WILLIAM PENN AND TOLERATION: FOUNDATIONS OF COLONIAL PENNSYLVANIA

The colony established by William Penn on the western shore of the Delaware River in 1681 became noted for the variety of religious beliefs and forms of worship practiced by its settlers of diverse ethnic and linguistic backgrounds. This lack of religious and cultural uniformity did not originate with the new colonists who settled under Penn, nor did the toleration of people of different nationalities or faiths. What was new was the ideological basis for pluralism. Toleration was actively encouraged by William Penn, and became more than an unthinking response to shifts in European rivalries and the difficulties of obtaining colonists. Penn's ideas were often inconsistent; he compromised some of his ideals to achieve pragmatic or immediate goals; and he did not always see what the implications of his thoughts might be if they were put into practice. Yet even without a clear blueprint for the colony he envisioned, his ideas concerning individual liberty of conscience, the constraints on faith or practice he believed necessary, and the role of the state in religious matters, as well as his attitudes toward people of different nationalities or beliefs, provide an important foundation for the development of Pennsylvania into a heterogeneous, and broadly tolerant, society.

The Quakers were among the most radical of the English sects that sprang up during the seventeenth century. Their belief that Truth had not been entirely revealed, with a corresponding emphasis on the Inner Light that enabled each individual to search for and understand the will of God without the intermediaries of priests, preachers, liturgies, or sacraments, provided a foundation for their emphasis on liberty of conscience and freedom from coercion in matters of faith and worship.
Knowledge of God was individual and could not be judged by another. Thus, although Quakers believed that they had found the way to salvation and had a responsibility to share this with others, they were also committed to a belief in the free individual quest for Truth and in the ultimate persuasiveness of it. One of their most significant contributions to the concept of liberty of conscience was that they fought not only for their own privilege of worshiping according to their own fashion, but were willing, even obligated by their theology, to extend this as a right to all individuals regardless of their particular beliefs. Everyone was obligated to follow the dictates of his or her own conscience.2

Quakerism had begun to stabilize by the time William Penn was converted to its tenets in 1667, at the age of twenty-two.3 The extreme individualism of the early years was becoming subordinate to the structure of meetings and group discipline; the courting of persecution and martyrdom, and submission to it, were being replaced by legal challenges and political lobbying; and the hope of converting the world to Quakerism was gradually being replaced by the hope of obtaining toleration of religious dissent.4 It is not surprising that Quakers often petitioned for relief from persecution for members of their own society; it is, however, significant that these demands were often couched in more abstract or universal terms. Their demands for toleration were a direct result of their religious views, not a consequence of the persecution they suffered.5

Despite the Quaker emphasis on the equality of all individuals before God, Penn's superior education and social position were probably important factors in his recognition as one of the leading spokesmen for his sect, particularly in the affairs of this world.6 Apprehended at a Quaker meeting in Cork in November 1667, Penn was imprisoned along with several other Friends who had attended this meeting.7 This first instance of persecution for his beliefs8 brought forth his first exposition of the rights of individual conscience. Writing to the Lord President of Munster in an attempt to secure the release of the Quakers from confinement, Penn admitted that “to dissent from a National system imposed by Authoritie renders men hereticks . . .” However, he asserted “y' diversitie of faith, and worships contribute not to ye Disturbance of any place” and that “morall uniformity is barely requissett to preserve y' peace.” He denied that freedom of conscience was “riotous or Tumultuary, as some vainly imagind”; on the contrary, freedom in matters relating to conscience offered an effective means “to improve or advantage this Country.”9

Penn's subsequent writings, particularly the pamphlets he wrote after
1670, developed the themes indicated in this letter. His arguments became increasingly more sophisticated, and came to emphasize theological or moral justifications for toleration or liberty of conscience, constitutional arguments, and historical precedents that demonstrated the wisdom of respecting individual beliefs. His most important essays are those in which he argued systematically for liberty of conscience: *The Great Case of Liberty of Conscience* (written in Newgate Prison, 1670); *England’s Present Interest* (1675); *An Address to Protestants of All Perswasions* (1679); and *A Perswasive to Moderation* (1686). The immediate needs of persecuted Quakers were deemphasized in these tracts; Penn frequently argued in abstract terms and included the relief of all religious nonconformists in his pleas for toleration.10

Addressing his 1670 essay to the “Supream Authority of England,” Penn not only criticized the government’s harsh measures directed at Quakers but also recommended indulgence for all dissenters as “not only most Christian and rational, but Prudent also.”11 He then defined liberty of conscience as “not only a *meer Liberty of the Mind*, in believing or disbelieving this or that Principle or Doctrine, but the *Exercise of our selves in a visible Way of Worship*, upon our believing it to be indispensibly required at our Hands, that if we neglect it for Fear or Favour of any Mortal Man, we Sin, and incur Divine Wrath: . . .” The lawfulness of meeting for public worship extended only “as it may refer to religious Matters, and a Life to come,” that is, to meetings “wholly independent” of secular affairs. “Imposition, Restraint, and Persecution” included not only the requirement that stated doctrines be believed or denied, with penalties incurred by those who could not conform, but extended to “any coercive Lett or Hindrance to us, from meeting together to perform those Religious Exercises which are according to our Faith and Perswasion.”12

Penn’s central argument was that persecution was illegal, immoral, and contrary to both reason and nature. When the state took upon itself the responsibility of establishing beliefs or forms of worship, it invaded the Divine Prerogative, set itself up as infallible, and prevented the operation of grace in each soul. Furthermore, the “Christian Religion intreats all, but compels none.” He also expressed his faith in the Quaker notion that Truth would prevail if all individuals sought for it. Forced belief, however, subverted true religion, for then a person believed or disbelieved merely out of obedience, regardless of the veracity of the tenet. “Force may make an Hypocrite; ’t is Faith grounded upon Knowledge, and Consent that makes a Christian.”13 The use of compuls-
tion or coercion in matters relating to conscience contradicted that nature and ends of government, which were justice, peace, plenty, and unity. Liberty and property were fundamental components of English rights, which persecution subverted.  

