

LAND HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN COLONIES.*(For the Review.)*

By THOS. L. BRUNK, B. S., M. D.

CHAPTER V.

PENNSYLVANIA.

In the study of Virginia, Massachusetts, and Carolina, the three leading colonies that had most to do in after years in moulding the character of our people and in contributing most to the genius of our political and social institutions, we found these colonies were Royal grants to a collection of individuals. We have now to consider the history of the largest Royal grant ever made to a single individual. It consists of 40,000 square miles of territory west of the Delaware river and north of Maryland, or nearly all of present Pennsylvania. Then, to round out this gift and secure complete control of the Delaware river and thereby of the traffic to this extraordinary grant, the whole State of Delaware was also given to this same person, William Penn.

From the land question point of view, there is no more interesting nor instructive portion of our early history than colonial Pennsylvania. There is none aside from Massachusetts that started with higher ideals of equality, of the rights of men, of brotherly love, of peacefulness, of true democracy, and of those altruistic instincts that beget genuine neighborliness and general thrift, and then in less than a century come to such an ignominious end; an end filled with the fruits of speculation and greed that always ripen on the boughs of our inherited land system.

At the beginning I should state that in our school-books, purposely or otherwise, this part of our colonial history is so colored and enveloped in misty tradition that the true inwardness of William Penn's motives is concealed. He is commended to our rising generations as the model Christian, the protector of his religious convictions, the sainted patron, the mildly ruling demigod of his chosen people, the defender of the Indian. While there is no scar upon his integrity nor shadow upon his honor, yet we will find he was very human; and when under the charm of the serpent of magic riches, he yielded to it as many others have done before. He had as keen an insight into the possibilities of land value growth and what it meant to him financially as any modern exploiting landlord. In fact, he was a past master as a real estate manipulator, and being an influential courtier, with a large estate in England and another in Ireland, he was at the beginning of his career a long way on the road toward reaching his life's ambition of great riches.

While at Oxford, the training school of nobility, he wandered away occasionally to listen to a Quaker minister. The plainness of dress and sincerity of speech touched his refined, sympathetic nature, and he finally became infatuated with the doctrine and the people. He heard of George Fox and

his futile effort to find a home in the new world for his people. He saw about him corruption, imprisonment, tithes. He began to dream of a home for his faith in the virgin woods across the seas. He left college and for twenty years learned the world. "He became by turn a soldier, traveler, fop, courtier, fanatic; his nature shifting and hesitating between the two influences he had received at college,—the love of pleasure, distinction, and a courtier's life, and the religious infection which his father detested." (Pennsylvania Colony and Commonwealth. By Sidney G. Fisher).

At the age of 36 his father died, leaving him to collect a debt of £16,000 due his father from the Crown for his services as Admiral in the English Navy. To cancel this debt he asked Charles II. for a grant of land in Pennsylvania where he might make a home for his religious sect and at the same time build up a great fortune, one of the chief ambitions of his life. The grant was completed and authority given him to adopt for the new province any form of government he chose, provided the majority of his colonists consented. The vastness of this grant and the ease by which he obtained Delaware from the brother of the King, shows how powerful was his influence at Court. Though an avowed Quaker, he was popular among the aristocracy of England. "Besides being the political governor of the province, Penn was also the feudal Lord and owner of all this land." Notwithstanding this, only on two occasions was he the resident Governor; the first time for a year and ten months, and the second time, eighteen years later, for ten months. He ruled, and his sons after him, almost exclusively by deputy Governors; he and his sons after him, being the true Governors, residing on their estates in England.

The colossal real estate feature of Penn's plans reveals the leading motive directing his genius. "It was his intention to *sell* to the settlers from time to time in such tracts as should be convenient, reserving on the tracts sold a *small quit-rent to be paid to him and his heirs forever.*" As the historian says, "Although neither the selling price nor the rent was very large, yet when 40,000 square miles had been sold in this way, the Governor would be a very rich man." "The reservation of rent to be paid forever assured him the position of Lord of the Manor, and made the colonists his tenants." The system "was thoroughly feudal and always a cause of more or less dissatisfaction among the people; but as Penn was liked personally, there was not so much protest against the rents as might be expected."

It would seem that Penn would have preferred to make his colony an exclusively Quaker settlement, but he advertised in England for promiscuous settlers and while the Quakers predominated, he did not object to "the numerous nationalities and religions which soon made up the population of the province." "The Dutch, Swedes, English, Germans, Welsh, and Scotch-Irish settled there and later many New Englanders came in." It can be gathered that the quit-rent was as good to him from Lutheran, Episcopalian, Menonite, or Presbyterian, as from a Quaker. Religious toleration in this colony had a decided tinge of real estate exploitation.

