

3-2018

Anthony Benezet's (1713-1784) Revolutionary Rhetoric: Slavery and Sentimentalism In Quaker Political Remonstrance

Jon R. Kershner
Pacific Lutheran University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.georgefox.edu/qrt>

 Part of the [Christian Denominations and Sects Commons](#), and the [Christianity Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Kershner, Jon R. (2018) "Anthony Benezet's (1713-1784) Revolutionary Rhetoric: Slavery and Sentimentalism In Quaker Political Remonstrance," *Quaker Religious Thought*: Vol. 130 , Article 2.
Available at: <https://digitalcommons.georgefox.edu/qrt/vol130/iss1/2>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by Digital Commons @ George Fox University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Quaker Religious Thought by an authorized editor of Digital Commons @ George Fox University. For more information, please contact arolf@georgefox.edu.

ANTHONY BENEZET'S (1713-1784) REVOLUTIONARY RHETORIC: SLAVERY AND SENTIMENTALISM IN QUAKER POLITICAL REMONSTRANCE

JON R. KERSHNER

Following the Seven Years' War (1756-1763), many Britons resented the human and financial cost of the war and looked to the colonies for partial reimbursement. To this end, Britain passed the Stamp Act in 1765, which levied a tax on paper, and beginning in 1767, the Townsend Act, which taxed imported tea, lead, and other products. Colonial printing presses quickly decried these taxes as unfair and rebuked the general economic interference in colonial life by lawmakers in London. The American Patriots employed a rhetoric of virtue, natural rights, and liberty to enflame the popular colonial conscience with the conviction that they were being used unjustly.¹

In the decade between the passage of the Stamp Act in 1765 and the Declaration of Independence in 1776, two causes in colonial America worked tirelessly to become popular movements that could unite the colonies. One of those causes was the antislavery petitioning of Quakers, like Anthony Benezet (1713-1784), who incorporated natural rights arguments, biblical interpretation, and traveler's accounts into his transatlantic antislavery advocacy. The other cause was the American Patriots' effort to resist the economic and political interference of the British in the colonies and to assert their political and social liberty. A key leader of this second cause was the widely acclaimed and influential political petitioner, Quaker "fellow traveler,"² wealthy lawyer and Founding Father, John Dickinson (1732-1808).

Two political statements, published within a year of each other but within the Quaker community, provide a test case for exploring the crucial political and theological differences between Quaker abolitionists and American Patriots. The first statement is John Dickinson's 1765 *The Late Regulations Respecting the British Colonies on the Continent of America*.³ Dickinson, a Quaker sympathizer and the President of Delaware and Pennsylvania under the Articles of

Confederation was a slave owner, who manumitted his slaves, but indentured many of them to long terms of service.⁴ Historian Jane Calvert describes Dickinson as a “Quakerly Patriot,” and one of the most influential writers of the Revolutionary Era.⁵ Dickinson was not a member of a Quaker meeting, and he was not a pacifist, but, he was born into a Quaker family, attended meeting regularly, married into a prominent Quaker family and translated Quaker ecclesial polity into political theory, most notably by advocating for a gradual process of constitutional amendment akin to Quaker discernment practices.⁶ By placing Dickinson within the broad Quaker tradition, Calvert shows Quakerism of the era to be more theologically and politically diverse than scholars have previously acknowledged.

The other political statement is Quaker abolitionist Anthony Benezet’s 1766 essay, *A Caution and Warning to Great Britain and her Colonies in a Short Representation of the Calamitous State of the Enslaved Negroes in the British Dominions*,⁷ which was addressed to Parliament and called for the intervention of British lawmakers to end the slave trade and slavery. Benezet, a leading Philadelphia Yearly Meeting reformer, is known as the “Father of Atlantic Abolitionism” because of his many antislavery essays and his crucial role in developing a transatlantic antislavery network.⁸ Benezet and other Quaker reformers, like John Woolman (1720-1772), are the most famous American Quakers of the eighteenth century. However, it is important to remember that they and their fellow reformers held a minority view of Quakerism for most of the century. Their vision of religious purity became more influential through disciplinary proceedings, some of which convinced their Quaker peers to reform and some of which caused the un-reforming to leave the Society, or forced them to. However, with the streamlining of Quaker acceptable behavior and theology came also the streamlining of arguments, influence, and rhetoric, which, in turn, shaped the nature of acceptable antislavery discourse.

