

## PRELUDE TO REVOLUTION

On 18 October 1764 the Assembly read into the minutes a circular letter from the Rhode Island legislature warning of an “Act in Embryo, for establishing Stamp Duties,” being prepared by Parliament. The measure as proposed by the House of Commons, argued the authors of the letter, was an assault on the traditional liberties of the colonies, and they urged the colonial assemblies to unite in protest over the duties. “If all the colonies were disposed to enter with Spirit into the Defence of their Liberties,” the letter stressed, and “if some Method could be hit upon for collecting the Sentiments of each Colony, and for uniting and forming the Substance of them all into one common Defence of the Whole,” then the Rhode Islanders believed Parliament might be persuaded to forgo passage of the stamp taxes. Presumably none of the legislators in the Pennsylvania Assembly listening that day to the letter doubted its sense of urgency, but they preferred caution over action and eschewed any type of united front that might offend Parliament. At stake for the House’s Quaker party representatives was the petition for royal government, which the House had sent to the king five months earlier. The Assembly, therefore, was particularly concerned not to appear too zealous in denying parliamentary authority at the very time that it was requesting the crown to take direct control of the province. Instead, the House instructed its agent in London to oppose all internal taxes laid on the colonies by Parliament as unconstitutional and to remind the ministry that Pennsylvania had undertaken “an immense Load of Debt” in support of the recent war, which debt would not be retired until 1772.<sup>1</sup>

Once those instructions to its agent had been approved, the House had little occasion to discuss the proposed duties again, but in May 1765 readers of the *Pennsylvania Gazette* learned that Parliament had passed the Stamp Act in mid-March and that the act was to take effect on 1 November. They also learned that a leading member of the Quaker party, **John Hughes**, had been appointed stamp distributor for the province. The new law required individuals to purchase specially stamped paper for all deeds, licenses, bills of lading, court documents, wills, newspapers, pamphlets, playing cards, almanacs, and diplomas. The tax was to be paid in specie, a hardship for the colonists because gold and silver were always scarce, and the act was to be enforced in British vice-admiralty courts and not in local courts of jurisdiction, thus avoiding potentially sympathetic juries. The immediate hostility exhibited throughout the colonies toward the Stamp Act must have taken many Americans, as well as British officials, by surprise. In August a letter from a dissenting member of Parliament appeared in the *Pennsylvania Gazette* denouncing the Stamp Act (although not the right of Parliament to pass the tax), and an effigy of the Massachusetts stamp distributor swung on the Boston Commons for a full day until evening, when it was paraded before the courthouse and set ablaze. The same mob turned on the distributor’s house where they shattered his windows and destroyed his furniture, leaving him little choice but to resign his commission the following day. Two weeks later another Boston mob wrecked the home of the colony’s lieutenant governor, and shortly afterward a mob destroyed the home of the deputy register of the court of admiralty. In September a Newport, Rhode Island, crowd hung and burned effigies of three prominent Stamp Act supporters, then severely damaged the homes of two of the men and threatened the life of Newport’s collector of the customs.<sup>2</sup>

Against that backdrop, the 1764 Pennsylvania Assembly reconvened for its final session in September 1765, hoping to avoid any association with the violent demonstrations of opposition against the Stamp Act occurring throughout the colonies. The House voted unanimously to remonstrate to the crown against the imposed tax and other restrictive legislation passed by Parliament, but the members divided bitterly over the question of whether to send delegates to the proposed Stamp Act Congress scheduled to be held in New York City in October. The congress had been proposed by the Massachusetts legislature in a June 1765 circular letter to all the colonies, and by a 15-to-14 vote the House narrowly agreed to send three delegates to the gathering. Hughes and other Quaker party assemblymen reportedly spoke against both the proposal and participation in the conference, illustrating the Quaker party’s dilemma. Without alienating popular opinion, it sought to maintain a low profile during the crisis, in order to proceed in its efforts to replace proprietary government with royal government. Although approving the motion to attend the congress, the Quaker party-controlled House sought to distance itself from the opposition to Parliament by naming as the four delegates **John Morton**, a moderate member of the Quaker party, **George Bryan** and **John Dickinson**, both of whom were adherents of the proprietary party, and Speaker **Joseph Fox**, a supporter of the Quaker party (who chose not to attend the congress). Moreover, the committee appointed by the Assembly to draft

instructions to the delegates contained six proprietary party assemblymen and only two members of the Quaker party. The instructions matched the temper of the House by ordering the delegates to support the drafting of a humble, decent, and respectful petition to King George III requesting that the duties be repealed. A second committee, ordered to draft a series of resolves on the stamp tax intended for the Assembly's constituents, consisted of four Quaker party representatives and three proprietary party members. Not coincidentally, the ten resolves reported by that committee were far bolder in declaring the Stamp Act unconstitutional than the previous House pronouncements on that subject, which had been intended for Parliament. The resolves stated unequivocally that the Assembly was the only legitimate political forum for levying taxes on Pennsylvanians and that, in effect, Parliamentary impositions were "manifestly subversive of public Liberty" and "utterly destructive of public Happiness."<sup>3</sup>

The crisis, however, did not end with the resolves. Agitation over the stamp duties continued and on 5 October 1765, the last day of the provincial election, which returned a victorious Quaker party to the Assembly, a ship transporting the stamped paper arrived in Philadelphia, accompanied by a British man-of-war. Church bells were rung, drums were beaten, and flags were flown at half-mast as news of the ship's arrival threw the "City in a Ferment." Although most Quakers refused to participate, several thousand people gathered at the statehouse to protest the planned enforcement of the act, and a seven-member committee drawn from the crowd went to the home of the stamp distributor and demanded that he resign from the position. Witnessing the ferment, the ship refused to land the stamped paper and Hughes, to the irritation of the protestors, conditioned his resignation on the fate of the tax throughout the colonies. Governor John Penn confided to his uncle in late 1765 that opposition to the tax had not dwindled in the least but continued to grow, and he worried that while Pennsylvania had been relatively calm in its response it could quickly become the scene of rioting similar to that in other colonies if the crisis were not resolved soon. In an attempt to bring about such a resolution, approximately 400 merchants and 300 retailers, in separate petitions in November 1765, joined a movement that had begun in New York and refused to import any goods from Great Britain until the odious act was repealed. Boston adopted similar nonimportation resolutions in December.<sup>4</sup> The nonimportation of English goods was intended to remain in effect until the act was repealed. In addition to nonimportation, many colonies, including Pennsylvania, refused to recognize the tax and proceeded with their affairs as if the stamped paper did not exist.

The 1765 Assembly reconvened for its second session in January 1766 and received from its delegates to the Stamp Act Congress copies of the petitions sent to King George III and the two houses of Parliament signed by representatives from the colonies of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland, South Carolina, and Pennsylvania. In those petitions, the authors respectfully noted the impracticability of representing the colonies in any polity other than their "respective subordinate Legislatures," and they observed that Parliament, when "adhering strictly to the Principles of the Constitution," had never taxed those constituents not "actually represented" in Parliament. The petitioners also stressed the lack of specie circulating in North America and the act's potential injury to the trade and economy of the colonies, and they urged the government to repeal the measure. The House thanked the delegates and ordered copies of the petitions sent to Assembly agents **Benjamin Franklin** and Richard Jackson in London. By March 1766 the effect of nonimportation was forcing English merchants to pressure Parliament for the act's repeal, and in the same month Governor Penn, on assurances from British Secretary of State Henry Conway, advised his uncle Thomas Penn that the Stamp Act would be repealed. "If it is not," he added gloomily, "I dread the Consequences."<sup>5</sup>

The Assembly in June 1766 officially learned of the act's repeal on 18 March and responded with a congratulatory note to the governor (although Quaker party leader **Joseph Galloway** ridiculed the note as presenting a pretended "Face of Harmony" between the two branches of government) and an address to King George III expressing the legislature's "warmest Thanks" and its intention to continue in "Loyalty and Affection" to the king and Parliament. Accompanying the address was a resolution passed by the House assuring the king and his government of the province's military and financial assistance whenever Pennsylvania was asked "in a constitutional Way" to contribute in a time of crisis. The Quaker party, however, could not resist the temptation of adding the partisan observation that the only hindrance to such assistance came from the proprietors, who traditionally undermined attempts to aid the king whenever they perceived their private interests were at risk. Whitehall did not respond to the petition or the resolve, although **James Pemberton** believed that they were both well received by the ministry, and Galloway made a

similar observation to the Assembly. Confident that Parliament had listened to the grievances of the colonies, the 1767 Assembly instructed its agents to urge the ministry to repeal the 1764 Currency Act, which prohibited emissions of paper money by the individual colonies.<sup>6</sup>

Pennsylvanians, like most colonists, had misunderstood the temper of Parliament, which remained determined to raise a revenue from the North American colonies and to establish its right to legislate for the colonies. In June 1767 Parliament authorized the establishment of the American Board of Customs Commissioners in order to enforce compliance with the Navigation Acts and, wittingly or otherwise, provoked the colonists by naming volatile Boston as the board's headquarters. In the same month, Chancellor of the Exchequer Charles Townshend received approval from Parliament for his proposed 1767 Revenue Act, which contained what became known as the Townshend duties, levied on glass, paper, paint, and tea imported by American merchants. The proceeds of the duties were to be applied to payment of the salaries of colonial governors and judges, a scheme that possessed the twofold benefit of reducing the crown's administrative expenses for the colonies and of freeing royal officials from the purse strings of colonial legislatures. Parliament also approved the New York Restraining Act, which ordered the suspension of that colony's legislature until it had complied with Parliament's Quartering Act of 1764 by appropriating money for the provisioning of British troops stationed there.<sup>7</sup>

