

James Logan as the First Political Boss

Of Lancaster County When It Was The Wild Frontier

BY EVELYN A. BENSON

INTRODUCTION

Four Sundays ago* the *New York Times Magazine* carried a feature article in honor of Abraham Lincoln. In it were several phrases describing the Lincolns which apply to settlers of every frontier in our history. Much that was true of the frontier in Indiana and Illinois in Lincoln's youth was true of Lancaster County one hundred years earlier . . . but so many things of that remoter past have been forgotten.

The title of the *Times* article about Lincoln is "The Strength of the Land Was in Him." The phrases which seemed as though they had been written for me to use as an introduction to this paper were: "The Lincolns were humble people . . . they were frontier people—ambitious, not for fame, not for monuments, but for the rich earth . . . They sometimes felt themselves cheated and outwitted by the people in the cities—that was the blacker side of their lives."

For the name *Lincoln* you might substitute the name of any Lancaster county pioneer from 1710 to 1750 and you would have statements equally true. It is as an epitome of our forefathers' struggle to be free men in a free land that we honor Lincoln.

Lincoln seems a long way from James Logan, the subject of this paper—and he was, not only in time, more than a hundred years, but in thought concerning the common man, in the attitudes of humility versus arrogance, and in concept of the purpose of government. James Logan was outwardly a humbly Quaker. In describing Andrew Hamilton, the great Philadelphia lawyer of the Zenger trial, James Logan said, "Andrew had ever some design in his view, tho he affected in appearance a plainness in all things."¹ Logan may well have been looking into his own mirror when he penned those lines. James Logan and Andrew Hamilton were two subtle minds, mutually appreciative, matching wits for decades . . . but that is another story.

*February 6, 1955.

L. L. B. means Logan Letter Book. All manuscripts referred to are to be found in the Historical Society of Pennsylvania unless otherwise noted.

¹ L. L. B. 1748-50, p. 28.

It is my purpose in this paper to show the first incident in Lancaster's early history in which the new American concept of a free land came into conflict with James Logan's concept of Pennsylvania as the private property of the Penn family, a land to be held with some aspects of the old feudal tenure.

In a paper read before this society in November, 1953, I pointed out that James Logan owned the first Conestoga wagon and opened a general store at Conestoga in 1717. I noted, too, that before that date the chief non-German inhabitants of this region, the Cartlidges, Martin Chartier, Peter Bezallion, the LeTorts, James Patterson, Richard Grist and a number of others, were employed by James Logan as fur traders. In preparation for that paper I reviewed notes which I took over ten years ago for another purpose, and the significance of James Logan in the earliest history of this county struck me forcibly. I searched for an evaluation of James Logan's local importance in all our Lancaster histories and publications, but in vain.

The only comments to be found on the politics of this area in the first decades of its history were made by H. Frank Eshelman.² He said that in 1732 the political question in our county "was the Scotch-Irish policy of driving Maryland below the 39th degree of north latitude versus the Dutch policy of allowing Maryland to encroach to the west bank of the Susquehanna." He later says, "The first distinct party cleavage in this county was upon the question of the common peoples' interest, versus the proprietors' interests . . . our county was for many years against the proprietary party. The Scotch-Irish and Germans held similar views on the subject."

Tonight I hope to throw a ray of light on the reason why at first some Scotch-Irish were active in the proprietors' interest and why the Germans were passive. In a future paper or papers, I would like to show how and why the majority of the pioneer settlers of Lancaster County, both German and Scotch-Irish, turned against the proprietary interests.

LAND PROBLEMS THE KEY TO COLONIAL POLITICS

In 1729, the year in which Lancaster County was erected, both James Logan, the Penn's business representative in Philadelphia, de facto governor of Pennsylvania, and Governor Calvert of Maryland commented upon a situation alarming to the established order. Logan spoke of the "people crowding in and breathing an air of freedom."³ Governor Calvert remarked, "This Superiority, as I may term it, of the people over the Government, seems Un-naturall."⁴

Just before the formation of our county, the western part of Chester County, which became Lancaster County, was already well settled except for large unoccupied areas such as Conestoga Manor, reserved for the proprietors,

² Papers read before the Lancaster County Historical Society. Vol. 20, p. 37; Eshleman, H. Frank. *The Political History and Development of Lancaster County's First Twenty Years, 1729-1749*.

³ Logan Papers X, p. 46.

⁴ Hopkins Studies, vol. 21, p. 304.

and much land on Swatara⁵, which James Logan was trying to keep unoccupied for future speculative purposes. The settlers in Lancaster County, as we all know, were the Germans and Swiss at Strasburg and Pequea, the Scotch-Irish at Donegal and the southern part of the county, and a few Quakers, such as Samuel Blunston and the Wrights, personal friends of James Logan, very recently settled in a strategic position from which they could keep an eye on the other groups.

What did these groups have in common? What was James Logan's relation to each of them in 1729?

The Scotch-Irish, the Germans and the Quakers had all come to Pennsylvania for one specific reason above all others: to obtain land upon which to work and raise their daily bread. They all came from countries in which they had been deprived of political privileges and secure title to their properties because of their religious beliefs. What they *all* wanted was secure title to their property. All three groups hoped here to manage their own affairs, religious and secular, within their own church groups and escape contact with, or interference from, higher government as much as possible.

As land was what they had come to look for in America, so land was the key to their relationship to James Logan.

L-A-N-D *land* is the key work to this entire puzzle.

Land was the basis of wealth.

Land was what every man wanted.

To get land every man had to speak to James Logan.

Therefore James Logan is the key man to the understanding of much activity which our earliest historians found merely confusing.

ABSENTEE OWNERSHIP VERSUS SETTLERS RIGHTS

Two types of men were seeking ownership of land in Pennsylvania. These were the land speculators or absentee owners, and the "honest settlers," as Edward Shippen called them, i.e., the men who wanted to make a living on the land by settling and farming, the men who wanted only enough for their own families to live on.

The Penn heirs and some of their close friends, such as James Logan, were the largest speculators in Pennsylvania land. The sons of William Penn had no interest in Pennsylvania except as a source of wealth. William Penn, himself, in granting to his Pennsylvania Quaker settlers a charter of political privileges and religious toleration greater than could be found anywhere else in the world, had created a hot bed for the growth of ideas of independence which his loyal friend, James Logan, found interfered with the proprietor's own financial interests.