Penn also disputed the contention that religious uniformity was essential to the maintenance of government. On the contrary, civil disorders arose out of a "Narrowness of Spirit, in not Tolerating others to live the Freemen God made them, in External Matters upon the Earth, merely upon some Difference in religion." In conclusion, he insisted that he had "not defended any Dissenters, whose Quarrel or Dissent is rather Civil and Political, than Religious and Conscientious"; such individuals were "unworthy of Protection from the English Government, who seek the Ruin of it; . . ." But, he emphasized, those who were "Contributors to the Preservation of it, (though Dissenters in Point of Faith or Worship) are unquestionably intituled to a Protection from IT."  

England's Present Interest, an elucidation of Penn's interpretation of the compact theory, Magna Carta, and the fundamental rights of liberty and property, focused on the nature of the English government. Penn's purpose was to "show that Church Government is no Essential Part of the old English Government, and to disintangle Property from Opinion, . . ." He noted that the privileges granted in the great charter predated protestantism; indeed, they were a legacy of pre-Christian England. He plainly stated that "Religion, under any Modification, is no Part of the Old English Government." Furthermore, "the Civil Affairs of all Governments in the World, may be peaceably transacted under the different Liveries, or Trims of Religion, where Civil Rights are inviolably observ'd." Because dissent was not a civil crime, those who refused to conform could not be punished by an arbitrary deprivation of their property through fines, imprisonment, or similar measures.  

Reviewing English religious history since the Reformation, Penn found that individuals had been forced to take repeated and contradictory oaths "under the Penalty of losing Estate, Liberty, and sometimes Life it self; . . ." But coercion of belief was sinful, for conscience was thereby "Debauch'd by Force, and Property toss'd up and down by the Impetuous Blasts of Ignorant Zeal, or Sinister Design." "[T]he sincere Promotion of general and practical religion" was an obligation of civil authorities, but this he defined only as the Ten Commandments, the Sermon on the Mount, and other biblical teachings that guided
outward behavior. "Every Man owns the Text; 'tis the Comment that's disputed." He believed that if all people lived moral lives in accordance with such basic tenets, peace and prosperity would come to the state.  

Penn's *Address to Protestants of All Perswasions* amplified his argument that morality should be the basis of civil society. He argued that when reason and truth became subject to human authority, most people would conform without critically evaluating the authorized opinions. Thus many would hold their beliefs from "blind Obedience" rather than from conviction, for those who questioned or expressed doubt were often subject to harassment. Because people whose faith was not grounded in genuine belief might behave improperly, he proposed to "let some Plain, General and Necessary Truths be laid down in Scriptural Terms, and let them be few; . . ." He thought it "very strange" that the book given by God to lead men to salvation should be "so obscure, or subject to so many various, nay, contradictory, Constructions," and offered a suggestion for reforming society and government: "Let the Scriptures be free, Sober Opinion tolerated, Good Life cherish'd, Vice punish'd: Away with Imposition, Nick-Names, Animosities, for the Lord's Sake, and let the Scripture be our Common Creed, and Pious Living the Test of Christianity, . . ."  

Concentrating on the expediency of toleration rather than on fundamental rights or on the sinfulness of persecution, the *Perswasive to Moderation* represents a somewhat different line of argument from that of the earlier tracts. Penn declared that "worse Things have befallen Princes in Countries under Ecclesiastical Union, than in Places under divided Forms of Worship; and so Tolerating Countries stand to the Prince, upon more than equal Terms with Conforming Ones." Religious dissent as such did not cause men to become traitors. Civil wars could be initiated by either dissenters or conformists, for factors other than religion could produce social disorder. Penn nevertheless insisted that a prince who granted freedom of conscience would be greatly loved by his people, and thus the state would become more secure.  

Penn advocated a balance of interests among the various churches and sects. If diverse forms of belief and worship were tolerated, the competition among them would lead to greater security for everyone's interests by preventing the destruction of liberties that might occur if one faction attained domination. Another advantage of toleration of dissent was that it might allow more qualified men to hold positions of trust and honor. It was a man's talents that made him desirable as a citizen, and Penn thought that perhaps qualified persons were overlooked simply because of their nonconforming beliefs.
Despite Penn's arguments for religious toleration, liberty of conscience was to be restrained within certain bounds. He firmly believed that there were universally acknowledged standards of morality which must be enforced by the state if people were to live together in society. To an extent, he separated conscience ("the Apprehension and persuasion a Man has of his Duty to God") and behavior:

... I always premise this Conscience to keep within the Bounds of Morality, and that it be neither Frantick nor Mischievous, but a Good Subject, a Good Child, a Good Servant, in all the Affairs of Life: As exact to yield to Caesar the Things that are Caesar's, as jealous of withholding from God the Thing that is God's.