News of the Townshend duties and the other parliamentary measures initially stirred little commotion among the colonists. Readers of the *Pennsylvania Gazette* had first learned of the proposed duties in July 1767 and read in October that the act had passed Parliament and that the duties were to take effect on 20 November. The 1767 Assembly, however, ignored the entire affair in its instructions, adopted in October, to the provincial agents, Franklin and Jackson. The House urged the agents to press for the repeal of the Currency Act, the amendment of the Sugar Act, and permission to import wine, fruit, and oil directly from Spain and Portugal rather than through English merchants. The instructions contained only an oblique reference to future regulatory acts. "[W]e are directed," the members of the committee of correspondence noted in an accompanying letter, "to request you will not omit to give us the earliest Intelligence of every new Measure or Regulation that shall be proposed, or intended to be proposed, in Parliament, wherein the general Liberties of America, or those of this Colony, may, in the least, be affected or concerned." Such proposals were then to be put for consideration before the House, which, in turn, would instruct the agents either to concur with or oppose those measures, which were "beneficial or injurious to the Interest and Welfare of the Colonies."<sup>8</sup>

The new measures of Parliament, however, did not go entirely unnoticed. From December 1767 to February 1768 the *Pennsylvania Gazette* published **John Dickinson's** 12 "Letters from a Farmer in Pennsylvania," which openly declared the new acts to be unconstitutional and oppressive. Although he framed his commentaries within expressions of British patriotism and encomiums for the empire, Dickinson nonetheless challenged the colonists to respond to the latest round of dangerously misguided actions by the British legislature. "Here then, my dear countrymen," he pleaded, "Rouse yourselves, and behold the ruin hanging over your heads." He renewed the arguments against taxation by Parliament made during the Stamp Act crisis and identified the Townshend duties and the Restraining Act as taxes in disguise. He was especially concerned over both the fate of New York's legislature and the indifference of the other colonies. "With a good deal of Surprise I have observed, that little Notice has been taken of an Act of Parliament, as injurious in its Principle to the Liberties of these Colonies, as the Stamp Act was," he observed incredulously. "I mean," he added, "the Act for suspending the Legislation of New York." Dickinson argued that forcing New York to pay for the provisioning of the troops (which Dickinson believed the legislature should have done, however) was tantamount to direct parliamentary taxation of New Yorkers and was a reassertion of Parliament's unconstitutional claim of supremacy over the colonies "in the Point of Taxation." He expressed his dismay that the colonies had remained inexplicably silent over the issue, particularly the Pennsylvania Assembly, which he chastised for failing to instruct its agents to protest the imposition of those duties. "Thus we should have borne our Testimony against it," he concluded in the first of his essays, "and might therefore reasonably expect that, on a like Occasion, we might receive the same Assistance from the other Colonies."<sup>9</sup>

In his essays Dickinson dismissed the argument that the duties were external taxes and therefore legitimate exercises of Parliament's power. Unlike the Stamp Tax, the Townshend duties were levied on goods prior to their entry into the colonial market and Parliament reasoned that they would be more

acceptable to the American public. Dickinson, however, noted that colonists would eventually pay the duty in the increased cost of the commodity. He also drew a distinction between duties levied on goods imported into the colonies and those levied on goods exported to Great Britain, the latter duties having fallen within the traditional powers exercised by the crown in its regulation of trade. But duties on imported goods, he asserted, were taxes and, as such, were aimed at raising revenue and therefore were historically within the sole purview of the local assemblies. Taxation without representation (and Americans lacked representation in Parliament) was a form of slavery. "We are therefore Slaves," he added in dramatic conclusion. Dickinson's essays created an immediate sensation, and in April 1768 the *Boston Chronicle* reported that they had been printed in every colony from Florida to Nova Scotia. By the following year they had appeared in London, Dublin, and Amsterdam.<sup>10</sup>

Undoubtedly reacting to the success of Dickinson's "Letters," the Assembly in February 1768 ordered its agents in London to work with the agents of the other colonies in preparing a "decent and respectful Application to Parliament" for the repeal of the Townshend duties. Still fearful of appearing disloyal, the representatives added that the colony's agents could act only if the agents of the other colonies had been ordered by their governments to protest against the duties. Despite that caveat, the Assembly's committee of correspondence explained to the agents that the duties were viewed as "highly injurious to the Rights of the People," and detrimental to the commercial interests of the colonies. The Assembly's initial unwillingness to take a more pronounced stand owed much to its speaker, **Joseph Galloway**, leader of the Quaker party and future Loyalist, who seemed to be more comfortable with Parliament's claims of authority than with the extralegal and sometimes violent opposition to those claims by the colonists.<sup>11</sup> Moreover, the Quaker party, which dominated the Assembly, was reluctant to embrace fully the opposition to imperial Britain, particularly as the party still longed for royal government in the colony.

In June 1768 the Assembly, ready to adjourn for the summer, received a circular letter from the Massachusetts legislature, which had petitioned against the duties, calling on all the colonial assemblies to emulate their action. The representatives, about to leave for home, postponed consideration of the letter until the House reconvened in September. Governor John Penn informed his uncle that the letter would most likely have been ignored completely, except for the arrival after the House adjourned of another circular letter, which had been sent by British Secretary of State Wills Hill, earl of Hillsborough. That second letter had been intended to defuse the crisis created by Massachusetts by ordering all colonial governors to dissolve their assemblies if they endorsed the Massachusetts appeal. In fact, Hillsborough's letter had the opposite effect, inspiring a surge in the colonists' anger toward the British government. "Even those persons who were the most moderate," complained Penn, "are now set in a flame and have joined in the General Cry of Liberty." As an example, Penn described a public rally at the statehouse led, in part, by prominent Philadelphians, which culminated in the signing of a petition by a considerable number of the attendees, calling for cooperation among the colonies in a protest over the duties. Penn was uncertain how the Assembly would respond to the circular letters when it convened in September, but he was pessimistic about the future. "[I]t is my firm opinion," he observed to his uncle, "that the Submission required by the Government at home of the American Colonies, can never be obtained but by the Sword." Once back in session, the House drafted a petition to Parliament and to the crown requesting that the duties be repealed. The petition and a subsequent letter written to the agents by the House revealed the Quaker party's full retreat from its previous willingness to accept the Revenue Act, and its decision to adopt the language of **John Dickinson** in declaring the duties a form of illegal taxation.<sup>12</sup>

While the Quaker party in the Assembly struggled to balance public opposition to the duties against the party's preference to placate Parliament, the city's merchants also attempted to find a response to the duties. In March 1768 Boston merchants and traders had voted to suspend importation of all goods from Great Britain until the Townshend duties were repealed, if New York and Philadelphia merchants would adopt similar measures. At meetings held on 26 March and 28 April 1768 Philadelphia merchants balked at the suggestion, however, despite anonymous letters of encouragement on the one hand, and bitter criticism published in the *Pennsylvania Gazette* and *Pennsylvania Chronicle* and in pamphlets written by Dickinson on the other hand. Under the influence of Galloway and the Quaker party, the merchants, especially Quakers, steadfastly opposed cooperation with Boston and New York, even after those cities had agreed to nonimportation measures without Philadelphia. Finally in November 1768 more than 240 city merchants signed a public letter to merchants in London requesting that they use their influence with the government in

repealing the Townshend duties, which the writers called unconstitutional and destructive of the traditional liberties of the colonists as well as injurious to both American and British trade and to the entire Atlantic trading community. Not everyone supported the relatively moderate tone of the letter, but it managed to postpone further agitation over the duties and nonimportation. "We are with the greatest impatience waiting for the determinations of the new Parliament with regard to American liberty," wrote **William Allen** to Thomas Penn in December 1768, adding, "If it should be unfavorable to us then and not till then shall we begin our Constitutional war with our mother Country."<sup>13</sup> Ironically, three of Allen's sons, including **James Allen** and **Andrew Allen**, would become Loyalists during the Revolution.

A November 1768 letter from London that appeared in the *Pennsylvania Chronicle* in February 1769, however, revealed the extent of the British government's hostility toward American resistance to the duties, reporting that Frederick, Lord North, the chancellor of the exchequer, had denounced a petition from Virginia's legislature as "highly blameable" and "exceptionable." Friends of the American cause in England, the letter observed, had concluded that all parties in the House of Commons supported the government against repeal. Subsequently, about 250 Philadelphia merchants in February and March 1769 concurred with the merchants of Boston and New York and signed a nonimportation agreement refusing to accept any goods imported from Great Britain after 1 April until the duties were repealed. Among those merchants who signed the agreement were **James Pemberton, George Bryan, John Bayard, George Clymer, Samuel Miles, Edward Penington, Daniel Roberdeau, Hugh Roberts (1706-1786), John Ross, John Steinmetz, Charles Thomson, and Thomas Willing**. A committee of 20 merchants and retailers, which included **Robert Morris, Thomas Mifflin, Abel James, and Charles Thomson**, was elected to enforce the nonimportation agreement. The committee's first test came in July 1769. Committee members determined that a shipment of malt from Yarmouth, England, to Philadelphia (and erroneously believed to have been ordered by Philadelphian **Amos Strettell**) defied the prohibition, and they staged a public meeting at the statehouse to protest against its unloading, at which meeting the city's brewers appeared and announced to the "universal Applause" of the crowd that they had agreed in writing not to purchase any of the offending malt. The meeting resolved that any person who attempted to purchase the cargo was "an Enemy to his country." In the following month the nonimportation committee ruled that goods arriving in the city could not be stored by their owners in anticipation of the repeal, if the exporter in Great Britain had known that Philadelphia had adopted the nonimportation agreement,<sup>14</sup> the committee believing that merchants who warehoused such proscribed merchandise would, when importation resumed, have an unfair advantage over those traders who had not ordered goods from England and whose shelves would be empty for a period after the embargo was lifted.

