Iowa Research Online
The University of Iowa's Institutional Repository

University of Iowa
Iowa Research Online

Theses and Dissertations

2008

Peace through conversation: William Penn, Israel Pemberton and the shaping of Quaker-Indian relations, 1681-1757

Larry Brent Hershey
University of Iowa

Copyright 2008 Larry Brent Hershey

This dissertation is available at Iowa Research Online: http://ir.uiowa.edu/etd/27

Recommended Citation
Hershey, Larry Brent. "Peace through conversation: William Penn, Israel Pemberton and the shaping of Quaker-Indian relations, 1681-1757." MA (Master of Arts) thesis, University of Iowa, 2008.
http://ir.uiowa.edu/etd/27.

Follow this and additional works at: http://ir.uiowa.edu/etd

Part of the Religion Commons

PEACE THROUGH CONVERSATION: WILLIAM PENN, ISRAEL PEMBERTON AND THE SHAPING OF QUAKER-INDIAN RELATIONS, 1681-1757

by

Larry Brent Hershey

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the Master of
Arts degree in Religious Studies
in the Graduate College of
The University of Iowa

May 2008

Thesis Supervisor: Professor Theodore Dwight Bozeman

Graduate College
The University of Iowa
Iowa City, Iowa

CERTIFICATE OF APPROVAL

MASTER'S THESIS

This is to certify that the Master's thesis of

Larry Brent Hershey

has been approved by the Examining Committee
for the thesis requirement for the Master of Arts
degree in Religious Studies at the May 2008 graduation.

Thesis Committee: _____
Theodore Dwight Bozeman, Thesis Supervisor

_____
Ralph Keen

_____
Michelene Pesantubbee

To Lorie, Dillon and Eden:
May we learn together the tradition of peace through conversation

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 1

CHAPTER ONE: WILLIAM PENN'S RELIGIOUS VISION: PEACE THROUGH CONVERSATION 3

Holy Circumstances, Holy Ground.....4
The Pennsylvania charter and God's providence 4
The eschatology of Pennsylvania 11
Conversation as Religious Practice 15
The Delaware Indians.....16
Inner Light theology: a basis for action.....17
In practice: Penn's letters of justice.....20
Conclusion 37

CHAPTER TWO: ISRAEL PEMBERTON: RESTORING HUMANITY AND RECAPTURING PENN'S VISION.....39

The Setting of Violent Conflict 39
"Savage" Indians and a Forgotten History 47
The Delaware Deserve Justice.....53
The power of conversation 54
Advocating for Indian humanity 66
Conclusion 71

CONCLUSION: QUAKER CONVERSATION: A COMMON RELIGIOUS CONVICTION 73

BIBLIOGRAPHY 75

INTRODUCTION

A religious tradition whose members interact with its surrounding world is always in the midst of change. Some religious leaders in some eras of a tradition's history attempt to appropriate the tradition's defining values in a way that remains faithful to the founding vision, but flexible enough to respond to the challenges of its current context.

In the tradition of the Society of Friends, or Quakers, pacifism is one of its defining values. The settlement of Pennsylvania in 1682 by proprietor William Penn, a religious leader with political aspirations, provides an opportunity to examine how a religious visionary, one who appropriated pacifism in England, adjusted the ways of peace in Pennsylvania. Penn was faced with a cross-cultural context like none he had experienced in Britain, a context that immediately put his pacifism to the test. How Penn approached the Delaware Indians, residents of "his" territory for centuries but suddenly under British control, would become a matter of religious importance with political implications. To interact peacefully with natives antagonized by European explorers in the past would be a challenge indeed. While Penn acquired the Indian land under the banner of pacifism, some of his Western assumptions undermined his peaceful intent.[1]

By 1756, another Quaker, Israel Pemberton, was confronted with a similar daunting task. After years of being neglected and ignored by a new generation of leadership in Pennsylvania, the Delaware Indians violently protested during the autumn and winter of 1755-1756. The government leaders, taken aback by the rage and surprised by the hostility, responded with their own cries of war. Yet Pemberton and other peace Quakers, informed by the religious vision of William Penn and the broader Quaker

---

[1] It must not be forgotten that Penn's acquisition of Indian land by peaceful means does not lessen the impact of its loss for the Native people. While we will touch on portions of the Delaware Indians' own story of this complex interaction, this paper is primarily an examination of the context of Penn's approach from a Quaker, rather than Native, perspective.

tradition of pacifism, faced the challenge with a message of peace that reflected their religious beliefs.

This thesis argues that for both Penn and Pemberton, a model of peaceful interaction was expressed through direct conversation with the Delaware Indians. Both men attempted to resolve conflict and prevent more violence with the Delawares by seeking out their leaders and relating to them on a one-on-one basis. In both contexts, Penn and Pemberton negotiated in light of the embodied the Society of Friends theology of the Inner Light within all persons. While the predominant colonial culture in each context degraded the Indians and judged them as less than human, Penn and Pemberton respected the Delawares as equal human beings and used direct conversation to build up trust and friendship that would ensure a peaceful co-existence. Penn's actions came from a religious vision of idealized relationships in his colony; Pemberton's actions recalled, both explicitly and implicitly, the same peaceful ways of Penn updated for a changed social setting.

In colonial Pennsylvania, the value of peace expressed and modeled through conversation provided a continuity of Quaker values. Though the times and actions had changed around them, Penn and Pemberton both practiced conversation with the cultural "other" that expressed the same religious value of peace in terms of justice and respect for all persons in humanity.

CHAPTER ONE: WILLIAM PENN'S RELIGIOUS VISION: PEACE THROUGH CONVERSATION

Among the myriad of influences surrounding William Penn's acquisition in 1681 of the land that would become Pennsylvania, religion is one that has often been pigeon-holed by the phrase "holy experiment." The term usually refers to the relationship of faith to political structure, and Pennsylvania is seen as the testing ground of the melding of the two. It is our task to consider more closely how William Penn's religious vision for the colony affected his relationships with the Native Americans already living in Southeastern Pennsylvania upon his arrival in 1682. A set of letters Penn wrote in 1681 after receiving the charter for the territory, but before most of the new settlers had come to the new world, showcased Penn's vision by rooting his plan for justice, coexistence and peace with the Native Americans in a practice that reflected his Quaker background. Penn modeled conversation, a one-to-one engagement between English and Indians, as his way to peace.

As chief intellectual architect of colonial Pennsylvania, Penn held a religious vision that had two components. First, he defined the circumstances around his land acquisition, along with its physical setting, in terms of their spiritual significance. The land and the place held important religious value. Second, he infused the actions and practice of his people's interaction with the Native Americans with a responsibility to please God. His call for fair and just dealings with the Indians reflected Quaker Inner Light theology, which recognized the full and equal humanity of every person. These two characteristics of Penn's religious vision—setting and practice—demonstrated that peaceful interaction with Native Americans was a non-negotiable aspect of Quaker religious conviction. Penn's religious vision, though at times darkened by the shadow of ethnocentrism, set the spiritual tone for conversation regarding fair treatment of Native Americans in 1681 and, as we shall see later, in the mid-1750s.

Holy Circumstances, Holy Ground

In the years before the first English settlement in Pennsylvania in 1682, Penn's letters reflect his view of the colony's religious significance.[2] God was intimately involved in the circumstances that surrounded the acquisition of Pennsylvania, and would continue to participate in the process of sustaining the new settlement. Penn assigned religious significance to Pennsylvania's creation in two specific ways. First, he claimed that the gift of the charter from the English throne was a sign of God's providence, and second, Penn found in biblical eschatology grounds to believe that Pennsylvania had a holy calling. It was a place where millennial aspirations would be fulfilled.

The Pennsylvania charter and God's providence

It is unclear when William Penn first formulated his plan to initiate a New World colony founded on Quaker values. While there is little evidence of substantial pre-1680 political experience that would have put Penn on the path to proprietorship, his involvement in religious causes foreshadow themes that become distinctly Pennsylvanian. Penn became a member of the Society of Friends in Britain 1667 and soon after became involved in public religious activities such as publishing religious tracts and debating points of faith with other religious leaders. Thereafter, he worked for religious freedom both at home and abroad.[3]

---

[2] Penn's thought at the time was expressed in a series of letters that are extant and collected in Richard S. Dunn and Mary Maples Dunn, eds, *The Papers of William Penn,* vols. 1-5 (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1982); hereafter *PWP*.

[3] Melvin Endy Jr., *William Penn and Early Quakerism* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1973), writes that Penn published more than forty pamphlets and books in his first six years as a Quaker. "Many of these were tracts on toleration" and "most were controversial works, expositions of Quakerism, or appeals to conversion." One of Penn's best known early works, *The Sandy Foundation Shaken*, was a written account of his first public debate with Prebyterian minister Thomas Vincent, ibid., 129. Penn also staged public debates against Catholics and Protestants, especially Anglicans, Presbyterians, Independents and Baptists, ibid., 132.

Most often, Penn's public pleas in England in the later 1670s called for religious toleration of members of the Society of Friends. The established church, charged with upholding proper 17th century British values, deemed many practices of the Friends—or Quakers— dangerous. For example, Quakers refused to remove their hats before social superiors, and this became a major social and religious point of contention. Like his contemporary George Fox, founder of the Society of Friends, Penn suffered through the difficulties of imprisonment and physical abuse for his religious views, but continued to lobby Parliament and the King's officials for religious acceptance.[4]

From the time of his conversion in 1668 into the early 1680s, Penn explored the political ramifications of his religious thought. He became intrigued with the possibilities of exporting and expanding the Quaker faith in the context of the New World. Beginning in 1665, he served as a trustee for a Quaker colony in West New Jersey, and advocated for its right to self-government. Penn's connections and involvement in West New Jersey familiarized him with some aspects of proprietorship and perhaps set his intellectual wheels in motion as he envisioned a society where religious liberty could be practiced.[5]

Personal economic concerns merged with Penn's religious interests as he formulated his case for land to the King in the spring of 1680. As the son of an esteemed British navy admiral, Penn was well-steeped in English aristocracy. Though his Quaker faith remained a point of contention in the father-son relationship until his father's death in 1670, the younger Penn had ample access to his family's stable financial base. On a personal level, however, Penn financial decisions were paradoxical; throughout his life he

---

[4] One notable imprisonment serves as an example to Penn's resolve upon enduring persecution. He spent almost nine months—from December 1668 to July 1669—in solitary confinement for failure to obtain a printing license for his pamphlet *The Sandy Foundation Shaken*. It was under these conditions that Penn completed one of his most famous early works on Quaker conduct entitled *No Cross, No Crown.*

[5] *PWP*, 2:22-25 provide correspondence between Penn and friend Robert Barclay over the West New Jersey colony.

preached frugality but lived with extravagance. Richard S. Dunn stated that an inability to live within his means was "certainly Penn's greatest character defect."[6] By 1680, at 36 years old with estates in England and Ireland to his name, Penn's business dealings suffered from poor cash flow and he contracted considerable debt by borrowing money to meet expenses.[7] Thus, Penn was on the lookout for new sources of income, and a proprietorship had the potential to provide a considerable revenue stream. If he could gain title to a portion of land, he could re-sell tracts to those looking for adventure or simply a fresh start in a New World setting. Governing a colony also came with great financial risk, as proprietors still answered to the English crown. Recent experiments in North Carolina and West New Jersey, however, indicated that some colonies had the freedom to establish their own government and enact their own laws, an element that was attractive to Penn given his religious concerns.[8] Thus, both the religious and economic potential of a proprietorship were on his mind as Penn approached the King.

Penn did have one advantage as he prepared his request. Upon his death, Penn's father had passed on a longstanding credit that the British government owed his family. A

---

[6] Ibid., 51.

[7] By 1680 evidence suggests that tenants were regularly defaulting on rents owed to Penn. See further Richard S. Dunn, "Penny Wise and Pound Foolish: Penn as a Businessman," in Richard S. Dunn and Mary Maples Dunn, eds., *The World of William Penn,* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1986), 37-54, for the successes and failures and of Penn as a businessman and specifically his strained financial relationship with his steward Philip Ford.

[8] In July 1680, several months after Penn's original petition (see following note), lawyer John Darnall outlined the earliest known draft of the Pennsylvania charter, which states geographical and physical elements to be granted, as well as governmental rights of proprietor, which loosely follows charters used for both Maryland and the Carolinas. In this early version, Darnall includes a version of what is known as the "Bishop of Durham clause" in which he fashions what the editors of *the Papers of William Penn* term "nearly regal power," *PWP* 2:40. The Bishop of Durham clause gives the proprietor extensive governing rights—-ability to make and enforce laws, punish and pardon, as well as divide and erect counties, cities, boroughs, churches—and makes the colony subject to no "other colony or prince but only and immediately to England," *PWP* 2:40-43. The final charter granted by England to Penn, *PWP* 2:63-77, did not include such extensive governmental freedom. *PWP* 2:33-61 chronicles the known negotiations between Penn and the agents of neighboring colonies Maryland and New York (boundary issues) as well as the Board of Trade (governmental rights) during the winter of 1680-1681.

reconstruction of Penn's original petition indicated that this debt (16,000 pounds and growing through compounded interest) played a significant role in Penn's land request. The exact circumstances and amount of the original arrangement with Admiral Penn is not clear. But for King Charles II, Penn was not merely any wayward religious revolutionary asking for free land to create a colony for religious dissenters. William Penn had valid financial leverage and its potential impact would only strengthen over time. Given the circumstances, the King's best interest was a timely satisfaction of the debt, and he granted Penn's request in principle in June of 1680.[9] Though the exact details needed to be arranged, William Penn was now the proprietor of 45,000 square miles of land in the Americas.

Considering England's New World land policy during 1675-1680, approval of a grant such as Penn's seemed improbable. During that time, the Lords of Trade, the British government body responsible for New World operations, increased its enforcement of land statutes in the Americas. At every turn, the Board exercised considerable authority over specific colonies. Military-bred royal governors were appointed; legislative practices and privileges in both Virginia and Massachusetts were scrutinized. Approval of a new colonial proprietor—especially a confessed pacifist Quaker with publicly demonstrated beliefs of religious and political dissension—seemed incongruous with the Lords' operational strategy.

Scholars have suggested a number of explanations for the grant's approval, most related to the crown's distaste for Quaker meddling in British affairs. Some propose the crown was fed up with Quakers disrupting England and so thought it advantageous to exile them to another continent. Others see the charter as the monarchy's bribe to keep Penn from joining the Whig political party, which opposed the Crown-supported Tory

---

[9] Only a fragment of Penn's original petition to the King remains, *PWP,* 2:32. The editors of the *Papers of William Penn* have attempted to reconstruct it, *PWP* 2:33, and approximate the date of Penn's original petition as sometime in May of 1680.

party. Dunn and Dunn, the editors of the *Papers of William Penn*, acknowledge the complexity of issues surrounding the grant and its approval. Though they lean towards the interpretation that Pennsylvania was "a cheap way of honoring the longstanding debt to William Penn's father, and an easy way of honoring the memory of Admiral Penn," they also hint at the grant's multi-faceted meaning that includes a religious and an economic mission: "By obtaining the proprietorship to an American colony [Penn] could vastly expand his service to Quakerism and to the cause of religious and political liberty—and at the same time greatly enlarge his property holdings."[10] At least a portion of Penn's intent was to create a society with a religious foundation.

A set of Penn's letters from 1681, written after the charter was granted but before Penn himself sailed to Pennsylvania in 1682, hinted at his belief in God's favor towards the province.[11] Written to current Europeans living in Pennsylvania, English friends who could help him recruit and settle, and even to Native American residents, the letters celebrate the events leading up to the forming of Pennsylvania as acts of divine inspiration. In addition, the letters of recruitment reveal Penn's expectations that settlers will respond to God in thankfulness by engaging in fair relations with Indian people.

In April 1681 Penn sent a letter to the known European inhabitants (primarily Swedish and Dutch settlers) of the territory to announce his arrival. The tone of the letter and its call for friendship between Penn and the inhabitants foreshadowed similar interactions between Penn and the Native Americans. Penn attempted to convince the recipients that he was no ordinary landlord by distancing himself from other leaders "that come to make [their] fortune great." Instead, he planned to create a system where

---

[10] *PWP*, 2:22.

