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Introduction

What does it mean to grow up in a Quaker community- at home, at school, and in the weekly meeting- and what happens when external events challenge the values and the identities learned in these institutions? Through the lens of the development of two young men raised in Quaker families, with a long-standing tradition in the Society of Friends, this essay explores the context of family life and a college founded by and for Quakers, Haverford College, as the conflict between the southern slave states and the northern non-slave states erupted in Civil War, spurring a “crisis” within the Society of Friends. There were three main contexts that formed the world of young people going to Haverford during this time, the boys themselves and their familial background, the “guarded and liberal education” of Haverford College, and the wider Quaker community in which they were raised. A look at the lives of two bright young Haverford students from Quaker families, one of whom went on to fight in the war while the other did not, encourages us to look at influences beyond their common background, that shaped their attitudes about the war and other external events. This leads us to question to what extent growing up in a Quaker community influenced the view of the outside world by these two men and their peers at Haverford.

Placing two Haverford students, Benjamin Hayes Smith and William Morrison Coates, in the context of their life at home, at college, and in the larger social, political, and economic tensions of the Civil War, gives us a sense of the world they grew up in, and the expectations and values by which they lived their lives. These young men had grown up in a part of the Philadelphia area Quaker community in households of Friends. Although there is no evidence that Benjamin and William were formal members of a Quaker meeting, they grew up with the values and expectations of their respective families, reflected in the fact that both boys received a
“guarded Quaker education” and went on to pursue similar careers and interests as their Quaker fathers.

The boys went to college to learn, and to live in a community steeped in the values of their families. Not surprisingly, the leaders of Haverford College had strict moral and academic expectations of their young students, and did not intend for Haverford to be all fun and games. Although open to students from other denominations, the main goal of Haverford’s Board of Directors was to provide a “guarded and liberal education” to the sons of Friends. This education was, most significantly, based upon a social emphasis on protecting young and fragile Christians from the corrupting influences of the outside world. The task of the faculty was to provide an academically superior classical liberal curriculum, although they were limited in what they could teach by the strictures of the Board, who demanded that the course material fit the Orthodox Quaker-based moral standards of the college. Fortified with such an education one of these Haverford alums went to war, and one did not.

Chapter One focuses on the policies of Haverford College, as an institution representing and purportedly teaching Quaker principles. Of primary interest will be the actions and concerns of the Board of Managers and the faculty in response to the outbreak of the Civil War, as recorded in Board of Manager minutes and other outside sources. The Board’s censures, recommendations, and implementation of rules exhibit their thought processes in preserving Christian principles and the Quaker peace testimony amongst Haverford’s students during a time when they thought that the college’s young men were under dangerous and immoral pressures.

Chapter Two looks at Haverford’s “official” histories, seeking clues of how the College’s collected memories of its history and mission address the emotionally loaded events of America’s Civil War years. The ways in which Haverford College’s several histories have
treated the period of the Civil War era is diverse and quite interesting, which I discuss in Chapter Three. Creating history is an ongoing process, and as the college has changed since 1833, its vision of itself and the vision of the eminent figures at Haverford who have written the college histories also changed. As time has passed, the college’s history during the Civil War has become increasingly deemphasized. I will look at why more recent college histories have reinterpreted Haverford’s formative years, downplaying the more troublesome Civil War era.

An anti-slavery posture is frequently associated with the Society of Friends- both the “Orthodox” and “Hicksite” branches that resulted from a bitter schism that occurred among Friends during the era of American history known as the Second Great Awakening.¹ In order to exemplify the enclosed environment of Haverford College on young Christian lives in the 1860s, we examine in Chapter Three the diaries of Benjamin Hayes Smith and William Morrison Coates. A closer look at the lives of these young men challenges the notion that Haverford’s students were completely protected from the world around them. While some students were concerned mostly with classes and being able to go sledding during the winters, others were deeply impacted by the conflict. Some students, such as Benjamin Smith, would go on to participate in the war effort. This indicates that Haverford students were not immune to the external pressures forced upon them by the war and the outside world, no matter how protected they were by their Quaker parents, the college’s guarded education and controlled curriculum, and the pacifist urgings of its professors.

Chapter Four situates William Morrison Coates and Benjamin Hayes Smith within their families, both of which had deep-rooted Quaker traditions in the Philadelphia area dating to the

¹ Despite the official stance of the Society and the majority of members, there were many Friends on both sides of the conflict who opposed slavery. The Orthodox-Hicksite schism was partly about the methods and ways that individuals could use to oppose it. For more information read H. Larry Ingle’s Quakers in Conflict. For more information on the Second Great Awakening read Chapter 26 of Sydney Ahlstrom’s A Religious History of the American People.
17th century. We investigate the Quaker traditions and values of both families, one of which was Orthodox (the Coates family) and the other Hicksite (the Smith family), the two branches of the Society of Friends which resulted from the 1827 schism. The strong degree to which career and outside interests were passed on to Coates and Smith by their families is of considerable interest, as this familial context influenced and shaped the worldviews of young men who attended Haverford College and went on to successful careers and public lives.

The Smiths and the Coates were only two of the many Quaker families struggling with moral and spiritual questions related to the breakup of the Union and the breakout of Civil War. Chapter Five takes a look at the Quaker community and the conflicts brought about by slavery, the breakup of the union, and Civil War. Friends had to decide which was more important, the Society’s peace testimony or their desire to help rid the nation of slavery. They looked for the answer to this dilemma as well as other related questions amidst the conflict of obeying the peace testimony of the Orthodox and Hicksite branches of the Society versus complying with government pressure to fight to protect the Union. In this chapter, of particular importance were the vigorous contemporary debates occurring over these issues among both Orthodox and Hicksite Friends. An investigation of Quaker publications *The Friend* (for Orthodox Friends) and *The Friends Intelligencer* (for Hicksite Friends) further reveals a sense of crisis in some corners of the Society as Friends attempted to hash out where they stood on the complicated issues raised by the peace testimony, opposition to abolition and loyalty to the Union.

Friends were not alone in advocating for a peaceful revolution to the debate over slavery prior to the Civil War. Chapter Six seeks to address the larger debate regarding the Society’s conflicting beliefs in abolition and pacifism in the overall context of the other religions and numerous non-sectarian peace movements that advocated in the mid-19th century. Many
Quakers were important figures in America’s wider peace movement, and thereby drew the anger of more conservative members of the faith who saw no need for the “corrupting influences” of outsiders, even if they held seemingly congruous beliefs. The chapter also addresses the strengths and the weaknesses of the secondary literature of Quaker pacifism in the 19th century, concluding that there is much more work to be done.

While William Morrison Coates and Benjamin Hayes Smith’s lives do not completely represent a microcosm of the “Haverford experience” in the late 1850s and early 1860s, they do represent two very different paths that students could choose to take in a time when the external pressures of national crisis threatened some of the basic foundations of the Quaker community. These boys are seemingly far away from the larger debates going on in society and blissfully unaware of the realities and consequences of Civil War, until they see trains filled with troops rolling by the college. Events such as these forced them to deal with issues such as whether or not they should participate in flag-raising and other demonstrations at the college. Despite these minor conflicts while many young men their age were fighting and dying to protect the union, the fact remained that many Haverford College students spent winters mainly concerned with mastering Tacitus and sledding with their friends.

This was the intention of the Board of Directors. The mission of Haverford from its creation in 1833 was to provide a higher education that Quaker parents could be confident was not polluted by the corrupting influences of immoral teaching and influences. The Board, sought to create a “guarded” but “liberal” curriculum that kept students on campus, where following the model of the Quaker grammar schools such as Westtown near Philadelphia, Quaker morals and a classical education could be safely ensured. Actually providing such an education as the rhetoric
suggested, not surprisingly, would prove to be more difficult than the Board of Directors imagined.
Haverford College was a very different place in the 1800s than it is today or was in the 20th century as indicated in the above excerpt of an address given by William Brown to the Haverford School Association in 1833. It was comprised of three different groups during the Civil War era, with their own separate goals and agendas that in different ways contributed to the environment on campus. There was the Board of Directors, responsible for creating and maintaining the viability of the college, whose primary interest was providing a protective educational experience for students that prevented them from being corrupted by the outside world. The Board was motivated by two main interests: establishing a positive reputation for Haverford College and ensuring a steady stream of students which would, in turn, ensure a healthy budget.

There was also the faculty, comprised mostly of Friends, whose mission was to provide the sort of classical liberal education by the best Greek and Roman scholars- except for those subjects that interfered with accepted Quaker moral and spiritual standards. They attempted to provide the best education possible to their students within the strict religiously-informed curriculum standards set by the Board. Then, finally, there were the students, eager to learn but even more eager to enjoy freedom away from their (usually strict and Quaker) families, play with their friends, and occasionally pull pranks and cause mischief. The ways in which the desires and goals of these three groups interacted, conflicted, and were resolved determined how Haverford College evolved through the 19th century and the experience that the students received.

---

The leaders of Haverford College before and during the Civil War were, like their peers at other universities and colleges, supremely concerned with discipline and morality. If Haverford College was to be successful as an institution run mainly by and for Friends, these two elements would certainly play an important role. Toward meeting these goals, the board created a curriculum, and instituted other disciplinary structures that placed emphasis on a “liberal and guarded education”. The Haverford experience in the Civil War era, as intended by the Board of Managers and the faculty, was sheltered and strictly supervised, to “protect” young students from the immorality of the outside world. The degree to which this effort was successful could be considered mixed at best.

A concern for the morality and discipline of Quaker children was a fundamental reason behind the creation of Haverford College, as early as two years before the college’s doors opened. At a meeting of the managers of the Friends Central School Association dated 3d mo 12 1831, Charles Yarnall wrote in his letter to the Board of Managers of the association titled Outline of Instruction, Plan of Buildings for the School that “it is our decided conviction that all the students should be carefully instructed in the doctrines of Christianity as held by our religious society, and in the nature and grounds of our peculiar testimonies”.4

Important Friends, concerned with the way their children were being taught and disciplined, meant to create an atmosphere that they deemed appropriate to their belief system. Parents were unhappy with both the curriculum and the methods of discipline used by “mixed schools” (schools in which Quaker students were mixed with those of other backgrounds), and were deeply concerned that their children did not seem to be exhibiting the sort of values that

---

they expected. It was assumed that a properly moral education would produce the desired results of children not being contaminated by the bad influences of the outside world, as described in the address of the Managers of the Haverford School Association to the public in 1833.

If an institution were once founded, which should carry out to the completion of the education, so well begun in the Yearly Meeting schools, of combining sound literary instruction with a strict guard over the morals and manners, and a careful seclusion of the temptations inherent to mixed schools… Friends’ children are at this time receiving their education at colleges and academies, amidst associations calculated to lead them from the simplicity of their profession, surrounded by examples of dissipation and extravagance, which no pious parent can witness without pain.\(^5\)

While these words were written when the school was to boast an all-Quaker student body, which would itself become more “mixed” after the college briefly closed due to financial concerns in the 1840s, the emphasis of providing a moral education for Quaker children continued to be reflected in the discipline and the curriculum of the college through the Civil War era.

The moral education that Haverford College was intended to provide was rooted in two elements- an education that was (as described in the address of the Managers of the Board) more “liberal” and more “guarded” than other institutions.\(^6\) Note that the Board and particularly the faculty wished to give the students a classic “liberal” education not in a 20\(^{th}\) century political sense, but in the sense of that expounded on by Aristotle and Plato and acclaimed by Roman scholars, emphasizing grammar, math, science, formal logic, and the languages. Accomplishing this goal was made difficult, particularly in the subject of English, due to the Society of Friends’ prohibition against fiction and other “corrupting” books on moral grounds. The faculty had to teach English while eschewing Shakespeare, Dickens, and most of what we consider today to be the typical English canon.