William Penn, in embracing ideas of religious and political freedom, had not set out deliberately to impoverish himself. In a way he had thought of him-

⁵L. L. B. III, p. 125. J. L. to A. Galbraith, 26 April, 1729 . . . "ye Land which I thought was within ye Bounds of Donegal proves to be on Sohataroe where we have never yet allow'd any one Settlement to be made on any accot whatsoever."

self as lord of the manor; he intended to reserve to himself 1000 acres in every 10,000 and all the Indian fields. He established some few specific manors with certain aspects of feudal tenure, and he expected that he and his family forever would receive an annual feudal quit rent from every acre in Pennsylvania.⁶

The ingratitude of those who refused to pay his quit rents after he had exerted himself so devotedly for the cause of religious and political freedom, embittered Penn's later years. James Logan's job in Pennsylvania, over the years, had been to try to collect from the unwilling people, revenues for the support of the Penn family. It took all the abilities of an astute politician to assert the dying feudal rights against the the aggressive and growing democracy.

James Logan often pointed out to William Penn's sons that the political privileges which their father had secured to the people were the direct cause of the family's financial embarrassment. In giving greater power to the people he had put into their hands weapons with which to fight all feudal tenure, especially quit rents, upon which the family depended for an income. He pointed out that with "no executive officer above a Sheriff (and even he by thy father's Indulgence is chose by ye people)" it would be "exceeding difficult" to enforce eviction of large groups who had settled without grants upon the proprietors' lands (1727)⁷. He told them that their troubles were caused by "your father's too great Indulgence to ye People in granting them Privileges beyond what ye Constitution of England the best in ye world, has secured to them which were sufficient for their happiness & ease in government."⁸

Logan wrote the Penns that "Liberty & Priveleges are ever ye cry."⁹ This, to Logan, was "a contagion affecting ye Peoples minds as ye Plague does humane bodies." (1728)¹⁰. The Juries, he said, were made up of the common people, who would never find in favor of the Penns.¹¹ "Seeing nothing can be recovered here by law but by Juries (as in other places) which Juries are made up of the common People it may easily be concluded what justice will be obtained in your behalf in any case that is brought to such a Trial." In this there may have been some oblique reference to the famous trial of William Penn (1670) in which a jury, for the first time in history, dared to decide in opposition to the ruling of the court, finding William Penn "not guilty" of speaking to an unlawful assembly. For this the jury was imprisoned, but sued the judge and won for English and American juries the right to decide a case regardless of the opinion of the presiding judge.¹² This power of juries, obtained through the trial of William Penn, James Logan found extremely in-

⁶ Cadwallader Collection, Penn Agency 22, Brief of Springettsbury Title; *Pa. Archives, Series 2, vol. 19*, pp. 6; 7.

⁷ L. L. B. IV. p. 160.

⁸ *Ibid.* p. 187; L. L. B. II, p. 295.

⁹ L. L. B. III, p. 274.

¹⁰ L. L. B. IV, p. 188.

¹¹ L. L. B. II, p. 283.

¹² *Encyclopaedia Britannica, 11th ed.* under *William Penn*.

convenient in prosecuting cases for the benefit of the Penn landed interests in Pennsylvania.

Nurtured on the letters of James Logan, by 1730 Thomas Penn would gladly have turned back the clock if that were possible to regain some of the governmental powers which his father had bestowed upon the people, powers which would have made legal his use of force in collecting rents and evicting settlers. Just as James Logan lamented that his children did not inherit his love of books and learning,¹³ so might the ghost of William Penn have bewailed that his sons were in nowise capable of appreciating the philosophical considerations which had led to their father's Noble Experiment. William Penn had been a rich man's son with humanitarian leanings, his sons had been brought up in comparative poverty, convinced that their ills had been brought upon them by their father's too great concern with high thoughts. They were determined not to imitate him. When Thomas Penn finally took charge of the family affairs, his line of thought was much closer to that of James Logan than to that of his noble father. Thomas stated flatly, "I never desire to have views so noble extensive and benevolent as my Father . . . because these views tho good in themselves yet by possessing him too much led him into inconveniencys which I hope to avoid."¹⁴

From the height of his own great intellectual gifts James Logan looked down upon "the weaker sort, that is, the great number of the people."¹⁵ To him the mere number of these people presented a danger to those who would control government and finance. His correspondence shows a life devoted to proving that a devious intellect by adroitly pitting one group against another can control mere numerical superiority. "Divide and rule" was Logan's successful policy as it was that of the British Empire for centuries. Anyone who has the patience and eyesight to wade through the thousands upon thousands of pages of letters and accounts written in James Logan's minute seventeenth century handwriting will discover in Quaker garb a character of great intricacy, a scholar, a scientist, a Machiavellian diplomat, a schemer of the first water.

James Logan referred to our pioneer ancestors, German and Scotch-Irish alike, as "vast crowds of bold and indigent Strangers,"¹⁶ "a parcell of impudent necessitious foreigners" who "thronged into ye Country as a place of Common Spoil." To James Logan, Pennsylvania was a piece of private real estate, he himself the agent for the owner. James Logan did not represent the spirit of his times, the spirit of these vast crowds he despised, the spirit to which the thoughts and writings of William Penn had given such impetus. He battled constantly against the new concept of man's rights and privileges, against the new freedom which hailed William Penn as its great apostle.

We have then, in Pennsylvania, at the time of Lancaster's organization, two points of view,—the proprietary, represented by James Logan, with a determination to build a fortune for the Penns at all costs, as their legal due,

¹³ Logan Papers X, p. 53.

¹⁴ Penn Family Correspondence 1732-67, p. 28.

¹⁵ Logan to Hannah Penn. Quoted *Pa. Mag. of History*, vol. 33, p. 347.

¹⁶ L. L. B. II, p. 285.

since the land and the government had been granted to Penn by the king and he had been at great pains to found the colony; opposed to that was a surging tide of men who had stored in them generations of resentment towards lords of the soil, a tide of men everyone of whom dreamed of being a freeholder, of owning a piece of land all his own without strings on it or dues to any overlord. These men had thronged to Pennsylvania because of the political and religious freedom in the ideals of the great founder. James Logan's concept of the Penn government of Pennsylvania was: government of the people, for the proprietors, by the proprietors. There was already stirring in the soil the germ of an idea expressed over a hundred years later as "government of the people, by the people, for the people."