[11] For a proprietor of such a significant portion of land, Penn actually didn't reside in Pennsylvania very long. He stayed for approximately two years, from 1682-1684, then returned to London to attend to other business affairs and functioned as an absentee landlord. He also resided in the colony in 1700 for another two years and then returned to England.

residents had a voice in some aspects of decision-making. He vaguely promised that "you shall be govern'd by laws of your own making, and live a free and if you will, a sober and industrious people. I shall not usurp the right of any, or oppress his person."[12] Penn's standard of fairness that extended human rights to all inhabitants emerged early in the populating process. As such, he criticized the medieval lord/servant relationship and anticipated the principle of personal liberty and relational equality that would become tenets of future Pennsylvania government. Penn did not offer specific examples of these "laws of your own making," instead, he asked the inhabitants to trust his encounter with the divine to reveal a fair model of leadership. "God has furnished me with a better resolution and has given me his grace to keep it," Penn continued. Nevertheless, Penn acknowledged the new political territory. "It is a business," he said, "that though I never understood before, yet God has given me an understanding of my duty and an honest mind to do it uprightly." Penn's spirit was certainly willing, even if his practical experience was weak. Not only did Penn infuse the complexities of statecraft with religious significance, he also petitioned the people to trust *him* as interpreter of this ambiguous "better resolution" with which God was intimately involved.[13]

But Penn did not want credit for the positive things that happened as the preparations took shape. As seen in two letters, also in 1681, to British friends who were involved with recruitment of future residents, Penn identified an inner subordination to a divine plan as reason for a successful recruitment campaign. Sometimes, this subordination entailed personal hardship. In an August 21 letter to Thomas Janney, a Quaker minister from Cheshire that eventually immigrated to Pennsylvania in 1683, Penn said that because of "much patience & faith as well as cost & charges," he had been made "to look to the Lord and believe in him as to the obtaining of [the land]." The

---

[12] William Penn, "To the Inhabitants of Pennsylvania," 8 April 1681, *PWP,* 2:84.

[13] Ibid.

subordination was an experience like no other, but not without reward, "for in no outward thing have I known a greater exercise, & my mind more inwardly resigned to feel the Lord's hand to bring it to pass" than the attempt to settle Pennsylvania. More than other endeavors, this process of obtaining Pennsylvania and the associated difficulties "comforts me," Penn wrote, and "I am firm in my faith that the Lord will prosper it."[14] He relinquished control of the place, the setting of Pennsylvania, to God. He then made the letter into a sales pitch about helping to identify those who "desire to have their land lye in the best places," for they should be ready for the ship to sail in September.

Four days later Penn wrote a letter to James Harrison, a prosperous Lancashire businessman. Penn similarly recounted an inner surrender of his own will to God, and recognition of discerned divine intervention in the outcome. "For my country I see the Lord in the obtaining of it: the more was I drawn inward to look to him and to owe it to his hand and power than to any other way." In the letter, Penn commissioned Harrison as one of his first land agents to precede him to the New World, to "lay out the first and best land to the first adventurers" who were to arrive in Pennsylvania on the September ship and to keep him informed of any new purchases.[15] Penn wrote of other Europeans that were ready to migrate: "many from France, some from Holland and I hear some Scotch will go." He also related a successful recruitment visit to areas west of London earlier that summer. A common theme through both letters was his belief in God's involvement in populating the land and thankfulness for the results. "The Lord has prospered me beyond words," he wrote to Harrison.[16]

Melvin Endy has argued that religion was foremost among the multi-faceted concerns Penn brought to the proprietorship. In his spiritual biography of Penn, Endy

---

[14] William Penn to Thomas Janney, August 21, 1681, *PWP*, 2:106.

[15] William Penn to James Harrison, August 25, 1681, *PWP*, 2:108-109.

[16] Ibid., 108.

identified Penn's inward resignation as a state of mind by which Penn understood the gift of Pennsylvania. Endy wrote, "For that reason he was confident that the hand of the Lord was upon the colony and that, for his part, a renewed dedication to the service of God was required."[17] This dedication needed to come not only from Penn, but also from the settlers themselves. Their practice was the substance of their religious commitment. As we will see later, assuring that this practice continued throughout future generations was to be a difficult task.

The eschatology of Pennsylvania

Penn's religious vision, which included the understanding of Pennsylvania as a divine "place," stretched further than God's involvement in a certain geographical area. His belief that the creation and occupation of Pennsylvania was linked with biblical eschatology supplemented Penn's spiritual conception of his task. His writings of 1681 employed eschatological imagery to describe Pennsylvania's future. Prophetic references from both the Old and New Testament and the name given to the colony's signature city indicated Penn's belief that the colony had cosmic significance in the context of the New World. William Frost has highlighted the religious case of Penn's reflections about Pennsylvania at this time, pointing in particular to the role of eschatology in writings during 1681.[18]

Penn's letters read biblical themes of separation into the Pennsylvania experience. Quakers interpreted scripture in terms of how biblical characters separated themselves spiritually from the world at hand. Upon conversion, Quakers were expected to exemplify

---

[17] Endy, *William Penn*, 348.

[18] Few other scholars address eschatology's place in Penn's worldview. Frost's views are explained in two articles: William Frost, "'Wear the Sword as Long as Thou Canst': William Penn in Myth and History," *Explorations in Early American Culture* 4 (2000), 13-45; and Frost, "William Penn's Experiment in the Wilderness: Promise and Legend," *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 107, no. 4 (1983), 577-607.

a personal calling to God that reflected their ultimate concerns with a spiritual, rather than material, world. These responses had social and political implications. Penn applied a similar separation principle to Pennsylvania: it would be a colony that held God's intentions foremost, and thus responded differently to social conditions than other New World ventures. Individuals living in accordance with God in the province of Pennsylvania, Penn said, would help usher in the end of time. The letter to Thomas Janney written in August 1681 portrays Penn's hopes for the province:

> Mine eye is to a blessed government and a virtuous ingenious and industrious society, so as people may live well and have more time to serve the Lord, than in this Crowded land. God will plant America and it shall have its day: the fifth kingdom or glorious day of Jesus Christ in us reserved to the last days, may have the last part of the world, the setting of the son or western world to shine in.[19]

In terms of the role of eschatology and place, three references from this excerpt deserve attention. The first is the phrase "fifth kingdom." The fifth nation is an Old Testament term used by the prophet Daniel, who, while interpreting King Nebuchadnezzar's dream in Daniel 2:36-45, foresaw four kingdoms, each destined to pass away due to their flaws in construction. But the fifth kingdom, whose foundation is laid by God, would endure forever.[20] By invoking this image, Penn blessed Pennsylvania—built with God's blueprint—with a favored and eternal status that would be pleasing to God. Due to its citizens' ability to successfully live a life of spiritual separation, the physical setting would not pass away when hardship and difficulties arose. Rather Pennsylvania, with its Godly foundation, would be a place where the chosen people would gather and prosper.

The second biblical reference recalled the book of Revelation in the New Testament. The "Glorious day of Jesus Christ in us reserved to the last days" was the point at which Christ returns at the end of time to make way for a new, restored city of

---

[19] Penn to Janney, *PWP*, 2:106.

[20] Frost, "Promise and Legend," 581.

Jerusalem. The millennial city, according to Revelation, would need neither the sun nor moon because the "glory of God is its light."[21] Frost observed, "Penn's metaphor joins the sun's setting in the West (i.e., America) and the Light of Christ, conflating the 'son' Jesus and 'sun' light."[22] The people of this holy colony—where the character of residents' acts reflected their separate status—Penn seems to have said, would participate in the millennial experience.

Penn also made clear the importance of the setting of Pennsylvania in this holy narrative, where residents will "have more time to serve the Lord, than in this crowded land." He implied that the place of the new Land, because of its open spaces, would provide better opportunity for service to God than what England could allow. The place, the setting, of Pennsylvania, had religious significance, for it would "have its day," the "last part of the world." Penn employed both Old and New Testament images of the end of time to support his intentions that settlers would live blameless lives pleasing to God, and thereby infused Pennsylvania with a religious charter and charge.

In addition to connecting the place of Pennsylvania to biblical images of the end times, Penn also had a particular blessing for the specific town he planned to build on the Delaware River. Frost highlighted the naming of this city as a metaphor of divine providence in his new land, a kind of synecdoche in which Penn's name for Philadelphia stood for his intentions for all of Pennsylvania. Frost reflected that most scholars refer to the Greek meaning for "Philadelphia" as "city of brotherly love," while "the scriptural references are ignored."[23] In the first three chapters of Revelation, the biblical

---

[21] Revelation 21:23, New Revised Standard Version.

[22] Frost, "Penn in Myth and History," 34.

[23] Frost, "Promise and Legend," 585. Dunn and Dunn, for example, in the notes to the letter in which the naming of Philadelphia is announced, give the Greek definition prominence. They do identify Philadelphia as one of the ancient churches to which Revelation is addressed, but do not explore its significance or relevance to Penn's religious hopes for his colony. Dunn and Dunn, eds., *PWP*, 130.

Philadelphia was the only community out of seven that was looked upon favorably. Philadelphia was chosen to become "the city of my God, the New Jerusalem which comes down from my God out of heaven"[24] whose residents "kept my word and have not denied my name."[25] The combination of Penn's reference to Pennsylvania as the fifth kingdom, and naming the city "Philadelphia" pointed to Penn's belief that Pennsylvania was a place chosen by God whose residents were favored because of their holy living. Penn named the centerpiece community of his new province after biblical Philadelphia for a reason: the imagery enhanced the expectation for Quakers and others inhabitants to act in such a way as to please God. By accepting the charter as God's providence, Penn took on the responsibility of God's investment in Pennsylvania. By naming the place after scriptural ideals, Penn assumed the settlers' behavior would reflect belief in specific biblical principles. He linked specific and expected types of practices to the world's end.

The remainder of this study will address one such practice: How Quakers in Pennsylvania, in light of their special concerns for separation and the eschatological future, were expected to relate to and treat the original Indian inhabitants of the province. In 1682, William Penn modeled relationships that outwardly cast aside the overt notion that technological superiority and a measure of European "civilization" should determine the makeup of rulers and subjects in a bi-cultural society. A few of his interactions, though, indicated how difficult it was to fully disengage from European assumptions. In 1756, Israel Pemberton asserted that Quaker pacifism still had relevance in a time of open conflict, and demonstrated a respect for all humans that permeated his actions. In each setting, leaders expressed peace and a desire for friendship through the method of face-to-face conversation. This religious conviction—one that had significant political implications—was perceived as the method to remain in God's good graces.

---

[24] Revelation 3:12.

[25] Revelation 3:8.

Conversation as Religious Practice

Though Penn infused the physical location of the new colony with religious significance, he also realized that actions of the settlers would ultimately maintain the religious flavor of Pennsylvania. It was not enough to simply accept one's role in God's plan; additional steps were necessary to fulfill God's desires for Pennsylvania. Only proper actions by settlers would bring about the great things that Penn's eschatological hopes promised. His letters of the preparatory period, while filled with the religious symbolism of place, also provided specific instructions and examples of how settlers should foster and care for the colony. The most prevalent example involved English interactions with the Native Americans.

Penn's interaction with the Indians in 1681 was two-fold. First, as human beings, the Native Americans were treated justly. The concern for justice is traceable to the Quaker theology of the Inner Light. Relations between Indians, which were guided by fairness and justice, would sow seeds of trust that when cultivated, would blossom in a sustainable, long-term peace between the vastly different European and Indian cultures. Second, Penn's letters embodied the art of conversation as an expression of justice. By actively engaging the Native Americans and attempting to understand their traditions, Penn modeled to the Quaker community a commitment to diplomatic conversation that would result in non-violent conflict resolution. These two actions—treating Indians justly and embodying justice through conversation—constituted the "renewed dedication" Endy mentioned above. Though Penn's attitude was at times less pure than what he promoted, his actions served as the Quaker foundation for a religious practice of peace and goodwill towards the Indian population of Pennsylvania.

After a brief introduction to the Delaware Indians and an account of how the Quaker Inner Light theology related to 17th century English/Indian relationships, we will examine three of Penn's letters that provided settlers and Indians specific instructions about cross-cultural behavior. The letters also provided a model for conversation and

understanding between the two diverse groups. Penn offered specific instructions on how to settle individual grievances, instructions that reflected his religious vision and served as an example for how to communicate in a peaceful manner. Thus, Penn's religious framework affected prescribed behavior, both for the settlers and himself.

The Delaware Indians

According to archeological findings, the Lenni Lenape Indians, also known as the Delaware, lived along the coast of the Atlantic Ocean in what is now Eastern New Jersey prior to European contact. Originally foragers, fishermen and gatherers, rather than the agrarians that the Quakers encountered in the 1680s, the Delaware migrated westward across the Delaware River and into future Pennsylvania territory as European explorers appeared with more frequency in the 1600s. They sought out better hunting grounds to replace their livelihood that was disrupted by European expansion.[26]

The Delaware Indians provided a challenge for Europeans that desired to interact with them. Most European explorers expected to encounter an Indian political system like their own, where one leader of a nation negotiated important matters with another nation's leader and information about the result of the exchange was disseminated through the hierarchical chain of command. The Delaware were a loosely configured group that shared a related language but did not have any binding or collective political leadership. Each local group was responsible for its own decisions, and decisions were often made collectively, rather than by one chief. This became a source of frustration for English leaders, especially as they encountered the Delaware in different parts of

---

[26] Marshall Becker, "Native Settlements in the Forks of Delaware, Pennsylvania, in the 18th Century: Archaeological Implications," *Pennsylvania Archaeologist* 58, no. 1 (1988), 43-60; Marshall Becker, "The Lenape and Other 'Delawarean' People at the Time of European Contact: Population Estimates Derived from Archaeological and Historical Sources," *The Bulletin: Journal of the New York State Archaeological Association* 105 (1993), 16-25.

Pennsylvania.[27] The proprietors had to deal with different local groups separately, and found this especially challenging in times of military conflict when issues and concerns of one group conflicted with interests of another. Europeans would have preferred a political structure more familiar to their own.

In the early years of English settlement, William Penn deftly navigated this landscape of native pluralism and invoked the trust of nearly all the Delaware, as well as other Indian groups, in the territory.[28] One reason for his success in juggling interests was his acceptance of the Delaware's equal humanity. Penn's recognition provided the basis for peace between the cultures. In addition, his own experience in England of diverse Christian communities that sought their own model of governance was in some ways similar individual Delaware tribes with diverse interests. In both cases, his sense for toleration and fairness in dealing with diverse peoples was linked directly to Friends theology of the Inner Light. Acceptance of another's humanity and treating the "other" with justice did much to inform Penn's dealings with the Delawares.

Inner Light theology: a basis for action

The theological writings of William Penn touched often on the Quaker tenet of the Inner Light. Though varied and not always consistently applied, Penn's views on one's internal access to the divine illuminates his understanding of God's interaction with human beings. He put this theology into practice in his relationships with Native Americans before and during his time in Pennsylvania. His practical steps of extending the initial hand of friendship, guaranteeing that the Indians treated fairly by the European

---

[27] Delaware had dispersed west and north from original homeland on the Atlantic Coast. For our purposes, the present subject pertains to tribes of Eastern Delaware, residents of the Delaware and Lehigh River Valleys, unless otherwise noted.

[28] Francis Jennings summarized interactions of both William Penn in the 1680s and subsequent Pennsylvania leadership up to the 1750s in with several groups of Delaware in "Brother Miquon: Good Lord!", in *The World of William Penn,* Richard S. Dunn and Mary Maples Dunn, eds., (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1986), 195-214.

settlers, and procuring a goal of peaceful coexistence between English and Indian can all be seen as extensions of his Quaker theology. It is particularly noteworthy that Penn extended this hospitality to persons of a very different culture than his own. In a time when many European leaders and settlers looked for ways to exploit the Native Americans, Penn's treatment of the native people reflected a renewed dedication to God.