In brief, he that acknowledges the civil Government under which he lives, and that maintains no Principle hurtful to his Neighbour in his Civil Property.\(^{28}\)

Penn envisioned this morality or foundation of civil society as Christian, and the people of such a state as Christians, although he did not hesitate to draw examples of toleration by pagans to strengthen his arguments concerning the benefits toleration would bring. Implicit in his arguments for toleration of conscientious dissent was the assumption that it should extend only to Christians who fell somewhere within the bounds of "orthodoxy."\(^{29}\) Consideration of the limits on freedom of conscience was relatively abstract in the European setting, where Penn's principal concern was to obtain toleration for persecuted Christians; it became a more important question in the colony he established.

Penn did not respect equally all varieties of Christianity; there is a contradiction between his advocacy of liberty of conscience and his opposition to the doctrines of the Roman Catholic church. In some instances, he suggested restricting the rights of English Catholics or requested concessions for Quakers or other Protestant dissenters that he would not extend to Catholics.\(^{30}\) He directed tracts to Protestants in which he urged mutual forbearance and a union of interests; they should form a united front to prevent the spread of Catholicism.\(^{31}\)

As a young man, Penn strongly denounced the tenets and practices of the Roman Catholic church. Not unlike other religious reformers, he accused it of corrupting primitive Christianity from the simplicity of doctrine and worship established by Christ and His apostles. He thought that "Papists, through many Generations, Received for doctrine the Precepts of Men, ..."\(^{32}\) He appealed to Catholics to return to the true foundation, Christ, and leave "an Outward Glittering Church, that is inwardly polluted."\(^{33}\) His main reasons for opposing the Church of
Rome, however, were its tradition of persecuting dissent, its requirement of “blind obedience” from its adherents, and the spiritual—as well as civil—authority of the pope. Penn had no doubt that the doctrinal and institutional structure of Roman Catholicism firmly demanded uniformity and would permit no questioning of its teachings.

He frequently made comparisons between Protestant establishments that oppress dissenters and Catholic persecution of alleged heretics. He believed that if those who broke with Rome had a right to do so in order to follow the dictates of their consciences, so, too, did those who believed that the Reformation had ceased prematurely or had taken a wrong turn. He also feared that the persecution of Protestants by other Protestants would encourage or provide a justification for Catholic repression of Protestants in countries or territories where they held power. He believed it difficult, if not impossible, for Protestants to devise an argument for persecuting dissenters that could not be turned against them.

Roman Catholicism was also a potential political threat to England. In an age in which religious factors often played a role in the origins of war or the alliances that were formed, there was reason to question the loyalty of subjects adhering to a religion that gave to its leader civil as well as spiritual powers and demanded allegiance transcending that due their temporal ruler. It was dangerous for a people to give a foreign authority any power. Penn also believed that the “Principle which introduces Implicit Faith and Blind Obedience in Religion, will also introduce Implicit Faith and Blind Obedience in Government. . . . This is the Fatal Mischief Popery brings with it to Civil Society, and for which such Societies ought to beware of it and all these that are Friends to it.”

Despite the fears of Penn and other Englishmen about the potential threat Catholicism posed to fundamental rights, he recognized that

Violence and Tyranny are no Natural Consequences of Popery, for then they would follow every where, and in all Places and Times alike. But we see in Twenty Governments in Germany, there is none for Religion, nor was for an Age in France; and in Poland, the Popish Cantons of Switzerland, Venice, Lucca, Colon-ia, &c. where that Religion is Dominant, the People enjoy their Ancient and Civil Rights, a little more steadily than they have of late Times done in some Protestant Countries nearer Home, almost ever since the Reformation.

His illustrations of the success of religious toleration included numerous examples of territories under Catholic dominion. Furthermore, even
“in the obscurest times of Popery, they [Englishmen] were not left without a Sense of Justice, and a Care of Freedom; . . .” He reminded his readers that Magna Carta had been obtained by “Papists, whom many think no Friends to Liberty and Property, . . ."\textsuperscript{41}

Despite Penn’s mixed thoughts about the Roman Catholic faith, his belief that conscience must not be coerced led him to work to improve their lot. Nevertheless, his first priority was to relieve the sufferings of Quakers, and he would on occasion compromise his demands for toleration of Catholics if he thought it necessary.\textsuperscript{42} He also believed that a distinction must be made between Protestant and Catholic dissenters from the established church, at least so that individuals were not harassed for being something they were not. There was a difference between a Quaker who refused to take an oath of loyalty to the king simply because his religious beliefs precluded swearing any oath and a Catholic who might refuse to take it for political reasons. Thus he could request alterations in the test laws so that Quakers could take them, but leave provisions that made it impossible for a Catholic to subscribe them.\textsuperscript{43} He asked to be spared the “Execution of Laws, that . . . were never made against us."\textsuperscript{44} Nevertheless, he declared

I would not be mistaken: I am far from thinking it fit, that Papists should be whipt for their Consciences, because I exclaim against the Injustice of whipping Quakers for Papists; No, for though the Hand pretended to be lifted up against them, hath (I know not by what Discretion) lit heavy upon us, and we complain, yet we do not mean that any should take a fresh Aim at them, or that they must come in our Room, for we must give the Liberty we ask, and cannot be false to our Principles, though it were to relieve our selves, for we have Good Will to all Men, and would have none suffer for a truly Sober and Conscientious Dissent on any Hand: . . .\textsuperscript{45}

Penn’s concern for liberty of conscience, religious toleration, and the sufferings of religious people solely in consequence of their beliefs led him beyond the English Channel, preaching the message of Quakerism, writing to or visiting rulers who required uniformity of faith or practice and tried to suppress dissent, and eventually to recruiting non-English immigrants for his colony. It did not matter that the people on whose behalf he worked were not Quakers, probably would not convert to Quakerism (Quaker missionary journeys to the Continent produced meager results\textsuperscript{46}), spoke a different language, and had a different culture. This issue that concerned Penn was religious persecution.