The nonimportation movement in Pennsylvania, however, soon encountered difficulties. In a September 1769 epistle (drafted, in part, by **Israel Pemberton [1715-1779]**), the Philadelphia Meeting for Sufferings officially advised Friends not to subscribe to nonimportation. Friends were disturbed that enforcement of the agreement involved Quakers in behavior that suggested violence toward those merchants who did not wish to participate in the "voluntary" agreement; moreover, Friends were uncomfortable with the process of reaching decisions at public rallies.<sup>15</sup>

The fissure caused by Quaker merchants seceding from the agreement was widened, ironically, by Parliament's repeal of nearly all of the Townshend duties. In April 1770 Lord North, by then Great Britain's prime minister, had Parliament repeal all of the duties except that on tea exported to North America from England. North justified the remaining duty as a symbol of Parliament's political supremacy over the colonies. Philadelphians learned of the partial repeal by May, and the city's mechanics, or artisans, at a meeting that month resolved to continue complete nonimportation until all of the duties were repealed and urged the city's merchants to hold firm in their stance against Parliament. Consensus was reached among the city's merchants despite the defection from the nonimportation agreements of a considerable number of Rhode Island merchants, who had resumed importation of all British goods except tea. Prominent Philadelphia Quaker merchant Henry Drinker, partner of **Abel James**, sharply criticized those Rhode Island merchants for deserting the cause. The decision to maintain the nonimportation agreement as originally designed was confirmed by the Philadelphia merchants at a general meeting at the statehouse on 5 June 1770, and by a committee of merchants and inhabitants of the borough of Lancaster later that month. Reports in July that New York City merchants had broken the agreement caused considerable dissatisfaction in Philadelphia, and at a meeting chaired by **Joseph Fox** at the statehouse that same month resolves were passed declaring, among other things, that the action of the New York merchants was "sordid and wanton." Two

months earlier, essayists in the city's newspapers had urged Philadelphia merchants to remain united and not to allow the partial repeal to break their resistance. "Who can tell," one anonymous author pleaded presciently, "what a Year may bring forth?"<sup>16</sup>

Dissension within the ranks of the city's merchants, however, had been growing, and newspaper articles in the summer of 1770 revealed the readiness of some of them to question the utility of maintaining the embargo when other colonies had either abandoned or compromised it. The solution for the dissidents lay in the example of Rhode Island. "[H]ow are we to escape paying these Duties, evade the Laws, and preserve our Liberties," Philo Veritas asked in reference to Philadelphia merchants in one such essay for the *Pennsylvania Gazette*. "The answer is plain and obvious," the author concluded, "Import nothing whereon a Duty is laid." In September 1770 about 135 Quaker and dry goods merchants led by **Thomas Willing** gathered at a local tavern in the city and voted to maintain the embargo on tea but to resume importing goods from Britain that were no longer subject to Parliamentary taxation. The decision was defended by those merchants "as the most rational and prudent Step" to protect their interests against merchants who had resumed importation in other colonies, while at the same continuing opposition to Parliament's unconstitutional authority. **Charles Thomson**, **Thomas Mifflin**, and nine other men resigned from the nonimportation committee in disgust, and a mass meeting of artisans held later in September, chaired by **Joseph Fox**, condemned the decision to alter the agreement.<sup>17</sup> At the October Assembly election, the artisans expressed their disapproval through the ballot box by forcing Quaker party leader **Joseph Galloway** to seek reelection in Bucks County rather than in his traditional base in Philadelphia County because of his support of those merchants who had refused to continue the total embargo. He was replaced on the Philadelphia County ticket by artisan **Joseph Parker**.<sup>18</sup>

Although those individuals who withdrew from the agreement had remained steadfast in their refusal to import English tea, their decision nonetheless left bitter feelings in the colony and proved to be a turning point in the imperial crisis. The betrayal of the unified front by the merchants in 1770 dramatically recast the opposition to Parliament in Pennsylvania and presaged a realignment of the opposition forces. Future resistance would no longer depend on the will of the city's merchants but would increasingly rely on a broader base that extended beyond any one specific group or geographical location. However, in the immediate future the partial nonimportation meant that much of the opposition was left undirected, and perhaps in an attempt to refocus their efforts an unidentified member of the Assembly in February 1771, most likely **John Dickinson**, successfully moved for a petition to be forwarded to King George III requesting the repeal of that "great Danger to the Rights of the Americans," the remaining duty on tea. The petition, drafted by Dickinson, assured the king that the House did not wish "any Diminution of Royal Prerogative," but simply the removal of a parliamentary "Precedent" that had no legal foundation and jeopardized the property of Americans.<sup>19</sup>

Dickinson's petition, however, failed to influence the king, and Parliament's attitude remained unchanged; in fact, a letter dated 20 February 1772 and published two months later in the *Pennsylvania Gazette* assured its readers that the House of Commons was firmly united and that Prime Minister North proceeded "calmly, steadily and firmly," with "the full Confidence of his Master," King George III. Clearly Pennsylvanians did not have reason to expect that Parliament would repeal the tea duty, although the 1772 Assembly reminded its agent, **Benjamin Franklin**, to continue to work toward that end. The House also advised him to pursue any measure that would restore "Harmony between Great Britain and her Colonies" for the "mutual Safety and Happiness" of all British subjects.<sup>20</sup>

Agitation against the empire continued. Throughout the colonies armed mobs, customs collectors, and the king's forces clashed (sometimes violently) in isolated incidents that were all tied to the growing opposition to parliamentary authority. In March 1773 Virginia's House of Burgesses was sufficiently alarmed at the continued intransigence of the British ministry that it asked the other colonies to establish committees of correspondence in order to coordinate appropriate responses to the crisis. The 1773 Pennsylvania Assembly agreed and in October ordered its standing committee of correspondence to receive and report all such communications from other colonies. The House's concurrence with Virginia undoubtedly resulted from Parliament's May 1773 passage of the Tea Act, which allowed the financially troubled East India Company to export tea directly to the colonies from India at a lower price but with the duty intact. Lord North had rejected requests from the company to eliminate the duty altogether and had calculated instead that Americans would purchase the tea and pay the duty because the price would still be cheaper than any of

the competing smuggled teas flooding colonial markets. The prime minister sanguinely hoped therefore to accomplish two goals in one measure, the economic salvation of the company and the acceptance of Parliament's authority by the colonists. In fact, the opposite occurred. Pennsylvania pamphleteers, including **John Dickinson** and **Thomas Mifflin**, denounced the act, and, at a public meeting held at the statehouse on 16 October 1773, resolutions were passed condemning the measure as calculated to enforce the Townshend duty on tea. A 12-member committee was appointed to encourage the resignations of those merchants who had been commissioned by the company to distribute the tea. In the following month the committee expanded to 24 members by incorporating the more radical members of the nonimportation committee of 1769, many of whom had insisted on maintaining a complete embargo until all the duties were repealed. The new and emboldened committee quickly convinced the two firms handling the East India tea to surrender their commissions, including the firm of **Abel James** and Henry Drinker, which complied, albeit reluctantly. Public pressure undoubtedly helped the committee in its endeavors. An article innocently entitled "Queries Respecting the Tea Act," written in New York and appearing in the *Pennsylvania Gazette* on 8 December 1773, posed the question as to what should happen to those "traiterous Persons" who imported the tea. The article then answered its own question: "Such base Traitors to this Country, without Exception, should immediately and resolutely be dragged from Concealment, . . . [and] transported or forced from every Place in America, loaded with the most striking Badges of Disgrace." Later that month nearly 8,000 people assembled at the statehouse and enthusiastically endorsed resolutions proposed by the committee, which successfully demanded that the tea aboard the recently arrived *Polly* should remain in the ship's holds. The gathering also commended the opposition in Boston for its more creative resolution of the tea crisis.<sup>21</sup>

Parliament's reaction to the Boston Tea Party, in which thousands of pounds of tea, valued at about £10,000 sterling, were dumped into the waters of Boston harbor, led to an escalation of the imperial crisis. From March to June 1774 Parliament enacted a series of laws, known as the Coercive Acts, which closed the port of Boston until the city paid for the destroyed tea; restructured the government of Massachusetts by eliminating the election of provincial councilors and restricting the frequency of town meetings; permitted quartering of British troops in private homes if necessary; and removed trials of all crown officials charged in Massachusetts courts to more sympathetic jurisdictions. To emphasize the seriousness with which Parliament viewed the situation, the ministry replaced the Bay Colony's royal governor with Major General Thomas Gage, who would act as both chief executive and commander of British troops stationed in Boston. Before Parliament had finished passing all of the acts, Philadelphia opposition leaders **Charles Thomson**, **John Dickinson**, and **Joseph Reed** organized a public gathering in May 1774 that passed by acclamation resolutions calling on Governor John Penn to convene the legislature in response to the Boston crisis. The crowd also voted to enlist the support of the southern colonies in protest against Parliament's measures, and to send a letter of support and encouragement to the people of Boston. In a final gesture the crowd elected a 19-member committee to oversee the execution of the resolutions. Governor Penn, however, assured his uncle Thomas Penn that he would treat the petition to convene the Assembly with the contempt it deserved. He added that he understood the real purpose of the petition was to gain time to enable the opposition leaders to "see what part the other Colonies" would take "in so critical a Juncture."<sup>22</sup> Penn was most likely correct. The more radical Whigs regarded the Assembly, then still under the leadership of Speaker **Joseph Galloway**, as dilatory in the struggle against Parliament, a view reflected by the prominent Philadelphia merchant, Thomas Wharton, Senior, who described the House, in relation to the imperial crisis, as "thin of Men of Understanding."<sup>23</sup>

Governor Penn was true to his word and contemptuously refused to consider the petition, despite its 900 signers, a move that encouraged the opposition to increase its efforts. In early June nearly 1,200 artisans met in support of continued resistance to Parliament, agreeing with the committee of 19 to hold another public rally on 18 June. The committee met on 10 and 11 June with leaders of the city's religious denominations and drafted resolutions for the public meeting, agreeing on another resolution to ask Speaker **Joseph Galloway** to convene the Assembly from its summer recess regardless of Governor Penn's objections, and proposing that county committees should draft instructions to the legislature regarding the crisis. At the 18 June mass meeting held in the statehouse yard, the gathering denounced the closing of Boston's harbor and demanded a congress of colonial representatives, which would petition Parliament directly on behalf of all the colonies for repeal of the Coercive Acts. The attendees, however, rejected the resolution that Galloway should convene the House and instead elected a committee of 43 members to decide the most efficacious method of naming

and instructing delegates to the proposed congress, a reflection of the increasing distrust of Galloway and the Assembly. To insure broad support and internal unity, the 43-member committee comprised a fairly broad spectrum of attitudes within the opposition movement and elected as chair and secretary, respectively, the more moderate **Thomas Willing** and the more zealous **Charles Thomson**.<sup>24</sup>

