

Phi Kappa Phi Annual Student Paper Competition.

*Of Pen and Sword: The Pennsylvanian Press and the Decline of
Quakerism: 1740-1765*

Spencer Wells

Sophomore

801-378-2288

2101 May Hall

Nominated by Chris Hodson

As the Seven Years' War stretched into 1758, an "unknown Gentleman" in Pennsylvania censured surrounding Quaker communities for failing to raise provincial "Troops in . . . a Time [of] inevitable destruction." Arguing that pacifist policies proved dangerous in times of war, the author claimed that if natives attacked the undefended colony Quakers would "be[come] accessory [sic] to the Murders of their Wives and Children."¹ Although issued during the heat of war, this blatant prejudice against Quakers remains startling to modern ears. Yet, while eighteenth-century Pennsylvanian politics often descended into petty religious quarrels, not until the early 1750's did anti-Quaker rhetoric turn noticeably vindictive. Even throughout the tense years of King George's War (1741-1748), when newspapers openly criticized Quakers for opposing British martial activities, political censure rarely turned into religious vilification.

What, then, accounts for the press's changed perception of Quakers between 1740 and 1765? Though newspapers of the time predominantly blame Quaker pacifism, such criticism, taken alone, fails to account for important secondary causes. While anti-Quaker rhetoric during both wars repeatedly attacked pacifism, the root of volatile Quaker censure from 1755 onward lies not in questions of Quaker theology, but in colonial expansionist policies. While backcountry relationships between colonials and Natives remained stable during the first half of the eighteenth century, anti-Quaker rhetoric within Pennsylvania failed to gain prominence within the press. What little criticism existed remained relatively calm and respectful. However, as the Ohio Valley Company increasingly encouraged settlement on Indian land after King George's War, anti-Quaker sentiment rose in direct proportion to Indian anger and aggression against frontier settlers. With an increasing number of alarmed frontier citizens, Pennsylvania's press found it all the easier to wage a heated literary war against Quakers and Quakerism. When

such rhetoric gained ascendancy following the bloody Paxton rebellion of 1763 Quaker influence in Pennsylvania dramatically waned: falling victim to the word rather than the sword.

The advent of King George's War ignited latent anti-Quaker sentiment in Pennsylvania. Though voters returned Quaker representatives to Pennsylvania's Assembly in record numbers from 1741-1750, discontent gradually appeared as Quakers repeatedly refused to fund Britain's war against Spain.² Broaching the issue of martial spending in 1739, Governor Thomas chastened Quaker Assembly members who continuously refused to "bear their Proportion of the [military] Expense . . . judged necessary for the common Security."³ Yet, while heated discussions raged between legislature and governor in succeeding months, these disputes remained surprisingly civil. Though worried about colonial security Governor Thomas addressed the Quaker majority in a "most affectionate" manner,⁴ seeking to avoid political schism at all costs. Though he disagreed with core Quaker principles, he realized the need for tact if he wished to keep the colony together. In a poignant example of his concern for unity, Thomas even attempted to bridge a widening colonial religious gap, reminding the Assembly that both Quakers and non-Quakers believed in a Bible which called for "Watchmen"⁵ to defend their city.

Rhetorical respect continued into the 1750's. Up through 1748, *Evans Early American Imprints* shows only three anti-Quaker publications in Philadelphia, all of which remain fairly innocuous. The first, an address by James Logan to a yearly convention of the Society of Friends, argues in behalf of defensive war. Yet, even while attacking Quaker principles Logan avoids offending leading Quakers directly. Logan states in his opening that he approaches the Society of Friends through great "apprehension." He only asks for the "Right to lay before

[them] the heavy Pressure of Mind that late Transactions in . . . Government . . . have given [him].”⁶ Samuel Chew, a practicing Friend allegedly wrote the second anti-Quaker publication. Defending military action from a religious stance, Chew went farther than either Governor Thomas or Logan before him. However, Chew’s censure of policy does not technically qualify as harsh anti-Quaker sentiment for the single reason that Chew continued on as a practicing member of the Society of Friends after the article appeared before the public.⁷ The final outcry against Quaker policy surfaced in 1748, in an article written by Gilbert Tennent. Yet, even this article, written by a preacher opposed to pacifism, broaches the topic in a remarkably civil manner. Like his predecessors, Tennant refused to assail “particular persons or societies.”⁸ Even Benjamin Franklin appeared to follow the practice, indicating that he refused to print slanderous articles of the day in his paper the *Pennsylvania Gazette*.⁹