Penn’s first missionary journey to the Continent occurred in 1671.
His purposes were to meet with Dutch Quakers and to attempt to convert a group of Labadists living in Herford, Germany, to Quakerism. The most important outcome of this trip, however, was the friendship that developed between Penn and Benjamin Furly, an Anglo-Dutch merchant living in Rotterdam; he was to play a major role in the recruitment of German, Dutch, and French emigrants to Pennsylvania. Penn made two subsequent missionary journeys to Holland and the Rhineland, in 1677 and 1686. These travels were devoted not only to preaching Quaker doctrines and advocating religious toleration but also to recruiting colonists for the Quaker provinces of East and West Jersey and Pennsylvania. Some of Penn’s religious essays were translated into Dutch and German for the benefit of those who could not understand English, and he once addressed an exhortation to return to the true spirit of Christianity specifically to “all People in the High and Low-Dutch Nations.”

In 1674 Penn wrote to the council and senate of Emden complaining of fines, imprisonment, banishment, and other forms of persecution visited upon Quakers residing in that city. His central argument was that persecution of individuals who dissented from an established church was unchristian. He pointed out that Protestant reformers had made a similar argument against Catholic insistence on uniformity, and that the magistrates were assuming an infallibility not unlike that for which they castigated the Church of Rome. He emphasized “that they are Men as well as your selves, born free, and have equal Plea to Natural and Civil common Privileges with your selves”; their differences in opinions regarding things of another world “neither unmans nor uncivilizes them.”

During Penn’s 1677 journey through Holland and Germany he authored an appeal to the king of Poland to grant religious toleration to the people of Danzig. He explained the central tenets of Quakerism, informed the king that “True Religion” does not persecute, and bluntly asked for “that speedy and effective Relief which becometh Christian Magistrates to give to their own Sober and Christian People.” Penn also wrote to the Elector Palatine during this journey, in this instance to commend the prince for the indulgence he granted to dissenters living in his territory as natural, prudent, and Christian. He suggested that the elector inculcate such wise principles into his son and probable successor.

Penn addressed an appeal for toleration to the Prince of Orange in 1680. Writing in behalf of Friends in Crefeld, who had been banished for their nonconformity to the Reformed religion, he reiterated his usual
arguments that it was impossible to compel belief by force and unchristian to attempt to do so. He concluded with a request that, if no offenses could be proved against them “but we relates to faith & worship so liberally allow’d in ye 7 provinces under thy Command, they may enjoy ye liberty of y’ their native country” and be permitted to return to their homes.54

Perhaps Penn’s interest in people in other nations was quickened by his study of the history of dissenting movements and enforced conformity, and by his need to demonstrate that other societies not marked by uniformity had been stable and prosperous. He frequently cited precedents that illustrated his contention that a diversity of interests could actually strengthen the state and that intolerance might prove to be a source of instability or disorder. Most of his examples, drawn from biblical accounts of the Jews and their neighbors, pagan empires (especially the Roman Empire), and christianized Europe, illustrated religious diversity; once he indicated that cultural diversity could prove a source of stability.55 His most practical and immediate example of the prudence of toleration, however, was contemporary Holland, “that Bog of the World, neither Sea nor dry Land, now the Rival of tallest Monarchs; . . .” Its wealth came not as a result of conquest, marriage, or other methods of building an empire, but from the industry of its people. When people were assured that their beliefs would not be questioned and that they would not be fined or otherwise lose their property as a result of religious nonconformity, they would labor to provide a sufficiency for themselves and their families. The nation would thereby also be enriched.56 He suggested that toleration created a unity of interests among Dutch Protestants, thereby strengthening the country against a reimposition of Roman Catholicism.57 Penn also cited examples from elsewhere in seventeenth-century Europe to prove that peace, prosperity, and security of government occurred where toleration was practiced,58 and that disorder erupted where uniformity was enforced.59

Penn believed that the population of a country contributed to its wealth. He thought that some of the economic problems of England could be resolved if it adopted the more tolerant views of the Dutch. The swarms of beggars and poverty evident in England were attributable, at least in part, to the high cost of dissent and to the dislocations caused by the civil wars.60 Because the fruits of the labors of dissenters as well as those of churchmen contributed to the nation’s economy, the former ought not to be discouraged or hindered in performing their work.61

Persecution also fostered emigration.62 Penn was to take advantage of this in settling his colony, but he argued that it was in England’s interest
to preserve and if possible to augment its population through a policy of
toleration. He was convinced under the "antient Laws of the Kingdom,"
in which property rights had been carefully maintained, none of the
subjects of England were "ever tempted to transplant themselves into
other Countries." On the contrary, "Strangers" who found themselves
persecuted in their native lands were frequently invited to emigrate to
England. By the 1670s, however, "many whole Families of the
industrious & trading subjects of this Kingdom for the preserving of
their properties, & avoyding of the grivous penalties of the before
mentioned [Penal] Statutes, have been enduced to forsake this Kingdom,
& to go & plant y^m^selves with their Estates & fortunes in other
Countries, . . ."64 Although those who went to the colonies which offered
a greater measure of toleration remained within the empire,65 Penn
feared that the magnitude of this emigration would weaken England.