The committee of 43 moved quickly to promote the resolutions passed at the public meeting and sent circular letters to opposition leaders in the counties encouraging them to convene similar public meetings in order to protest Parliament's most recent actions. The committee urged the county committees to support an intercolonial congress and to appoint delegates to a provincial convention. **John Dickinson**, **Charles Thomson**, and **Thomas Mifflin** toured the interior counties and met with county organizers, while **Joseph Galloway** yielded to public pressure and promised his support for the resolutions. Governor Penn may have succumbed to pressure as well. On 27 June 1774 he issued writs for the Assembly to meet in July, claiming, however, that he was reconvening the House because of the latest Indian attacks on the western frontier rather than because of the crisis in Massachusetts. Almost certainly, whatever his stated reason for convening the Assembly, Penn hoped that the more cautious Assembly and not the various extralegal bodies would lead Pennsylvania's response to the imperial crisis. Thus James Tilghman, secretary of the proprietary land office and a provincial councilor, observed that the Assembly would certainly "take some Notice of the Boston affair" but would be "more moderate than the people themselves in their Town Meetings."<sup>25</sup>

In accordance with the request of the Philadelphia-based committee of 43, meetings were held in each Pennsylvania county at which delegates were chosen to serve in a provincial convention scheduled to convene on 15 July in Philadelphia, three days before the meeting of the reconvened Assembly. In all, there were elected to the convention 75 delegates, 11 of whom were at that time also members of the legislature and 34 of whom lived in the city and county of Philadelphia. Among the delegates were **Thomas Willing**, **Joseph Reed**, **John Dickinson**, **Thomas Mifflin**, **Charles Thomson**, **John Bayard**, **Samuel Miles**, **Edward Penington**, **Thomas Fitzsimons**, **George Schlosser**, **George Gray**, **Joseph Kirkbride** (1731-1802), **Henry Wynkoop**, **John Wilkinson**, **Anthony Wayne**, **John Sellers**, **George Ross** (1730-1779), **Joseph Ferree**, **Emanuel Carpenter**, **Alexander Lowry**, **James Webb**, **Matthias Slough**, **James Smith**, **Edward Biddle**, **William Edmonds**, **Peter Kachlein**, **Jacob Arndt**, **Samuel Hunter**, and **George Woods**. The convention, meeting at Carpenters' Hall, resolved that the representatives to the proposed continental congress should be instructed by the Assembly to insist on the repeal of the Coercive Acts and the duty on tea, and to support nonimportation and nonexportation agreements in order to force the ministry to comply.<sup>26</sup>

The Assembly convened on 18 July 1774 and the next day read letters from the legislatures of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Virginia calling for concerted action against the measures of Parliament. The House then received a resolve from the provincial convention stating that there was an "absolute Necessity that a Congress of Deputies from the several Colonies be immediately assembled." Two days later, a committee from the convention presented the Assembly with its proposed instructions to Pennsylvania's representatives to the congress. After debate, the House endorsed the convention's call for a congress to convene immediately but rejected the recommended detailed instructions, which included nonimportation and nonexportation agreements. The Assembly also ignored the convention's unofficial recommendation to appoint **John Dickinson**, **Thomas Willing**, **Charles Thomson**, and James Wilson as delegates, the House viewing them as too radical, and instead the representatives named as congressional delegates **Joseph Galloway**, **Thomas Mifflin**, **John Morton**, **Edward Biddle**, **George Ross** (1730-1779), **Samuel Rhoads**, and **Charles Humphreys**.<sup>27</sup>

The First Continental Congress met in Carpenters' Hall in Philadelphia on 5 September 1774 and, to the astonishment of Galloway, elected the radical Thomson as its secretary. The congressmen also shelved Galloway's conciliatory plan of union and voted to begin nonimportation of British goods on 1 December, with nonexportation to become effective 10 September 1775. Congress also agreed to a Continental Association binding the colonies to the nonimportation agreement and drafted a declaration of grievances, an address to the king, and petitions to the people of both Great Britain and the colonies explaining its actions. Having set in motion an organized plan of protest that promised greater coordination of colonial opposition to Parliament, Congress adjourned until May 1775. The focus of resistance then returned to the individual colonies, and on 12 November 1774 Philadelphia voters, in response to the congressional call for the implementation of the Continental Association, elected a committee of observation and inspection. At that

election, voters were presented with two tickets, one listing candidates considered more radical toward British policies, the other considered more moderate. In a foreshadowing of future events, the more radical slate, with **Charles Thomson**, **Joseph Reed**, **John Bayard**, and **George Clymer**, was triumphant. Committees of observation and inspection were also elected at about the same time in the counties of Philadelphia, Berks, Lancaster, York, Chester, Northampton, Cumberland, and Bucks.<sup>28</sup> The frontier counties followed suit at later dates.

The election of the committees throughout the province indicated the extent to which popular concern over the crisis had spread, and also the level of sophistication achieved by the opposition movement. As noted previously, no longer was opposition to parliamentary authority entrusted solely to the province's most prominent Philadelphia merchants; instead leadership had been seized by individuals whose goal was resistance without compromise, and who were not restricted to certain occupations or geographical areas. Moreover, the emerging leaders relied on extralegal means to accomplish their ends, which undermined the authority and power of the colonial government.

The Philadelphia Committee of Observation and Inspection immediately set about ensuring compliance with the resolves of Congress by the city's merchants and shopkeepers. The committee's task was daunting, as the Association consisted of 14 detailed articles involving the nonimportation of British goods, the regulation of prices and resources, and the establishment of procedures for the sale of goods seized in violation of the Association. The committee reached an accord with the city's butchers on preserving the stock of sheep (for greater production of wool); issued regulations regarding goods arriving in the city after 1 December; divided the city into six districts for more efficient enforcement of nonimportation; warned vendors against raising prices; and on 22 December proposed a January 1775 provincial convention of representatives from all the county committees to discuss the boycott. Of the 105 elected delegates who attended, 6 were members of the Assembly, and 55 were from the city of Philadelphia; oddly, Bucks, Bedford, and Westmoreland counties were not represented. The purpose of the meeting ostensibly was to solidify support for the Association throughout the province and to encourage the development of local industries to replace manufactured goods no longer imported from Great Britain. Thus, the convention resolved that Pennsylvania should produce its own woolen goods, as well as its own dye, salt, saltpeter, gunpowder, nails, wire, paper, glass, wool combs and cards, copper sheets and kettles, malt liquors, grindstones, and tin plates. The delegates recommended that residents purchase goods from industries within the colonies, and they warned merchants not to sell goods at "extravagant" prices on pain of being labeled enemies to their country. Some of the convention's organizers also had hoped to convince the delegates to establish a provincial militia or, at the very least, to authorize military preparations. "[I]t is probable something of that kind will be proposed at that meeting," **Joseph Reed** informed British Secretary of State for the Colonies William Legge, 2<sup>nd</sup> earl of Dartmouth, before the convention began, but in fact the delegates balked at such a drastic step, laying aside the motion "without discussion." Reed offered that unwillingness to create a provincial militia as proof to Dartmouth that Pennsylvania continued to hope for a peaceful resolution.<sup>29</sup>

Governor John Penn, however, viewed the developments with increasing alarm. In November 1774 Penn had predicted that the acts of Parliament would never be obeyed in America unless enforced by the British army. "Indeed I foresee that this Country will be involved in all the horrors of a Civil War," he wrote at the time, "if it should be Determined to Carry the late measures of Government into Execution." Three months later, desperate for a solution and under pressure from future Tory **Joseph Galloway**, Penn attempted to separate Pennsylvania from Congress by imploring the Assembly to petition the king directly "as the only proper and constitutional mode of obtaining Redress," but Penn discovered that the 1774 Assembly was under considerable pressure from the radicals. Both **Charles Thomson** and **Thomas Mifflin** were members of the legislature and undoubtedly influenced the House to elect as speaker **Edward Biddle** in place of Galloway, who had declined nomination to the post, alleging reasons of health, and to endorse the work of Congress, including the resolves against Parliament. Penn and his former enemy Galloway had become allies, both men desperate to avoid war with Britain; thus, Galloway actively promoted the recommendation that the Assembly abandon Congress for a separate petition to the crown. After two days of debate, the House in February 1775 by the slim margin of 19 to 18 agreed to postpone consideration of the message from Penn for about two weeks, a temporary victory of sorts for Galloway and the conservative legislators. The conservatives enjoyed another victory when the House rejected by 18 to 13 a radical motion that would have admitted the public into the Assembly chambers to witness the debate over Penn's proposal, the radicals

sensing the growing public support for war. The House approved a motion to draft a response to the governor's proposed separate petition before 10 May, the day Congress was scheduled to return. A broad-based committee that included **Joseph Galloway**, **John Dickinson**, and **Thomas Mifflin** was assigned to frame the House's response, and from all appearances Galloway and the Assembly conservatives were finally within reach of the support necessary to repudiate Congress and reduce radical influence in Pennsylvania.<sup>30</sup>

Appearances, however, were deceiving. Through the intervention of **Edward Biddle** and **John Dickinson**, the committee framed an address hostile to Galloway and Penn, and the House, by a vote of 22 to 15, signaled its continuing support for Congress by defeating Galloway's request to recommit the committee's address (where it would be redrafted to Galloway's liking). By the same margin, the Assembly approved the committee's address to Penn. The address rejected any suggestion of solicitations to the crown independent of Congress and reminded the governor that "a most humble, dutiful and affectionate Petition from the Delegates of all the Colonies" had already been presented to King George III, who would undoubtedly, the address concluded, take the necessary measures to restore "Peace, Confidence and Harmony" between Great Britain and the colonies.<sup>31</sup>

