afflicted by the rulers on account of their testimony, there was less likelihood of uniting in spirit with them in things inconsistent with the purity of Truth.

In this passage Woolman asserts on a church-wide level a conclusion he previously had come to on personal terms: that suffering for the cause of righteousness was the pathway to blessing. The purity of the ancient Quakers seems to Woolman to have been a function of their marginalized or persecuted status: having no share in government, they could pay taxes and still remain separate from the carnal spirit of the world. He suggests that those who remain in office, and by so doing contribute in diverse ways to the war effort, are in danger of "quenching the tender movings of the Holy Spirit in their minds" and of erasing Quaker distinctiveness: "And thus by small degrees there might be an approach toward that of fighting, till we came so near it as that the distinction would be little else but the name of a peaceable people." But Woolman does recognize the difficulty of refusing to pay taxes when everyone else does so freely: "It requires great self-denial and resignation of ourselves to God to attain that state wherein we can freely

---

27 Ibid., 83-4.
cease from fighting when wrongfully invaded, if by our fighting there were a probability of overcoming the invaders."28

Because Woolman believed his position against paying taxes to be in accordance with the Divine Will, he was not content to let his position pass as a personal scruple and sought a consensus among other leaders. At the Yearly Meeting in Philadelphia in September 1755, two committees, appointed to visit the Monthly and Quarterly Meetings to enforce Quaker discipline, were also to convene at a later time to discuss the "weighty" matter of taxation for war purposes. They met in mid-December, following the November 25th passage of the Militia Act. This meeting was difficult and contentious, according to Woolman, and, in the end, some leaders who did not oppose the tax withdrew. Those who remained drafted "An Epistle of Tender Love and Caution to Friends in Pennsylvania," signed on December 16. In the opening, the epistle affirms the coming of the peaceable kingdom, as promised in the Hebrew scriptures:

[W]e find our spirits engaged to acquaint you with that under a solid exercise of mind to seek for counsel and direction from the High Priest of our profession, who is the Prince of Peace, we believe he hath renewedly favoured us with strong and lively evidences that in his due and appointed time, the day which hath dawned in these later ages foretold by the prophets, wherein swords should be beaten into plowshares and spears into pruning hooks [Is. 2:4], shall gloriously rise higher and higher, and the spirit of the gospel which teaches to love enemies prevail to that degree that the art of war shall be no more learned, and that it is his

28 Ibid., 84.
determination to exalt this blessed day in our age, if in the depth of humility we receive his instruction and obey his voice.\textsuperscript{29}

In the opening paragraph, the Yearly Meeting leaders also express their belief that "the art of war" might, in their time, cease to studied and peace prevail. This is strikingly optimistic, since they had, just two days before, witnessed what the "art" of scalping could do to the human body.

The epistle declares that the recent taxation measure overtly violated the Quaker policy to not "be concerned in wars and fightings." Quaker leaders, thus, do not argue that paying taxes is an issue that each believer must decide individually, but, rather, suggest that coreligionists should refuse to pay. With the Militia Act, a concession had been made to Quakers stipulating that some of the money to be set aside for restoring peaceable relations with the Indians. But, for Woolman and fellow leaders, it was morally impossible to wage war against the Indians and at the same time foster friendship with them:

And [we take this position even] though some part of the money to be raised by the said Act is said to be for such benevolent purposes as supporting our friendship with our Indian neighbours and relieving the distresses of our fellow subjects who have suffered in the present calamities, for whom our hearts are deeply pained; and we affectionately and with bowels of tenderness sympathize with them therein. And we could most cheerfully contribute to those purposes if they were not so mixed that we cannot in the manner proposed show our hearty concurrence therewith without at the same time assenting to, or allowing

\textsuperscript{29} Ibid., 85. The Epistle is quoted in its entirety in Woolman's \textit{Journal} (pp. 85-86).
ourselves in, practices which we apprehend contrary to the testimony which the
Lord hath given us to bear for his name and Truth's sake.\textsuperscript{30}

The expression of sympathy for suffering "fellow subjects" is a response to those, such as
William D. Smith, who had asserted that pacifist Quakers were men of "stony hearts,"
unmoved by the Indian depredations.\textsuperscript{31} The authors of the epistle are also careful to
distance themselves from any charges of sedition because of their refusal to pay the tax:
"[O]ur fidelity to the present government and our willingly paying all taxes for purposes
which do not interfere with our consciences . . . justly exempt us from the imputation of
disloyalty."\textsuperscript{32} While asserting the right and moral obligation to be conscientious
objectors to the taxation policy, Quaker leaders recognize that their position would
provoke opposition. Still, they encourage coreligionists to bear the pacifist testimony
"faithfully and uniformly," despite what it may cost them.

Not all Quakers welcomed the epistle. As Richard Bauman has noted, because
the epistle "advis[ed] all Friends in Pennsylvania not to comply with a law passed by an
Assembly the majority of whose members were Quakers in good standing," it "acted as a
powerful stimulus to the polarization of opinion."\textsuperscript{33} In a letter to John Churchman,
Samuel Fothergill remarks on this mixed response to the epistle:

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 and others, cavil and rage; but the seed is relieved and
the honest-hearted are strengthened. I see it will be a time of division between the

\textsuperscript{30} Ibid., 85-6.
\textsuperscript{31} William D. Smith, Discourses, 110.
\textsuperscript{32} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{33} Bauman, For the Reputation of the Truth, 45.
wheat and chaff, and that we shall find some amongst the latter we thought would have been more deeply weighty, and perhaps the contrary in some other instances. But the company, in which some who dissented from us find them themselves left, will, I believe, awaken some weak, honest hearts to ponder, whether Divine wisdom hath changed the channel of instrumental intelligence from its usual course, by a living, sensible ministry, into the muddy pipes of the licentious.34

Friends who remained in government (as constables and collectors) and had to enforce the tax, often by confiscating fellow Quakers' property, became the subject of a hot debate, and ultimately of a "deep exercise" at the 1757 Yearly Meeting. In the end, finding no consensus, committee members recommended "that Friends everywhere endeavour earnestly to have their minds covered with fervent charity towards one another."35 Later, when troops and militia were reviewed at Mt. Holly, Woolman had the opportunity to "consider the advantage of living in the real substance of religion, where practice doth harmonize with principle."36 His allegiance to this principle was tested in early 1758, when one hundred soldiers came to Mt. Holly, and he was asked to lodge two soldiers for six shillings a week. At first, he did not respond, troubled by his potential

34 Fothergill, Memoirs and Letters, 178.
35 Haverford College Library. Haverford, Pennsylvania. Quaker Collection. Philadelphia Yearly Meeting Minutes, 9/17-24/1757. The issue of Quakers prosecuting coreligionists for refusal to pay war taxes continued to be a problem for several years, as indicated by John Churchman. On November 4, 1761, he spoke to four friends about disrespecting scruples of Quakers who refuse to pay taxes: "And whosoever continues to trample upon, or despise the tender scruples of their brethren in relation to their clearness concerning war, will certainly find it a weight too heavy for them to bear" (Account of Gospel Labours, 209). He also speaks out against those Quakers "who seem to have given, or sold away for this world's friendship, the testimony they should have borne for the Prince of Peace" (210).
36 Ibid., 88.
complicity in supporting the war effort. In the end, only one came, but he would not accept his money, indicating that if he did so he would be participating in violence.\textsuperscript{37}

In 1756 tax collectors began to demand payment as stipulated by the assembly legislation, and would bring in the constable to distract the goods of those who refused. Typically, they would auction off property, keep the proceeds that covered the tax, and return any surplus to the owner. Those who had no goods were most often jailed.\textsuperscript{38} Joshua Evans experienced this hardship for his scrupulosity regarding war taxes, recounting in his journal the unpopularity he incurred because of his refusal to pay them:

[I]t was opened clearly to me, that to hire men to do what I could not, for conscience's sake, do myself, would be very inconsistent. This led me, in deep humility to seek for wisdom to guide me rightly; and I found it best for me to refuse paying demands on my estate, which went to pay the expenses of war:

\textsuperscript{37} Ibid., 89.
\textsuperscript{38} Taxation continued to plague Delaware Valley Quakerism after 1756. The following year, for instance, the Assembly and Governor Denny enacted a tax for 100,000 pounds for the continuing war effort.
\textsuperscript{39} Evans, \textit{Journal}, 19.
although my part might appear but as a drop in the ocean, yet the ocean, I considered was made up of many drops.\textsuperscript{40}

Like Woolman, Evans' response to the tax is highly individual. His focus is not on the tide of public opinion – the "ocean" of collective acquiescence in support of the war, but on the "drop" which he refuses to contribute. Reproached by fellow Quakers, Evans becomes energized by the opposition he meets and refuses to compromise, seeing persecution as an essential part of being a Christian: "I had enlisted under his banner who declared his kingdom was not of this world, or else his servants would fight." As a result of his opposition, some of his goods were confiscated "to answer demands of a military nature," and re-sold under value. Some reacted to this misfortune with pity, or accused him of stubbornness, claiming that he must suffer the consequences of not "rendering to Caesar his due." But Evans states that he could find nothing in Christ's command about paying taxes for war, adding his own gloss of the passage: "Although I have been willing to pay my money for the use of civil government, when legally called for; yet I have felt restrained by a conscientious motive, from paying towards the expense of killing men, women and children, or laying towns and countries waste." His wife encouraged him in his unpopular, costly stance, declaring, "If we suffer in right spirit, we obtain that peace which the world can neither give, nor take away."\textsuperscript{41} The difficulty of this situation also gives Evans pause to consider his own understanding of pacifism:

\begin{quote}
I cannot see how to reconcile war, in any shape or colour, with the mild spirit of Christianity; nor that devouring disposition, with the peaceable, lamblike nature of our blessed Saviour. It seems to me we might as well suppose, theft and
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{40} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{41} Ibid., 20.
murder do not contradict his royal law, which enjoins the doing unto others as we would have them do unto us.

As with William Reckitt and the authors of the "Epistle of Tender Love and Caution," Evans emphasizes the gentle, lamblke disposition that is to characterize believers. They are dependent upon Christ, as Evans records of himself: "Whilst these storms on account of my peaceable principles were permitted to continue, I endeavoured to keep close to the heavenly Light within." And yet this "mild" faith entailed more than a refusal to do harm to others – conversely, it enjoined its adherents to be proactive in assisting others, evidenced by Quaker efforts to restore peace with the Indians.43

Samuel Fothergill and Quaker Withdrawal from the Pennsylvania Assembly

British Friend Samuel Fothergill was not obligated to pay the tax, but still was troubled by what it portended. When he arrived in Philadelphia in 1754, he was met with the growing fears of violence. However, at least initially, he encouraged fellow Quakers not to focus on the possibility of external war, but on inner, spiritual warfare. In a letter to his brother John, he relates:

I am disqualified to give thee any information on the state of affairs in relations to the wars; it is not my business, and have found it my concern to deny my curiosity in inquiring after news, or hearing anything about it. I have found great peace in my endeavours by example and precept, to draw Friends' minds to their own warfare – that as our hands cannot be

42 Ibid., 21.
43 This subject will be detailed in the next chapter.
active [in outward war], so our minds cannot be embroiled [in it],
consistently without testimony.\textsuperscript{44}

In a letter written at the end of November 1755, he mentions the reports of a party of seventy Indians burning settlements on the frontier, but attempts to keep an emotional distance: "I meddle not in those proceedings; they are not my province or business."\textsuperscript{45} But once the 60,000 pound-tax was approved, Fothergill's engagement with the crisis intensified. Writing to his wife, he comments on the controversy among Quakers over the Militia Act, noting that "many solid Friends cannot pay it, which is likely to bring such a breach and division as never happened among us since we were a people."\textsuperscript{46} Before, Fothergill had dismissed the rumors of frontier violence and the political crisis it created as relatively insignificant in comparison to spiritual warfare. But in this letter, he appears to have changed his mind, suggesting that the war and concomitant taxation might be the greatest test Quakers would ever face. In this case, at least, Quaker inner warfare was inextricably intertwined with the material circumstances of outward war.

Because of the Assembly's support for a defensive war, Fothergill and other Quaker leaders began to question whether their coreligionists could remain in the legislative body and maintain the purity of their testimony. In a letter to Timothy Waterhouse, Fothergill warns against the moral dangers of participating in a government which violates the peaceable testimony:

\textsuperscript{44} Fothergill, Memoirs and Letters, 151. Letter is dated 4/17/1755.
\textsuperscript{45} Ibid., 168. Dated 11/24/1755, one day before the passage of the Militia Act.
\textsuperscript{46} Ibid., 173.
Have a care of the world, and its spirit; its friendships are enmity with, and destructive of that lamblike, innocent life which inherits all things. Let not thy mind be encumbered with posts or places in the government; they are not for thee; stand out of them all, in the ranks of the Lord's army; and thus, I am persuaded, the Lord would bless thee, and others through thee. 47

In this case, Fothergill advises one individual to stay out of politics. Several months later he received a letter from Lydia Lancaster, a fellow British Friend, who suggested that all conscientious Quakers should withdraw from public office:

As to the state of affairs in America, I do not think myself a proper judge; but think our people had better quitted their places in the Assembly, as the world is circumstanced. They are in a strait and very difficult station: I see not how Friends can faithfully bear up the ancient testimony, without being loudly cried against, and live in peace and quietness, minding their own business, as Friends do everywhere else, seems to me most agreeable. 48

Within two months, Fothergill came to the same position. On April 10, 1756, a commission of eight members of the Assembly drafted a petition that asked the governor to officially declare war against the Delawares, and to advertise bounties for their scalps: $130 for males, and $50 for females. Thomas Penn, the colony's proprietor, supported the measure, arguing that it was the sole effective means of ending destructive incursions

48 Ibid., 174. The letter is dated, 2/10/1756.
into frontier settlements. Four days later the plan was approved by Governor Robert H. Morris.

In a letter to his sister, Fothergill acknowledged Quaker efforts to intercede with the Indians, expressing the hope that the action will provoke their dismissal or withdrawal from office:

Friends have interposed for the restoration of peace, and borne their testimony faithfully; I hope it will issue in their dismissal from government, their connexion with which hath been of a great dis-service of later times to the real end of our being raised up as a peculiar people, to bear our testimony to Him whose kingdom is in peace and righteousness. 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 savour. 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.

For Fothergill and others among the ministerial elite, maintaining the Quaker testimony against war was paramount. Since spiritual purity and political power had become incompatible, they chose the former. And yet, Quaker leaders saw their power and

---

49 During the Seven Years War many colonies – including New York, Maryland, Virginia, and the Carolinas – passed scalp acts to counter the destructive raids on their frontiers following the July 1755 defeat of Braddock near Fort Duquesne. However, as James Axtell notes, the offensive potential of scalp bounties was never realized, primarily because of the "ingrained defensiveness" of white settlers (Natives and Newcomers: The Cultural Origins of North America [New York: Oxford University Press, 2001], 270-71). In Chapter 11 of Natives and Newcomers, entitled "The Moral Dilemmas of Scalping" (pp. 259-79), Axtell focuses his discussion on how the practice changed when appropriated by English settlers, and how they justified its apparent "barbarity."

50 Ibid., 179. Dated 4th mo. 28th 1756.
influence as deriving from the integrity of their faith: it was the savour of their salt. They did not renounce power, but relinquished it in the colonial assembly in order to bolster, or consolidate, the potency of their religious testimony.

In mid-June 1756 six Quaker leaders – James Pemberton, Joshua Morris, William Callender, William Peters, Peter Worral and Francis Parvin – stepped down from their positions in the assembly. And in the following autumn elections, many Quakers officials declined to run. Of the thirty-six newly elected in October 1756, only seventeen were Quakers, and four of these resigned their seats. The remaining thirteen were asked to resign by the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting, but this exercise of discipline was complicated by the fact that only eight of these thirteen were in good standing with the Society. Thus began a gradual withdrawal of Quakers from political leadership in Pennsylvania. Another important step occurred during the 1758 Philadelphia Yearly Meeting, when ministers acted to ban officeholders from business meetings, because of the problem arising from Quakers prosecuting coreligionists who refused to pay war taxes.