JAMES LOGAN'S ATTITUDE TOWARD THE GERMAN-SWISS

James Logan's attitude toward the German-Swiss settlers of Lancaster County can only be called hostile. In 1710 when the first Conestoga Land was surveyed to them, he was sojourning in London, convincing William Penn that the Pennsylvania Assembly was misguided in seeking his arrest.¹⁷ He seems to have thought that the Germans were treated too well in this land grant for he says, "In my absence . . . warrants were directed to [Taylor, the surveyor] to lay out lands for ye Palatines, whom he settled without any knowledge of mine, to ye utmost of his power to their advantage, and for the time he spent with them, they will say to this day they paid him largely."¹⁸

Although he did not discourage the Palatines who came in 1717, because they came prepared to pay,¹⁹ his attitude toward them was anything but warm. Concerning the German settlers of 1717 he wrote to England, "There are divers hundreds arrived here who have not one word of English and bring no Credentials with them, a method that we conceive no way safe for any Colony. Tho we hope these may be honest men, yet by the same Routes & methods ye like number of Swedes might be poured in upon us . . . This Government must not be too free . . . in making ye admission easy. . ." "The Palatines that come next spring must expect to pay ten pounds per head here to ye Govt for we are resolved to receive no more of them . . . our cuntry People are inflamed against them and we are to sell them no more land."²⁰

In 1725 Logan wrote Hennah Penn, "Your whole Interest in the cuntry deeply suffers. Your lands to the Northwd are overrun by a number of those unruly Palatines sent in the year 1711 to New York at the Queens charge . . . the southern parts are in the same manner possessed by as disorderly persons."²¹

As shipload after shipload of Palatines arrived in the Delaware during the seventeen twenties and thirties his alarm increased. He told Hannah

¹⁷ *Pa. Col. Records*, vol. 2, pp. 344, 508.

¹⁸ *Pa. Archives, Series 2, vol. 7*, pp. 81, 126.

¹⁹ L. L. B. IV, p. 60: Sept. 25, 1717, "We may shortly expect . . . some of that money, tho we have seen none of it yet that ye Palatines are said to have brought over . . ."

²⁰ *Ibid.* p. 81.

²¹ L. L. B. II, p. 249.

Penn that Governor Keith, Logan's political opponent, hoped to gain the Palatines "as his Janesaries upon occasion, for they have generally been soldiers."²²

The following extracts from Logan's correspondence in 1727 well show his attitude towards the Germans:

Sept. 1727. "Last year . . . mention was made of a large number of Palatines that were expected here this summer. Just now one large ship brought up above 400 of them & we are assured there are no less than three more at Sea, whose arrival is daily expected. At this rate you will soon have a German colony here & perhaps such a one as Britain once received from Saxony in ye 5th century. . ."²³

Oct. 30, 1727. "I have received a Petition from ye inhabitants of Donegal requesting yt ye Dutch may not be allowed to settle between them and Sohataroe (Swatara), to wch I can say very little further than that I think they can't be too much restrained at present from settling any where. . ."²⁴

Nov. 25, 1727. "We have many thousands of foreigners, mostly Palatines so called already in the country of whom near 1500 came in this last summer, many of them are a surly people, divers Papists amongst them and ye men generally well arm'd."²⁵

Dec. 6, 1727. "I am now informed on very good Grounds that six thousand Palatines are to be imported hither next Summer . . . This must be prevented by an Act of Parliamt or these Colonies will in time be lost to the Crown. They are a warlike & morose People."²⁶

Two days later, in writing to Joshua Gee of London, Logan enclosed an act which he hoped Parliament would pass to prevent immigration of the Germans. He said he did not want Keith or the mob to know of it or they might use it against the administration.²⁷

Logan wrote to John Penn in the same strain two months later, urging that the Palatines be prohibited from entering Pennsylvania by an act of Assembly . . . he said that "Maryland wants them."²⁸

One vile practice of those wicked people, the Dutch, which aroused Logan's ire was that they "actually paid ye Indians above twenty pounds per hundred" acres for some lands on Delaware, "believing that ye principal part of the Title was lodged in them." This had raised the price of the land so high that Logan had to pay the Indians a great deal for the Durham ironworks property, a sum which he expected the Penns to refund him, because they had granted him the land "free of Indian claim."²⁹

In spite of James Logan's often expressed dislike and distrust of the German settlers he had no hold over those in Lancaster County. Their land had been granted them before the death of William Penn. It was paid for.

²² L. L. B. IV, p. 255.

²³ *Ibid.* p. 145.

²⁴ L. L. B. III, p. 111.

²⁵ L. L. B. IV, p. 152.

²⁶ Logan Papers, I, p. 89.

²⁷ L. L. B. IV, p. 169.

²⁸ Stauffer, *Governors of Pa.*, p. 42 (H. S. P. Mss. dept.)

²⁹ L. L. B. IV, p. 194.

Most of them had become naturalized citizens. So, luckily for them, by 1729 they were in a position to ignore him. *The Scotch-Irish at Donegal were in an entirely different position.*

LANCASTER COUNTY LAND TITLES IN 1729

William Penn died July 30, 1718. Penn's death was the real cause of the difference in the status of the German settlers, secure in title to their land, and the Scotch-Irish who had no secure title to their land. From the date of William Penn's death, and for many years thereafter, the trustees of the Penn estates were not able to sell land or give title. The earliest date given for any considerable number of Scotch-Irish is 1718,³⁰ the Donegal settlement. The number of Scotch-Irish increased steadily in the following years, yet there was absolutely no legal way in which one of them could obtain title to an inch of unsettled land in Pennsylvania. Many Germans coming in after 1718 might go to their relatives or countrymen who had purchased large holdings before 1718. The Scotch-Irish had no such refuge.

There is a tradition in Pennsylvania history that the thrifty Germans arrived, money in hand, to pay for their land, whereas the shiftless Scotch-Irish were all squatters, seizing land for which they could not pay. There is merely a germ of truth in this notion. There is evidence in James Logan's correspondence that possibly as many Scotch-Irish as Germans were ready to pay for their land, but were not allowed to do so. James Logan, as the most active trustee of the Penn estates could merely advise them where they might settle, with the understanding that, when litigations over the estate were settled, they *might* be allowed to purchase the spot they lived on, providing they had behaved well in the meantime.³¹

This was the club Logan could hold over their heads . . . that he would have the power to give title or withhold it when the time for purchase arrived. He settled the men at Donegal with this understanding. They were the first comers. Thousands who arrived after them in the seventeen twenties were not quite as impressed with the power of Logan. They received the definite impression that the land in Pennsylvania belonged to no one, and was theirs for the taking. This was logical because the estate was being contested for by two sets of heirs, the children of William Penn's two wives. Besides that there was the broad strip across the colony, south of a line passing through what is now Columbia, which was claimed by both Maryland and Pennsylvania, making the ownership of it doubly dubious. It was in this strip of doubly contested ter-

³⁰ Klein, H. M. J. ed. *Lancaster County, Pennsylvania, A History*, 1924, vol. 2, p. 779.