In April 1775 Penn tried a different tack. He presented the House with Parliament's resolution promising to forgo direct taxation of any colony that promised to contribute its proportionate share toward colonial expenses, including the maintenance of the colony's civil government, the administration of its judicial system, and the defense of the empire. Parliament, however, reserved the right to approve all proposed contributions. The governor implored the legislature to consider seriously Parliament's offer as a "Plan of Reconciliation, held forth and offered by the Parent to her Children." At about the same time, however, **Charles Thomson** laid before the Assembly a letter from **Benjamin Franklin**, Arthur Lee, and William Bollan, the agents for Massachusetts and, in Franklin's case, for Pennsylvania as well, stating that the petition from Congress had been delivered to Parliament "undistinguished among a Variety of Letters and other Papers from America." They also reported that a motion made in Parliament by former prime minister William Pitt, 1<sup>st</sup> earl of Chatham, to remove British troops from Boston had been defeated, and they included in their dispatch an excerpt of a letter that had been made public noting Major General Thomas Gage's comment that Lord Dartmouth's idea of disarming certain colonies was "consistent with Prudence and Safety" but impracticable. Several days later the Assembly officially rejected Parliament's proposed compromise and warned Governor Penn that the colony would not desert the other colonies while embarked on "the same Common Cause."<sup>32</sup>

The public mood in Pennsylvania took a sudden turn for the worse in April 1775 when the *Pennsylvania Gazette* published accounts of skirmishes between British troops and Massachusetts militiamen. The "dreadful News" of the 19 April engagement, which left an estimated total of 122 British and American dead and over 200 wounded or missing, shocked Pennsylvanians and confirmed for many of them their worst suspicions of the British empire. On 25 April an estimated 8,000 city residents met to listen to "several eloquent and patriotic Speeches" and to associate into volunteer companies in order to defend "with Arms their Property, Liberty and Lives." A petition was presented to the House from a number of Philadelphians on 4 May calling for an appropriation of £50,000 to be used in defense of the province. The House declined for the moment to consider such a massive expenditure, but the representatives nonetheless appointed on 12 May a committee dominated by radical Whigs with orders to purchase up to £5,000 in military provisions. The Assembly also appointed the recently arrived **Benjamin Franklin**, as well as **Thomas Willing** and James Wilson, to serve in Congress and accepted the disillusioned **Joseph Galloway's** resignation as a congressman. At the same time, volunteer military associations were formed in Berks, Lancaster, Cumberland, Philadelphia, Bucks, Bedford, Chester, Westmoreland, and Northampton counties, and three battalions of Associators were established in the city of Philadelphia.<sup>33</sup>

In June 1775 the committee of observation and inspection for the city of Philadelphia demanded funding from the Assembly for the enlistment of Associators and officers, and for the purchase of military provisions in order to defend the province against the threat of British invasion and subsequent occupation. The Second Continental Congress also requested that the House provide a battalion of eight companies of riflemen to join the newly created Continental Army, then positioning itself outside British-occupied Boston. For the first time during the imperial crisis, the Assembly was confronted with a set of demands that were clearly intended to escalate the resistance movement to new and more dangerous levels. The legislature did not hesitate and took the extraordinary step of granting both petitions. The House authorized the raising of

Continental troops from within the province and appointed a committee to consider measures for putting the province into “a State of Defence.” On the issue of defense, the Assembly dramatically altered the political landscape in Pennsylvania through its adoption of 16 resolves that, in essence, militarized the colony, by calling for the appointment of an agent or commissioner for each county to acquire, on behalf of the Associators, cartridge boxes, knapsacks, muskets, and saltpeter, and for the establishment of a provincial Committee of Safety with authority to call the volunteer soldiers into service. The initial Committee of Safety consisted of 25 members, 12 of whom were members of the Assembly, and was empowered to spend upwards of £35,000 in paper money issued by the Assembly, to be sunk through taxes levied by the county commissioners. The committee focused almost entirely on military issues, including the defense of the city and the Delaware River from attack, the procuring of military stores and provisions, and the granting of commissions to officers. The committee also issued the Articles of Association, which regulated the behavior of the soldiers while on active duty. According to those articles, offenses committed by the troops were to be handled by either a regimental or a general court martial, depending on the nature of the offense. The punishments included censure, fines, and dismissal. Similar rules were drafted for those men who served on armed vessels in the pay of Pennsylvania. The committee also established the order in which the Associators would be called into service.<sup>34</sup> Remarkably, the measures creating the Committee of Safety and the issuing of paper money for military purposes were passed by the Assembly and enforced by Assembly resolution and not by statute, and the decisions by the Committee of Safety were decreed under its own authority, which procedures completely circumvented even the pretence of seeking the governor’s approval.

In late September 1775 the Committee of Safety reported to the Assembly that more money was needed. “It must be obvious to the House,” the report stated, “that much yet remains to be done, . . . particularly if the British Ministry should obstinately persist in their present arbitrary Measures.” The total spent and “to be expended” by the committee amounted to £87,237, the bulk of which went for arms, ammunition, and medicines acquired in Europe and North America, and for an additional 4,500 muskets that had been ordered for the use of the minutemen, who were to be organized out of the Associators. In addition to the call for more money, the committee requested that the House adopt regulations to impose fines on those men who refused or failed to enlist. “[T]he Associators complain,” the report stressed, “and with great appearance of Reason, that Whilst they are subjected to Expences to accoutre themselves as Soldiers, and their affairs suffer considerably by the time necessarily employed in acquiring a knowledge of the Military Art, very many of their Country Men, who have not associated,” the report continued, “are intirely free from these Inconveniences.”<sup>35</sup> The report concluded by pointing out that equity demanded that the burden of securing the liberties and freedoms enjoyed by the whole community should be upheld by everyone, including non-Associators.

On 2 August 1775 the Second Continental Congress adjourned until 5 September, having established the Continental army; advised the colonies to form militias and committees of safety; published the Declaration on Taking Arms, a spirited defense of the actions of Congress; and drafted the petition to the king popularly called the Olive Branch Petition, one last attempt to avert the seemingly inevitable confrontation. The Philadelphia Committee of Observation and Inspection also adjourned, having been scheduled to serve for the length of Congress. An election for new members was set for 16 August and the committee recommended expanding its membership from 66 men to 100. Three sets of tickets were circulated by candidates before the election, with each ticket generally representing either the radical, moderate, or conservative faction of the resistance movement. As in the previous election, the radical ticket was victorious. The new committee elected trusted radicals **Joseph Reed**, **George Clymer**, Thomas McKean, and Samuel Meredith to serve as chairmen, presumably in that order, and the committee elected John Bayard Smith as secretary, with radicals Robert Strettel Jones and Peter Lloyd as his assistants. The committee then reorganized itself into sub-districts for the greater enforcement of nonimportation and, as of 9 September, nonexportation. The members also took up the issue of internal dissent and, at their behest, a company of Associators in September 1775 paraded Quaker attorney Isaac Hunt in a cart around the city for having challenged the committee’s authority to enforce nonimportation regulations. According to diarist Christopher Marshall, however, Hunt’s ordeal ended abruptly when he was literally replaced by a Loyalist, Doctor John Kearsley, who had attempted to fire pistols at the Associators. The following month the committee of observation and inspection arrested Kearsley for having urged Lord Dartmouth in private letters to send 5,000 British troops to Philadelphia to crush the opposition. Congress intervened and

recommended that local dissidents who might “endanger the Safety of the Colony, or the Liberties of America” should be brought before provincial committees of safety. Along with his co-conspirators, Kearsley was apprehended by the city committee and turned over to Pennsylvania’s Committee of Safety, under whose authority he was imprisoned. After an interrogation supervised by Colonel **Daniel Roberdeau** revealed “a scene of villainy,” Kearsley was sent to the town of York, where he was imprisoned indefinitely.<sup>36</sup>

The willingness of the Committee of Safety to try cases of disloyalty was a natural outgrowth of the extralegal authority it was exercising. In September 1775 Duncan Campbell was brought before the committee for secretly recruiting volunteers for the British army, and in the same month the committee advertised in the *Pennsylvania Gazette* that citizens were not to abuse suspected enemies to the resistance but were to present their information to the committee for investigation. The advertisement assured Pennsylvanians that the committee was fully prepared to try such cases, with those individuals found guilty to be punished as enemies “to the rights of British America.”<sup>37</sup>

Despite the obvious erosion of the provincial government’s authority and the continued existence of extralegal committees, the fall 1775 election to the Assembly failed to signal clearly either acceptance or rejection by the voters of the resistance movement. Radicals **Thomas Mifflin** and **Benjamin Franklin** were elected for the city of Philadelphia (Franklin replacing the equally radical **Charles Thomson**, who stood instead for Philadelphia County, while Mifflin was reelected) and fellow radicals **Samuel Miles**, **Robert Morris**, and **Thomas Potts** were elected for Philadelphia County (replacing **Henry Pawling**, **Israel Jacobs**, and **Samuel Rhoads**, all of whom probably chose not to run). **Joseph Galloway** refused to run for office. **Charles Thomson**, however, and fellow radical Thomas Pryor were unable to win in Philadelphia County, while radical **Joseph Parker** and conservative **Jonathan Roberts** were both returned by county voters. In all, 25 of the 31 representatives elected in the remaining counties were incumbents, suggesting that the electorate had opted for continuity over change, despite the escalating crisis.<sup>38</sup>