This article argues that there were fundamental differences between the political remonstrance of Dickinson and Benezet that diminished antislavery’s popular appeal, and, so, limited the prospect of antislavery ideals becoming a significant plank in the American quest for independence. What I am arguing is that in the immediate aftermath of the Stamp Act in 1765 and 1766, Quakers, like Benezet, articulated a narrow understanding of antislavery protest that was unable to become a popular movement because it was so closely identified with the reformist strain of eighteenth century

Quaker theology.⁹ By itself, this contention is not new. However, by comparing Dickinson's and Benezet's political writings, this paper shows that the path of antislavery argumentation pursued by Benezet, which focused on sin, judgment, and transnational identity, were not the only options for political and popular redress available from within the Quaker tradition. In proceeding along the lines that he did, Benezet drove a political and rhetorical wedge between antislavery Quakers and the American population as a whole. This paper, then, probes the limits and boundaries of Quaker antislavery argumentation by, perhaps, the most dedicated abolitionist of the century. I do not want to second-guess Benezet, I want to show the consequential relationship between theology and antislavery advocacy. Dickinson is a helpful conversation partner since he identified with the Quakers, but held different theological convictions that, then, translated into a different form of political remonstrance.

I am not aware of any external evidence to suggest that Benezet's 1766 antislavery pamphlet was modeled after Dickinson's 1765 essay. However, Dickinson's standing in the Pennsylvania Quaker community, Benezet's knowledge of current events, and the wide publication of Dickinson's essay in periodicals, such as the *Pennsylvania Gazette*, lead me to believe that he would have been intimately familiar with the arguments in the address if not the text of the address itself. The striking internal similarities between the two documents suggest that Benezet viewed the transatlantic political discourse after the Stamp Act as a potential opening for antislavery argumentation.

In *The Late Regulations*, Dickinson wrote what may be described as an open letter to a friend in London, which was printed on both sides of the Atlantic.¹⁰ The letter was certainly intended to sway audiences in the colonies and in Britain. Dickinson described the suffering of colonists caused by British taxation policies in affective language.¹¹

What man who wishes the welfare of *America*, can view without pity, without passion, her restricted and almost stagnated trade, with its numerous train of evils—taxes torn from her without her consent—Her legislative assemblies, the principal pillars of her liberty, crushed into insignificance—A formidable force established in the midst of peace, to bleed her into obedience—The sacred right of trial by jury, violated by the erection of arbitrary and unconstitutional jurisdictions—and general poverty, discontent and despondence stretching themselves over this unoffending country?... YET still their resentment is but

the resentment of dutiful children, who have received unmerited blows from a beloved parent. Their obedience to *Great-Britain* is secured by the best and strongest ties, *those of affection*.¹²

Dickinson's appeal carries the trademark images and diction of the rhetoric of sentimentalism, a literary movement that viewed cultivated individuals as beings of moral feeling. Sentimentalism was a rhetorical strategy in the second half of the eighteenth century that emphasized the promotion of human happiness and morality through attention to one's feelings.¹³ Invoking "Pity," "passion," "bleedings," "tenderness," "hearts glowing," "sentiments of duty and affection," and the unrequited love of a calloused parent punishing a sensitive and innocent child, Dickinson is appealing to his readers' emotions.¹⁴ He used sentimentalism to make a powerful case for colonial American innocence in light of British aggression. The theme of innocence would play an important role in Patriot propaganda.

But it wasn't only the Patriot propagandists who wished to interpret and fashion political events for their audiences. Benezet also desired to influence British political and legal structures through a public antislavery campaign. Not only did Benezet innovate and expand on the Quaker antislavery tradition by combining biblical arguments, philosophical arguments of natural rights, and travelers' accounts of African industriousness in his antislavery essays,¹⁵ he also employed a subdued sentimentalism in his political writing.¹⁶ Like Dickinson and the Revolutionary propagandists, Benezet desired to sway popular opinion with the language of the "moral marketplace."¹⁷ His attempt to appropriate the methods of public discourse for antislavery purposes marks an important politically-engaged turn for Quaker antislavery activists in the late eighteenth century. However, the impressive list of antislavery arguments Benezet employed overlooks the potentially effective arguments he would not use, or could not use, without threatening his view of faithful Quaker identity.

