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TOWARD 1756: THE POLITICAL GENESIS OF JOSEPH GALLOWAY

The partnership formed in 1756 by Benjamin Franklin and Joseph Galloway dominated assembly politics in pre-Revolutionary Pennsylvania and influenced both of their careers. Together they transformed a weak association of Quaker representatives into the most powerful assembly party in America, challenged the proprietors with a sophisticated campaign for royal government, and offered daring solutions for the turbulent problems of Anglo-American relations. But their association has perplexed scholars because Franklin’s voluminous papers, personal charm and staunch patriotism seem to overshadow the accomplishments of his younger partner. Galloway’s sparse correspondence, abrasive ways, and eventual flight as a Tory also detract from his importance as a leader in his own right.

Galloway emerges in Pennsylvania politics as an inexperienced newcomer who admired Franklin and matured only under his tutelage. Most historians view him as a “bland” or “narrow” intellect and see little need for examining his origins to determine what assets he contributed to the powerful alliance.¹ This is unfortunate because Galloway was an independent thinker of exceptional


ability. By the 1770s contemporaries considered him the undisputed spokesman of the Pennsylvania Assembly, a key personality at the First Continental Congress, and the leading Tory in the middle colonies. A fresh look at his background to 1756 reveals much about the turbulent society that fostered his rise and what he did to change it.\(^2\)

This discussion, based upon substantial new research, redefines the assets that Galloway brought to the assembly in 1756 and places Franklin’s influence on his career into clearer perspective. Other factors of the contemporary political situation then take on new significance. As Galloway’s origins, estates, and professional associations are examined in some depth, he rises from a much broader political base and offers much more to his partnership with Franklin than was previously assumed. In his early twenties, Galloway used a strong family background and education to establish a thriving law practice, marry the daughter of a wealthy future Executive Councilor, and make connections in virtually every political faction of the colony. Before Franklin made any existing record of knowing Galloway, the young lawyer had won the admiration of several leading Quakers as a helpful counselor, personal friend, and valuable political writer. He also played a critical role in what Speaker Isaac Norris called the assembly transformation from a vehicle of Quaker policy before the French and Indian War to the popular voice of all Pennsylvania freemen thereafter. An unusual blend of events placed Galloway within reach of immense power in 1756. A rare combination of family connections, education, and ability enabled him to capitalize on his good fortune.

The family background which eventually proved so important in the political genesis of Joseph Galloway had an inauspicious beginning. Whether his forebears could afford their own transportation to America is uncertain, but they were people of modest means who made the best of their advantages. In 1638 one John Ashcomb received fifty acres for bringing great-grandfather Richard Galloway from England to Virginia, where he chafed as a Quaker under the intolerance of an Anglican establishment.

---

JOSEPH GALLOWAY IN HIS LATE FORTIES.

Courtesy of Henry E. Huntington Library.
Relief came eleven years later when Richard claimed 200 acres for transmitting three settlers into Maryland.  

There Richard Galloway’s fortune improved, and his sons, Samuel (1659–1720) and Richard (1664–1736), became men of prominence in the Meeting and in their communities. Their children increased the household wealth and status by marrying into elite families like the Pacas and Chews. Most third generation Galloways were at least as well-connected in business and local affairs as Joseph Galloway’s father, Peter Bines Galloway (1696–1752). As the eighth child of Samuel Galloway, he enjoyed all the advantages of an upper-class Quaker home, including a moderate inheritance and marriage to Elizabeth Rigbie, the orphaned heir of the Rigbie estate and that of her mother’s first husband, John Gassoway. Their fifth child was Joseph, who was born in the winter of 1730–31.