In 1681 as deputy Governor, he sent his cousin William Markham with the first band of settlers and to arrange for the purchase of the land from the Indians. Penn arrived in October of the next year with many settlers on the ship *Welcome*. To the Swedes and Dutch who had already settled in Delaware, "he exhibited the deeds of the Duke of York giving him that territory and placed the government of those settlers in the hands of a deputy." Even the established government of a people crumbles before the power of individual ownership. Penn said: "Let there be a change, I own the country." The same is true today. The landowners say, let there be a change of government officials, and there is change. Knowing that the Penn government would give them better protection than their home governments, these Swedes and Dutch afterwards asked to be under his government; so it was mutually agreeable in this case.

Penn's insight into empire building led him first to found a city that would be the gate-way to his vast possessions and also the seat of his government. Therefore, the next day after landing, he was rowed down the Delaware river from Chester till he came to the fascinating spot with high banks at the fork of two rivers. Here with appropriate ceremony he dedicated the place for a great city. At once his commissioners began to lay out the streets and a large number of lots. Within nine months Philadelphia had 80 houses with 300 farms laid out around it. Within a year 3,000 settlers arrived.

Penn's affability, fairness and frankness not only won the complete devotion of his people, but his liberality was also shown somewhat in the form of government which he instituted. The basis of government was framed according to the "Laws Agreed upon in England" and a constitution known as the "Frame of Government." The first were rules which defined who should be freemen. They designated that all voters were to include "landholders and also such inhabitants as artificers who paid 'scot and lot' to the government." Only those who believed in God and were Christians could hold office. They abolished oaths and established freedom of worship.

The Constitution provided for a Council of 18 members, at first elected by the people and later appointed by Penn, and a General Assembly of 36 members also elected by the people. The Council for several years proposed all laws and submitted them to the Assembly for approval. This was a constant source of friction. The Governor and Council formed the executive part of the government and appointed all the judges, sheriffs and justices. Thus we see how guardedly Penn gave the people a voice in their government, and how careful he was to close every avenue to their asserting their rights in case any question arose that would jeopardize his own interests. The Council and Courts were all appointive, hence tools in his hands.

During Penn's first short period as Governor in person, he brought a state into being and gave it his laws and constitution. He made his famous treaty with the Indians which gave the colony peace for seventy years. He also began the erection of his mansion on the grounds selected for his country seat at Pennbury, about twelve miles north of Philadelphia. He went home

in August, 1684, to settle the boundary dispute between Pennsylvania and Maryland.

No sooner had he gone, than confusion and strife began in the government of the colony. The Assembly had no right to originate bills, but was determined to use its utmost power to reject those originated by the Council. Numerous reports of this trouble reached the ears of Penn, and becoming disgusted with the show of democracy he determined to use his full authority by appointing five commissioners whom he endowed with power to enact, annul, or vary the laws as if he himself were present." Some writers question whether he had this power, but he exercised it and proved that he considered himself a Feudal Lord. The commissioners wisely kept these instructions a secret, knowing that it would produce a great commotion among the colonists if they became known. Instead of exercising their powers, they proceeded to give the people as much of a voice in the lawmaking as possible under the constitution. But as we will see later their rights were not secured till they pressed their demands and had the constitution remodeled. In this colony as in all the royal colonies, even in Pennsylvania, all the liberty secured by the people for eighty years was by "exchanging supplies the Governor wanted, for laws the people wanted." In all the colonies outside of New England the people fought for all the liberty they at last enjoyed. What was given they asked for and in some cases rebelled to secure.

At the close of 1699, Penn returned to his colony to act as its Governor for only ten months. In point of numbers and prosperity, it had been successful. Already it had become the wonder and talk of all Europe. But it was not all joy and happiness with the colonists. There were excesses and disorders among the lower classes who were inflamed at the licensed drinking houses, and there were petty bickerings among the colonists over the laws, the church, and the courts. Penn came to put a stop to all this and at the same time to retire from his arrests and struggles in England. He was now 55 years old. He was heartily received by the people.