³¹ James Logan Parchment Letter Book 1717-31, p. 80: Aug. 26, 1719, "The Propr Decease has putt a Considerable stop to ye getting in of money, for during his life time our method of Granting Lands was by Patents in his name under his great seal wch method can no longer be used." L. L. B. IV, p. 175: June 26, 1728, "The People especially since Sir Wm. Keith began to act his game have been universally led into an opinion that while ye will was not decided, there could be no sufficient Power to manage any affairs of Property . . ."

ritory that the Scotch-Irish, arriving in the seventeen twenties, chiefly settled.³²

Even though the German-Swiss settlers of 1710 and 1717 lived in this doubly contested strip their title was still safe, for on October 28, 1718, an agreement had been reached between Maryland and Pennsylvania that all persons seated in the disputed zone at that time should be under the jurisdiction of the province whence they received their original patent. This did not apply to persons surveying after the date of the agreement.³³

The succession of bad harvests in northern Ireland in the years 1725 through 1727, added to the political and religious situation, increased the flow of immigration to Pennsylvania to such a point that in 1726 James Logan wrote, "I doubt not but there are at this time near a hundred thousand acres possessed by persons who resolutely sitt down & improve without any manner of Right or pretence of it. Some tis true have had a permission to prevent worse coming into the place."³⁴

The next year he told Springett Penn that "there is very little vacant land left untaken up . . . or invaded by those shoals of foreigners the Palatines & strangers from the North of Ireland that crowd in upon us, and for want of Grants which we have not power to make, sitt down any where with or without leave and on any spot that they think will turn out *grain* to afford them maintenance."³⁵

The thousands who came were not desperate outlaws, but they were hungry men, determined to work to raise their grain and eat it. They wished to conform to the rules of the country if possible. They came to James Logan to ask direction. He wrote, July 10, 1727:

"My life is at present intolerable. I am obliged to sitt all day in a low room, next my Door to receive the continual senseless & fruitless applications of People for Lands or else for my ease to get out of town. . . . I must now resolve to give all men one short answer viz that no man has anything to do in Property affairs and that they may proceed to such measures as they please."³⁶

"I hear that divers of those people who sitt down on lands without leave pretend there was a Proclamation issued by ye Propr encouraging all who were inclined to it to come over & settle his lands. Pray acquaint them that this is utterly false . . ."³⁷

"I know nothing of any such proclamation of Govr Penns as the impudent People mention. In ye year 1681 now 46 years ago he invited many honest people to come & settle under him, but by ye accot we have of ye conduct of too many of these folks, they do not appear to be the men intended. Or had they come over at that time they could have had no Land till ye owner granted

³² L. L. B. IV, p. 152.

³³ Mathews, Edward B. ed. *Resurvey of the Mason-Dixon Line 1907*, p. 155.

³⁴ L. L. B. II, p. 289.

³⁵ L. L. B. IV, p. 168.

³⁶ *Ibid.* p. 158.

³⁷ L. L. B. III. March 11. 1730.

it to them, so yt in short we see no other way than to prosecute those bold Invaders of other Peoples Rights . . . Let this be done quietly and with as little noise as possible . . .”³⁸

“Last week one of . . . the Irish applied to me in the name of 400, as he said, who depended all on me for directions where they should settle. They said the proprietor invited People to come & settle his countrey, they are come for that end & must live. Both they & the Palatines pretend they would buy but not one in twenty has anything to pay with. The Irish settle generally towards Maryland, where no Lands can honestly be sold till the dispute with Lord Baltimore is decided. There is also a large settlement of them above Conestoga, by Permission.”³²

In retrospect he later told F. J. Paris, “For 2 or 3 years or more during the scarcity in Ireland vast Numbers crowded in from thence with their families. They said the Proprietor had published Proclamations to all people to come and settle his Country, promising them Land on their Arrival . . . therefore since they had quitted all on those invitations Land they would have where they could find it, they came away to avoid Starving & they would not perish here, while Land lay vacant & unimproved they would people it and Defend the Country & would pay what was reasonable as soon as they could. I found some means however to make some Regulation amongst ye best of them to prevent a general combination & opposition.”³⁹

LANCASTER COUNTY FORMED TO THWART SQUATTERS AND MARYLAND

It is possible that erection of Lancaster County was James Logan’s method of obtaining a legal framework docile to his will with which he could prevent unauthorized settlements on his own lands in this area, as well as on the lands of the proprietors. The evidence points to James Logan rather than to the signers of the petition, as the motivating force in the project for a new county.

During the years 1726 to 1738 James Logan was at the peak of his political power in colonial Pennsylvania. As representative of the proprietary interests for a quarter of a century before 1726 he had been fighting the mob, the levellers, the ideas of democracy which seemed to obsess the people. For fifteen years preceding 1726 the going had been exceedingly rough for Logan in his battle with the governor, Sir William Keith. In the confusion caused by William Penn’s death, Keith had sided with the popular faction while espousing the cause of William Penn, Jr., against Logan who upheld the interests of the younger branch of the family, and stoutly resisted further extension of popular government.

At long last, in 1726, Sir William Keith was dispossessed of his authority and position as governor. He was replaced by Patrick Gordon, a man whose advanced age and pleasant disposition made him only too happy to let Logan do all the work and write all the papers. Gordon was eighty-two years old

³⁸ *Ibid.* pp. 102-3.

³⁹ L. L. B. III, pp. 358-9.

when he assumed office in 1726, ninety-two years old when he died in office in 1736.⁴⁰ At his death, James Logan, as President of the Council, became officially the acting governor for two years more, as he had been in fact for the entire period of Gordon's administration.

In a letter to John Penn dated 20 October, 1726, Logan describes Gordon's lack of ability and complete dependence upon himself. In this letter Logan says that he writes all of Gordon's speeches, that the governor is decayed, decrepit and aged.⁴¹ Writing to Ferdinand J. Paris in 1734 Logan says that Gordon "is unable to manage of himself or otherwise than as he is directed."⁴²

The most influential politician in Pennsylvania, the man who could make the Donegal settlers tremble over their land titles, might lead them willingly to sign a petition for a new county, especially as the officers of the new county were to be drawn from the signers. Eshleman pointed out that only eleven German names appear on the petition, whereas most of the signers seem to be from Donegal.^{42a} Logan had no influence over the Germans.

Some in this area sent petitions *against* formation of a new county. However, on May 2, 1729, the governor and his Council, of which Logan was president, decreed the erection of the county. The Assembly showed reluctance to pass the measure. After a message from the governor, received May 6, the Assembly finally passed the bill erecting Lancaster County. The message of the Governor, undoubtedly written by Logan, says,

"Dispatch all bills that are necessary to prevent the growing disorders in this country . . . it is absolutely necessary to enable the inhabitants of Susquehanna to exert the powers of Government in those parts, where great numbers of the worst seek shelter in the hope of immunity in their great distance from more regular administration of Government."⁴³

The implication here is that ruthless bandits were terrorizing the wild frontier on Susquehanna. Logan's letters show that the phrase "growing disorders" referred only to people settling themselves upon land which no one had the authority to sell them, and there raising their grain. Another source of possible disorder Logan had in mind was the Marylanders west of Susquehanna pressing close to the Pennsylvania settlements.⁴⁴ Logan never forgot the legal value of establishing possession and jurisdiction in contested areas.