The Inner Light, Penn explained, had two components. First, it was simply an internal awareness of God that is inherent in every person. Noting Penn's reference in 1670 to humanity's "instinct of a Deity," Endy likens it to a "spiritual sense or set of spiritual senses."[29] This sense subconsciously guided one's moral decision-making to a limited extent. Full deployment, though, could not come without human response. The second component provided the opportunity. For the Inner Light was also a psychological catalyst, an ever-present agent of regeneration. When responded to, as in a conversion experience, the Inner Light was fully illuminated and one was "transformed" into a state where the rational faculties worked in tune with God to make moral decisions.[30] God and the human person became partners in decision-making.

Once transformed, the "image of God" was a guiding symbol in subsequent action. God's attributes—wisdom, justice, mercy, holiness, etc.—were to be replicated in earthly relationships. Penn explained that "As Man becomes Holy, Just, Merciful, Patient, etc. By the Copy he will know the Original, and by the Workmanship in himself, he will be acquainted with the Holy Workman."[31] In other words, Penn understood his actions of peace, friendship, and justice towards others as the very attitudes of God and the avenue for knowing God. Penn's practices were simultaneously evidence and example of his

---

[29] Endy, *William Penn*, 158. "Instinct of a Deity" from William Penn, "Great Case" (1670) from the *Works of William Penn* vol. 1 (London: J. Sowle, 1726), 451. Hereafter *Works*, 1:451.

[30] See further Endy, *William Penn*, 150-159.

[31] William Penn, "Primitive Christianity" (1696), *Works,* 2:866.

own regeneration. It followed, therefore, that a regenerated colony of people would have cosmic implications on the political life of the colony.

Penn's actions also demonstrated his belief that the Inner Light was universal. Penn understood this psychologically, as he wrote in 1698: "the innate notions or inward knowledge we have of God, is from this true light that lighteth every man coming into the world."[32] Universality distinguished Penn's beliefs and the New World provided a testing ground for them. He understood the theology of the Inner light as not only pertinent to citizens of Britain, Ireland and others in Europe, but also to the Indians of the Delaware River Valley. The true light "lighteth *every* man coming into the world." Using this aspect of universality, Penn granted the Indians their place in the human race that most European settlers did not. Rather than labeling their unfamiliar actions, language and cultural traditions as savage and beyond redemption, Penn assigned value to native society and the persons in it, for God resided in each one. By accepting Native Americans as equals in the human race on religious terms, Penn understood right relations with the Delaware as his spiritual responsibility, a decision that also affected his political relationships.

In addition, Penn could not conceive of a situation where one human was more important to God than another. All should be treated with justice. Endy observed that to Penn, "a theology that did not provide all men equally with a clear—even unmistakable—light of divine knowledge made God 'more unjust than the worst of men.'"[33] A just God could only desire justice for all humans. Penn's signature theological step was to redefine "humanity" in a way that included Native Americans.

---

[32] William Penn, "Defence of a Paper" (1698), *Works* 2:898.

[33] Endy, *William Penn,* 260, quoting William Penn, "Spirit of Truth" (1672), *Works* 2:105.

We now turn to specific examples of Penn's expressions of justice to Native Americans in the 1680s. These conversations of peace, rooted in Quaker theology, stem from a religious worldview that applied the Inner Light to political circumstances, but also contained traces of condescension that Penn outwardly rejected.

In practice: Penn's letters of justice

Aware of the native population and the interaction that the settlers would have with them, Penn showed that he believed in the power of a first impression. In three letters written in the span of four months in 1681, he demonstrated that he envisioned Pennsylvania as a place where Europeans and native peoples could treat each other justly and coexist peacefully. Aware of the injustices and conflicted nature of previous European/native interactions, Penn asked both his English brethren and native neighbors for a clean slate and a clear conscience towards the other, and promised to all a colony that would embody relationships based on mutual understanding. In the letters Penn bridged significant differences of culture, language and lifestyle to find a common thread of equal humanity that called for mutual respect. On the one hand, the repeated calls for justice and patience make Penn seem ahead of his time among European colonizers. But on the other hand, Penn was still the one making the rules. Upon close inspection, Penn took on a parental role of one who knows what's best for the Delaware, and knowingly or not, justified coercion and colonizing. We will examine three documents during the spring and autumn of 1681 and seek places that reflect his Quaker religious belief in terms of Indian relations, as well as identify portions that take on an air of patronization. In addition, we will focus on the specific practice of dealing with Indian grievances as a window of his concerns for justice.

Letter to the first purchasers, July 1681

William Penn had started recruiting settlers as early as the spring of 1681, when he assembled promotional material in hopes of garnering interest that would lead to land

sales. By mid-July, he incorporated varied feedback from early purchasers into "Conditions or Concessions to the First Purchasers," a document which updated his conditions of sale with the hope of increasing the number of Pennsylvania settlers. The changes included limits to protect against large-scale land speculators, limits on the amount of free land Penn would have to give to masters and servants, and an obligation by Penn to build a capital town. Most relevant to purposes of justice and religious peacemaking, however, are the five consecutive paragraphs of the twenty-paragraph document that inform potential buyers of behavioral expectations of new residents in relation to the Native American population.

When he sold land in Pennsylvania, Penn wanted to be sure that buyers knew what kind of relationships were expected of them. It is clear Penn desired that the settlers treat the Indians they would inevitably encounter with the same respect and care that they would treat each other. It was a riff on the biblical golden rule—do unto the Indians as you would do among yourselves—applicable in any number of settings.

For instance, Penn addressed expectations for the town's marketplace in terms of equality between the Europeans ("planters") and Indians. The formal marketplace was a setting where the two cultural groups would interact and exchange goods. Penn warned against either the planters or Indians trying to water down their trade goods. In fact, the province would benefit from perpetrators. "If bad ware and prized as good, and deceitful in proportion or weights," one would "forfeit the value as in good and in full in weight and proportion, to the publick treasury of the Province, whether it be the merchandise of the Indian or that of the Planters."[34] Each had a stake in honestly representing their wares. Penn prohibited exchanges outside the market, where one was unable to confirm the quality of the goods sold. The marketplace was where one "suffer[s] the test whether

---

[34] William Penn, "Conditions or Concessions to the First Purchasers," (July 1681); *PWP,* 2:100.

good or bad, if good to pass, if not good, not to be sold for good." To shore up the point for the Europeans, Penn addressed the potential for the technologically superior immigrants to take advantage of the Indians. In a terse statement obviously meant for the English—but a phrase that perhaps revealed Penn's fears of the planters' tendency—Penn stated, "the Natives may not be abused nor provoked."[35] In the marketplace, at least, economic exchanges between planters and Indians would be regulated and equal.

Penn also addressed crime between natives and planters. Each offense would be treated and punished the same regardless of the offender. An offense by a planter against an Indian "shall incur the same penalty of the law as if he had committed it against his fellow planter." In addition, a planter must not take the law into his own hands if he felt wronged by an Indian, but "shall make his complaint to the Governor of the province or his Lieutenant or Deputy." The officials in turn would "take care with the King of the said Indian; that all reasonable satisfaction be made to the said injured planter."[36] Penn's intention was for community leaders to work out severe differences, and placed a heavy responsibility on his yet-appointed magistrates to actually follow through with the work of administering justice between members of two diverse cultures. The statement served to simultaneously warn new European residents of the expectations of, and protect them from, justice in the midst of an uncertain cultural encounter. Planters who struck out at Indians would not be dealt with differently than those that injured each other, and Indians who offended planters would be held to the same rules of punishment.

Penn also reminded the settlers of the Indians' humanity and their right to engage in day-to-day chores much like their own. Even at this pre-settlement stage, Penn's language about Indian rights reflects the freedoms for which colonial Pennsylvania became known. He wrote, "the Indians shall have liberty to do all things relating to the

---

[35] Ibid.

[36] Ibid.

improvement of their ground and providing sustenance for their families, that any of the planters shall enjoy."[37] The golden rule applied to commerce, law and domesticity in William Penn's ideal Pennsylvania.

Though Penn had good intentions of fairness and equity, the letter also reveals three parental preconceptions. First, by limiting an economic exchange to the marketplace, Penn imposed his own Western ideals of trade. For a culture that prior to European contact had little concept of personal property, trade regulations were meaningless. The marketplace Penn had in mind was a Western concept. Second, Penn's rules about offenses against one another made sense to planters used to their culture's behavioral and punishment expectations. At least one scholar has suggested that the Delaware "were a society in which social control was maintained by public displeasure or shame before others," a system quite different than the English.[38] It seems that Penn pushed his own conception of the process of determining right and wrong and the onto the Delaware people. Third, the idea of "improvement of the ground" was a European value. Native Americans understood the land as belonging collectively to the people, not something that one would individually use to provide personal benefit or value. These examples show that Penn expected native people to conform to European concepts of property and behavior that he understood as best for a society, much in the same way that a parent guides a child into the accepted and unaccepted rules of a society. Rather than conferring with the Indians about these standards of conduct, he imposed his own.

There is no known surviving documentation of the provincial treasury fattened by the cost of a spoiled slab of pork, or a settler being punished for not allowing an Indian to

---

[37] Ibid.

[38] In addition, in the Delaware system "women were the primary praisers and shamers of society," writes Margaret M. Caffrey, "Complementary Power: Men and Women of the Lenni Lenape," *American Indian Quarterly*, Vol. 24, No. 1 (Winter, 2000), 53. The Europeans certainly did not have women taking part in judicial punishment matters.

plow or plant his ground. Nevertheless, in this letter to purchasers months before his party arrived, William Penn was clear about his outward intentions for justice to reign in the colony. No planter was to feel that his rights were any more, or less, important than the rights of his Indian neighbor. Given Penn's religious theology of the Inner Light and how justice proceeds from acknowledged universal humanity, Penn's religious worldview significantly affected his diplomacy, even as his assumptions undermined his intentions.

Letter to commissioners, September 1681

Penn's awareness of the role of Indian relations in creating a peaceful colony resurfaced several months later in a different context. In September of 1681, Penn composed a document that charged three men as his commissioners. Their task was to set sail that autumn ahead of Penn and the bulk of the settlers, and to begin laying out the town of Philadelphia. This act would result in significant interaction with Native Americans who had sustained themselves for generations along the Delaware River. Penn realized the combustible nature of development, especially in light of the Quaker religious conviction for peace with one's neighbors. He treaded carefully in this area. Among the detailed directions for streets and buildings, appropriate methods for dividing land plots for settlers, and the expansive plans for his own estate, Penn devoted a small section of the letter to how the commissioners should interact with the Indians during their stay. Though innocent in its intentions, the letter was also fraught with condescending presuppositions about expected behavior.

The gist of Penn's short message was to treat the Indians with kindness. Penn gave the commissioners instructions on buying land rights from Native Americans but he warned the agents of not pushing these transactions too far.[39] "Be tender of offending the

[39] Penn had made a commitment to prospective settlers that the land would come with a clear title. This meant that throughout his lifetime Penn continued to purchase rights to Indians' lands before he could sell them to settlers. While costly, the practice did diminish border

Indians," he cautioned, aware that unrestrained mass expansion could have a longstanding negative consequence in Indian relations. Penn understood his role as an outsider, and did not want to overstep his welcome. Instead, he instructed commissioners to be peacemakers. "Soften them to me and my people," Penn continued later. "Let them know that you [have] come to sit down lovingly among them."[40] Penn was aware that he would have to convince Indian leaders that he was not a land-hungry outsider bent on empire. His strategy was to approach the culturally different Native Americans with respect and openness, and the responsibility for peace fell at his feet.

As mentioned earlier, Penn's religious belief about the universal Inner Light undergirded his societal goal of peaceful coexistence. As a transformed person who had responded to his own Inner Light and now viewed relationships differently, Penn knew that his part in making peace a reality hinged on mutual trust, friendship and a measure of cross-cultural acceptance. He was now responsible to pursue his societal ideals in whatever the setting. In Pennsylvania, kindness to Native Americans was the starting point. However, in his letter to the commissioners, Penn employed two important elements—one a cultural image, one a method of communication—that showcased his cultural awareness. Lasting peace with the Indians would take much more than simple kindness, or even assurances of justice. A measure of acceptance of the other's culture and tradition laid the groundwork for a deep friendship. A trusted neighbor employs kindness, but kindness alone does not assure a trusted neighbor.

Penn demonstrated acceptance by employing an image of Native American culture in his letter. The Quaker leader's intent to "sit down lovingly among" the Delaware carried considerable significance in European/Indian relations in 1681. The

---

disagreements. See further Francis Jennings, "Brother Miquon," 195-214. Alteration of this practice by his son Thomas Penn and other Pennsylvania leaders in the 1730s significantly impacted Indian relations; see Chapter 2 below.

[40] William Penn, "Initial Plans for Philadelphia," 30 September 1681, *PWP*, 2:120.

Native council fire was a hospitable place for diplomatic negotiations with on opposition tribe. In addition, it was a setting where tribal business was conducted. While other Europeans decried the fire as demonic or as an example of the uncivilized savagery from which the Indians needed to be rescued, Penn embraced the opportunity for dialogue between Quakers and the Indians. The phrase "sit down lovingly among" can be taken in at least two ways. A literal reading interpreted leaders from different cultures sitting and discussing differences, forming trust and friendship along the way. This interpretation certainly would have appealed to Penn given his religious preference of diplomacy and conversation rather than force to resolve conflict. A second, more figurative sense was that the planters would settle in Indian territory with a sense of commonality and solidarity with the natives, rather than with an air of cultural superiority. Both interpretations were consistent with Penn's Quaker values of peaceful coexistence based on justice and conversation.

In each reading, Penn accepted, rather than denounced, a cultural tradition different than his own. Though European methods favored written treaties to resolve conflict and prevent political misunderstandings, Penn validated the native tradition of oral communication. He recognized that eye-to-eye contact connoted trust and goodwill that a written letter or statement could not carry. Furthermore, he understood that literacy is not necessarily a prerequisite of an established civilization. Progress gained in conversing around the council fire could equal advances though written communications. Penn realized that adjusting the English norms of written authority to a native-preferred model of oral communication would have extensive benefit in Quaker-Indian relations. Penn's goal was to accumulate enough trust between the two groups to secure the bonds of peace that would last generations. He realized that in cases where it was possible, face-to-face diplomacy and conversation helped to build that trust. Peace was not only a political ploy that could prevent benefits both sides from engaging in the costs and horrors of war. Nor was it solely defined by the absence of war. Instead, peace was a

long-term goal, ultimately the result of fostered friendships that began with commonality and reciprocal respect for the other's culture: a respect that started, in the Native tradition, by sitting down face-to-face and talking through differences.

These same passages when taken from perspective of the Delaware Indians, however, raise significant questions about Penn's assumptions. As in his letter to the first purchasers, the letter creates a paradox between Penn's ideals and his unstated ethnocentrism. Though he presented the role of peace and friendly interactions as the goal, he still assigned worth to European values that had little relevance to the Native American culture. For example, the language of "be tender" and "soften" assumes that an initial English stance of meekness towards the Indians would predicate future friendly relationships. These friendly relationships, however, would become the foundation on which the English could justify future negotiations for land that belonged to the Native Americans. Furthermore, the request to "sit down lovingly among them" does not exonerate Penn of intents of coercion. One can sit down lovingly among Natives while simultaneously being intent on convincing them of to concede to something you want. Penn's letter had hints of paradox between his outward religious ideals of peace and its more hidden political implications.

Perhaps best example of the paradox is expressed in section of the letter in which Penn gave instructions to his commissioners on conduct of any such meeting. His representatives were to

> Let my letter and Conditions with my Purchasers about just dealing with them be read in their own tongue, that they may see, wee have their good in our eye, equal with our own interest, and after reading my letter and the said Conditions, then present their Kings with what I send them, and make a friendship and league with them according to those Conditions, which carefully observe, and get them to comply with you; be grave they love not to be smiled on. [41]

---

[41] Ibid. Dunn and Dunn, editors of the *Papers of William Penn*, speculate that "my Letter" referred to the letter to the Kings of the Indians (analysis below), and "Conditions" could be the letter to First Purchasers from 11 July 1681 (above). The editors do not address the

Penn demonstrated his religious emphasis on peace and a measure of tolerance in his instructions to them to read a document to the Indians. The manner of communication—providing their thoughts and exchanges in the Native American's own language—signified a stance of acceptance. Rather than expect that the Delaware Indians would, or should, be able to initiate means to understand a European language in the cross-cultural interaction, Penn intended to bring his message of friendship to the Indians "in their own tongue." For Native Americans accustomed to flamboyant and invasive Europeans who looked for an excuse to forcibly impose their own lifestyle, Penn's intention to translate his message of goodwill into their language signaled a change in the way Europeans would relate to the Indians. The talk of peace was not just temporary, but rather a long-term arrangement. The instruction demonstrated Penn's seriousness about extending equality to a culturally different group.