There was so much to engage his attention that he was a very busy man. He traveled over the country on horseback, preaching at Quaker meetings, visited New York and Maryland, met with the Council and Assembly, and gave most of his time to the planting and care of his country seat, Pennbury Manor. Here he spent much money for "personal display, high life, and distinction." In fact Penn displayed all the characteristics and tastes that develop in men whose wealth is obtained from land rent or its equivalent. He was the Quaker exhorter, a man who suffered imprisonment for debt and for his belief, an altruist, but he too became a captive and a devotee of the goddess of unearned wealth and yielded to her entreaties by lavishly expending money for self-aggrandizement. His castle at Pennbury cost £5,000 or \$100,000 in present values. Its spacious parlors often became the seat of government, for when he did not feel disposed to go to Philadelphia he had the Council and Assembly meet him there. It "was built of brick, wainscoated with English oak, and furnished in a manner which considering the surroundings may be

called extravagant." "There were Turkey-worked chairs, plush and satin cushions, satin curtains, and a carpet, which at that time was an article seldom seen outside of palaces." Penn had a well known fancy for handsome dress and probably wore a red sash when he met with the Indians to make an impression on the savage. In all his dealings with the Indian, he was shrewd and tactful. To use a street expression, he was a good "jollier."

"Penn was by far the most sumptuous of all colonial Governors, and a striking contrast to the economical rulers of New England." The liberality of his entertainment may be judged from the presence of "six vessels called cisterns for holding water or beer." "Madeira was his favorite wine, but his cellar was not without canary, claret, and sack." For his beer supply, "he built a brew-house as a part of his country place." "Unlike most of his sect, he approved of dancing and sports and encouraged them by his presence." 'He was skilled in the use of the sword,' had great 'natural vivacity, and gay good humor.' He employed black slaves without scruple. 'He failed in his attempt to secure to the negro slave mental and moral culture, the rights and happiness of domestic life, and he died a slaveholder.' " (Bancroft's History of the United States.)

He took much pleasure in his barge in which he was rowed to and from Philadelphia. He also had a fine coach, a light calash, a sedan chair, and saddle horses for his wife and children. Judging by the entries in his cash book, he gave away a great deal in charity. He went to all the fairs and Indian Canticoes, and gave the Indians a great feast under the trees in front of his mansion. It can be seen that William Penn was fairsighted enough and versed in all the tactful influences and courtly finesse to hold the good will of his people and at the same time further his own interests. He appeared liberal, but at heart was grasping and avaricious. When he governed in person, he was more successful and popular than any deputy he appointed, for he knew how to give rights and privileges that would rebound to his ultimate advantage; he dealt frankly and openly with the people and yielded to circumstantial to preserve essentials. On this last visit he gave the people a new constitution which gave the right to the Assembly to originate bills, to determine their time of adjournment, and other important democratic powers. But he made the Council appointive instead of elective as before. He had no deliberate intention of oppressing his people, but "if he was to maintain his position of Feudal Lord and Proprietor, it was natural he should err on the side of power." (Fisher's Pennsylvania and the Commonwealth.)

After a stay of less than a year, he issued his last letters of instruction and farewell, and sailed, never to return. Being a favorite of Queen Anne, he returned to his old court life that he might ward off any movement against proprietorships. A bill was then before Parliament to turn the Proprietary colonies into Royal ones; but his influence was great enough to stop it. His was an expensive life, and as his quit-rents were in arrears, he could not meet the demands of an extravagant, dissipating son and the salaries of his deputy Governor and other officials. He declared that with all his sales of lands he was £20,000 in debt.

To rid himself of debt and the trouble created by the anti-proprietary party that arose in Pennsylvania against him, he tried to sell his political power in the colony to the Crown. With this load removed and with it all the expenses of the government while he yet remained Proprietor of the lands, "the sales and quit-rents would in a few years restore his fortune." To make a good bargain with the Crown in this sale, he upheld his Governor Evans in refusing his assent to a bill confirming the right of the Assembly to adjourn at pleasure as his new constitution granted. He reasoned that the fewer the privileges he allowed the people, the more the Crown would be induced to buy and the higher the price it would pay for it. Surely the saying is true, "The government cannot enrich one man without despoiling another." In this case the exalted Quaker ruler and preacher was willing to sacrifice the freedom of his people for self-enrichment.

The Assembly was indignant at Evans and at once prepared nine resolutions to be sent to Penn. It was a detailed attack on Penn full of invective, bitterness, and insinuation, accusing him of taking sides with the enemies of the Province, and of extortion and corruption in the sale of land. They referred to the increase of vice since the arrival of his son William. This son was a trial to his father as many a son has been under the corrupting influence of wealth gained without honest labor. This son lived in sumptuous style at his father's mansion at Pennbury where he dissipated and drank. But this memorial to Penn was not popular with the people who had not forgotten the many liberal privileges he had given to them; so the Assembly had to retract what they had said though they believed what they had written to be largely true. It was Penn's strong effort and intent to be so kind and affable that when enemies and accusations arose against him, his people would remain loyal to him.