JAMES LOGAN ON THE NEED FOR MILITIA

In his frustration at inability to prevent people from settling on land which he wished to keep for himself and the Penns, James Logan thought of an army. Is it possible that this simple Quaker longed for the power of armed force to drive the settlers where he wished? He saw that if these doughty

⁴⁰ Dunaway, W. F. *A History of Pennsylvania*. Prentice-Hall, N. Y. 1935, p. 103.

⁴¹ Logan Papers. Correspondence. I, p. 87.

⁴² L. L. B. IV, p. 405.

^{42a} Papers read before the Lancaster Co. Historical Society Vol. XII, p. 29, Eshleman, *Birth of Lancaster County*.

⁴³ Klein, op. cit. p. 20.

⁴⁴ L. L. B. III, p. 124 to John Wright, Apr. 15, 1729.

Scots ever realized their strength and all worked together they could take over the government of Pennsylvania.

Logan often spoke of the need of militia for defense against French and Indians. The Logan correspondence shows that the value of militia in handling the settlers themselves had been a strong thought in James Logan's mind on more than one occasion. Lacking the force of arms to oppose the Scotch-Irish if they should unite to hold the land, James Logan determined by what he called "interest," by what we might call diplomacy, or even bribery, to divide the Scotch-Irish, to set them against each other in order to prevent a strong combination against the proprietors. He gave the men of Donegal to understand that if they worked with him they would be secured in title to their land.

Donegal, strategically located by Logan at the point of strongest possible friction between Maryland and Pennsylvania, on the Susquehanna near the 40th parallel of north latitude, had an equally strategic relation to the Indians and to the "morose and well armed" Germans whom Logan distrusted. In Donegal lived most of the fur traders who were indebted to him for advance on goods, and at Donegal were settled, as leaders in the new county, his close personal friends, members of old Quaker families, the Wrights, and Samuel Blunston. Donegal was truly James Logan's special charge, as Thomas Penn expressed it years later.⁴⁵

It was the men of Donegal who had first impressed Logan as a valuable possible militia. In 1728 he wrote that the Donegal settlements, "none purchased yet . . . were made by some of ye first Irish that came over about ye year 1720 with our consent upon some appearance of misunderstanding at that time with ye Indians against whom we thought those People might prove a considerable Security . . ."⁴⁶

Concerning the floods of subsequent Scotch-Irish he told John Penn, "Of those who have sate down on Lands divers neither are nor are likely to be able to purchase them . . . it may be doubtful whether your right & authority can be at all enforced *without an army* . . ."⁴⁷

"Those from Ireland already settled if suffered to continue in their possession while . . . you can make no grants . . . will in a little time make a right of that Possession and their numbers may become their security."⁴⁸

The very week in which the erection of Lancaster County had been pushed through Logan wrote, "The people begin now almost to think ye country is given up to them."⁴⁹ Then in consternation at reports of more people leaving Ireland for Pennsylvania he warned, "Pray think what condition we are like to be in wth those additions to ye Poyson in our own Bowels while we have neither militia nor any force whatsoever but constables some of whom are not much better than some of ye others."⁵⁰

⁴⁵ *Pa. Archives, Series 2*, vol. 7, p. 165. Old Donegal Township in 1722 included all land west of Pequea Creek.

⁴⁶ L. L. B. III, p. 279.

⁴⁷ L. L. B. IV, p. 160.

⁴⁸ L. L. B. III, p. 278.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.* 297.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.* 299.

Two months later: "It now looks as if Ireland or the Inhabitants of it were to be transplanted hither . . . if some speedy method be not taken they will make themselves Proprietors of the Province. Many of those that come now seem to be of a better sort . . . Tis strange that very few come over to any other colony besides this. They are desirous of more people in Maryland but few besides convicts are imported thither."⁵¹

In reference to a possibility of trouble with French and Indians Logan wrote to the Penns, "I have often told you that besides Palatines there are great numbers of wilful people from ye North of Ireland who have over run all ye back parts of the Province as far as Susquehanna . . . a Militia will become unavoidable for which these men are well fitted. Pray therefore consider how they are to be dealt with on account of ye Lands they possess. I am sure it will require ye utmost prudence & caution."⁵²

That this militia might have other useful purposes he had already indicated. He finally made the point in a succinct phrase (1731):

"Government without force is an absolute contradiction."⁵²

FORCE ON CONESTOGA MANOR

In January of 1728⁵³ James Logan slipped upon the ice in his own Philadelphia yard and broke the upper knuckle of his left thigh bone short off at its insertion into the socket. No surgeon in Philadelphia was able to find out what ailed him. It was not until eight or nine months later that he received the proper diagnosis by letter from his brother, a physician of Bristol, England. By that time the callous on both sides of the fracture had rendered it incurable. For the rest of his life he went on crutches. In a long business letter to the Penns. November 16, 1729, James Logan gave them a pathetic picture of his infirmity:

"I am no longer capable of anything; my Limb grows daily weaker & more troublesome; I neither am nor can ever be able to move one step without Crutches, and my strength sensibly decayes every way. Had not ye winter prevented I should now have been settled with my family on my Plantation, after which I shall rarely ever see Philadia. again."⁵⁴

For a man no longer capable of anything, James Logan, just one year later, set in motion a great deal of activity on Susquehanna. The day came for which he had organized Lancaster County. A group of landless Scotch-Irish built cabins on Conestoga Manor, the best unsettled land in the county, much of it his personal property. But Logan had "found the means to make a regulation amongst them and prevent a general combination." His Donegal men were ready and willing to go against their countrymen for his benefit.

At his new country home, Stenton, outside of Philadelphia, carefully

⁵¹ *Ibid.* 302.

⁵² Dickinson-Logan Letter Book. 1731-42, p. 9.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, p. 76.

⁵⁴ *Pa. Archives Series 2*, vol. 7, p. 129.

placed just north of the fortieth parallel,⁵⁵ James Logan was writing a letter to Thomas Penn on December 22, 1730, when he received news of the seizure of Conestoga Manor by the landless settlers. He hastily scribbled a P.S. to the letter:⁵⁶

"I have this minute an account that a parcel of disorderly People have now very lately possess'd themselves of all Conestoga Mannor (15,000 acres) part of it the best land in ye Province wch I reserved for you and none attempted to Settle before. In Short if speedy measures are not taken you may give up the country. This is the most audacious Attack that has ever yet been offer'd. They are of the Scotch-Irish so called here of whom J. Steel tells me you seem'd to have a pretty good opinion, but it is more than I have tho their Countryman."