The tone of the letter, however, established his role as cultural parent and his subsequent actions at times contradicted his own words. Though he provided the commissioners a reason for the worthiness of sitting down with them—"that they may see, we have their good in our eye, equal with our own interest"—his phrase "get them to comply with you" implied manipulation. It seems he wanted to create the conditions whereby the Delaware could agree to an already-decided course of action. At the very least, Penn took on the role of the condescending parent who attempts to maintain household peace between siblings. As the one with the correct interpretation of an issue and the ability to enforce it, Penn's language connoted an decision already made that his stance of equality and dual benefit contradicted. Though Penn spoke of toleration in religious terms, his own communication implied political implications of avoiding the messiness of conflict that would support his own religious goals for Pennsylvania.

---

curiosity of how the present letter to the Commissioners, written 30 September 1681, could refer to the letter to the Indians, written later (18 October 1681). The editors also cite an unfound letter from 15 Sept 1681 could be "Conditions." *PWP*, 2:122 n11.

Much as in his letter to the First Purchasers, Penn raised the standard of conduct for planters who were to be civic leaders. Penn had confidence in the leaders to treat the Delaware Indians justly. He assumed in this letter that his commissioners would be able to exercise judgment that corresponded with his intentions of peace and fairness. In this case, there was no reason to believe that the commissioners strayed from Penn's stated expectations. But over succeeding generations, Penn's own kindred would trade his lofty ideals of coexistence, tinged though they were with European assumptions, for a more overt and upfront desire for European gain at all costs. Years, then decades, passed before new visionaries, though with their own blind spots, looked to recapture and repackage the ideals of an original prophet.

Letter to Indians, October 1681

The most telling example of Penn's peaceful approach through direct conversation is his letter to the Indians themselves. In his "Letter to the Kings of the Indians" in October of 1681, he provided the fullest account of intended planter/Indian relationships, expectations both of how his people will act and how they will be expected to act. The letter provided insight into Penn's religious vision of a colony based on peaceful relationships with Indians, though again he also failed to recognize the political implications of his religious ideals.

Penn immediately recognized the two groups' common humanity in God. "There is one great God and Power that hath made the world and all things therein, to whom you and I and all People owe their being and wellbeing," Penn began.[42] He emphasized the co-existence of these two cultures by way of a singular relationship to God. Though unstated, the Quaker belief in the Inner Light, where all humans are equal under God, is the underlying expression. Penn was not threatened by the different cultural and religious beliefs of the Native Americans; instead, he preached commonality in spiritual matters.

---

[42] William Penn, "To the Kings of the Indians," (18 October 1681) *PWP,* 2:128.

By acknowledging God as creator of the earth and source of all humanity, Penn established a level playing field in cross-cultural relations.

Knowingly or not, Penn tapped a stream of Indian cosmology that attributed all of nature and humanity to a transcendent source. Much like the Quaker theology of God who rests in each person as the Inner light, Native Americans' relationship with each other was one built of respect for another's life. In addition, native persons saw themselves as caretakers of lands and wider creation given by the transcendent one, and natural harmony was disrupted by mistreatment of others or the land. So when Penn cited a Godly "law written in our hearts, by which we are taught and commanded to love and help and do good to one another," the Indians resonated with the language and theme.[43] Likewise, Penn named a responsibility and accountability for English actions that the Indians felt in their own worldview. Penn's care to keep from pitting an "English world" against "Native world" or "our God" from "your god" enhanced the common language. Both English and Indian believe in the "great God and Power" as someone "to whom you and I must one Day give an account, for all that we do in this world." Responsibility for one's action was a shared value in Quaker and Indian cultures.

Specifically, Penn wrote that from this accountability would spring peaceful co-existence with all of God's creation. Therefore, the divine intent would be "that we may always live together as Neighbors and friends, else what would the great God say to us[?]" Penn's language transcended differences, and invoked a model of friendship and trust that would lead to peace.[44] Though at times unaware of the political ramifications in terms of land acquisition, Penn believed that the responsibility for peace came from religious belief.

---

[43] Ibid.

[44] Ibid.

Not oblivious to the intentions of previous European settlers in the New World, in the September letter to his commissioners Penn told his representatives how important it was to communicate his goodwill towards the Indians. In his direct communication with the Delawares a month later, Penn disassociated himself from previous European explorers; his colony would treat the Indians differently. He explicitly identified the wrongs of European colonialism: "I am very sensible of the unkindness and Injustice that hath been too much exercised towards you by the people of these parts of the world, who have sought themselves, and to make great advantages by you, rather then be examples of justice and goodness unto you."[45] Previous Europeans had been driven by imperialism rooted in selfishness, Penn said. He acknowledged that the injustices towards natives had been painful, and that unfair treatment had "caused great grudgings and animosities, sometimes to the shedding of blood." Without excusing the violence or pointing fingers to accuse the initiator, he again referred to the viewpoint of a common deity. The hostilities on both European and Indian accounts were a situation "which hath made the great God Angry."[46] God's intention, across cultures, was for friendship, not hatred.

Thus, by speaking of a common peaceful deity for both English and Indian, Penn condemned bloodshed as antithetical to God's desire in both cultures' worldview. The cycle of suspicion, war and the layer upon layer of resulting retribution is a dangerous path to follow for any culture wishing to please a god they understand as promoting peace.

After condemning earlier leaders' practices, Penn distanced himself from a culture of domination, and called on his English reputation for proof. "But I am not such a Man, as is well known in my own country: I have great love and regard towards you, and I desire to win and gain your love and friendship by a kind, just and peaceable

---

[45] Ibid.

[46] Ibid.

life."[47] Penn realized that deeds—a just attempt to "win and gain" friendship—not just words, were the only long-term method of peaceful sustainability. He hoped settlers would share his conviction of peaceful coexistence: "the people I send are of the same mind, and shall in all things behave themselves accordingly."[48] Though not being able to account for behavior of future generations, Penn confidently depicted his group as concerned with peace and justice for the Indians.

Penn ended the letter by asking for kindness in return, and once again expressed his belief in the value of face-to-face conversation, honesty and justice on the way to peace. "I shall come shortly to you my self," he wrote, "at what time we may more largely and freely confer & discourse of these matters."[49] Penn also sealed the letter with presents, which served not only as "Testimony of my Good will to you," but also "my resolution to live justly peaceably and friendly with you."[50]

That William Penn, a British aristocrat, exercised the initiative to write to Indians in Pennsylvania, whom he had never met, cannot be taken lightly. He trusted that the letter would find favor in the eyes of the native people. Penn believed that the Indians were human, and used this common humanity to make connections between cultures about God, responsibility and peaceful relations. However, his plea for acceptance and goodwill on religious grounds did not address the cultural change that his beliefs imposed on the Delaware people. Yes, there was one common god among Europeans and Indians, and that god was not pleased with either injustice or bloodshed. And all creatures must give accounts for actions, for what would the great God say if, as Penn wrote, we lived not as "sobertly and kindly together in the world" but instead in a state where we

---

[47] Ibid.

[48] Ibid.

[49] Ibid, 129.

[50] Ibid.

"devoure and destroy one an other"?[51] But Penn's intention that came from a religious commitment also affected political relationships. In light of his parental language about the Delaware when writing to other Europeans, the letter to the Indians can also be seen as a ploy for land acquisition—a "making nice" gesture in the face of the reality of inevitable colonialism. Since there would be no Pennsylvania settlement without land for immigrants to live, and since his religion forbade open armed coercion, Penn's religious peace can be seen as his justification for acquiring land that did not belong to him, and in the process displacing the original owners. Such a the deal seemed acceptable to the Delaware. They had been in contact with Europeans for nearly eighty years, used European common tools and goods but also had been decimated by European diseases such as smallpox and measles, for which they had no immunity.[52] Given the alternative of openly hostile and coercive Europeans, the Delaware saw value in transferring land transfer in a manner that did not threaten their people, but would provide economic benefit. An exchange by which the Delaware were paid for land by a European proprietor whose religious belief decried open domination would have been preferable to the other bloody possibilities.

Though far from perfect in its application, the religious conviction of Penn dictated a respect for Delaware humanity. Initiating conversation directly with leaders from another culture about his religious conviction of peace is one of William Penn's contributions to Quaker-Indian relations.

Case study: Grievances

Though meant for different audiences, the letters written by Penn to both the first purchasers in July 1681 and to the Delaware Indians in October of the same year had

---

[51] Ibid., 128.

[52] Dunn and Dunn, eds., *PWP,* 2:128.

similar themes. In each, Penn attempted to reach out to the Native people with a sympathetic hand. His goal was lasting friendship, and he took pains to extend goodwill both through his agents, and himself. One practical strategy that both letters agreed upon was how to settle disputes between Indians and planters. Penn correctly anticipated that conflicts between the cultures would still occur. In both letters, Penn gave both Quaker settlers and the Delaware Indians tools by which to solve these problems without resorting to force. The tools, however, were imposed to conform to European standards of social control.

In the letter to his purchasers**,** Penn gave instructions for a planter to not take matters of Indian wrongdoing into his own hands. Instead, a settler "shall make his complaint to the Governor of the province or his Lieutenant or Deputy, or some inferior magistrate near him, who shall to the utmost of his power, take care with the King of the said Indian." Even in these conflicts, between leaders or common civilians of the English and Indians, Penn had a plan of conflict resolution through mediated channels. Justice was sought for the parties, but not through the cycle of violence. Instead, "all differences between the planters and the Natives shall also be ended by twelve men, that is by six planters and six Natives." The combined court was a symbol of the equality Penn wanted to create in his colony, one in which both English and Indian could be a part of the solution. Mutuality created trust that avoided further misunderstandings, however, but did a forced mutuality work? Penn desired "that we may live friendly together, and as much as in us lyeth, prevent all occassions of heart burnings and mischiefs."[53] As we saw earlier, for Penn peace was based on mutual respect and dignity for the one culturally different than himself. War and retribution only led to chaos. By understanding and trusting the other, even in conflict, differences could be endured and solutions could be created.

---

[53] Penn, "Conditions or Concessions to the First Purchasers," *PWP*, 2:100

Penn repeated this diplomatic expectation in his letter to the Delaware. Given that they were the party of lesser power, this statement was a strong promise of how Penn understood a dispute should be resolved:

> If in any thing any shall offend you or your People, you shall have a full and Speedy Satisfaction for the same by an equall number of honest men on both sides that by no means you may have just Occasion of being offended against them; I shall shortly come to you my selfe.[54]

Penn anticipated that problems would arise between the Delaware and the English, regardless of common humanity. Human nature and diverse interests bred conflict. Penn's solution of sitting down with an "equall number of honest men on both sides" attempted to assure the Delaware that their grievances would be heard and judged fairly—a point of contention in the years to come.

This method was not original in Pennsylvania. As the editors of the *Papers of William Penn* note, Penn in the West New Jersey Concessions also advocated juries that included an equal number of whites and Indians to mediate disputes.[55] In Pennsylvania, he put in place a resolution system that included Native Americans alongside of English. The goal was that any unresolved conflict or a charge of injustice would be examined and decided quickly and fairly. This method of conflict resolution kept the Indians involved in decision-making but still created the conditions for a sustainable long-term peace. The method was preventative—to nip differences in the bud, to talk about differences between each other honestly, and to be judged by equal representation. A lofty ideal, the concept proved difficult to practically implement.

No evidence exists of this jury ever being employed. Though Penn's intent was that Native Americans would be treated fairly and would take part in the resolution, the jury idea sidestepped the fact that different societies deal with conflict in different

---

[54] Penn, "To the Kings of the Indians," *PWP* 2:128.

[55] Dunn and Dunn, eds, *PWP,* 2:129, n5.

manners. Penn assumed Delaware mediation tactics were similar to his own. The absence of any jury records indicates that in reality, planters and Indians found other means by which to resolve differences. Penn's religious vision informed an authority structure about conflict resolution. Expressed in terms of a parent/child relationship, the authority structure attempted to hold love and discipline in balance. Like a parents, Penn loved these people, understood them as equal humans and intended to deal with them fairly. But at the same time he also felt that his ways of doing things were the last word and would be best for the Delawares. He thought he was guiding the Quaker-Indian relationship according to his religious principles of peace, where a long-term friendship would last. But his acts had more social implications than he perhaps realized. His religion at times upheld and supported the same culture of domination that he recognized in other European colonists, yet hoped to avoid.

For William Penn, the action that came to represent the "new dedication" in terms of Quaker-Indian relations came in two forms. First, the Quaker theology of the Inner Light required that an encounter with the Indians, or any other human being, happen on equal ground. Because of the belief that God resided in every person, Penn strove to treat Native Americans with respect and justice, regardless of cultural differences. And, as seen in his letters that attempted to prepare his agents and future residents for this cross-cultural encounter, Penn anticipated that other Quakers would follow his example. God expected that humanity-affirming action would follow and represent belief. Second, Penn's letters of 1681 showed that conversation was a primary and precursory expression of justice. Penn's effort to communicate directly with the Delaware Indians about his coming, his motivations and his expectations represent his ideal that honest conversation led the way to peaceful co-existence. Furthermore, Penn's method of communication on the surface accepted and reconciled rather than assumed and ignored the cultural gap between Europeans and Native Americans. By acts such as attempting to find a Native speaker to help with language differences and incorporating images and traditions of

Native culture into his message of friendship, Penn exemplified the very principles he championed. But as we have seen, his own set of assumptions about correct behavior and the manner in which he communicated his preconceptions at times undermined his peace message. The religious motivations also affected and supported his political and economic interests, though this would not surface for another 70 years. Offering a standard of justice and illustrating it through conversation laid the groundwork for the trust and peaceful coexistence that subsisted between Pennsylvania planters and Native Americans until the 1750s.

Conclusion

As seen through his letters of 1681, Penn's intention was a colony in which friendliness towards neighbors, even neighbors from a drastically different culture, would form the base for a long-lasting peace. Peace was a part of Penn's religious vision, which interpreted the setting of Pennsylvania as holy—a land blessed with cosmic opportunity. Though he perceived it to be a territory destined by God, Penn believed that correct action had a positive effect on its potential. The realm of cross-cultural relations with the Native Americans became one area of their religious expression. Guided by the Quaker theology of the Inner Light, Penn advocated for justice when interacting with Native Americans, and modeled direct conversation with them as a way of establishing trust and friendship that would evolve into a long-term peace.

A second unrecognized force in Penn's vision, though, balanced and at times undermined his peace effort. By taking on a parental role with both settlers and Delaware Indians, Penn carried with him a European conception of leadership, property ownership and social control that he imposed on the Delaware Indians. After experiencing the worst of earlier European colonization tactics and diseases that left their population decimated, the Delaware in some ways accepted Penn's language that echoed many of their own

religious values. At least in this case, a fair exchange of goods for land was preferable to the violent alternative that could have extinguished their group.

Subsequent Pennsylvania leaders altered and then discarded Penn's ideal as the colony developed, opting for a political stability unabashedly built on domination and violence. But Penn's peaceful Indian relations policy was rooted in a tradition that understood its acts of religious expression (every human capable of trustworthy conversation) as also meeting the needs of the province (peace among inhabitants). It was a tradition that required nurture and development.