Peter Galloway’s inheritance and marriage insured a comfortable upbringing for Joseph and the other children. But, at forty years of age, he had yet to attain an office of trust. The handicap of being a Quaker younger son diminished his chances for recognition in a province where proprietary Anglicans controlled the patronage. He decided about 1735, perhaps in light of his situation, to join his friend Samuel Chew of Maidenstone and the many Quakers then leaving Maryland for the Lower Countries on the Delaware River. They were among the first men of stature

3. Probably the best work on the impact of family on success in Pennsylvania society is Raymond S. Klein’s Portrait of an Early American Family: The Shippens Across Five Generations (Philadelphia, 1975). Although the Shippen and Galloway families differed greatly, many of Klein’s findings prove useful here. For example, he has discovered sociological data indicating that most early converts to the Society of Friends were younger sons of mobile families who experienced substantial discontinuities in growing up and choosing an occupation or religious belief. This theory is intriguing when applied to the first three generations of the Galloway and Growdon families in America (p. 227n). See also Nell M. Nugent, Cavaliers and Pioneers, Abstracts of Virginia Land Patents and Grants (5 vols., Richmond, 1934), 1:165; J. R. Kelly, Quakers in the Founding of Anne Arundel County (Baltimore, 1963), pp. 41–59; L. Morris Leisenring, “Tulip Hill, Anne Arundel County,” Maryland Historical Magazine, 47 (1952): 188–96.


to settle in Delaware, where Peter Galloway became a successful landowner and a local justice of the peace. Yet no member of his family profited more from the move than Joseph, who was placed within reach of all the advantages offered by the thriving Philadelphia metropolis.6

The original Galloway family in Maryland evolved more as the political allies of the Penn family than of the Quaker doctrinaires. As William Penn's son Thomas abandoned Quaker simplicity for worldly attainments, the Maryland Galloways joined his Pennsylvania allies to do likewise.7 A few remained devout Friends until the Revolution, but more of them ignored the strictures of the Society to join in such irreverent activities as military service, theatre attendance, and horse racing. Members of the proprietary Allen, Burd, Willing, Chew, and Shippen families could be found among the closest business associates and social companions of Maryland's third generation Galloways.8

Peter Galloway and young Joseph did not fall easily into the doctrinaire or proprietary factions of the family. His household remained nominal Friends though their names do not appear in any meeting records, and he allowed his son to become a lawyer in direct violation of Quaker restrictions against the swearing of oaths. Politically, Peter Galloway seems to have followed John Kinsey and the opponents of Thomas Penn in Pennsylvania. Kinsey "interested himself for Mr. Galloway" in a land suit against the Penns, while anti-proprietary stalwart, Abel James, was a close business associate of the justice. Letters from Richard Peters, a leading follower of the Penns, indicate that the proprietors knew Peter Galloway and did not like his politics. Galloway's closest neighbor was Walter Wharton, a forebear of Quakers Thomas

6. James Steel to Hugh Durborow, 5 March 1735, Steel Letterbooks, HSP; Affirmation of Peter Galloway and Samuel Chew, Anne Arundel, Judgments, 1737; Samuel Chew Will, 15 October 1737, Maryland Historical Society; P. Galloway to John Galloway, 21 June 1738, Galloway-Maxey-Marcoe Collection [GMMC], LC; P. Galloway vs Samuel Dickinson, 1739-40, Logan Papers, HSP; Kelly, Quakers and Anne Arundel, p. 41.


and Samuel Wharton, who became Joseph's friends and partners in several anti-proprietary party schemes. Also, Peter Galloway's lengthy suit against Samuel Dickinson in 1739 over a disputed land claim near Murder Creek foreshadowed the many courtroom debates between their sons, Joseph Galloway and John Dickinson, a generation later. Clearly, Peter Galloway's parental guidance made a mark on the political genesis of his son Joseph.

Though Joseph acquired a solid education in law and political theory, he did not attend any of the colonial colleges. Instead he gravitated during the 1740s with members of the Burd, Dickinson, and Chew families, whom he had known from childhood, to nearby Philadelphia, where he read law. The city then served as county seat for almost 50,000 people and boasted a circulating library, a statehouse, and a thriving community of intellectuals. The influence of the aristocracy was based upon commerce and land and strengthened by tradition and intermarriage, but often divided by religion and politics.

