A portion of a letter written by Lieutenant Governor and Chief Justice Hutchinson to Governor Bernard in 1769 in which he affirmed: “At the congress at Albany in 1754 I was in favor of an Union of the Govts for certain purposes & I drew the plan which was then accepted.”
THE DRAFTING OF THE ALBANY PLAN OF UNION:

A PROBLEM IN SEMANTICS

By LAWRENCE HENRY GIPSON

Prefatory Note—Professor Gipson has written extensively on the Albany Plan of Union. In Volume V of his series, The British Empire before the American Revolution, published in 1942, he considered some of the various plans for a union of the North American colonies and was inclined to ascribe one of them, for a union of the more northern colonies, to Thomas Hutchinson, who was acting at Albany in 1754 as a commissioner from Massachusetts Bay. In the January, 1950, number of The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography in an article entitled “Thomas Hutchinson and the Framing of the Albany Plan of Union, 1754,” he went beyond the position taken in 1942 and arrived at the conclusion that the Albany Plan of Union was in reality a fusion of Benjamin Franklin’s “Short Hints Toward a Scheme for Uniting the Northern Colonies” and the “Plan of a proposed Union” of the more northern colonies of which Hutchinson was apparently the author. This position he supported in the July, 1951, number of the same magazine in his “Letter to the Editor.” In the present article he presents additional evidence to this end, and analyzes in detail the meaning of Hutchinson’s assertion, made in 1769 in a letter to Governor Bernard: “At the Congress at Albany in 1754 I was in favor of an Union of the Govts for certain Purposes & I drew the Plan which was then accepted.”

The Albany Congress that met in formal session on June 19, 1754, and continued to sit until July 11 was the most important and most representative meeting of delegates from various colonial governments that took place in North America before the gathering of the Continental Congress in 1775. Its general activities have naturally been the object of attention of many writers. What is here proposed is to re-examine the question of the authorship of the justly famous Albany Plan of Union which represents

1 New Jersey, Delaware, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, as well as the frontier colonies of Nova Scotia and Georgia were not represented at the Albany Congress.

the most significant achievement of the Congress—despite the fact that the effort to implement it proved abortive. For the Plan laid down a broad and statesmanlike pattern for united action on the part of the North American colonials which was destined to have a profound influence on American constitutional developments.

On the basis of contemporary evidence the name of Benjamin Franklin will always be associated with the drafting of the plan of union that was ultimately agreed upon by the Congress, and that was referred to the respective colonial governments for approval. In a letter to his friend, Peter Collinson, dated December 29, 1754, Franklin wrote: “For tho’ I projected the Plan and drew it, I was oblig’d to alter some Things contrary to my Judgment or should never have been able to carry it through.” Further, in his Autobiography, written late in life, in referring to the unanimous agreement on the part of the commissioners to the Albany Congress to take steps to draw up a plan of union, he stated: “A Committee was then appointed, one member from each colony, to consider the several plans and report. Mine happen’d to be preferr’d, and, with a few Amendments, was accordingly reported.”

Again, Governor Thomas Hutchinson of Massachusetts Bay, then a loyalist refugee in England, wrote in the third volume of his The History of Massachusetts Bay, when referring to the activities of the Albany Congress: “The plan for a general union was projected by Benjamin Franklin, Esq., one of the commissioners from the province of Pensilvania, the heads whereof he brought with him.” The authorship of the Albany Plan of Union, when considered in the light alone of this contemporary evidence, appears to be beyond dispute. However, this is not the case.

3 Ibid., I, 387.
4 The History of the Colony and Province of Massachusetts Bay (ed. L. S. Mayo, Cambridge, Mass., 1936), III, 16. The Diary and Letters of Thomas Hutchinson (ed. P. O. Hutchinson, Boston, 1884), I, 55, contains the following additional comment by Hutchinson: “The same famous Dr. Franklin was one of the Commissioners from Pensilvania. He with Mr. Hutchinson, were the Committee who drew up the plan of Union and representation of the state of the Colonies. The former [the plan of union] was the projection of Dr. F., and prepared in part before he had any consultation with Mr. H., probably brought with him from Philadelphia; the latter [the representation] was the draught of Mr. H.”
In tracing the history of the evolution of the Albany Plan of Union, one is in fact confronted with much the same sort of problem of authorship as is involved in the pamphlet, *The Interest of Great Britain Considered, with regard to her Colonies, and the Acquisitions of Canada and Guadeloupe*, that appeared in 1760 which Franklin later called "My Pamphlet." Was it not, however, more accurately the result of the combined efforts of Franklin and his close associate, Richard Jackson of Inner Temple, with the latter providing the initial formulation of the major part of it? This, at least, was the assertion of Baron Francis Masères, also of Inner Temple, in writing in 1780 to Benjamin Vaughan, publisher of Franklin's *Political, Miscellaneous, and Philosophical Pieces* that issued from the press in 1779. In his reply to Masères, Vaughan wrote in some embarrassment: "The affair of the Canada Pamphlet has now become too delicate for the editor again to intermeddle in it. He observes that Mr. Jackson's present claim goes to about 2/3 of the pamphlet." After considering critically this claim, Carl Van Doren, who edited the Franklin-Jackson correspondence, concluded: "The voice speaking through these passages may be Jackson's, but the hand that wrote them is Franklin's.”

Now as to the drafting of the Albany Plan of Union, one is confronted with the highly confidential draft of a letter written on October 27, 1769, to Governor Francis Bernard of Massachusetts Bay by Hutchinson who, at the time, was both Lieutenant Governor and Chief Justice. It was concerned with the grave situation in America that arose out of the Townshend Acts, followed by the non-importation agreements against Great Britain entered into by colonial merchants. As it is a letter of general interest as well as

*Writings of Benjamin Franklin* (ed. A. H. Smyth), I, 224.

7 For the Vaughan letter, which is undated, see *Letters and Papers of Benjamin Franklin and Richard Jackson, 1753-1785* (ed. Carl Van Doren, Philadelphia, 1947), 13. It would also appear that Franklin himself acknowledged aid in writing the *Canada Pamphlet*. Vaughan in 1779, while preparing the edition of Franklin's writings referred to in the text, inscribed the following note in the "Addenda & Corrigenda": "Dr. Franklin has often been heard to say, that in writing this pamphlet, he received considerable assistance from a learned friend who was not willing to be named" (*ibid.*, 10).