CHAPTER TWO: ISRAEL PEMBERTON: RESTORING HUMANITY AND RECAPTURING PENN'S VISION

Seventy-five years after William Penn first contacted the Delaware, circumstances in European-Indian relations had drastically changed. Though the Quakers no longer possessed political power, Israel Pemberton, like William Penn, was concerned with the issue of treating the Delaware Indians fairly. Rooted in his Quaker heritage, Pemberton's concern manifested itself during a time of violent conflict between the Delaware and European communities. In contrast to the Pennsylvania government's dehumanizing campaign to cast the Delawares as a brutal enemy, Pemberton, as a Quaker leader, acknowledged and restored the humanity of the Delaware Indians. By seeking direct conversation with the estranged Delaware and advocating for a measure of cultural acceptance to those in power, Pemberton hoped to re-establish a sustainable long-lasting peace between the colonials and the original inhabitants. In many ways, Pemberton echoed William Penn's intention for the colony in the 1680s.

The Setting of Violent Conflict

If it indeed was God's intent for the English and Indians to "always live together as Neighbors and friends" as Penn wrote to the Kings of the Indians in 1681, then by April 1756, there was no doubt that something had gone horribly wrong. Violence between Native American residents and their European cohabitants of Pennsylvania awakened all to the un-neighborly attitude of each side towards the cultural "other." Delaware raids on European settlements caused the provincial government and others to point the finger at the Indians as initiators of the conflict that became one portion of the Seven Years War. But when viewed through the lens of the history of European-Indian relations after the death of William Penn, the reasons were much more complex. The Delaware Indians did attack violently and without warning during the autumn of 1755,

and as the story of Edward Marshall illustrates, their aggression often resulted in fatal consequences.

One day in May 1757, Marshall, a second-generation European immigrant, accompanied several of his children and a friend to a log-cutting expedition along Jacobus creek in Eastern Pennsylvania, not far from his home.[56] When Marshall returned later that afternoon, his children at the house told a horrifying tale. Sixteen Indians had descended on the Marshall homestead and took Marshall's wife Elizabeth and the couple's month-old twins as prisoners. Five of the younger children were alerted to the attack when one of the Indians inadvertently threw his match coat on a gardenside beehive. In the ensuing confusion, the children escaped to a safe hiding place. The couple's eldest daughter Catherine, approximately 14 years old, ran to escape but was shot once in the shoulder. She survived by hiding in a nearby stream. Approximately six months later, the remains of Elizabeth were found in the mountains several miles north of the Marshall residence. She was scalped, with additional evidence of tomahawk wounds to the skull and breast. Nearby laid the remains of the couple's twins. And that was only a start: three months after the first attack, an Indian party again came calling to Marshall's house. Only eldest brother Peter was at home, he was promptly shot and killed.

Approximately eighteen months earlier, in the fall of 1755, relations between the Delaware tribes and European settlers in Pennsylvania had deteriorated to the point of guerilla warfare. Bands of Indians—both Delaware and their Western Pennsylvania Shawnee cousins—were emboldened by the defeat of British commander Edward Braddock in western Pennsylvania earlier that summer. Consequently, the Native Americans took to the offensive and attacked single farms like Marshall's and small villages on the western frontier of eastern Pennsylvania, frequently with the support of

---

[56] Account summarized from William J. Buck, *History of the Indian Walk performed for the Proprietaries of Pennsylvania in 1737; to which is appended a life of Edward Marshall*, (1886), 222-229.

French troops. Often conducted under the cover of darkness, the raids separated European families by death or by capture. To the victims, the violence seemed to come without warning or reason. As word spread of the attacks, many residents of single homesteads took flight to the nearest town, exchanging crops and nearly all their belongings for some sense of security. Edward Marshall, in fact, was one of them. He temporarily moved his family in late 1755 or early 1756 to New Jersey for about one year to avoid the violence.

Not all European settlers, though, responded with flight. Others, especially those of Scottish and Irish descent, harbored no hesitations about picking up a weapon of revenge against an enemy or attempting to defend their property. They armed themselves and actively sought out Indian targets for revenge. For example, after he had lost a wife and three children to Indian violence, Marshall earned a reputation as an Indian hunter; one who stalked and killed Native Americans in the Eastern woodlands. Another resident even asked the governor if the proprietors were going to offer bounties for Indian scalps; if so, he and his band would be ready.[57] The ongoing cycle of violence and retribution was in full spiral in Pennsylvania by the mid-1750s.

To discern the reason for the Native American raids, though, one needs to delve more deeply below the surface. By taking English lives and prisoners, the Native Americans gained the proprietor's attention. The Delaware Indians had been seeking a diplomatic relationship with Pennsylvania for decades. The skirmishes in the autumn of 1755 were more than a simple battle for military supremacy, for a provincial change of policy prompted the frontier violence.

Though William Penn birthed the colony with a religious ideal for peaceful coexistence in the 1680s, upon his death in 1715, the English-Indian relationship deteriorated. The proprietorship eventually passed to William's son Thomas, but the new

---

[57] Steven Craig Harper, *Promised Land : Penn's Holy Experiment, the Walking Purchase, and the Dispossession of Delawares, 1600-1763* (Bethlehem, PA: Lehigh University Press, 2006), 99.

leader shared neither his father's religious vision for the colony nor his commitment to justice for Native Americans. William Penn's sense of respect on a humanitarian level for the culturally different Native American residents was replaced by Thomas Penn's economic concerns. Thomas Penn and his henchmen—led by provincial secretary James Logan—viewed the Indians' primary value to the colony as members who coveted European trade goods. Penn chose to exploit this market for his own economic gain. No longer were there fears of the repercussion of "bad ware … prized as good" in the marketplace, as William Penn wrote in 1681.[58] For second-generation Pennsylvania leaders, concerns of Indian equality had been swapped for concerns of empire.

The foremost goal in Thomas Penn and James Logan's conquest was land acquisition, a pursuit that consumed their time and energy. William Penn had promised to purchase land plots from the Delaware Indians through negotiation, and to only sell land to settlers once he had gained clear title. Logan and Thomas Penn, while paying lip service to William's promises, gradually changed the practice. Lured by lucrative resale values for themselves and friends like the powerful William Allen, the Pennsylvania leaders granted tracts to speculators before having full Indian consent, then coerced the Delawares into giving up right to the land for much less than it was worth. Upon resale, the proprietors and others realized an enormous profit.[59] But though the practice generated significant new revenue for proprietors,[60] the ensuing cost—loss of Indian goodwill as the Delaware realized the proprietor's underhanded tactics—exceeded monetary gains. As English settlements appeared without warning in land that the Delaware had not consented to release, resentment towards the newcomers and the

---

[58] Penn, "Conditions or Concessions to the First Purchasers," *PWP,* 2:100.

[59] For several examples of land policies, see Harper, *Promised Land*, 48-51.

[60] Ibid., 49-50.

government policies that had changed the ways of land transactions for slowly accumulated.

The most important example of post-William Penn provincial land policy is the Walking Purchase of 1737. The Walking Purchase epitomizes the deception and coerciveness of Thomas Penn's leadership and his lack of respect for Delaware property. All efforts were made to take, rather than negotiate in good faith, rights to land that had long been under Delaware control. Where his father at least attempted to negotiate fairly with the Delaware, Thomas Penn had little scruples about exploiting Indian traditions for his own gain. The immediate and long-term effects of the Walking Purchase also foreshadowed the dehumanizing of the Delaware Indians by the Pennsylvania government in the mid 1750s.

The Walking Purchase began in the mid-1680s as treaty negotiations between William Penn and the Delaware for a new territory purchase for the English. Conceptually, it followed the blueprint of other land negotiations: the English were to receive land north and west of Penn's original 1682 purchase (which included Philadelphia). The Delaware River (the modern-day boundary between Pennsylvania and New Jersey) would serve as an eastern boundary; the western and northern boundaries were to be negotiated. Once the boundaries were satisfactory, the territory was to be exchanged for English goods, and ownership would be transferred to Penn's colony.

But as Stephen Harper described in *Promised Land: Penn's Holy Experiment, the Walking Purchase, and the Dispossession of Delaware, 1600-1763,* the Quakers and the Delaware had varied reports of the execution of the negotiations and subsequent payment of this tract of land in the mid-1680s. Most accounts agreed that the western and northern boundaries would be marked by how far a man could walk, starting from a point on the northern boundary of the 1682 purchase, in a day and a half. Some accounts said the walk (by both Penn and Indian representatives) was completed but never paid for; others say the walk never actually happened. Harper wrote that there is "compelling evidence that

the negotiations finally came to nothing."[61] Sometime after the negotiations, Penn left to return to England in 1684. The only surviving written documentation was an incomplete deed from 1686 and an extract from a letter to Penn from Surveyor General Thomas Holmes that suggested the matter was unsettled.

By the 1730s, Logan and Thomas Penn were under pressure to find ways to maximize profits for themselves and other land speculators. Their focus became prime land in the upper Lehigh Valley, approximately 60 miles north of Philadelphia, where the Lehigh River runs into the Delaware River. Several Delaware accounts indicated that this land—known as the Forks, or Forks of the Delaware—was not a part of the original negotiations in the mid-1680s, for it was under the control of another tribe. But Thomas Penn and Logan had promised these tracts of land to William Allen and other wealthy European speculators for resale; they had financial motivation to see it come under their control.

Penn's sons, along with Logan, resuscitated the Walking Purchase in 1736 as a means of gaining possession of the Forks. They presented a copy of a draft of a 1686 deed to Delaware Indian chiefs as evidence of a completed agreement, even though there were large gaps in the document and no signatures to verify its authenticity. The agreement, as Logan presented it, stated that the western boundary would be marked off by how far a man could walk in a day and a half, following the general course of the Delaware River.

The layers of deception in the re-introduction of this disputed deed reveal the depths to which the proprietors of Pennsylvania would stoop in their quest for land. After a contentious conference with the Delaware leaders in 1736, the Indians were eventually convinced of the validity of the incomplete 1686 document, and signed off on the

---

[61] Ibid., 40. The most likely time period for this negotiation was during William Penn's first residence in the colony, between 1682 and August 1684. But upon his return to England in 1684, several accounts agree that the land had not been paid for.

execution of the treaty, scheduled for September 1737.[62] Unknown to the Delaware, the proprietors had conducted a trial walk before they presented the agreement to ensure the Forks would be included in a day-and-a-half walk. When the actual "walk" came to pass in September 1737, the Delaware were perplexed by the actions of the English. The Delaware River's path from the Walk's point of departure near modern-day Trenton, NJ, runs northwest, then turns north and then northeast after the Forks. The walkers started on the northwesterly path, but continued in a straight line after the river curved north, walking away from, rather than along, the river. Instead of a mutually agreed upon pace, the walk was conducted at a tempo that the Indians, certainly more adept at crossing wooded terrain than the English, could hardly sustain. In addition, the proprietors employed two walkers solely for the purpose of covering as much ground as possible. Both walkers had participated in the trial walk two years earlier, and in 1737 were motivated by a reward of 500 acres in the new territory to the one who covered the most terrain. In all, the walkers covered 60 miles, and after turning the perpendicular survey line at the end of the walk, the proprietors took title to 1100 square miles, more than twice the land that the Delaware thought they had agreed. As signers of the 1736 document, the Delaware had little legal recourse in the eyes of the English. But the sour taste of the loss of goodwill in land transactions lingered for the Indians.

The story of the Purchase demonstrates the shift in Pennsylvania Indian relations policy from William Penn to Thomas Penn. William Penn, building on the trust and goodwill he had accumulated from dealing fairly with the Native peoples in the past, wished to buy land only with the Delaware's consent. Fifty years later, Thomas Penn, with a desire to build an economic empire, exploited thousands of acres from Indian

---

[62] Harper terms the scheme to convince the Indians that the document was authoritative a "proprietorial conspiracy." He details how Penn and Logan fabricated witnesses to the 1686 "agreement;" presented an English map drawn to mislead the Delaware to the enormity of English land claim; and brokered secret agreements with the Iroquois, all with intent to prove that the terms of the 1686 document should stand. Harper, *Promised Land*, 46-76.

control via a forged document and subversive execution of a suspect treaty. Harper recognized the symbolic power of the Walking Purchase of 1737, which "marked the end of negotiated boundaries in Pennsylvania, both geographical and cultural."[63] No longer would land and goods be given with mutual benefit. By the 1750s, Pennsylvania had broken its promise to coexist,[64] and in the process rendered the words of William Penn that "we may live friendly together" strikingly irrelevant.[65]

Therefore, the violent attacks of the Delaware Indians during the fall and winter of 1755-1756 can be at least partially explained as retribution for fraudulent land policies at least twenty years previous. As a threatened and silenced minority, Delaware chose force to give their voice legitimacy, and their strikes were carefully chosen. The Moravian writer William C. Riechel—whose group developed a Christian mission in the Purchase territory—observed that the Delaware targets in 1755 were "wherever the white man was settled within this disputed territory" of the Walking Purchase.[66] Harper noted that the raids during this time were on the outskirts of the territory—places like Easton, Bethlehem, Nazareth—and then got closer to the land in question, including the burning of the Moravian settlement, named Gnadenhutten, on November 24, 1755. By the next month, a war party had systematically destroyed homes, farms and crops of individual homesteads in a line running southeastward into the heart of the Walking Purchase territory.[67] The assault on Edward Marshall and his family chronicled above was no random act. Marshall was one of the Walking Purchase runners employed by Thomas

---

[63] Ibid., 14.

[64] Ibid., 16.

[65] Penn, "To the Kings of the Indians," *PWP,* 2:128.

[66] William C. Reichel, comp. *Memorials of the Moravian Church*. 3 vols. (Philadelphia, 1870), 192.

[67] Harper, *Promised Land*, 95.

Penn back in 1737, and the only one to finish the entire "walk." The Indian violence was strategically aimed at reclaiming the land taken by fraud and causing injury to those involved with its original misdeed. After all diplomacy and promised resolution by William Penn failed for the Delaware, war was the method by which their concerns were heard.

"Savage" Indians and a Forgotten History

Provincial officials in 1755-56 were more concerned with the immediacy of Indian raids than the history that preceded the Delaware uprising. The intent of William Penn's vision was to sustain peaceful relations over a long period of time. By contrast, the primarily goal of his son was temporary and temporal: to protect an expensive investment by subduing the opposing military force. The solution of Thomas Penn, through his resident governor Robert Morris, was to enhance the dualism between Europeans and the attacking Delaware by creating an enemy with non-human characteristics.[68] In turn, government leaders neglected the important diplomatic history of William Penn and the Delaware. Rather than talking and conversing directly with the perpetrators of the violence, Morris allowed second-hand information to dictate his decision to retaliate. In addition, he demonized Delaware warriors by describing them as "savages" and reinforcing images of uncompassionate destruction. Thus, the government stripped the Indians of their humanity, and pared down the conflict to a simple one of good versus evil. [69] Pennsylvania residents viewed the Delaware as a terror-wielding, unrelenting, bloodthirsty machine that possessed no rational capacity to negotiate, no empathy and no ability to take responsibility for the pain they inflicted. The effort to

---

[68] Thomas Penn, like his father, spent most of his time in England. Handpicked governors, like Robert Morris at the beginning of the Seven Years War, were appointed specifically to represent the proprietor's interests in colonial affairs and governance.

[69] For our purposes, "humanity" is defined as the relative equality necessary for cross-cultural relationships, in which mutual benefit, rather than coercion or domination, is the goal.

dehumanize the Delaware Indians began in public rhetoric and culminated in the government's active response to frontier attacks.

Violent Indian unrest started to surface with the defeat of British General Edward Braddock in western Pennsylvania during the summer of 1775. Braddock was dispatched from England with three thousand troops and the charge to take the French-controlled Fort Duquesne near modern-day Pittsburgh. The fort was a major trading center located at a strategic position in the Ohio River Valley. The English feared that French and Indian trade relations would turn the Indian alliance away from the English and make westward English expansion more difficult. Combined French and Indian forces ambushed the British army on the road to Fort Duquesne in early July. Though outnumbered, the French and Indians soundly defeated the army and killed Braddock.

Morris attempted to use the defeat to advance his own political ends. As governor, he was in constant conflict with the Pennsylvania Assembly, a representative body established by William Penn to balance the power between the people and the government. The governor had for some time wanted to fund a militia to help protect the western boundaries of the province. The Assembly, stocked by pacifist Quakers until the mid-1750s, refused to pass any militia-funding bill that would require civilian participation or that exempted the large provincial estate from the property taxes necessary to fund the bill. So news that General Braddock was defeated in part by a French/Indian alliance provided Morris ample fodder to further his claim for frontier defense.