**Trusting in God's Sovereign Protection of Pennsylvania**

As an alternative to the construction of forts and the development of militias, Quaker leaders emphasized God's sovereign protection which had been manifested, as they saw it, in the long peace that Pennsylvania had experienced since its founding. In the spring of 1748, John Churchman records that the Governor adjourned the Assembly "and in pressing terms laid before them the defenseless state of Pennsylvania," seeking money "to station a ship of force at Delaware capes, also to encourage the building a battery
below the city." Churchman was deeply troubled by these proposals, recording in his journal:

[O]ne night as I lay in my bed, it came very weightily upon me to go to the house of assembly, and lay before the members thereof the danger of departing from trusting in that divine arm of power which had hereto protected the Inhabitants of our land in peace and safety.51

For Churchman, taking defensive measures would be a slap in the face of God, who had faithfully safeguarded settlers for the duration of Pennsylvania history. He does recognize, however, the dilemma that many Quakers faced as citizens of Pennsylvania, concerned with her welfare:

[F]or it seemed to be a very difficult time; many, even of our society, declaring their willingness that a sum of money should be given to the king, to shew our loyalty to him and that they were willing to part with their substance for his use, tho' as a people, we had a testimony to bear against all outward wars and fightings.52

Thus put, it is a clear-cut issue of fear versus trust. Indeed, Churchman suggests that if the leaders of Philadelphia stop trusting God and take matters into their own hands, God would likely withdraw his protecting "arm of power":

[I]f those in authority do suffer their own fears and the persuasions of others, to prevail with them to neglect such attention [to "seek unto God . . . for wisdom and counsel"] and so make, or enact laws in order to their own protection and defence by carnal weapons and fortifications, styled human prudence, he who is

51 Churchman, Account of Gospel Labours, 69.
52 Ibid.
superintendent, by withdrawing the arm of power, may permit those evils they feared to come suddenly upon them, and that in his heavy displeasure. May it with gratitude be ever remembered how remarkably we have been preserved in peace and tranquility for more than fifty years! no invasion by foreign enemies, and the treaties of peace with the natives wisely began by our worthy proprietor William Penn, preserved inviolate to this day.53

Such estimates of Pennsylvania's bloodless history epitomize the mid-century Quaker view of William Penn as the paragon of egalitarianism and justice. Richard Bauman notes that Churchman's "appeal to the charter exemplified the mythic view of the colony's history held by the many Quakers of the period, for none of the charters framed by Penn, including the one of 1701 which was then in effect, made any reference at all to this aspect of military affairs."54

Like Churchman, Samuel Fothergill emphasizes trust in divine protection as an alternative to militarism. There is a strong sense of perturbation in his correspondence over Quakers who are cowed by the potential dangers of war. In a letter written to his wife shortly after the first Indian attacks against frontier settlements, he is severely critical of Quakers who had abandoned their homes:

I was some weeks ago, at a settlement of Friends beyond the Blue Mts., who were then in great quiet, but have since all removed through fear of the Indians, and left their plantations and dwellings desolate. In the midst of this confusion, too few know the Rock of Defense, or have confidence towards the Ruler of heaven and earth; their minds scattered, and their

---

53 Ibid., 71-2.
54 Bauman, For the Reputation of the Truth, 15.
foundations discovered very weak, having lost confidence in the Divine arm, trust in their own. . . . 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.\textsuperscript{55}

Fothergill also reacts negatively to the Assembly-led measure to erect forts on the frontier, arguing that they exacerbated violence instead of preventing it. The idea was to build forts around the quarter circle from the forks of the Delaware to the Maryland line, about fifteen miles apart, to hamper Indian incursions. Fort Allen was the first to be built, in mid-January 1756, under the leadership of Benjamin Franklin. A month later, in a letter to his brother, Fothergill comments:

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. The neighbourhoods of those forts have been, since their being erected, the scenes of the greatest barbarity; in contempt and mockery of the attempt, eleven people being destroyed a few days ago, within a mile of their forts.\textsuperscript{56}

\textsuperscript{55} Ibid., 166. Dated 11/6/1755. In the same letter, Fothergill also downplays the rumors of people killed: "I expect you will have heard great rumours of mischief done by the Indians in this province; but the latest and best accounts to this day, do not amount to above ten or twelve killed; but multitudes have fled from their habitations" (166). Although this statement could be read as indicative of an insensitivity to the loss of life, Fothergill makes it in the context of reporting the "great confusion" in Pennsylvania over the Indian raids. In general, he is distrustful of reports from the frontier because their exaggerated character heightens pro-war sentiment. He mentions that a few days before Philadelphia had been "alarmed" by accounts that a force of 1800 French and Indians was within seventy miles of the city, but it proved to be "a false rumour" (165).

\textsuperscript{56} Ibid., 176. Dated 2/20/1756.
Fothergill reflects on the apparent futility of human efforts to prevent further Indian raids in support of his position that God would protect Pennsylvania. For him, the "mockery" belongs to God as much as it does to the Indians.

The "Epistle of Tender Love and Caution," drafted in December 1755 in response to the Militia Act, also asserts the importance of turning to God for protection against fear and potential danger:

And having the health and prosperity of the Society at heart, we earnestly exhort Friends to wait for the appearing of the true Light and stand in the council of God, that we may know him to be the rock of our salvation and place of our refuge forever. And beware of the spirit of this world, that is unstable and often draws into dark and timorous reasonings, lest the God thereof should be suffered to blind the eye of the mind, and such not knowing the sure foundation, the Rock of Ages, may partake of the terrors and fears that are not know to the inhabitants of that place where the sheep and lambs of Christ ever had a quiet habitation, which a remnant have to say, to the praise of his name, they have been blessed with a measure of in this day of distress.57

What is particularly striking about this passage is the contrasting language between "the council of God" and "the spirit of the world." The former is characterized by light, and leads the believer to a place of security that is immutable and eternal. The latter is characterized by darkness and instability, exposing its adherents to the horrors of warfare.

Perhaps the most remarkable dramatization of these two responses to the crisis in Pennsylvania is the dream-vision of Isaac Child, a Bucks County minister (1734-1769).

57 Ibid., 86.
"The Vision of Isaac Child," from July 1757, is apocalyptic in nature, borrowing heavily from the bizarre imagery of Revelation, and like John and the Old Testament prophets, Child is commanded by the Lord to write down the vision. Initially, the vision focuses on preparations for war. Men are likened to candlesticks on a mountain. There are various candlesticks: gold, silver, brass and iron, "some of which were burning very bright and clear, and some appeared dull, and almost gone out, and some were quite gone out." The golden candlesticks are "people who are in a large degree of perfection and holiness." The various metals represent degrees of purity: "And as gold exceedeth silver, and silver brass, and brass iron, even so are some men more purified than others, and are proceeded further in the work of their souls' salvations." 58

Storms and darkness come over the land, and many candlesticks are extinguished. A fight then breaks out against the one who followed after the ignis fatuus leader on the "scarlet coloured beast," whose name was "Opposition and Defense," an image of France. Some join in the battle, saying, "We will do valiantly, for our God is with us; and we will tread down upon our enemies, even every one that riseth up to oppose us." Others provide money instead, saying, "Go forth with thine army, and beat down these storms and tempest wherewith we are so tormented." These also conspired to build defenses, "Let us build ourselves places of refuge, whereunto we may flee in the time of trouble." They also take God's name in vain, saying, "He will be with us, and go forth with our armies." 59

59 Ibid., 4.
But, according to the vision, God is not with them. One "glorious in appearance" arrives, saying, "Cease ye to make unto yourselves martial preparations, and instruments of war and of defense: for, behold! there is in this Mountain a safe hiding place, and the walls thereof are safe.” And most do not heed him because of hardness of heart, and "remained exercising themselves in a martial manner." God becomes angry because of this lack of belief, commanding:

Remove the golden walls and bulwarks from about this Mountain, for they have exalted themselves in their own strength, and have forgotten the mighty Power, who hath been a place of refuge in the midst thereof, and who build the walls and set up the candlesticks, and lighted the candles that are therein.

The wall is then taken away suddenly, "and the wild boar of the forest entered into the borders thereof, and raged in his fury, for his chains were loosed, and he was released out of his prison." The "wild boar" is the Indian who attacks the city of God because its inhabitants have lost faith in God. It intends to destroy the mountain and many candlesticks are removed. But God is in control and restrains the wild boar.60

Then, an "angel of the Highest" appears with golden snuffers to extinguish the dim candles. Child cites the causes of these catastrophes: "the cursed sodomy; and the great forsaking of the Lord their God" and "breaking the holy covenant of the Most High God." These evils exist because "they have made this wicked world their idol and they worship it day and night." The wall is removed so the wicked can receive the recompense for their works and the land be cleansed of their filth. Against the possibility of purification stand many hypocrites who "will afflict themselves with

60 Ibid., 5.
fasting, and put up their prayer, saying, 'Lord, save us,' whilst their hearts thirst after the blood of their enemies." In this Christian apocalyptic world, truth and safety on one hand and fear and the desire for blood on the other, are irreconcilable.61

But there is a faithful remnant: a strong tower remains inhabited by candles still burning, who represent those who say, "'Not by might nor by power, but by the spirit of our God, we are saved from our enemies'." They are under siege, though, by the inferior candlesticks, those of "silver, of brass, and of iron, [who] exercised authority over the golden Candlesticks, and would have overthrown them, but they would not, by reason of the Tower."62 Finally, the storms cease and the waters recede, and "the peaceable streams of Shiloh descend on the Mountain." Many repent their infidelity, confessing, "[We] have strayed from their Good Shepherd, who was meek, and low of heart, and gave his life for his sheep; who, when he was reviled, reviled not again, but suffered all." They recognize that they had "distrusted the power of the Highest, and made flesh their arm." Then, a new covenant is established in which "they should be His people, and He would be their God." And this covenant is confirmed with a promise from the Most High: "[A]nd ye shall have peace from your enemies round about; and I will build again, about this place, walls and bulwarks of my salvation." But, the people must be obedient – they must trust God to preserve them, not the vain cunning of the flesh. If they disobey, they will be cut off from the earth.63

Child ends the vision with a gloss of the history of Pennsylvania:

---

61 Ibid., 5-6.
62 Ibid., 8.
63 Ibid., 9-11.
'For behold! saith the Lord, I brought your fathers from a land where they were oppressed, and could not serve me freely; and I moved the heathen back for their sakes; though not by the power of the sword, nor strength of battle, but I myself rebuked them, that they should not destroy mine anointed, nor do my people any harm. And I fed your fathers in the wilderness many days, and gave them strength to cultivate the land, and blessed their labors with success, and gave them corn in abundance, and many goodly things, and they increased in the land, and their generations were in prosperity, and they waxed fat, and, rebelled against me. 64

Invoking God's special relationship with Israel from the Old Testament, Child argues that divine favor had made Pennsylvania prosperous, not human diligence or innovation. Consequently, as the colonists turned to "the power of the sword" they would be turning their backs on their Almighty benefactor, thus exposing themselves to the calamities so graphically depicted in the vision.

Child's concluding argument accords with the positions of Churchman and Fothergill, who argue that defensive measures serve to provoke hostilities, rather than prevent them. Thus, for Quaker leaders, a revitalized pacifism was more than a ethical or theological notion that effectively distinguished them from other Anglo-American settlers. It was a pragmatic response to the threat of French and Indian invasion – they were convinced that any violent measures taken to counter violence would result in calamity for Pennsylvania. They recognized, as Woolman articulated, that defense

64 Ibid., 11.
against invasion was a natural response, but argued, on the basis of the singular history of
the colony, that God's peaceable kingdom could not be maintained by human hands.
CHAPTER 3

Racialized Violence and the Land:
Negotiating the "Situation" of the Delaware Nation in Pennsylvania

While attending the July 1757 Easton Conference – the third of such meetings between the Pennsylvania government and Eastern Delawares – John Churchman became discouraged with the palaver and political positioning. Many Indians were in attendance at the peace conference, including 119 Senecas who, departing from the policy of other Iroquois nations, openly supported Teedyuscung’s accusation of land fraud against the province. Governor William Denny was under instructions from proprietor Thomas Penn to discredit the Delaware chief, and had forbidden Quaker attendance because they openly advocated justice for the Indians. But they came in great numbers anyway. And, when Teedyuscung requested a personal secretary, Denny demurred, and the chief went on a four-day drinking binge by way of boycott. In the end, Charles Thomson, a Quaker school-master from Philadelphia, was appointed for this post. After nearly a week of meetings and deliberation, Churchman notes on that on July 27 "there was no public treaty" and "things seemed in much confusion and very dull." Feeling discouraged and ill with "distemper," he decided to leave the conference. But before departing, he warned

---

1 The first Easton Conference was held from July 25 to August 7, 1756. During the meeting Iroquois power was reasserted over the Eastern (or Susquehanna) Delaware, but the Iroquois delegates also recognized Teedyuscung’s uninherited authority over the Delaware. No substantial agreements were made, but the Pennsylvania government now had a spokesman for the Eastern Delaware who was answerable to the Six Nations. The second Easton Conference, held November 8-17, 1756, was highly contentious. Despite the advice of Secretary Richard Peters, Governor Denny asked Teedyuscung if his people had any grievances against the government of Pennsylvania. The chief cited the Walking Purchase of 1737, in which the proprietors gained much more land than the Delaware intended to give. James Logan, an agent for the Penn family, supposedly turned up a land deed from 1686 that stipulated the northern boundary of the purchase in question to be as far as a man could walk in a day and a half from a specific landmark. After getting several Indian leaders to sign the deed, Logan claimed it had been improperly allotted. When it was reallocated he had a special trail built and hired runners to "walk" some sixty-five miles in 36 hours.
fellow Friends in attendance that "the working of a dark and revengeful Spirit, which opposed the measures of peace, was one reason why Friends were so baptized into distress and suffering."²

After describing his participation in the conference, his return home, and his illness, Churchman records a dream he had had before setting out for Easton. In the dream he was riding eastward in the twilight, when he saw a light near the rising sun. It was not a "common light," and something appeared to be inside of it. He thought it must be an angel and his horse was frightened. Because of the being's evident power, Churchman knew it would be vain to attempt escape and decided to rein in his horse and move towards it. As it drew nearer, he saw that "it was encompassed with a brightness like a rainbow, with a loose garment of the same color down to the feet." The luminous being then "stood still in the midst of many curious stacks of corn; it was of a human form about seven feet high." Smiling at Churchman, he asked him where he was going, and Churchman replied that he was headed towards a building straight ahead. The curious form seemed to approve and "vanished upwards." Churchman then records his interpretation of the dream:

I awakened and had particularly to remember the complexion of this angelic apparition, which was not much different from one of the Indians clean washed from his grease and filth; remembering my dream very fresh, when I had seen the Indians at the treaty, and had heard some matters remarkably spoken by some particulars of them, I was made to believe it was not unreasonable to conclude, that the Lord was in them by his good Spirit, and that all colors were equal to him,

² Churchman, Some Account of the Gospel Labours, 184.
who gave life and being to mankind; We should therefore be careful to examine deeper than the outward appearance, with a tender regard to station and education, if we desire to be preserved from error in judgment.3

The luminous "apparition" encompassed with angelic power and purity corresponds with the Indians that Churchman had seen at the treaty, leading him to conclude that God was with the Indians and that something like racial equality had divine sanction. This dream-allegory constitutes a remarkable statement, given the assumptions of superiority held by most European settlers. But because Indians have a measure of God's "good" spirit, people of all skin colors (as illustrated by the rainbow garment of the apparition) and skin conditions (greased, dirty, clean, or otherwise) are equal in his sight and one tone or shade should not be judged better than another – Europeans should "be careful to examine deeper than the outward appearance." At the same time, the metaphor of washing the "grease and filth" from the Indian, although possibly depicting baptism, might represent the Christianizing methods of "killing the Indian [to] save the man," part of the larger colonialist project of whitewashing cultural differences to put forth a Eurocentric construct of essential humanity.

Churchman's interracial, egalitarian vision – with its vivid imagery of a rainbow garment of many colors – is related conceptually to his response to the mutilated corpse incident less than two years before and his consequent thinking about the ultimate cause for the outbreak of violence in Pennsylvania: the case of slaves. In his connection between frontier warfare and the violence of slavery, Churchman implies a kind of symbiosis, or interdependence, related to the Quaker notion of egalitarian "brotherhood,"

3 Ibid., 186.
that exists between whites, the African slaves, and the Indians in the New World. This is a tri-racial community, in which violence pollutes the land. This community was obliquely referenced by William Penn in *Some Account of the Province of Pennsilvania*, in which he argues for the economic efficacy of his colonial project for the mother country. Along with emphasizing the potential growth of navigational trades, he also notes how natives and imported labor would bring industrial progress to England: "[W]e may easily see the Objection (That Colonies or Plantations hurt England) is at least of no strength, especially if we consider how many thousand Blacks and Indians are also accommodated with Cloathes and many sorts of Tools and Utensils from England, and that their Labour is mostly brought hither, which adds Wealth and People to the English Dominions." But Churchman asserts a community composed of equals, a de-mastered society, at least in its ideal form. The rainbow-clad figure represents the universality of humanity, where skin color is compared to a garment, and not indicative of that true essence.

Churchman's vision illustrates the Quaker reformist breakdown or depolarization of the civilized / savage binary, particularly in reference to the material sites of the colonial project: the body, land, and labor, and the twin colonialist atrocities of Indian dispossession and the African slave trade. Society ministers asserted Indian rights to the land and expose the injustices of slavery. This was due, in part, to their redefinition of church-world relations. Their disengagement from the power structures of the world pushed them to seek new windows of influence, and the questioning of their political position in Pennsylvania, led them immediately to question racial assumptions. This

---

process was concomitant with a renaissance or redefinition of Quaker pacifism, that was applied to specific cases of racialized violence. The revitalization of this doctrine is seen in the statement of the Mingos leader Scarouyady, who, meeting with Israel Pemberton and other leading Quakers (whom he refers to as "William Penn's children") on April 21, 1756: "We thought that the People of that Profession [pacifism] had been all dead, or buried in the Bushes, or in the Ashes." Two days later, upon agreeing to go to Iroquois leaders to ask for help in stopping the Delaware raids on the Pennsylvania frontier, Scarouyady restates this idea, "We are glad to hear so many of your sort of People are now alive, and that you rise again from the Dead, and tho' we have been lost to each other a great while, we are very glad to hear you are of the same sentiments with Onas."5

This Quaker attempt to take up the cause of the marginalized is as problematic as it is uncharacteristic for its time. Most basically, Quaker concern for Indian land rights and the abolition of slavery in the second half of the eighteenth century stemmed from religious ideology. This is seen in Churchman's assertion that "[gives] life and being to mankind," and each person has some measure of his spirit, or "light," within. Consequently, there are no racial distinctions for God: in Christ there is neither Jew nor Greek. In his journal, George Fox explicates this notion of "light," drawn from John 1:

\[B\]ut the true light which John bore witness to was the life in Christ the Word, by which all things were made and created. And it was called the light in man and woman, which was the true light which had enlightened every man that came into the world, which was a heavenly and divine light which let them see all their evil

5 Several Conferences between Some of the Principle People amongst the Quakers in Pennsylvania and the Deputies from the Six Indian Nations in Alliance with Britain (Newcastle upon Tyne: I. Thompson and Co., 1756), 22, 24. "Onas" is the Indian name for William Penn, and later, by extension, the Pennsylvania government.
words and deeds and their sins, and the same light would let them see Christ their Saviour, from whence it came to save them from their sin and blot it out.6

Quakerism had originated, along with a number of other radical Protestant sects, during a time of power struggle, when Puritan forces were gaining control of England. George Fox, disillusioned by such competitions of power, constructed a position essentially removed from contention and based on the egalitarian, tolerance-friendly assumption that everyone possessed the “Inner Light of Christ,” even if they were not conscious of it. Quakerism, then, was much more than theological quibbling — it was a social protest that resisted power, disparaging the ministerial elite and the medieval social order, leading Fox to refuse to doff his hat to “superiors” and to refer to everyone, regardless of social position, as thee / thou. However, Fox constructed this Quaker identity in the context of Cromwellian England. Late colonial America was different. Whether they realized it or not, Quakers in the New World belonged to a culture of colonizers, impacted by "critical encounters with new societies, new environments, [and] new chances for imagining political and social alterity."7

Quaker universalism might be read as part of the larger universalizing, missionizing tactic of European settlers designed to justify their presence in the New World. Although Quakers believed in the universal, transracial light of Christ, they were clearly dogmatic — they did not see their faith as one plausible position among many, but as the “Truth” that all needed to embrace. The early Quakers were “transgressive” voices; they earned a reputation for self-righteously opposing all other religious positions. Fox asserts a grand unity with his claim that all possess the light, but humanity also needs

---

6 Fox, Journal, 303.
7 Robert St. George, Possible Pasts, 3.
to be directed toward that light, as he expresses in his journal: "I was commanded to turn
people to that inward light, spirit, and grace, by which all might know their salvation and
their way to God." Although Indians possessed the light of Christ, they were clearly
"sitting in the darkness," and needed instruction from the more (en)lightened. Mid
eighteenth-century Quakers did look into alterity in a manner of speaking – for instance,
they probed Eastern Delaware grievances against the proprietaries of Pennsylvania. Still,
they were more interested in commonality and their interventions were based on the
assumption that all humans possessed an innate sense of right and wrong: namely, that
the Delawares would not have broken seventy years of peace without an actual grievance.