To note further the tribulations that grow out of privately owned land and the undue advantage even the best of men will take of others when such ownership is involved, let us refer to the Ford incident. Penn's English and Irish estates were under the management of Philip Ford whom Penn considered to be an exemplary Quaker. He trusted him implicitly, and thought so much of him that he gave him 10,000 acres of land in Pennsylvania, a city lot in Philadelphia, and 150 acres in the suburbs, as a present. Ford, however, seems to have rendered accounts from which it appeared that although he had received £17,000 of Penn's money and the expenses were only £16,000, yet he figured that Penn owed him £10,500. Ford pressed for payment. Penn neglected to make an investigation, and foolishly gave Ford a deed to Pennsylvania as a mortgage, to secure the debt. Then later he committed another piece of folly by accepting from Ford a lease to the Province which was used to show that the deed was intended as an absolute conveyance. Ford died and his widow and son made this public and professed to be owners of Pennsylvania. They brought suit against Penn for £3,000 rent in arrears and got judgment. As Penn could not pay it, he was imprisoned nine months. Finally a compromise was reached and a settlement

made with the Fords for £7,600 pounds. Under new management his estates in England and Ireland began to bring some returns.

Penn was now nearly seventy and he ceased active life. He became gouty. He still tried, however, to sell his government of Pennsylvania to the Crown to restore his family to prosperity. The sale was delayed, but finally an agreement was reached by which he was to have £18,000 and £1,000 was paid to him. The deed was ready to be signed when he was stricken with paralysis. He lingered for six years with his mind affected. The deed was never signed and the government of Pennsylvania was never sold. During these last six years he lived in ease as his lands began to sell more rapidly and his quit-rents increased. He died July 30, 1718.

Thus ended the life of a man who had the rare opportunity to establish a government and system of land tenure based upon the natural rights of all men. Instead of leaving a monument to eternal justice, he chose to grovel to the promptings of "pelf and place" and to listen to those suggestions of rivalry within that give to many that intense thirst for riches, power and dominion. He could not have been totally ignorant of the Puritan system which had been established for sixty years before he founded Pennsylvania. The Massachusetts system of free lands had been exciting both the interest and jealousy of Europe for years. Penn must have known how New England flourished under the land allotment system, but with all his professions of religion and pretence of making a place of refuge for his despised people, he deliberately planned to profit by their presence on his empire land. Life is the sum total of deeds and the motives that inspire them. The man that leads a useful life is too busy to give much time to the mere frills of existence. Penn appropriated the earnings of the settler without giving anything in return. As a result it gave him a life of worry, of contention, of ruin to his eldest son, of the sacrifice of the freedom of the people he professed to protect. His course was the means of inducing his colonists to become speculators and many to engage in privateering, and of fastening a quit-rent system upon the colony which to this day are paid to heirs, all ending at last in debt, disappointment, bickerings, and a train of misfortunes.

While Penn created a commonwealth with more freedom than was given the people of Virginia and Carolina, yet he planted in his State a tenure of land which developed the very institutions of oppression from which his people had fled. What then did he really do for his sect or for the world? Doubtless he treated the Indian kindly and justly. But the motive was to make his lands more available to settlers who would become his feudal tenants. That was a good business reason. While he sold to actual settlers in amounts they would actually use, thus preventing the early amassing of lands by the few as in the southern colonies, it nevertheless was a gigantic real estate deal that excited jealousies and the spirit of emulation both in England and in the colony of those who wanted also to get rich by increased rents. Then his example of building a large Manor house for show and added distinction was followed in the next century by scores of others till all the

aristocratic got the craze for a country seat. Evidently, William Penn is the progenitor of our modern rent-baron who draws each year a princely fortune from a few city lots supporting skyscrapers, without lifting his hand to do one thing for society.

But the story of William Penn does not end with his death. He dictates by a Will who shall enjoy the special privileges and powers that were his during his life. If the private ownership of land is a violation of justice to all men, then the Will being a part of our land system is also a violation of justice. "The Will, if not purely Roman in origin, at least owes to Roman law its complete development. Its original object was to secure the perpetuation of the family, and was at first the peculiar privilege of the Patricians or noblemen. On the advent of Christianity into Rome, the duty of bequeathing to the Church was inculcated, and in England the Church succeeded in holding in its own hands for centuries jurisdiction in testamentary matters. In some countries in early times, the right of disposing of property by will did not exist: as among the ancient Germans, and with the Spartans under the laws of Lycurgus, and the Athenians before the time of Solon."

The Willing of personal property or of buildings to heirs can never produce social evils or an injustice to anyone, for such property being the product of labor depreciates in value, is lost or requires labor to keep it in a useful condition; but land is the bequest of the Creator to His children as a whole and if controlled by a few involves the control of the fruits of those who toil. Therefore in its broad sense, the Willing of land by our present laws is handing down to the next generation the right to appropriate wealth that labor produces in the form of ground rent. As all available land is owned by fewer persons, it inevitably follows that labor must pay higher rents till it reaches the point where it will accept a wage so low that it can just live and reproduce.