Morris' language in favor of arming residents on the frontier reflected fear and hatred for the Delaware Indians. Only weeks after the attack on Braddock, he described the native group to the Assembly as

> barbarous Indians who delight in the shedding of human blood … who make no distinction as to Age or Sex, As to those that armed against them, or such as they can surprize in their peaceful Habitation. All are alike the objects of their Cruelty, Slaughtering

> the tender Infant and frighted Mother with equal Joy and Fierceness."[70]

By painting the Delaware as inhumane, indiscriminate and even smirking serial killers, Morris delineated the Indians from humans. Uncivilized in their ways of warfare, the Delaware possessed no discernment about their target, or capacity for compassion or reasoning. Morris branded them all alike in their wishes and successful execution of acts of cruelty.

Morris' rhetoric continued in the fall of 1755, as bands of Delaware and affiliated Shawnees raided homes and settlements in an eastward push. They struck first near the Susquehanna River in south-central Pennsylvania, then on to the settlements of Reading and Lancaster, and finally north to Northampton County (site of the Walking Purchase and the Forks) by December of 1755. "Savages" was the term Morris' used as his attempts to gain Assembly approval for funds and ammunition became more urgent. He repeated the good versus evil language of blamelessness and guilt. The "blood of the Innocent ... [is] shed by the cruel Hands of Savages," he stated. The Delaware are "an active enemy whose trade is War."[71] He characterized them as "savage neighbors whose tender mercies are cruelty"[72] whose "cruel and bloody Disposition … is well known to

---

[70] Samuel Hazard, ed., *Minutes of the Provincial Council,* vol. 6 (Harrisburg, Pa.: Theo Fenn & Co, 1851), 486. Hereafter *MPC* 6:486. The Provincial Council was a group of advisors to the governor, and the Minutes cover the gamut of the proprietorship-era of Pennsylvania (1681-1776). While a valuable resource, researchers have been prone to overlook the European bias inherent in the *MPC*. Written from the proprietary party's perspective, the *Minutes* are void of any material that may have cause the proprietors in a negative light, particularly with respect to "opponents" such as Native Americans or Quakers. For instance, there is no mention in the *Minutes* of Indian dissatisfaction with the Walking Purchase, though Harper chronicles complaints from sources other than ones written by representatives of the proprietor. He concludes that "the idea that the Delawares were content with the Walking Purchase until officious Quakers coaxed them to complain originated in the official Pennsylvania reports designed to cover the impropriety," Harper, *Promised Land*, 72-73. The proprietors used the power of the pen to write history; when some *MPC* entries are contrasted with Quaker sources of the same events (especially Indian treaty conferences), discontinuities sometimes appear.

[71] *MPC,* 6:487.

[72] Ibid., 6:533.

all."[73] The language was meant to create unity against the enemy, but the politicians did not budge. The Assembly refused to grant funds to pay for military supplies.

Other political figures also got into the habit of dehumanizing the actions of the Delaware. The mayor of Philadelphia termed the deaths and scalping occurring on the frontier an "inhuman slaughter of your fellow subjects" as the groups got closer to his city in the autumn of 1755. [74] The secretary of the council, who provided a chronology in December of 1755 of nefarious Indian activity during the previous six-month period, echoed Morris, lamenting "horrid cruelties and indecencies committed by these merciless Savages on the bodies of the unhappy wretches who fell into their Barbarous hands, especially the Women, without regard to Sex or Age as far exceeds those related of the most abandoned Pirates."[75] And even Benjamin Franklin, at this point a prominent member of the Assembly (though not a Quaker pacifist), was an outspoken proprietary opponent. Scholar Francis Jennings noted that, despite his genius, Franklin "conceived the human species in terms of race. From him the natural attribute of the 'tawny' race was a state of savagery."[76]

Soon, the attitude of colonial leadership affected the lay person's own experience. The actions of the Delaware were other-than-human, especially for those personally affected by the raids, which left property burned, crops destroyed, and families taken or murdered. For residents, there was only one response: revenge. Jennings stated that victims "perceived the enemy as demons who had tomahawked their kin and neighbors, and devastated their homes." In the eyes of European inhabitants, the Indians were

---

[73] Ibid., 6:671.

[74] Ibid., 6:734.

[75] Ibid., 6:768.

[76] Francis Jennings, *Empire of Fortune: Crowns, Colonies and Tribes in the Seven Years War in America,* (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1988), 259.

"monsters of a race other than human."[77] The message was clear in Morris' rhetoric, which became accepted expression to much of the population: The Delaware Indians were enemies that needed to be defeated, not people with whom one could converse.

A few Quakers thought differently. Assembly Speaker Isaac Norris reminded Morris in November 1755 that the violent outbursts did not include all Delaware. There were, he said, "Indians who are still inclined to preserve their alliances with us" and "seem equally terrified lest the remote Inhabitants and the English generally." Such groups were reliant on the Six Nations, or Iroquois Indians, who had favorable relations with the English. Instead of labeling the entire Delaware group as inhuman, Norris asked, why not attempt to find out the reason for their discontent? "It seems absolutely necessary on our part to request the Governor would be please to inform us whether he knows of any disgust or Injury the Delaware or Shawanese have ever received from this Province," Norris wrote.[78] Whether he was prompted or he acted on his own volition, Morris did respond. But rather than attempting to engage the Delaware himself, Morris dispatched Oneida chief Scarroyady (a member of the Six Nations), along with interpreter Andrew Montour, to northern Pennsylvania to visit with Delaware tribes and question them about their disposition towards the English in the winter of 1755-1756. Upon his return, Scarroyady reported that the northern Delaware he spoke with felt falsely accused of siding with the French, but that the British were "heartily their enemies."[79] This is the only instance previous to April 1756 in which the Pennsylvania government officials attempted to contact the Delaware leaders about their actions.

By the spring of 1756, the Delaware-as-subhuman rhetoric bloomed into full-blown warfare. Morris forged ahead. On April 14, despite the pleadings of concerned

---

[77] Ibid., 195.

[78] *MPC*, 6:678.

[79] Ibid., 7:70.

Quakers, he declared war on the Delaware Indians.[80] In lieu of an organized militia, Morris sanctioned his own guerrilla tactics: prices for Indian scalps. From the provincial treasury, $130 would be paid for each scalp of a male greater than ten years old, $50 for each female or male under ten years old. Declaring war and establishing Indian scalps a commodity was Morris' defining act of dehumanization. It represented his view of the hopelessness of diplomacy, even though he had not spoken specifically to the perpetrators of the frontier violence. In his speech that announced his delclaration to the residents of Pennsylvania, he stated that those responsible for chaos acted "in a most cruel, savage and perfidious manner, killed and Butchered a great Numbers of the Inhabitants, and carried others into barbarous Captivity; burning and destroying their habitations, and laying waste to the country."[81] But the declaration was self-damning. For all the rhetoric about inhuman bloodthirstiness of the opponent and all the barbarous acts they committed, Morris himself stooped to exactly that level of savagery. Now it was not only the Delaware, but also Morris, that had little regard for sex or age. The scalp strategy was savagery designed to defeat savagery.

Morris' inclusion of a reward for Indian scalps was the culminating act in the transformation in European-Indian relations in Pennsylvania. As we have seen, William Penn intended that face-to-face conversation in the context of an equally represented judicial body would fairly address grievances between English and Indians. By contrast, Morris chose to forgo diplomacy, and go to war with the Indians over grievances. To win the war meant more artillery and more bloodshed. Additionally, the call for scalps ignored the diplomatic link to the Pennsylvania's past. The intent of William Penn's diplomacy was forgotten and no longer valued.

---

[80] Israel Pemberton led a Quaker group that approached and addressed both the governor and the Assembly as Morris debated the call to war. The "Letter from Quakers the Governor" of April 12, 1756, is discussed below.

[81] *MPC*, 7:88.

The Assembly, though, still remembered. In asking for Morris to consider asking the Delaware the source of their unrest in November of 1755, Quaker Norris said, "this colony has been founded on Maxims of Peace and had hitherto maintained an uninterrupted Friendship with the Natives by a strict observation of treaties conferring benefits on them from time to time, as well as doing them justice on all occasions."[82] This memory of friendship, peace and concerns for justice remained with the members of the Assembly who still believed in diplomacy. The same memory motivated Israel Pemberton, a lay leader with a vision and the means to enact it, to re-engage conversation with the Delaware as a means to end the dispute.

The Delaware Deserve Justice

In response to the escalating conflict between the Pennsylvania government and the Delaware Indians in the mid-1750s, Israel Pemberton turned to matters of justice. Pemberton and other peace Quakers harkened back to William Penn's principles that treated the Indians with self-respect and dignity.[83] Pemberton's relationships with the Delaware restored the humanity of Indians, assuring that neither side sought political advantage or dominion over the other. The actions and letters of Israel Pemberton

---

[82] Ibid., 6:693.

[83] In the time leading up to the Seven Years War, the number of Quakers in the Pennsylvania Assembly who still held firm to the traditional pacifist teaching of the Society of Friends began to dissipate. Given the crisis of Indian raids in autumn and winter 1755, many Quaker Assembly members became convinced that organized defense of the colony was an acceptable course of action. We will use the term "peace Quakers" to refer to those Quakers, both inside and outside of the Assembly, who retained the traditional Quaker pacifist response that barred support of war. For an account of how the Seven Years War reshaped Quaker pacifism, especially in terms of official government involvement, see Jack D. Marietta, *The Reformation of American Quakerism, 1748-1783* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1984).

Peace Quakers includes, but is not limited to, members of the Friendly Association for Regaining and Preserving Peace with the Indians by Pacific Measures, a peace activist group started in response to the conflict. It met from 1756-1762 and Pemberton was its primary leader. Records are collected in The Papers of the Friendly Association for Regaining and Preserving Peace with the Indians by Pacific Measures, vols. 1-5, Quaker Collection, Haverford College (hereafter *PFA*).

demonstrate the fairness with which these Quakers conversed directly with the persons the government had branded its "enemy."

Like Penn, Pemberton and the others were guided by their theological belief in the Inner Light. As shown with William Penn, Quaker theology validated the human experience of Native Americans for the light of God resided in every person. The Quakers expressed this respect through their acts of direct conversation with the Delaware concerning the uprisings and by advocating on the Indians' behalf to those in the colonial government. Along the way, the Quakers respected Delaware customs and tradition, and incorporated Indian ways into their interactions. The acts of justice began to rebuild the cross-cultural trust between Quakers and Delaware that had eroded since the days of William Penn.

The power of conversation

Israel Pemberton's religious principles provided his life's direction. Born in 1715, he was the grandson of a Quaker settler who migrated with William Penn in 1682.[84] Following in the footsteps of his father, he was a successful Philadelphia merchant in the 1730s and 1740s, and profited greatly from trade during King George's War (1745-1748). By the 1750s, Pemberton had reconnected with his Quaker religious upbringing, which stressed a responsibility for the collective good of society, and his social and political involvement in Philadelphia took on a humanitarian and decidedly religious bent. Pemberton served as a clerk for Quaker schools, and was a founding member of both the Pennsylvania Hospital and Philadelphia's first fire company. He was elected to

---

[84] Paragraph summarized from Theodore Thayer, *Israel Pemberton: King of the Quakers* (Philadelphia: The Historical Society of Pennsylvania, 1943), especially 1-40. Thayer's account recognizes Pemberton's religious convictions of pacifism, but interprets his personal actions and those of the Friendly Association as primarily with a political, as opposed to religious, focus. There is much room for work on how the Quaker religious conviction of pacifism affected their responses throughout the Seven Years War era, especially in light of Native American relations. A reassessment of Pemberton as a religious figure is overdue.

the Pennsylvania Assembly in 1750, but after his term expired in 1751, his projects for social change occurred outside the official political paradigm. As the conflict of the Seven Years War approached, Pemberton was an important figure in the Philadelphia Quaker community, and "became widely known for his many private as well as public acts of charity," said his biographer Theodore Thayer.[85]

Though Governor Morris had unequivocally declared the Delaware Indians "the enemy" upon his War declaration of April 1756, Pemberton and other peace Quakers was not so quick to judge. Pulling from his spiritual resources, Pemberton demonstrated his belief that Native Americans, though in some ways his cultural opposite, were still brothers and sisters in the human race. Belief in God's design of a common humanity required that members of the Society of Friends treat the Delaware with respect, even in the face of Indian raids on English settlements. The theology of the Inner Light bred optimism and encouraged constructive responses to the crisis. Instead of viewing the conflict as a war to win with military strength, Pemberton and peace Quakers reframed the dilemma as a misunderstanding that could peacefully mediated. The first step was a face-to-face conversation to address both the Delaware grievances against the colony and to express the Quakers' preference for a peaceful and fair resolution.

Pemberton's response to Morris' declaration revealed his faith in conversation. He was aware that the group of Iroquois who reported on the disposition of northern Delaware to Morris was still in Philadelphia upon Morris' declaration of war. The Iroquois of modern-day New York were very familiar with the issues at hand in Pennsylvania—the threat of the French on the Delaware and Shawnee, the Delaware raids, and the value of remaining friendly with the Pennsylvania government.[86] After

---

[85] Ibid., 39.

[86] In particular, many historians note the subservient relationship between the powerful Iroquois Six Nations Confederacy and the Delaware. It seems that at some point in history the Delaware were branded "women" by the Iroquois, a confederation of six separate tribes with strong collective leadership. The origin and circumstances of the classification, though, is unclear

gaining the governor's approval, Pemberton invited the Indian group, led by Oneida chief Scarroyady, to his home in Philadelphia for a series of dinner meetings with peace Quakers on April 19, 21, and 23, 1756. Pemberton's goal was to offer the service of Quaker mediation between the Delaware tribes and the Pennsylvania government. [87] Pemberton hoped that the Iroquois would communicate to the Delaware that there was persons in the province who disagreed with the governor's military response and would prefer to seek resolution at the treaty table rather than on the battlefield. Recalling the religious vision of William Penn, Pemberton extended his hand of friendship to the Indians and proposed more official conversations between the proprietors and the Delaware to discuss specific circumstances that brought about the Indian uprising. In exchange for the Indians' chance to talk to the Governor, Pemberton asked for an end of the Delaware violence against the European settlers.[88]

---

and the subject of much debate. The crux of the historical problem is whether Iroquois signification of Delaware as "women" was understood as derogatory and stemmed from an unrecorded Iroquois military conquest, or whether the nomenclature was mutually assented to by both tribes and understood as an honored title. A "woman" is revered in many Native American cultures as peacemaker and provider for the tribe. The fact that nearly all references to this Iroquois-Delaware relationship come from records written by Europeans—with their own motivations and preconceived notions about gender roles—is in itself problematic. For a summary of this issue, see Jay Miller, "The Delaware as Women: A Symbolic Solution," *American Ethnologist* 1, no. 3 (1974), 507-514. For the conquest theory, see C.A. Weslager, "The Delaware Indians as Women," *Journal of the Washington Academy of Sciences* 34, no. 12 (1944), 381-388 and C.A. Weslager, "Further Insight on the Delaware Indians as Women," *Journal of the Washington Academy of Sciences* 37, no. 9 (1947), 298-304. For mutuality viewpoint, see Frank G. Speck, "The Delaware Indians as Women: Were the Original Pennsylvanians Politically Emasculated?," *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 70, no. 4 (1946) 377-389, and Anthony F. C. Wallace, "Woman, Land, Society: Three Aspects of Aboriginal Delaware Life," *Pennsylvania Archeologist* 17, no. 1 (1947), 1-35. For one exposition of the honored role of "woman" in Iroquois culture, see Barbara Alice Mann, *Iroquoian Women: The Gantowisas,* (New York: Peter Lang, 2000).

[87] Morris at this point was open to the Quakers' discussions with the Indians, though wary of a peace emphasis so soon (only several days) after declaring war. After some discussion among the governor's council, it was decided to keep Pemberton's request for diplomacy "entirely to Friends"—i.e., that it would be a private, rather than government-sanctioned, meeting. *MPC*, 7:103-104.