What, then, accounts for such civility? The fact that Quakers held all but eleven seats within the Pennsylvania Assembly at this period does not answer the question sufficiently.¹⁰ Though Quakers exercised great control over the colony, a large amount of anti-Quaker sentiment surfaced early in Pennsylvanian history. In 1740, two hundred sixty-five citizens of Pennsylvania drew up a document indicting Quakers for failing to provide for the colony’s defense. In addition, Pennsylvania’s Anglican community continuously cried out against Quaker legislation.¹¹ Consequently, even with a strong bloc of German immigrants supporting their pacifist agendas, Quaker leaders understood the extreme tenuousness of their power.¹² Thus, the causes which produced civil dialogue between these diverse parties must lie elsewhere. Comparing anti-Quaker rhetoric which found voice during King George’s War with that arising during the Seven Years’ War provides important clues. For, in analyzing articles from both periods, one quickly discovers that one key constituency calling for anti-Quaker rhetoric found

during the Seven Years' War remains markedly absent in earlier Pennsylvanian history: that of the colony's unruly frontier citizenry.

Beginning in the 1720's immigrants (many of whom were of Scotch Irish and German descent)¹³ began to settle Pennsylvania's backcountry in earnest. While often arriving destitute, those who eked out an existence "in this new and wild land"¹⁴ eventually coalesced into viable communities. Relying on rugged individualism more than Quaker politicians to make a living, these hardscrabble men and women created a stable economy in the midst of want. Beginning primarily as subsistence farmers these immigrants soon began selling surplus sheep, cattle, and hogs to larger Pennsylvanian settlements. Yet, the backcountry's economy stretched beyond agricultural endeavors. Situated on a vast wilderness bordering upon the Ohio River Valley, settlers also developed a profitable relationship with the Lene-Lenape Indians through means of the fur trade.¹⁵

During an upswing of frontier colonization which followed close on the heels of King George's War, two prime factors kept backcountry settlers from overtly condemning the Quaker majority in power. Jane T. Merritt alludes to the first in her monograph *At the Crossroads: Indians and Empires on a Mid-Atlantic Frontier, 1700-1763*. According to Merritt, colonists and Natives developed "kinship" relationships among themselves which allowed them to live in relative peace.¹⁶ From 1730 through the 1740's this produced a strong realization between the two races that "the close connection between [their] economic obligations and kin relations" boded well for the burgeoning fur-trade.¹⁷ Owing to relationships which saw gift-giving and hospitality as essential elements for "participation in the market economy," colonial settlers and natives alike benefited from each others' trade.

With networks of kinship in place, Quaker pacifism posed no real threat to Pennsylvanian security; for backcountry Indians formed a natural buffer against unwanted intruders.¹⁸ Governor Thomas and Gilbert Tennant could warn of possible French aggression, but no serious grounds for Quaker criticism existed as long as natives and colonists interacted within the bounds of prescribed trade.¹⁹ Consequently, Pennsylvania's press remained remarkably mild, allowing Quakers to retain their spots on the Pennsylvania Assembly relatively unchallenged. In effect, as long as the frontier Indians remained satisfied, all remained manageable for the Society of Friends.