The 1775 Assembly, led by Speaker **John Morton**, had no sooner convened than it was confronted with the issue of military service. Petitions from the committees of observation and inspection for the city of Philadelphia and Chester County echoed the demands made by the Committee of Safety to the previous Assembly for military regulations that laid the burdens of service equally throughout the province. The cause was supported by the radical committee of privates, which demanded the extension of the Associator regulations to all Pennsylvanians, and which also insisted that “any Indulgence . . . thought necessary to be granted by the House to any Freemen of the Province” should be open to everyone equally and granted by the House on terms believed by the representatives to be “adequate to the many difficult and dangerous Services of those . . . willing to hazard their Lives and Fortunes in Defence of their Country.” The privates were adamant that non-Associators had to contribute to the war effort. The Quakers were quick to respond, petitioning the House against passage of a law that would deprive Friends of their right to “full Enjoyment of *Liberty of Conscience*” by imposing on them, despite their pacifism, military obligations or fines for refusing to participate in the war effort. Friends also urged the Assembly to adopt conciliatory measures toward Great Britain in an effort to restore peace. Petitions from the committees of privates and officers, and the committee of observation and inspection for the city of Philadelphia promptly appeared before the legislature denouncing the Quaker petition as inconsistent with equity and truth, as the Quakers had previously paid taxes to support military efforts in Pennsylvania.<sup>39</sup>

For nearly three weeks the House debated the merits of revising the Associator regulations, a debate that was not without some drama. At one point, the members of the city’s committee of observation and inspection solemnly marched two-by-two to the statehouse in order to present their protest against the Quaker petition, and about the same time a motion made in the Assembly to allow the public to witness the debates was defeated 18 to 9. Nonetheless on 8 November 1775 the House passed a series of sweeping resolutions calling for the continuation of the Association; the enlistment of all White males from the age of 16 years to 50 years who did not refuse to bear arms for religious reasons; the contribution of a money equivalent to the time spent by the Associators in the field to be paid by conscientious objectors; and the printing of £80,000 in paper currency to reduce the burgeoning military debt. On 25 November the House officially adopted Rules and Regulations for the better Government of the Military Association in Pennsylvania, Articles of Association in Pennsylvania, and Resolutions directing the Mode of Levying Taxes on Non-Associators in Pennsylvania. On the previous day, the Assembly had resolved that the actions of

anyone who refused to accept the paper money should be declared “inimical” to the liberties of America.<sup>40</sup> The House passed those measures as resolutions and not as bills, thereby avoiding the need for the governor’s approval.

Although the House had taken significant steps toward possible confrontation with British forces, many assemblymen were not ready to accept the full significance of those actions, a sentiment also shared by many Pennsylvanians. “It is astonishing to me,” John Adams commented to his wife on 23 July 1775 in reference to Pennsylvania’s attitude toward armed resistance, “that the People are so cool here.” That reluctance to embrace the resistance was reflected in the composition of the congressional delegation named in November 1775 by the House, primarily conservative and moderate Whigs, although a minority of the delegates were more zealous in promoting continued agitation against Parliament. Moreover, the House entrusted the drafting of instructions to the delegates to a committee also dominated by cautious Whigs, led by **John Dickinson**. The instructions, almost certainly written by Dickinson and adopted on 9 November 1775, contained a clause encouraging Pennsylvania’s congressmen to work for redress of American grievances and restoration of harmony between Great Britain and the colonies. Of greater significance, however, was the order discouraging contemplation of independence. “[W]e strictly enjoin you, that you, in Behalf of this Colony,” the instruction noted, “dissent from and utterly reject any Propositions, should such be made, that may cause or lead to a Separation from our Mother County, or a Change of the Form of this Government.” The last line reflected Dickinson’s attempt to control the radical Whigs.<sup>41</sup>

Dickinson was not alone in his ambivalence toward the direction of the resistance movement. Although none of the political leaders in Pennsylvania spoke openly about independence and, in fact, many of them continued to deny that it was a goal, such reticence was increasingly difficult to maintain. In November 1775 the Continental Congress reported to the public that George III had refused to receive the Olive Branch Petition, had declared the colonies in rebellion, and had called on loyal subjects to assist his government in suppressing the American rebels. As for **John Dickinson’s** instructions to the delegates, they did not go completely unchallenged. Within two weeks, “A Lover of Order” protested against the presumed right of the Assembly to issue any instructions to the congressmen, arguing that Congress was an independent body representing the people at large, rather than representing the Assembly. Finally the January 1776 publication of Thomas Paine’s *Common Sense* openly broached the subject of independence with withering assessments of the British government, of monarchs in general, and of a ministry that had become corrupted by power. Paine questioned the continued loyalty of the Americans to a British government that had abused its colonies and was determined to suppress the constitutional rights of the colonists with troops and violence. The time had come, he declared, for Americans to admit what they had known all along, that they were capable of and deserving of self-government. The pamphlet set off a vigorous debate in the newspapers, and presumably in the coffeehouses as well, over the dramatically shifting direction of the resistance. Within that milieu, a new and more radical committee of observation and inspection was elected in February 1776 for the city of Philadelphia. The new committee immediately pushed for revision of the Articles of Association in order to impose heavier fines on non-Associators and also urged Congress to take a stronger and more active role in the regulation of prices, while the committee itself continued to pressure merchants and traders to accept Continental currency. Of greatest importance to the committee, however, was the need to recall the Assembly’s instructions prohibiting the delegates from voting for independence, although the members were not united on the manner of achieving that recall.<sup>42</sup> Some members were willing to work within the existing channels of authority, that is, the Assembly and the extralegal committees, while others favored bypassing the House completely and convening a provincial convention that would take control of Pennsylvania’s political direction.

The House, therefore, returned from its adjournment in February 1776 facing a crisis of unprecedented proportions. In response to petitions from battalions raised in Berks, Chester, Cumberland, and Lancaster counties, from the committees of observation and inspection for Chester and Bucks counties, from the privates and officers of the city of Philadelphia Associators, and from the inhabitants of two townships of Northampton County, the House appointed a committee of 15 members to revise the Articles of Association. The committee made its report on 29 March, and on 5 April the legislature adopted the revised regulations. The House also agreed to raise a battalion of 1,500 riflemen and musketeers to serve until 1 January 1778 in defense of the province, as requested by the Committee of Safety.<sup>43</sup> The Assembly deflected demands for a provincial convention by agreeing to expand its own membership to provide greater representation to the

outlying counties and to the city of Philadelphia. The House voted 21 to 11 to hold the elections for the new seats as early as possible (25 April), and 23 to 8 to pass the final bill for presentation to the governor; Penn signed the bill into law on 23 March 1776. The law established four additional seats for the city of Philadelphia, two additional seats each for Lancaster, York, Cumberland, Berks, and Northampton counties, and one additional new seat each for Bedford, Westmoreland, and Northumberland counties. While the law increased representation for areas that traditionally had been underrepresented in the legislature, support for the measure was, in fact, based on the presumption by members of the radical and moderate Whig factions that the by-elections would provide them with control of the Assembly. The results, however, proved to be a disappointment for both factions, as voters returned moderates and radicals in near equal numbers, thus denying either faction control. Moreover, some of the newly elected representatives were of neither camp, being uncomfortable with the resistance movement and unalterably opposed to independence; however, they and their like-minded colleagues already in the legislature were in a distinct minority in the House.<sup>44</sup>

The dissatisfaction of the radical Whigs with the results of the special election and their impatience over the House's reluctance to change the instructions to reflect their revolutionary ardor forced them to appeal to Congress for help. Under the influence of John Adams, Congress passed a resolution on 10 May 1776 calling on the colonies to adopt such governments as were competent to answer "the exigencies of their affairs" and able to provide for "the happiness and safety of their constituents in particular, and America in general." As intended, the congressional resolve allowed the radicals within Pennsylvania to overthrow the political dominance of the Assembly. On 15 and 16 May 1776 the city's committee of observation and inspection, having invited radicals to attend, held meetings at the American Philosophical Society to discuss whether the Assembly was capable of meeting the "exigencies" of the times. Popular opinion, at least among the more zealous Whigs, held that the legitimacy of the Assembly had been compromised because its authority rested on a charter approved by the crown, automatically making Pennsylvania's government incompatible with the demands of Congress. One anonymous radical stressed that point in the *Pennsylvania Evening Post* on 16 May 1776 through a series of questions regarding the colony and the constitution. "Should the officers of the old constitution be entrusted with the power of making a new one when it becomes necessary," the author asked, to which question he responded in the negative. Such an arrangement, he assured his readers would "exchange a bad constitution for a worse." In truth, the radicals were eager to eliminate the House as a political force, believing that it was dominated by conservative and moderate Whig assemblymen, many of whom continued to yearn for some form of reconciliation with Great Britain. Referring to those recalcitrant Whigs sitting in the legislature, one anonymous radical asked whether they would be remembered, should the opportunity for independence be lost, as patriots or would "their avarice, ambition, and servility . . . be characterized by the courtly phrases of Timidity, or Weak Nerves?" The radicals, by then calling themselves the independents, were beyond compromise. "Conquest, and not reconciliation, is the plan of Britain," warned Thomas Paine in April 1776 under the pseudonym "Forester" in the *Pennsylvania Gazette*. Paine asked his readers if they would be willing, should American resistance succeed, "to receive those for Governors, who, had they been conquerors," would have hung the rebels as "traitors." Paine then supplied what he regarded as the appropriate response: "Certainly not. Reject the offer then, and propose another; which is, we will make peace with you as with enemies, but we will never re-unite with you as friends."<sup>45</sup>

On 20 May 1776 about 4,000 people crowded into the statehouse yard, despite a heavy rain, and heard **Daniel Roberdeau** read the Congressional resolution (written by John Adams) that recommended the suppression of royal authority in each of the colonies, for which he received "three cheers" from the crowd. The next speaker, Thomas McKean, informed his listeners that the Assembly in April had rejected the petition from the city's committee of observation and inspection requesting that the House rescind its instructions to the congressional delegates that ordered them to oppose any motion to separate the colonies from Great Britain. The gathering then unanimously approved McKean's resolution that the instructions had "a dangerous tendency" to disrupt the harmony existing among the colonies and, after several resolutions essentially rejecting the right of the Assembly to even consider the new resolution as read by Roberdeau, the crowd unanimously approved a resolution calling on the county committees of observation and inspection to meet and appoint delegates to a provincial conference, which, in turn, would draft resolutions for convening a constitutional convention. The following day the city committee of observation and inspection notified the county committees to send delegates to a provincial conference scheduled for 18 June. "The People of this Province are thrown into the most violent Convulsions by the resolve of Congress sent you," wrote