The ideas that Penn had been developing began to take a more
definite shape when he became involved in colonial projects, first in
concert with other Quakers in West New Jersey67 and then with his own
colonies of Pennsylvania68 and Delaware.69 He attempted to guarantee
liberty of conscience and actively recruited emigrants from among
persecuted Protestants scattered throughout the British Isles and western
Europe. His policies, liberal for the time, reflect a conjunction of his
ideas about the inviolable rights of individual conscience and the
separation of church and state; his belief that government should
establish and uphold basic standards of behavior or morality; ambivalent
attitudes toward Roman Catholicism and its adherents; and a decade of
involvement with oppressed Christians of various beliefs and nationali-
ties. Nevertheless, Penn was vague about the nature of the "holy
experiment" he proposed to establish; his thoughts focused more on
attracting settlers, providing a properly constituted government, and
selling land than on the details of the settlement his colonists would
establish. Although they do not clearly reveal his goals, the ideals he
hoped to realize in the colony, or the means by which they were to be
attained, Penn's ideas, expressed in his polemical writings, promotional
tracts, and letters serve as the foundation upon which the colony was
organized, settled, and subsequently developed.

One of Penn's goals in acquiring his territory was "to lay y^c
foundation of a free Colony for all mankind, that should go thither . . ."70 Nevertheless, his motives were not entirely altruistic, for he
stated that "Though I desire to extend religious freedom, yet I want
some recompense for my trouble."71 His mixture of motives, that is, of
providing a refuge for oppressed Christians (especially Quakers), of offering an opportunity for industrious but poor people to improve their material conditions, and of reaping some profit from his venture, shaped the early years of the colony's existence; it provides an explanation for some of the confusion of thought and inconsistency of policy.

Penn's knowledge of the land and people he acquired in 1681 and 1682 seems to have been limited. One of his first steps after receiving his grant was to notify the inhabitants of Pennsylvania and to assure them that they ought not to be "troubled at y' chaine & the Kings choice, for you are now fxet, at y' mercy of no Governour y' comes to make his fortune great, you shall be govern'd by laws of y' own makeing & live a free & if you will, a sober and industreous People. I shall not usurp the right of any, or oppress his person." Penn's intention to sell land in large parcels and to reserve sizeable manors for himself seems to reflect an implicit assumption, however, that his colony consisted of virgin territory. His agents discovered that the Swedish, Dutch, and English settlers who preceded them had claims to most of the desirable land along the Delaware River and other streams, including the most suitable sites for the city Penn planned to establish. Initially, Penn was apprehensive about the way the inhabitants would greet the change of government, and seemed to think that they might prove "hard or griping, takeing an advantage of . . . Circumstances"; he was probably relieved at the warm welcome he was accorded upon his arrival in 1682. These residents rarely came into consideration in later years, except as another faction to be balanced.

The exact boundaries of tracts individuals purchased from Penn could be adjusted by the surveyors to reflect prior ownership and settlement patterns. For Penn, if not for Pennsylvanians, this was a relatively insignificant problem; his real concern was to sell land. He took an active part in the production of promotional tracts, addressed to both prospective colonists and speculators or investors, and appointed agents in London, Dublin, Edinburgh, Rotterdam, and elsewhere to assist him in providing information and selling land. Benjamin Furly helped to make transportation arrangements for several emigrants from the Rhineland, and merchants in various English ports assisted emigrants in obtaining passage to the colony. When we heard a rumor that "fifty or Sixty Swisser, called Menonists, comeing for Holland in order to goe for Pennsylvania" might be hindered in their journey by Dutch officials, Penn requested "If y' States Should Stop them, It would please thee [Charles Townshend], as for the Queens Interest & Service, It may
be taken off or prevented. Penn also participated in the negotiations involved in selling pieces of his territory and in other routine business affairs connected with the colony.

The most important factor involved in the successful recruitment of settlers for the colony were the pamphlets Penn authored and the promotional writings of others he helped to distribute. His connections on the Continent, particularly with Furly, and throughout the British Isles as a result of the organizational structure of the Society of Friends, helped to spread information about his province and to attract colonists from many lands. Penn developed an efficient system of publicizing his colony; the purposes of the advertisements included selling land and recruiting settlers as well as informing people that there was a refuge for those suffering persecution and a place of opportunity for those willing to work. In part Penn was being pragmatic in advertising his colony, for there were other “Quaker” provinces, such as the Jerseys, in which a speculator could invest or where a Quaker could be assured that his religious beliefs would be respected; in addition, promoters of other colonies, particularly the Carolina proprietors, were also actively searching for settlers. Both this competition to sell land and his belief that emigration from England would weaken its power in Europe may have provided additional incentives to publicize his colony abroad. In 1681 alone Penn prepared or sponsored the publication of four tracts, and was responsible for translations of Some Account of the Province of Pennsylvania into Dutch and German. Translations of Penn’s 1674 letter to the officials of Emden were included in the Dutch and German versions of this pamphlet. Although Some Account did not mention that liberty of conscience would be guaranteed in the colony, this letter would indicate Penn’s sentiments on religious toleration to those unacquainted with him or his ideas.