[88] The minutes of the meetings are preserved *PFA,* 1:103, 107, 108, 111, 112, and 123.

The significance of these face-to-face talks and their role in easing the conflict in Eastern Pennsylvania has been overlooked. In contrast to Morris' second-hand effort to gain information about Delaware disposition, Pemberton invited the Indians into his home to ask the Iroquois opinion and to ask if they would carry a message of peace to the Eastern Delaware. Conversation centered on peaceful resolution of the conflict rather than military intelligence and threats of revenge. As the two sides talked, the meetings revealed common viewpoints of the Quakers and the Indians that neither would have known. Most importantly, the meetings were a precursor to the proprietor, represented by the Governor, and the Delaware Indians sitting down at the treaty table together, which happened at least five times during the next two and a half years.

The three conversations in Pemberton's home produced unanimity on intentions and approach to the conflict that surprised attendees. A rediscovered history of friendly, peaceful relationships between the two groups established agreement about how to proceed. Three common viewpoints emerged. First, both Quakers and Indians claimed the importance of William Penn and his past relationships with Native Americans as a cross-cultural model to reinstitute. Second, the two groups discovered the other's political preference for peaceful, rather than violent, relations. Third, Quakers and Indians held to a similar worldview that embraced a common humanity and attempted to see all peoples as equal. The Quaker interaction in each of these roles re-instituted the humanity of the Indians, often by simply trusting the Indians' memory. As persons with memory of Penn and his principles, their own peaceful tradition and a universal worldview, the Indians began to reclaim what was taken away by the proprietor's campaign of casting them as the enemy.

Importance of William Penn

The meetings at Pemberton's home established the fact that the memory of William Penn was a positive image for all. Both peace Quakers and Indians claimed that

Penn's message and action was favorable in the past, fallen in the present, but redeemable in the future.

The assembled Quakers claimed both genetic and pragmatic continuity with Penn's past. Foremost, the Quakers reminded the Indians of his identity, and his relationship to them. "William Penn in the first settlement of this province took particular care to establish love & peace amongst the Indians," the Quakers began in the conference's first evening. "Some of our forefathers were of his Councill & assisted therein," they continued. But more than just ties of family, Pemberton's group stated their spiritual allegiance to Penn. There were "a great number of people who were of the same faith and principles with their Brother Onas who had been dead some years and could not go to Warr." Though the provincial government had declared a war of revenge, many citizens still held out for a peaceful resolution, the Quakers said.[89]

The Indians also revealed a reverence for Penn and his ways of diplomacy. Speaking for the Iroquois, Scarroyady said, "We have always maintained a great esteem for the memory of Onas who is dead & for the people of this Province," though his death seemed to end their hope. The past was favorable, though the present was murky. From his perspective, there was little recent evidence of any continuity between Penn's principles and the current provincial policy:

> We have formerly been told they were such who were of the same heart with him & could not join in Warr. But it was now so long since we had heard anything about them, we had concluded that when brother Onas dyed that Spirit dyed with him.[90]

The chief's sharp indictment of the people and policies of Pennsylvania caught the Quakers by surprise. Their tradition had failed to cultivate Penn's spirit of friendship, so much that the Indians thought it was lost.

---

[89] *PFA*, 1:103.

[90] Ibid.

Earlier, the Quakers took pains to distance themselves from the present government, and acknowledged that the present situation was far from their ideal. The Quakers pointed out that people with Penn's peace conviction no longer held official political power. Therefore, actions of the current government were not consistent with Quaker teaching. They accused their own government of a "breach of Friendship" by the act of war, and saw themselves as outsiders in the political process, unable to implement policies consistent with Penn's intentions. In addition, the residents also had lost the understanding of the role of peace, and the Quakers "observ'd with great concern the present uneasiness between the people of this province and the Indians." They didn't like what they saw.[91]

Besides agreeing on the favorable past and the misguided present, both the peace Quakers and Indians endorsed a future that restored Penn's ways. The Quakers took up the challenge of an uncultivated peace tradition with newfound vigor. They acknowledged their own shortcomings rather than defending their behavior after Penn's death. Pemberton confessed to Scarroyady that Quakers "have long layn hid & almost bury'd by the great numbers of others, who, are come hither, many of whom are men of different principles from us." Pemberton described citizens in both Philadelphia and the wider province as "Children of Wm. Penn and the first settlers, that Men of the same peaceable Principles" who, importantly, "love you as our Brethren."[92] The renewal included a new commitment to working for peace:

> We Shall now arise & show ourselves to you – for as we are sorrowful that differences have arisen between your cousins the Delaware & our people we are desirous of using our endeavor to restore peace.[93]

---

[91] Ibid.

[92] Ibid., 107.

[93] Ibid.

They offered their resources, "at our own expense & at our own persons," to see that peaceful co-existence could be a reality.[94]

In a similar way the Indians looked to the future where they could restore healthy relationships with English people, as once was the case with Penn. Scarroyady said, "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 one another a great while we are very glad to hear you are of the same sentiments with Onas."[95] Redemption and recovery of former friendly ways of Penn and the native people was a common theme during the meetings at Pemberton's home.

The Quakers then provided two examples of acts that embodied this new commitment to the ways of Penn. First, they followed Penn's example of how to mediate disputes between Indians and planters through dialogue. Given their own chance to speak with Indian representatives, they "were very desirous to know what could be the occasion"[96] that justified native violence on the Pennsylvania frontier. Second, they invoked an Indian practice to seal their words of desire. The Quakers gave the gift of a white peace belt, as Penn also did during his treaty negotiations. The practice followed a Native custom of giving one's treaty partner a gift to validate the agreement; as Pemberton remarked in 1756, the Quakers gave the belt "as a proof of our sincerity." Pemberton and the Quakers realized the value of gift-giving during treaty negotiations. Just as important as the gift itself was its symbolism. Pemberton explained that the beaded large belt

> is white without any mixture, as our love and friendship to you is. And it was made of many pieces, which were small and of little weight or strength before they were knit together, but is now

---

[94] Ibid., 103.

[95] Ibid., 123.

[96] Ibid., 103.

> strongly formed so we when collected and united together shall appear to our brethren and we desire you by this belt to lett both the Six Nations and the Delaware know that we have not forgot the Love and Friendship of their Fathers to ours and as we are all men of the same peacable principles, we are ready to give our assistance in any manner we can to putt an end to the [gruesome?] bloodshed and to open a way for a Treaty in which all uneasiness may be truly open'd,[97]

Peace Quakers gained strength and resolve from the Iroquois' challenge to keep alive their tradition. The belt served to communicate to the Six Nations and Delaware gratitude for "the Love and Friendship of their Fathers to ours," In addition, Quakers committed renewed assistance and desire for a treaty which would put an end to the hostilities and pave the way for a return to peaceful coexistence. Though no longer in political power, the Quakers felt responsible for the future of Pennsylvania. The responsibility was a religious conviction that extended from William Penn to the peace Quakers of the 1750s.

Preference for peace

Not only did the impromptu conference recapture the importance of William Penn for both the Quakers and Indians, but it also established that the Indians had a preference for peace. Contrary to the provincial portrait of Delaware as savage killers who slaughtered "the tender Infant and frighted Mother with equal Joy and Fierceness," the Indians who met at Pemberton's house preferred diplomacy and long-term friendship over violent quests for domination.[98] The language of kindred spirituality between the peace Quakers and Indians and the native remorse for violence would not have been discovered without the effort to cultivate relationships through dialogue.

Both the Indians and the Quakers expressed thankfulness upon learning of the other side's preference for a peaceful resolution. When on the first day of the conference Scarroyady learned that William Penn's spirit of peace had not died with him, he said

---

[97] Ibid., 107.

[98] *MPC,* 6:486.

"we rejoice to hear it is not so."[99] Upon departing four days later, the Indian chief reaffirmed that the Six Nations would welcome the news of persons in Pennsylvania willing to negotiate:

> We are very glad at your rising up and holding the white belt in your hands, as an emblem of peace, to endeavor to reconcile the people that are at War ... [the Six Nations] will be very glad to hear there are some people from the same principles of the first settlers, for they have not heard of you for many years.[100]

The chief's words expressed excitement in the rediscovery of the inclination towards peace.

Similarly, Pemberton recalled with "great satisfaction" the "friendship that subsisted between [Penn] and your fathers … it has rejoiced our brethren who have heard of it."[101] In an aside in the minutes from the April 19 meeting, a Quaker author expressed hopefulness in the Indian response: "Indians by their open candid behavior show they were much pleas'd" with the direction of the discussion, and "there appearing to us an Evidence of Sincerity accompany it, gave us much satisfaction."[102] The common preference for peaceful resolution of conflict illustrated a shared value of the role of peace in both the Quaker and Native cultures. Diplomacy was always the first choice.

Scarroyady's specific response to Quaker inquiry about the reason behind the Delaware raids confirmed this predisposal. The chief expressed disappointment that the Delaware did not know of the peace Quakers' intentions before they attacked. He stated that "if our Brethren [the Delaware] knew this [preference for peace] they would never

---

[99] *PFA*, 1:103.

[100] Ibid., 123.

[101] Ibid., 107.

[102] Ibid., 103.

hurt" the settlers.[103] The Indian assumption the peace principle died when Penn died had disastrous consequences for Pennsylvania. Scarroyady implied that violence was a last resort for Indian people and if offered the choice, the Delaware would have welcomed a chance to express their grievances to a listening government.

Given the Quakers' recommitment, Scarroyady was eager to take the news before the Six Nations council. He promised to "open the whole to them" about Penn's descendents, and predicted that news of Quaker desires for meeting would be met with an emotional response. "When I relate it," he said, "it will make their hearts melt." For the Six Nations and Delaware, Scarroyady predicted a spiritual kinship with Quakers. For these groups, peace was not just the absence of war, but also a core belief transgressed only in the direst of circumstances. "This principle of peace is Noble," Scarroyady continued, "and will be news very acceptable to the Six Nations." [104] The meeting in Pemberton's home helped both the Friends and the Natives realize that the other's predilection for conflict resolution was much like their own. Though from different cultures, the groups appealed to similar reasons for ending the bloodshed and re-establishing a lasting friendship.

A common humanity

A third shared principle emerged from the meetings at Pemberton's house. The Quakers and the Indians each presented a worldview of a common humanity that included the other. The universal viewpoint did not ascribe rank to persons, but rather extended justice to all. Persons did not resort to violence and war to settle differences; comparisons between cultures and people did not exist. Quaker and Iroquois shared a view of a higher power whose intention was human co-existence and friendship.

---

[103] Ibid.

[104] Ibid.

Scarroyady specifically identified the practical benefits of a commitment to peace. The Indian "was very glad to hear this account that [the Quakers] Loved that Peaceable Principle & could wish all mankind to be of the same mind. Knowing it would prevent any cause of difference or Contention between them & the English & take away the Occasion of Warr."[105] His wish for a world of the "same mind" was analogous to Penn's belief that the future of Pennsylvania, if cared for properly, would have millennial significance. One of the characteristics of the colony built on millennial expectations was that residents formed a common humanity. As one human race, cultural differences disappeared, short-circuiting violence as a way to solve disputes.

Both Scarroyady and Pemberton acknowledged a spirit of peace that outshone themselves. Much like Penn leveled the playing field when he acknowledged "one great God and Power that hath made the world and all things therein, to whom you and I and all People owe their being and wellbeing" in his first formal contact with the Delaware in 1681, so too did Pemberton and Scarroyady in their 1756 exchange.[106] As they parted ways, Scarroyady asked for Quaker persistence in meeting their goal of peace and appealed to a higher power for safety in the journey. "Do you steadily pursue [peace] & such measures as will promote love between us and them is a great spirit above which will protect you," he said.[107] Pemberton acknowledged that this spirit of common humanity had been lost, and its absence caused violence and pain on both sides. But a spirit of commonality could still prosper in the end and had the power to alter people's actions. He said,

> We ought able to apply the good spirit that is overall to subdue the evil spirit, which had influenced those who had done so much

---

[105] Ibid.

[106] Penn, "To the Kings of the Indians," *PWP,* 2: 128

[107] *PFA*, 1:103.

> mischief. We sincerely and heartily agree with you and shall fervently desire & pray to God to change their hearts.[108]

Like Scarroyady, Pemberton also sought safe passage for the word of peace that the Iroquois would carry to their brethren the Delaware. He said, "If it be his will [God] would protect the messengers now going & grant that they may return safely & with the message of Peace which they afforded to & recdi'd with a becoming solidly & satisfaction.[109] Both Pemberton and Scarroyady engaged in the simple act of blessing each other—and recognized their similar hope for peace.

The conference at Pemberton's house served as an example of religiously rooted Quaker diplomacy that found its traction in respectful, face-to-face interactions with the other so easily branded "the enemy." Governor Morris attempted to find out the disposition of the Delaware through the scouting reports of Scarroyady and Andrew Montour in the winter of 1755-1756. But the purpose was cloaked in military strategy: Were the Delaware going to keep on raiding English settlements in the early months of 1756? How many bands of Delaware were there? What would be the best way to defeat this enemy? Ultimately, the governmental campaign that branded the Delaware as inhumane would not allow for a non-military response.

By contrast, Pemberton and the peace Quakers desired to talk to the Delaware Indians as troubled friends. They approached them with an outstretched hand, offering justice that their religious background and tradition required. Their message was one of taking steps towards sustainable peace, and was predicated on Delaware's status as rational human beings who must have a reason for their unrest. This first step of meeting the Indians only days after the province had declared war on them produced the groundwork for future talks by establishing (a) common points of agreement about each group's history with William Penn, (b) the preference for peace over violence, and (c) a

---

[108] Ibid., 83.

[109] Ibid.

common worldview that valued the other's humanity. As the provincial campaign for defeat moved on, Pemberton and the peace Quakers sustained their call for fair treatment of the Delaware by reminding persons, both provincial officials and others, of the need to respect the Delaware. [110]

Advocating for Indian humanity

In the years that followed, Pemberton and the Quaker contingent spoke with Indian representatives directly with hopes of re-establishing friendship that would lead to lasting peace. The Friends also became advocates for the Delaware in other circumstances, with the goal of replacing the "savage" opinion about Native Americans with a picture that emphasized Delaware humanity. In two instances over a twelve-month span, Pemberton and the Friends petitioned government officials to treat the Delawares with respect.

Pemberton's peace conviction manifested itself in his attempt to influence government leaders at an early stage. In April 1756, upon hearing of Morris' serious consideration of going to war, a Pemberton-led group went to the governor and the Assembly to protest the action on religious grounds. In a letter to the governor signed by Pemberton and many future members of the Friendly Association, he acknowledged that land had become "the theater of bloodshed." But the Quakers argued that declaring war would be even more disastrous. Even Morris' rhetoric infiltrated the document: "All wars

---

[110] The Friendly Association subsequently acted as unofficial mediators for a series of treaty conferences between the Delaware Indians and Pennsylvania officials from 1756 until 1762. These treaties negotiated an end to Delaware attacks and the Pennsylvania declaration of war. The Delaware, with Friendly Association help, attempted to uncover the scandal of the Walking Purchase and to regain control of land in the Lehigh Valley, but provincial interest in covering up the impropriety proved too strong and provincial officials would never admit to any wrongdoing. The Delaware were granted a reservation near the area in Wyoming as part of the settlement, but it did not last long and suffered from poor provincial support.

Analysis of the Friendly Association's involvement in the treaties from the perspective of a religiously-founded peace conviction is lacking, due to the reliance of scholars on records penned by persons with a provincial interest. Such an analysis is beyond our current scope.

are attended with fatal consequences," the letter read, especially "with enemies so savage as those who have now become ours." The group pleaded instead for more diplomacy, and called for additional attempts for "pacific measures to reduce them to a sense of their duty." The letter mused that not all the Delaware were responsible for the frontier attacks. The opportunity must be made for those that "may be willing to separate from those who have been the wicked instruments of perverting them." Written just days before the meetings at Pemberton's home, the Quaker group had faith that the Indians would find favor with a peaceable solution.[111]

Significantly, the letter's authors started that their aversion to violence was reflective of a religious conviction. Their confidence in God's providence and God's expectation dictated that the Native Americans were treated fairly. Not unlike Penn's understanding of Pennsylvania as a state founded under God's care, the Friends of the 1750s interpreted the events since Penn's landing as the leading of God's hand.