Churchman's rainbow vision is also striking given the extreme racialized views of
Indians held by many at this time, when frontier settlements were being attacked and
settlers lost. Clearly it represents a move away from the differentiation colonialists
embraced, the line between civilized and savage. But to what extent does Quaker
universalism, apparent in the efforts for the marginalized peoples of the British colonial
project, misrepresent or commit epistemic violence? Edward Said argues that Western
representation of the Other "always involves a violence of some sort to the subject of the
representation, as well as a contrast between the violence of the act of representing
someone and the calm exterior of the representation itself, the image – verbal, visual, or
otherwise – of the subject." As pacifists, the ministerial elite would seem unlikely to
commit any kind of violence, physical or epistemic. They, in fact, were keen to correct
misperceptions of Othered peoples, and, in so doing, reverse the epistemic violence that

---

8 Fox, Journal, 35.
had been committed against them and the attempts of the new settler society to efface and erase the native. They countered the tendency that Abdul R. JanMohamed speaks of, when he notes that "the colonizers' invariable assumption about his moral superiority means that he will rarely question the validity of either his own or his society's formation and that he will not be inclined to expend any energy in understanding the worthless alterity of the colonized."\footnote{Abdul R. JanMohamed, "The Economy of the Manichean Allegory," in \textit{Post-Colonial Studies Reader}, Bill Ashcroft et al., eds. (London: Routledge, 1999), 18.}

At the same time, though, Quaker egalitarianism, for all its humanitarianism, tended to erase real material differences, ignoring alterity at the expense of commonality, as it viewed all humanity through the lens of its own universalist subjectivities. Fanon has discussed Western religion as a colonizing tactic which, in effect, attempts "to put [the native] out of the picture."\footnote{Fanon, \textit{The Wretched of the Earth}, 44.} An example of religious ideology eclipsing cultural difference is John Woolman's response to Indian war art, during his 1763 journey to the Indian settlement at Wyalusing (on the Susquehanna River in northeastern Pennsylvania):

Near our tent, on the sides of large trees peeled for that purpose were various representations of men going to and returning from the wars, and of some killed in battle, this being a path heretofore used by warriors. And as I walked about viewing those Indian histories [originally "Hierogliphicks" in the MS, but crossed out by Woolman], which were painted mostly in red but some with black, and thinking of the innumerable afflictions which the proud, fierce spirit produceth in the world – thinking of the toils and fatigues of warriors travelling over mountains and deserts, thinking on their miseries and distresses when wounded far from
home by their enemies, and of their bruises and great weariness in chasing one
another over the rocks and mountains, and of their restless, unquiet state of mind
who live in this spirit, and of the hatred which mutually grows up in the minds of
children of those nations engaged in war with each other – during these
meditations the desire to cherish the spirit of love and peace amongst these people
arose very fresh in me.\(^{12}\)

Clearly Woolman interprets the artistic representations of war through his pacifist
subjectivities. In this case, the preeminence of his universalist opposition to war occludes
the exigencies of Indian warfare and the centrality of the warrior culture – the "native" is
erased, in essence, by a counterhegemonic, yet Eurocentric, Christocentric world-view.
However, because there was no written language for the Lenni Lenape, picture writing
was a common technique of communication. It was typical for warriors to carve into
trees, or engrave stone, to record the number of men in their war party, the direction of
their march, the forts they had attacked, and the amount of scalps that had been taken.\(^{13}\)

Because Indians and slaves did not have a literary voice as such, Quakers felt obligated to
speak on their behalf. Indian leaders did express something of their perspective in treaty
conferences, but even that was doubly mediated: through the translator and then the
English-speaking narrator. Edward Said has noted the following regarding Western
portrayals of the Other: "The action or process of representing implies control, it implies
accumulation, it implies confinement, it implies a certain kind of estrangement or
disorientation on the part of the one represented."\(^{14}\) In the case of the Society of Friends,

\(^{12}\) Woolman, *Journal*, 126.
\(^{13}\) Weslager, *The Delaware Indians*, 87.
representation of the native was controlled through Quaker ideology, or to use
Churchman's metaphor, the "filthy" native was washed clean by universalist dogma.
Quakers based their remonstrance against land fraud and slavery on Euro- and Christo-
centric notions of justice, which differed from Indian conceptions and were often
irrelevant to them.\(^{15}\)

Quaker self-interest clearly factors into their interventions on behalf of Indians
and African slaves. Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffith, and Helen Tiffin, in speaking of
settler-colonies and the problem of nationalist self-definition, argue that "[a]t the heart of
the settler colony culture is . . . an ambivalent attitude towards their own identity, poised
as they are between the center from which they seek to differentiate themselves and the
indigenous people who serve to remind them of their own problematic occupation of the
country."\(^{16}\) The Quakers, who had been disenfranchised and marginalized from their
traditionally dominant role in Pennsylvania, reconstruct their "ambivalent" identity in
part by their embrace of and empathy with the Other. This action served to further
distance them from Anglo-American society – as Naomi Baker has noted of Quaker
narratives involving contact with non-European societies, "[O]ther peoples are involved
in order to dissociate the Quaker self from other Western Christian identities."\(^{17}\) Indeed,
because of their advocacy of Indian land rights during the Seven Years War, they were
vilified by many and, as a consequence, their reputation suffered considerably.

\(^{15}\) Baker, "'Men of Our Nation'," 16.
\(^{16}\) Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffith, and Helen Tiffin, The Post-Colonial Studies Reader (London: Routledge,
1999), 152.
\(^{17}\) Baker, "'Men of Our Nation'," 20-21.
George Fox and Thomas Chalkley on Indian Relations

In his journal, George Fox records a favorable view of Indians during his 1672-3 visit to the American colonies. From the beginning of his journey, Fox asserts the innate humanity of the Indians and their knowledge of "the Light and the Spirit." While in the Carolinas, he debated a leading doctor at Cone-oak Bay (now Edenton Bay, North Carolina), concerning the universal knowledge of truth:

And he [the doctor] so opposed it in every one, that I called an Indian because he denied it to be in them, and I asked him if that he did lie and do that to another which he would not have them do the same to him, and when he did wrong was not there something in him, that did tell him of it, that he should not do so, but did reprove him. And he said there was such a thing in him when he did any such a thing that he was ashamed of them.18

The Indian illustrates Fox's belief in an innate sense of right and wrong, or conscience, including the "Golden Rule." After visiting a number of Indian settlements, Fox is particularly impressed with their hospitality, often saying that the Indians were "loving." Later, while in New England, he records his conversation with a sachem who, impressed with Fox's message and demeanor, claims that those of his people who had been converted to Puritan Christianity were worse off than before, suggesting that they should turn to Quakerism and banish the Puritans instead.20

---

18 Fox, Journal, 642.
19 Ibid., 648. While traveling through Delaware and New Jersey, Fox notes, "And I came to an Indian king's house and he and his queen were very loving, and the rest of his attendance, and received me and laid me on a mat for a bed. . . . Then we came to another Indian town where the king came to me and could speak some English and was very loving, and I spoke much to him and his people" (619).
20 Ibid., 624. The sachem also tells Fox of his prophetic vision warning that the English were coming, and that the Indians must be kind or be destroyed.
sizable Quaker communities in Rhode Island for several months, and, at a first-day meeting with Indians at Shelter Island, remarks:

Their king and his council with about one hundred more Indians with him, sat about two hours, and I spoke to them by an interpreter that was an Indian that could speak any English very well. They sat down like Friends and appeared very loving; they said all was truth and did make a confession of it after the meeting. So I have set up a meeting among them once a fortnight, and a Friend Joseph Silvester is to read the Scriptures to them.21

Fox’s desire to spread the light of Quakerism is central to his view of the Indian, evident in "An Epistle to all Planters" (1681), written for emigrants to the new colony in Pennsylvania:

And in all the places where you do outwardly live and settle, invite all the Indians and their Kings; and have Meetings with them, or they with you, so that you may make inward Plantations with the Light and Power of God, the Gospel . . . and so by it you may make Heavenly Plantations in their Hearts for the Lord, and so beget them to God, that they may serve and Worship him, and spread his Truth abroad.22

Although recording impressions of incidents between Quakers and Native Americans outside of Pennsylvania, Thomas Chalkley discusses an intriguing account of preservation and Quaker responsibility in his journal. While visiting the meetings at Suckanuset, Scituate, and Sandwich in Massachusetts in 1704, Chalkey notes of recent

21 Ibid., 625-6.
22 George Fox, An Epistle to all Planters and Such Who Are Transporting Themselves into Foreign Plantations in America (London: Printed for Ben. Clark in George-Yard in Lombard-street, 1682). In the tract Fox also includes several quotations from the Old Testament regarding the evangelization of the whole world (Malachi 1:1; Psalms 97, 98, 149, 150).
Indian attacks that God "was pleased wonderfully to preserve our Friends, especially those who kept faithful to their peaceable principle." He then relates a peculiar account in which three Quaker men, who had lived according to pacifism, gave in to fear, armed themselves, and were killed:

The men used to go to their labor without any weapons, and trusted to the Almighty and depended on his Providence to protect them (it being their principle not to use weapons of war to defend themselves); and the Indians, who had seen them several times without them, and let them alone, saying, They were peaceable men, and hurt nobody, therefore they would not hurt them, now seeing them have guns, and supposing they designed to kill the Indians, they therefore shot the men dead.23

Remarkably, Chalkley does not castigate the Indians for their cruelty against fellow Quakers. Instead, he faults the Quaker men who had betrayed their testimony and given into a carnal security. Chalkley then discusses a similar case that happened during this period of Anglo-Indian conflict. A Quaker woman in the same area "began to let in a slavish Fear, and did advise her children to go with her to a fort not far from their dwelling. Her daughter being one that trusted in the name of the Lord, the mighty tower to which the righteous flee, and find safety could not consent to go with her." In the process of trying to escape to the fort, the mother was killed, but her daughter, Mary Doe, who remained faithful to the peaceable principle, was preserved. A neighbor of Mary Doe related to Chalkley

that as he was at work in his Field, the Indians saw and called him, and he went to them. They told him that they had no quarrel with the Quakers for they were a quiet, peaceable people, and hurt nobody, and that therefore none should hurt them. But they said that the Presbyterians in these parts had taken away their lands, and some of their lives, and would now, if they could, destroy all the Indians.24

During this conflict some Quakers were imprisoned for their refusal to fight, having been denounced by Puritan ministers who attributed the attacks (and famine) to the preponderance of Quakers in the region. According to Chalkley, one Puritan minister claimed that Quaker growth was in fact "worse than the Indians destroying them" because "the Indians destroy our Bodies, but the Quakers destroy the Soul." Chalkley then notes that this particular minister was killed in an Indian attack shortly after this utterance.25

Chalkley also made an important visit to Seneca and Shawnee Indians living near the Susquehanna River at Conestoga in 1706, with the support of the Nottingham Meeting elders, who sent an interpreter. A party of around thirteen traveled fifty miles into the woods, and "and then went on cheerfully and with good will, and much love to the poor Indians." When his group arrived, Chalkley writes that the Indians "received us kindly, treating us civilly in their way." One thing that immediately impressed Chalkley was the calm, collected demeanor of Indian meetings – "in which they were very grave, and spoke one after another without any heat or jarring" – countering the stereotype of Indians as uneducated and uncivil. He also observes the "elevated place" given to women, noting in particular one "ancient grave woman" who was always consulted on

24 Ibid., 45.
25 Ibid., 40.
important decisions. This "Empress," as Chalkley calls her, viewed his visit favorably: "She looked upon our coming to be more than natural, because we did not come to buy or sell, or get Gain, but came in love and respect to them, and desired their well-doing both here and hereafter." She then related a dream which she had had three days before, that she was in London, and that London was the finest place she ever saw (it was like to Philadelphia, but much bigger) and she went across six streets, and in the seventh she saw William Penn preaching to the people, which was a great multitude, and both she and William Penn rejoiced to see one another; and after meeting she went to him, and he told her, that in a little time he would come over and preach to them, also, of which she was very glad. And now, she said her dream was fulfilled, for one of his Friends had come to preach to them.

Because of the positive portents of this dream, the woman then advised her companions to listen to Chalkley and his companions.26 In the discussion of this visit, Chalkley includes a footnote which reflects his own view of Pennsylvania-Indian relations, some quarter-century into settlement:

'Tis worthy of notice, that at the first settling of Pennsylvania, William Penn took great care to do justice to the Indians, and bought his land of them to their satisfaction, and settled a trade with them; so that whereas the Indians were destructive to other colonies, they were helpful to Pennsylvania; and to this day they come to hear the name of William Penn.27

For Chalkley and other Quakers, Pennsylvania was unique among New World European colonial projects, because of its foundation upon equitable relations with the Indians.

26 Ibid., 50-1.
27 Ibid., 51.
Chalkley, encouraged by the warm reception, presented the Quaker gospel to the gathered Indians, and, in his journal, gives a synopsis of his gospel preaching, centered upon Christ's redemption, and the Indian response to it:

And by his grace and light in the soul, [God] shews to man his sins, and convinceth him therof, delivering him out of them, and gives inward peace and comfort to the soul for well-doing, and sorrow and trouble for evil-doing; to all which, as their manner is, they gave publick assents; and to that of the light in the soul, they gave a double assent, and seem'd much affected with the doctrine of truth.28

Chalkley is encouraged by the openness of the Seneca and Shawnee to his message, but, despite this positive assent, there is no indication that he or any other Quakers followed up this visit. His account of the visit does illustrate, however, the importance of Penn's legacy of equitable relations with the Indians.

Chalkley's sensitivity to Pennsylvania's peculiar relationship with its Indians neighbors is also apparent in a letter written some years later (5/21/1738), to the meeting of Quakers at Opeckon, Virginia, a new settlement which had relocated out of southern Pennsylvania. The letter is noteworthy not only for the insight it provides regarding Chalkley's views of Indian rights, but also for his comments on the bloody Indian policy of other colonies. In the epistle Chalkley centers his advice on the priority of good, just relations with the Native American population. Initially he advocates an open, amicable dialogue:

28 Ibid., 51.
First, I desire that you be very careful (being far and back Inhabitants) to keep a friendly correspondence with the native Indians, giving them no occasion of offence; they being a cruel and merciless enemy, where they think they are wrong'd or defrauded of their right, as woful experience hath taught, in Carolina, Virginia, and especially, in New England.  

As with his earlier discussion of his visit to New England in 1704, Chalkley places the burden of responsibility for peace upon his fellow Quakers. He had witnessed first-hand the ravages of Indian warfare, and therefore emphasizes the importance of "friendly correspondence," which would deter misunderstanding and head off potential violence.

Next, Chalkley encourages the Opeckon Monthly Meeting to respect the Indian's "natural right" to the land, an unusual perspective in the annals of British colonial expansion, which, in general, peremptorily claimed all territory for the monarch:

Secondly, as nature hath given them, and their forefathers, the possession of this continent of America (or this wilderness) they have a natural right thereto in justice and equity; and no people, according to our own principle, which is according to the glorious gospel of our dear and holy Lord Jesus Christ, ought to take away, or settle, on other men's lands or rights, without consent, or purchasing the same, by agreement of the parties concern'd; which, I suppose, in your case is not yet done.  

This notion of consent is of particular concern to Chalkley, given his belief that the new settlers had not yet made proper arrangements with the Indians. The next and most

---

29 Ibid., 309.
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belabored point of the letter, then, is that the Opeckon Quakers make a clear purchase "with speed":

Thirdly, therefore my counsel and Christian advice to you is (my dear Friends) that the most reputable among you, do, with speed, endeavour to agree with and purchase your lands of the native Indians or Inhabitants: take example of our worthy and honorable late proprietor, William Penn; who, by his wise and religious care, in that relation, hath settled a lasting peace and commerce with the natives, and through his prudent management therein, hath been instrumental to plant in peace, one of the most flourishing provinces in the world.31

Again, Chalkley appeals to the model of Penn, whose "religious care" had made Pennsylvania a province of peace on a continent of violent Euro-Indian contact.

Because the Opeckon settlement was outside of Pennsylvania, Chalkley argues that the Indians would be more hostile towards new settlers, especially in light of Virginia's rather bloody history of Indian relations. He notes an agreement with the Indians to limit settlement to the east side of the mountains, and, because Opeckon was situated west of the mountains, it was "open to the Insults and Incursions of the Southern Indians, who have destroyed many of the Inhabitants of Carolina and Virginia, and even now have destroyed more on the like Occasion, (The English going beyond the Bounds of their Agreement, eleven of them were killed by the Indians while they were travelling in Virginia)." The last part of this statement reaffirms Chalkley's respect for Indians and their natural right to the land, as he faults the English, not the Indians, for the violence, citing the failure to keep this agreement. Some Opeckon Meeting members might argue

31 Ibid.
that their settlement was still part of Pennsylvania, but Chalkley argues that it would be hard to prove that their claim is within bounds of Penn's patent from Charles II, being too far south. And, even if the settlement was part of Pennsylvania, the land must be bought properly lest they face the brunt of Indian wrath: "[Y]et, if done, that is of no Consideration with the Indians, without a Purchase of them; except you will go about to convince them by Fire and Sword, contrary to our Principles; and, if that were done, they would ever be implacable Enemies, and the Land would never be enjoyed in Peace."