The pamphlets and letters written by Penn and others after they had visited or resided in the colony offered more specific information to prospective emigrants. Promotional tracts describing the colony were widely distributed; in addition, some personal letters were published, while others were copied and circulated in manuscript. On the Continent, Furly seems to have taken the lead in publicizing the colony, although in at least one instance Penn relied on the Quaker historian Willem Sewel to superintend a pamphlet through the Dutch press. Letters from emigrants, whether or not they were intended for publication or circulation, tended to focus on individual experiences in the colony. They described the Indians, the rapid improvement of the colony, and the opportunities for industrious people, and also included.
practical advice on how to travel to Pennsylvania and the supplies to bring. Some of these letter writers mentioned that many people from Holland or German-speaking provinces had emigrated, and that they were welcome in the colony. Little emphasis was placed on the religious toleration guaranteed by the proprietor, although several writers mentioned the variety of religious beliefs observed in Pennsylvania.

Penn was solicitous of the interests of visitors in the colony who were looking for suitable land to purchase. He was particularly concerned with creating a favorable impression in the minds of visitors who were not Friends. He was aware of the importance of informal reports that were received in Europe about the colony, and that its future in some ways depended upon them. During his first visit to the colony he reported, “Germans, Dutch and French are concern’d in our prosperity with their own; for here are come three parties (one of each) as spies to the multitude, they say, behinde, that on their report will also embarque with us.” He repeatedly told his officials to “be kind to the people,” and to make minor concessions in settling emigrants favorably, lending them supplies, or providing other assistance. He was disturbed by reports “that there is no room for any but Quakers &c.”

Penn was enthusiastic about the success of his recruitment policies. While he recognized that he was acquiring a diverse group of colonists, and made statements such as “Let the people of all sorts of nations & persuasions, have my Kinde Remembrance,” for the most part he acted as though the province were peopled by Englishmen alone. Religious issues were more important to Penn, and to the early settlers, than the ethnic or linguistic diversity that also characterized the colony. Only in the issue of naturalization did Penn recognize that the aliens in his province, both those who had settled under previous governments and those attracted by his promises of religious liberty and economic opportunity, required special consideration.

Naturalization was one of the first issues considered when Penn arrived in the colony. At the first meeting of the assembly, the Swedish, Finnish, and Dutch residents presented a petition to the governor “to make them as free as other Members of the Province, and that their Lands might be entailed upon them and their Heirs for ever.” A naturalization law was enacted the following day. All aliens who currently lived in and held land in the province and who would promise allegiance to the king and obedience to Penn within three months “shall be held & reputed Freemen of ye Province & Countries aforesd, in as ample & full a manner as any Person residing therein, . . .” The religious beliefs of those who wished to be naturalized were not
questioned. Foreigners who subsequently settled in the colony and requested freemanship were to make similar declarations before a county court and would be granted the same privilege on the payment of twenty shillings; there was no residency requirement before these immigrants could become freemen. In March 1683 this law was declared a fundamental law, not to be “Altered, Diminished, or Repealed in whole or in part,” except with the consent of the governor and six-sevenths of the assembly and council.

A new provincial naturalization law for Pennsylvania was enacted in 1700, following Penn’s return to the colony. It declared “all Swedes, Dutch and other foreigners” who had resided in the province or territories before the grant to Penn to be “fully and completely naturalized.” Like the earlier law, religious beliefs formed no part of the qualifications for naturalization. Later immigrants who promised loyalty to the king and the proprietor could be naturalized by the governor, again without residing in the colony for any fixed period. Within the colony, those who took advantage of the law were entitled to all of the privileges of natural-born subjects except those expressly denied to aliens in the plantations by act of Parliament. This act was repealed by the crown, for “the proprietor hath no such power [to naturalize] by his grant”; the British attorney general thought “it not fit for him to give it himself by this act.”

The problem of naturalization was not considered again until 1709, when the assembly responded to a petition from several aliens who had resided in the province for many years. These individuals were required to prove that they were Protestants, probably in accordance with an English law of 1709 that eased naturalization procedures but applied only to Protestants. This law was allowed to stand. Until 1740, when Parliament enacted a general naturalization law for the colonies which simplified the procedures for acquiring citizenship, Pennsylvania was forced to rely on private acts which named each individual in order to incorporate aliens into provincial society.

Penn gave more thought to the religious foundations of his province than to problems that might arise from a heterogeneous population or to the practical question of how various ethnic, linguistic, and religious groups could live together peacefully. Yet despite his concern with religious toleration and persecution because of religious dissent, he did not emphasize religious freedom as one of the advantages of the colony in his promotional tracts. In his public writings he concentrated on the practical, economic, or imperial aspects of colonization rather than on
the more idealistic ones evident in some of his private correspondence. He was aware of the appeal his colony had to dissenters of various sorts and that persecution could be a motive for emigration, however; once he admitted that he "plead[s for toleration for Friends in Ireland] against my interest, for ye severities of those parts encrease the plantation & improvem' of these."  