Benezet's *A Caution and Warning* was intended to be read by power holders in Britain. In 1767, London Yearly Meeting reprinted 1500 copies of *A Caution and Warning* and gave them to each member of Parliament, and then, in 1770, sent copies to over 100 merchant houses in London.¹⁸ Written the year after the Stamp Act, the pamphlet notes the irony of the popular concern for "Liberty," while Britain and her colonies sustained the practice of slavery. Benezet mocked so-called "Advocates of Liberty, [who] remain insensible and inattentive to the treatment of thousands and tens of thousands

of our fellow-men.”¹⁹ While Quaker abolitionists disparaged the inconsistency between the Republican ideals of natural rights and liberties, on one hand, and slavery, on the other, Quakers and Patriots maintained different views of liberty.

Quaker abolitionists like Benezet and Quaker politicians like Dickinson held to a theistic understanding of liberty that originated in seventeenth century Quaker theology and informed the Quaker antislavery tradition. Liberty of conscience was granted to every individual by God.²⁰ It transcended the state and entailed a fundamental spiritual equality before God. The capacity to obey, with one's physical body, the message revealed by God, in one's conscience, required a certain amount of social and political freedom. By contrast, the Patriots held to a secular view of liberty that was defined within and against the state. Moreover, the Patriots conceived of human rights and liberties only as belonging *generally* to white, propertied, Protestant men, but not given *specifically* to each individual human being. In some cases, Patriots believed, rights and liberties could be withheld from some groups and individuals if full liberty would cause a threat to the general liberty of the community.²¹ Dickinson probably shared the Quaker understanding of liberty with Benezet, but most Patriots adhered to the latter view. For them, granting liberty to African Americans would lead to social chaos and endanger the general liberty of the community.²² These conflicting understandings of liberty explain, in part, why the consistent Quaker recourse to arguments from a theological understanding of liberty were often ignored.

The purpose of Benezet's pamphlet was to prod British rulers in London to intervene in the slave trade, ending it before God visited the British with justice. However, in Benezet's estimation, not all Britons were equal parties to this injustice. He laid most of the blame and cruelties at the feet of American colonists who he thought were the primary perpetrators. Whereas the American colonists are argued to be the chief offenders, the British government and wealthy British merchants were merely guilty of “countenancing” the slave trade.²³ The colonial slave owners are described as “brutal,”²⁴ and violently oppressive, while the British are guilty of passively allowing the trade to continue.

Even the passive guilt of Parliament would bring God's judgment, though. In language typical of the sentimentalism of the day, Benezet described the suffering of Africans as increasing a burden of national guilt that laid heavy on Britain:

and the groans, the dying groans, which daily ascend to God, the common Father of mankind, from the broken hearts of those his deeply oppressed creatures; otherwise the powers of the earth would not, I think I may venture to say, could not, have so long authorised a practice so inconsistent with every idea of liberty and justice.²⁵

Typical of Benezet's essays, he quotes from many different sources to make his antislavery appeal. He quotes selectively from sailors and Catholic missionaries to paint Africa as an idyllic land before it was despoiled by Europeans. He quoted from moralists and religious leaders like the Anglican preacher George Whitefield to describe the cruelties he witnessed in his travels in the colonies,²⁶ and he quoted extensively from enlightenment thinkers to show the inconsistency of slavery with the concept of liberty.²⁷

Benezet's plea is powerful, interspersing his own analysis with extended quotes from others. Benezet described the reports of slavery he presented as "detestable and shocking," especially for those "whose hearts are not yet hardened by the practice of that cruelty." Again, Benezet is tapping into the stream of sentimental rhetoric, which elevated the emotions as interpreters of virtue and morality. It was believed that what separated humans from the "brute creatures" was the capacity to have moral feelings and sentiment. To lose the moral capacity of emotion called into question one's humanity. This deprivation of human sentiment was, in fact, the only way Benezet could explain the cruelty of slave masters in the West Indies and American colonies: "Must not even the common feelings of human nature have suffered some grievous change in those men, to be capable of such horrid cruelty, towards their fellow men?"²⁸ There was a warning in here, too. Those who participated in slavery were in danger of losing their humanity and becoming insensible creatures.