Within twenty-four hours James Logan had dispatched letters to all the influential men of Donegal with explicit orders to evict the invaders of Conestoga Manor. To Andrew Cornish and John Postlethwaite, already magistrates in the new county, he sent a governor's commission and commission of the trustees appointing them overseers of Conestoga Manor. To each he sent a letter of instructions. He wrote to John Wright, member of assembly, to accompany the sheriff's posse as a magistrate. He wrote to Andrew Galbraith, the leading elder in the Donegal Church, and he wrote to the Presbyterian minister, James Anderson.⁵⁷

⁵⁵ Logan never lost sight of the fact that the Maryland charter gave the Lords Baltimore all land south of the 40th parallel of north latitude. He thought that when it came to a showdown Maryland might eventually obtain Philadelphia, and he wanted to be certain of being in Pennsylvania. The Rittenhouse habitation and some others were also placed just north of the 40th parallel.

⁵⁶ L. L. B. III, p. 334.

⁵⁷ In handling situations of this type James Logan had been developing a system, in which the minister of the Presbyterian congregation was a key figure. Faggs Manor, in Chester County, had presented a similar problem earlier in 1730. Writing about Faggs Manor Logan said "I suppose thou knows my rules have been of late years on the continued applications made by Strangers for land is Grant Liberty of Settling to some few of the best appearance to be Scattered in different parts in order to prevent a general combination in case all were to be treated alike hereafter . . . I have given Joseph Houston a Presbyterian Minister on the Borders an Expectation that he may have 300 acres . . . L. L. B. III, p. 358-9.

The way this policy worked is disclosed by a group of letters written earlier in the year to some presumptuous settlers who had settled on Faggs Manor after being ordered not to do so. Logan's letter to the settlers was enclosed in one to the minister, John Houston, who was asked to deliver it in person and to exert his influence in getting the men to move off. Logan spoke of his compassion for the "ignorance and poverty of these men of thy Congregation" and said he was giving the minister an opportunity to do something for those in whose welfare he was concerned by preventing their ruin. L. L. B. III, p. 150.

A short time later, after the minister had delivered the letter and spoken to the men Logan wrote to him, "For thy trouble taken herein I return thee my hearty thanks and shall always be ready to do thee any service consistent with my Duty. Thy request now made to be admitted a Purchaser of 2 or 300 acres in that manor I agree to, and would have thee as soon as may be pitch on ye place without interfering with other Surveys . . ." L. L. B. III, p. 154.

James Logan asked John Wright, as a magistrate, to be vigorous against the trespassers on Conestoga Manor. He said he had sent a Precept to the Sheriff, but said to Wright "you however must give him yours that what is done may be in ye course of law, and if founded on the law in general agst forcible Entries and Trespasses it may perhaps be better, than on that passed last year . . .

"P. S. Tis hoped the magistrates themselves will go on ye Manor accompanied with a large number of 50 at least, & I will pay for some liquor &c . . ."58

He immediately wrote a letter to Andrew Cornish: "Thou wilt receive an order from ye Governor to ye Magistrates there . . . in it . . . Thyself & John Postlethwait are named to take care of ye Mannor . . . I desire you would on this occasion . . . [and] hereafter appear concerned in it for the Proprietor . . . yet this is not to excuse thee from acting thy part as a magistrate . . . Pray dispatch the order to Jno Wright with notice to A. Galbraith & the Sheriff to meet John at Hempfield and let ye same person deliver these letters of mine enclosed . . . that to ye Minister as carefully as any . . ."59

Logan's explicit directions to Cornish and Postlethwaite advised less severity to settlers of longer standing:⁶⁰

"You will here receive the Commission from us the Trustees . . . appointing you overseers of Conestogoe Mannor of which you have also a Draught herewith as well as the Description of it in ye Body of the Commission, but tho this enjoins you to remove all persons whatsoever besides ["besides" here means "except"] Indians without exception Before you proceed with the older Settlers you had best only take an account of such as have actually been settled on it for some time past with their families & transmit their names to us the part of the Mannor they live on & the time of their Entry with some particular accot of ye persons themselves for some may have entered ignorantly & therefore may be intitled to more tenderness nor need you take any further notice of Ja. Patterson at present than to name him in your list and to caution him that he make no further wastes otherwise he will have the Less claim to favour. It may be adviseable also to encourage some of the older settlers to exert themselves in preventing others for this may probably recommend them . . ."

James Logan's agile pen was never more persuasive than in the letter he wrote to James Anderson, the Presbyterian minister at Donegal that twenty-third of December, 1730:⁶¹

Boyd, another Presbyterian minister, was also helpful to James Logan. "I once thought not only myself but the Governmt [Penn] obliged for ye endeavours he used on some Letters of mine to prevent disorders amongst the People of that neighborhood." [Western Chester Co.] "I must also say I take A. Boyd to be a man worth obliging and I have always found in all differences amongst those people their minister's sentiments are by much of the greatest weight and principally to be regarded." *Pa. Archives, Ser. 2, vol. 7, p. 154.*

⁵⁸ L. L. B. IV, p. 214.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.* p. 215.

⁶⁰ L. L. B. III. p. 168.

⁶¹ L. L. B. IV. p. 213.

"Since I first encouraged the Settlement of Donegal I have always had so Sincere a Regard to all such of my Countrey men in these parts as shew'd an honest upright Intention that I ever resolved to shew myself their true friend in what should be in my power with Justice to the Proprietor and others with whom they might be concern'd and tho at first some Irregularities to my no small uneasiness appeared amongst them yet by the tender and discreet methods that were taken they by ye good Providence of God have for some years past been in a great measure happily lay'd so that the Settlement has generally enjoy'd Peace amongst themselves and liv'd in good reputation amongst their neighbors. But now lately I have heard to my great Surprize that some of ye same Countrey from about Sohatará & ye Skirts of Donegal have been so audaciously impudent as to attempt a Settlement on Conestogoe Mannor regularly survey'd to the Proprietors use almost fifteen years Since and as duly bounded with lines as any other Tract in ye Province as if the Proprietor the Lord of ye whole Soil could have no private Property in it and He above all others in his own country were to be the most abused . . .