Penn's immediate goal was to secure the rights and privileges of Englishmen to his fellow Quakers, "not that I would lessen ye Civil liberties of others, because of their perswasion; but skreen and Defend our own from an Infringement on that Account." Although it was "a Colony & Constitution of Goverm' made by & for Quakers." Pennsylvania was, nevertheless, to be more than a Quaker colony where other religious practices were tolerated. Establishment of freedom of conscience with equal civil rights for all, not the more limited toleration, was Penn's goal. The royal charter contained only one provision that could be interpreted as a religious requirement that must be fulfilled in the province. Added at the insistence of the Bishops of London, it stated that if twenty inhabitants petitioned for a clergyman of the Church of England, and the bishop sent one to the colony, he must be permitted to "reside within the said province, without any deniall or molestacon whatsoever; ..." Given Penn's well-known views on liberty of conscience and toleration, this clause was superfluous.

Guaranteeing the fundamental right to worship God in whatever manner each individual thought most appropriate occupied Penn's thoughts as he attempted to establish a form of government. In one of the drafts of what he called the "fundamental constitutions" of Pennsylvania (1680), Penn established for the "first fundamentall of the Government of my Country, that every Person that does or shall reside therein shall have and enjoy the Free Profession of his or her faith and exercise of worship towards God, in such way and manner As every Person shall in Conscience believe is most acceptable to God ..." He hoped, however, to prevent this "Christian Liberty" from becoming "Licentiousness." Penn's justification for this liberal grant of liberty of conscience reflects the concerns he had expressed in his polemical writings advocating religious toleration: government cannot prosper where there is no division between the things of Caesar and those of God; the weapons of Christianity are spiritual, not carnal; unrest erupts where force is used in matters of faith and worship; and "this unpeopled Country can never be peopled if there be not due encouragement given to Sober people of all sorts to plant," for very few individuals would hazard
the wilderness conditions unless guaranteed that they and their posterity would not suffer for their beliefs.\textsuperscript{108}

Penn, and his assemblies, thought that the best method to ensure that "Christian Liberty" would not degenerate into "Licentiousness" would be to establish laws that would restrain Pennsylvanians' behavior, if not their ideas, within certain boundaries. Civil behavior was distinct from religious belief, at least to Penn, although he thought that religion in a generalized form should be at the core of all societies. Thus, laws were formulated to regulate marriage, forbid drunkenness and the drinking of healths, ban the practice of dueling, prohibit "rude and riotous sports," and otherwise encourage what most would consider to be proper or acceptable behavior.\textsuperscript{109} Other laws, such as the one requiring the use of numbers instead of the common "Heathen" names for the reckoning of time, mixed Quaker religious beliefs more closely with the state.\textsuperscript{110}

Although in England Penn had advocated religious liberty and the removal of governmental constraints on faith and practice, limitations on complete freedom of belief appeared once the actual laws that governed the colony began to be framed.\textsuperscript{111} According to the Laws Agreed Upon in England, only individuals who believed "the one almighty and eternal God, to be the creator, upholser and ruler of the world" and also held themselves obliged in conscience "to live peaceably and justly in civil society" would be protected in their religious observances and not compelled to attend any particular form of worship.\textsuperscript{112} A further restriction was also placed upon conscience: "according to the good example of the primitive christians, and for the case of the creation, . . . people shall abstain from their common daily labour" on the first day of the week.\textsuperscript{113} This law could be injurious to Jews and sabbatarians, both because of the infringement it involved in their religious observances and in consequence of the fines that could be imposed for violating this law.\textsuperscript{114} But the most significant constraint on the beliefs of Pennsylvanians was the requirement that all members of the assembly and council, and all who had a right to elect them, "shall be such as profess faith in Jesus Christ."\textsuperscript{115} When this law was reenacted by the first assembly, the generalization "faith in Jesus Christ" was defined to include the belief that He is "the son of God, the Saviour of the world."\textsuperscript{116} It should be noted, however, that despite the limitation of the franchise to Christians, Roman Catholics were entitled to political participation.

Further restrictions on liberty of conscience appeared during the two years in which the crown governed the colony directly through Governor Benjamin Fletcher, following the temporary abrogation of Penn's
charter in 1692. The laws concerning liberty of conscience and the qualifications for officeholders were among the statutes that the assembly petitioned Fletcher to reenact. Fletcher agreed to approve both of them, but insisted that under the terms of his royal commission the members of the assembly were required to subscribe to the declarations required of dissenters in the English Toleration Act of 1689. This was the first time that officeholding in the colony was specifically confined to trinitarian Protestants, yet the assemblymen objected not to the content of the tests nor to the idea that only men professing certain beliefs were qualified to govern, but to Fletcher’s insistence that subscription to the tests be made by oath rather than by affirmation.

The frame of government that William Markham established for the colony in 1696 after its restoration to Penn continued this limitation on officeholding to those who could conform to the beliefs required by the Toleration Act. Electors, however, were not longer explicitly required to be Christians. The primary purpose of Markham’s frame of government was the reestablishment of proprietary government. No mention was made of liberty of conscience or religious toleration; the only religious matter included was the formulation of affirmations to be taken by various officials who could not swear oaths.