It is argued that lands given to heirs divides the land and prevents its hoarding. That, however, is not the case. While it may seem to divide an estate, yet when carefully investigated it will be found that the increase of land in the hands of fewer owners is greater than the division. A father may have managed to buy farm after farm till he has a thousand acres. If he has four children and each gets an equal share, they will each start in life greatly in advance of their father or of thousands who start with nothing but their hands. "Illinois in 1900, had 15,044 fewer owners and 23,454 more tenants than in 1880." "In the young State of Oklahoma, for the ten year period ending 1900 there was a 200 fold increase of tenantry and only a six fold increase in ownership." (Ghent's Benevolent Feudalism.)

If every child had the same opportunity to get land under our laws as was accorded to its father, what would be gained by the Will? Nothing at all. If the government would guarantee to every human being under its flag the absolute equal right to the soil and prevent its monopoly by taking ground rent as the only revenue to defray its expenses, all would have as much land as they could use, absolute justice would prevail, and Wills would be of no use except for all movable property.

Pennsylvania is a conspicuous example of the injustice of the Will. Here had settled a half million of people who were to be subjected to the whims of seven heirs, no one of whom had the liberality and broadmindedness of their father. To his daughter Letitia by his first wife, Penn gave 10,000 acres in Pennsylvania; to his dissipated son William by the same wife, he gave his English and Irish estates then having an income of £1,500 a year, or about \$30,000 in present values. The rest of Pennsylvania he left to his second wife to be conveyed to her five children then under age. The government of Pennsylvania was never sold to the Crown, hence Mrs. Penn became for a few years the Feudal Lord Proprietor over Pennsylvania, the only instance in history of a woman holding such an office. Under her deputy governor Keith, there was a popular administration of the Government. It was during this time that Benjamin Franklin went to Philadelphia as a youth of seventeen.

In 1732 Thomas Penn, one of the three remaining heirs, began the administration of affairs in Pennsylvania and for the next forty years was regarded as Proprietor of the colony. While he was a careful man of affairs, he had none of the daring energy or broad, generous temperament of his father and often ruled the colony narrowly and sordidly, although he had a more difficult task. He governed a rapidly increasing mixed population filled with advanced ideas of liberty. He had the collection of all the purchase money, the rent, and the interest of a great estate rapidly rolling up millions of pounds of value. He arranged treaties with the Indians and purchased their titles to lands on the frontier.

And what good thing did these Penn heirs do with the vast income from this immense estate? We are told that, "The large fortune which rapidly began to accrue to Thomas and his two brothers was spent upon their country seats in England." Wisely spent, wasn't it? But the prodigality of men has always come out of rent or some form of land slavery. Thomas Penn's place at Stoke Park, enlarged and beautified by his son, has in the present century been pointed out as one of the finest country seats in England with a magnificent mansion house, library, game, and herds of deer." This is what William Penn's Will did for humanity. Does not this waste of wealth, earned by labor of others, illustrate what is taking place daily before our eyes due to the same system? Had Penn been given the whole United States, his heirs today would be ruling us and gathering quit-rents from the larger part of the millions now here. Probably there would not have been a Revolution and Washington and Jefferson may have been their feudal tenants.

But what influence did this land system have upon the plainly dressed, peace loving Quaker? "By the year 1745, the Quakers, especially those in the city, had become very much like the founder of their province and were largely men of the world. They had grown rich and prosperous, and they had grown accustomed to political power. They were becoming a sect of the upper class and on account of the strict discipline of their church, hundreds of them were becoming Episcopalians." Thus we see the demoralizing effect

and tendency toward aristocracy which this private land ownership system engendered even with the ascetic Quaker.

The Quaker too "had always professed to be very much shocked at the way in which Christians deprived heathen nations of their lands, and robbed, defrauded and murdered them." "The legal theory of Indian land ownership at that time was that the Indians owned only the land they actually lived on and cultivated. Their right was simply that of occupancy, about the same as the land title of a wolf or bear. The general rule of law, as laid down at the time by every writer and judge, was that no heathen people could acquire a title to land, except that of occupancy, which would be invalid against a Christian who wanted it; and the first Christian who took it could keep it." This rule of law, sometimes called the "Heavenly Title," has been recognized by modern courts as the original basis of ownership of a large part of the territory of the United States." (Fisher's Pennsylvania Colony and Commonwealth.)