Chalkley then points again to his perception of Indian relations in Pennsylvania: that "no new Settlements are made without an Agreement with the Natives," citing the example of Lancaster.32 He makes no mention, however, of the Walking Purchase made by the son of William Penn the previous year (1737), a case of land fraud that would further alienate the Eastern Delaware and cause a major rift between the proprietors and pious Quakers some twenty years later during the Seven Years' War.

**Penn's Mythical Legacy of Peace**

In his epistle to the Opeckon Monthly Meeting, Chalkley also comments on the outbreak of war between England and Spain, airing his general antipathy towards violence and its pernicious effects. According to him, the war had "occasioned much Disturbance and Distraction in our little peaceable Province and Government; war being destructive to Life, Health and Trade, the Peace and Prosperity of the People, and absolutely against the Doctrine and Practice of the Prince of Life and Peace, our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ." He cites Christ's teaching to love and pray for one's enemies, and to turn the other cheek.

---

32 Ibid., 309-11.
He then applies a probable objection of Christ's audience to this doctrine to the situation in eighteenth-century Pennsylvania:

> O, say they, *If we let this Man alone, the Romans will come, and take away our Place and Nation:* Just as the People now say in this Province, among and to those peaceable Men, who for the sake of Christ and his doctrine, cannot use the Sword; The Romans will come and take way our Country, if we don't build Forts and Castles, and have military Preparation.33

For Chalkley, those who turn to defense live in "slavish Fear," "too much distrusting of the divine Providence." He recognizes the objection that Quakers were outnumbered by people of other religious persuasions – "But now there are people who are not of that Principle" – but responds by appealing to the preeminence of Quaker settlers: "I answer, then why did they come among us, if they could not trust themselves with our Principles?"34 Quakers saw themselves as first among equals in the colony, because the initiative and principles of their forefathers had built Pennsylvania up from its pre-settlement "wilderness" condition. He then concludes his meditation on pacifism with an elegiac statement on William Penn (whom the "heathens loved") and the first days of settlement, a seemingly Edenic era whose utopian possibilities enticed him from his native England:

> The Sense of the Sweetness and social life that the first settlers of the Province of Pennsylvania and the city of Philadelphia lived in, makes me express myself in this manner: Oh! that the Inhabitants of the city and country did but live and dwell in that first Love and hold it fast; and then I believe that the Almighty would not

---

33 Ibid., 319.
34 Ibid., 319-20.
suffer any to take our Crown; which Crown is Righteousness, Peace, and Love, through the Faith.  

As evident with Chalkley, it is William Penn's mythic legacy that is more influential on the nostalgia for old Pennsylvania that Quaker leaders had in the mid-eighteenth century, than the actual contact, of a very limited sort, that Penn had with Native American inhabitants during his brief stay in the New World (1682-1684, 1699-1701). The Philadelphia Yearly Meeting, convening in April 1756, remarked on this legacy in a letter to Lieutenant-Governor Robert Morris, following his declaration of war against the Delaware, which officially ended some seventy years of peaceable relations: "The Settlement of this Province was founded on the Principles of Truth and Equity and Mercy, and the Blessing of Divine Providence attended the early Care of the first Founders to impress those Principles on the Minds of the Native Inhabitants." Because of this "Care" (in obedience to Fox's admonitions), early settlers had peaceable relations with the Indians, "So that when their Numbers were great, and that Strength vastly superior, they received our Ancestors with Gladness, relieved their Wants with open Hearts, granted them Peaceable Possession of the Land, and, for a long course of Time, gave constant and frequent Proofs of cordial Friendship." In a companion letter drafted for the assembly on the same day, Quaker ministers actually quoted Penn's advice on relations with Native Americans: "If Friends here keep to God, and in the Justice, Mercy, Equity, and Fear of the Lord, their Enemies will be their Footstool; if not, their Heirs, and my Heirs too, will lose all, and Desolation will follow (William Penn's Life, Folio

35 Ibid., 320.
Ironically, it was his direct heir, Thomas Penn, who moved away from this notion of justice by encouraging his agents to dispossess the Delaware through manipulation of intertribal rivalries (i.e., courting the more powerful Iroquois) and fraudulent land deeds.37

Israel Pemberton, Jr., in his attempts to negotiate a peace with the alienated Delaware, commented on the enduring importance of Penn's legacy in a series of meetings with Scarouyady and other pro-English Indian leaders held shortly after Morris's declaration of war in April 1756. From the beginning of the talks, Pemberton asserted the preeminence of the peace principle:

That as William Penn and our Fathers who first settled this Province, were Men of Peace and against all War; so there are still many of us their children, who hold the same peaceable Principle; and we hope there are many of your People who retain a love and Regard for your old Friends.

Scarouyady, who had been seeking help from the English for some time against the French, replies: "We love the peaceable principle, and wish that all Mankind were of that Mind." Pemberton then makes the connection to Penn more personal: "My Grandfather and Great Grandfather were his particular Friends and Councillors, and Men of his Principle; this is to live in love and good will to all men." Several days later, Pemberton and other Quaker attendees gave Scarouyady a wampum belt as a token of goodwill, remarking on his "lively and affectionate Remembrance of William Penn and [their]

36 Several Conferences between Some of the Principle People Amongst the Quakers in Pennsylvania and the Deputies of the Six Indian Nations in Alliance with Britain (Newcastle upon Tyne: I. Thompson and Co., 1756), 5-6, 12.
37 In chapters 12, 15, 17 of Empires of Fortune, Francis Jennings recounts in detail the political struggle between the proprietaries, the colonial assembly, and pacifist Quakers during the Seven Years War.
Forefathers, and the Friendship that subsisted between them and [his] Fathers."38 In
actuality, Penn's residence in Pennsylvania was too brief for extended contact with the
Iroquois. In 1701, however, just before his final departure from the province, he did hold
a council in Philadelphia with Conestogas, Shawnees, Conoys, and an Iroquois observer,
confirming friendship, trade agreements, and sale of lands on the lower Susquehanna.39

In addition to honoring Penn's peaceable legacy, mid-century Quaker leaders,
following Thomas Chalkley's example, expressed a deep concern for Indian land rights.
In a letter to his brother and sister, Samuel Fothergill mentions an Indian attack on the
South Carolina frontier in which sixteen were killed and nine taken captive. But, as with
Chalkley's response to violence on the Virginia frontier in the 1730's, Fothergill does not
fault the Indians, but instead blames the English for their irresponsible and unethical
disregard for Indian's property:

By what Indians the act was committed, is only conjecture; some northern Indians
were seen to march through the back settlements of Virginia and Maryland. It is
generally thought the English were settling themselves very fast on a piece of fine
hunting land belonging to the Indians, without giving them satisfaction for it, and
had been warned off by them, but disregarding it, received this severe token of
Indian displeasure.40

Indeed, Fothergill, demonstrates an unusually solid understanding of the complexity of
English-Indian relations, and is among the first Quaker leaders to pinpoint the cause of
hostilities between Indians and frontier Pennsylvanians, as seen in a letter to brother:

38 Several Conferences, 17-18, 20.
40 Fothergill, Memoirs and Letters, 146. Dated 12/13/1754.
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 judged 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 on this land, and land fraudulently obtained, that the barbarities are committed.\footnote{Ibid., 168. Dated 11/24/1755.}

Fothergill's assertion that land fraud was the cause of the violence was prophetic: a year and a half later Teedyuscung would cite the fraudulent Walking Purchase of 1737 as the primary Delaware grievance against the Pennsylvanian government, creating a political firestorm and triggering a major Quaker investigation into the validity of this accusation. Fothergill also notes the role of the Six Nations, who in 1736, made a treaty in Philadelphia renewing friendship with Pennsylvania and secretly stipulating that the Iroquois would, as "uncles," speak on behalf of the Delawares and other Indians on the colony's borders. The result of this treaty was a shift in Pennsylvania-Indian relations from the nearer Delaware to the more distant, powerful Iroquois, who helped the proprietaries, in effect, to dispossess Delawares of much of their land. In mid-December 1755, even after seeing the parade of scalped men and the mutilation that the Indians were capable of inflicting, Fothergill cites a failure on the part of colonial policy: "The ancient methods of dealing with the Indians upon the principles of equity and justice
And in late April 1756, after the declaration of war against the Delaware, Fothergill continues to assert unjustly obtained land as the cause of violence and the importance of restitution: "[T]he means of restoring peace, (to wit) doing the Indians justice, by fully paying them for their lands, were in the beginning shamefully neglected, and will now be very difficult to bring about."43

Other visiting British ministers commented on the violation of Indian land rights. William Reckitt, writing of his journey into the Pennsylvania interior in 1757, several years after the outbreak of violence and some twenty years after Chalkley's epistle, also points to the importance of land being properly purchased from the Indians. He records his passage past Goose Creek and over the Blue Mountains,

where the Indians had done much mischief, by burning houses, killing, destroying, and carrying many people away captives; but friends had not hitherto been hurt; yet several had left their plantations and fled back again over the Blue Mts., where the lands had been rightly purchased of the Indians (emphasis added).44

On her visit to America, from 1761 to 1763, Elizabeth Wilkinson also relates her concern about Indian land rights. While in New Garden around the time of the Quaker Meeting

---

42 Ibid., 170. Letter, dated 12/17/1755.
44 Reckitt, Journal, 59B. Like Chalkley, Reckitt records a favorable impression of Indian receptiveness to his message. After going to Barbados for a time, Reckitt returned to Pennsylvania and attended an Indian conference after arriving in Philadelphia in late November 1759: "After some time of waiting in silence, I had something to say, and one Isaac Still, an Indian, who could speak English, delivered the substance of what I said in the Indian language . . . Teedyuscung, and several of the Delaware chiefs were present, and a few of the Jersey Indians. They were solid, attentive, and behaved in a becoming manner" (79).
of Ministers and Elders (January 1762), she notes that she "had to caution Friends against settling on lands not agreed for with the Indians and much more to that effect."45

Quaker Response to the Declaration of War Against the Delawares

Any Quaker advocacy of Indians was greatly problematized, however, by the undeniable violence committed against white settlers, evident in the mutilated corpse incident of December 1755. Initially, the attacks were carried out by Ohio (or Western) Delawares who had been pushed out by encroaching European settlements. But later in the year they were joined by Delawares who lived within the province's borders. After losing patience with the Pennsylvania government regarding defensive aid against the French threat, Teedyuscung, leader of the Eastern Delawares, joined the Ohio Delawares in "taking up the hatchet" against the English. During the winter of 1755 and 1756 some two hundred Susquehanna Delawares and seven hundred Ohio Delawares raided settlements in the Kittitansies.46 At the General Spring Meeting in 1756, Quaker leaders responded to Governor Morris's declaration of war on April 10, in an address dated April 12.47 Initially, they attempted to correct perceptions that they were unconcerned about the safety of fellow Pennsylvanians who suffered as a result of Indian attacks:

We have with the most sensible Concern and Pain of Mind observed the sorrowful Alteration in the State of this late peaceful Province, now become the

46 Captain Jacobus (a Munsie warrior) had led a small group of Susquehanna (or Eastern) Delawares on a devastating raid against the Moravian mission at Gnadenhuetten on November 24, 1755, but most Eastern Delawares remained neutral until Teedyuscung grew tired of Pennsylvanian politics and joined in raids against frontier communities.
47 In a letter dated the same day, Samuel Fothergill writes: "Tenth, 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" (Memoirs and Letters, 182).
Theatre of Bloodshed and Rapine, and distressed by the cruel Devastation of a barbarous Enemy, which justly excites the most aggravating Reflections in every Considerate Mind; yet when we consider that all Wars are attended with fatal Consequences, and one with Enemies so savage as those who have now become ours, with Circumstances the most shocking and dreadful.48

The designation of "savage" for the Indian "Enemies" might seem, at first glance, to contradict the references by other Quaker leaders to Indian civility and openness to the "Truth." However, the term "savage" did not necessarily carry the same negative connotation as in modern usage. According to the Oxford English Dictionary, the adjective savage is derived from the Old French salvage (from the Latin silvaticus), which means "belonging to a wood or wild" (from silva, wood). In the English language, savage historically has indicated something that is in a state of nature, or wild, and has been used of animals, plants, landscape, manners, and people. Ironically, the term savage shares the same etymology as "silvania," the name Penn gave to his colony to conjure up Edenic associations of agricultural possibility and to qualm fears of the wilderness and wildwood.49

Although the use of the designation in this passage manifests a form of racism, savage in this context seems to be more directly related to the notion of descent to a state of wildness, characteristic of peoples who do not have the same moral constraints as Christians. Indeed, the term "savagery" did not only reference Indians – it was also "used of colonists who lived in horrid isolation on the frontiers, far from 'civilized'"

48 Several Conferences, 5-6.
settlements."\(^{50}\) For Quaker leaders, the violence of Indian attacks was truly alarming given their obsessive emphasis on Pennsylvania's mythic peace. And the violence itself, more than those who committed it, represented the province's backsliding to its pre-settlement, wilderness condition – the "re-savagizing" of Pennsylvania, perhaps. This notion is apparent in Samuel Fothergill's letter to his wife on December 17, 1755: "[T]he spirit of war and destruction endeavour[s] to break loose, in order to reduce this pleasant, populous province to its ancient wilderness condition."\(^{51}\) In the same way, Quaker leaders appear to have viewed Indian violence as a lapse, rather than as characteristic. They assumed that the Delaware could be corrected, and their April 12 address to Morris requested that "some farther Attempts be made by pacifick Measures, to reduce them to a Sense of their Duty, and that a farther Opportunity may be offered to such as may be willing to separate from those who have been the wicked Instruments of perverting them."\(^{52}\) Although paternalistic, this notion of "reducing" suggests the Quaker belief that the Indians possess reason, and could be led back, as errant children, to their former peaceable state. Indeed, in his April 19 meeting with Scarouyady, Israel Pemberton refers to the Delaware as children without wardens, "[F]or as we consider, they have no King, and their old wise Men are gone, we look on them as Children, who do not know what they are doing; therefore, if they will forbear any further Mischief, and repent, we will do all that we can to have them forgiven."\(^{53}\)

---

\(^{50}\) Axtell, *Natives and Newcomers*, 310.


\(^{52}\) Several Conferences, 6.
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Related to the assumption that Indians could be corrected, was the more basic assumption in the address (evident also in the writings of Fox), that Native Americans were rational beings, possessing an innate sense of justice:

The Records of the several Treaties with those Indians, and our Ancestors, our own, and our Neighbours Experience, have fully proved, that though they are savage, and inexpressibly cruel to their Enemies, they are not void of a large Share of natural Understanding; have, in many Cases, clear Sentiments of Justice and Equity. [54]

Because of this sense of justice, Quaker leaders assumed that the Indians must have had cause to attack western settlements. They requested of the governor "that full Enquiry may be made whether some Apprehensions these Indians have conceived of a Deviation from the Integrity of Conduct towards them, so conspicuous in the first Establishment, may not, unhappily, have contributed, in some Degree, to the Alteration of their Conduct." [55] In the companion letter written to the Assembly, Quaker leaders made the same request, but worded it differently: "[W]e therefore desire it may be the care of all concerned (tho' not convinced as we are, that War is repugnant to the Doctrine and Principles of the Gospel) first to be assured that our Affairs with these People have been transacted, in every Respect, in the most honest, upright, and equitable Manner." [56]

In his declaration of war, however, Morris precludes the possibility of injustice as a legitimate cause for the attacks, which, he states, had been committed "without the least Provocation," characterizing the Indians as "cruel Murderers, and Ravagers, sparing

---
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neither Age nor Sex." They were "Enemies, Rebels and Traitors to His most sacred Majesty," and therefore worthy of destruction.\(^{57}\) This representation of the Delawares fits the colonialist pattern of epistemic violence discussed by Fanon:

> The colonial world is a Manichean world. It is not enough for the settler to delimit physically . . . the place of the native. As if to show the totalitarian character of colonial exploitation the settler points to the native as a sort of quintessence of evil. . . . [H]e is the corrosive element, destroying all that comes near him; disfiguring all that has to do with beauty or morality.

Fanon also notes the dehumanizing effect of this Manicheism: the settler turns the native "into the animal."\(^{58}\) For Morris, then, to offer a scalp ransom for the Indians was an exercise of justice, neither barbaric nor inconsistent with Christianity. From his official standpoint, the reversion of the Indian to wild or savage status, evidenced by the shocking violence committed against white settlers, thoroughly dehumanized the native population, putting them in the category of beast. Even earlier, however, the act of dispossession had stripped the Indians of their humanity and livelihood, a pattern in colonialism which Fanon also discusses: "For a colonized people the most essential value, because the most concrete, is first and foremost the land: the land which will bring them bread and, above all, dignity."\(^{59}\)

Investigation into the causes for Delaware alienation would be carried out most thoroughly by the Friendly Association for Regaining and Preserving Peace with the

---

\(^{57}\) Ibid., 13-14. In Natives and Newcomers (2001), James Axtell discusses the sense of guilt that some Europeans had over adopting "barbarous" warfare practices like scalping: "[R]ather than admitting that by adopting them, they had been 'reduced to savagery,' or had deviated seriously from Christian standards, they projected their guilt onto the Indians by insisting that the (mythically) 'unprovoked' assaults of savages demand a savage response" (260).

\(^{58}\) Frantz Fanon, The Wretched of the Earth, 41-42.