8 *Ibid.*, 16; see also V. W. Crane, "Certain Writings of Benjamin Franklin on the British Empire and the American Colonies," *Bibliographical Society Papers*, XXVIII (1924); *Benjamin Franklin's Letters to the Press*, 1758-1775 (Chapel Hill, 1950), 16-17; and *Benjamin Franklin and a Rising People* (Boston, 1954), 94.
one that throws light on the question under consideration, it may
be well to quote the major part of it in full:

Boston, 27 Oct. r 1769

"Dear Sir:"

Our Mercht subscription goes on & altho there are some
who refuse to join [the non-importation agreement] yet
it is generally supposed the same measures will be used
as have been to compel a compliance with the former
agreement. [Col.] Dalrymple told me a day or two ago
that one who was present at the Merchts meeting in-
formed him that Mr. Hancock said he had concerted
with the Merchts of Phila. and N.York a plan of an
union & a Congress of Deputies in order to carry these
measures into execution & to settle other measures as
may from time to time be necessary & that Molineux
proposed to proceed imediately to the choice of them
but it was thought best to defer it to the next meet-
ing wch will be in about 10 days. I mention this to
you because I think it most probable he has wrote to
England to the same purpose but upon enquiry I heard
he misunderstood the gentleman and that noth. of this
sort was said in the meeting and that it was only sheer
conversation upon Mr. Hanc. return from Philad. &
N.York. However, I think nothing [in the] future can
be more certain than that these People who have now the
Power in their hands will keep it & will improve it in
opposition to Parliamt until Parliamentary Power sup-
presses them. It is notorious that Mr. [Royall] Tyler
[1724-71] who ought to have advised me to a Proclama-
tion against the confederacy or to direct the Att.y Gen.
to a Prosecution is a subscriber to the new agreement &
most of his brethren are favorers of it & the rest pas-
sive. I mean those who are in town. The Treas. I except
he having declared against it. Mr. Hubbard has been ill
for some time incapable of business.

I am more and more confirmed that the Repeal [(] I
mean no date [)] of the last Act [the Townshend Act]
will make [credite ?] among our sons of liberty. Many
in each colony will be content whilst others will continue
their opposition. If ever Machiavellian Policy [could ?]
be justified this is the time & I cannot think there can be
any ground for complaint if every dispute about bounds
or of any other nature should be suffered to continue un-
til it be made certain what sort of subjects we intend
to be.
At NY. they are in full expect. of an Amer. Par[l]. upon the Plan of the govt of Irel. This would be the strang[est] Policy that ever was heard of. If Ireland could be removed 3,000 miles from Britain it would soon cease to be under the dominion of the same Prince—[with] still greater reason we may say it would never submit to Parliament authority. At the congress at Albany in 1754 I was in fav'r of an Union of the govs for certain Purposes & I drew the Plan which was then accepted [but] if I had imagined such absurd notions of govt could ever have entred into the heads of the Americans as are now publicly avowed I should then have been against any sort of union as I was for it."

Unless one assumes either that Hutchinson at the time of composing the above letter was under a mental cloud, quite confused, and therefore not responsible for what he said about so important a matter, or that he saw fit, for unknown reasons and with his

*Massachusetts Archives, 26:395, State House. For a comment on this letter see Malcolm Freiberg, “Thomas Hutchinson: The First Fifty Years (1711-1761).” *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd ser., XV, 52 n. Dr. Freiberg takes the position that what Hutchinson really had in mind was not the Albany Plan of Union but the Albany Congress’s representation on the state of the colonies which he himself drafted with the aid of other members of the Congress’s committee on a colonial union and which, designed to be sent to the Board of Trade, was approved by the Congress on July 9. To me such a thesis violates sound principles of historical interpretation. In the entire document there is no reference to a colonial union, outside of the next-to-the-last sentence in which the hope is expressed “That there be a Union of His Maj[esty]s several Governs on the Continent, that so their Councils, Treasure and strength may be employed in due proportion agst their Common Enemy” (*New York Colonial Documents*, VI, 888). It is quite illogical to confuse the representation, a series of observations and recommendations respecting the menacing conditions on the frontiers, with a formal plan of colonial union that, after amendment, redrafting, and further amendment, was finally accepted by the Congress as the plan to be submitted to the various colonial governments for their consideration. Hutchinson was not the sort of man to do so in 1769.

Returning to the Hutchinson letter, Governor Bernard, who was in England, acknowledged it on December 4, 1769. On the subject of an American parliament he had the following to say, which will be of interest to the American reader: “The Expectation of an American Parliament is the absurdest Idea that could enter a Man’s Head at this time. When we recollect what an Alarm the late Congress at New York [the Stamp Act Congress of 1765] occasioned, can it be imagined that such an Assembly would be authorized by Great Britain? There are Men of Authority & Power here who (not with standing the foolish notion of the Expediency of dividing the Colonies into many little Governments which has pervaded heretofore) would be glad to see America divided into several large Principalities, with a Constitution as similar to Great Britain as well may be. But the present is not the time for so great an undertaking” (Bernard Correspondence, 8: 26-28, Houghton Library, Harvard).
high position in government, to falsify the part he played in the evolution of the Albany Plan, any reconciliation of the disclosure of October 27, 1769, with the three previous statements, would appear to lie primarily in the field of semantics. Since the letter in question and all of his papers covering this period are precise and clear, indicating that he was in full possession of his faculties, and since, under the peculiar circumstance, there could not have been the slightest justification for so wilful a misstatement of the part he felt he had played in the process of constructing the Albany Plan, the task confronting the student is, as already indicated, to reconcile, if possible, this conflicting testimony. To do so it will be necessary to examine what evidence is at hand that could possibly justify such a statement as that, "I drew the plan that was accepted," while at the same time accepting his later statement that it "was projected by Benjamin Franklin."

It seems necessary at the outset to make two assumptions. The first is, that when Hutchinson was writing the third volume of his History of Massachusetts Bay in England—with an American union under the guidance of a Continental Congress waging war against Great Britain—he was very anxious for reasons of his own to disassociate himself completely from the effort, or desire, to create a colonial union in 1754; the second is, that when stating in 1769 to his superior, Governor Bernard, that he himself had prepared the plan which was adopted by the Albany Congress, he must have meant that before the Congress met he had drafted a constitution for some kind of an American colonial union with such care and in such detail that it eventually became the main structure of the Albany Plan of Union, rather than the Franklin "Short Hints." There are valid grounds for believing that these two assumptions are correct.