Thus the curriculum of the College was to be founded on religious and liberal principles that were not always in harmony. These apparent conflicts were resolved in rhetoric at least by

---

6 Ibid. Page 1.
emphasizing the pragmatism of the College’s education, which was not reflective of many universities and colleges at the time. The Board, who did not “aim so much to make brilliant scholars of our pupils as to turn out serious, reflecting, and useful men”,\textsuperscript{7} took the matter of creating the curriculum very seriously and their goals at times do not sound so different from the goals of the curriculum of Haverford today:

> The acquisition of knowledge valuable for its own sake, is chiefly to be prized as the measure by which incomparably more important objects- the cultivation of the mental powers, and the formation of correct principles and habits… those parts of human knowledge must be selected… which is most strengthening to the faculties and the application most useful in the affairs of life. These have been decided to be… the abstract and natural science and the languages.\textsuperscript{8}

A typical course in English literature was omitted. Instead, the Minutes of the Committee on Instruction from 1866-1872 notes that the English curriculum focused on grammar, including such fascinating works as Dymond’s Essays and the Philological Study of the English Language, which fortunately for the students were replaced by newer (and hopefully more interesting) grammar books in 1868.\textsuperscript{9}

This lack of an English literature course was very important to many Friends, particularly those who were strongly critical of fiction, and any other writing outside the Bible and religiously-affiliated publications such as The Friend. Many Quakers worried that teaching books that emphasized more uncomfortable aspects of the secular world, such as sex, lying, and fiction, were corrosive to a person’s moral character and should thus be avoided.\textsuperscript{10} The Board wished to address this concern during the creation of Haverford by prohibiting such immoral material in its address to the public, taking the opportunity to make explicit its unabashed condemnation of some material taught in “mixed” colleges:

\textsuperscript{7} Ibid. Pages 4-5.
\textsuperscript{8} Ibid. Page 3.
\textsuperscript{9} “Minutes of the Committee on Instruction, 1866-1872”. 15d 9 mo 1868.
It is true that some of the writings of the heathens are tainted with the impurity of their superstition… These offensive books are to form no portion of the course of study in our school; for it is intended carefully to exclude them.\textsuperscript{11}

The Board thus made it clear what was and was not acceptable at Haverford from the very beginning. Over time, however, the members of the Faculty at the college changed. While the basic curriculum did not change, individual professors were successfully able to incorporate some of their own material. This did not usually merit much attention from either the students or the faculty, as the overall course syllabi did not change significantly.\textsuperscript{12}

This changed, however, when it became clear that Faculty members were taking extreme latitudes with the curriculum, and teaching material that related directly and indirectly to the ongoing Civil War. Such activity culminated in the reading and discussion of the merits of President Lincoln’s Emancipation Proclamation. These acts, in conjunction with other “abuses”, caused the Board of Members to take the extreme step of rebuking the Faculty as a whole in a board meeting held on 2d mo. 5, 1864. Included in this address to the faculty was the following excerpt:

…Books of an infidel, immoral, or otherwise injurious tendency, of everything which tends to promote a military spirit, whether in the form of addresses or papers directly or indirectly advocating war, or the practice of cheering companies of soldiers as they pass along in the railroad cars, the display of pictures in their dormitories inconsistent with the position of the College as under the control of the Society of Friends, and the advocacy of views in regard to religion and morals among the students inconsistent the with established views of Friends…\textsuperscript{13}

This rebuke, forwarded on to the Faculty, was a tacit acknowledgment that discussion of the war in anything but distinctly critical terms was forbidden by the faculty. It also reflected the fear amongst the Board of Members that any even-handed assessment of the merits of war could have potentially disastrous effects on the young people whom they were entrusted. In the case of

\textsuperscript{11}“Address of the Managers of the Haverford School Association”. Page 5.
\textsuperscript{13}“Minutes of the Board of Managers of Haverford College”. 2d 5 mo., 1864.
some former students such as Benjamin Hays Smith, such an attempt at damage control was too late.

The curriculum as directed by the Board attempted to aid Quaker families in raising model young Friends, and shield them from the immorality taught in “mixed” schools. Of course, teaching young Friends the most useful knowledge possible was useless if they could not prevent the incorrigible from running amok about the college. Therefore, discipline (or the “guarded” part of the education) was from the beginning always linked with liberal educational theory as being essential for the success of Haverford College,

An early report of the Managers of the Haverford School Association from 1837 shows the early emphasis on discipline made by the Board, as well as the submissiveness of the students. There is little doubt that a main element of the “guarded” education was protecting students from their worst instincts, and this led to the concern with subduing the students, a common concern amongst educators during the 19th century. This is revealed in the following excerpt, despite its positive comments:

Of the discipline of the school, it is satisfies the Board to… speak in terms of commendation; a firm but mild and conciliating demeanor on the part of the teachers, has been almost uniformly met by a prompt compliance with the regulations; and it as easy, as it is gratifying, to perceive that the confidence and respect of the students have been secured as well as their submission.

Haverford College, if unique in terms of its curriculum, was not going to dismiss older ideals of discipline linked with proper, moral behavior, as evidenced in how it implemented its ideas of the “guarded education”.

This emphasis, evident from the very formation of the college, strengthened as the school grew and the practical difficulties of day-to-day administration became evident. An excerpt from A History of a Small College, written by a group of Haverford alumni in 1893, includes an

14 Thelin. Pages 74-75.
amusing example of the tug-of-war that occasionally erupted between the administration and the students. In 1860 all students except seniors were not allowed to step foot off campus for a month after “an unusual disorder and the difficulty of detecting the offender”. The students were apparently punished harshly because someone had placed some chickens on the second floor of Founders Hall, and much fun was made of the “animated efforts of the tall and elderly governor to catch them”.

The effort to maintain discipline became a more serious concern of the Board as students engaged in activities related to the Civil War during the 1860s. The Board and college authorities were perturbed at the active participation of students at flag raisings, as well as their constant watching of the transportation of troops from the nearby train tracks, among other “disturbances”. The displeasure of the Board of Directors was probably exacerbated by their observation of other disturbing trends occurring at the time as a result of the war. There was a drop of 10 students; “owing largely to the war” from 1860 to 1861, and the loss of tuition had a distressing impact on the college’s budget.

To some it appeared that the college was in the midst of a crisis, and the Board of Directors determined to dispel such notions in 1861 after observing some of the activities of the students on campus. As the northern states and the Union army prepared for war, the Board of Managers worried about the perceived “escalation” of pro-Union and war sentiment on campus, and the Battle of Fort Sumter apparently forced the body to take action. Two weeks after the battle, the Board explicitly asked Haverford College students to uphold the principles of Christianity, the Quaker peace testimony, and refrain from participating in the war effort. A minute dated 5th mo., 3 d., 1861 states:

---

17 Ibid. Page 297.
18 Ibid. Page 300.
The Managers feeling the importance at this time of commotion of maintaining the character of our institution as designed for the guarded religious education of the sons of Friends consistently with our Christian principles and testimonies, conclude to record on their minutes, and to communicate to the Faculty their earnest desire that all connected with the college may endeavor, as far as possible, to restrain all undue excitement, and specially to avoid any participation in measures tending to compromise our testimony against war, or which is likely to be so understood, and to cherish a quiet and forbearing spirit, and to place their trust, in times of public danger and private distress, in the superintending Providence of their Heavenly Father, rather than anything tending to violence or bitterness of spirit toward any class of their fellow men.19

Accompanying this proclamation was a renewed profession of emphasis on Discipline in the school. This prevailing mantra of the day resulted in “Discipline” becoming one of the first concerns of the “fresh and stringent” rules enacted at Haverford in 1861 by new Superintendent William Forster Mitchell with the permission of the Board of Directors.

These new rules included stipulations that students who lived in Philadelphia were not allowed to leave campus to travel home even once a term, with no exceptions allowed except for “very urgent circumstances, such as the serious illness, death or marriage of someone in the immediate family”.20 Another new rule stipulated that members of the Board were obligated to check every student’s trunks before they entered the college. Finally, the most stringent rule required that no more than two students were allowed to converse together before and after class time, because larger groups were seen to “incite trouble”.21 Another important element was that Forster now lived near the college in Founders Hall, in order to prevent “any drawback upon the regularity and efficiency of the discipline”. An excerpt from A History of Haverford College makes it clear that his attempts at stricter discipline during this period, although no doubt made with good intentions, were an unequivocal failure:

His previous work had been among younger boys and of a humbler class than Haverford students. Severe punishments were routinely inflicted, but it was impossible to maintain discipline under the system. There was still something to be learned by the Managers and the Faculty.22

---

19 “Minutes of the Haverford College Board of Managers”. 3d 5 mo., 1861. Haverford College Archives.
20 A History of Haverford College for the First Sixty Years of its Existence. Page 301.
21 Ibid Page 301.
22 Ibid. Page 303.
Forster’s limitations eventually became clear to the Managers and Faculty, who excused him as early as 1864, but it is clear to at least some that during this period Haverford’s “guarded” education became a bit too constricted for its own good. Students were accustomed to a certain degree of autonomy and playfulness that was difficult to crush with an iron fist.

The creation of the “Haverbubble”, a term students use today to describe a perceived feeling of insulation from news and life off-campus, was a goal of the Haverford Board of Directors during the 1860s. We have seen that this emphasis emanated from the very foundations of the college and followed the Quietist bent of many Orthodox leaders and those most responsible for the founding of the College. The members of the Board, as morally upstanding Friends, wished to prevent their students from participating in the sort of patriotic fervor and romantization of war that they felt endangered the students’ commitment to Christian principles.

The fact that this was the intent of the Board of Managers and the Faculty, however, does not mean that the institution was necessarily successful in producing a “Christian ethic”, or engendering Quaker principles in the minds of its young men. The story of the chickens is one of many stories of pranks and tricks pulled by students during the Civil War period. One other notable offender among many was Frank Sharpless, who was caught taking the linens off the beds of freshman, pouring acid in zinc-filled test tubes on freshman while they were sleeping, and building a fire of fence rails near the train tracks.23 A History of Haverford College for the First Sixty Years chronicles the furor such incidents caused amongst the administration. The book also notes that harsh penalties against those responsible for these events did not prevent the outside world from seeping into the lives of its young, “guarded” students:

23 “Minutes of the Committee on Instruction”. 1866-1872.
These incidents [pranks] seem very trifling now, but it was an era of small things. They are cited to illustrate the effect of harsh discipline upon the average young man. The age of the students was still some years below that of today, and the course of instruction was lower. The little community, moreover, was more interested in watching the great struggle for the suppression of slavery and the preservation of the Union than the progress of education.  

This raises the question of how exactly the Civil War permeated the smaller world of the college and touched the lives of students. The majority of students, it seems, continued their college experience relatively untouched by the war, although they might abstractly grapple with ideas of rights for African-Americans, comment on the viability of states’ rights and secession, or catch a sight of President Lincoln passing through Haverford via train. Although most students continued in this way and abided by the peace testimony, maintaining Quaker principles, there were “notable exceptions” who fought in the war, noted by President Sharpless in his history of the college. Some went off and fought in the war and other could no longer afford tuition, which was reflected in the drop in attendance from sixty to fifty between 1860 and 1861.

During the Civil War era, each of the three major forces on Haverford’s campus (the administration, faculty, and the students) had different interpretations of the “guarded and liberal” philosophy underlying the education at Haverford. Each of these groups, even the students, was successful to some extent in maintaining autonomy and realizing their goals, although each would be occasionally reined in by the other groups. Negotiation of power took place on a day to day basis as the faculty manipulated the curriculum, the students tricked the faculty and administration and pulled pranks, and the Board of Managers used their power to censure the students when violations were deemed to be egregious.

This leaves open the question of how the college, as it continued to grow in size, prestige, and sophistication has developed since the Civil War years and how it has chosen to remember

---

and memorialize this significant period in the college’s history. A look at the several histories of Haverford College provides an interesting perspective into how authors and prominent figures of the college’s history interpreted the events of this period and how it fits into the more modern vision of what Haverford is and what Haverford is supposed to be.
Haverford College Histories and Interpretations of the Troublesome Civil War Era

There are four histories of Haverford College, the first of which was written in 1893, and the latest of which was written in 1983. These histories reflect the interest of the college in providing a narrative of its existence and an anthology of its development as an elite institution of higher education. Even when covering the same periods of time, each treatise emphasizes different aspects of the college’s history, and has its own subtleties and nuances in interpretation. These histories reflect the authors’ (who were distinguished members of the Haverford community) vision of what Haverford was and how it should be represented, and thus provide an interesting perspective of the college’s definition of its past.

A look at how the Haverford College histories treat the controversies of the Civil War years is very illuminating. History is often distorted, reflecting the biases and conventional wisdom of the era in which the historian lives. After the Civil War many Americans wanted to “get beyond” the bad taste the war had left in their mouths, and it seems to some extent post-Civil War Haverford was not totally immune from this feeling.

The troublesome issues facing the college during the Civil War period, of course, are not harmonious with Haverford’s vision of itself as providing a “liberal and guarded education” to its students. As Haverford’s history has developed, the message that the college is sending to its alumni, students, prospective students, and the surrounding community today is different than it was in the mid 1800s or even the 20th century. How the college histories treat the controversial period of the Civil War years (what they say, how they say it, and what they do not say) are all important in determining how the college viewed itself and its legacy.

Haverford College histories do not consistently locate the institution within the debates concerning Quaker education, pacifism, and the Civil War that occurred in the Society of Friends.
during the 1850s and 1860s. The historical commentary on the impact of the Civil War on campus life reveals that a degree of historiographical evolution has taken place, resulting in an emphasis on the principles of the “guarded education” for good Christian children that the college was founded on, while excluding the traumatizing effects that the war had on college finances, the student body, faculty, and administration.