\(^{59}\) Ibid., 44.
Indians by Pacific Measures, a group that encouraged the anti-proprietary Assembly to conduct a separate inquiry of their own. The organization's beginning is suggested in the letter to the Assembly in which Quaker leaders indicate that some among them would "freely assist with their Estates and Persons, to endeavour to the regaining the Friendship of our Enemies, and promoting pacifick Measures in the same Manner as the unhappy Experience of several of the most martial neighbouring Colonies hath, after long and bloody wars, testify'd it must at last, if ever, be obtain'd."\textsuperscript{60} In his April 19 meeting with Scarouyady, Israel Pemberton, clerk of the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting and one of the wealthiest men in Pennsylvania, confessed his ignorance of the cause of bloodshed and expressed his hope that the Iroquois would use their influence to end it: "But we are made very sorrowful by the bad Conduct of your Cousins the Delawares, who contrary to the Friendship they had for us have done very wickedly, and shed the Blood of many of our Brethren, without any Cause given them that we know of."\textsuperscript{61} Pemberton's meetings with Scarouyady marked the functional beginning of the Friendly Association. Robert Daiutolo notes that "on behalf of the Susquehanna and Ohio Delawares the Friendly Association would solicit provincial favor, witness conferential activities, and purchase goods and clothing, and out of self-interest would attempt to discredit the proprietary party."\textsuperscript{62}

Although many weighty Quakers were involved in the Friendly Association, Quaker ministers themselves seemed less inclined to enroll in the organization. Minister

\textsuperscript{60} Several Conferences, 12.
\textsuperscript{61} Ibid., 18.
\textsuperscript{62} Robert Daiutolo, Jr., "The Role of Quakers in Indian Affairs During the French and Indian War," in \textit{Quaker History} (Spring 1988), 10-11.
Daniel Stanton attended several of the Easton conferences in 1756 and 1757, noting his coreligionists who

freely contributed their money and time, for promoting the restoration of peace with the natives . . . and believe they have been the were instrumental [sic] in the Lord's hand to appease the revengeful nature of so barbarous and cruel an enemy, the hearts of the Indians retaining a great love for the memory of our first worthy proprietary William Penn . . . that I do believe they were a great blessing in the hand of God, to the government of this province for the restoration of peace with such an enraged enemy.63

However, Stanton himself was not encouraged by the conferences, remarking: "I underwent with several faithful hearts, a deal of inward suffering and anxiety of spirit; a dark and dismal cloud of opposition appearing to the good work of peace."64 John Churchman attended the July 1757 conference at Easton, but seems to have been more concerned with the spirit of fellow Quakers than with the political intrigue between the Pennsylvanian government, the Friendly Association, and the Delawares.

**Anthony Benezet's Deconstruction of Representations of the Indian Other**

In *Some Observations on the Situation, Disposition, and Character of the Indian Natives of This Continent* (1784), Quaker Anthony Benezet (1713-84) sets out to "obviate some mistakes" in the way fellow European settlers perceive Indians. The tract echoes many of the assumptions that Quaker leaders had about their Indian neighbors during the Seven Years' War, and explicates the injustices done to them. In the preface, Benezet assumes
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their basic humanity and capacity for reason: "Be not offended therefore if the Indian is represented as a rational being as well as ourselves, if having an immortal soul capable of receiving the refining influence of our holy religion." This point is supported by the Quaker doctrine of innate conscience:

Human nature, even in its rudest state, is possessed of a strong sense of right and wrong; a pure principle which is not confined to any name or form, but diffuses itself as universally as the sun; it is "That light which enlightens every man coming into the world," John i.9. All those who yield to its impressions are brethren in the full extent of the expression, however differing in other respects.  

Since Indians possess a conscience – "a strong sense of right and wrong" – they can be injured (and, consequently, take retaliatory action), another disclaimer of the preface:

"And if the Indian is represented to have been oppressed and injured, it is not to provoke a spirit of retaliation, nor to excite a discontent, but to state to the view of the public, wherein they have been aggrieved."  

To counteract the prejudice against Indians, derived in part from the bloody transactions of the Seven Years' War, Benezet reminds his readers of the peaceable beginnings between Pennsylvanians and their Indian neighbors:

65 Anthony Benezet, Some Observations on the Situation, Disposition, and Character of the Indian Natives of This Continent (Philadelphia: Joseph Crushank, 1784), iv, 9 (footnote). Indeed, in his extensive quotation of Spanish bishop De las Casas, Benezet suggests that Indians are corrupted by European vices: "To blacken these unhappy people, their enemies assert, that they are scarce human creatures – but it is we [who] ought to blush for having been less men, and more barbarous than they. – They are represented as a stupid people, addicted to vice; – but have they not contracted most of their vices from the examples of Christians?" (15). De las Casas, as quoted by Benezet, also questions the right of the Spanish to be in the New World, appealing to the "golden rule": "[A]ll nations are equally free: one nation has no right to infringe upon the freedom of another: let us do towards those people as we would have them to have done to us, if they had landed upon our shore, with the same superiority of strength" (16).

66 Ibid., iv.
The first settlers of Pennsylvania, who had full opportunities of being acquainted with the nature and disposition of the Natives, and who made it a principal point to observe strict justice in all their transactions with them, have left us very favourable memorials of the long continued kindness they experienced from these people: the great disadvantages to which their ignorance and roving temper subjected them, our forefathers thought it their duty to endeavour to draw them from, by exemplary acts of benevolence and instruction.

Benezet makes a point of "strict justice," contrasting it with the current government's inequitable Indian policy. He does not regard them as racially inferior, but argues that "the apparent difference in them, as well as in the Black People and us, arises principally from the advantages of our education and manner of life."67 The Indians' alleged technological and lifestyle disadvantages were due to "ignorance" (lack of education) and "roving temper" (lack of a "settled," sedentary lifestyle). Benezet also exposes the agenda of denigrating hegemonic representations of the Indians (the "disposition to misrepresent and blacken the Indians"), which, he argues, are intended "to justify, or palliate the practice of unjust and cruel measures toward them."68 Consequently, if they are ruthlessly violent, it is not the result of an inherent disposition, but because they have been ill-treated by Euro-Americans:

Some writers have represented Indians as naturally ferocious, treacherous, and ungrateful, and endeavoured to establish this character of them, from some particular transaction which hath happened on special occasions: but no

---

67 Ibid., 7-8.
68 Ibid., 23. Benezet discusses this tendency particularly in reference to the Moravian Indians of Muskingum.
conclusion of their original character should be drawn from instances in which they have been provoked, to a degree of fury and vengeance, by unjust and cruel treatment from European Aggressors.69

Appealing to earlier accounts of Anglo-Indian trade, Benezet notes that the Indians generally manifested themselves to be kind, hospitable and generous to the Europeans, so long as they were treated with justice and humanity; but when the adventurers from a thirst of gain, over reached the Natives, and they saw some of their friends and relations treacherously entrapped and carried away to be sold for slaves, themselves injuriously treated and driven from their native possessions, what could be expected but that such a sordid conduct in the Europeans, would produce a change of disposition in the Indians.70

Again, he attributes the hostility of Indians to European avarice, particularly as manifested in slave-kidnappings and dispossession.

Benezet's generalized statements about Native Americans derive, in part, from his acquaintance with the Christian Indian chief Papunahung (or Papunhank or Papoonahal), who visited Philadelphia in 1760 and 1761.71 The first visit in July 1760 was occasioned by the transference of three white captives whom the chief had redeemed from other Indians. Papunahung's Indians were pacifists: they were "religiously disposed,

---

69 Ibid., 8. Benezet discusses the ill treatment of this group in Some Observations... on the Indian Natives, pp. 23ff.
70 Ibid., 9. Benezet also cites an instance of forced slavery from Neal's History of New England (p. 21): "One Hunt, an early trader with the Indians of New-England, after a prosperous trade with the Natives, enticed between 20 or 30 on board his vessel, and contrary to the public faith, clapped them under hatches, and sold them to the Spaniards at Malaga; but the Indians resented it, and revenged themselves on the next English that came on the coast" (footnote, p. 9).
according to Benezet, "& refused to join the other Indians in the War." When meeting with the Governor to deliver the prisoners, Papunahung used the occasion to protest various abuses in trade between whites and his people. First, he requested that the Governor stop the traffic of rum: "Hearken Brother I pray you would have some Pity on us & and let us have no strong Liquor at all here. All we that live at the Place called Wahackloosing, and if any of our young Men come down to ask them where they come from, & where they say from Wahackloosing I pray you not to give them a drop of Liquor." Papunahung also expressed his pacifist principles to the Governor: "I am a great Lover of peace, & have never been Concerned with War Affairs. I have a Sincere Remembrance of the Old Friendship which subsided between the Indians, and your Forefathers, & shall always observe it." He then, according to Benezet,

    complained of some abuses in Trade, & Said that they had not received the price for skins which had been Promised them, that his put their young upon playing unfair Tricks with the skins, by leaving on the Several parts which were of no use, as ears, paws & this, added he, is not as it ought to be, We should not Skin our Skins in such a way but our Corrupt Hearts have found out this way of dealing. In addition, the Indian leader complained of high prices: "Now Brother, I desire you will not raise your goods too high a price but lower them as you can afford it, that we may live & walk together in one Brotherly Love & Friendship as Brothers ought to do."  

After recording his impressions of the conference between the Governor and Papunahung, Benezet discusses the "awakening" that had taken place among these Indians, giving particular attention to their pacifist resolve: "[T]hey absolutely refused to

---

72 Ibid., 480.
73 Ibid., 481.
Join the Other Indians in the Prosecution of the War, letting them know, that they would not Join them in it though they should kill or make Slaves . . . of them." Benezet questioned the chief about this unusual position, and the chief responds "that what ever argument might be advanced in defence of War, yet he was fully persuaded that when God made Men he never intend [sic] they should kill or destroy each other." When asked further about his pacifism, Papunahung acknowledged the difficulty of convincing his people of that position, but also remarked at the hypocrisy of European Christians eager to engage in warfare: "I have often thought it Strange that the Christians are such great Warriors, & I have wondered they are not greater lovers of Peace." 74 Benezet then asked the chief "what he thought was the cause of alterations of the Times, & Why they were so changed from what they had been some years past." Papunhank responded, "People are grown cross to each other, if they Lived in Love it would not be so, but they grow Proud & Covetous which causes God to be angry." 75

**John Woolman's 1763 Journey to Wyalusing**

In August 1761 Papunahung visited Quakers in Philadelphia for a second time, and during this stay John Woolman had an opportunity to meet and converse with the Christian chief. Among other things that Papunahung communicated at this time, the following prayer must have impressed Woolman: "that he [Papunhank] might be preserved in Love and Affection to all Men, so that he might never slight or undervalue the Poor, or the Mean nor set up the great ones; but be kept in that Love which preserves

---

74 Ibid., 482.
75 Ibid., 483.
the Heart lowly, humble, and in respectfull regard to all our Fellow Creatures." In his journal, Woolman records his favorable impression of Papunahung and his people: "I believed some of them were measurably acquainted with that divine power which subjects the rough and froward will of the creature." In June 1763, after several years of deliberation, Woolman decided to visit Papunahung's people at Wyalusing, a mission settlement founded around 1749 by Moravians (they called it "Friedenshuetten," meaning "tents of peace" in German), and situated some 200 miles from Philadelphia. In his account of the visit, Woolman makes the most direct statements about his convictions regarding Euro-Indian relations, views which, in some ways, reflect those of Papunahung.

While staying overnight at Fort Allen en route to Wyalusing, Woolman conversed with an Indian trader from Wyalusing, who remarked on the sale of rum to the Indians. Like other Quakers Woolman was troubled by this traffic: "[B]ut to sell to that people which we know does them harm and which often works their ruin for the sake of gain, manifests a hardened and corrupt heart and is an evil which demands the care of all true lovers of virtue to suppress." He argues that rum is often used to weaken Indians' reason, causing them to sell their furs at a lower rate. Concerned over this exploitation, Woolman analyzes the conditions that encourage the practice, observing that most whites who cheat Indians are those who have been driven out of the urban areas by the wealthy:

78 Journal, 125. Benezet discusses the problem of alcoholism among Indians at length in Some Observations on . . . the Indian Natives, pp. 41ff. The Philadelphia Yearly Meeting also issued warnings against the sale of rum in 1685, 1687, 1719, and 1722 (Rufus Jones, Quakers in the American Colonies [London: MacMillan and Co., 1923], 499), demonstrating that it had been a problem among Quakers since the beginning of settlement.
"I also remembered that the people on the frontier, among whom this evil is too common, are often poor people, who venture to the outside of a colony that they may live more independent of such who are wealthy, who often set high rents on their land." This leads Woolman to consider the importance to "universal love and righteousness," which would eradicate such injustices from society:

[B]eing renewedly confirmed in a belief that if all our inhabitants lived according to sound wisdom, labouring to promote universal love and righteousness, and ceased from every inordinate desire after wealth and from all customs which are tinctured with luxury, the way would be easy for our inhabitants, though much more numerous than at present, to live comfortably on honest employments, without having that temptation they are often under of being drawn into schemes to make settlements on lands which have not been purchased of the Indians, or of applying to that wicked practice of selling rum to them.79

Again, there is a distancing from the pursuit of wealth and luxury, which Woolman sees not only as vain, in itself, but also as detrimental to Indians and slaves. Woolman, like Churchman, sees colonial society as symbiotically inclusive of Indians, so that injustices committed by whites against other whites negatively impacted Native Americans as well.

Woolman states in his journal that his intent in visiting Wyalusing was not merely to impart some spiritual gift to the Indians, but also to learn from them. On June 12, 1763, being too rainy for travel, Woolman describes an exercise he underwent while waiting for the weather to clear:

---

79 Ibid., 125-6.
[W]e continued in our tent, and here I was led to think on the nature of the exercise which hath attended me. Love was the first motion, and then a concern arose to spend some time with the Indians, that I might feel and understand their life and the spirit they live in, if haply I might receive some instruction from them, or they be in any degree helped forward by my following the leadings of Truth amongst them. And it pleased the Lord to make way for my going at a time when the troubles of war were increasing, and when by reason of much wet weather travelling was more difficult than usual at that season, I looked upon it as a more favourable opportunity to season my mind and bring me into a nearer sympathy with them. And as mine eye was to the great Father of Mercies, humbly desiring to learn what his will was concerning me, I was made quiet and content.  

In *Regeneration through Violence*, Richard Slotkin discusses this passage, emphasizing Woolman's sense of empathy, or "near sympathy" with the Indians during this journey, and the departure from normal Anglo-perceptions of the Indian Other that it represented. He comments that, although Woolman viewed the Indian "as an image of the natural man: man in his most basic, primitive, prerevelationary form," he also held "natural man to be the vessel of the inner light. . .  Thus he prepared himself during this journey by projecting himself imaginatively – by attempting to feel with the Indians to share their sympathies and perceptions, to bring himself into a more profound intimacy with and adjustment to the conditions of their world." However, according to Slotkin, this mental "adjustment" was "temporary, since his mission was to redeem the Indians, to develop the

---

80 Ibid., 127-8.
seeds of grace that God had planted in their red souls.” 81 Although Woolman's approach to Indian relations was necessarily Eurocentric, Slotkin misreads the purpose of his visit to Wyalusing, a settlement of Christianized Indians. Woolman never gives any indication that he intended to "convert" Indians on his short visit, probably because there was no need. In addition, he was not an evangelist or enthusiast, but a quietist. Woolman also seems to remain well "adjusted" after his return to Anglo-America, writing in the conclusion of his record of the visit: "But I was not only taught patience [by difficulty of travel] but also made thankful to God, who thus led me about and instructed me that I might have a quick and lively feeling of the afflictions of my fellow creatures whose situation in life is difficult." 82

What strikes Woolman most in his condition of empathy with the Indians are the "failing prospects" for many of the natives, whose livelihood was being taken away by English settlement, evidenced by the decrease of game and the epidemic of alcohol consumption. After that day of meditation in his tent, Woolman wrote a lengthy entry describing the effects of European expansion on the Indians:

The sun appearing, we set forward, and as I rode over the barren hills my meditations were on the alterations of the circumstances of the natives of this land since the coming in of the English. The lands near the sea are conveniently situated for fishing. The lands near the rivers, where the tides flow, and some above, are in many places fertile and not mountainous, while the running of the tides makes passing up and down easy with any kind of traffic. Those natives

82 Woolman, *Journal*, 137.
have in some places, for trifling considerations, sold their inheritance so favourably situated, and in other places been driven back by superior force, so that in many places, as their way of clothing themselves is now altered from what it was they far remote from us, [they] have to pass over mountains, swamps, and barren deserts, where travelling is very troublesome, in bringing their skins and furs to trade with us.83

Woolman's comments about the ways in which Indians had been disadvantaged by European settlement are unusually insightful, given the dominant ideology of his time that tended to erase Indian grievances. Throughout British North America, colonials had taken the good land for a "trifle," pushing the Indians to less commodious lands in the west.

The indigenous group to whom Woolman's comments apply most directly is the Lenni Lenape, whose homeland corresponds with present-day New Jersey, Delaware, Pennsylvania (between the Susquehanna and Delaware Rivers), and the south-eastern part of New York (west of the Hudson River). Like other coastal Indians, they were semi-nomadic, and their mobility enabled them to greatly benefit from the land's diverse resources. Before the founding of Pennsylvania, there had been a concentrated population of Lenni Lenape in the vicinity of what would later become Philadelphia. When William Penn arrived in the New World, he was determined to treat the Indians as equals, living on their land with their consent. This policy was remarkable since Penn was under no obligation to acknowledge Indian land tenure rights, as the "true and absolute proprietor" of Pennsylvania. He also established Indian-friendly conditions for

83 Ibid.
trade – for instance, goods had to be of high quality and the sale of liquor was prohibited. However, because Penn resided in the colony for less than five years, the laws were not strictly enforced.