Unhappily, by reason of the destruction of most of the private papers of Hutchinson in 1765 at the time his home was ransacked by Stamp Act rioters, one is compelled, in accepting Hutchinson's assertion in 1769, to rely upon evidence that is indirect in nature. Nevertheless, this is sufficiently impressive to support the view that he was the chief architect of just such a plan. It may be added that—quite contrary to the facts and doubtless for the reasons previously mentioned—neither in his History nor in his Diary does he leave the impression, as already indicated, that he
had the slightest desire in 1754 to see the formation of a colonial union. His one aim in these writings seems to have been—with the American union then a fact—to place the chief responsibility for promoting earlier unions on the shoulders of his one-time friend, Franklin, who was now his enemy and that of all American loyalists. At the time of his writing the third volume of the *History* and also the *Diary*, he was undoubtedly even more violently "against any sort of union" of the colonies than he had been in 1769—especially as the union that had finally been created not only was engaged in war against the mother country, but had brought about his exile and that of the members of his family with the loss of their property. Can one imagine that Hutchinson, under these circumstances, would desire to remind posterity that at one time he had labored to create an American union?

Let us now consider the chain of indirect evidence pointing to Hutchinson's efforts to create an American union in 1754. In that year Governor William Shirley of Massachusetts Bay was strongly committed to the idea of such a union. In urging the General Court to give support to the proposal of a congress to treat with the Iroquois Confederation—in line with the request of the British Board of Trade in 1753—he declared on April 2, 1754: "Such a Union of Councils . . . may lay a foundation for a general one among all His Majesty's colonies for . . . our mutual Support and Defence. . . ." He thereupon warned the legislators that this was a matter of great urgency in the following words: "For forming this general union, Gentlemen, there is no Time to be lost: The French seemed to have advanc'd further toward making themselves Masters of this Continent within these past five or six Years, than they have done ever since the first Beginning of their Settlements upon it. . . ." In their joint reply on April 9 the two houses stated: "Your Excellency must be sensible that an Union of the several Governments for their mutual Defence, and for the Annoyance of the Enemy, has long been desired by this Province, and Proposals [were] made for this Purpose; We are still of the same Sentiments, and shall use our Endeavours to effect it."

Shirley also urged other governors to seize the opportunity that such a congress would provide for dealing unitedly with the

---

10 For Shirley's address and the reply of the General Court see *Journals of the House of Representatives of Massachusetts, 1753-1754* (Boston, 1955), 268-275.
Iroquois Confederation and for strengthening the posture of the colonies in face of French aggression. Indeed, he was the only one of the colonial governors to give active support to the idea of an American union. Moreover, the zest of this popular governor for colonial union was shared by the Massachusetts Bay General Court. It not only agreed to the appointment of commissioners to the proposed congress but gave definite directions to them to work for "a general, firm and perpetual union & confederacy" of the American colonies. It should be noted in this connection that Massachusetts Bay was the only colony that instructed its commissioners to try to realize this objective, which in fact was placed first in importance in the list of instructions.

In view of Shirley's warning that in "forming this general union . . . there is no Time to be Lost" and the assurance of the General Court that "We . . . shall use our Endeavours to effect it," it is unbelievable that at least one of the commissioners chosen to attend the Congress did not take it upon himself to draft with great care and in detail some plan of union during the interval between his appointment in April and the meeting of the Albany Congress in June. To assume that no preparations were made prior to the Congress by any of the Massachusetts Bay commissioners is so contrary to the quality of leadership displayed during this period by the men of this colony that it must be rejected, unless positive evidence can be produced of this neglect of duty. Indeed, one seems justified in assuming that these commissioners came to Albany exceedingly well prepared to press the major point in their instructions: union of the colonies.

It is quite clear that Benjamin Franklin, before he arrived in Albany, had prepared his "Short Hints toward a Scheme for Uniting the Northern Colonies," which was presented to the Congress for consideration. But this was not the only plan submitted to the Congress, and apparently prepared in advance. Franklin himself, in referring to the "Short Hints" in his Autobiography, stated that "several of the commissioners had form'd plans of the same kind. . . . A committee was then appointed . . . to consider

---

21 This point has been well developed by R. C. Newbold in his The Albany Congress and the Plan of Union of 1754 (New York, 1955), 30-31.
22 Massachusetts Archives, 4:468-469.
23 Ibid., 4:471.
24 Writings of Benjamin Franklin (ed. A. H. Smyth), III, 197-199.
the several plans and report." In view of this affirmation by Franklin, taken together with the vital interest displayed in colonial union by Massachusetts Bay—the only colony definitely committed by both branches of its legislature and its governor to union—is it not proper to assume that one of the plans submitted to the consideration of the Congress among the "several" had its origin in the Bay colony? That there were other plans than the "Short Hints" at the time the Congress met is also made clear by its minutes. These indicate that one of the first things that was done as soon as that body was called to order on June 19 by Lieutenant Governor De Lancey was to create a committee "to prepare and receive Plans or Schemes for the Union of the Colonies, and to digest them into one general plan for the inspection of this Board [that is, the assembled commissioners]."

Assuming that the Massachusetts Bay commissioners did not come to Albany without preparation and without a carefully formulated plan, what was the type of union that they at first favored? According to the report that they rendered to the Governor's Council on October 25, 1754, after their return to Boston, they affirmed that at the beginning of the Congress they

... were in doubt, whether it might [not] be convenient that the colonies should be divided into at least two Districts, as the great distance of the two Extream [sic] parts of his Majesty's Governments from each other, must render it always very burthensome to some or other of the members to give their attendance, be the place of meeting where it will and in a Government of so large an extent there will be danger of some parts being neglected or unequally considered;

They then went on to state:

but as the designs of the French may probably require the united strength & Councils of the whole British Continent and as it seems to be of the last importance that all affairs Which relate to the Indians should be under but one direction, and considered without any special regard to any particular Government we were induced to prefer the present plan [that is, the Albany Plan of Union].