Maryland congressman Thomas Stone to a friend on 20 May, the day of the statehouse gathering, “the result of which it is impossible to foresee.” He observed that the gathering, as noted, had demanded the suppression of the Assembly, the recall of the legislature’s instructions prohibiting the province’s congressmen from voting for independence, and the summoning of a constitutional convention. But, he added, the committee of observation and inspection for Philadelphia County, rejecting the radicals, had passed a resolution supporting the Assembly. Stone’s letter highlighted the political crisis unfolding in Pennsylvania. The attempts by Pennsylvania’s radicals to overthrow the 93-year-old legislature appalled the moderate Whigs, who uniformly balked at such an unprecedented move, regardless of whether or not they supported independence. Stone concluded that the fate of the revolutionary movement in Pennsylvania rested on those moderate Whig House members: “We shall know in a few days whether they will maintain their Ground.”<sup>46</sup>

The House reconvened on 22 May 1776, having failed to achieve a quorum on 20 May, the day of the public meeting, and having gathered a quorum too late for business on 21 May. The representatives who met on the 22<sup>nd</sup>, however, were undecided on the direction they would take. To appease popular opinion that all references to royal authority be quashed, the new members from the special election were allowed to take their seats without taking the oath of allegiance to the crown, prompting the immediate departure of an indignant **James Webb** from the House in protest. Nor was he alone. After serving the House for 19 years as its clerk, Charles Moore resigned his office on the same day that Webb walked out, stating only that to continue was “inconvenient to him in many Respects.” Probably coinciding with Moore’s resignation, the Assembly resolved to conduct business without the governor (and by extension, the proprietors), in effect denying his authority over the representatives and thereby unceremoniously dropping from its printed minutes the running header, “John Penn, Esq; Governor,” substituting the date instead. But such measures were deemed insufficient by the radicals; an anonymous account of the House’s proceedings published in the *Pennsylvania Gazette* on 26 June 1776 made clear the author’s belief that the Assembly’s actions were insincere. “In this sitting the Assembly got into a double way of doing business,” the author noted. On the one hand, minutes were taken as always, but on the other hand, the House failed to record the desperate efforts of the moderates to challenge the radicals without exposing themselves to public outcry. “No Ayes or Nays to be found this sitting,” observed the author, “for when any objecting members found that they could not carry their point, they withdrew their objection to avoid being known to the public.” Thus, for example, the author noted that a legislator demanded in the House that oaths of allegiance be eliminated also for unqualified German voters, prompting a fellow representative, “one of the proprietary gentlemen, who had taken his seat without oaths,” to call for postponement of that motion. His motion calling for the postponement was seconded, but, realizing the unpopularity of their actions, the two assemblymen withdrew their motion and thereby avoided exposure in the minutes. The author also noted that the committee appointed to draft a resolution for eliminating oaths of allegiance for those German voters was composed of the same members who had attempted to postpone the motion. “[T]he persons who objected against admitting the Germans were put on the Committee for taking off their disqualifications;” the author stressed, “by which artful scheme the objectors to their enfranchisement were represented in the votes as their friends.” Although the author failed to mention the “objectors” by name, the assemblymen to whom he was referring were undoubtedly **James Allen**, **Andrew Allen**, and possibly **Alexander Wilcocks**, all of whom were assigned to that committee.<sup>47</sup>

The congressional resolution calling for the adoption by the colonies of new governments, however, continued to threaten the Pennsylvania legislature. Moderate Whigs understood the inherent danger in mishandling the explosive issue, and, rather than risk the immediate collapse of the Assembly’s authority by openly declaring their opposition to that resolve, they maneuvered in the House for the appointment of a committee that would draft a memorial “setting forth the different Meanings . . . assigned to the said Resolve.” The committee, consisting of two radicals (**George Clymer** and **George Ross** [1730-1779]), two opponents of independence (**Alexander Wilcocks** and **Andrew Allen**), and a moderate Whig (**Isaac Pearson**), was ordered to request from Congress a clarification of its resolve. The committee brought into the House a memorial, which was read, tabled, and forgotten. The moderates, playing for time, were hoping that a delay would impede radical momentum. Instead the moderates were likely to fail, according to that anonymous critic in his 26 June article, primarily because of the ineffective leadership of **John Dickinson**, who, the author noted, “steered an indefinite course, sometimes agreeing with one side, sometimes with the other, sometimes

with neither, seeming upon the whole to have no other fixed object in view than Himself.” Although the author claimed that the weak opposition in the House consisted of members of the proprietary party, he could have included the moderate Whigs as well as believers in what the author described as the “ruinous delusions of reconciliation.”<sup>48</sup>

Despite their hopes, time was not on the side of the moderate Whigs. “The General Assembly of Pennsylvania is averse to any Change,” wrote New York Congressman James Duane to John Jay on 25 May 1776. Pennsylvania’s radicals undoubtedly came to the same conclusion and were determined to end the Assembly’s instructions to the congressional delegates that prohibited them from voting for independence. “The infamous instructions given by the Assembly to their Delegates, which they, at their last meeting refused to alter,” noted New Hampshire Congressman Josiah Bartlett to his congressional colleague John Langdon in May 1776, “is the cause of their losing their confidence of the people.” The radicals continued to press for change in the instructions. On 28 May a petition from the freemen of Cumberland County requesting that the instructions be recalled was read before the House. The petition was read a second time on 5 June, and, “after a Debate of considerable Length,” a motion to appoint a committee to bring in new instructions passed the House “by a large Majority,” without a roll-call vote. **James Allen**, who voted in the minority, recorded in his diary that 13 members opposed the motion, although he failed to name them. “[T]he Tide,” noted Allen, “is too strong; we could not prevent a change of Instructions to our Delegates.”<sup>49</sup> Clearly some moderate Whigs had yielded under pressure, but moderates outnumbered radicals by 4 to 3 on the committee appointed by the House to draft the new instructions. The committee, headed by **John Dickinson**, prepared instructions that only authorized Pennsylvania delegates to concur with other congressmen in forming compacts among the colonies or treaties with foreign nations, or adopting “such other Measures” as were necessary for the liberty and safety of America. The word “independence” did not appear in the text. Ironically, the same day the committee was appointed, the House read a letter from the General Convention in Virginia that included a unanimous resolution instructing Virginia’s congressmen to propose in Congress that the united colonies be declared “free and independent States.”<sup>50</sup>

Although they had been consistently outmaneuvered by the radicals, the moderate Whigs in the House had one last plan to regain control of the political process. On 8 June 1776, when the committee appointed to draft the new instructions made its report, an unnamed member proposed an additional instruction, which he “read in his Place.” The motion was seconded and ordered to be considered by the House in three days. The minutes are silent as to the substance of the additional instruction, but the anonymous author of the 26 June 1776 article in the *Pennsylvania Gazette* noted that “a new scheme began to appear in the House,” after adoption of the new instructions, which scheme, “if carried into execution, would have probably thrown the province into irrecoverable disorder.” The moderates suggested that in addition to passing the new instructions, the House should also comply with the congressional resolve of 15 May by calling for a convention of delegates to be convened in order to adopt a government appropriate to the changed circumstances of the province. Apparently, the moderates intended to determine the total number of delegates, the method of their election, and their proportionate number by county, as well as deciding other significant issues about the convention. The author of the article complained that the moderates had made their suggestion knowing that representatives from the county committees were then being selected for the provincial conference scheduled to meet later that month. “[N]othing but confusion could have been produced by the Assembly meddling therewith,” the author stressed. There would be two conventions, with some members “insisting on one mode and some on the other.” By their scheme, the moderates had “created new suspicions” among the representatives, with the radicals viewing it as a “dangerous experiment.”<sup>51</sup>

Despite their efforts, the moderate Whigs failed to stop the momentum toward independence or to bring about a competing convention, as radical members in the House blocked further discussion by refusing to attend any more Assembly meetings. Beginning on 9 June 1776, the Assembly failed to achieve a quorum. The walkout also prevented the moderates from appointing two brigadier generals for the provincial Associators, in accordance with a request from Congress that each colony provide troops and officers. A protest from the city’s committee of privates denied the Assembly’s right to name the brigadier generals, arguing that such a decision belonged to those men serving in the military. Moreover, they denied that the House possessed the legitimacy to serve as the representative body for the people of Pennsylvania, the representatives having lost that right when all royal authority was ended in the province. The Assembly minuted the protest but, in any event, was powerless to proceed for lack of a quorum. On 14 June the

remaining members of the House yielded to the inevitable, ordered the revised instructions to the delegates to be transcribed, and adjourned till August.<sup>52</sup>

On 18 June 1776 the provincial convention, consisting of 108 delegates, convened at Carpenters' Hall, Philadelphia, and after eight days of deliberations agreed on the details for a constitutional convention. On 8 July, four days after both the Declaration of Independence and the election at Lancaster by Pennsylvania's Associators of **Daniel Roberdeau** and **James Ewing** as brigadier generals for the state, elections were held across Pennsylvania for delegates to the convention. That body, convened on 15 July and sitting until 28 September, replaced the congressmen appointed by the Assembly with a new set of nine delegates, including **Benjamin Franklin**, **George Ross** (1730-1779), **George Clymer**, **Robert Morris**, **John Morton**, and **James Smith**, all committed to the Revolution. The convention also drafted a state constitution that completed the overthrow of Pennsylvania's proprietary political system. However, despite the passage of the Declaration of Independence, the establishment of a new Committee of Safety, and the convening of a constitutional convention, the Assembly, whose legal status by then was questionable, attempted to convene upon its adjournment on 26 August. Not surprisingly, a quorum failed to appear. Nonetheless, the attempt by some legislators to carry on the business of the House must have been a curious sight for Philadelphians and visiting politicians. "It was a strange scene at the State House," admitted **James Allen**, who attended the Assembly, "where Congress, Assembly, Convention & Admiralty Court were sitting, all at the same time." The revolutionary authorities allowed the House to meet only in order to settle its accounts. The House sat until 28 August, adjourned on 23 September, and then sat for three more days, never achieving a quorum that entire span, before finally closing its doors. Despite the questionable legal status of the House at that time, the legislators voted 16 to 12 to give John Penn his governor's salary of £1,000, and, on the colonial Assembly's last day of existence, a handful of assemblymen had the temerity to pass resolutions denying the right of the constitutional convention to pass ordinances that fined non-Associators and empowered justices to imprison indefinitely citizens suspected of being "too dangerous, unfriendly or inimical to the American cause." The Assembly's parting gesture of defiance, however, aroused little interest, as war and revolution eclipsed all other events. Moreover, at least a dozen members present in the House were revolutionaries, attending only to prevent any attempt by the old guard to reassert the authority of the legislature. When the House finally "rose" and its remaining members either retired to their homes or carried on their new responsibilities in the cause for independence, the last vestige of colonial government in Pennsylvania had come to an end.<sup>53</sup>

1. *Votes*, 5:376, 378.