However, one other economic practice hindered complaints against Quaker leaders during King George's War. Throughout the years in question, the Ohio River Valley, which figured so prominently in the ensuing conflict of 1755, remained relatively uninhabited.²⁰ While the Ohio Company continuously wished to sell land within the fertile valley, not until 1749 did it receive a grant from the British Crown to legally conduct business.²¹ While settlers kept their eye on such lands, Pennsylvania's government issued proclamations upholding Indian sovereignty. In 1742 Governor Thomas even reaffirmed a past declaration wherein he refused to allow settlement "Westward of the . . . Blue Mountains," while promising to remove illegal squatters residing on Indian lands.²² While never conducted with complete equanimity, the political and economic practices Pennsylvanians pursued with Natives during this era allowed both groups to enjoy a remarkable amount of peace (even in the midst of a war with Spain). As long as over-zealous squatters or proprietary companies did not push outward into the beckoning wilderness too hard or fast, relations remained stable. Kinship networks and economic viability between the two groups continued to develop, if not flourish, and Quakers retained the level of strained respect they had enjoyed from the days of Pennsylvania's founding.

And yet, beginning in the latter half of the eighteenth century, perceptions of Quakers changed dramatically. With a new war against France on the horizon, and a growing threat of Indian aggression, public images of Quakers quickly soured. Increasingly aware of the threats pacifism posed to a state surrounded by restless natives, newspapers began attacking Quakers directly. Printing a fiery broadside in 1755, a man under the pen-name of Philadelphius epitomized this growing trend when he declared: “Quakers are from their Religious Principles, incapable of doing any Thing for us in this Time of Danger.” Continuing, Philadelphius then sought to convince his fellow citizens “that a Concern for the maintaining . . . [our] religious and Civil Liberties should engage [us] to choose Men of different Principles to represent [the state].”²³

Philadelphius did not think alone. As 1756 drew to a close, colonial Pennsylvanians, anxious over the significant rise of frontier Indian attacks since the beginning of the Seven Years War (at one point the Natives occupied an outpost a mere forty miles from Philadelphia)²⁴ began to find fault in all manifestations of Quakerism. Whether such practices directly related to pacifism or not no longer mattered. When faithful Quakers declined to honor a provincial fast in May of 1756 a newspaper publisher named James Chastin allowed a scathing sermon into his newspaper. The article, while comparing Quakers to “mules” for refusing to fast, also blamed the society for bringing “ruin and desolation” upon a colony faced with imminent destruction.²⁵ The fact that Quakers chose not to observe public days of fasting out of religious principles meant nothing, citizens, both in the city and along the frontier now saw threats of colonial annihilation behind every Quaker idiosyncrasy.

While Quakerism failed to construct a workable framework for securing Pennsylvania against Indian invasions between 1756 and 1757, Pennsylvania's woes did not completely in Quaker religious beliefs and practices. To better comprehend the root of the problem one must search among the increasingly strained relationships between backcountry settlers and Native inhabitants. Understanding the genesis of this conflict not only sheds light on the changing nature of colonial/native interaction during this time, but also further explains the press's role in Quaker declension during the latter half of the century. Taking this viewpoint, the loss of Quaker power after the Seven Years' War stems less from Quaker political impotency, than from a mismanagement of frontier policy. Refusing to acknowledge risks which backcountry expansion held in a land full of Native Americans, the backcountry brought conflict upon itself. Even so, Quakers inevitably became the perfect scapegoat once conflict broke out. Left with an undefended frontier, Pennsylvanian society quickly laid blame on pacifist Quakers, refusing to acknowledge their own role in the unfolding drama. Playing to such popular sentiment the Pennsylvanian press found it increasingly easy to vilify Quaker leaders.

In the years directly preceding the Seven Years' War, Pennsylvania's Native-American policies underwent a radical change. When the British Crown granted the Ohio Company the right to hold and sell land within the Ohio River Valley in 1749 suspicion immediately arose within Iroquois communities. Forced to cede disputed areas in 1752, Native anger soon began to simmer.²⁶ As if to add insult to injury, Pennsylvanian politicians (Quakers among them) largely ignored the threat which French forces posed to Native tribes. When "over two-hundred Ottawas and Chippewas" (along with a small detachment of French troops) attacked the Pennsylvanian settlement of Pickawillany with orders "to kill all such Indians as are in amity with the English," Pennsylvania refused to send arms as a deterrent against further attacks. Pennsylvania's

ignorance alienated Delaware and Shawnee tribes, driving many over to the French on the eve of war.²⁷ With such ferment in the backcountry, the kinship networks which Merritt so remarkably details rapidly disintegrated, resulting in massacres along the frontier. In the space of a year, native attacks against backcountry settlers killed roughly one percent of the inhabitants of Pennsylvania and Virginia, a casualty rate akin to those suffered during the Revolutionary War two decades later.²⁸