15 Ibid., I, 387.
16 New York Colonial Documents, VI, 860.
17 Massachusetts Archives, 4:463.
Thus, in the course of the proceedings of the Congress they "were induced to prefer the present plan"—that is, the Albany Plan that they brought back with them—instead of a plan of union that they had first favored which grouped the colonies "into at least two Districts." That some of the commissioners at the time of their arrival at Albany strongly favored partial unions is also indicated by Franklin in his "Reasons and Motives on Which the Plan of Union was Formed"—drawn up either at Albany or soon after leaving, which stated: "It was proposed by some of the Commissioners to form the colonies into two or three distinct unions; but for . . . reasons [six in number] that proposal was dropped even by those who made it. . . ."18

Again, it appears that the Massachusetts Bay commissioners, in desiring at first a union of the more northern colonies, sought to make sure that their own colony would have the sort of prominence in it that had been enjoyed in the seventeenth century both during the existence of the New England Confederation and that of the Dominion of New England which followed it, and which finally comprehended all the colonies to the north of Pennsylvania. At least it was recorded that Lieutenant Governor De Lancey of New York, who presided at the Congress, complained "... that Massachusetts acted with an aim to procure the President's chair for their Governor, and, predicted, as he well might, that it would not be much encouraged by New York."19

That the commissioners from Boston should have at first been disposed to favor a union of the more northern colonies in North

18Writings of Benjamin Franklin (ed. A. H. Smyth), III, 205-207.
19William Smith, History of the Late Province of New-York, II (New York Historical Society Collections, 1830, Vol. V), 183-185. The author, a loyalist, who became Chief Justice of the Province of Quebec and who died in 1793, was the son of William Smith, a member of the New York Council. His father was present in this capacity at the Albany Congress and represented New York on the committee appointed to recommend a plan of union. On July 23, 1754, Smith recorded in his "Memoirs" that his father had informed him that De Lancey was disturbed at the Congress when he found the "Boston men ... want a President from among them to govern the Provinces" ("Memoirs," 2:368, New York Public Library). The hostility of De Lancey and members of the New York Council toward Massachusetts Bay is stressed by Thomas Pownall who was present at the Albany Congress, and who later became the Governor of Massachusetts Bay. For his letter to the Earl of Halifax, dated July 23, 1754, see Beverly McAnear, "Personal Accounts of the Albany Congress of 1754," Mississippi Valley Historical Review, XXXIX (1953), 745.
America, under the presidency of the Governor of Massachusetts Bay, and a corresponding southern union, rather than one general union of all the older continental colonies stretching from Maine to Georgia, may seem strange in view of their instructions which required them to seek to realize "a general, firm and perpetual union." In violating these instructions they may have been influenced by the power of tradition and by provincial pride, as well as by the other arguments in favor of a limited union such as they themselves put forward in their report of October 25. Whatever their motives, it would appear that they were committed on their arrival at Albany to the idea of a partial union in connection with which the chief executive office would be combined with that of Governor of Massachusetts Bay.

That such a plan for a more northern union was under early consideration at Albany would seem to be clear from evidence furnished also by a joint committee of the Connecticut Assembly which was appointed upon the return of the Connecticut commissioners after the Albany Congress had concluded its work. This committee of the two houses, under the chairmanship of Lieutenant Governor William Pitkin, was called upon "... to take into consideration ye part of his Honr ye Govr's Speech at ye Opening of this Assembly Relating to ye Proposed Plan of Union therein mentioned and Report their Opinion with ye Reasons[;] therefore wt Measures may be proper for this Assembly to come into ... Relating to the Premisses [sic]."

So far as can be ascertained from available documents, the Connecticut committee gave its attention to setting forth its reasons why the Albany Plan was not acceptable and to the measures that should be taken in opposition to it. However, on October 2 it submitted to the Assembly a report, the final sentence of which reads as follows: "All which, with the draught for a union, delivered in herewith, is humbly submitted, by Your Honour's Committee. ..." This "draught for a union" differs in certain fundamental respects from the Albany Plan. As printed in the Massa-

---

A New England Plan of Union. This was a plan to unite the northern colonies only, suggesting also a corresponding union for the more southern colonies. This plan, as revised, was "recommended by commissioners from several colonies, met in congress, at Albany, June 14, 1754." (Trumbull Papers, 1:93, Conn. State Library.)
chusetts Historical Society Collections it appears with the following significant caption:

Plan of a proposed Union of the several colonies of Massachusetts-Bay, New-Hampshire, Connecticut, Rhode-Island, New-York, & New-Jersey, for their mutual Defence and Security, & for extending the British Settlements Northward & Westward of said Colonies, in North-America; recommended by Commissioners from several Colonies, met in Congress, at Albany, June 14, 1754.22

Ibid., VII, 203-207. In the July, 1951, issue of the Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography (LXXV, 350-362) there appeared two letters, one by Professor V. W. Crane and the other by the writer of this article. These letters were concerned with the above plan of union and another shorter plan, both of which provided for a limited union of the more northern colonies and can be found in the Connecticut Historical Society Collections, XVII (1918), 20-29. One matter about which there was a difference of opinion between us was, which of the two plans was sent by the committee of the Connecticut Assembly as a part of its report? Professor Crane took the position that it was the longer one. At the time I thought I had grounds for deciding in favor of the shorter one, but now recognize that Professor Crane was right. However, the crux of the difference in our points of view had to do with two other matters: one was, whether the two plans came into existence before the Albany Plan of Union had been evolved, or, after its approval by the Congress; the other was, whether the two plans of union were originally drafted by the committee of the Assembly referred to above. My position was, and still is, that the two plans were conceived before the Albany Plan of Union took form. Although I was inclined to the view in 1951 that the shorter plan was probably the creation of the Connecticut commissioners while at Albany and was drafted after they had studied the longer plan, with a desire to provide a union more in line with the political outlook of the people of their colony, I now have serious reservations that this was the case—unless the plan came into existence before the formal opening of the Congress.

It should be pointed out that each of the above two plans embodied one feature that was apparently very distasteful to Lieutenant Governor Pitkin and his fellow Connecticut commissioners at the Congress, but that was finally made a part of the Albany Plan. It was the clause which reads as follows in the shorter plan: “That humble application be made for an Act of The Parliament of Great-Britain, by Virtue of Which one Government may be Formed In America, including all The Said Colonies [of Massachusetts-Bay, New Hampshire, Connecticut, Rhode Island, and New York] . . .” (Connecticut Historical Society Collections, XVII, 25-26). According to Theodore Atkinson, a New Hampshire commissioner, when the question arose in the Congress on July 2 “weither [sic] an Act of Parliament was the only Expedient to Obtain such a Union,” Connecticut, alone of the colonies represented at Albany, refused to approve it on the first vote and also refused approval on the second vote when its commissioners were joined by two of those from Pennsylvania. See Atkinson’s “Memo Book” (ed. Beverly McAnear), Mississippi Valley Historical Review, XXXIX (1953), 737.