This focus on downplaying the Civil War dominated the “official” college histories despite evidence in the college’s own archives and Board of Managers’ minutes that the Civil War caused a significant disturbance in the college. Haverford’s earliest college history, the one written in the 19th century, explicitly acknowledges this fact. Therefore it is surprising—perhaps disturbing—that recent Haverford histories omit the fact that members of the administration, faculty, and students, both Quaker and non-Quaker, felt certain pressures as the debate over slavery and the union heated up and culminated in the war itself. Haverford has, maybe unintentionally, distanced itself from its own history during the Civil War and antebellum periods.

Haverford histories in the 20th century have increasingly intimated that the 19th century “Haverbubble” was so powerful that contemporary Board members and students were either uninterested or incubated from these forces. The primary and most recent example of this trend is the excerpt on the period written by Stephen Cary Kannerstein’s *The Spirit and the Intellect* (1983). Unaware of the Board of Managers’ minutes of the era, it asserts that the college and specifically the Board of Managers were too focused on establishing itself financially and academically to be concerned with anything occurring off campus, apparently including the Civil War. The book states that “events outside had little impact on its cloistered Quaker world, and
Haverford in turn showed little concern for the wars, depressions, and famines of the 19th century”.

Isaac Sharpless’ The History of a Small College, written in 1918, devotes five pages to the growth of cricket at the college from the 1850s to 1870s but only two concerning the impact of the Civil War. He recites the Friends’ official position vis-à-vis the war, summarized by the peace testimony. He notes the sympathies of President Lincoln with the Quakers, only cryptically mentioning that “there were breaks among the younger men and the military records of certain Haverford men were conspicuous”.

Reaching further back in time, however, we find a different story being told. A History of Haverford College for the First Sixty Years of its Existence, written in 1892, reveals that the Civil War actually had a tremendous impact on the college. It mentions the concerns of the Haverford Board of Managers and superintendents during the Civil War period with attendance, patriotism amongst students, and regard for the peace testimony. The author notes the college’s concerns with student discipline, recorded in official minutes in the Board of Managers meetings distributed to the faculty. These concerns culminated in the creation of stringent rules designed to prevent Haverford students from embracing dangerous feelings of patriotism that were felt to be invading the college. There was also a drop in enrollment, apparently “owing largely to the war”, from sixty in 1860 to fifty in 1861, showing that a lack of student regard for the peace testimony could have a drastic impact on the future of the college. As a result of the decreased attendance and unpaid tuition payments, the war also had a distressing impact on the college’s received tuition payments and financial situation during this period.

---

29 A History of Haverford College for the First Sixty Years of its Existence. Page 300.
The omission of the troublesome impact of the Civil War on the student body, faculty, and administration in more recent Haverford College histories may be related to the evolution of the college’s vision of itself and its history as reflected in the authors’ writings. As the college moved through the 20th century, there developed a romantic- but inaccurate- notion of the “guarded education” that college leaders attempted to provide students during most of the 19th century. The College and the Society of Friends were very different at that time than in the 1860s, and their familiarity with the troublesome period may have ebbed as alumni tended to look back more fondly on “the good old days”.

The omission of the Civil War turmoil from the College’s official histories is particularly surprising in light of the increasingly proactive role the college would take in addressing troublesome issues in the 20th century. The significant achievements of the college during the First World War, such as founding the American Friends Service Committee with Rufus Jones at its head, and of the Society as a whole, with Friend Herbert Hoover leading the United States Food Administration, seemed in stark contrast to their performance during the Civil War. Perhaps the difference was that during World War I, Quakers could maintain their identity as good Americans while also staying true to the tenets of their faith, e.g. pacifism, and Haverford could do its part in the war effort while still maintaining its standing as a Quaker institution.

Rufus Jones’ fabulous Haverford College: A History and an Interpretation (1933) is a poignant example of the trends occurring in the Haverford College histories. The book focuses on the principles of the “guarded education” as the backbone of the educational principles of Haverford College in the 19th century. He effectively sums up the motivations behind founding Haverford College as created from the deliberations of meetings held in New York City and Philadelphia in 1830:
The education was to be “guarded education”, which meant that the mind was to be trained to fit into a religious system that was to their minds more or less fixed and static. The provisions of the Plan of the Association called for “a liberal education in ancient and modern literature and the mathematical and natural sciences under competent instructors of our own Society, so as not to endanger their religious principles or alienate them from their early attachments” (his emphasis).30

Jones dissects the theory at length, characterizing the 19th century practitioners of the “guarded education” as men of their times who wished to build the Society of Friends of the future in their own religious image. While providing a very friendly and readable narrative of the college’s history, Jones was clearly not interested in complicating this story by expounding on the troublesome events that occurred in the 1850s and 1860s.

He admits that students were not given the same sort of multifaceted education expected in his own day (he published in 1933), but that this knowledge was not easily reachable, saying “it is a mistake to treat education as a means to… the establishment of a religious position… but that the larger lesson has been only slowly learned”.31 Jones does mention that “the discipline and morale of the institution were at a low ebb” during the Civil War and mentions the anecdote of President Lincoln’s passing the college by train. However, while acknowledging these imperfections, he makes no mention of any disciplinary and educational problems occurring during the war period, instead choosing to place his focus on the lack of a President at the college until the appointment of Samuel J. Gummere in 1864.32

This depiction of the college in the 20th century college histories as relatively unperturbed (if not happy) during the Civil War era, however, flies in the face of observations in A History of Haverford College of the First Sixty Years of its Existence, as well as records in the college’s archives. There is no doubt that the Board of Managers and the faculty intended to enclose

31 Ibid. Pages 4-5.
32 Ibid. Page 37.
Haverford students on campus during the Civil War era and that they implemented other rules in order to “protect” young students from the immorality of the outside world. Further, it is equally clear that there was a significant disturbance in the college caused by the Civil War, to the point where the Board of Managers felt that there was a moral crisis and a need for action.

The prevailing thinking of the day was that “Discipline” was among the first responsibilities of educational institutions, and *A History of Haverford College for the First Sixty Years of its Existence* emphasizes the “fresh and stringent” rules enacted at Haverford in 1861 by new Superintendent William Forster Mitchell and the Board were no exception. In general, the work clearly addresses issues considered important at the time, such as disciplinary matters with students and the inclusion of class materials concerning the war effort that other Haverford College histories simply do not address.

Looking back, the various histories of Haverford College make a surprisingly inconsistent attempt to chronicle the college during one of the most important periods in the history of the United States, despite the fact that it occurred during the formative years of the college. Perhaps not terribly surprising is the fact that there is a trend towards reinterpreting the past towards stressing the “liberal and guarded education” envisioned by the early Board of Directors and forgetting the financial, educational, and disciplinary problems the college faced at the time. The histories following *A History of Haverford College for the First Sixty Years of its Existence* are more concerned with more recent events and trends in the college’s history. They are understandably less interested in the Haverford College of the Civil War era, particularly when compared to the college’s leadership in forming the American Friends Service Community and leading the Quaker response to the First World War.
As the college moves further into the 21st century, it is likely that the Civil War period will probably have even less to do with Haverford’s future vision and constitute an even smaller part of its history. That said, many of the lessons emanating from that difficult period in the college’s history were important in shaping the college’s moral outlook today. We can only hope that the next group of authors to undertake the task of recording the history of Haverford will not forget the importance of the Civil War era in the development of the college as we experience it today.

While a self-reflective look at the historiography of Haverford College reveals much about how the college views itself as a Quaker institution and has redefined the meaning of the Civil War era to fit that vision, this still leaves the question of how students of Quaker backgrounds experienced Haverford during this period. The students of that time wanted to learn and wanted to play, but they were also at the center of several forces that promised to mold and shape their lives while at Haverford. Some of these forces were inside the college, such as the faculty and their classes, and the administration and their rules. External forces included Quaker families and the erupting conflict over slavery that threatened the breakup of the Union. A look at the diaries of Haverford students William Morrison Coates and Benjamin Hayes Smith shows the degree to which students were impacted by the various influences swirling around them.
The Respective Worldviews of William Morrison Coates and Benjamin Hayes Smith

Analysis of the diaries of William Coates and Benjamin Smith, complemented by a thorough investigation of their lives, makes it apparent that the role of their surrounding community- their respective families, extended family and friends- were the main determinant in their development, both in terms of their interests and of their career choices. The diaries, in this vein, confirm what we suspected based on the history of the families, and the respective careers and public pursuits chosen by William and Benjamin. During their years attending Haverford, 1857-1859 for Benjamin and 1860-1864 for William, the boys spent their time either with their family or at College. The values these boys possessed, which would later determine their future life paths, were fundamentally impacted by these sources.

The lens provided through the diaries of Benjamin Hayes Smith and William Morrison Coates allow us to see directly into their lives while they were studying at Haverford College during the Civil War era, during which the powerful external influence of the war pierced the “guarded education” of the college and affected daily life. The recorded thoughts, feelings, and activities of students in their own voice is a good way to determine if the “guarded and liberal education” of Haverford College actually was effective in protecting these young Christian men from the external pressures of political conflict and war.

At first glance, it appears that we are provided a view into the lives and the outlooks of two young men who are very similar. Smith and Coates are two Haverford College students who come from widely-respected and to some extent privileged families with strong Quaker traditions. However, there are also fascinating differences between Smith and Coates, reflected not only in their backgrounds but in their diaries that do much to illustrate the worldview of the respective students. It is important, while acknowledging the influence of the family and
religious backgrounds of our young Haverford students, to not discount their individual abilities in confronting and reacting to the world in which they lived.

Although the diaries are similar in many respects, some of the ways in which they differ are instructive as to why Coates (who followed the majority of Haverford students in not joining the war effort) joins with his brother George and follows his father into the wool business, while Smith enlists in the Union army in 1861. In particular, Benjamin Smith’s richer diary entries reveal an extremely thoughtful and reflective young man who took the events of the outside world seriously, and was capable of making a decision that was destined to disappoint members of the Quaker community at Haverford and at home. The regimentation and consistency of William Coates’ diary, on the other hand, points to a more conventional man who is not as questioning of the world in which he lived and is very satisfied to follow the expectations placed on him by his Quaker family and community.

The diaries of William Morrison Coates and Benjamin Hayes Smith are unique testimony into the lives of Haverford College students of that time. Bequeathed to the college by their individual families posthumously, each of the diaries have been sitting in college archives for nearly a century, much of it in the college’s Special Collections Library, one of the few Quaker libraries in the world. Neither of the diaries has ever been published, despite the relevance and importance of both of the men to Haverford’s and Philadelphia’s history.

Textual analysis of diaries is a delicate business that requires care. As one expert on documentary editing comments, “these intimate records, revealing so much of the inner life of a public figure, demand the most literal textual treatment their method of inscription permits”. 33

The intended audience of a diary usually is the author himself, although each author has his own

motive, be it a compilation of a daily log or a reference for later reflection. The key to effectively reading a diary is maintaining the transparency of its source, as implicit patterns, themes, and hidden texts are as significant as the overt messages conveyed by the author according to P.D.A. Harvey:

Informal in nature and private in intent, diaries lose rather than gain by any attempt to impose excessive conventions of print publication. If a writer’s punctuation or spelling is less regular and correct in diaries than in correspondence, so be it. The very fact that an author allows himself or herself such lapses may be significant.34

The extent to which Smith and Coates use shorthand in their entries and other methods to save time and space differ depending on time and place. Coates in particular is fond of using extensive shorthand, especially for people, to the point that one must know Coates intimately to know of whom he speaks. How to approach deficiencies of explanation in the text is in and of itself problematic. I have attempted to follow P.D.A. Harvey’s counsel in my interpretations. Additionally, I have chosen to use brackets when necessary, in the stead of more excessive footnotes.35

Another difficult aspect of the analysis of diaries can be their format, particularly if the pages are not numbered and the dates are not entered in a regular manner. Fortunately, both the Coates and Smith diaries are numbered by page. As far as dating, the Coates diary is dated in a uniform manner, and while the Smith diary is not dated the same way every day, he always conveys at least the day and the month of each entry.

Close examination and interpretation of the patterns and themes in Coates’ and Smith’s diaries makes it evident where they saw themselves as young students at Haverford College in a time of social, political, and economic transformation. Similarities and continuities between the two diaries include concern with the weather and daily social encounters, but the more important

34 A Guide to Documentary Editing, Page 127.
divergences between the two texts involve differences in length and regularity as Benjamin Smith matures in his diary and writes longer, more self-reflective entries. The fuller, richer entries provided by Benjamin, particularly as he matures after graduation, may be indicative of the fact that he is a more introspective and thoughtful young person who is willing to risk losing the respect of the community he grew up in to do what he believes is right.