With the failure of backcountry relations, disparate factions within Pennsylvania gained an excuse to vilify pacific Quakers through the press. However, the new surge in anti-Quaker rhetoric differed from preceding persecution in two important ways. First, while such sentiment during King George's War expressed itself in a restrained manner, anti-Quaker criticism took on an increasingly acerbic turn in the years following 1755. In addition, the press's influence over non-Quakers expanded markedly during the years in question. Making use of popular genres of poetry and song to criticize the Society of Friends, anti-Quaker articles began to appeal to greater amounts of Pennsylvanians than before.

One need not look far to appreciate changing rhetorical styles of the Seven Years' War. Merely comparing the change in style of anti-Quaker publications through the titles under which they ran during these years offers remarkable insight. During King George's War, articles espousing dissent against the Quaker legislature remained couched behind diplomatic headings. *The American Magazine's* coverage of Governor Thomas's dispute over Quaker financial policy appeared before the public under the bland title: "An Abstract of the Proceeding of the Assembly of Pennsylvania."²⁹ In 1741, when James Logan indicted the Society of Friends at an annual meeting, his remarks received similar shrift, published mildly under the heading: "To Robert

Jordan, and others the Friends of the Yearly Meeting for business, now conven'd in Philadelphia.”³⁰

All such respect vanished at the onset of the Seven Years’ War. For, not only did critical articles of this period become more numerous, but the rhetoric became ever more vehement. After Quakers failed to support the colony-wide fast of 1756, an article published by James Chattin addressed itself to the populace under the long-winded name: “An Address to those Quakers Who *perversely* refused to pay any Regard to the late Provincial Fast, May 22, 1756.”³¹ (The resentment becomes all the more obvious when one realizes that the author personally added his own italics). Such inflammatory rhetoric continued throughout the war’s duration. Even when Indian attacks on the frontier lessened after 1757, the press’s invectives continued. An article published in 1764 by Hugh Williams illustrates the continued tension. Publishing his article under the appellation of “The Plain Dealer: or a few Remarks upon Quaker-Politics, *and their Attempts to Change the Government of Pennsylvania*,” Williams blamed Quakers directly for “the stream of innocent blood” which “drenched” the “frontier.”³² By the time the Seven Years’ War drew to a close, the press’s continued invective stigmatized Quakers to a greater extent than at any other point in Pennsylvanian history. No more did respect and restraint dominate the press. The fall of the backcountry assured its disappearance.

In the years preceding 1756, anti-Quaker sentiment primarily took the form of broadsides (large single-sheet posters often hung in public) and magazine articles. During this period *Evans Early American Imprints* yields no results for anti-Quakerism in verse. The arrival of such forms of anti-Quaker media during the French and Indian War holds interesting implications. By their very nature, magazine articles in 18th century Pennsylvania targeted a

fairly educated citizenry. Not so with poetry and song. While *The American Magazine*, which reported Governor Thomas's complaints against Quaker pecuniary policy, promoted itself as a political periodical,³³ amateur creations of poetry appealed to a broader audience. Crass in nature and humor, such creations found resonance with those of Pennsylvania's large middling and backcountry population.³⁴ Because many of these creations glorified the common man, anti-Quakerism began to appear more acceptable to common Pennsylvanian citizens. Nicholas Scull, author of the anti-Quaker poem "Kawanio che keeteru: a true relation of a bloody battle fought between George and Lewis, in the year 1755" provides a case in point.