With respect to the probability of the origin of the longer of the two plans in Connecticut—over and beyond the point made above against application to Parliament—the question may be validly raised, is it at all likely that
It should not escape notice that the date given when this "draught for a union" of New England, New York, and New Jersey, and for a second union as well, had been "recommended by commissioners from several colonies" was June 14, 1754. This was five days before the more formal opening of the Congress, but it is important to bear in mind that it was the date that had been set for the commissioners to meet when the call was sent out for the Congress. Indeed, it would have been surprising if as many of them as had arrived had not gathered together on the day that had been appointed for their first meeting. The fact that the chairman of the committee of the Connecticut Assembly that framed this report was also the leader of the delegation from his colony to the Congress lends great weight to the accuracy of the wording of the preamble of the plan as given above, and also to the accuracy of the rest of the document, forming, as it does, really an integral part of the committee's report. That there was at the time of the

this plan for a northern union is the sort that any group of leading Connecticut men would have originated? Why, if they were the drafters of it, should they have been more zealous than the men of Massachusetts Bay in seeking to make sure that the province across their northern border should occupy a privileged position in a northern union, with the office of a royal President General fused by them with that of the royal Governor of that province, and with Boston thereupon becoming the capital of the union? What could have been the motive of these enemies of royal interference in seeking to promote a plan that would mean much greater royal interference in their affairs, both in peace and in war? Why did they seek to aggrandize the power of an already too powerful neighbor with whom in 1754 they were in the midst of a dispute over the common boundary, involving the fate of a number of towns seeking to unite with Connecticut but not permitted to do so? Finally, has any evidence ever been presented that any man of influence in Connecticut ever expressed in 1754 a desire to see their precious charter rights infringed upon by any kind of union? Was not the blast in this report of the committee of the Assembly in October 2, against the Albany Plan, also a blast against any plan that would sacrifice any of these rights?

It seems quite clear that the editor of Volume VII of the Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society, published in 1801, had little or no knowledge of the Albany Congress. His ignorance of the outcome of its work is indicated by the fact that in preparing for publication the report of the committee of the Assembly he placed the main body of this report after the above "draught for a union," which was manifestly appended to the report as a part of it and which should therefore have followed the main body of it. As a result, to the confusion of the reader there appears the heading: "Report of a Committee, chosen by the Assembly of Connecticut, respecting the foregoing Plan of Union." This report, as he should have realized, was not concerned with the plan of union "recommended by commissioners from several colonies, met in Congress at Albany, June 14, 1754," but was directed solely against the Albany Plan of Union—finally recommended by the commissioners as the one most proper to be sent to the various colonial govern-
assembling of the commissioners at Albany a movement in favor
of the creation of two or more unions was—as has already been
stated—also affirmed by the Massachusetts Bay Commissioners in
their report upon returning home, and by Franklin in his “Reasons
and Motives.”

Assuming the accuracy of the printed version of the report of
the committee of the Connecticut Assembly, including that part of
it having to do with the plan of union, it does not follow that this
plan was identical with any plan that the commissioners from
Massachusetts Bay may have brought with them to Albany and
which, according to Hutchinson, he himself had drafted. Indeed
it would have been surprising had any plan, the work of one person
ments for their approval—for creating a government of “his Majesty’s
territories . . . seventeen hundred miles” in extent and in depth “fifteen
hundred miles.” That the editor had at least heard of the latter plan is
indicated by a footnote (ibid., VII, 203, n.) which reads: “There was an-
other plan proposed which embraced all the colonies of North America,
except Georgia and Nova Scotia.” It was this plan that, in view of the
wording of the report of the committee, should have preceded the report in
order to make sense. Nevertheless, the editor, outside this major blunder,
seems to have been circumspect, so far as can be determined, in reproducing
faithfully from the manuscript copy the contents of the report, including that
portion relating to the limited plan of union appended to it and a part of it.

With reference to the plan as printed in the Collections, there is, first of
all, a recital in the text of the preamble as given above, then comes the
entire list of commissioners and delegates (for New York had on hand no
“commissioners” but only members of the Council), with no attempt made,
however, to designate those commissioners who had been present on June
14 and had “recommended” the plan; thereupon follows the detailed plan of
limited union. Unfortunately, the manuscript containing the report of the
committee of the Connecticut Assembly, “with a draught for a union, de-
livered in herewith,” cannot be located, despite a careful search for it at the
Massachusetts Historical Society, the Massachusetts Archives, the Con-
necticut Historical Society, and the Connecticut State Library. When the
editor of the Collections of the Connecticut Historical Society, the late Mr.
Albert C. Bates, came to republish in 1918 the main body of this report, he
was obliged to rely upon the text of it that had appeared in 1801 in the
Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society. But, as was true of his
predecessor in Boston over a century earlier, he failed to recognize the
organic connection between it and the text of the plan for a limited union
of the colonies, which was out of place in the earlier publication and which,
as has been indicated, should have followed the main portion of the report.
What is more, he compounded his error by failing to print the preamble of
the text of the plan of union, while presenting the main body of the plan,
thus leaving out data of the utmost importance that clarifies the place this
limited plan of union occupies in the evolution of the Albany Plan. This
failure in the responsibilities of editorship on his part and on that of the
editor of Vol. VII of the Massachusetts Historical Society Collections has
brought confusion to generations of students of American colonial history
concerned with the Albany Plan of Union.

Massachusetts Archives, 4:463, and Writings of Benjamin Franklin (ed.
A. H. Smyth), III, 205-207.
or of a group from one colony, not been submitted to some re-
vision at least before it would have been "recommended by com-
missioners from several colonies." This is apparently what hap-
pened. In fact, it seems probable that before any plan prepared by
Massachusetts Bay had been considered at Albany it received at
least one alteration that may be attributed to the influence of
Franklin's "Short Hints." The latter, in referring to the proposed
Council of the colonies called it the "Grand Council"; the same
name was given to this body by the plan recommended on June 14.
One could hardly expect this very appropriate title would have
originated with the framers of each of these plans independently.
Franklin's activities before the meeting of the Congress may pro-
vide the solution of this problem. He with his fellow commissioners
from Pennsylvania arrived in New York on June 5 and, after
consulting with James Alexander, Archibald Kennedy, and
Thomas Pownall about his projected plan of union, thereupon—
according to the original manuscript of his Memoirs—"met the
other commissioners and met at Albany about the Middle of
June."25 It is at the same time quite clear that at least two of the
commissioners did not meet Franklin either in his progress toward
Albany or at that place "about the Middle of June." For it is
certain that Theodore Atkinson rode through the country to
Albany and did not arrive until June 17 and that Thomas Hutch-
inson did not put in an appearance—apparently as the result of
the pressure of business in Boston—until after the formal opening
of the Congress on June 19.26 Nevertheless, we may be confident
that one or more copies of any plan drafted by him would have
been entrusted to his Massachusetts Bay colleagues in order that
they might be in a position to carry out without delay the injunc-
tions of the General Court and the Governor. We may therefore
surmise that the expression "Grand Council" found its way into