William Morrison Coates was born on October 16, 1845, would graduate from Haverford College in 1863 and go on to occupy 127 Market Street after graduation with his brother George Morrison Coates, carrying on the family’s wool business under the name of Coates Brothers. This career clearly brought him great success, and much like his father he devoted a great deal of his time to public interests in organizations. He followed in his father’s footsteps (and exceeded them) to become President of the Board of Trade, Trustee of the Penn Mutual Life Insurance Company, and Director of the American Security and Trust Company. He and his two brothers were Episcopalian as a result of his father's being disowned after marriage.

Although he graduated from Haverford and his grandfather George Morrison Coates, Sr., was a wealthy and respected elder of the Philadelphia’s Orthodox Arch Street Monthly Meeting, his explicit views on the Society of Friends are unclear. William married Anne Morris Lloyd on September 30, 1869, and they had four children, Esther Malcolm, Samuel, Benjamin, and John Lloyd. He pursued a variety of interests, including art and music, and was a member of the Philadelphia Art Club, the University Club of Washington, and was President of the Apprentices Library. He lived to the age of 88, passing away in 1937.

---

William Morrison Coates

William Coates kept a diary as a Haverford College student in 1861, and was a sophomore at the time of the writing of the diary (he entered the college in 1859). His entries are brief, averaging about four sentences and about six lines in his pocket-sized diary per day. He faithfully recorded every day what he saw to be significant, often using abbreviations and shorthand, and occasionally including incomplete sentences, evidently as a time-saving measure. Most of his diary is consumed with mentioning the weather, the people he saw, and the places he visited. The diary takes place within two contexts, home and Haverford College, and does not reflect the radical transformations that occur in Benjamin Hayes Smith’s diary when he graduates in 1859 or heads to war in 1861.

A member of the Everett Society at the College, Coates wrote opinionated essays, including a diatribe against the violence occurring in “Bleeding Kansas” before the Civil War. Such reflective commentary or analysis of the outside world are noticeably absent from his diary. William’s diary gives the reader a sense of relative regimentation and routine in his daily life. This is particularly due to the repetition of a small number of themes and concerns in his writing. Even when he mentions extraordinary events, such as his birthday or seeing Abraham Lincoln, which occurred on February 20th and 21st, 1861, he writes only a line or two and does not reflect on it in his diary. We can only speculate why he does not include more reflection or commentary in his interests, but it seems that William has little use for more than a brief daily log. Seemingly not interested in recording his thoughts or reactions for posterity, he appears to be only concerned with recording his daily activities, what he read, and what work he did. His

writing efficiency also reflects the analytical and calculating mind of a person who would one day be a businessman, and seems to foretell William’s future occupation.

It is important to note the emphasis on social interaction with his extended family in William’s diary. While family is also a very important element in Benjamin Hayes Smith’s diary, William’s differs because of his constant interaction not only with his nuclear family but with his extended family. This large community of extended family and friends must have been critical to his development considering his constant presence in their audience. When reading about this interaction the prosperity of the family’s business, the mostly Quaker composition of the family, and the fact that it was held in high esteem amongst Philadelphia Orthodox Friends are all significant factors that cannot be ignored. Although his writing is brief, the entries of Wednesday and Thursday, January 30 and 31, 1861 provide a brief glimpse of the extent to which this large and prosperous Quaker family entered and affected William’s daily life:

Wednesday, 30.
Uncle Sam and Aunt Anna at Hav. to hear Henry and the other Juniors speak. Our trunks left Hav. at 7.30 am. We left at 12.30 am. Went to Grandfathers.
Thursday, 31.
Went to F.M. Dixon’s. Went to see Grandma Aunt Eliza Coates etc. Mr. Norris, Mr. Addams & Uncle Ned spent the evening at our house.40

Another example is his entry on Sunday, February 10, 1861, where he is visiting the Hornor side of the Coates family, a highly esteemed Quaker family in their own right:41

Sunday, 10.
Went to Church of the Atonement with Joe. Went to Aunt Mary Hornor’s with Joe. Loafed, read and wrote up diary as I usually do.42

These entries are typical of William’s entries while he is on break. If he leaves the home, it is to go see his extended family, and if visitors come by the house then it is also usually members of the family. The brief nature of William’s entries, unfortunately, make it difficult for a reader to

41 Mary Coates. Page 75.
see exactly how the family interacted, and as a result we cannot precisely judge the ways in which members of his family played an active role in forming his social context and behavior or served as inspiration or special role models for him. We can see clearly, however, that William constantly interacted with his entire family and his extended family, and that based on William’s career choice and public interests we can assume that they must have had a defining role in shaping his outlook on life.

The continuous references to William’s activity outside of class, both when at Haverford and when at home, are revealing. Very much still a young boy, being able to “play” is clearly very important to him. He almost always refers to his social activities each day, whether it is taking a walk, going swimming, skiing, or sledding, or even bugging! He always mentions who he does his activities with, unless it is a college-wide activity that all the “fellows” engage in. He also mentions the occasional days when he is feeling too sick, too lazy, or the weather is too awful for him to do anything outside of work, eat, and sleep. Often entries in June and July are peppered with observations “about doing nothing before and after supper”, which he noted in July 9, 1961.43

Sledding and skiing are typical social winter activities for Coates, swimming and bugging prevail in the summer, and taking walks are the usual activity during March and April when the weather is rainy and not good for much else. Occasionally these patterns are broken up by a “trip into town” often to go shopping at a store called “Snobb’s”, or by engaging in popular activities such as a game called “shinny”, chess, or working in the carpenter’s shop. It is clear that while very smart and intelligent, young William is still a boy. These activities allowed him freedom not typically allowed in class or while doing work, and thus were particularly treasured

by William. This explains why he is displeased and takes care to mention each time when he is too sick or too busy to be able to get out and about.

Another interesting aspect of William’s daily commentary on his social activities is that it reflects a more formalized form of interaction in the 19th century than we are familiar with today. He viewed his activities as an important social necessity. Almost a ritualized form of interaction, the walks and other games and pastimes were a relatively exciting part of his day compared to the monotony of class and schoolwork, and had the additional effect of reinforcing the habitual pattern of his daily routine. This trend is evident when William refers to “taking a walk” or “going to the store” with a friend or two, where the company appears to be more important than the walk or the trip to the store itself.

_Benjamin Hayes Smith_

Benjamin Hayes Smith was born on May 7, 1841 in Upper Darby, Pennsylvania. Entering Haverford College in 1857, he was Secretary of the Henry Society from 1857-1858, and graduated in 1860.44 As previously noted, Benjamin was not born a Quaker, due to the fact that his father George was not yet an official member of the Hicksite Radnor Meeting (although he was attending meetings regularly). It is mildly surprising that George, a member of a Hicksite Monthly Meeting, paid for his son to attend Haverford, an Orthodox Quaker institution, but the inherent tensions were most likely resolved by the fact that Benjamin himself was not a Hicksite and that there is no other Quaker college nearby yet. He volunteered for the Union army in 1861 and served as a topographical engineer surveyor during the war from 1861 to 1863. He was on

---
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duty at General Buell’s headquarters in Kentucky, Tennessee, Mississippi, and Alabama, and was with General Rosencrantz through the Stone River campaign.45

After the war, Benjamin demonstrated the extent to which he was influenced by his father, by pursuing similar interests in botany and history. Although making a living as a surveyor after the war, Benjamin continued his father’s interest in his home county and published the Atlas of Delaware County in 1880. He also became a noted botanist in his own right, and produced the work “Flora of Delaware County, Pennsylvania”. Interest in the Society of Friends apparently did not pass to Benjamin. In addition to participating in the war, Benjamin’s marriage to Addie Brooke of Radnor in 1866, a non-Quaker, was ordained by a reverend minister, which is in direct conflict with tenets of the Quaker faith.46 After his father died, Benjamin moved to Denver, Colorado, where there were opportunities to pursue his career as a surveyor. He would live there with his wife and four children until his death in 1918.

The diary of Benjamin Hayes Smith differs from William Coates’ both in breadth and scope.47 The Smith diary begins in 1856, before his entrance into Haverford College, and continues through January 1, 1864, when he is in a hospital recovering from illness related to exhaustion, a result of his time spent as a surveyor on the war front. A mammoth volume in comparison to the Coates diary (which is under 100 pages), Smith’s entries fill 259 pages the size of an 8.5 inch by 11 inch notebook. Each entry averages about five to six sentences and fills about six to seven lines, and there is a greater degree of variation from entry to entry in his diary than in Coates’. Smith occasionally skips a day or two between entries, which Coates almost

---
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47 The Diary of Benjamin Hayes Smith. Haverford Special Collections (HSC). All references to “Smith’s diary” or “Benjamin’s diary” pertain to this diary, and all entries cite its text.
never did, but nonetheless he is pretty consistent and usually makes five or six entries in a week. I have concentrated on the years 1858-1861, during which period he attends Haverford, graduates, looks rather unsuccessfully for a surveying job, and decides to volunteer for the Union army as a surveyor.

Benjamin Smith’s diary also has distinct patterns and a continuity of themes that persist throughout his diary. Smith’s diary does not give the reader the same feeling of repetition as Coates’ diary, partly due to the greater length and detail of his entries and also his more varied life experience. The contents of Smith’s diary can be separated relatively easily into a number of different topics or phases, including Haverford College life, life at home with his parents and close family, life after graduation, and his experiences in training for and participating in war.

It should be stressed that Benjamin Smith’s diary, more than anything else, reveals that in many respects he is a boy who is growing but has not yet reached full maturity. Although Benjamin shows a precocious awareness of the outside world, and at times acts and sounds older than his years, he is only 16 when he enters Haverford and barely 18 when he graduates. It must also be noted that there are times when Benjamin sounds even younger than his age, and before we give too much importance to his thoughts on politics and religion, we must remember that he is most excited when talking about something that he considers “fun”. As evidence of this I point to his entry written as a senior at Haverford on January 20, 1859:

**Henry Samp[son] [best friend] came in towards collection “Ben, want some fun?” “Yes!” “Well, let’s go in the woods set those leaves on fire” “Agreed!” And off we went. Set them on fire and then ran at full speed. While looking back at the great conflagration which so small a match had made I ran into a hole, stumbled, turned a somersault and Hen came down on the top of me with his Mylodonian proportions… we ran to the fire with the rest and had great fun.**

His punctuation, tone, and narration betray the excitement Benjamin felt from this nefarious adventure, and it stands out in sharp contrast to his more typical recordings of academic progress.

---

and daily activities. It seems that while Benjamin feels an obligation towards being responsible and is indeed successful in both his academic and social pursuits at Haverford, he is still a boy and is most happy and comfortable when he is allowed (and allows himself) to be one. There appears to be a subtle yet significant development occurring as Benjamin is writing in his diary and is feeling the urges of adolescence and the pressures to grow up and, after graduation, to find a job.

Benjamin, in keeping with his boy’s life at Haverford, is preoccupied with his friends and brother Clem, who is also attending Haverford. Whether it is skating, playing, taking walks, or causing trouble, these boys serve as Benjamin’s family when he is away from home. Activities go in and out of vogue, but no matter what is going on academically at Haverford, these companions form the center of Benjamin’s world at Haverford. Henry Sampson, his best friend, as we have already seen, is mischievous and Benjamin clearly likes him for the dangerous adventures that he brings into his life. There are several other friends, including Al, Dick, and Harry Pancoast, Ed Rhoads, and Dick Paxson, who make up Benjamin’s community at Haverford and are mentioned continuously in his recountings of his daily activities. No professor receives as much attention in the diary, although Benjamin does mention and demonstrates respect for Professor Chase. Any administrative figures are mentioned only in anecdotal fashion, if at all.

Benjamin was very aware of his responsibilities, and he took his schooling and his intellectual pursuits quite seriously. While a student at Haverford, he religiously recorded his progress both in class and in his studies. He refers daily during junior year to class or recitations with Professor Chase, for example, and his progress in Greek, whether in Antigone or
Demosthenes or Tacitus’ *Agricola*. It is notable that, considering his successful career as a botanist and surveyor, he only briefly refers to subjects such as analytical geometry and statistics and that when he does he usually proclaims them to be “easy”. Reading his diary gives few clues as to his future intellectual areas of interest. Smith’s diligent record of intellectual and scholastic progress in entries during his Haverford days nonetheless indicates that his academic progress is of primary importance to him, that he is quite intelligent, as well as a bit bookish.