"Now the Insolence of this Act being so provoking that the Government for maintaining of Peace and supporting Justice & some good order in the Public must think itself concern'd to interpose and putt a timely stop to such outrages, and to proceed if there be a necessity for it to the utmost Extremity even to declare these men Rebels & Outlaws and to treat them as such by which they will be putt out of all protection of the Law. To prevent this I request thee as thy Christian Endeavors have hitherto been highly serviceable to they Hearers themselves as well as to the Publick Transquillity that thou wouldst advise & prevail with these unhappy People to desist in time & obey the Magistrates . . . The Indulgence that has hitherto been shewn these uppermost Settlers has been great but if they can make no better use of it they must be taught & feel how much they have been in the wrong.

"Some I hear have been so foolishly weak as to value themselves on their number but they will find themselves mistaken . . . as old Homer sayes: Justice is Sacred & will prevail. One man with this on his side is more powerful than many without it for even the consciences of Such fight against them and Possessions of Lands are not to be held by force tho Pirates & Robbers may carry off rich Booty But their families sink & sure Destruction follows where they have not Right for their foundation But I need not enlarge to thee on this head. The Reason of what I say is Sufficient and I know thy hearty Inclination to bring those who Err to a Sense of their Duty. It further concerns your whole Settlement whose Prosperity I have always had at heart as I have thine in particular being very sincerely Thy real loving friend . . ."

The recipient of this letter may have perceived the iron hand in the velvet glove, as well as the veiled threat to the Donegal settlement itself and the promise of reward to the minister.

Without laying down his quill pen James Logan addressed another urgent note to Andrew Galbraith, the ruling elder⁶¹ of the Donegal congrega-

tion, directing him to confer with the minister⁶² and then to "engage all those who would expect any regard or favour . . . to acquit themselves on this occasion as becomes honest men, so far as any of them may be called on." Logan advised that the minister and the ruling elder talk with the sheriff⁶³ "as early as may be & give him a just sense of his Duty that he may accordingly discharge it with honesty & vigour . . . these vile trespassers . . . must be effectually routed & their very foundations levell'd for such audacious attempt has seldom ever been known . . ."

When Logan addressed the proprietors again six days later he had not yet heard the result of his masterly stroke: "I wait with impatience to hear what is done with those Trespassers on Conestogoe Mannor, having immediately dispatched'd on ye first accot of it an Express with Ordrs from ye Governor to ye Magistrates & Sheriff to raise the Posse if necessary to remove them, for they gave out as we hear, that they would hold it by ye Sword."⁶⁴

In his spring letter to John Penn, Logan was able to report the happy consummation of the affair: "December last a body of Irish were resolved all together to settle Conestogoe Mannor by force alledging that it was against the Laws of God and Nature that so much Land should be idle while so many Christians wanted it to labour on and raise their Bread. We took measures effectually to defeat their purpose & by the Sherif of that County with a sufficient force had pulled down & burnt about 30 of their cabins . . ."⁶⁵

Successful in this master stroke, Logan in the same breath requested 2,000 acres in Conestoga Manor for himself, saying: "I think the reasonableness of my Claim is obvious as the whole was first survey'd and has since been secured for you by my care . . ."

James Logan's constant aim in land affairs during this period had been to maintain the theory that the proprietors had absolute ownership of every

⁶² Land Office Minutes 1726: James Anderson, the Presbyterian minister who formerly lived at New Castle "is desirous to settle among the people at Donnigall and therefore requests the grant of about 300 acres for a plantation. He having lived in repute amongst the people of New Castle may be of service to the people where he now is going to settle, for which reason Secretary Logan has ordered this entry to be made in his favor."

Sept. 21, 1736. Land Office Day Book shows that the 33 pounds, 10 shilling due on Anderson's acres at Marietta was exactly equalled by what the Proprietor said was "allowances for his (Anderson's) services" to him. Therefore Anderson did not have to pay a penny for his 300 acres. These two entries are quoted in *Pennsylvania Internal Affairs Monthly Bulletin* for March, 1954, p. 10.

Although in 1733 William Allen thought that James Anderson "had now very little interest or influence over the (people)" at Donegal (Pa. Archives, Series 2, vol. 7, p. 144) yet in 1736, just before the capture of Cresap, Logan suggested that Thomas Penn might find it advisable to talk to James Anderson, the minister at Donegal "at this time when those people ought by all means to be animated to vigorous resolutions." *Ibid.* p. 204.

⁶³ The sheriff at that time was John Galbraith. Lancaster County Road Docket No. 1. (Records of the Court of Quarter Sessions). Lancaster County Court House.

⁶⁴ Penn Papers, Official Correspondence II, p. 147.

⁶⁵ L. L. B. III, p. 339.

acre in Pennsylvania, that no settler had any right in the land without the proprietors' permission to settle and buy. He even maintained that when a man *had* been given permission to settle he had no right to dispose of his settlement without obtaining permission from the proprietors' trustees.⁶⁶

The crowds of landless settlers arriving from Europe developed a theory of their own. Their theory was that the first man to settle upon a tract and build a home there had the first right to buy it, regardless of what the proprietor might say. The opinion of the common man is found expressed in these words:

"In new settled colonies Possession and Improvement is the best Title any Man can have."⁶⁷

This quotation is from a printed brief I found at the Historical Society of Pennsylvania. The subject of the brief is an ejectment on Conestoga of Christian Stover vs. the Pennsylvania Land Company, to be heard by Council at the Cock-pit, London. The date is 1766. Christian Stover, the defendant, said that he had been settled on the land since 1720. The peoples' theory was to be tested in the highest English court. How this case turned out in London I have not discovered. It is an interesting point for further research.

But how the peoples' theory worked out in America is well known. As the Pennsylvania frontier crossed the Susquehanna and moved westward, at every step the man who wanted to build a home on just enough for his family found himself in conflict with the big city speculator whose ambition was for thousands and eventually millions of acres to hold and dole out at his will and his own price to the thronging settlers. The plans of speculation grew larger and larger. London became the center of the fever for ownership of land on the Wabash . . . Vandalia, the Grand Ohio Company—these vast projects for land profits were reaching dizzy heights in Philadelphia and London in 1774. It is curious that the history books over-emphasize taxation and tea. The riflemen from the western waters were fighting for their own piece of western land free from great city overlords.

With the Declaration of Independence in 1776 the London land companies blew up. At the same time Pennsylvania ceased to be a proprietorship and became a commonwealth. But the struggle between the settler and the land speculator did not end with the Revolution. The center of speculation was merely transferred from London to the eastern cities of America.

In 1838, over a hundred years after the burning of the cabins on Conestoga Manor, a bill was being argued in the U. S. Congress called the Pre-emption Act. The United States Government was now the greatest land owner,

⁶⁶ May 20, 1730: "Brown's sales are of no matter of validity for tho he might have liberty to settle *himself* he had no right to dispose [of *his*] settlement without ye approbation of those from whom he first obtained leave to sitt down himself." L. L. B. III, pp. 156-7.