25 Benjamin Franklin's Memoirs . . . (ed. Max Farrand, Berkeley, Calif.,
1949), 326. In the original manuscript Franklin wrote and crossed out, as
perhaps of little interest: "the [Pennsylvania] Commissioners set out for
the Congress met those from New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhodeisland,
[sic] . . . Connecticut, New York (ibid.). In the William Temple Franklin
version of the Memoirs the passage reads, that "we met the other com-
mmissioners at Albany about the Middle of June" (ibid.).
26 See Atkinson's "Mem⁰ Book of My Journey as one of the Commissioners
. . . 1754" (ed. Beverly McAnear), Mississippi Valley Historical Review,
XXXIX, 729-739, and Malcolm Freiberg, "Thomas Hutchinson: The First
Fifty Years," William and Mary Quarterly, 3rd ser., XV, 51-52.
the plan for a northern union at the time (or perhaps before) it
came up for consideration on June 14.\textsuperscript{27} There could hardly be
any opposition to its use. We may be sure that Hutchinson would
not have objected to such an amendment.

It is now time to consider a major problem that confronts the
student in his efforts to reconstruct out of the source materials at
hand a coherent explanation of the origin of the plan that was
presented by the committee of the Connecticut Assembly as a part
of its report of October 2, 1754. Its place at the end of the report,
without any recommendation for or against it, would seem to
indicate simply a desire on the part of the committee to emphasize
the fact that there was at least another plan of union more limited
in scope, which had met the approval on June 14 of some of the
Commissioners before the Albany Plan was evolved. However, in
taking this position one must do so in face of the fact that there
is in existence in the Connecticut State Library and in the hand-
writing of Jonathan Trumbull a copy of a plan of union with
interlineations in the form of revisions, also in his hand, which,
only as modified by these revisions, conforms exactly to the plan
submitted by the committee as the one recommended on June 14.
In addition, among these same papers is a shorter plan of union
also with interlineations in Trumbull's hand.\textsuperscript{28}

\textsuperscript{27} It should be pointed out that James Alexander writing to Cadwallader
Colden before the above date enclosed a copy of the “Short Hints” embody-
ing that expression. He gives the date on his letter as May 9, 1754, which,
as the editors of Colden's papers point out, should have been June 9. See
Letters and Papers of Cadwallader Colden (New York, 1921), IV, 441-444.
We may therefore assume that Franklin's “Short Hints” used the term
“Grand Council” first.

\textsuperscript{28} In a preceding footnote, No. 23, reference is made to the confusion of
the editor of Volume XVII of the Connecticut Historical Society Collections
with reference to the report of the committee of the Connecticut Assembly in
October, 1754, on the Albany Plan of Union. This confusion is also in evi-
dence when he comes to treat of the origin of the two plans for a union of
the more northern colonies among the Trumbull Papers, reference to which
has been made above in the text. He expressed the view that both of them
seem to have come into existence before the opening of the Albany Congress
(\textit{ibid.}, XVII, 20. n.), but was far from clear in his mind on other points.
While he surmised that both may have originated in Connecticut prior of
course to the Congress (\textit{ibid.}), he at the same time stated that the plan with
which we are particularly concerned in this paper was “sometimes called
Hutchinson’s Plan” (\textit{ibid.}). This latter point of view he apparently supported
strongly in the Introduction to the volume in question when he wrote (\textit{ibid.},
xxvii): “Regarding the Plans of Union presented at Albany, and fathered
by Franklin and Hutchinson, their stated objectives are itemwise perfectly
lucid on the surface, as the unstated ones are equally so below the surface,
though not so conclusive to us as to them, nor to them in 1776 as in 1754.”
Trumbull, it should be understood, was not a Connecticut commissioner at Albany nor does there seem to be any proof that he was there on business. On the other hand, it is quite apparent that he was the secretary of the above committee which only came into existence after the conclusion of the Albany Congress. Was not this plan and also a shorter one in manuscript, likewise in his script together with interlineations, manifestly the product of the labors of his committee—in other words of Connecticut origin and drafted subsequent to the return of the Connecticut commissioners from Albany? If this is so, what about the evidence already presented that points to the existence of some such plan prior to the opening of the Congress on June 19? Here we have an excellent example of evidence apparently in sharp conflict.

Every effort at historical reconstruction presents problems—some of them baffling in nature. But no solution is found by ignoring or gliding around inconvenient facts. Although the weight of evidence may point strongly to a particular conclusion, this, nevertheless, is not enough, if there is left out of account any evidence of importance that calls it into question. Therefore, a solution worthy of general acceptance must involve a logical reconciliation of all significant divergent evidence.

With respect to the problem now under examination, any solution of it, by reason of its complexity and the need for more light, must be tentative. With this reservation it may be suggested that this apparent conflict of facts can be reconciled if certain reasonable assumptions are made. The first of these is, that the committee of the Connecticut Assembly appointed to report on the Albany Plan of Union came to the decision that with its report, hostile as it was to the Plan, it would be proper to submit one or more other plans that had been presented at Albany—plans that, from the point of view of the members of the committee, were less objectionable. Second, that some member of the Connecticut delegation brought back from Albany fair copies of two plans of limited union, one of which was derived from the other, and that Trumbull was called upon to transcribe them. Third, that these plans had themselves been modified in certain respects at Albany, especially the longer plan and, in view of these revisions—information respecting which was subsequently furnished to Trumbull—interlineations were made in the fair copies to conform with these modifications.
Fourth, that a decision was finally reached by the committee to append to its report the draft of but one plan—the one that had received the greatest degree of support from commissioners from various colonies at the meeting of June 14, but without any recommendations respecting it. With this in mind a fair copy of the revised copy of the longer plan of union, including a list of all the delegates to the Congress, was prepared and submitted with the report.

In support of these assumptions one may affirm that what we seem to have in the unamended manuscript copy of the longer of the two plans of union in Trumbull's handwriting is really a copy of the original drafting of a plan of union that was executed before June 14 by a member of the Massachusetts Bay delegation and, more specifically, by Thomas Hutchinson. A study of the Trumbull manuscript copy with its interlineations shows the repeated deletion of such expressions as "general government" in favor of "general union." Hutchinson's partiality for the use of the former expression and also for the use of the word "government" when others would use "colony" characterizes his writing. For example, in the representation of the state of the colonies that he drew up in Albany we find the following sentence: "That there be a union of his Majtys several Governts on the Continent . . ."; likewise, in his letter to Governor Bernard in 1769, he wrote: "I was in favo of an union of the govts for certain purposes." In fact, we may be quite sure that—in view of the destruction of Hutchinson's papers in 1765 in the Boston rioting—no more authentic copy of the plan of union, that he affirmed he drew up, is likely to come to light than this. But the unamended Hutchinson plan for a union was not the one that, according to the committee of the Connecticut Assembly, was recommended by the commissioners of the various colonies on June 14. It was only after amendment at various points, with the substitution of phrases more to their liking, that a plan—with less "general government" of the colonies and more "general union" of them—was provided. Thus the alteration of what may be called the Hutchinson plan of union to conform to the one "recommended" on June 14 would appear to be a logical explanation for the interlineations on the Trumbull manuscript.