Benjamin Smith engaged in other (more formal) college social activities, which included writing for *The Collegian* and participating in the Chess Club and several societies. Perhaps most interesting among his activities is his faithful recording of his participation and work for the various societies he participates in. He is an active member and especially interested and involved in the goings-on of the Loganian and Everett societies. Through the Loganian Society he was elected Editor of the Collegian on July 3, 1858 and often was selected to produce works or give speeches. From this we get an early sense of Benjamin’s interest in politics and the world around him, which we did not get from the Coates diary. Smith makes notes every time he feels that a political societal meeting was informative or spirited, including a Loganian meeting concerning the Dred Scott case on March 30, 1858 and a subsequent one on April 13, 1858 when he notes:

April 13
…Interesting debate in the Loganian on ‘which had the most reason for complaint, the Indian or the African?’ Decided in favor of the Indian, despite my opinion on the matter, because one must judge based on the respective cases given…

Another example of his interest in politics and social justice, and particularly in slavery and abolition occurs in his entry written March 24, 1858, when he notes “finished reading Dred

---
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[referring to the Supreme Court decision of the Dred Scott case] and got disgusted with the last part”.\textsuperscript{51}

Benjamin’s interests are early signals of his concern for social justice and the world around him, and were most likely inculcated by his father George, who was a Quaker and reputedly used his Delaware County Science Institute as a post on the Underground Railroad.\textsuperscript{52} His interest in the Dred Scott case also indicates his support for abolition which is consistent with his decision to volunteer for the Union army two years later.

Benjamin’s diary entries offer some interesting insights regarding his relationship with religion, his Quaker classmates and the Society of Friends. Given that his father was a respected Hicksite with strongly held Quaker ideals, the fact that Benjamin was not a Friend at all and does not appear to be religious is surprising. He almost never mentions God, a higher power, or religion. Even when his sister Rebecca dies in early February, he expresses “sorrow but not his lamentation”, and notes that he does not share the question of “why has God taken her too early” that extended family and friends ask.\textsuperscript{53}

Despite this seemingly irreligious stance, he does not completely ignore Quakerism in his diary, as he comments positively on attending Thursday meetings at the college. His interest in the Society of Friends and attending meeting appears to increase as time goes on. By April 1858, he goes out of his way to announce the beginning of the Orthodox Quakers’ Yearly Meeting week, and notes:

April 19. Yearly Meeting commences… Some of the fellows went in to attend Yearly Meeting- I wish I could go as some of them do.\textsuperscript{54}

\textsuperscript{51} Ibid. March 24, 1858. Page 94.
\textsuperscript{53} Benjamin Smith. February 8-10, 1856. Pages 6-7.
\textsuperscript{54} Ibid. April 19, 1858. Pages 100
It is not apparent from this entry whether Benjamin wants to go to the Yearly Meeting because he is seriously interested in the Society or whether he has religious reservations that are preventing his attendance. An entry made soon after, however, confirms Benjamin’s nominal interest in the faith and desire to attend Meeting. In this case, surprisingly, he wishes to attend the old Hicksite Haverford Meeting and argues with his father over the subject:

May 16. Sunday. Woke up at home!... Started up at the father, wishing to go to Haverford Meeting (old). This is extremely surprising that Benjamin would express an interest in attending a Hicksite meeting while attending Haverford, an explicitly Orthodox institution that almost no Hicksites attended. It is highly unlikely that Benjamin is ignorant to the reality of the Orthodox/Hicksite divide, considering the fact his father is a Hicksite. It also makes little sense that Benjamin would repeatedly express his desire to attend Quaker events (Hicksite or Orthodox notwithstanding) if he did not have some degree of interest in the faith. Nonetheless, it appears that Benjamin at this age was still relatively ambivalent regarding the Quaker faith and is far from a religious zealot.

Benjamin, although in many respects still a boy, lived in a man’s world, and as graduation approached, a shift in his focus and priorities becomes increasingly evident. A major change for Benjamin is that he is in love with his future wife, Addie L. Brooke. Although they are not officially married until 1866, they apparently were promised to each other before he graduated in 1859. Although he at first mentions her sparingly, when he does write about her there is no doubt as to the nature of their relationship, as evidenced by his entry from his 18th birthday, May 7th 1859:

7th Saturday. My birthday, being now 18. Got a bouquet a.m. to give to Mrs. A L Smith [he underlines twice for emphasis] but when I got home she was not there. Sammy brought us up in the evening.

---
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It is unclear if Benjamin and Addie promised to marry each other at this time, why they did not marry until 1866. Parental permission probably played a role, as did Benjamin’s participation in the Civil War from 1861 to 1863. Nonetheless, these were heady times for Benjamin, as his older brother was married in April (did this spur the thought of proposing marriage?). He graduated from Haverford soon after, on July 13th, 1859. His diary entries concerning this seemingly momentous occasion were quite dispassionate. He noted that his family came up, his Greek speech went without much trouble, he received his diploma from Professor Chase, and that “it was an awful hot day”. \(^{57}\)

Following graduation and over the summer he still was surrounded by many of his colleagues and friends from Haverford, including Dick Paxson, the Pancoasts, and Henry Sampson, among others, which perhaps eased Benjamin’s transition out of college and towards the future and an occupation. It would not be until later that Benjamin would begin to voice worries and concerns about his future in his diary. There are signs that Benjamin is still growing up, and may have much more to do, as he talks of learning to fish with his friends and notes in the third person that he “danced- first time for Benjamin!” \(^{58}\) Reality apparently began to set in when his brother Clem went back to Haverford in September for his senior year. Benjamin notes that “it seems queer for me not to go back at the usual time”. \(^{59}\) In the meantime he kept busy assisting his father, who had begun to write his *History of Delaware County*, by creating maps, copying records, and writing some 83 pages of the work for his father.

The significance of the change in Smith’s character as indicated by his diary entries over the years cannot be underestimated. After writing prolifically in 1857 and 1858, we begin to notice a trend in Smith’s diary away from regimentation and towards more self-reflection and
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longer entries. In 1859, Benjamin still writes entries for about ten to fifteen days of the month, but he will not write for several days at a time, and when he does write, he is not recapping events of the day but choosing to note only things he deems to be important, showing more discretion and thoughtfulness in his responses. This trend continues in 1860 and beyond. There are periods when Benjamin will not write for days and sometimes weeks at a time. There are no entries for several long stretches, including from July through December 1860, from the beginning of February to March 1861, and from May into July 1861.

Benjamin typically follows prolonged periods of inactivity in his diary with compulsive reflections of what he sees to be the major issues of his life, which at this point are usually the current events precipitating the Civil War, and his search for a job. These two factors, it appears, are the compelling elements of Benjamin’s life from 1860 to 1861. Although he finds work assisting his father and surveying around Middletown, Delaware, he feels that he is going nowhere and “losing valuable time”. He wants to work as a surveyor in the west, and is particularly disheartened by his languishing application to J. Edgar Thomson to survey for the Pacific Railroad Company, which was in the process of beginning plans for its transcontinental line at the time. He first mentions applying in November 1859, at which point he sounds very hopeful. By the time the Pacific Railroad bill is shot down by Congress in June 1860, we get a different picture- of a disappointed and worried college graduate no longer content at home and itchy to get on with the next phase of his life:

Now that the Pacific RR bill has been postponed until Congress meets in Dec, I have lost hopes of hearing from Thomson. Put in spare time at my collection of “Citeopteva” made at Haverford and now study with the aid of a French work describing the genera which Father gave me. Feel that I have lost a year and should have had a job in view before I left college.  

---
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Smith is cognizant of events in the outside world, and tracks the events of Harper’s Ferry and the execution of John Brown and his compatriots in his diary. He begins to broaden his worldview in general, continually referring to important current events. Among the many interesting stories he mentions include the murder of Washington, D.C. District Attorney Philip Barton Key by Congressman Daniel Sickles (who was the first person found innocent based on the grounds of temporary insanity due to Key’s affair with his wife) in 1859. Another entry notes the arrival of the Japanese ambassador in the United States for the first one ever in May 1860. This shows that Benjamin Hayes Smith at this point had both the time and the inclination to be genuinely interested in the world around him, which reflects both his growing maturity and his ample amount of free time.

William Morrison Coates’ diary gives the reader a quite different sense. Seemingly much less contemplative than Smith, Coates also shows considerably less imagination and a greater sense of regimentation and routine in his daily life, particularly from the repetition of a small number of themes and concerns in his writing. Even when he mentions important events, such as his birthday or seeing Abraham Lincoln, which occurred on February 20th and 21st, 1861, he writes only a line or two and does not reflect on it in his diary. This is evidenced in his noted interest in societies and his contemporary reading of important historical moments. There are similarities and continuities between the two diaries, such as concern with the weather and daily social encounters, but the general differences between the two texts are indicative, if not reflective, of the future divergence in their career and life paths. The two young men did not overlap in their tenure at Haverford College. Nevertheless, the Quaker flavor of the college helped shape both of their lives.

---

The Social, Political, and Familial World of Benjamin Smith and William Coates

The William Coates and Benjamin Smith families are both from deep-rooted Quaker backgrounds dating from their arrival in 17th century America. Thomas Coates moved into the city of Philadelphia and Richard Hayes (Smith’s paternal great-great-great-great-grandfather) a few miles away in Haverford. The Coates family soon came to be recognized as one of the prominent business families amongst the Society of Friends in Philadelphia, part of a tight-knit Orthodox Quaker community that was primarily concerned with philanthropy and keeping to themselves. The Smith family would also achieve success, but at times in more worldly pursuits such as politics that were suspect in the eyes of the more Orthodox Friends. There are significant differences in how their family roots and traditions which shaped the world in which their sons, eventual Haverford students, grew up. In the 19th century Benjamin’s father and mother would become Hicksites. The family’s connection with the Quaker faith did not carry over to its Benjamin’s other relatives, however, and the Smiths did not run in the same elite circle of Friends to which the Coates’ were accustomed.

William’s father George Morrison was born a Quaker, but was disowned by the Philadelphia Orthodox Twelfth Street Monthly Meeting for marrying an Episcopalian. Benjamin Smith’s father George was not born a Quaker, yet would later become a respected elder on the Hicksite Haverford Preparatory Meeting who sat at the head of the Hicksite Philadelphia Yearly Meeting. His mother was also a lifelong Friend. Both men would go on to follow in their father’s footsteps to a great extent, both in their career as well as their interests. William, however, was to a greater extent heavily influenced by his extended family’s Quaker connections and history, which was measured in centuries. This tradition not only determined his playmates,
education, and future occupation, but also his values and interests. To whatever extent Benjamin’s values and beliefs were an extension of the values of his father and mother, they were probably sorely tested by Benjamin’s decision to volunteer for the war in 1861, which must have been not only disturbing to his father but also (we can only surmise) contributed to the ongoing controversy occurring within the Hicksite community.

There is a large amount of information about the Coates family, due to its rather exceptional history and importance in the Philadelphia area, dating from the colonial period. Included in the tome Colonial Families of Philadelphia, the Coates’ by the early 20th century had been for more than two centuries prominently identified with the commercial, professional, and social life of Philadelphia. The community of extended family and friends, and their understanding of the family’s Quaker history not surprisingly had a fundamental influence in shaping the world in which young William Morrison Coates grew up. A closer look at the Coates family and its history in the Philadelphia area illuminates how enclosed the elite Quaker community was and how certain expectations and values came with the status conferred upon the individuals in these families.

Prominent among such families were connections to elite institutions identified with Quakers and their ideals. There was a significant relationship between the Coates family and Haverford College, the first college established by the Religious Society of Friends. In addition to William’s graduation from the college, William's uncle Benjamin was a member of the college's governing board and a regular contributor to the college. In addition, two of William's cousins, Edward Hornor and George Morrison, graduated from Haverford in the 1850s and

---

1860s, respectively.\textsuperscript{64} The Coates family, prominent members of the Friends Meeting at Fourth and Arch streets, included noted Philadelphia philanthropists and business people, and the family owned a number of residential and business properties near their meeting house.\textsuperscript{65}

The success and prominence of the Coates family in Philadelphia had its roots in their proud history, extending well before the family's move to America. The family is descended from one of the oldest county families in England, which was previously named Cotes, located in Cotes, Staffordshire, whose landed possessions it is claimed have passed from father to son in an unbroken line from the 11\textsuperscript{th} century into the 20\textsuperscript{th} century.\textsuperscript{66} It has even been said that they held lands in Normandy before the time of William the Conqueror, but the earliest record of the name is from a Norman knight named Richard de Cotes around 1100.

In general, the individual members of the Coates family represented principles and values developed over time by the tradition of the family from its deep-seated history. A look at various members of the families also reveals a similar trajectory both in their professional career and their public and philanthropic interests. Thomas Coates was the first of the family to make the voyage to America in 1682. He bought property in Pennsylvania soon after in 1686, and made a considerable living as a shipping merchant in Philadelphia.\textsuperscript{67} He was also the first Coates to be disowned by the Philadelphia Meeting, which occurred in 1702 for his severe criticism of Friends in general and his refusal to apologize for it.\textsuperscript{68}

William’s grandfather (and Thomas Coates’ great-grandson), named George Morrison Coates, was born in 1779, went to the Friends’ Grammar School on Fourth Street and thereafter
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entered into the hardware business. He worked under his father-in-law Benjamin Hornor (he was married to Rebecca Hornor), who lived in Benjamin Franklin’s old house.⁶⁹ He “possessed common sense and a quick perception of character, which, together with cool courage and presence of mind, made him a great dependence and a tower of strength in any emergency, even in his blind old age”.⁷⁰ A merchant who retired early in life, according to “Aunt Mary” he had a talent for mechanics, and was a member of the Horticultural Society. In 1808 George and Rebecca moved from the Philadelphia Northern District Monthly Meeting to the Western District Monthly Meeting, where he would become a respected elder in the Society. George senior had seven children, including William’s father George Coates Jr., lived until 1868, and was no doubt a fixture in the Coates household during William’s youth.