Pennsylvania-Delaware land deals, like most other transactions between whites and Indians, were characterized by misunderstanding from the beginning, most often to the advantage of the Europeans settlers. Delawares understood land tenure differently from Europeans – for them, "ownership" related to what was on the land (i.e., hunting, fishing, and agricultural rights) during the course of the year, not the land itself.\(^84\) Because Delawares did not settle in one location, but moved around, European settlers felt that the land's potential was not being tapped, and, therefore, that they had a right to land, as William Cronon notes:

> English colonists could use Indian hunting and gathering as a justification for expropriating the land. To European eyes, Indians appeared to squander the resources that were available to them. Indian poverty was the result of Indian waste: underused land, underused natural abundance, underused human labor.\(^85\)

In addition to the problems created by different conceptions of land use, land deals in Pennsylvania were plagued by ill-defined boundaries that were liberally interpreted by English settlers. Unauthorized Indian vendors and frontier squatters, whom the government had difficulty controlling, also created considerable tension. Because of these factors, Delawares were forced north and west, up the Susquehanna River, by 1710. They were joined by refugees from other tribes – Shawnee, Conoy, Nanticoke, Mahican, Tutelo, Twightwee – who had left neighboring colonies because they were tired of being

---

\(^84\) Weslager, *The Delawares*, 37.  
\(^85\) Cronon, *Changes in the Land*, 50.
pushed off their lands and heard that the Pennsylvania frontier was friendly towards Indian populations. The Iroquois (particularly the Cayuga and Oneida) claimed land rights to the Susquehanna Valley, but allowed these tribes to live there in the hope that they would prevent whites from settling on these lands. However, this region was considerably less arable and contained less game than the lands to the east, making further movement west, to the Ohio Country, inevitable.86

After assessing the poor situation of Indians in Pennsylvania, Woolman contrasts it with the prosperity of Anglo-American settlement, not only in Pennsylvania, but along the entire Atlantic coast:

My own will and desires being now very much broken and my heart with much earnestness turned to the Lord, to whom alone I looked for help in the dangers before, me, I had a prospect of the English along the coast for upward of nine hundred miles where I have traveled. And the favourable situation of the English and the difficulties attending the natives in many places, and the Negroes, were open to me. And a weighty and heavenly care came over my mind, and love filled my heart toward all mankind, in which I felt a strong engagement that we might be obedient to the Lord while in tender mercies he is yet calling to us, and so attend to pure universal righteousness as to give no just cause of offense to the Gentiles, who do not profess Christianity, whether the blacks from Africa or the native inhabitants of this continent. And here I was led into a close, laborious inquiry whether I, as an individual, kept clear from all things which tended to stir

---

86 As Alden T. Vaughan has noted, “by the end of the mid-eighteenth century the best the Indian could expect was seclusion on an ever-shrinking reservation or westward migration in the face of an advancing colonial frontier” (Roots of American Racism [New York: Oxford University Press, 1995], 20).
up or were connected with wars, either in this land or Africa, and my heart was
deePLY concerned that in future I might in all things keep steadily to the pure
Truth and live and walk in the plainness and simplicity of a sincere follower of
Christ.

And in this lonely journey I did this day greatly bewail the spreading of a
wrong spirit, believing that the prosperous, convenient situation of the English
requires a constant attention to divine love and wisdom, to guide and support us in
a way answerable to the will of that good, gracious, and almighty Being who hath
an equal regard to all mankind. And here luxury and covetousness, with the
numerous oppressions and other evils attending them, appeared very afflicting to
me, and I felt in that which is immutable that the seeds of great calamity and
desolation are sown and growing fast on this continent. Nor have I words
sufficient to set forth that longing I then felt that we who are placed along coast,
and have tasted the love and goodness of God, might arise in his strength and like
faithful messengers labour to check the growth of these seeds, that they may not
ripen to the ruin of our posterity.\(^{87}\)

In this remarkable passage, Woolman clearly delineates the inequalities of American
colonial society: the English (and other European settlers) were favorably situated on the
coast, while the Indians and slaves lived in difficulty. This was particularly true of the

\(^{87}\) Ibid., 128-9. Anthony Benezet concludes his tract on Indians with a jeremiad-like warning: "Indeed we
cannot be too weighty in considering how we lay our foundation for future happiness or misery; as our
Saviour's declaration will be verified often, in time, and certainly in eternity: *That as we sow we shall reap;
and with that measure we meet, it shall be measured to us again.* And altho' the children are not
accountable for the iniquity of their fathers; yet where the children are basking and rejoicing in the ease and
plenty they enjoy thro' the sins of their fathers, as is peculiarly the case of those, who are possessed of
estates procured by hard measures towards Indians, or thro' the oppression of the Negroes; these as they
rejoice in those possessions, which the S I N has produced, cannot expect otherwise than, *to be partakers in
the P L A G U E* (Some Observations, 51).
middle Quaker colonies: after seventy years of settlement Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware had some 220,000 inhabitants. In Woolman's estimation, a "wrong spirit" was spreading, as English prosperity, luxury, and oppression grew fast, making a "great calamity" inevitable. His own response is to embrace "universal righteousness," and "keep clear from all things which tended to stir up or were connected with wars," living in "plainness and simplicity." Woolman's simplicity, then, is not isolated asceticism for its own sake, but a response to real oppression and injustice. If that "universal love" was ignored and the seeds of avarice were not checked, disaster awaited the heirs of English settlement in America.
Early in the morning of May 29, 1770, shortly after suffering from pleurisy, John Woolman had a dream that vividly dramatizes his anti-slavery ideology:

I dreamed a man had been hunting and brought a living creature to Mount Holly of a mixed breed, part fox and part cat. It appeared active in various motions, especially with its claws and teeth. I beheld and lo! many people gathering in the house where it was talked one to another, and after some time I perceived by their talk that an old Negro man was just now dead, and that his death was on this wise: They wanted flesh to feed this creature, and they wanted to be quit of the expense of keeping a man who through great age was unable to labour; so raising a long ladder against the house, they hanged the old man.

One woman spake lightly of it and signified she was sitting at the tea table when they hung him up, and though neither she nor any present said anything against their proceedings, yet she said at the sight of the old man dying, she could not go on with tea drinking.

I stood silent all this time and was filled with extreme sorrow at so horrible an action and now began to lament bitterly, like as some lament at the decease of a friend, at which lamentation some smiled, but none mourned with me.

One man spake in justification of what was done and said the flesh of the old Negro was wanted, not only that this creature might have plenty, but some
other creatures also wanted his flesh, which I apprehended from what he said were some hounds kept for hunting. I felt matter on my mind and would have spake to the man, but utterance was taken from me and I could not speak to him. And being in great distress I continued wailing till I began to wake, and opening my eyes I perceived it was morning.¹

Woolman does not offer a detailed interpretation of the dream, but in the margin of the journal manuscript does write his understanding of some of its symbolism: "A fox is cunning; a cat is often idle; hunting represents vain delights; tea drinking with which there is sugar points out the slavery of the Negroes, with which many are oppressed to the shortening of their days."² This dream clearly reflects Woolman's great concern over slavery, and the feeling that his "testimony" against it was not shared by many. Particularly striking is the cold deliberateness of the slave murder: food is needed for the family's new, wild "pet" (the product of hunting, or "vanity") and the old, used-up slave is dispatched. A woman's ritual of drinking tea is spoiled, but she speaks of the offense "lightly." Given Woolman's marginal comment, a connection can be made between the consumption of the slave's body for vanity and the consumption of sugar, the product that came at the expense of the life-blood of West Indian slaves. That hounds are fed in addition to the wild creature shows the utterly unspeakable degradation of the slave's body, as during the dream Woolman is literally deprived of utterance. The slave is worth less than a beast to the dream's company, and, once his usefulness has been exhausted, he is cannibalized for the sustenance of "other" beasts.

² Ibid., 162.
Woolman’s opposition to slavery began in his youth, when he was asked by his employer, a shop owner to whom he was apprenticed, to draft a bill of sale for an African slave. In his journal Woolman details his response:

The thing was sudden, and though the thoughts of writing an instrument of slavery for one of my fellow creatures felt uneasy, yet I remembered I was hired by the year, that it was my master who directed me to do it, and that it was an elderly man, a member of our Society, who bought her; so through weakness I gave way and wrote it, but at the executing it, I was so afflicted in my mind that I said before my master and the Friend that I believed slavekeeping to be a practice inconsistent with the Christian religion. This in some degree abated my uneasiness, yet as often as I reflected seriously upon it I thought I should have been clearer if I had desired to be excused from it as a thing against my conscience, for such it was.3

Because of this incident, Woolman became more convinced about the wrongfulness of slavery, and several months later, when another Quaker asked him to "write an instrument of slavery," Woolman was prepared to respond: "I told him I was not easy to write it, for though many kept slaves in our Society, as in others, I still believed the practice was not right, and desired to be excused from writing it." The young man responded that "keeping slaves was not altogether agreeable in his mind," but because the slave had been a gift to his wife, he had taken her in.4

3 Ibid., 32-33.
4 Ibid., 33. The issue of inherited slaves would plague Quaker debate about slavery into the 1770's.
Woolman's Exposure to Southern Slavery

Another formative event in Woolman's abolitionism was his first exposure to the slavery of the southern colonies during his visit to Friends in Maryland, Virginia, and Carolina in 1746. As he put it, "two things were remarkable to me in this journey":

First, in regard to my entertainment: When I eat, drank, and lodged free-cost with people who lived in ease on the hard labour of their slaves, I felt uneasy; and as my mind was inward to the Lord, I found, from place to place, this uneasiness return upon me at times through the whole visit. Where the masters bore a good share of the burden and lived frugal, so that their servants were well provided for and their labour moderate, I felt more easy; but where they lived in a costly way and laid heavy burdens on their slaves, my exercise was often great, and I frequently had conversation with them in private concerning it. Secondly, this trade of importing them from their native country being much encouraged amongst them and the white people and their children so generally living without much labour was frequently the subject of my serious thoughts. And I saw in these southern provinces so many vices and corruptions increased by this trade and this way of life that it appeared to me as a dark gloominess hanging over the land; and though now many willingly run into it, yet in future the consequence will be grievous to posterity!\(^5\)

It was customary for a traveling minister to stay with fellow Friends on his journey, but this practice presented a problem for Woolman because it put him in a position where he

\(^5\) Ibid., 38.
directly benefited from slave labor. His conscience was less troubled when his hosts were kindly and caring for their slaves, but was not completely "easy." More essentially, in accordance with his approach to material possessions, Woolman objects to masters who live luxuriously off their slaves rather than in simplicity and frugality. In addition, Woolman became concerned with the legacy of slavery for the children of the master class, who were being reared in an environment of leisure produced by the hard labor of slaves. Because of this injustice, a "dark gloominess" hung over the land, threatening an apocalypse for Quakerism in these southern provinces.

Eleven years later, Woolman visited coreligionists in the South again, and in his account expands his thinking on the issues of how to respond to slave-produced hospitality and the moral effects of slavery. On this journey, Woolman is clearer in his mind about whether he should accept hospitality from slaveholding Friends. He comes to the conclusion that if he did so, he would, in effect, be condoning the evil and benefiting from the "gain of oppression":

As it is common for Friends on a visit to have entertainment free [of] cost, a difficulty arose in my mind with respect to saving my own money by kindness received which to me appeared to be the gain of oppression. Receiving a gift, considered as a gift, brings the receiver under obligations to the benefactor and has a natural tendency to draw the obliged into a party with the giver.6

Woolman then continues by explaining the biblical model of the disciples of Christ, who were sent out to preach the gospel, and did not take provision with them, but relied on the gifts of those "whose hearts God had opened to receive them, from a love to them and the

6 Ibid., 59.
Truth they published.” After a time of "exercise" – "Many were the afflictions which attended me, and in great abasement with many tears, my cries were to the Almighty for his gracious and fatherly assistance" – Woolman embraced the following solution:

The way in which I did it was thus: When I expected soon to leave a Friend's house where I had entertainment, if I believed that I should not keep clear from the gain of oppression without leaving money, I spoke to one of the heads of the family privately and desired them to accept of them pieces of silver and give them to such of their Negroes as they believed would make best use of them; and at other times I gave them to the Negroes myself, as the way looked clearest to me. Woolman remarks that this approach was awkward at times, particularly when his hosts appeared to be moneyed, but that the "fear of the Lord" made the task easier than he had expected and that "few if any manifested any resentment at the offer." Woolman's scruple demonstrates a recognition that the labor of slaves was unlawfully (in the moral sense) taken from them and, therefore, they were entitled to monetary compensation.

Woolman's striking approach of "keep[ing] clear from the gain of oppression," foreshadows twentieth-century discussions of reparations for slavery.

Speaking of the musical contribution of African-Americans in The Souls of Black Folk (1903), W. E. B. DuBois is moved to remark on the debt that Euro-America owes to black "hands":

Your country? How came it yours? Before the Pilgrims landed we were here.

Here we have brought our three gifts and mingled them with yours: a gift of story and song – soft, stirring melody in an ill-harmonized and unmelodious land; the

7 Ibid., 59-60.
8 Ibid., 60.
gift of sweat and brawn to beat back the wilderness, conquer the soil, and lay the foundations of this vast economic empire two hundred years earlier than your weak hands could have done it; the third, a gift of the Spirit. . . . Would American have been America without her Negro people?9

Although Woolman came to the point where he denounced the pursuit of the material – i.e., what eventuated in the "vast economic empire" that Du Bois speaks of – his insistence on paying for work done by slaves reflects a concern over the potential complicity of those who did not own slaves. It also demonstrates the centrality of free or cheap labor to the "success" of empire. Woolman's movement away from economic prosperity sharpens his perception of the injustices that feed it. More recently, Frantz Fanon has addressed the issue of remuneration for colonialist forced labor and slavery. He calls attention to the rhetoric of European nations after the fall of Nazism ("Germany will pay!") and notes its distinction from their approach to newly-founded, post-colonial nation-states. For him, the "moral reparation" of independence (i.e., withdrawal of colonizing forces) was not enough:

We are not blinded by the moral reparation of national identity, nor are we fed by it. The wealth of the imperial countries is our wealth too . . . . For in a very concrete way Europe has stuffed itself inordinately with the gold and raw materials of the colonial countries . . . . Europe is literally the creation of the Third World.10

---

10 Fanon, The Wretched of the Earth, 102.
Woolman recognizes a similar principle at work in the southern colonies: that prosperity came at the cost of the oppressed, and he tries to put himself in a position so as not to benefit from that oppression and thereby implicitly condone it.\textsuperscript{11}

During the 1757 visit to the southern colonies, Woolman was not only repulsed by the physical oppression of slaves, but also by the moral oppression of the practice on children of slave-holding families. He denounces the physical and spiritual indolence that slavery often fosters in his account of a conversation with a Port Royal, Virginia colonel:

\begin{quote}
I took occasion to remark on the odds in general betwixt a people used to labour moderately for their living, training up their children in frugality and business, and those who live on the labour of slaves, the former in my view being the most happy life; with which he concurred and mentioned the trouble arising from the untoward, slothful disposition of the Negroes, adding that one of our labourers would do as much in a day as two of their slaves. I replied that free men whose minds were properly on their business found a satisfaction in improving, cultivating, and providing for their families, but Negroes, labouring to support others who claim them as their property and expecting nothing but slavery during life, had not the like inducement to be industrious.
\end{quote}

Although the colonel agrees with Woolman's assessment about slavery and slothfulness, his focus is not on the children of slaveholding families, but the slaves themselves.

Woolman argues that oppression can hardly be expected to produce efficiency, since slaves enjoy no temporal benefits from their labor.\footnote{Ibid., 61. During this trip Woolman also confronted the argument that blacks were offspring of Cain, and, as such, were cursed with blackness, the mark of God. Woolman counters from the prophets who "declare that the son shall not suffer for the iniquity of the father, but every one be answerable for his own sins." Woolman then comments on "the darkness of their imaginations" in reference to the use of "weak arguments" in support of slavery and the "love of ease and gain," the primary motive, as he sees it, for keeping slaves. The "spirit of this world" feeds and feeds off of slavery (\textit{Journal}, 62-3).}

**Woolman's Anti-Slavery Tracts**

Woolman's influential tract \textit{Some Considerations on the Keeping of Negroes: Recommended to the Professors of Christianity of Every Denomination\footnote{Woolman also appeals to the "general brotherhood" of all humanity, a common argument in early abolitionist literature, citing Genesis 3:20 ("And Adam called his wife's name Eve; because she was the mother of all living") ("Some Observations" I, in \textit{Journal}, 200).} (Part I, published 1754), in which he exposes the "darkness in the understanding" regarding slavery and racism, was partly the result of his first visit to Friends in the southern colonies. In it he critiques the common arguments for slavery and, in so doing, deconstructs the notion of racial inferiority used to justify the practice. Woolman pins his entire treatise on the Christian notion of fraternal equality, taking his epigraph from Matthew 25:40, "Forasmuch as ye did it to the least of these my brethren, ye did it unto me."\footnote{\textit{Some Observations} I, in \textit{Journal}, 200.} This scriptural passage is similar conceptually to the "golden rule," which Woolman also quotes: "Whatever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye even so to them." (Matthew 7:12). He then restates the principle: "How should I approve of this conduct were I in their circumstances and they in mine?" But with the Matthean passage of the epigraph even more is at stake: the way one treats a fellow human being is the way one treats Christ himself. One properly reads an acknowledgment of outward inferiority in Woolman's appropriation of the New Testament text ("the least of these"), but then moral
relations regard inward and spiritual equality, as indicated by Christ's own identification with the "least."  

The basis of fraternal equality in Woolman's argument against slavery is the universality of divine love: "For, as God's love is universal, so where the mind is sufficiently influenced by it it begets a likeness of itself and the heart is enlarged towards all men."  

The all-pervading influence of this love is apparent early in Woolman's journal:

[I] was early convinced in my mind that true religion consisted in an inward life, wherein the heart doth love and reverence God the Creator and learn to exercise true justice and goodness, not only toward all men but also toward the brute creatures; that as the mind was moved on an inward principle to love God as an invisible, incomprehensible being, on the same principle it was moved to love him in all his manifestations in the visible world; that as by his breath the flame of life was kindled in all animal and sensitive creatures, to say we love God as unseen and at the same time exercise cruelty toward the least creature moving by his life, or by life derived from him, was a contradiction in itself.  