2. *PAG*, 23, 30 May, 1, 29 Aug., 12 Sept. 1765; Morgan, *Stamp Act*, 163-64, 166-67.

3. *Votes*, 5:419-22, 426-27; *SHP*, 6:127; *FP*, 12:265.

4. GRJCSP, case 2, box 13; *PAJ*, 10 Oct. 1765; PPOC, 11:263; *PAG*, 14, 21 Nov., 19 Dec. 1765.

5. *Votes*, 5:440; PPOC, 10:33; MPC, 9:308-9; Morgan, *Stamp Act*, 143, 330-32.

6. *FP*, 13:292; *Votes*, 5:477-78, 501-3; PEMP, 34:147.

7. *Empire*, 105-6.

8. *PAG*, 16 July, 13 Aug., 8 Oct. 1767; *Votes*, 6:4-5.

9. *PAG*, 3, 10, 17, 24, 31 Dec. 1767, 7, 14, 21, 28 Jan., 4, 11, 18 Feb. 1768.

10. *PAG*, 24 Dec. 1767, 14 Jan., 14 April 1768; *Empire*, 111.

11. *Votes*, 6:53-54; *PMHB*, 97:20; Hutson, "Campaign," 94:441.

12. PPOC, 10:158; *Votes*, 6:93, 103-7.

13. *PAC*, 23 May, 25 July 1768; *PAG*, 31 March, 14, 21, 28 April, 12 May, 21 July 1768; Ford, *Dickinson*, 1:409-11, 435; Jensen, *Maritime Commerce*, 173-74; Brunhouse, "Townshend Acts," 54:363-64; MRNIR, 2:6; PPOC, 10:186.

14. *PAC*, 6 Feb. 1769; HDPAPS; Brunhouse, "Townshend Acts," 54:365; *PAG*, 20, 27 July, 3 Aug. 1769.

15. PHMFS, 5 Aug., 1 Sept. 1769.

16. *Empire*, 144-45; *PMHB*, 14:44; Olton, *Artisan*, 43; *PAG*, 17, 31 May, 7, 28 June, 19 July 1770; Ryerson, "Leadership," 103-4.

17. *PAG*, 2 Aug., 27 Sept., 4, 11 Oct. 1770; Ryerson, *Leadership*, 105-8.

18. *FP*, 17:228; Olton, *Artisans*, 51-53.

19. *Votes*, 6:284, 299.

20. *PAG*, 30 April 1772; *FP*, 19:338.

21. *Votes*, 6:455, 490; *Empire*, 167-68, 170-71; PENPAC, 18 Oct. 1773, 3 Jan. 1774; Ryerson, *Leadership*, 115-16, 120-24; *PAG*, 8, 29 Dec. 1773.

22. Labaree, *Tea Party*, 170-93; Ryerson, *Revolution*, 40-41; PPOC, 11:149.

23. Quoted in Anderson, Wharton, 287.

24. Olton, *Artisans*, 60; Ryerson, *Revolution*, 45, 158-64, 176; PAG, 22 June 1774.
25. Ryerson, *Revolution*, 53; MPC, 10:180; PPOC, 11:153.
26. PAG, 27 July 1774.
27. *Votes*, 6:513, 516-20; Ryerson, *Leadership*, 216-17. Ryerson notes that contemporaries disagreed on whether the Assembly voted unanimously to participate in the Congress, as stated by **Joseph Reed** in a private letter discussing the Assembly's vote, or whether there was opposition to sending delegates to the Congress, with **Charles Humphreys** among the opponents, as claimed by William Bradford in a letter to James Madison. Neither Reed nor Bradford were members of the Assembly, however; Ryerson speculates that the absence of opposition in this instance was improbable, although the minutes of the House recorded the vote to participate in the Congress as "N.C.D.," that is, *nemine contradicente*, which, of course, does not mean unanimity (Ryerson, "Leadership," 215).
28. LDC, 1:xxiv, 27, 107, 112-17; Burnett, *Continental Congress*, 51, 54-55, 58; PENPAC, 14 Nov. 1774; Ryerson, *Revolution*, 99-100, 261.
29. PAG, 2, 30 Nov., 7, 14, 21, 28 Dec. 1774; PA, 2<sup>nd</sup> ser., 3:625-26, 628-30; Reed, *Reed*, 1:90, 94.
30. PPOC, 11:189; MPC, 10:233-34; *Votes*, 6:546, 553, 555-56, 572, 576; LDC, 1:204, 315, 322-24.
31. LDC, 2:315-19, 322; *Votes*, 6:577; MPC, 10:238-39.
32. MPC, 10:250-51; FP, 21:472-73; *Votes*, 6:581, 584-85.
33. PAG, 26 April 1775; *Votes*, 6:585-87; Boatner, 631; Ryerson, *Leadership*, 345, 350-51.
34. *Votes*, 6:589-94; MCS, 10:282-372.
35. MCS, 10:348, 350-51; MPC, 10:349.
36. Burnett, *Continental Congress*, 75, 85-87, 98; PAG, 9, 30 Aug. 1775; Marshall, *Diary*, 16, 18 Aug., 6 Sept. 1775; JCC, 3:280; MCS, 10:357-58, 360-61, 367, 371, 373; PAJ, 11 Oct. 1775; Ryerson, *Leadership*, 379-84; LDC, 2:151-53; PEP, 2 Sept. 1775; Ryerson, *Revolution*, 131.
37. LDC, 2:246-47; PAG, 27 Sept. 1775.
38. PAG, 13, 20 Sept. 1775; PEP, 3 Oct. 1775; Ryerson, *Leadership*, 408; *Votes*, 6:622.
39. *Votes*, 6:627-28, 633-37, 639-40.
40. Marshall, *Diary*, 29, 30, 31 Oct. 1775; *Votes*, 6:637, 646, 653, 655, 658, 660.
41. LDC, 1:649; *Votes*, 6:644, 647; Ryerson, *Revolution*, 141; Stille, *Dickinson*, 165.
42. Ryerson, *Leadership*, 453-54, 482-83; PAG, 15 Nov. 1775; LDC, 2:286n, 291; PAJ, 22 Nov. 1775; Foner, *Paine*, 74-75; PEP, 17 Feb. 1776.
43. The Assembly on 5 March voted "in the Affirmative" to enlist 1,500 men, although the Committee of Safety had requested 2,000 men. The House, however, divided equally on the length of time the troops were to serve. The speaker broke the tie that set the 1 Jan. 1778 deadline (*Votes*, 6:686).
44. *Votes*, 6:668, 671, 673-74, 676, 681-84, 686, 689, 691-93, 703, 706; *Statutes*, 8:459.
45. JCC, 4:342; PEP, 16 April, 16 May 1776; Marshall, *Diary*, 15, 16 May 1776; PAG, 24 April, 22 May 1776.
46. PAG, 22 May 1776; Marshall, *Diary*, 20 May 1776; LDC, 4:49; Ryerson, *Revolution*, 215.
47. Allen, "Diary," 188; *Votes*, 6:726; PAG, 26 June 1776; *Votes*, 6:726-27, 729.
48. *Votes*, 6:727, 729; PAG, 26 June 1776.
49. Marshall, *Diary*, 8 June 1776, reported that only 12 members voted against the motion. That the moderate Whigs were divided over the issue of independence is clear from **James Allen**'s observation that some assemblymen switched sides. "We were undone," Allen wrote in his diary in reference to himself and other representatives who were unalterably opposed to independence and new instructions, "by false friends in Assembly, who have since turned out warm independents tho' they affected to oppose it then." The charge of "false friends," leveled against those moderate Whigs who switched sides, may be harsh; their view may be reflected in the final paragraph of the new instructions written by **John Dickinson** that freed Pa. congressmen to vote for independence: "The Happiness of these Colonies has, during the whole Course of this fatal Controversy, been our first Wish. Their Reconciliation with Great-Britain our next. Ardently we have prayed for the Accomplishment of both. But, if we must renounce the one or the other, we humbly trust in the Mercies of the Supreme Governor of the Universe, that we shall not stand condemned before his Throne, if our Choice is determined by that over-ruling Law of Self-preservation" (Allen, "Diary," 187-88; *Votes*, 6:740).
50. LDC, 4:55, 70; *Votes*, 6:730, 736, 740; Allen, "Diary," 187-88.
51. *Votes*, 6:738; PAG, 26 June 1776.
52. *Votes*, 6:739-40, 742-43.
53. PA, 2<sup>nd</sup> ser., 3:636-65; Allen, "Diary," 187-88; MPCSP, 44-45, 49-50; *Votes*, 6:743, 764.