The first statute enacted upon Penn’s return to the colony was one defining and guaranteeing liberty of conscience. Once again, inhabitants were required only to believe in God and hold themselves obliged in conscience to live peaceably under civil government. Perhaps reflecting the religious disputes that had already occurred in the colony, this law stated that “if any person shall abuse or deride any other for his or her different persuasion and practice in matter of religion, such person shall be looked upon as a disturber of the peace and be punished according-ly.” The English attorney general, however, was scandalized by a law that paid “no regard . . . to the Christian religion” and gave the Quakers greater privileges than they were allowed in England, and recommended its repeal to the Board of Trade. Another liberalization occurred in the qualifications required of electors and candidates for office. Penn retained the provision of Markham’s frame that did not explicitly require electors to profess Christianity, but, more importantly, this was extended to candidates for the assembly and council as well.

The 1701 frame of government, under which Pennsylvania would be governed until the Revolution, included a declaration of liberty of conscience to all who believed in God. It was very similar to the earlier constitutions promulgated by Penn and the acts for liberty of conscience
enacted while he was in the colony. There was one significant restriction in the frame: for the first time, the constitution of Pennsylvania explicitly stated that only Christians could serve in the executive or legislative branches of the government. Nevertheless, all Christians, including Roman Catholics, were capable of holding office, "notwithstanding their other persuasions and practices in point of conscience & religion," for the only tests to be subscribed were those of allegiance to the king and fidelity to the proprietor. Slightly contradictory was the provision that the "Qualifications of Electors and Elected, and all other matters and things relating to Elections" remain as established by laws formulated in the previous session of the legislature.

In the absence of Penn, and before the liberal 1700 statutes were repealed by the crown, the Pennsylvania assembly made its final statements on the extent of religious freedom acceptable in the colony. They represent a more restricted sphere for liberty of conscience than one would expect from Penn's earlier, more abstract writings on the subject and, unlike the ones he helped to frame, they were permitted to remain law. New limits were placed on the beliefs of persons allowed to dwell in the colony unmolested in their faith. Colonists not only had to believe in God the Father, but also in "Jesus Christ, His only Son, and in the Holy Spirit, one God blessed for evermore." Pennsylvanians were also to "acknowledge the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament to be given by divine inspiration." Officials were required to fulfill the English religious requirements established by the Toleration Act of 1689, although affirmations could be substituted for oaths. Catholics were thereby debarred from public office.

The legal restraints on conscience, however, seem to have applied only to individuals who hoped to attain positions of profit or honor. The beliefs of prospective settlers were not scrutinized, and non-Christians were not expelled from or forbidden to settle in the colony. Although in one of his tracts advocating toleration Penn had argued that it was impossible to have religious toleration if officials were required to conform to certain beliefs, it appears that he was forced to acquiesce in the distinction between personal and political rights of his colony. Penn's role in the transformation of liberty of conscience into a more limited religious toleration is ambiguous. Despite his pleas for the right of men and women in many lands to worship in the way each thought most appropriate to the will of God, he seemed unable to understand that it might be possible, in good conscience, not to believe in God. This may account for the clauses in acts for or declarations of liberty of conscience that required a belief in God. And while he knew that
non-Christian societies could be stable and properly governed, he was unwilling to allow Pennsylvania to be such.

He did help to frame the Laws Agreed Upon in England, the statutes of 1682 and 1683, and the 1701 frame of government, all of which simultaneously proclaimed almost complete freedom of conscience and restricted officeholding. Only in 1700 did laws pass that did not require voters or candidates for office to be Christians. Nevertheless, under none of these laws was “Christian” further defined to eliminate adherents of certain tenets or to require specific beliefs. Those restrictions came when Penn was not present in his colony and exerted little influence over the statutes enacted.

It is unclear why Penn did not object to the 1705/6 law that established religious qualifications for both settlers and officials which, if enforced, could severely circumscribe freedom of conscience. Perhaps he feared that he would again lose the colony if it did not conform in law to some of the boundaries of English toleration. In addition to reflecting the English prejudices against and fears of Roman Catholicism, Penn also had to contend with accusations that he was a Jesuit; perhaps these factors led him to acquiesce in the political restrictions placed upon Catholics. Yet although he disagreed with them on many points of doctrine and worship, he did extend a measure of toleration toward them. And perhaps the frequent inclusion of Christianity as a qualification for enjoying certain rights and privileges was intended to answer the doubts some people still had at the end of the seventeenth century whether Quakers were Christians.

Penn’s thoughts in terms of religious liberty played an important part in laying the foundation for an extremely heterogeneous society. His belief that conscience should not be restrained and that persecution was wrong led him to work for the relief of oppressed Christians, primarily but not exclusively Protestants, in England and abroad. Thus, when he needed colonists to people his territory, he turned to those persecuted for the sake of conscience but also advertised his province in more secular terms. Whatever the precise nature of the appeal to each individual who chose to emigrate to Pennsylvania, the province grew rapidly, adding greater variety to the pre-1681 settlers and soon overwhelming them.

Penn never seems to have considered how individuals of different faiths, languages, and nationalities could live together peacefully. And he does not seem to have thought beyond the formulation that good men would make good laws: “Though you are not of one Judgment in Religion, you are of one family in Civilis, and should Aime at ye publick good,” he once lectured the council. He expected sects ready to
persecute when they came to power in the European setting to live in harmony, or at least in restrained competition. Penn always seemed surprised that his “experiment” turned out to be less than “holy.”
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