For Woolman, the love of God – the heart of the "inward life" – manifested itself in love for all to whom God had given the breath of life. Cruelty was an anomaly, because of God's immanent presence in his creation, which renders all creatures equal. In Some Considerations Woolman acknowledges differences in the material conditions of whites and blacks, but these ultimately are subsumed by divine love, which, ideally expressed,

14 Woolman, Journal and Essays, 200-203. The appeal to the universality of Christ's death was not new with Woolman. George Fox also had argued against slavery from this perspective.  
15 Ibid., 202.  
knows no favoritism. In reference to relations between humans, William Christian has noted that this "sense of divine brotherhood begotten by the divine love requires real equality. Fraternity is incompatible with domination or submission." Woolman is interested, then, in de-mastering relations between whites and blacks by pitting the love of God against the love of dominion, which "was corrupting the whites of his generation and hardening them to the blatant injustice of their relations with Blacks." But, for Woolman, the God who loves is also the God who judges. One was answerable to God, and therefore love had to be put into action. Mere feeling was not enough: Woolman's "strong sense of God's justice and power saved him from sentimentality." And yet, despite this assertion of innate equality, one might still perceive in Woolman a degree of Eurocentric condescension towards the slaves, seen in his comment about "the general disadvantage which these poor Africans lie under in an enlightened Christian country." But Woolman's focus is on culturally imposed effects, not on innate characteristics, while his irony suggests that if a Christian country were truly enlightened, it would not generate disadvantages for anyone. And yet, precisely these "disadvantages," as a corrupt Christianity imposed them, were being seized on to justify slavery. However, for Woolman, one must get past ephemeral differences and be mindful of that Christian faith which erases rather than creates of reifies distinctions:

But when we forget [the "general brotherhood" of all in Christ] and look chiefly at our outward circumstances, in this and some ages past, constantly retaining in our

minds the distinction betwixt us and them with respect to our knowledge and improvement in things divine, natural, and artificial, our breasts being apt to be filled with fond notions of superiority, there is danger of erring in our conduct toward them.\(^{20}\)

Woolman, in effect, de-masters slavery by arguing that there is only one Master, who is "no respecter of persons," a basic assumption which not only erases cultural differences but universalizes the notion of God's favor: "To consider mankind otherwise than brethren, to think favours are peculiar to one nation and exclude others, plainly supposes a darkness in the understanding."\(^{21}\) Woolman does acknowledge that the American colonies had been extraordinarily "blessed" with material prosperity, using the trope of Israel's travail in the wilderness and its arrival at the promised land:

\[
\text{The wilderness and solitary deserts in which our fathers passed the days of their pilgrimage are now turned into pleasant fields. The natives are now gone from before us, and we establish peaceably in the possession of the land, enjoying our civil and religious liberties. And while many parts of the world have groaned under the heavy calamities of war, our habitation remains quiet and our land fruitful.}^{22}\]

But blessing is not indicative of divine favor based on superiority – rather it entails moral responsibility to those less blessed. Woolman states that it should "excite in us a Christian benevolence towards our inferiors" – that is, again, towards those less well circumstanced. And because all humanity are connected,

\(^{21}\) Ibid., 201, 202.
\(^{22}\) Ibid., 207.
Whoever rightly advocates the cause of some thereby promotes the good of all. The state of mankind was harmonious in the beginning; and though sin hath introduced discord yet through the wonderful love of God in Christ Jesus our Lord, the way is open for our redemption, and means appointed to restore us to primitive harmony.\textsuperscript{23}

Promoting the notion of the "good of all" is key to Woolman's concern, clearly rooted in the Christian gospel (i.e., Christ's redemptive work) which makes "primitive harmony" possible once more. Christ is essential as redeemer, the paragon of love in practice:

\begin{quote}
Now this mind being in us, which was in Christ Jesus, it removes from our hearts the desire of Superiority, worldly honours or greatness. A deep attention is felt to the Divine Counsellor, and an ardent engagement to promote, as far as we may be enabled, the happiness of mankind universally.\textsuperscript{24}
\end{quote}

The notion of universal human happiness implies a symbiotic, global community, related to Churchman's response to the mutilated corpse incident of December 1755. Churchman states it negatively: violence against some is violence against all. Woolman states it positively: advocating the cause of some advances the good of all. In "Some Considerations on Trade," Woolman restates the idea, depicting humanity as an interdependent "family":

\begin{quote}
Where one in the family is injured, it appears consistent with true Brotherhood, that such who know it, take due care respecting their own behavior and conduct,
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{23} Ibid., 208.

\textsuperscript{24} John Woolman, "The True Harmony of Mankind," in The Journal and Essays of John Woolman, ed. Amelia Mott Gummere (Philadelphia: Friends Book Store, 1922), 448-49. The first part of the quotation ("this mind being in us, which was in Christ Jesus . . .") uses the language of Philippians 2:5-8, where Paul speaks of the "kenosis," or emptying – the complex theological notion that Christ voluntarily laid aside (or emptied himself of) the prerogatives of divinity and took on human form to redeem humanity, through a humiliating death on a Roman cross.
lest the love of gain should lead them into any affairs, so connected with the
proceedings of him who doth the injury, as to strengthen his hands therein, make
him more at ease in a wrong way, or less likely to Attend to the Righteous
principle in his own mind.  

In Woolman and Churchman there is a sense of kinship, however Eurocentric and
Christocentric, with oppressed slaves and Indians. As Margaret Stewart has noted, "The
enslavement of Blacks, the expropriation of Native Americans, incipient capitalist
exploitation – all found matching inverted reflections in Woolman's emphasis on kinship
with people of color." Rather than "strengthen" the hand of the oppressor, and in so
doing make that person more at ease in his or her injurious behavior, one had to keep
clear of the gain of unrighteousness through scrupulous vigilance.

Part II of Some Considerations on the Keeping of Negroes, completed in late 1761
and published the following year, is more sharply critical of complicity in the
"world" than Part I, perhaps because it was written after Quaker withdrawal from the
Pennsylvania government. The material conditions of slavery and the slave are the
primary targets of attack. In the introduction, Woolman denounces "idolatry," the evil
root of the system of slavery. He argues that those who perpetuate it are "more intent on
the honours, profits, and friendships of the world than [they are] in singleness of heart to
stand faithful to the Christian religion." And, again, for Woolman the essence of

---

25 Woolman, "Some Considerations on Trade," in Gummere, 400.
26 Stewart, "John Woolman's 'Kindness'," 272.
27 Woolman, "Some Considerations" II, in Journal, 210. Anthony Benezet, who restates many of
Woolman's arguments in A Caution to Great Britain and Her Colonies in a Short Representation of the
Calamitous State of the Enslaved Negroes in the British Dominions (London, 1767), also cites greed as the
primary reason for the perpetuation of slavery: "Thus an insatiable desire of gain hath become the principle
and moving cause of the most abominable and dreadful scene that was perhaps acted upon the face of the
earth" (20).
Christianity is to "love God sincerely and prefer the real good of mankind universally to [one's] own private interest." 28 Ultimately, there is a choice between luxury and simplicity, between righteous living and the "folly" of those "who lay heavy burdens on others to support themselves in a luxurious way of living." Woolman's criticism is not so much against wealth itself, as it is against how that wealth is produced and utilized. In Part I Woolman had warned, not against the wealth transferred to one's children, but the legacy of injustice that slavery passes on to future generations – that it is a snare for children who grow up "lording it over their fellow creatures." 29

Woolman also moves beyond skin-level distinctions that were used to justify slavery, identifying dress as a reification of racial categories. Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths, and Helen Triffin have noted the following about Western constructions of the Other: "The 'difference' of the post-colonial subject by which s/he can be 'othered' is felt most directly and immediately in the way in which the superficial differences of the body and voice (skin color, eye shape, hair texture, body shape, language, dialect or accent) are read as indelible signs of the 'natural' inferiority of their possessors." 30 In Some Observations, Part II, Woolman comments on the deceptiveness of dress and skin color. Many in his time argued that blacks deserved slavery because they lacked "honor, riches, outward magnificence [and] power, their dress coarse and often ragged, their employ drudgery and much in the dirt." 31 But according to Woolman these conditions are often forced on slaves to keep them in a state of degradation: "Placing on men the ignominious

---

28 Ibid., 211.
29 Ibid., 205-6. But the moral dilemma is not put off for future generations to sort out – it is a present danger, an impending storm that requires immediate attention: "Where unrighteousness is justified from one age, it is like dark matter gathering into clouds over us" (212).
title SLAVE, dressing them in uncomely garments, keeping them to servile labor in
which they are often dirty, tends gradually to fix a notion in the mind that they are a sort
of people below us in nature."32 Here Woolman attacks the colonialist tactic of definition
through symbolic inversion: using the "native" (or an imported form of native) at the
conceptual level to define the notion of the civilized, and at the material level to accrue
great economic advantage. The slave's humanity is effaced by ill-treatment and, in turn,
he or she is treated horribly because of his or her miserable living conditions and
powerlessness to escape them. But Woolman states that even if blacks were poor and
wretched because they deserved it (as many slavery advocates argued), "true charity," the
ideal for all Christians, should "sympathize with the afflicted in the lowest stations of
life." Woolman makes much of this notion of slavery as a mental construct: "[I]deas of
Negroes and slaves are so interwoven in the mind." Racist assumptions about African
slaves are perpetuated because "slavery [is] connected with the black color and liberty
with the white."33

In Part II Woolman also denounces slavery because of the violence it engendered:
"[A] haughty spirit is cherished on one side and the desire of revenge frequently on the
other, till the inhabitants of the land are ripe for great commotion and trouble."34
Woolman illustrates this "trouble" by including vivid first-hand accounts of the slave
trade from Africa which describe the selection process, in which slaves were herded like
cattle, stripped, sorted, and branded.35 He mentions the complicity of Africans in the

32 Ibid., 221.
33 Ibid., 225,6.
34 Ibid., 227.
35 In A Caution to Great Britain and Her Colonies in a Short Representation of the Calamitous State of the
Enslaved Negroes in the British Dominions (London, 1767), Anthony Benezet also details the "misery and
bloodshed" of slavery from the kidnapping of children to the collection centers on the West African coast,
trade, who willingly sell one another to Europeans for gain. However, Woolman attributes greater responsibility for the evil to Europeans, who had exponentially expanded the scale of human misery: "[T]hough there were wars and desolations among the Negroes before the Europeans began to trade there for slaves, yet now the calamities are greatly increased." In light of the increased violence perpetuated by the trade, Woolman argues that any involvement is complicity in the shedding of innocent blood:

Should we meditate on the wars which are greatly increased by this trade and on that affliction which many thousands live in, through apprehensions of being taken or slain; on the terror and amazement that villages are in when surrounded by those troops of enterprizers; on the great pain and misery of groaning dying men who get wounded in those skirmishes; we shall necessarily see that it is impossible to be parties in such a trade on the motives of gain and retain our innocence.36

Indeed, for Woolman great distance from the centers of the slave trade does not lessen one's partnership in the evils it perpetrates: "To willingly join with unrighteousness to the injury of men who live some 1000 miles off is the same in substance as joining with it to the injury of our neighbours."37 Woolman enlarges – even globalizes – the geography of the Christian notion of "neighbor," based on his belief in God's sovereign gaze:

He seeth their affliction and looketh upon the spreading, increasing exaltation of the oppressor. He turns the channels of power, humbles the most haughty people,

---

37 Ibid., 233.
and gives deliverance to the oppressed at such periods as are consistent with his infinite justice and goodness.  

Woolman's critique of potential complicity in the modes of production and consumption related to slavery is epitomized by his scruple with sugar. He recounts in detail his struggle with West Indies products – particularly rum, sugar, and molasses – because they were "the fruits of the labour of slaves." His boycott of these products, designed "to bear a consistent testimony against the method by which [they were] produced," foreshadows the free produce movement, the most significant attack on slavery before Garrisonian abolitionism. In 1770, when he desired to travel to Barbados, he had difficulty taking a trade ship at a low cost because, in his words, "I should not take the advantage of this great trade and small passage money." Again emphasizing the importance of attending to "universal righteousness," Woolman warns against conducting business – of any sort, however peripheral – with those who are connected with the slave trade:

To trade freely with oppressors and, without labouring to dissuade from such unkind treatment, seek for gain by such traffic tends, I believe, to make them more easy respecting their conduct than they would be if the cause of universal righteousness was humbly and firmly attended to by those in general with whom they have commerce.

---

38 Ibid., 237.
39 Woolman, Journal, 156.
As in the case of the hospitality of southern Quaker slave owners, Woolman finds a way out of this moral dilemma through monetary compensation: for his passage to Barbados he offered to "pay more than is common for others to pay." In the end, he did not go to the West Indies, but nevertheless remained with a strong sense of the "groans of [the] oppressed people" there, as well as "a tender feeling of the temptations of my fellow creatures labouring under those expensive customs distinguishable from 'the simplicity that there is in Christ' (2 Cor. 11:3)."41

**The Quaker Response to Anti-Slavery Reform**

Part I of *Some Considerations on the Keeping of Negroes* was approved by the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting in September 1754 because Woolman had worked through proper channels and because of the changing face of Quaker leadership in the early 1750’s. Between 1681 and 1753, at least one-third of the Yearly Meeting leaders were slave owners and more than two-thirds of the overseers of the press during the same period had slaves.42 Of the thirteen Quakers whose careers ended in the Yearly Meeting between 1742 and 1753, ten owned slaves. But, of the fifty weighty Friends whose careers began between 1746 and 1755, including John Woolman and Anthony Benezet, only four owned slaves after 1760 (and two of these were forced out of leadership roles by 1756). In the case of the overseers of the press, a special committee of the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting that regulated publication, eight of the fourteen who served

---

42 Jean R. Soderlund, *Quakers and Slavery: A Divided Spirit* (Princeton UP, 1985), 47. For instance, James Logan (1674-1751), who served for many years as the Penn family’s secretary and chief representative in the province, was also a slaveholder and overseer of the press.
died or resigned by 1752. Six replacements were appointed in that year, of whom only two had slaves.\textsuperscript{43}

Slavery had been a topic of controversy throughout the history of the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting. Indeed, from the beginning of New World settlement, "individual Friends pointed out that slavery was inconsistent with the Society's beliefs in nonviolence, the equality of people all in the sight of God, and the sinfulness of ostentation, but they were unable to convince the Yearly Meeting."\textsuperscript{44} However, the crisis of the early 1750’s brought it to the fore. In 1753, the Buckingham Monthly Meeting asked Bucks Quarterly Meeting what to do about Friends who bought imported slaves, and Bucks referred them to the 1730 Yearly Meeting minute advising Friends to admonish slave buyers. But that did not settle the issue and in 1754 slavery was a hot topic at the Yearly Meeting, which not only approved Woolman's anti-slavery tract but also produced and published \textit{An Epistle of Caution and Advice Concerning the Buying and Keeping of Slaves}, a tract which reiterated many of Woolman's arguments. Soderlund notes that the epistle "represented an important shift in the Society's policy. For the first time the Yearly Meeting suggested to its members that slaveholding itself, and not just importation, was an un-Christian practice."\textsuperscript{45} The epistle begins by lamenting the apparent increase of slavery and its negative moral consequences – "that, where Slave keeping prevails, pure Religion and Sobriety decline." As with Woolman's tracts, it appeals to the "royal law, of doing to others, as we would be done by," and the

\textsuperscript{43} Ibid., 43-44.
\textsuperscript{44} Soderlund, \textit{Quakers and Slavery}, 173. Two of the most famous of early critics were George Keith, who criticized slavery in the 1690's, and Benjamin Lay, who was excommunicated in 1739 for his radical stance against the practice.
\textsuperscript{45} Ibid., 27.
Mosaic law which prohibits "Man-stealing." It also cites the egalitarian nature of the redemptive work of Christ ("Christ died for all Men, without respect of Persons") and the exemplary love of Christ ("Love and good Works; our Saviour's whole Life on Earth was one continual exercise of them"). The epistle then concludes with an admonition to slave-holders to remember their "Duty to set them free" and "to weigh the Cause of detaining them in Bondage"; if they were after "private Gain," their "hearts [were] not sufficiently redeemed from the World." This language indicates that the Meeting had not yet reached the point of complete abolitionism – the notion of "weighing the cause" of having slaves implies that there could be a legitimate reason for doing so – but represents a forceful step in that direction.

Because of the influence of the 1754 Epistle and Woolman's *Observations*, antislavery gained momentum in the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting. In the 1755 meeting, a resolution was drafted instructing local meetings to ask their members, "Are Friends clear of importing and buying Negroes and do they use those well which they are possessed of by Inheritance or otherwise endeavouring to train them up in the Principles of the Christian Religion." But monthly meetings struggled with the enforcement of this minute and, as a result, the Philadelphia Quarterly Meeting appointed a committee to discuss the issue, urging the Yearly Meeting to elucidate or rewrite the 1755 query. The 1758 Philadelphia Yearly Meeting discussed the matter, but with no little controversy, as Woolman relates in his journal. In communicating his position to fellow leaders,

---

48 Ibid., 6,7.
Woolman first emphasizes God's disapproval of slavery: "Many slaves on this continent are oppressed, and their cries have reached the ears of the Most High!" He then calls for positive action, warning of the impending judgment for failure to do so:

Should we now be sensible of what he requires of us . . . and neglect to do our duty in firmness and constancy, still waiting for some extraordinary means to bring about their deliverance, it may be that by terrible things in righteousness God may answer us in this matter.