Several themes in Benezet's tract are important for understanding its relation to the political petitioning of his day. First, Benezet's depictions of "cruelties," "suffering," "feeling," "groans, the dying groans," and "pity" of the "miserable Negroes" place this argument within the stream of sentimental rhetoric.²⁹ Benezet appealed to the head and the heart, to the basic humanity of the power holders who could use their influence to dissolve slavery. Not only was the rhetoric of sentimentalism fashionable in literary circles, and held currency among upper class Britons, it also coupled very well with the familiar antislavery argument of the Golden Rule. Quaker antislavery

advocates had utilized the Golden Rule since the time of George Fox.³⁰ Benezet's sentimental language vividly took the reader into the experience of the slave so that they could not only imagine what it would be like to do unto others as one would be done by, but to feel what they felt.³¹

A second theme in Benezet's essay is that of sin, guilt, and judgment. Benezet reminds Parliamentarians, "must we not tremble to think what a load of guilt lies upon our Nation generally and individually, so far as we in any degree abet or countenance this aggravated iniquity."³² Benezet returned again and again to the language of iniquity, guilt, and trembling in the face of divine wrath, not only as individual sins but as cumulative offenses accruing to the nation as a whole. This "judicial providentialism" contended that national crimes brought national punishments.³³ The sin of slavery committed by colonists would bring God's wrath on the whole nation if left unchecked, including the Mother country, so it was up to Britain to stop it or pay the consequences.

Like Dickinson, Benezet used sentimental language to emphasize his point. Like Dickinson, Benezet called upon republican theories of liberty to support his cause, even if they had different understandings of liberty from the philosophers they quoted. Like Dickinson, Benezet had at least some hope that his argument could influence both colonists and British lawmakers. Where Dickinson chided Parliament for taxing colonists without their consent, Benezet criticized slaveholders for ruling over their slaves without consent. Where Dickinson confronted the loss of the "sacred right of trial by jury," Benezet rejected the enslavement of Africans for term of life without due process.³⁴ Both Benezet's antislavery remonstrance and Dickinson's political suasion entered a thought-world that was primed to consider liberty as an abstract and secular concept, as well as to employ sentimental rhetoric as an important avenue of moral formation.

Despite these similarities in tone and vocabulary, the two tracts are different in their assignment of guilt and innocence, and that difference explains in part why antislavery, despite the obvious connection to liberty, did not become a central tenet of the Revolutionary movement. Dickinson's sentimentalism was intended to establish the "unoffending" innocence of the colonists in the face of British oppression. By contrast, Benezet's sentimentalism emphasized the innocence of the Africans in the face of colonial guilt, which would bring divine judgment as far away from southern plantations as the Houses of Parliament.³⁵

Benezet was right that the Stamp Act and the pre-revolutionary rhetorical and intellectual environment provided an opportunity for antislavery thought as a popular cause, but he was wrong to think that colonial sin, rather than purity, could undergird American antislavery logic. Dickinson's letter skillfully argued, and brazenly embellished, the theme of colonial innocence. Innocence in the face of a much larger aggressor characterized the political writings of the Patriots and supported an ideology of colonial purity.³⁶ By contrast, Patricia Bradley has shown that antislavery proponents, especially Quakers, and particularly Benezet, often employed an "America as a guilty party" trope that emphasized the brutality and corruption of American colonists. Benezet's pamphlet ignored the British origins of slavery and its continuing complicity in slavery in America and beyond. Whereas Dickinson's sentimental rhetoric was intended to establish colonial innocence and increase British guilt, Benezet's sentimentalism was intended to increase colonial guilt and encourage the British to expunge the contagion.³⁷

Moreover, in appealing to London politicians to stop colonial atrocities, at the very moment that anti-British sentiments were growing in the colonies, Benezet triangulated antislavery Quakers and London against the colonies.³⁸ It was an effective strategy for establishing a transnational antislavery Quaker identity, but it drove a wedge between American antislavery Quakers and their fellow colonists, the very people they most needed to persuade. Colonial American Quaker abolitionists had been deferring and appealing to London Yearly Meeting for almost a century by the time of Benezet's essay. This consistent recourse to London and British abolitionists, coupled with Quaker anti-war stances and a declared neutrality in the conflict between the colonies and Britain, caused many colonists to confuse Quakers for Tories.³⁹ Colonial Quakers were seen as standing against American virtue and liberty, a stance that contributed to their loss of public importance and tainted the antislavery cause.⁴⁰

Quaker abolitionists like Benezet could not rally around a nationalist agenda, because they had cultivated a transnational Quaker identity as a "Holy Nation" united in Spirit and behavior but set apart from and opposed to the world's people.⁴¹ During the Revolution and its immediate aftermath, Quakers had to distance themselves from antislavery efforts, especially outside of Pennsylvania, because their misunderstood association with Tories had become toxic to the effort.⁴² This distancing was temporary, but the version of antislavery

discourse that would emerge in post-Revolutionary America combined many of the Quaker arguments of the eighteenth century with the power of persuasion practiced by the Patriots.⁴³

This analysis of Dickinson's and Benezet's political petitioning demonstrates that Benezet attempted to coopt the language of revolutionary propagandists and attempted to weave antislavery advocacy into current events. The Quaker theological tradition had played an important role in developing arguments against slavery across the eighteenth century, but Quaker transnationalism, its deference to London, and an emphasis on sin and guilt almost guaranteed that antislavery would not be taken seriously in Revolutionary America.