One of William Coates’ uncles, Benjamin Coates, was a particularly notable man. In a household led by father George and mother Rebecca “as a Quaker family that raised him to believe in the principles of the Religious Society of Friends” (along with his brother and William’s father George Coates’ Jr.), Benjamin aimed to tackle the problem of slavery.⁷¹ This was not atypical of Friends, who had been concerned about slavery for more than a hundred years, and published the first known declaration against slavery of any religious group in Germantown in 1688.⁷² Friends would go on to establish the first abolitionist organization in the world in 1775, the "Pennsylvania Society for Promoting the Abolition of Slavery, the Relief of Negroes Unlawfully Held in Bondage ; and for Improving the Condition of the African Race", better known as the Pennsylvania Abolition Society, which attracted such men as Benjamin

---
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Franklin and Benjamin Rush. Some Quakers—particularly many who became “Hicksites” after the 1827 schism, came to advocate a radical and confrontational position supporting the "immediate" and "unequivocable" end of slavery.

A businessman and officer of the Pennsylvania Abolition Society, Benjamin's commitment to helping Black Americans relocate to West Africa was exceptional, particularly among Orthodox Friends of the day. His discourse with abolitionists resulted in relationships with such eminent figures as Joseph Jenkins Roberts, Mary Ann Shadd Cary, Henry Highland Garnet, Frederick Douglass, George L. Stearns, and William Coppinger. His commitment to Quaker ideals, if not already evident in his abolitionist sympathies, were exhibited by his involvement in the Quaker business community and his support of Quaker-led schools and charities.

George Morrison Coates, Jr., William’s father, was born in 1817 and educated in private schools in Philadelphia and was quickly placed into the mercantile business established by his father. He established a very successful wool business with his aforementioned brother Benjamin in 1859. They moved on to become active partners in the prominent publishing house under the firm name of Porter & Coates. George Morrison Coates was involved in a number of organizations, although he did not share his brother’s interest in abolition, and was an active member of the Board of Trade and the Board of Health. Interested in politics, he was a supporter of the Republican party and was a presidential elector in 1864, 1868, and 1872. He

---
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was the director of the Pennsylvania Railroad Company, and filled a number of other positions of trust.76

An event bearing heavily on William Morrison Coates’ life was his father’s marriage to Anna Troth in October 1840. Although she was descended from one of the earliest settlers on the eastern shore in Maryland, she was Episcopalian, and Quakers were not permitted to marry outside the faith. The marriage thus resulted in George Morrison Coates being disowned by the Twelfth Street Meeting in Philadelphia for “marrying out of unity” on December 24, 1840.77 William’s mother Anna, termed “conservative by nature”, was an involved member and on the Board of the Industrial Home for Blind Women.78

As one of the first families to settle in Philadelphia, the Coates family had become one of the preeminent families in the city. Their world revolved around the city's Quaker community, and particularly the Arch Street Monthly Meeting, to which William's grandfather belonged, as well as his aunts and uncles, and his father until his marriage.79 Even as additional Friends meetings grew around the city, the Coates family valued its membership at the Arch Street Meeting, which was not received or given up lightly.80 With its numerous branches and many members, the family held a revered place in the Arch Street community.81

The Coates family was quite typical of the Orthodox Friends from that particular meeting. They were conservative urban businessmen and, while sharing a concern for social reform with the Hicksites, were less likely to advocate aggressive flaunting of tradition.82 Thus,
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when Long Island minister Elias Hicks and his followers formed the Hicksite branch of the Society of Friends in 1827, it is not surprising that William's grandfather George chose to remain with the Orthodox branch of the church.

While the split between the Orthodox branch and the Hicksites created years of bitterness between the two communities, the impact of the schism within the Coates family and their close friends and associates was not significant. Although some distant cousins and close friends painfully broke apart from the community and joined the Hicksites, the Coates family for the most part remained firmly with the Orthodox branch of the Society, as did the majority of the Quakers residing in Philadelphia and probably most of the Coates family's closest friends (3,000 Orthodox to 1,500 Hicksites).83

Much as his grandfather had provided for his father, William's family made sure that he was included in the cozy and nurturing family and community, with traditions and relationships that had roots from the time of the Quaker's colony's founding.84 Even if not Quaker himself, through childhood, education, and his early career he would be sheltered within the confines of this close-knit Philadelphia community. He would have been close with the Hornor family, and played often with their Quaker children.85

In this uniquely "Quaker" family configuration, a typical result of the development of Friends' communities, certain values were expected. Everything from inheritance practices to education to attitudes about how to treat African-Americans was affected These communities could be quite insular, as a community scarred by the schism of 1827 looked inward for assurance and affirmation:
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Large and close-knit families and communities such as Coates enjoyed made it quite unnecessary for family members to go beyond their Quaker circles for friends, education, or employment. Not only did they have many cousins to play with and go to school with... But events were mostly confined to Quaker neighborhoods and Quaker people.  

Staunchly Orthodox Quaker families such as the Coates did not allow their children to "mingle with the world's people" and attend the University of Pennsylvania or Harvard, which explains why William (albeit not officially Quaker) attended Haverford College and his ancestors did not attend college. Until Haverford was founded in 1833 many young Quaker were not afforded the opportunity for higher education due to this reason. Although William was probably not as insulated from the outside world as his father and others who had grown up in the aftermath of the Orthodox-Hicksite split, it is clear that to an extent he was cloistered by his family's Quaker "walls".

While inclusion amongst the prestigious and powerful Quaker elite is evident with the Coates family, it does not exist to the same extent for Benjamin Hayes Smith's ancestors. He nonetheless comes from a proud family with a distinct Quaker heritage and long-standing presence in the area. The family had a successful history in politics, with Benjamin’s great-great-grandfather serving in the Assembly of Pennsylvania from 1704 to 1737, his grandfather (also named Benjamin) elected to the Pennsylvania state legislature from 1801 to 1804, and his father George serving a term as a State Senator representing Delaware and Chester Counties from 1832 until 1836. The family lived for nearly two centuries on the same plot in Delaware County, and came to be identified with the area. The Smith family’s history and tradition in their locale was to some extent completed by George’s publication of the History of Delaware County in 1865.
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This history began with Benjamin Hayes Smith’s great-great-great-grandfather on his paternal side, a Quaker named Richard Hayes, who immigrated to America in 1687 to escape the persecution of Friends in Wales.\textsuperscript{89} He built his home along the Darby-Paoli Road in Haverford Township, where his descendants would live until Benjamin’s father George Smith moved the family to his wife Mary Lewis Smith’s estate in Upper Darby, “one of the largest and most prominent in Delaware County”.\textsuperscript{90} The Smith family tradition came to be identified with their property, which apparently was typical of outlying town Radnor, Haverford, and Merion, where many owners during the 19\textsuperscript{th} century inherited their land from their ancestors, the first settlers of the land.\textsuperscript{91} In a eulogy delivered to the Historical Society of Pennsylvania, James Levick discussed how the link between land, kinship, and values helped make the Smith family virtuous and successful:

They are simple in their manners, kind to strangers, and far removed from the wickedness of the present day… Thus living among themselves, and marrying among themselves, it is not surprising that their descendants should inherit the lands but also the virtues of their ancestors. Nowhere could be found a better example of this than George Smith.\textsuperscript{92}

The Smith family like the Coates family, also has a Quaker background dating back centuries, although their family was not nearly as large. The family was affiliated with the Haverford Preparatory and Radnor Monthly Meeting beginning with Richard Hayes’ joining in 1687 and his son Richard Jr., Benjamin’s great-great-grandfather, being born a Friend in 1688.\textsuperscript{93} Benjamin’s grandfather, also named Benjamin, was a life-long member of the Society of Friends, Haverford Meeting, and he was in charge of the First Day School for many years.\textsuperscript{94} Benjamin’s father Dr. George Smith was not born a member of the Society and, although he was friends with
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Quakers and would marry Mary Lewis, who was a life-long Quaker, he would not become a Friend until later in life. Nonetheless, according to the *Friends Intelligencer* and the *Bulletin of the Friends Historical Society*, George died in 1882 as a “respected elder” of the Hicksite Haverford Preparatory and Radnor Monthly Meeting, who at times sat at the head of the Yearly Meeting at Race Street. Despite these facts, he did not participate in the same sort of Quaker philanthropic or business interests in which members of the Coates family often involved themselves.

Because George did not officially join the Society until after the birth of his children, none of them, including Benjamin, were born into the Quaker faith. Not only were they not born into the faith, but there is no evidence that they later joined the Hicksite Haverford Preparatory or Radnor Monthly Meeting with their father and mother. We can only speculate why this is the case, but it is clear that George must have been rather tolerant in regards to his children. For example, he did not impose his values and lifestyle on his children as indicated by the fact that his son Benjamin fought in the Civil War, which was against the peace testimony that George was required to commit himself to as a Friend.

George, despite not bringing Benjamin into the Quaker faith, was clearly a role model for his son in other respects, as his interests and pursuits were examples that Benjamin would later emulate. A committed botanist, he founded the Delaware County Institute of the Sciences in 1833, where he established its herbarium, and was its President until his death in 1882. The Institute was also rumored to be a station on the Underground Railroad and possessed “a mysterious room underneath the basement of the building whose small entrance was hidden by a large chest of drawers”, which, if true, would be a powerful indicator of abolitionist sentiments.

---

on George’s part. Also an avid historian, he was a member of the American Historical Society and published the *History of Delaware County* in 1865.

It is impossible to say exactly to what extent our two protagonists, William Morrison Coates and Benjamin Hayes Smith, were a product of their Quaker environment. It is easy to see in the case of the Coates family that William was born into a community whose legacy demanded schooling at Quaker institutions, a career as a Philadelphia businessman, and an interest in philanthropy and the public good. While he was not Quaker himself, William certainly was from birth until death a part of the community, as he grew up with them, learned and worked with them, and was expected to hold their values. Benjamin grew up in a household of Quaker parents who had a proud history in the Delaware County area and with the Haverford Preparative and Radnor Monthly Meeting. He would go on to attend Haverford College, as well as follow his father’s interest in botany and Delaware County, even helping to complete his father’s work. Beyond the fact that he was profoundly influenced by his father, Benjamin’s upbringing does not appear to have been influenced to the same extent as William Coates by “Quaker” values, community tradition, and extended family.

---

The Orthodox and Hicksite Responses to Abolition, War, and a Generational Crisis as seen in *The Friend* and the *Friends’ Intelligencer*

It is difficult to say where Coates and Smith were getting their ideas, but if they were following their communities' preference for reading only Quaker periodicals, they would have seen how Orthodox Friends were struggling with questions of how to express their abolitionist sentiments, without going to war or working with non-Friends, exhibited in their weekly periodical, *The Friend*. Though Hicksites were willing to connect to the secular Freedmen's relief groups in Washington, the Orthodox families tried to steer clear of this. Might Haverford boys have had access to the periodicals of "the other side" (the *Friends’ Intelligencer*)? If so, they might have seen how their Hicksite cousins were struggling, though differently, with similar questions. The debates evident in the Hicksites’ *Friends’ Intelligencer* speak to the fundamental questions these Friends were asking regarding the peace testimony and the Civil War.

Both factions were struggling with the war, slavery, and identity, as well as the fact that they are trying to remain inside their insulated communities, while being tempted by factors outside their insulated communities. I argue that the most serious problem facing Quakers was that of an age divide, which was precipitated by the emergence of the nonsectarian abolitionist movement. Each branch of the Society of Friends possessed, to a different degree, an elderly and respected leadership who prized Quietism, a mode of thought that came in vogue amongst Quakers around the beginning of the 19th century. This was a generally introspective moral and ethical perspective that distrusted outside organizations for their own immoral and unethical behavior, and their potentially corrosive impact upon the morals and ethics of Friends.