Scull's poem portrays a common honest farmer named George. Unhappily, in the midst of plenty, George falls prey to a common criminal named Lewis, who takes his pastureland and robs his house of valuables. Unable to buy a sword, George begs his Quaker friend Simon to lend him money with which to buy a replacement. While decrying the philosophy of self-defense Simon eventually lends George the needed funds. After George vanquishes Lewis, Simon receives a call from a staunch Quaker layman named Nathan. Furious that Simon lent George money which helped promote violence, Nathan informs his wayward neighbor that "the church is almost broken-hearted/Lest [he] hast from the Truth departed." The remainder of the poem details Simon and Nathan's increasingly heated debate concerning the morality of defensive war.³⁵

Scull's poem reveals the increasing scope of anti-Quakerism in Pennsylvania. Articles attacking Quaker policy before 1756 focused predominantly on the Quaker leaders holding positions of power. "Kawanjo che keeturu" on the other hand only portrays characters of a middling caste. Both the hero George, and the antagonist, Simon, take the role of common

settlers, while the Pennsylvanian Assembly plays no role. Critiques which had once targeted policy makers now blamed the every-day practitioner of Quakerism for their troubles with “Indian Foes.”³⁶ With the rise of popular anti-Quaker sentiment in verse Quakers began to bow out of legislative positions. In 1756 only eight professing Quakers remained in the Pennsylvania Assembly, no match for the broadening influence of their detractors.

Unsurprisingly, the rise of anti-Quaker verse correlates remarkably with the increased threat of Indian attack on the frontier. 1756, the year of Scull’s publication, also saw the invasion of the backcountry by Delaware and Shawnee tribes. By 1764, months after a group of vigilante Pennsylvanians named the Paxton Boys attacked and killed six undefended Indians in Conestoga, Pennsylvania, anti-Quaker expression gain ascendancy in the press.³⁷ By this point resentment ran so strongly against the Quaker bloc that the press not only blamed the Society of Friends for the unprotected state of their colony, but also brashly asserted that Quakers themselves “persuaded [Indians] to kill the frontier inhabitants.”³⁸ Going beyond this bold assumption, the same author also targeted the few remaining Quakers in power; accusing them of tampering with Indian peace conferences then in the works.³⁹ That Quakers (many outside the Assembly at this point) had initiated successful peace treaties⁴⁰ where the government remained unable to do so failed to turn the bitter backcountry once again to their former leaders.

The effect on Quaker political power in 1764 proved remarkable. Though the Quaker party still retained seats in the Pennsylvania Assembly, they increasingly separated themselves from pure Quaker beliefs in order to garner support for their party. Indeed, sentiment against pure Quakerism proved so pervasive that the Yearly Meeting of Friends finally felt compelled to “disassociate . . . [themselves] from the actions of the Assembly.”⁴¹ Furthermore, with Pontiac’s

Rebellion still fresh in the populace's mind, Quakers lost further seats in the Assembly during the same year.⁴² And, while not entirely effaced from the councils of state, Quaker power nonetheless continued to fade, never again reaching the prominence it once enjoyed before the opening salvos of the Seven Years' War. The "frontiersmen" and prejudiced press, who saw "themselves threatened by a double enemy [Quakers and Indians], within and without" assured their fall.⁴³

In 1839, the dramatist Edward Bulwer-Lytton coined the phrase "the pen is mightier than the sword"⁴⁴ to explain the great impact words exercised over men and nations. The treatment of eighteenth-century Quakers by Pennsylvanian newspapers is a poignant historical footnote testifying to the validity of Lytton's statement. While never resorting to physical violence, Pennsylvania's press nonetheless played upon colonial fears of invasion to eliminate Quaker leadership once the Seven Years' War began. Refusing to report an unbiased account of how expansionist tendencies instigated conflict in the Pennsylvanian backcountry, publishers vilified Quakers through acerbic rhetoric, while increasing the appeal of such persecution through stanza and verse. With the ascendancy of such bias in the 1760's, the day of Quaker leadership inevitably passed; unfortunate victims to the prejudice of the Pennsylvanian press.

Endnotes:

¹ Ebenezer Durham, "To the Inhabitants of the Province of Pennsylvania," (Philadelphia, 1758), 1.

² Jack D. Marietta, *The Reformation of American Quakerism, 1748-1783* (Pennsylvania, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1984), 135.