> The settlement of this Province was founded on the principles of Truth, Equity and mercy And the blessing of Divine Providence attended the early care of the first founders to impress these Principles on the minds of the Native Inhabitants, so that when their numbers were great and their strength vastly superior they receiv'd our ancsestors with gladness, receiv'd their wants with open hearts, granted them peacable possession of the land and for along Course of time gave constant and frequent proofs of a cordial friendship, all which we humbly ascribe to the Infinite wisdom and Goodness of God.[112]

According to the peace Quakers, God's involvement in Pennsylvania was evident in both the appreciative native response to the English immigrants, as well as care for Penn and the founders. A people open to divine principles such as the Delaware should not be extinguished, the Quakers wrote, especially ones that offered "frequent proofs" of friendship towards the English. In fact, the Delaware should be given a chance to express

---

[111] *PFA*, 1:85.

[112] Ibid., 86.

their grievances before being subjected to attack. Quaker religious tradition—both expressed in the legacy of William Penn and Inner Light theology that validated all persons—predicated caution in organizing a military strike.

The Friends provided biblical justification for their aversion to war that revealed their reliance on the figure of Jesus and his teaching. Akin to William Penn's belief that the province of Pennsylvania had a millennial aspiration, Pemberton expected peace on earth as a sign of the reign of God:

> The birth of our Lord Jesus Christ … the example and precepts which he as the Prince of Peace gave thro' the course of his personal appearance on Earth have given us undoubted assurance that the Day is dawn'd in which his Peaceable reign will be exalted and gradually become universal.[113]

In addition, Pemberton and the Friends justified their outspokenness as an obligation of their faith commitment from which they could not be separated:

> We cannot without neglect of our duty and sacrificing the peace of conscience we profess to every temporal blessing omitt [serving?] our Testim[ony] in this time of probation that all warrs appear to us contrary to the nature of the end of the Gospel Dispensation that we as people still firmly believe that on an humble and steady acquiescence with the disper[sion] of Divine Providence our real protection and security depends and from which no Temporal Inconveniences & Difficulties can justify our departing.[114]

But even the impassioned eleventh-hour plea could not change Morris' mind. As the war declaration became a reality and the Pennsylvania took steps to extinguish the Delaware, Pemberton continued to express his concern that the Delaware were not being treated justly, and invited Indians to his home for the conference. The meeting led to gatherings of the Pennsylvania government and Indian leaders in the summer and autumn of 1756.

---

[113] Ibid., 87

[114] Ibid.

In April 1757, Pemberton attempted contact with another political official with the hope of gaining support for the Quakers' peace efforts. He wrote a letter to Sir William Johnson, the British crown's representative in the New World who directed all Indian affairs. Johnson's primary contact was with the Iroquois, but he had been given jurisdiction over any negotiations between Britain and the Native Americans. Pemberton repeated some of the same themes in the letter to Johnson that the Friends communicated to Morris. Pemberton mentioned the "pressing circumstances of our affairs with the Indians" that he hopes to "retrieve them from the present, unhappy state."[115] War caused only additional bloodshed, and if the plan for "extirpating them" wins out, Pemberton wrote, "the desolation of the finest part of the English dominions" would be the result of "so injudicious and wicked and intention."[116] To Pemberton, war was not the answer.

Pemberton wrote that instead of force, friendship would form the trust from which sustainable peace would emerge. One needed to engage even the "enemy" in conversation to have real hope of going forward, for "without the Interposition and concurrence of some in whom the Indians can confide there's no room to expect a permanent peace will be made."[117] Hope would not be possible without conversation and negotiation. Lasting peace would not come from only military responses to this crisis, Pemberton wrote. But a diplomatic resolution, formed on acknowledgement of Indians' mutuality, civility, and commonality with Europeans, would be the best chance for a peaceful settlement. Simply "Cultivating our Friendship," said Pemberton, would assist in "removing the occasions of the present animosity some of them have entertained."[118] Pemberton recalled the days of meeting with the Iroquois chiefs and

---

[115] Ibid., 309.

[116] Ibid., 311.

[117] Ibid.

[118] Ibid.

their agreement about diplomacy. A year later, Pemberton remained emboldened in his hope for a diplomatic settlement.

Pemberton's correspondence with government leaders was often infused with religious imagery. In the letter to Johnson, Pemberton made a clear statement that connected his call for social action with spirituality. Peace was not only for the good of the citizens of Pennsylvania, but was a deep religious conviction for Pemberton. Aware to not to overstep his bounds as a civilian spoke to a General, he characterized the Quaker interest as

> the act of private persons who are engaged in it on a religious principle, & have both inclination and ability's sufficient to bear the expense and will cheerly go thro'with it, if divine providence favours our design and we have no unsurmountable obstructions from such here, who ought to promote it."[119]

Pemberton's stance was a religious one, built from conviction and a sense of providence; but, like Penn, one with political and social implications. No fleeting ideal, the stance was practical and achievable. The Quakers understood the combination of worldly resolve and heavenly guidance as something that could not be defeated, as long as Johnson (or others) provided "no insurmountable obstructions." Pemberton claimed the peace response as divinely favored, but fully realized only with an active personal commitment.

By April 1757, Johnson was more interested in subduing the Delaware through Iroquois control than reaching out to the Indians in conversation. By this time, the Friendly Association was in place, and the organization performed the tasks of peacemaking with exact "inclination" and "ability" to which Pemberton referred. The Friendly Association, from its beginnings in autumn of 1756, gathered persons around a principle based on religious peace conviction that had political implications. It gained subscriptions from both peace Quakers and other Pennsylvania pacifist groups and used funds to help facilitate treaty conferences between Delaware and the provincial

---

[119] Ibid.

government. It provided the Quaker peace tradition a working example of belief in the Inner Light—the optimism of Quaker theology.[120]

As seen in both the conversation at his house, and in the advocacy of Friends on behalf of the Delawares, Pemberton believed that sustainable peace is built on kinship. The Friends viewed peace as not only the absence of war but a mindset built on mutual respect that valued the coexistence of cultures. Thus, cultivating trust through honest exchanges and interactions rendered violent responses unthinkable (or at the very least, out of the ordinary). For where there was a commitment to share the land, there followed a commitment to friendship and justice that benefited both groups. From the perspective of the Friends, peace would not come from defeating or disabling the other party, but instead from the acceptance and good-faith negotiation that valued the spark of humanity in each Native American person. Given the Quaker theology of the Inner Light, peace with, rather than domination over, the Native American community was a religious tenet demonstrated in the actions of Israel Pemberton.

Conclusion

The actions of Israel Pemberton in the mid-1750s deserve special attention. As a wealthy, third-generation immigrant and successful Quaker businessman in colonial Philadelphia, Pemberton was not particularly out of the ordinary. But his reframing of William Penn's religious vision for the colony—one that assumed healthy and friendly relationships with the Native American people—put him at odds with the provincial government as well as other Quakers. By his acceptance of a worldview that respected the humanity of Native Americans as much as other Europeans, Pemberton sought to

---

[120] Funds from the Friendly Association treasury often supplemented the provincial treasury to fund the peace conferences with the Delaware from 1756-1758. Jennings also lists aid to Indian refugees, support for the Moravian group in Bethlehem, and private hospitality of Indian leaders passing through Philadelphia as beneficiaries of Friendly Association funds. Jennings, *Empire of Fortune*, 334-35.

converse with aggrieved Indians at a time when they were officially Pennsylvania's enemies. His belief in cross-cultural peace as a religious conviction provided motivation for seeking justice for and conversation with the Delaware, and ultimately assisted in diffusing the Seven Years' War conflict in Eastern Pennsylvania.

CONCLUSION: QUAKER CONVERSATION: A COMMON RELIGIOUS CONVICTION

Both William Penn and Israel Pemberton reflected a view of a common humanity and friendship between English and Indian that would set the tone for fruitful nonviolent diplomacy in colonial Pennsylvania. Despite the differences in time and role, both Penn and Pemberton deemed it important, if not integral, to sit down and converse with the persons whom the political and civic leaders of the day wished to call—and frequently did call—the "enemy." Both Pemberton and Penn, through relationships based on a model of mutuality and co-existence rather than on a framework of master and servant, showed a knack for fruitful dialogue. Through engagement of the Native American community, the Quaker leaders expressed their religious belief in the humanity and the worthiness of the Native American people. In contrast to the prevailing government propaganda of the time, which called for domination and civilization of the Indian culture to western ways, Penn and Pemberton executed a practice of diplomacy that valued mutual coexistence, honest friendship, and trustworthy relations between English and Indian people on American soil. By having faith in Native Americans as rational people with the same fears, desires and goals as their European brethren, the peace Quakers of these two generations each appropriated Friends' theology of the Inner Light.

Penn and Pemberton acted on this theology in quite different social surroundings, but each had to throw off conventional European thinking and practices. Penn had to overcome prejudices of Europeans about Indian ways and traditions. Europeans of the time viewed Indian culture as uncivilized—even demonic—and interpreted Native culture as primarily a Christian mission field, where potential converts abounded.[121]

---

[121] For one account of this view, see Karen Anderson, *Chain Her by One Foot: The Subjugation of Native Women in Seventeenth-Century New France*, (New York: Routledge, 1991).

Penn, like other Europeans, had the cultural resources at his disposal necessary for successful coercion of Native culture. For instance, technological advances in tools, trade and navigation naturally created a power imbalance in his favor, ripe with the potential to demand and dominate. Though his methods still at times undermined his words, Penn intended to approach the Delaware Indians directly, with a diplomatic message of God's desire that the groups live peacefully together. He extended the hand of justice from his belief that earthly actions should mirror his own Quaker theology. Though he at times did not see the social implications of his religious goals, Penn valued the link between religious conviction and the political need for peace.

Seventy-five years later, Pemberton and other peace Quakers had to dismantle a provincial attitude that depicted all Indian inhabitants as irrational savages who lived only for war and blood. The Quakers had to overcome this during a time of open conflict, when their own government had declared war on the Delaware and promised bounties for Indian scalps. Pemberton and the Friends also directly approached the Indians in an attempt to regain their trust and to promote a coexistence that would cease the open hostilities. They also demanded fair relationships with the Delaware, relationships that had withered away after the death of William Penn. In returning to treat the Indians with some measure of equity in this diplomatic affair during a time of war, Pemberton's Friends risked rejection and further bloodshed, but instead found a Native American community with a memory of the peaceful and fair ways of Penn. Pemberton granted the Delaware their humanity by inviting them to the negotiating table.

Penn and Pemberton represent two very different social settings, but one common religious conviction. The Quaker goal of peaceful coexistence in colonial Pennsylvania rested on the justice of extending the theology of the Inner Light to Native Americans.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Becker, Marshall. "The Lenape and Other 'Delawarean' People at the Time of European Contact: Population Estimates Derived from Archaeological and Historical Sources." *The Bulletin: Journal of the New York State Archaeological Association* 105 (1993): 16-25.

———. "Native Settlements in the Forks of Delaware, Pennsylvania, in the 18th Century: Archaeological Implications." *Pennsylvania Archaeologist* 58, no. 1 (1988): 43-60.

Brock, Peter. *The Quaker Peace Testimony 1660 to 1914*. York, England: Sessions Book Trust, 1990.

Bronner, Edwin B. *William Penn's "Holy Experiment": The Founding of Pennsylvania, 1681-1701*. New York: Temple University Publications, 1962.

———. "The Quakers and Non-Violence in Pennsylvania." *Pennsylvania History* 35, no. 1 (1968): 1-22.

Buck, William J. *History of the Indian Walk performed for the Proprietaries in Pennsylvania in 1737; to which is appended a life of Edward Marshall.* 1886.

Caffrey, Margaret M. "Complementary Power: Men and Women of the Lenni Lenape." *American Indian Quarterly*, 24, no. 1 (2000): 44-63.

Camenzind, Krista. "From the Holy Experiment to the Paxton Boys: Violence, Manhood and Race in Pennsylvania During the Seven Years' War." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, San Diego, 2002.

Dunn, Richard S. "Penny Wise and Pound Foolish: Penn as a Businessman." In *The World of William Penn*, edited by Richard S. Dunn and Mary Maples Dunn, 37-54. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1986.

Dunn, Richard S., and Mary Maples Dunn, eds. *The Papers of William Penn 1680-1684*. 5 vols. Vol. 2. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1982.

Endy, Melvin B. Jr. *William Penn and Early Quakerism*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1973.

Frost, William. "William Penn's Experiment in the Wilderness: Promise and Legend." *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 107, no. 4 (1983): 577-607.

———. "'Wear the Sword as Long as Thou Canst': William Penn in Myth and History." *Explorations in Early American Culture* 4 (2000): 13-45.

Harper, Steven Craig. *Promised Land : Penn's Holy Experiment, the Walking Purchase, and the Dispossession of Delawares, 1600-1763*. Bethlehem, PA: Lehigh University Press, 2006.

Hazard, Samuel, ed. *Minutes of the Provincial Council*. Vols. 6 and 7. Harrisburg, Pa: Theo Fenn & Co., 1851.

Hershberger, Guy F. "The Pennsylvania Quaker Experiment in Politics, 1682-1756." *Mennonite Quarterly Review* 10, no. 4 (1936): 187-221.

Ingle, H. Larry. *First among Friends: George Fox and the Creation of Quakerism*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1994.

James, Sydney V. *A People among Peoples: Quaker Benevolence in Eighteenth-Century America*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1963.

Jennings, Francis. "Brother Miquon: Good Lord!" In *The World of William Penn*, edited by Richard S. Dunn and Mary Maples Dunn, 195-214. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1986.

———. *Empire of Fortune: Crowns, Colonies and Tribes in the Seven Years War in America*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1988.

Ketcham, Ralph L. "Conscience, War, and Politics in Pennsylvania, 1755-1757." *The William and Mary Quarterly* 20, no. 3 (1963): 416-39.

Mann, Barbara Alice. *Iroquoian Women: The Gantowisas*. New York: Peter Lang, 2000.

Marietta, Jack D. *The Reformation of American Quakerism, 1748-1783*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1984.

Miller, Jay. "The Delaware as Women: A Symbolic Solution." *American Ethnologist* 1, no. 3 (1974): 507-14.

Nickalls, John L., ed. *The Journal of George Fox*. Cambridge: University Press, 1952.

Papers of the Friendly Association for Regaining and Preserving Peace with the Indians by Pacific Measures. Vols. 1-5. Quaker Collection, Haverford College.

Parrish, Samuel. *Some Chapters in the History of the Friendly Association for Regaining and Preserving Peace with the Indians by Pacific Measures*. Philadelphia: Friends Historical Association of Philadelphia, 1877.

Reichel, William C., comp. *Memorials of the Moravian Church*, 3 vols. Philadelphia, 1870.

Rothermund, Dietmar. *The Layman's Progress: Religious and Political Experience in Colonial Pennsylvania, 1740-1770*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1961.

Speck, Frank G. "The Delaware Indians as Women: Were the Original Pennsylvanians Politically Emasculated?" *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 70, no. 4 (1946): 377-89.

Thayer, Theodore. *Israel Pemberton: King of the Quakers*. Philadelphia: The Historical Society of Pennsylvania, 1943.

———. "The Friendly Association." *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 67, no. 4 (1943): 356-76.

Wallace, Anthony F. C. *King of the Delawares: Teedyuscung, 1700-1763*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1949.

Wallace, Anthony F. C. "Woman, Land, Society: Three Aspects of Aboriginal Delaware Life." *Pennsylvania Archaeologist* 17, no. 1 (1947): 1-35.

Weslager, C.A. "The Delaware Indians as Women." *Journal of the Washington Academy of Sciences* 34, no. 12 (1944): 381-88.

———. "Further Light on the Delaware Indians as Women." *Journal of the Washington Academy of Sciences* 37, no. 9 (1947): 298-304.