The Orthodox sect of the Society was particularly notable for the predominance of conservative leaders staunchly and unconditionally avowing these Quiestist ideals. In keeping
with their Quietest beliefs, they made sure that Orthodox Friends maintained an independent course in pacifism from both other denominational and non-denominational peace movements. Conservative Orthodox leaders such as George F. White of New York, acted with distinct hostility towards such groups and encouraged Quakers not to join them, typified by statements such as these:

> It is safer, at least in the present state of the world, that we keep much to ourselves, and not act as a body in reference to this important testimony, lest by joining with others we should unawares be led into a compromise or evasion of any of its requisitions.98

Distrustful of nondenominational organizations that talked of the perfectibility of man rather than of God’s will or inner revelation, these leaders completely disparaged and disavowed such young activist Hicksite reformers such as Lucretia Mott and other young Quakers who could not stand its isolationist aspects and would join the abolitionist movement.99 Even in forming postwar relief organizations, Orthodox Friends would choose to form their own organizations rather than support those sponsored by the national government.

The stern, unquestioning rejection of the larger abolitionist movement by the conservative leadership seems to have made some impression on young Orthodox Quakers of the day, who despite maintaining anti-slavery sentiments generally eschewed outside abolitionist organizations. This helps explain why relatively few Orthodox Friends participated in the war effort, although several certainly did. Only 4 of 150 Philadelphia Orthodox Quakers, for example, drafted into the army actually served in the conflict.100

Hicksite Friends, after their break with Orthodox Friends in 1827, had been more actively controversial than their counterparts throughout the 19th century. Like Orthodox Quakers,
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Hicksite Friends had remained "unprogrammed", which meant that they based their worship on silence and without pastors. Some Hicksite Friends, however, were swept up in the atmosphere of radical reform of the 1840’s and advocated women’s rights. As a result, Hicksite Friends, generally more rural and geographically removed than their Orthodox brethren, were already more disposed towards acting outside the loose constraints of its leadership and many moved on to join outside abolitionist movements.

The widespread embrace of abolitionist sentiments on the part of Hicksite Friends combined with a vigorous re-reading and dissection of the bible, a major point of emphasis in contemporary articles in the *Friends Intelligencer*, resulted in a general reevaluation of the peace testimony on the part of many, causing what some Hicksites would call “a period of chaos”. Sympathies with abolition explain not only why more Hicksite Friends fought in the war than Orthodox Friends, but also why Hicksite Friends were not as strict in disowning soldiers who refused to acknowledge their error in fighting as they could have been, and even retained a brigadier general in their membership after the war!

The minutes of *The Friend* and the *Friends’ Intelligencer* speak to the conflict amongst Quakers during this time period between this “old guard” and younger Friends who possessed very strong abolitionist sentiments and wished to express them in a myriad of ways. This included the desire to join outside, nonsectarian abolition groups such as the American Anti-Slavery Society. The degree to which Quaker leaders could internalize dialogues regarding slavery and abolition determined their ability to frame debate on the matter, and steer young Friends towards the peace testimony and away from war. If young Orthodox and Hicksite Quakers were reading *The North Star* instead of *The Friend* or the *Friends’ Intelligencer*, their
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chances of holding abolitionist principles dearer than the peace testimony and participating in the Civil War was no doubt significantly higher.

The official weekly periodical of the Orthodox branch of the Society of Friends is *The Friend*, published and distributed from Philadelphia since 1827. The Hicksites’ version, the *Friends’ Intelligencer*, was first published in 1838 in New York and from 1844 in Philadelphia. Many Quakers, possessing a seemingly modern distaste for the “contaminating” effects of media, used these publications as their sole sources of news and current events. This was noted in *The Friend* in the context of the Civil War:

> Many take no newspaper, being unwilling to admit within their family circle, the contaminating literature they so frequently contain… where it is a great deal calculated to excite un-Christian feelings, and weaken our testimony against the war…

The periodicals could vary slightly in length and format according to the editors and the time period, but both always included a brief recap of important local and world events, editorials on important issues of the day, and informational articles on topics engaging almost any possible subject, from prayer to the state of the educational system to the boll weevil. The main concern of *The Friend* and the *Friends’ Intelligencer*, however, was religious, and as such they were supposed to represent the prevailing official Quaker thought of the day and lead discussion on vexing debates of the day.

A thorough reading of *The Friend* and the *Friends’ Intelligencer* is important to understanding how they influenced the thoughts of Orthodox and Hicksite families, individuals, and institutions, including Haverford College, during the Civil War. Was there any controversy, or did the publications reflect the official firm line on the peace testimony?

---
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A review of those issues published slightly before and during the Civil War, focusing on the editorials written in the period dating from the last three months of 1861 to the end of 1863. The approach of the two periodicals was surprising in their candor in addressing the conflict many Friends felt about preserving the peace testimony and abolition, yet they did so in different ways. Both tentatively grappled with the war at first. Both wrote sparingly (if at all) about the war itself at its inception, only occasionally launching an editorial regarding the “evils of war”.

_The Friend_, after initial hesitation and confusion, reached a turning point in its approach to the war in December 1861. After including coverage of important battles and events in the Civil War through October 1861, the editors decided the coverage was “unseemly” (because of the abominations occurring in the war) and resolved to suspend news coverage of the war. However, the “abundant complaint of the omission of… any notice of the prominent events of the war now unhappily waged in our country” on the part of individual Friends clearly caused a change of heart amongst the editors, who now determined to “exercise our discretion as to what items of intelligence respecting the war we shall lay before our readers… we will endeavour to give place to nothing that will promote a martial spirit”.¹⁰⁴ Not only did detailed coverage of the war continue in the “News” section, but the number of editorials regarding the war increased—from 8 in 1861, to 15 in 1862, to 17 in 1863.

The editorials in _The Friend_ were effective in showing a confident consensus amongst Orthodox Friends to the war effort. The editorials read much like a cheerleader who could not take part in the effort (in any way) yet morally was rooting unabashedly for the Union. There was little question where loyalties lay:

> Those at the south suddenly made a wanton and inexcusable attack on the Union, strove to break up the organization of the government; lawlessly seized its property, and recklessly commenced hostilities against
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it...we believe there is no religious body which has been more loyal in its feeling toward the government.\textsuperscript{105}

Not only does this stance make sense in consideration of the abolitionist sentiments of its members, but also encouraged good relations with the government that determined the fate of the numerous Quaker conscientious objectors. It seems this was effective, as seen by the number of Friends released from any military obligation thanks to the efforts of Secretary of War Edwin Stanton and President Lincoln.

The other defining characteristic of \textit{The Friend}’s approach to the war was its unquestioning embrace of the peace testimony. Perhaps emboldened by the fact that a relatively small number of Orthodox Friends joined the war effort or even paid the commutation fee of $300, the publication was able to repeatedly portray participation in the war as almost beyond conception and completely outside of Quaker principles:

\begin{quote}
All Friends true to their principles feel that they cannot go counter to the express commands of Christ by using the sword to destroy men’s lives in its defense... For two hundred years the Society has borne uniform testimony to the peaceable spirit... The faithfulness with which they have adhered to their convictions, often under suffering calculated to test their sincerity, has convinced their countrymen that their claims to exemption from military service, are not put forth for the purpose of eluding duties... they are, by almost universal consent, acknowledged to be conscientious non-combatants.\textsuperscript{106}
\end{quote}

Later, as the war dragged on, the periodicals began to confront the war even more directly. The way these periodicals addressed the war said much about the state of the Orthodox and Hicksite branches of the Society at the time. One respect in which both were united was in their support after the war for philanthropic and volunteer efforts on behalf of the freedmen. The Orthodox members founded and repeatedly promoted their own “Friends’ Association of Philadelphia and vicinity, for the Relief of the Coloured Freedmen” in \textit{The Friend}, while in the \textit{Friends’ Intelligencer} the Hicksites solicited contributions for the National Freedman’s Relief Association based in Washington, D.C. It is indicative of the Orthodox branch’s antipathy for outside
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organizations and movements that while the Hicksites align themselves with a national relief organization, Orthodox Friends decided to form their own.

While *The Friend* reflected a branch of the Society of Friends that was confident in its beliefs and in its membership, the *Friends’ Intelligencer* seems to portray an organization in crisis. Curiously, due ostensibly to theoretical reasons of “propriety”, the periodical did not carry current events from the war in any manner, which in retrospect seems almost deafening in its silence. The number of editorials regarding the war did increase, although there were never as many as in *The Friend*, from 6 in 1861 to 10 in 1862 to 15 in 1863.

The editorials seem to reflect a society in flux whose members are questioning and debating the peace testimony. The *Friends’ Intelligencer* was filled with editorials exhorting its members to look to the seminal text of the Quaker faith and also referenced biblical passages in a defense of the peace testimony including this excerpt from a report on the Philadelphia Women’s Yearly Meeting:

> Much interest has been felt that we should be more alive to the vital importance of the faithful maintenance of the Christian testimonies embraced in the sixth query. We have been urged to examine the foundation on which these testimonies are based, especially that against war. We believe this examination would cause us to see the inconsistency of manifesting an interest in the military movements of the day.

There is a certain insecurity regarding the loyalties of many Hicksite Friends that is continually repeated in the pages of the *Intelligencer*, particularly in regards to the “young and ardent” amongst their members. It is not surprising that one of the main projects that sprung up during the war was a movement for a Hicksite school to “shield [our children] at a tender age from the many temptations by which they are surrounded at public and other schools”.

Indeed, even early on it seems as if some Friends were conceding that they had to some extent lost much of the Quaker youth and other young people who might be disposed toward the
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Society (such as Benjamin Smith) to the general enthusiasm regarding the war. This occurred despite the best efforts of their elders to advise them better (these efforts were reflected in the occasional editorial decrying the violence and senseless loss of life due to war). An editorial from November 1861 seems almost resigned to the loss of many young Friends even before Lincoln’s Emancipation Proclamation solidified the connection between the war and abolition:

That many of the young and ardent in our own religious Society should have been drawn into the whirlpool of popular enthusiasm, is not to be wondered at. The apparent connection of this contest with the anti-slavery movement, in which Friends have taken such a lively interest, has induced the desire on the part of some, to have a war prosecuted with vigor, which seems to them to promise, as one of its results, the long-desired enfranchisement of the coloured race.109

To be mentioned in such a manner in the Friends’ Intelligencer indicates the grave concern that leaders in the community had that many young Quakers were supportive of the war effort.

A further indication that divisions existed among Hicksites regarding the peace testimony is shown by two articles that ran in the Intelligencer during June and July 1863. During this period two editorials appeared concerning the moral impact of paying the $300 commutation fee, or the payment that the government allowed conscientious objectors to avoid being forced to fight when recalled. Until this point the official stance had always been that making the payment was capitulating to the war effort and therefore immoral. As Jesus had loved his enemies, the Friends’ were obligated to love theirs, was the essential credo. However, an explosive editorial dated June 27th gives us a close glimpse into the debates and confusion actually held amongst Hicksite Friends. The fearful sense of chaos, open questioning, and argument of the writer is a powerful combination:

In this momentous crisis in our history it becomes us as a Society, and individually, to reexamine the stand we have taken- to ascertain for ourselves… whether the ground we occupy is all tenable… It must be conceded, if the government has, in the nature of things, a right to this money, we the holder of it have no right to refuse its demand. The relations which subsist between government and property may be deduced from the history of Jesus in “Matthew xxii”… where [Jesus] saith unto [the Pharisees], render therefore unto Caesar the things that are Caesar’s, and unto God the things that are God’s.110
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The argument concluded that the money was essentially the property of the government and as such was their right to request, no matter the purpose. The editorial also pointed out that Friends pay their civilian taxes in times of war, despite the fact that a significant portion of those funds must go to the war effort in one respect or another.

This editorial, not surprisingly, sparked an impassioned response in the July 7th edition that defended the peace testimony. However, it kept the door open for debate, saying that the testimony “should not be held ignorantly and blindly as mere traditions… nor yet recklessly departed from because their beauty and value are not seen”.

The encouragement to open debate and dialogue was apparently ended on August 15th when editors of the *Intelligencer* noted that they were going to “withhold” the flurry of letters on the subject that they had subsequently received from various Hicksites.

To summarize, it is clear that, after initial recalcitrance, both *The Friend* and the *Friends’ Intelligencer* were forced to write about the Civil War and its impact on its members. While the former exuded confidence and an unquestioning unanimity in favor of the peace testimony amongst its members, the latter appeared to be defensive regarding the behavior of its younger members, and reflected possible deeper divisions within members of the Society regarding certain aspects of the peace testimony such as paying the commutation fee.

It is difficult to determine how extensively *The Friend* was disseminated and followed at Haverford College, and the weight it carried in the Coates family, as well as how much young Benjamin Hays Smith was influenced by writings in the *Friends’ Intelligencer*. One or the other- or both- however, were probably read in the household of each of our young students, and contributed to their views on the peace testimony abolition, and the Civil War.