What was persuasive internally to Quakers would need significant adjustment before it could extend beyond them. Of all the antislavery Quakers associated with the Reformation of American Quakerism, Benezet unleashed the broadest and most sophisticated campaign to end slavery. However, even here, perhaps his success would have been greater if he had shown Dickinson's willingness to abandon a narrow understanding of Quaker faith and identity and proved himself willing to become a bad Quaker, that is, to secularize the Quaker values that led to an antislavery critique, to ride the wave of American nationalism that united the colonies, and so, to triangulate the cause of the enslaved and colonists against the British. Of course, Benezet could have made all of these compromises and still run against the racialization of African slavery by White Americans. To compromise his faith and still fail in his antislavery concern would have been a devastating blow, but this comparison with Dickinson reveals additional strategic pathways for antislavery advocacy in the era of the Revolution.

ENDNOTES

- 1 Jane Calvert, *Quaker Constitutionalism and the Political Thought of John Dickinson* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 207; Richard C. Allen, "Samuel Meredith (1741-1817): American Patriot and Welsh Philanthropist," in *Quakers and Their Allies in the Abolitionist Cause, 1754-1808*, ed. Maurice Jackson and Susan Kozel (London: Routledge, 2015), 74-76.
- 2 Calvert, *Quaker Constitutionalism and the Political Thought of John Dickinson*, 189.
- 3 John Dickinson, "The Late Regulations Respecting the British Colonies on the Continent of America Considered, in a Letter from a Gentleman in Philadelphia to His Friend in London," in *The Complete Writings and Selected Correspondence of John Dickinson, 1762-1769*, ed. Jane E. Calvert, vol. 2, 8 vols. (Newark, DE: University of Delaware Press, Forthcoming 2019), 257-76.
- 4 Gary B. Nash and Jean R. Soderlund, *Freedom by Degrees: Emancipation in Pennsylvania and Its Aftermath* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991), 144, 146.

- 5 Calvert, *Quaker Constitutionalism and the Political Thought of John Dickinson*, 208.
- 6 Calvert, *Quaker Constitutionalism and the Political Thought of John Dickinson*, 189, 299.
- 7 Anthony Benezet, *A Caution and Warning to Great Britain and Her Colonies in a Short Representation of the Calamitous State of the Enslaved Negroes in the British Dominions: Collected from Various Authors, and Submitted to the Serious Consideration of All, More Especially of Those in Power* (Philadelphia: Printed by Henry Miller, in Second-Street, 1766).
- 8 Maurice Jackson, *Let This Voice Be Heard: Anthony Benezet, Father of Atlantic Abolitionism* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2009); Irv Brendlinger, *To Be Silent... Would Be Criminal: The Antislavery Influence and Writings of Anthony Benezet* (Lanham MD: Scarecrow Press; Center for the Study of World Christian Revitalization Movements, 2007), 19–20, 22, 27.
- 9 Patricia Bradley, *Slavery, Propaganda, and the American Revolution* (Jackson, MS: University of Mississippi Press, 1998), 85; Nash and Soderlund, *Freedom by Degrees*, 78.
- 10 John Dickinson, *The Life and Writings of John Dickinson: The Writings of John Dickinson*, ed. Paul Leicester Ford, vol. 1 (Philadelphia: Historical Society of Pennsylvania, 1895), 210.
- 11 Calvert, *Quaker Constitutionalism and the Political Thought of John Dickinson*, 210.
- 12 Dickinson, “Late Regulations,” 274.
- 13 Brycchan Carey, *British Abolitionism and the Rhetoric of Sensibility: Writing, Sentiment, and Slavery, 1760-1807* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005), 4–5; Philip Gould, *Barbaric Traffic: Commerce and Antislavery in the Eighteenth-Century Atlantic World* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2003), 25.
- 14 Dickinson, “Late Regulations,” 274–75.
- 15 Benezet scholars Jonathan Sassi, Maurice Jackson, and Brycchan Carey have demonstrated that Benezet incorporated biblical rationale, travelers’ accounts, Quaker tradition, and enlightenment rationalism to fashion important arguments against slavery. Jonathan Sassi, “Africans in the Quaker Image: Anthony Benezet, African Travel Narratives, and Revolutionary-Era Antislavery,” *Journal of Early Modern History* 10, no. 1–2 (2006): 100; Brycchan Carey, *From Peace to Freedom: Quaker Rhetoric and the Birth of American Antislavery, 1657-1761* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2012), 212; Jackson, *Let This Voice Be Heard*, xi.
- 16 Frost argues that Benezet employed sentimentalism in the essay, while Carey argues that it was not “strictly” the rhetoric of sensibility because it was not as excessive as European strains. Thus, he suggests, Benezet’s rhetoric could be understood as sentimentalism within the Quaker plain style. J. William Frost, ed., *The Quaker Origins of Antislavery* (Norwood, PA: Norwood Editions, 1980); Carey, *British Abolitionism and the Rhetoric of Sensibility*, 109.
- 17 Gould, *Barbaric Traffic*, 25.
- 18 Christopher Leslie Brown, *Moral Capital: Foundations of British Abolitionism* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2006), 401–2.
- 19 Benezet, *A Caution and Warning to Great Britain*, 3.
- 20 Douglas Gwyn, *The Covenant Crucified: Quakers and the Rise of Capitalism* (Wallingford, PA: Pendle Hill Publications, 1995), 259.
- 21 Jane Calvert, “An Expansive Conception of Rights: The Quakerly Abolitionism of John Dickinson,” in *When in the Course of Human Events: 1776 in America and Beyond*, ed. William R. Jordan (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, Forthcoming 2018), 34–35.