This law originated with the Pope and was a part of his policy for the increase of his temporal power. When Columbus discovered America, it will be remembered that the Pope claimed it as his of right, and kindly gave it to Spain. The comment has often been made that the Romans were arrogant despots and conquerors; they took what they wanted, and because they wanted it, but they never claimed that there was enough magic in their religion to change the universal rights of property in land.

Massacres and wars were frequent among the Indians in New England, Virginia, and Carolina, which checked the advance of those colonists, while the entire absence of such difficulties in Pennsylvania for the first seventy years was one of the causes of her wonderful growth and prosperity. Penn paid the Indian for every acre of land he took from them and at a price that satisfied the Indian. While cold investigation of Duponceau, Fisher, and Stone show that the great Penn treaty with the Indians, that has been exalted and embellished by historians, is probably pure fiction with hardly even a respectable tradition to rest upon, yet Penn had an understanding with his red friends; and his fine tact in treating them as friends and in making them presents of wampum always made a strong impression upon the savage mind. The white man agreed with the red man to love one another; and Penn's last words which tradition says he used, that so touched the children of the forest, "We are the same as if one man's body were to be divided into two parts; we are all one flesh and blood," are as applicable today to the oppressor and the oppressed as they were then.

While Penn's sons followed their father's policy in the main, yet they took advantage of the Indian in several cases. In the great purchase of 1754 of about 7,000,000 acres, they gave for it but 750 pounds, or at the rate of about a penny for every 39 acres. The Indians became dissatisfied with this sale; so the land was bought over again in small tracts. The Penns did not buy the frontier land fast enough to keep pace with the advancing pioneers; as a result the settlers encroached upon Indian land and would not vacate when

the Indians made complaint. The delay of the government to act irritated the Indians, and the French in Canada a few years later took advantage of this and secured the alliance of the Indians against the English.

The famous "Walking Purchase" was another event which helped to increase the discontent of the Indian. Chief Justice Allen, connected with the Penns by marriage, selected 10,000 acres in the very fertile region known as the Minisink lands. Settlers went onto this land in large numbers and began clearing and building. But this land belonged to the Delaware tribe and they clamored incessantly for their rights. To meet their demands, an old deed purporting to give the settlers a right to extend a line that could be walked in a day and a half, was brought into requisition. If this line could be made long enough, it would include all of this valuable tract. This line had never been run, so the whites surveyed and cleared it beforehand so there would be no delay in walking. When the morning came to do the walking, the most active woodman had been selected to cover as many miles as possible in twelve hours. The line was walked in part, but he ran most of the time so that by night he had passed the point the Indians had estimated could be reached only at the end of the day and a half. By the next day at noon the line was extended to thirty miles beyond what would have been a fair distance had the whites walked. Then, too, the line drawn from the ending point to the Delaware river to make the northern boundary line, was run northeastward instead of directly east as the deed required, and thus the whole territory was enclosed.

This was fraud and the Indians not only would not move from the tract, but never forgot this treachery of the Penns who were responsible for it all. Then to get the Indians to move off, the whites sent for a delegation of the Six Nations to order them away. The Delawares were at this time a subject tribe to the tribes of New York. The whites took advantage of this fact and bribed the delegation by a present of £300 to make the Delawares move. A speech was made by one of the delegates calling them "their women" and ordered them to move to Wyomen. At this command they slunk away like whipped curs; but they never forgot this wrong and the French and Indian war gave them a chance to wreak vengeance on the frontier whites for the wrong done them by the land grabbers.

But the greatest fraud was the grasping purchase of 1754 by the Albany treaty. This treaty included nearly all of Pennsylvania west of the Susquehanna River. It was obtained by such irregular practices as deceiving the Indian by the compass courses, having the deed signed without proper notice to the Six Nations, and including lands of tribes who never signed the deed. When the import of this deed became known, their lands being gone, the Indians went over to the French in a body, when the latter promised to restore their lands to them.

Not only was Thomas Penn responsible for these causes of the French and Indian war, but when the colonists wanted to contribute his share of the taxes to carry on the war to protect the settlers on the frontier, he flatly

refused. But they retaliated by sending a commission to England to place the matter before the King and Parliament.

Benjamin Franklin and a man by the name of Norris were appointed, but as Norris was in ill-health, he remained at home and Franklin started alone. He had become famous abroad from his discovery of electricity in the clouds. He was warmly received, was dined at country seats and at London houses. Everywhere he made known his complaints against the Penns; wrote articles for the public press and worked up a public sentiment in favor of forcing the Penns, whose property was enjoying protection by taxes raised in England, to pay their just proportion.