---

Pacifism, Peace Societies and the Quakers

It has been asserted that two different groups composed the peace movement in antebellum America. On one side were the American Peace Society, the self-proclaimed champion of Christian civilization, who sought to educate Christian nations to reject the barbarities of war. On the other were nonresistant or sectarian radicals, who strove to persuade individuals to dissociate themselves from the state and to adopt the nonresistant lifestyle exemplified by Jesus. Each group found positions in Christian tradition and Scripture to support its argument, but had different reforming temperaments and manipulated religious language and tradition to suit their viewpoint.

Prominent within the sectarian movement was the Society of Friends, who despite their strict adherence to the peace testimony held a variety of opinions on war, peace, and reform. The urge to pursue reform activity in support of the peace testimony conflicted strongly with the desire of leaders of both the Orthodox and Hicksite branches of the Society to pursue a course independent from any outside organizations, even if the other organizations supported beliefs held by Friends. This Quaker position was complicated, however, by the fact that the Civil War, which seemed increasingly inevitable as the 1850s moved on, had as one of its goals the end of slavery, which most Friends supported.

Pacifist religious sects, including the Quakers, were the leading advocates for peace in the colonies in the 18th century. Later, however, they did not have the same influence on outsiders, particularly as proselytizers, into the 19th century. The nonsectarian character and organizational aspects of 19th century American humanitarian peace movements enabled these
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groups to be more dynamic than religious pacifist groups. As a result they reached a broader audience than the more inward looking Quaker Yearly Meetings, Brethren, and Mennonites. Humanitarian reformers such as William Lloyd Garrison epitomized these movements, which talked of the perfectibility of man rather than of God’s will or inner revelation. These humanitarian advocates detested the violence of the Civil War but also held strong abolitionist sentiments. More of these advocates softened or recanted their antiwar stance than the Quakers in particular, although they too were not immune to pressure aimed at their pacifism.

This does not mean that pacifist religious sects did not have an influence on a significant number of conscientious objectors in the Civil War. The tensions resulting from the reaction of many religiously-minded individuals to the first conscription act suggested an inherent conflict between some forms of Christianity and civil government in the United States. During the Civil War, conscientious objectors to the draft were driven by religious convictions that forbade them from fighting under any circumstances. This differs strongly from the scruples of many 20th century nonsectarian conscientious objectors, who based their refusal to fight on political and philosophical as well as on religious grounds. Among those for whom religious scruples were the cause of pacifist sentiments were members of nonsectarian abolitionist organizations including many who wrote for Garrison’s *The Liberator*, and also resulted in many nonsectarian pacifist organizations such as the American Anti-Slavery Society and more cross-cutting alliances such as the Universal Peace Union (UPU).
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Although they were a very eclectic group, these religiously-minded pacifists shared a certain “restorationist” impulse that affected their belief systems. They desired a return to the practices to the early Christian Church, unsullied by the forces of sectarianism, ecclesiastical hierarchy, and corruption in general. Of this mind were many U.S. Christian denominations and sects, including not only the Quakers but the Mennonites, Amish, Shakers, Mormons, Jehovah’s Witnesses, Pentecostals, Methodists, and Baptists, amongst others.

These religiously-based objectors used a certain reading of the Bible that forbade them from conflict. They took for their model the biblical teachings of Jesus and the example of the early Christian Church as described in the New Testament. Through obedience to God’s laws, these Christian “perfectionist” pacifists believed, one could obtain Christian perfection, thus immediately entering into God’s millennial kingdom on earth:

Prominent among God’s laws was the doctrine of nonresistance, formulated from Jesus’ command in Matthew 5:38-39: “Ye have heard that it hath been said, an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth: but I say unto you, that ye resist not evil”… under no circumstances should one sinful act be met with another… Although [they] were adamant opponents of slavery, their nonresistance beliefs would not allow them to countenance violence to destroy the peculiar institution.

Taking literally the words of Paul the Apostle to the Corinthians, “The weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty through God” (Corinthians 10:4). Religious groups such as the Quakers, Anabaptists, and Shakers were tested by the first Federal conscription act created for the war because they could not comply with the obligations for exemption from the battlefield, including a commutation fee or even a period of service in a hospital.

Quakers were possibly most prominent among the religious sects known for their pacifist beliefs because of their adherence to their “peace testimony”. The testimony forbade Friends from participating in conflict and was related to the doctrine of the Inner Light, or the existence
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of Christ within each soul, which could be discovered through self-reflection. The peace testimony essentially stated that Friends must follow Jesus’ example in refraining from violence or conflict, and instead asserted that kindness and fairness were the best weapons to use against conflict. Refusal to follow this basic precept of the Society of Friends’ belief system resulted in an expulsion from the Society.

In retrospect, it may seem surprising that the Society took an independent course from both other denominational and non-denominational peace movements. Conservative leaders in the Orthodox branch of the church such as George F. White of New York, however, had historically acted with distinct hostility towards nonsectarian groups, and attempted to push the Orthodox branch away from any evangelical tendencies. These leaders consistently encouraged Quakers not to join nonsectarian peace organizations, typified by statements such as these:

> It is safer, at least in the present state of the world, that we keep much to ourselves, and not act as a body in reference to this important testimony, lest by joining with others we should unawares be led into a compromise or evasion of any of its requisitions.122

This stance was the product of a general quietist perspective amongst members of the Society, as well as an isolationist stance toward other organizations, both of which dated from the 19th century. While acknowledging that the peace testimony was carefully nurtured and rigorously guarded by Friends during this time, historians characteristically regard the official Quaker stance during this period as lacking a “vital spark”. At the very least, it strongly discouraged dynamism and collaboration with other groups with potentially similar belief systems.

This was even truer of the Hicksite branch of the Society of Friends, dating to the convictions of its founder, Elias Hicks. Despite the fact that he pioneered the ”free produce” movement many abolitionists would embrace (which rejected the consumption of slave-produced
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items), he chastised evangelical Protestantism’s involvement with organized reform, Bible societies, and missionary work.\textsuperscript{124} He feared that these activities compromised the work of George Fox two centuries earlier, and thus he also discouraged Hicksites from participating in outside peace organizations.

The formation of the Progressive Friends, another Quaker splinter sect, finally gave an option to Quakers who were interested in reform activity. The Progressive Friends emphasized an individualistic approach to religion that needed no dogma, because Christian truth existed within each soul.\textsuperscript{125} Progressives sought to apply this truth to the world around them, and the desire of many Hicksites to associate themselves with reform activities ignited the final separation with Hicksite elders that resulted in the birth of the sect in 1853. The Progressive Friends attracted the interest and sympathies of many antebellum reformers, Quaker and non-Quaker, including Theodore Parker, Samuel J. May, Sojourner Truth, Oliver Johnson, and Lucretia Mott.\textsuperscript{126}

What this meant to Quakers living day-to-day and their involvement in the war effort, however, is unclear. Were Quakers uninfluenced by outside peace movements able to maintain adherence to the testimony? The answer, to at least some degree, seems to be yes. Narrowing the focus of participation in the war to Philadelphia-area Quakers affirms these conclusions. As mentioned earlier, statistics state that only 4 of 150 more urban Orthodox Quakers drafted into the army actually served in the conflict, while many more Hicksite Friends joined the army.\textsuperscript{127} This range of conviction regarding the peace testimony reflected a generally surprising diversity
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of practices and ideology amongst Orthodox, Hicksite, Wilburite, Gurneyite, renewal, and revival Friends, among others.

The Civil War precipitated a gradual shift away from Quietism amongst all Friends and a greater participation in outside organizations and movements, particularly during the following decades before World War I. The war had clearly provided Friends with a series of crises that forced them to come to terms with the extensive demands of the beliefs they had developed. Examples include the 1874 Orthodox constitution, the recommending of arbitration to President Cleveland in an 1887 dispute with Canada, and interest in the 1899 Hague Conference as a few of the many examples of this movement.128

There is some literature concerning Quakers and pacifism that cover the war period, most notably the works of Peter Brock, including Pacifism in the United States: From the Colonial Era to the First World War as well as Radical Pacifists in Antebellum America. Brock emphasizes that the nonsectarian character and organizational aspects of 19th century American humanitarian peace movements enabled these groups to be more dynamic than religious pacifist groups. As a result they reached a broader audience than the more inward looking Quaker Yearly Meetings, Brethren, and Mennonites.

Smith and Coates’ steeping in Philadelphia Quaker culture tells only part of the story. The more aggressive Orthodox Friends from west of the Appalachians, who fought in the war in great numbers, particularly the Gurneyites in Indiana, have gained the attention of some scholars, most notably Thomas Hamm in The Transformation of American Quakerism: Orthodox Friends, 1800-1907. Hamm notes the problem of dissension in western Quaker groups, such as the Gurneyites in Indiana. Governor Oliver Morton was quoted as saying Quakers provided a larger
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enlistment in proportion to membership than any other denomination in his state. Hamm also addresses the suffering of Southern Friends, noting that they were discriminated against both for their typically pro-Union sympathies and their refusal to acquiesce to strict Confederate conscription laws. Northern Friends were not exempt from poor treatment, as seen in the case of Cyrus Pringle, but Secretary of War Edwin Stanton had Quaker relatives and, with President Lincoln’s approval, made it understood that conscientious objectors would be treated fairly.

Philadelphia, however, was one of the centers of both the Orthodox and Hicksite Quaker world throughout the 19th century. Even so, there is a relative dearth of information about Delaware Valley Friends during this period. Much research is left to be done to give context and texture to Coates’ and Smith’s choices and to test Phillip Benjamin’s assertion that “as a test of pacifist mettle, the Civil War was not very demanding”.

Certainly, during World War I, the Quakers are noted for having led significant humanitarian efforts at home and abroad and were embraced by much of America for their efforts, which is a significant contrast with the castigation they received for not fighting in the Civil War. This era is well documented. However, the Civil War era was a significant period in which the Society of Friends began to reshape and redefine themselves in ways that placed them in the position to respond successfully to these later challenges.
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Conclusion

The objective of thesis has been to explore some of the Quaker culture that surrounded young men raised in Quaker families who attended Haverford during the Civil War era. This has been achieved by discussing the factors that most influenced their development, most prominent of which are the influence of their families in a Quaker religious environment, the “guarded and liberal” education that they received at Haverford, and their relationship with their family and friends.

A review of Board of Managers minutes and administrative and faculty records from the war period reveal their perspective in attempting to protect Haverford’s students from exposure to various aspects of the conflict, particularly widespread pro-Union sentiment outside the college and the trains carrying Union troops nearby the college. Their response to the flag raising controversy and student demonstrations show that, while deeply concerned about the students, the Board of Members were people of their time and envisaged strict punishment as the best way to encourage positive Christian morals and discipline.

Haverford’s early histories supplement early records to help reveal how the college connected discipline with a liberal yet “Christian” curriculum in order to achieve its educational goals. Achieving these goals seemed increasingly difficult in the 1860s as decreased attendance, financial troubles, and issues with discipline and the curriculum all at some point beset the school. As time has gone on, however, these troubles have faded from memory and college histories have increasingly emphasized the stability of Haverford’s “guarded and liberal education” throughout the 19th century.

The diaries of William Morrison Coates and Benjamin Hayes Smith reveal how the boys lived through their tranquil days at Haverford, which were punctuated by the whirlwind of events
occurring outside the college. We learn about their families, which is supplemented by family transcripts and other Quaker materials showing the deep impact these figures had as role models and doting parents. Their diaries reflect their strong desire to enjoy their freedom and play with their friends. Benjamin Smith in particular grows as a writer and a person throughout his diary, and shows an interest in the developing political and moral questions concerning the war. The diaries show two different styles of writing and recording what William and Benjamin feel to be most significant about their lives.

Editorials in the Orthodox publication *The Friend* and the Hicksite publication *The Friends Intelligencer*, supplemented by Quaker materials and secondary literature of 19th century peace movements situate the world the boys are living in around the context of the Civil War. Haverford could not completely keep the outside world at bay, and these influences forced members of all communities, religious and otherwise, to consider the moral and spiritual ramifications of abolition and fighting in the war. This had special significance and promised unique dangers to the Quaker community. The strength of the peace testimony was tested on an individual basis as Friends decided whether abolition or preserving the integrity of their faith was more important.

Observation of the contexts of Haverford and the larger Philadelphia-area Quaker world in the 1850s and 1860s, complemented by reading the diaries of students William Morrison Coates and Benjamin Hayes Smith, has allowed us to see how two young men growing up under these conditions reacted to the external pressures of the Civil War era. Although the efforts of Haverford administrators, anxious parents and surrounding Quaker communities succeeded in influencing most students away from pro-Union sentiment and the war effort, their efforts were not completely successful. William Morrison Coates “conformed” and remained within the
guidelines. Benjamin Smith, on the other hand, is an example of an independent and reflective soul who made his decision on his own, and shows that Haverford’s education could only “guard” its students so much from their own belief in what was right.
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