- 22 Bradley, *Slavery, Propaganda, and the American Revolution*, 126.
- 23 Benezet, *A Caution and Warning to Great Britain*, 33.
- 24 Benezet, *A Caution and Warning to Great Britain*, 22.
- 25 Benezet, *A Caution and Warning to Great Britain*, 4.
- 26 Benezet, *A Caution and Warning to Great Britain*, 10–12.
- 27 Benezet, *A Caution and Warning to Great Britain*, 6–7, 24.
- 28 Benezet, *A Caution and Warning to Great Britain*, 32.
- 29 Benezet, *A Caution and Warning to Great Britain*, 4, 7, 21–22, 32, 35.
- 30 Carey, *From Peace to Freedom*, 30–31.
- 31 John Woolman, “Notes and Commentaries on A. Benezet’s *A Caution and Warning to Great Britain*,” in *John Woolman and the Affairs of Truth: The Journalist’s Essays, Epistles, and Ephemera*, ed. James Proud (San Francisco, CA: Inner Light Books, 2010), 93–101.
- 32 Benezet, *A Caution and Warning to Great Britain*, 33.
- 33 John Coffey, “‘Tremble, Britania!’: Fear, Providence and the Abolition of the Slave Trade,” *British Historical Review* 77, no. 527 (August 2012): 846, 849.
- 34 Dickinson, “Late Regulations,” 274; Benezet, *A Caution and Warning to Great Britain*, 21.
- 35 Bradley, *Slavery, Propaganda, and the American Revolution*, 85.
- 36 Bradley, *Slavery, Propaganda, and the American Revolution*, 83.
- 37 Bradley, *Slavery, Propaganda, and the American Revolution*, 85.
- 38 The Quaker antislavery appeal to London had deep roots in colonial antislavery, including the joint 1758 decision to admonish slave owners.
- 39 J. William Frost, “Introduction,” in *The Quaker Origins of Antislavery*, ed. J. William Frost (Norwood, PA: Norwood Editions, 1980), 25.
- 40 The chief Revolutionary propagandist, Samuel Adams, wrote that “it is a good Maxim in Politicks as well as in War to put & keep the Enemy in the wrong.” That principle guided Patriot propaganda, and created a strong, popular nationalist movement. Samuel Adams, *The Writings of Samuel Adams: 1773–1777*, ed. Harry Alonzo Cushing, vol. 3 (New York: G.P. Putnam’s Sons, 1907), 206.
- 41 Sarah Crabtree, *Holy Nation: The Transatlantic Quaker Ministry in an Age of Revolution, American Beginnings, 1500–1900* (Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press, 2015).
- 42 Calvert, *Quaker Constitutionalism and the Political Thought of John Dickinson*, 223; Nash and Soderlund, *Freedom by Degrees*, 78.
- 43 Bernard Bailyn et al., *The Great Republic: A History of the American People*, 4th edition, vol. 1 (Lexington, MA: Cengage Learning, 1991), 475.