³ "An Abstract of the Proceedings of the Assembly of Pennsylvania," *The American Magazine*, (Philadelphia, 1740), 3.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 4

⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶ James Logan, "To Robert Jordan, and others the Friends of the Yearly Meeting for business, now conven'd in Philadelphia," (Philadelphia, 1741), 1. Logan takes a bold stance in the rest of his letter, asking for the resignation of Quakers from government positions. Yet, though such a request was unusual in the printed press of the day (gaining ground in the 1750's) Logan couches his request in polite terms, remarking that he only asks practicing Quakers to submit because of "the sincerest Zeal for the Publick Good . . . [and from] the most solid Interest of [the] Friends as a People." Logan, 4.

⁷ Samuel Chew, "The speech of Samuel Chew, Esq; chief justice of the government of New-Castle, Kent and Sussex upon Delaware: delivered from the bench to the grand-jury of the county of New-Castle, Nov. 21. 1741; and now published at their request," (Philadelphia, 1741), 1-15. Chew's article must be taken with a grain of salt, for the following March an advertisement appeared in the *Pennsylvania Gazette* in which Chew indicated that the New-Castle speech was nothing more than a hoax, written by another man entirely. Yet, even if true, the argument still holds. The very fact that a Philadelphian wishing to express anti-Quaker sentiment had to resort to intrigue in order to make his opinion known to the larger public infers that anti-Quaker sentiment of the time was considerably less than some articles make it out to be. Samuel Chew, "Advertisement" printed in *The Pennsylvania Gazette* March 3, 1742.

⁸ "An Abstract of the Proceedings of the Assembly of Pennsylvania," *The American Magazine*, (Philadelphia, 1740), 1-4; "Proceedings of the Assembly of Pennsylvania," *The American Magazine*, (Philadelphia, 1740), 2-3; "To Robert Jordan, and others the Friends of the Yearly Meeting for business, now conven'd in Philadelphia," (Philadelphia, 1741), 1-4; Gilbert Tennent, "The late association for defence farther encouraged: or, Defensive war defended; and its consistency with true Christianity represented. In a reply to some exceptions against war, in a late composure, intituled [sic], The doctrine of Christianity, as held by the people called Quakers, vindicated," (Philadelphia, 1748), iii.

⁹ Benjamin Franklin, *The Autobiography*, quoted in Brett Rushforth and Paul W. Mapp, ed., *Colonial North America and the Atlantic World: A History in Documents* (New Jersey, Pearson Prentice Hall, 2009), 253. Franklin recorded the following: "In the conduct of my newspaper, I carefully excluded all libelling [sic] and personal abuse, which is of late years become so disgraceful to our country. Whenever I was solicited to insert anything of the kind, and the writers pleaded . . . the liberty of the press . . . I would print the piece separately . . . but . . . I would not take upon me to spread his detraction."

¹⁰ Mareitta, 135.

¹¹ Richard Bauman, *For the Reputation of Truth*, (Maryland, The John Hopkins Press, 1971), 7-8.

¹² Alan Taylor, *American Colonies: The Settling of North America*, ed. John Froner (New York, Penguin Books, 2001), 321-322. Taylor records that German immigrants supported Quaker policy-makers because they feared “that a militia [in Pennsylvania] will bring them under as severe a bondage to governors as they were formerly under the princes in Germany.”

¹³ Sally Schwartz, *“A Mixed Multitude”*: *The Struggle for Toleration in Colonial Pennsylvania*, (New York, New York University Press, 1987), 1. Schwartz records that “the 1790 [American] census suggests that for the United States as a whole . . . approximately 9 percent were German, 8 percent were Scottish, 6 percent were Scotch-Irish.”

¹⁴ Gottlieb Mittelberger, “German Immigrant Gottlieb Mittelberger’s Journey to America,” quoted in Rushforth and Mapp, 245.

¹⁵ Matthew C. Ward, *Breaking the Backcountry*, (Pennsylvania, University of Pittsburgh Press, 2003), 10-12, 19-22. While spread out over larger distances, the Pennsylvania backcountry still contained a strongly demarcated class system. Yet, the backcountry elite exercised less real control over lower classes than in other cities, especially during times of danger, as the lower classes tended to disregard their superiors’ orders. Ward, 77.