March 2. 1731: to James Anderson at Donegal, "You are all sensible that no man has any right to the Privilege of purchasing the Land he has improved who enter'd not on it at first either directly by Licence from the commissioners or otherwise had their Settlement pointed out to them by those of your Township who by our approbation took that charge upon them." L. L. B. III, p. 170.

⁶⁷ Penn Mss. Pa. Land Grants 1681-1806, p. 213, 215.

the public lands were looked upon as a source of government revenue. Terms of purchase had been made easy by acts of 1800 and 1820, but the squatter, the man who settled on land without title, had not yet received official recognition. Muzzey says, "The Westerner believed that the moral, if not the legal title to the land belonged to the man who settled and developed it, and not to the speculator in some Eastern city."⁶⁸

Concerning the Preemption Act James Buchanan, senator from Pennsylvania, made a speech on the floor of the Senate in January 1838.⁶⁹ Mr. Buchanan said that the question was one in which the government had but little, if any pecuniary interest. "It was a question between the actual settler on the one side, and the organized bands of speculators which attended the land sales on the other. It was notorious—it had often been established on this floor—that these speculators, acting in concert had prevented bidding above the minimum price, and had purchased our most valuable lands at a dollar and a quarter per acre. If the settlers should not obtain these lands at this price, the speculators would. This was the alternative."

Mr. Buchanan said that he "should always lean to that side which would protect the poor man in the possession of the land which he had rendered valuable by the sweat of his brow, rather than in favor of those who had come from a distance to purchase him out of house and home."

Mr. Buchanan took his stand especially against an amendment to the bill which would have made a distinction between native-born citizens and foreigners who had settled upon the public lands. He said, "in the darkest days of the Revolution, who had assisted us in fighting our battles and achieving our independence? Foreigners; yes sir, foreigners."

The senator from Kentucky sounded remarkably like Mr. James Logan when he asked Mr. Buchanan if he would compare the hordes of *foreign paupers* that are constantly flooding our shores, with the de Kalbs, the Steubens, the LaFayettes and the Pulaskis of the Revolution?

Mr. Buchanan replied that "these were *leaders* of our armies, but what could they have done without soldiers? Was it not a fact known to the world, that the emigrants from the Emerald Isle—that land of brave hearts and strong arms—had shed their blood freely in the cause of our liberty and independence? It was now both ungrateful and unjust to speak of these people, in the days of our prosperity, as *hordes of foreign paupers*. Such was not the language applied to them during the Revolutionary War, when they constituted a large and effective proportion of our armies."

In 1841 Congress passed the Preemption Act, which allowed the squatter to purchase the land on which he had settled, at the minimum price, before it was up for public auction.

Is it possible—can it be—that one of the *bold and indigent strangers* whose cabin was burned on Conestoga Manor in 1730 might have been named *Buchanan*?

⁶⁸ Muzzey, D. S. *History of the American People*, Ginn & Co. 1929, p. 324.

⁶⁹ Horton, R. G. *Life & Public Services of James Buchanan*. Derby & Jackson, N. Y. 1856, p. 239 *et sequi*.

The burning of the cabins on Conestoga Manor is an incident significant, not only as a point of local history, but as the first clear-cut example of a technique followed by later proprietary agents, such as Richard and William Peters, in dealing with settlers whom they wished to prevent from settling upon the best western land which they planned to reserve in manors. It is a story that can be followed in successive stages across Pennsylvania from the Brandywine to Redstone. It is a story that holds in it a powerful germ of the American Revolution.

The Conestoga incident receives merely passing mention in Shepherd (*History Proprietary Government in Pa.* n. p. 546-7) and Lincoln (*Revolutionary Movement in Pa.* n.p. 33) both of whom cite *Watson's Annals* as their source and use the episode to illustrate the Scotch-Irish disregard for Indian rights. It is probable, however, as Miss Elizabeth C. Kieffer has pointed out to me since the reading of this paper, that the Presbyterian congregation of Derry, just above Donegal, may have been made up of the settlers whose cabins were burned on Conestoga Manor. This congregation, in 1732, made over to their new pastor, Mr. Bertram and his heirs "their right & title to ye Plantaon [Plantation] commonly called ye Indian Town, purchased from ye Indians . . ." (Klett, *Presbyterians in Colonial Pennsylvania*, p. 111, quoting Minutes of Donegal Presbytery.) As the best-known Indian Town was upon the Conestoga Manor, it may be that the Derry congregation had taken care to purchase the Indian rights before making their ill-fated settlement in 1730. In that case the only right they had flouted was the proprietors'.

The story of the Proprietors' determined struggle to purchase all pre-emption rights from the Indians and prevent settlers from making individual Indian land purchases is another extremely interesting chapter of Pennsylvania colonial history yet to be written. Pennsylvania traditional history has repeated over and over again the story of the Scotch-Irish contempt for Indian rights to the lands, failing to observe that, in many cases, it was *the Proprietors' right to purchase all Indian title* that the frontiersman resented not the Indians themselves. Development of this thesis will throw an interesting light upon some exciting episodes in our early history.

H. J. Ford (*The Scotch-Irish in America*, Princeton U. 1915, p. 271) also mentions the invasion of Conestoga Manor in passing, but he points out a danger inherent in the Proprietary system which caused the invasion: "It was the policy of Penn and his associates to make large reservations for themselves . . . If their desires had been gratified there might have developed in Pennsylvania a tenant system with absentee landlords like that from which Ireland is now extricating itself. The chief instrument by which this system was frustrated seems to have been the Scotch-Irish." (p. 272-2).

I have found no reference to the burning of the cabins on Conestoga Manor in any local historical work except Martin Herwin Brackbill's paper on *The Manor of Conestoga in the Colonial Period*. He mentions it only in a footnote, pages 23-24, and for source of information on burning the cabins he refers to "details . . . which have been handed down by tradition." He cites as confirmation of the tradition the Day Book of James Steel, Receiver General

of the Province 1730-33, entry of April 15, 1730: "Acct. of charges dr. to cash—3 pounds, 15 shillings pd. John Postlethwaite for John Galbreath's account of expenses in dislodging the people out of the Manor of Conestoga." Brackbill concludes that this incident took place *before* the formation of the county. A re-check of the Day Book may show that the date of the entry should read *1731* instead of *1730*.

The episode is not mentioned in Dunaway's *History of Pennsylvania*, although he does mention it briefly in his *History of the Scotch-Irish in Pennsylvania*, with correct dating.

Guy S. Klett's *Presbyterians in Colonial Pennsylvania*, gives an apologetic page to this Conestoga Manor story, referring to original sources in the Logan Papers.