New York Colonial Documents, VI, 888, and Massachusetts Archives, 26:395.
The interlineations on the shorter manuscript plan did not eliminate words that seem to have offended those who amended the longer plan, and would seem to indicate that it was not given much consideration and was allowed to remain, with a few amendments introduced, the uncompleted plan we find among the Trumbull papers.

It should again be emphasized that Hutchinson could not have been present at any meeting of commissioners at Albany on or before June 14 at which time what must be regarded as his plan of union was taken into consideration and, after being submitted to modifications, "recommended." What is more, we may infer that when he at last arrived from Boston he disapproved of some if not all the amendments—outside of accepting the name "Grand Council," the term used for the general council of the union by Franklin. At least we can be quite sure that as between the two, the original plan was used as a model in the drafting of the Albany Plan and not the modified plan "recommended" on June 14—again assuming the accuracy of Hutchinson's affirmation in his letter to the Governor of Massachusetts Bay in 1769.

In turning now to the evolution of Franklin's "Short Hints toward a Scheme for Uniting the Northern Colonies" into the finished Albany Plan of Union, certain steps may be noted. Although the Congress was given its more formal opening on June 19—to be distinguished from the more informal activities of the commissioners from June 14 to that day—other matters involving Iroquois Indian relations took up most of the time for the next five days. During this interval a good deal of thought was doubtless given also to the question of a colonial union, with various proposals on hand. Then at a session on June 24 a motion was made "whether a Union of all the Colonies is not at present absolutely necessary for their own defence." It would seem that with the pass-

50 That Franklin, in using the term "Northern Colonies," had in mind the British North American continental colonies, as over against the British tropical colonies in the West Indies is clear by the fact that on May 9, 1754, there appeared in his Pennsylvania Gazette an article advocating an American union with the device of a snake separated into ten parts bearing the legend "Join or Die" and comprehending the southern as well as northern colonies. He never from that time, it is quite apparent, wavered in his desire to see the creation of a general American union. That Nova Scotia and Georgia were not included in his proposal of 1754 seems to have been due to the fact that they were being defended as frontier colonies by troops in the pay of the Crown.
ing “in the affirmative unanimously” of this motion, one may fix the date of the collapse of the movement favoring a union of only the more northern continental colonies, and a corresponding union of the more southern colonies, that had come to a head on June 14—again assuming the report of the committee of the Connecticut Assembly to be correct. The commissioners thereupon appointed a committee, “to prepare and receive Plans or Schemes for a union of the Colonies, and to digest them into one general plan.”

The composition of the committee, with the names listed in the minutes on a geographical basis, was as follows: Thomas Hutchinson of Massachusetts Bay, Theodore Atkinson of New Hampshire, William Pitkin of Connecticut, Stephen Hopkins of Rhode Island, Benjamin Franklin of Pennsylvania, and Benjamin Tasker of Maryland. To join the commissioners in their work, William Smith, a member of the New York Council, was named the same day by Lieutenant Governor De Lancey. Five days later the committee was prepared to make a preliminary report on its work. In doing so it submitted the draft of a plan, which according to the abbreviated minutes of the Congress still carried the Franklin title of “Short Hints of a Scheme” of union. The full title, however, seems to have been “Short Hints Toward a Scheme for a General Union of the British Colonies on the Continent,” according to the title carried by a plan of union that is among the Miscellaneous Papers in the New York Public Library and is in the handwriting of Meshec Weare, one of the New Hampshire commissioners to the Albany Congress. A comparison of it with

New York Colonial Documents, VI, 860.

Ibid., VI, 863.

Father Newbold's treatment of the probable relationship of this manuscript to the developing general plan of union is excellent. See again his Albany Congress and Plan of Union 1754, 105-114. I fully agree with him that this plan is to be considered but a logical expansion of the original Franklin “Short Hints” by the Congress committee on a union and was not the work of Weare. The minutes for June 28, in fact, state that copies of it “were taken by the Commissrs of the respective provinces” (New York Colonial Documents, VI, 863). The document manifestly was not designed as a formal constitution for the colonies but was rather a series of suggestions—as was true of Franklin’s original “Short Hints”—that later might be embodied in such a frame of government. These suggestions were preceded by a series of propositions so characteristic of Franklin’s manner of writing, especially his skill in the use of aphorism and antithesis, as to mark them as coming from his pen. What other man at the Albany Congress is likely to have written the following: “In Such a Scheme ye just Prerogatives of the Crown must be preserved or it will not be Approved & Confirmed in England—the just liberties of ye People must be secure or ye
the original Franklin "Short Hints Toward a Scheme for Uniting the Northern Colonies," makes clear that it is nothing more than an expansion of the original rough draft. While the new title represents an improvement in clarity of language, yet the revised proposal is still lacking all essentials of a well-organized draft of a constitution for the American continental colonies, such as characterized the final form of the Albany Plan of Union. By July 2 the title "Short Hints Toward a Scheme" had disappeared in favor of "The plan for a union of the Colonies."

On the 4th, 5th, and 8th, the plan was under deliberation, and on the 9th it was "debated and agreed upon, and Mr. Franklin was desired to make a draught of it as now concluded upon." Then on the morning of the 10th, "Mr. Franklin reported the draught in a new form of a plan of a Union, agreeable to the determination of yesterday which was read paragraph by paragraph." In the afternoon of that day it was agreed that the plan in its "new form" should be laid by the commissioners "before their respective constituents for their consideration." It was now, as accepted by the Congress for reference to the colonial assemblies, a finished draft of a union of all the older North American colonies, outside of Delaware, and carried the title, "Plan of a proposed Union of the several Colonies of Massachusetts Bay, New Hampshire, Connecticut, Rhode Island, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, and South Carolina, for their mutual defence and security, and for extending the British Settlements in North America."