¹⁶ Jane T. Merritt, *At the Crossroads: Indians & Empires on a Mid-Atlantic Frontier 1700-1763*, (North Carolina, University of North Carolina Press, 2003), 50-86.

¹⁷ Merritt, 50, 170. However, native/colonial relations did not enjoy constant harmony in this period. Though colonials and natives in the back-country developed a modicum of respect for each other, this period of history also saw one of the largest land-grabs of colonial history on the part of White proprietors. In 1737, the “Walking Purchase,” headed by Pennsylvania proprietors, stripped the Delaware Nation of “five hundred thousand acres” of land. Originally agreeing to give the proprietors the amount of land capable of being walked in one day, the Lenni-Lenape lost more land than originally intended when Thomas Penn and James Logan hired professional runners to traverse as much land as possible in the space of twenty-four hours. In addition, by 1730 Logan had already pushed Delawares off much of the land they claimed (Merritt, 46-49; Taylor, 323; Ward, 25).

¹⁸ Merritt, 77.

¹⁹ *The American Magazine*, 2; Taylor, 265-267.

²⁰ Ward, 22.

²¹ After the beginning of the Seven Years’ War the Assembly eventually backed down and agreed to fund a volunteer force. Yet, even this small concession failed to meet the extreme need on the Pennsylvanian frontier. Ward, 64-66.

²² George Thomas, “Proclamation. 1742 October 5th,” (Philadelphia, 1742) , 1.

²³ Philadelphius, “To the Freemen of Pennsylvania, and more especially to those of the City and County of Philadelphia,” (Philadelphia, 1755), 1.

²⁴ This happened when Natives attacked a town in Reading, Pennsylvania. Ward, 67. Compare with Ward’s map of Pennsylvania, xi. For distance see *The Times Comprehensive Atlas of the World*, 11th edition (Germany, Times Ltd.), plate 103.

²⁵ “An Address to those Quakers, Who perversely refused to pay any Regard to the Late Provincial Fast, May 22, 1756,” (Philadelphia, 1756), 1-2.

-
- ²⁶ Ward, 28.
- ²⁷ Ibid., 30; Merritt, 150.
- ²⁸ Ibid., 72.
- ²⁹ *The American Magazine*, 1.
- ³⁰ Logan, 1.
- ³¹ Chattin, 1.
- ³² Hugh Williams, “The Plain Dealer: or a few Remarks upon Quaker-Politics, *and their Attempts to Change the Government of Pennsylvania*,” (Philadelphia, 1764), 1,6.
- ³³ *The American Magazine*, 1. The full name of the periodical is *The American Magazine; or A Monthly View of the Political State of the British Colonies*.
- ³⁴ This potentially exerted great influence on the back-country Scotch Irish, who were repeatedly portrayed as a largely uncontrollable democratic population in Pennsylvania’s backcountry. See James Logan, quoted in Schwartz, 200.
- ³⁵ Nicholas Scull, *Kawanio che keeteru: a true relation of a bloody battle fought between George and Lewis, in the year 1755*,” (Philadelphia, 1756), 1.
- ³⁶ Ibid., 15.
- ³⁷ Ward, 239.
- ³⁸ Williams, 6.
- ³⁹ Ibid., 7.
- ⁴⁰ Merritt, 203.
- ⁴¹ Bauman, 118. Bauman records the increasing split between The Society and Quakers in power when she remarks: “participation in government had led some Quakers to promote military service and even to countenance offensive war.” Even though the party name of Quaker still held a majority of seats in the Assembly at the time, those belonging to the party did not always associate themselves strongly with the Society. 103.
- ⁴² Ibid., 123.
- ⁴³ Ibid., 108.
- ⁴⁴ Edward Bulwer-Lytton, quoted in Allen C. Christensen, ed., *The Subverting Vision of Bulwer Lytton: Bicentenary Reflections*, (Delaware, University of Delaware Press, 2004), 21.