In response to this speech, several slave-owning Friends suggested a ban on future slave purchases. However, according to Woolman, other leaders responded that "the root of this evil would never be effectually struck at until a thorough search was made into the circumstances of such Friends who kept Negroes, in regards to the righteousness of their motives in keeping them, that impartial justice might be administered throughout."50

At this juncture in the discussion, it was suggested that a group of men be appointed to visit Quakers who owned slaves, to inquire into the "righteousness of their motives." This measure was approved and a committee answerable to the Yearly Meeting was created, which included, besides Woolman and Churchman, John Sykes (1682-1771), a farmer from the Chesterfield Monthly Meeting (and active in the Yearly Meeting since 1728), John Scarborough (1704-1769), a farmer from the Buckingham Monthly Meeting, and Daniel Stanton (1708-1777), a Philadelphia joiner. These men conducted visitations of slave-owning co-religionists between November 1758 and August 1761, discontinuing in 1762 because they felt concern over slavery had spread sufficiently. Woolman records his visits to fellow Friends who owned slaves in

50 Woolman, Journal, 93.
December 1758, and again the following March. He was accompanied by John Churchman who writes that there were "some heavy labours" in this work (Woolman refers to "sharp conflicts"), but because of "[d]ivine love in a tender sympathy prevailing at times, [there was] a hope that these endeavours would not be in vain."51 Regarding his participation, Daniel Stanton relates that slavery was a "weighty concern" for leaders in the Yearly Meeting of 1758, and "for further reformations from the practice of keeping slaves for term of life," a committee was formed for visitation to slave-owning Friends "to advise their liberty."52

In addition to this committee, Woolman notes the progress made in the 1758 meeting in terms of an official minute against slavery:

[M]any Friends declared that they believed liberty was the Negroes' right, to which at length no opposition was made publicly, so that a minute was made more full on that subject than any heretofore and the names of several Friends entered who were free to join in a visit to such who kept slaves.53

The minute that Woolman refers to expresses the leaders' desire "to take every Method in [their] Power consistent with true Wisdom and Charitee to put a stop to the Practice."

For those who continued practicing slavery, "the respective Monthly Meetings to which they belong should manifest their disunion with such persons by refusing to permit them to sit in Meetings for Discipline or to be employed in the Affairs of Truth, or to receive from them any contribution towards the Relief of the Poor, or other Services of the

52 Daniel Stanton, Journal, 111.
53 Woolman, Journal, 93.
Meeting." The Meeting also recommended that those who manumitted their slaves make "a Christian provision for them according to their Ages."\(^{54}\)

Woolman, however, was not content with political victories in the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting, understanding that the actual oppression of slavery could not extirpated by meeting minutes, however strictly enforced. Indeed, slavery continued to be the major concern of Woolman's journal beyond this period of visitations. In 1766, Woolman traveled to the eastern shore of Maryland, but by foot, "that by so travelling I might have a more lively feeling of the condition of the oppressed slaves, set an example of lowliness before the eyes of their masters, and be more out of the way of temptation to unprofitable familiarities."\(^{55}\) As with his journey to the Indian village at Wyalusing three years before, Woolman attempts to induce a state of empathy with those in suffering. This demonstrates his commitment to "keep clear from the gain of oppression," as he provides an example of humility and simplicity to slave owners, whose love of luxury perpetuated the evil system. Woolman could not stomach the oppressive affluence of Anglo-American society, which, as illustrated by his dream-vision regarding the cannibalization of the old, worn-out slave, literally consumed the life-blood of Indians and Africans, as it appropriated the land of the former and the labor of the latter.


\(^{55}\) Journal, 145.
CONCLUSION

The reforms that began to be enacted and enforced by the leadership of the Delaware Valley Quakers in the 1750's, such as a new discipline structure and anti-slavery, had major ramifications for the demographics of the religious community. With a stricter enforcement of the Quaker code, membership decreased and the movement's status in the American colonies notably declined. In the mid-eighteenth century, then, despite the preeminence of "the Quaker City" in the American colonies, Quakers moved from a position of material and political privilege to a more marginal yet ethically stronger space. The present study has traced this movement away from the "world," with the corollary emphases on pacifism, Indian land rights and the abolition of slavery. Although the stance adopted by the Quaker leadership against slavery and fraudulent or deceptive land deals was counterhegemonic, only a few leaders, such as Woolman, Benezet, and Churchman, critiqued racialized assumptions of the Other, which were the cause and consequence of injustice and inequality.

The connection between Indian warfare and slavery is most easily understood in relation to Quaker self-interest – that is, their stake in the "Holy Experiment" of Pennsylvania. Many leaders saw the frontier attacks as punishment for the toleration of slavery, as seen in Churchman's comments on the corpse incident, and, consequently, the restoration of the peace of Pennsylvania and the "name" of the Society of Friends meant correcting the injustices of ill-gotten gain in land and labor. To fail to do so would bring on the kind of apocalypse that Isaac Child relates in his vision. In Part II of Some Observations on the Keeping of Negroes, Woolman cites the Old Testament example of
Israel, who suffered the destruction of their civilization because they "had erred in their conduct towards the stranger." He also notes, in reference to the slave wars, that "luxury and oppression have the seeds of war and desolation in them," a notion which he applied to the Seven Years' War.¹ Oppressed Indians and slaves are constructed through Quaker ideology – particularly, the notion of Christ's universal love – which, although uncharacteristic of dominant colonialist discourse in its advocacy of land rights and the abolition of slavery, reflects Eurocentric assumptions about "civilization" and the exclusivity of religious "truth."

After the declaration of war against the Eastern Delaware in April 1756, there was a flurry of Quaker activity, spearheaded by Israel Pemberton, to restore peace and prevent open war. Many weighty Quakers were involved in the Friendly Association's attempts to broker a peace deal with the Lenni Lenape, under the leadership of Teedyuscung, particularly during the numerous conferences at Easton (1756-62). But Quaker ministers, such as John Churchman, Daniel Stanton, and John Woolman, although supportive of the organization, showed little interest in active participation, in part because of the continual political wrangling and controversy in which the association was embroiled. In their efforts to restore peace with the Delaware, the Friendly Association had to negotiate not only with the aggrieved Delaware, but also with the Iroquois, who claimed authority over them, the Pennsylvania governor, who served the interests of the proprietary family, the colonial assembly, and the British imperial government, represented by the Superintendent of Indian Affairs, William Johnson, and the head of the British ministry, William Pitt.

The Association's attempt to validate Teedyuscung's claim of land fraud and
discredit Thomas Penn ultimately failed, because Teedyuscung accepted a nominal
monetary indemnity from the imperial government in June 1762. And Quaker support of
the Delaware, which had been sharply criticized throughout the duration of the war,
became untenable when a number of the tribe joined in Pontiac's Rebellion the following
year, carrying out raids on western Pennsylvanian settlements and even conducting a
siege of Fort Pitt. It was during these hostilities that John Woolman visited the Indian
settlement at Wyalusing. In 1764, the Friendly Association ceased to be active, but,
despite their inability to substantiate land fraud, they did play a major role in bringing the
Eastern Delaware back into the Anglo-axis of influence. In 1768, at Fort Stanwix on the
Mohawk River, the Iroquois sold much of the Susquehanna Valley to Pennsylvania,
along with vast tracts of land in the Ohio Country. Once again, Indian communities were
pushed West, and their miserable "situation," which Woolman had deplored in 1763,
worsened.

In 1773, following repeated requests for teachers, Zebulon Heston and John
Parrish visited the Ohio Delaware. But the Revolutionary War disrupted their efforts,
particularly since the Indians sided with the British. After the war, however, Quakers
renewed their attempt to establish a mission amongst local Indians. In 1790 several
factors sparked this interest. First, Philadelphia, as the capital of the new nation, was the
focal point of the management of Indian affairs. Secondly, three Seneca chiefs came to
the city (Cornplanter, Big Tree, and Half Town) requesting instruction in the ways of
white men for their children.\(^2\) In 1792 the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting established the

\(^2\) Bauman, For the Reputation of the Truth, 202.
Indian Committee to educate Native Americans in religion and agricultural technology. The following year they began a mission among the Allegheny Seneca, and, in 1796, among the Oneida.

Perhaps Quaker leaders threw their weight into anti-slavery more willingly because it was less politically contentious than supporting the Delaware. Abolition was promoted within the Society itself and conflict was limited to coreligionists who, at least nominally, shared the same moral values. By 1776 Delaware Valley Quakers had successfully eradicated slavery from the Society, but to what extent was this success the product of reformist efforts is debatable. Slavery had existed in Philadelphia, the center of Quaker power, since December 1684, when 150 slaves were imported to meet the high demand for labor. At the time the population of the city was around 2000; so the African slaves formed a sizeable minority. Between 1687 and 1705, around one in fifteen Philadelphia families owned slaves. However because of the high import duties on slaves, imposed after 1712, slave importation fell off. And from 1732 to 1756, because of the influx of German, and Scots-Irish redemptioners and indentured servants, slave purchases among Quakers were low. As Gary Nash has noted, Quakers generally preferred indentured European servants to African slaves.

However, the onslaught of the Seven Years' War in 1756, marked the beginning of the decade in which slavery and slave trading reached their height in colonial Philadelphia. This was because of imperial legislation which encouraged indentured servants to enlist for the frontier war effort, making them a risky investment. In 1757 one
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3 Gary Nash, Red, White and Black: The Peoples of Early America, 92.
4 Nash, Red, White, and Black, 93.
5 Ibid.
hundred slaves were brought into Philadelphia – that number jumped to around five hundred in 1762, the peak year of slave importation. When the war ended, slave purchases returned to previous levels. Regarding Quaker anti-slavery efforts, Gary Nash points out that

> Attempting to end the slave trade through appeals to conscience at a time when white indentured labor was becoming unreliable and expensive, these ideologues found their pleas falling on ears rendered deaf by sudden changes in the economics of the labor market.

So, according to Nash, slavery declined among Quakers, not because of reform efforts, but because of economic factors. Between 1767 and 1775 the slave population of Philadelphia was reduced by one-half, a precipitous decline. Earlier, in 1758, Friends who bought and / or sold slaves, had been excluded from business meetings and contributing to the Society. But such de facto excommunication was less resorted to by 1764 when Quakers in general stopped buying slaves because indentured servant labor was made available again. However, bequests of slaves to posterity remained a contentious issue, as seen in John Churchman's comments on the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting, held in September 1767: "Friends were cautioned against bequeathing by will, as slaves to their posterity, the poor Negroes, their fellow-creatures, it being an unlawful act in the sight of the great and righteous parent of all mankind."

Woolman also continued to battle against the practice of slaveholding, as seen in his 1767 visit west of the Susquehanna, "amongst people who lived in outward ease and greatness, chiefly on
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6 Ibid., 95.
7 Ibid.
8 Ibid., 98.
9 Ibid., 109.
the labor of slaves." He continued his journey on foot, "covered with sorrow and heaviness on account of the spreading, prevailing spirit of the world, introducing customs grievous and oppressive on one hand, and cherishing pride and wantonness on the other."

Under this exercise, he attended the Quarterly Meeting at Gunpowder, and "in bowedness of spirit" related his opinion "respecting Friends living in fullness on the labours of the poor oppressed Negroes." Clearly, slavery did not end with the publication of Woolman's tracts. But Quaker opposition to the practice was not limited to the economic factors which Nash discusses.

In discussing the legacy of Quaker antislavery, Jean R. Soderlund argues that there were two types of reformers: tribalistic and humanitarian. "The primary concern of those general reformers was not justice for enslaved blacks. Rather they believed that slavery – and perhaps the slaves themselves – polluted their religion . . . ." Samuel Fothergill's statements on American slavery appear to indicate a primary interest in the purity of the Society rather than the welfare of the slaves. In a November 9, 1756 letter to James Wilson offering an extensive overview of his visit, Fothergill comments on Maryland that "the gain of oppression, the price of blood is upon that province – I mean their purchasing and keeping in slavery negroes – the ruin of the religion the world over, wherever it prevails." He also notes that "Friends there are greatly decreased in number, and mixed with the world, in whose spirit they dwell." Regarding North Carolina, Fothergill comments that "they have been a lively people, but negro purchasing comes more and more in use among them, and the pure life of Truth will ever proportionably

11 Woolman, Journal, 149-150.
12 Soderlund, Quakers and Slavery, 174.
decay." Instead of godliness, "worldly mindedness and lukewarmness have seized upon many."\(^\text{13}\)

And yet, despite the focus of many, it is also clear that Quaker leaders were not interested in abolishing slavery simply for a more distinct community identity. After slavery was rooted out of the movement, there was a continued concern expressed by the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting for emancipated slaves. With many upstanding Quakers manumitting their slaves, there was a sizable population of freed blacks in Philadelphia by 1770. Meetings recommended that members give financial assistance to their former slaves, but could not always convince them to do so. In 1778, the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting instructed its members to not only give financial help, but also to educate freed slaves, adopting "the humanitarian impulse for aiding blacks to fit their well-practiced system of supervising and caring for members.\(^\text{14}\) However, emancipated blacks had little choice about how they used this compensation. Weekly meetings were held for them, but they were conducted by whites – indeed, black members were not allowed into the Society of Friends as official members until the 1790's.\(^\text{15}\)

Despite the focus on the "purity" of the Society of Friends itself and the limited scope of ideological, or "conscience" reform, there is an attempt to identify with Indians and slaves in the case of John Woolman that makes him such a remarkable figure for this time period. Although many ministers' voices who have been relegated to obscurity deserve recovery and close study, Woolman's reputation is especially well-deserved, particularly because of the lucidity of his prose and his counterhegemonic concern for the

\(^{13}\) Fothergill, Memoirs and Letters, 189-90.  
\(^{14}\) Soderlund, Quakers and Slavery, 181.  
\(^{15}\) Ibid., 177.
oppressed in late colonial society. His attempt to feel the suffering of fellow human beings is evident in yet another dream-vision he had in 1770, when he was ill with pleurisy. He writes:

I was brought so near the gates of death that I forgot my name. Being then desirous to know who I was, I saw a mass of matter of a dull gloomy colour, between the south and east, and was informed that this mass was human beings in a great misery as they could be and live, and that I was mixed in with them and henceforth might not consider myself as a distinct or separate being.16

Woolman notes that he remained in this state without identity for several hours, until he heard an angel sing, "John Woolman is dead." He then immediately remembered his name, and wondered what the words could mean, since he was still alive in the body. He continues:

I was then carried in spirit to the mines, where poor oppressed people were digging rich treasures for those called Christians, and heard them blaspheme the name of Christ, at which I was grieved, for his name to me was precious. Then I was informed that these heathens were told that those who oppressed them were the followers of Christ, and they said amongst themselves, "If Christ directed them to use us in this sort, then Christ is a cruel tyrant."17

This particular scene is the most vivid of the dream and illustrates Woolman's primary arguments against slavery (and against the ill-treatment of Indians). The mine-workers labored in wretched conditions to enrich others, and in their misery spoke ill of the name of Christ, in whose name they were oppressed. Woolman is doubly-grieved, then: by the

16 Ibid., 186.
17 Ibid.
oppression of the workers, and the profanation of the Christian religion, which, he would argue, should bring joy and freedom to the "heathen," not hatred and bondage.

In the course of the dream, Woolman writes that the angel's song remained an enigma. In the morning, when he awoke, he asked his wife if they knew who he was, and they told him, thinking he was "light-headed." Unable to speak because his tongue was dry, Woolman "moved it about and gathered some moisture," and after being still in bed for a time, felt divine enablement to speak, uttering, "'I am crucified with Christ, nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ that liveth in me, and the life I now live in the flesh is by faith in the Son of God, who loved me and gave himself for me' [Gal. 2:20]."

At this point the mystery regarding the angel's words, "John Woolman is dead" were made apparent: "[They] meant no more than the death of my own will." Margaret Stewart notes of this passage that Woolman "interprets his resurrection, lived out through empathy with the oppressed, in words taken from Galatians." For the next year, after he had recovered from the illness, Woolman could not speak in public meetings for worship. He writes in his journal: "My mind was very often in company with the oppressed slaves as I sat in meetings." But, many times he was able to express sorrow over this oppression by an "abundance of weeping."

It is also apparent from Woolman's journal that he did not see his advocacy of the oppressed in general or of the abolition of slavery in particular as an end in and of itself, but rather the beginning of a movement towards the observance of "universal righteousness" in all facets of society. He speaks this gradual process when discussing

---

18 Ibid.
19 Margaret Stewart, "John Woolman's 'Kindness'," 256.
20 Ibid., 187.
the abolition of slavery among Quakers in Maryland during his 1766 visit. Considering
the difference between Quakers in the southern and middle colonies, he observes that the
latter "were settled by many Friends who were convinced of our principles in England in
times of suffering, and coming over, bought lands of the natives and applied themselves
to husbandry in a peaceable way, and many of their children were taught to labour for
their living." The history of the settlers of the southern colonies, was, however,
significantly different:

Few Friends, I believe, came from England to settle in any of these southern
provinces, but by the faithful labours of travelling Friends in early times there was
considerable convincements amongst the inhabitants of these parts. Here I
remembered reading of the warlike disposition of many of the first settlers in
those provinces and of their numerous engagements with the natives, in which
much blood was shed, even in the infancy of these colonies. 21

Friends from more northern colonies had come to southern colonies initially to spread
Quaker beliefs, and, now, Woolman returns to call them back to the egalitarian
implications of their original faith. He does suggest that reform seemed to be taking
hold: "[S]ome of these masters I suppose are awakened to feel and see their error and
through sincere repentance cease from oppression and become like fathers to their
servants, showing by their example a pattern of humility in living and moderation in
governing, for the instruction and admonition of their oppressing neighbor." However,
he recognizes that much work remains, expressing his hope that it will go further: "Not
only to instruct others by their example in governing well, but also to use means to

21 Ibid., 147.
prevent their successors from having so much power to oppress others.” But that will not be easy, particularly for fellow ministers who, according to Woolman, "will yet have more bitter cups to drink in those southern provinces for Christ's sake than we had."22

Woolman's remarks about the state of anti-slavery among Quakers in the southern colonies speaks to the larger challenges that other reform-minded co-religionists faced throughout the British imperium. Quakers may have been focused on the re-structuring of their own identity, but that is a matter of course, since, in order to have an impact on the larger culture, they themselves must have a consolidated, consistent testimony against social evils, such as slavery. Woolman provides a schematic for societal reform, illustrated by his own life: one person models simplicity "for the instruction and admonition of their oppressing neighbor." This is larger effect that Quaker ministers hoped to create beyond the immediate task of abolishing slavery from their own ranks. Like Woolman, they longed for the day when "universal love," which promotes the good of all, would not only govern their Society, but all societies.

---

22 Ibid., 147-8.
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