Franklin was in England two years on this mission and while there a bill was passed in the Pennsylvania Assembly subjecting the estates to taxation. The bill was sent to England and the Penns opposed it before the Privy Council as hostile to their rights and ruinous to themselves and their posterity. "They professed to believe that all their wild and unmarketable lands would be taxed at the same rates as the cultivated lands, and *that their lots would be taxed at such rates as to cut off all profit from a rise in value. The taxes would be increased until their income was cancelled, and all hope of speculation gone.*" In other words, "they believed that the *colonists would apply* to them the *Single Tax* which has been so much discussed in our time, and which by putting all taxes on land and taxing them to their full value, will, it is supposed, cut off speculative profit and turn it in the direction of the laborer instead of into the hands of the landlord." (Fisher's Pennsylvania Colony and Commonwealth.)

Franklin replied, "All that was asked was equality; and that the assessors were honest men under oath who would take no advantage." The outcome was that the King approved the papers giving authority to tax the Penn estates, and Franklin's work was done. The tax was assessed and the Penns had to pay £566. They had expected to use the war to control provincial rights; but the end of the war brought a curtailment of their own excesses. This was a step toward constitutional liberty, and Franklin returned home covered with honors and glory.

At this early date these Penns saw how easily their profits in the advances in land values could be taken away from them by the simple process of making the tax on land values high enough to take all the profit for the support of government. Had these colonists seen the wisdom of such a tax and applied it, they would have rid themselves of the Penn proprietors without sending anyone to England to make a formal complaint against them. Quit-rents, and the vast domain held by the Penns to despoil the earnings of the colonists, would have vanished as dew before the sun. They would have had to sell what they could and abandon what they could not actually use. Those seeking land under such a system could enter such lands without paying a speculative value for it to an absentee monopolist. Also hoarding wealth by the rent process would have been an impossibility and no one would have held more land than wanted for actual use. Therefore

labor would have had free access to the 10,000 acres tract that the favorites of the Penns had appropriated. Moreover, they would have left a history of the same thrift and high moral character and development as handed down to us by the Puritans.

Under this system, also, no one could have rented his land and moved to town to live on the product of another's toil as we see all over our country today. The Puritans had no such class as the "retired farmer." When a man will submit to pay rent to another who owns the land, it is the unmistakable sign that land in general is monopolized. The system induces men to buy more land than they can use in the hope of profiting by the future increase in value.

While Franklin was chairman of a committee to prepare a report on the country's condition and prospects in 1759, he estimated the wealth of the Penns' Pennsylvania holdings, not including Delaware, at about £10,000,000 or in present values \$200,000,000; their annual income from quit-rents at £58,936 or \$1,178,720. Some recent writers claim that Franklin's estimate is too high and place their wealth at £4,000,000 and their annual income at £10,000. Whichever estimate is taken, the principle is just the same. They were able through their ownership to command half a million people to pay to them either of these large sums every year. The useful members of society were taxed to support these heirs in idleness; and the princely income led the Penns to lead lives of prodigality and luxurious leisure. How much has the world been benefitted by the coming of Thomas Penn or his brothers? They can be classed only as parasites on the toiler and as wasters of wealth.

After the Revolution all the American colonies threw off the Royal and Proprietary governments and in most cases confiscated the lands of the Royalists who left this country or were living in England. Pennsylvania had never become a royal province, although it would have been one had William Penn signed the deed of transfer. While the Assembly abolished the political power of the Penns and their feudal title to the land, yet they were allowed to keep certain private estates which had been settled on the children of Penn's first wife, all their manors, and some of their quit-rents; and to reimburse them for what was confiscated, the Assembly stupidly gave them £130,000 in money. This was as unjust to labor as paying the Penns a quit-rent for which they did not in any sense give a value in return. Hence but little was gained by confiscation. "Private property in land is a bold, enormous wrong, like that of chattel slavery," (Henry George) and when an owner of land is paid by the government for the value the community creates, the people at large are wronged. This same money paid by taxation can be used in buying more land and the same monopoly established as before.

Buying land is simply prepaying rent, therefore. If money is raised by taxation to buy back great tracts of land appraised at present values, as they are doing in New Zealand, they have simply paid the landlord his rent in advance and very little is gained. Land values belong to the people; why should they pay for a thing that already belongs to them? A stolen horse

is not paid for by his rightful owner when found; it is simply taken. Taxing land values is taking the stolen horse that belongs to society.

The audacity of the Penns did not end in being reimbursed by the Pennsylvania colony. It was estimated that they lost by the Revolution about £944,817. This they claimed from the British government; and by an act of Parliament, filled with sympathizing landlords, the tax-payers of England were made to pay the Penns an annuity of £4,000 on this claim. This was paid annually down as late as 1884 when it was commuted by a grant of £67,000. At the present time, the Penn heirs "own a few manors in the interior of the State of Pennsylvania, and collect a few quit-rents through their agents, and some of the land on which quit-rents are paid lies in the most populous part of Philadelphia."