What was the organic relationship of this plan, that is, the Albany Plan of Union, to the one that was embodied in the longer plan of union in Trumbull's handwriting (when freed of interlineations) carrying the title: "Plan of a proposed Union of the

Several Colonies will Disapprove of it & Oppose it. Yet Some Prerogatives may be abated to extend Dominion & Increase Subjects and Some Liberty, to obtain Safety. The Power of all the Colonies should be Ready to Defend any one of them with the Greatest Possible Dispatch. Therefore Particular [sic] Considerations in Several Assemblies of the Expediency of any General Measure must be avoided as attended with much delay, many difficulties and great uncertainty."

34 New York Colonial Documents, VI, 868.
35 Ibid., VI, 868-885.
36 For the text as given in the New York Colonial Documents (VI, 889-891), with corrections from the manuscript in the Public Record Office transcribed for the Library of Congress, see The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography, LXXIV, 29-34.
Colonies of Massachusetts-Bay, New Hampshire, Connecticut, Rhode-Island, and New-York, for their mutual Defence and Security, & for extending the British Settlements Northward & Westward of said Colonies in North America." One looked to two distinct unions for the American colonies with detailed emphases on a constitution for the more northern of them; the other, for one general union. One provided for a President General who should be "the Governour of The Province of the Massachusetts-Bay for the Time being"; the other simply that the President General was to be appointed and supported by the Crown. One relied upon the old system of requisition on the colonies for financial support; the other, upon the levying "such general duties, imports or taxes as shall appear most equal and just." There are also other minor differences. However, the language and the plan of organization of the two constitutions, with the above exceptions, are identical—one must have been patterned after the other.

Let us now summarize the evidence leading to the conclusion that the Albany Plan of Union was a fusion of Franklin's "Short Hints Toward a Scheme for Uniting the Northern Colonies" and the "Plan of a proposed Union of the Several Colonies of Massachusetts-Bay, New Hampshire, Connecticut, Rhode-Island, and New York. . . ."

1. In the face of ominous developments along the frontiers, by the spring of 1754 there existed in Massachusetts Bay a sense of urgency such as was to be found in no other colony regarding the need for creating some kind of union of the colonies. Governor William Shirley gave expression to this feeling in addressing the General Court on April 2 when he declared: "For the formation of this general union, Gentlemen, there is no Time to be lost."

2. In response the two houses in their joint address to the Governor on April 9 declared that a union of the several governments "has long been desired by this Province. . . . We are still in the same sentiments, and shall use our Endeavours to effect it."

3. The first of the instructions given by the General Court to the commissioners of Massachusetts Bay appointed to meet those

For a tabular view of the Albany Plan of Union, the Franklin "Short Hints," "the Plan of a proposed Union" that was appended to the report of the committee of the Connecticut Assembly on October 2, 1754, and a shorter plan by the same title, see ibid., 29-35.
Manuscript copy of a portion of the Albany Plan of Union that the commissioners to the Congress approved for submission to their respective governments. (Jonathan Mayhew Papers, Chenery Library, Boston University.)
of other colonies at Albany was to work for "a general, firm and perpetual union & confederacy" of the colonies.

4. In view of their instructions to work for a colonial union, it is incredible that the Massachusetts Bay commissioners could have gone to Albany without a most carefully prepared plan of union, especially as they were representatives of the only colony that had committed itself to try to achieve this end.

5. That there were other plans of union submitted to the Albany Congress than the Franklin "Short Hints" is testified to by Franklin himself when he wrote that "several of the Commissioners had form'd plans of the same kind."

6. While there is every indication that the commissioners from Massachusetts Bay gave their efforts to create a union, it was not at first a "general" union, but rather a partial union, with suggestions also for another union, as they reported on their return from Albany and for reasons that they presented.

7. The Massachusetts Bay commissioners were also accused by Lieutenant Governor De Lancey of acting "with an aim to procure the President's chair for their Governor."

8. According to the report of the committee of the Connecticut Assembly, a plan for union of the more northern colonies and another for the more southern colonies was "recommended by commissioners of several colonies, met at Albany on June 14, 1754"—four days before the Congress was formally opened—a plan which provided for the union of the offices of President General and of Governor of Massachusetts Bay for the more northern union.

9. The plan of union so recommended was in harmony in the main with the particular views held by the Massachusetts Bay commissioners at the beginning of the Albany Congress, and there is every reason to believe that it was based upon a plan which they submitted for approval before the Albany Plan of Union was framed.

10. Hutchinson himself disclosed in confidence on October 27, 1769, that he "drew the plan which was then accepted" at Albany.

11. This statement can only be reconciled with other known facts, and with Hutchinson's rationality at the time of this disclosure, if one takes it to mean that the structure and language of the final Albany Plan were of his original drafting.

12. Neither the Franklin "Short Hints," nor the revision of it known as the Meshec Weare plan, bear any close relationship in
structure and language to the Albany Plan, although the fundamental ideas embodied in the three plans are much the same.

13. The Congress committee on a colonial union of seven members included both Franklin and Hutchinson. While one of the latter was assigned by his fellow members the task of drafting a plan of union and the other that of preparing a representation of the state of the colonies, the two seem to have been closely associated together in the execution of their respective tasks. This is indicated by Hutchinson in a passage already quoted from his Diary and Letters: “The former [the Albany Plan] was the projection of Dr. F., and prepared in part before he had any consultation with Mr. H. . . .” In other words Franklin consulted Hutchinson while engaged in the framing of the Albany Plan.

14. The plan Franklin was drafting was given a “new form” on July 10 at the request of the Congress on July 9. This “new form” is almost identical in structure and language with the manuscript plan, stripped of its revisions, to be found among the Trumbull Papers—outside of eliminating certain clauses and introducing in their place other clauses that characterized the Franklin “Short Hints.”

15. There is therefore the strongest warrant for taking the position that the plan in the Trumbull Papers, when stripped of its interlineations, is none other than the plan to which Hutchinson made reference in his letter to Governor Bernard in 1769 when he wrote: “I drew the plan which was then accepted.”

16. The conclusion that one is therefore forced to reach in view of the weight of evidence is that while the Hutchinson plan for two unions rather than for one, together with other features, was rejected by the Congress in favor of certain broad, fundamental principles enunciated in Franklin’s “Short Hints,” each of the two men played leading parts in bringing the Albany Plan of Union into existence. They may therefore be properly called the joint architects of it. Twenty years later one of them, Franklin, America’s most distinguished patriot, still strove to create a union of the colonies and was still animated by the vision of 1754; the other, Hutchinson, America’s most distinguished loyalist, saw at the later period only danger to the British Empire in a union of the colonies and, even in 1769, it is clear, had turned his face against it under whatever guise.