Thus we come to the culmination of a great land grant with its full quota of woe and retrogression following in the wake of a century of land speculation. While we may ascribe to William Penn the noblest motives in planting a refuge for his people, concede that he dealt more fairly with the natives, that he was in many ways liberal with the emigrants, that he was sincere and honorable, and with a brave, courageous spirit opposed evil and intolerance, yet he upheld and engrafted upon American soil a pernicious system of land tenure which so conservative a writer as Bancroft admits gave Pennsylvania, even under this just Quaker, a century full of strife, in which the colonists were led "to complain, to impeach, to institute committees of inquiry, to send persons and papers, to quarrel with the executive." Bancroft further say: "Pennsylvania, for nearly a century, sought to impair the executive right to pre-emption (to buy land first) and to compel an appropriation of the income from quit-rents, in part at least, to the public service. Jealousy of a feudal chief was early displayed. The maker of the first Pennsylvania almanac, Franklin, was censured for publishing Penn a Lord." "William Penn established a democracy, and was himself a feudal sovereign. These two elements in government were incompatible; and for ninety years the civil history of Pennsylvania is but the account of the jarring of these opposing interests."

If Pennsylvania suffered contentions for a century by the conflict of democracy with feudal aristocracy, may we not conclude that with the same conditions existing today of great tracts of land equally as valuable as the whole State of Pennsylvania in the hands of feudal corporations and individuals, we are suffering from the same chronic disease of the body politic as then? Do we not hear of "complaints, of committees of inquiry, of sending persons and papers"? Yea, more, do we not hear of magnates conniving in their secret places to destroy all freedom in production by owning all the best of our natural resources that they may dictate both the wage to labor and the prices for necessities? Do we not hear of legislative scandals, bribery for office, court intrigues, secret plots, colonization schemes, strikes and riots, and dynamited buildings? Do we not hear of increasing crime, insanity, suicide, tenantry and poverty?

We did not hear of such complaints under the New England system.

They did not have the quit-rents and the rapid sale of lands to build up a great fortune for one man and his family from the honest toil of the many. We did not hear of jealousies, of agents sent to England to implore the aid of the Privy Council to compel the large landholders to pay their just portion of the taxes and prevent them from annulling the rights of the legislative Assembly. Neither did we hear of great country seats and manor houses of an over-rich ruling class growing, separating society into two widely divergent classes; the one a leisure, pleasure-seeking, idle class living in mansions, the other producing all wealth by its toil, bearing all the burdens of government, and building all the mansions while modestly sheltering itself in the humble cottage.

Social conditions among the Puritans remained undefiled for a century and a half while the Pennsylvania people after a century of growth threw off the restraints of Quakerism and began a life of gaming and debauchery. The Quakerism that said, "The word of an honest man was evidence without an oath"; that checked "the mad spirit of speculation by a system of strict accountability applied to factors and agents"; that prohibited "pleasures of the senses, masks, revels, stage-plays, bull-bates, and cock-fights"; that esteemed marriage a civil contract; that did not allow poor rates nor "tithes" that had worked out a rule of equality in families and had annulled the law giving the eldest son the estate; were swept away when the sluice-gates to unearned riches were opened.

In place of this sound social equilibrium and a state of solidarity in which all were prosperous and none poor, the church of aristocracy was substituted which encouraged speculation, luxurious living, and the building of country seats about Philadelphia similar to those of England. Society became loose in its habits and morals, was broken up into opposing classes, with an idle set at the top throwing those below into mad frenzy in their efforts to obtain money at any hazard or by any means to keep up to the prodigal pace the rich displayed on every hand. Privateering was encouraged and became "a regular part of a merchant's calling." Among these merchants was Robert Morris, the wealthy financier of the Revolution who was ready at any time to turn over to Washington the cargoes he had stolen from the French or Spanish vessels. Are we not proud of such benevolence and of such forefathers? Was this country born in the "Cradle of Liberty" or in the Cradle of Graft and Plunder?

Is not Pennsylvania, in fact, typical of what is true of the history-making of the present? We have a population from every corner of the earth, striving to make an honest living, endeavoring to live virtuous, upright lives, in most cases liberal and benevolent, courageous and tolerant; but under the powerful influence of corporate and private monopoly of the tremendous land values piling up wealth to staggering heights, our ship of State has long since heaved her anchor at the moorings of peaceful, honest industry and social contentment, and has these many years been floundering in the rough sea of class-struggle, class-rule, and class-exploitation.