The mainstays of upper-class life during the fifties were land and trade. The accompanying legal problems were as common as deeds and contracts, and they brought continuing business for the lawyers. Peter Galloway's association won friends for Joseph. The young man made his first appearance in the Philadelphia courts in 1747, and was admitted to the bar on 26 September 1749, along with family friend, John Coxe (d. 1753), the brother of Daniel and William Coxe, and an ally of the powerful John Smith of Burlington. In the next decade Galloway took on associates and students, and argued cases in several other counties. He

9. Richard Peters to Thomas Penn, 16 March 1752; 2 October 1756, Penn Official Correspondence [POC] Joseph Galloway to Thomas Nickelson, 1 July 1774, GC, LC.
10. Like the Shippens, the Delaware Galloways gradually broke with the Society of Friends. Yet the increasingly heterogeneous nature of the province enabled members of both families to gain great power in the generation before the Revolution because specialized training in the professions allowed them to seize the opportunities which the fluid social and economic conditions afforded. The family often functioned as a means of educating and motivating its members, and launching them into the world. The fact that the Delaware Galloways were such a small family surely won Joseph even more of this specialized attention. See Klein, Portrait of an Early American Family (Shippens), pp. 5-7.
preferred civil as opposed to criminal cases, and his specialty was property law. By the early fifties, Galloway had become a legal advisor for his future in-law, John Smith of Burlington and for the West Jersey Meeting of Friends. In this association, he was concerned primarily with Quaker land claims, and he had time to establish lasting relationships with Quaker politicians such as Isaac Norris, Samuel Smith, and William Logan. His opponents usually were allies of the Penns. Norris called him a “Respected Friend,” borrowed from his library and employed him on several private legal matters. Galloway further demonstrated an early anti-proprietary bent by joining the Schuylkill Fishing Company, an exclusive club associated with the assembly faction. His first effort at public service was an August 1750 petition to be appointed Excise Collector for the City and County of Philadelphia. Though the assembly considered the talented teenage applicant, it eventually selected an older and more experienced man.

About the same time, Galloway served as executor for the estate of his unmarried brother, Richard. His sisters, Susannah and Mary, also died about mid-century. When their father died in early 1752, Joseph and his surviving sister, Elizabeth, inherited the entire estate. For Joseph this early mastery of his birthright brought important


14. The relationship between Smith and Galloway was distant. Lawrence Gordon left £50 each to cousins Mary Smith and Sarah Smith of Trenton; according to his will proved 1 May 1700, GC, Henry E. Huntington Library, San Marino, CA. They were probably sisters of John Smith. See Richard M. Smith, The Burlington Smiths (Philadelphia, 1877), pp. 18, 133.

advantages in a society where power was often a privilege of age.\textsuperscript{16}

Being well-to-do,\textsuperscript{17} and independent of family restrictions, Joseph sought a suitable wife and proved perceptive in his choice. When he and Grace Growdon (1729–1782) wed in 1753, she was perhaps the most eligible heiress in the province, bringing family and wealth. Her grandfather, Joseph (d. 1730), was a close friend of William Penn and held almost every legislative, judicial, and executive office in the province. He had four children, and each offered a different contribution for the genealogical dowry of granddaughter Grace. Aunt Elizabeth married the affluent silversmith and political moderate Francis Richardson, while Grace’s namesake and favorite aunt chose the radical assembly lawyer David Lloyd. Uncle Joseph, Jr. (d. 1738) became attorney general of the province in 1726. The unexpected deaths of both Joseph, Sr. and Jr. in the 1730s secured most of the Growdon estate for Grace’s father, Lawrence (1694–1770), as the only male heir.\textsuperscript{18}

In these years Lawrence Gordon was already enjoying luxury and prestige. With an estate and mansion house, which only a few Philadelphians could afford, he had sufficient prestige to serve in the assembly as the representative from Bucks County. But the voters withdrew their support in 1738, when he accepted favors from the governor, so he took an executive appointment as a justice of the peace. Two years later, he became a supreme court judge, an appointment which so angered Quaker elders that the Society disowned him for the administration of oaths. By the time Lawrence assumed a chair on the executive council in 1758, his overriding commitment to the proprietary was well known.\textsuperscript{19}


\textsuperscript{17} Hints of Galloway’s wealth include Grace Calloway to Elizabeth Nickelson, 6 November 1753, GC, HEH; \textit{PG}, 2, 9 May 1754; \textit{Pennsylvania Genealogical Magazine}, 21 (1959): 181.


\textsuperscript{19} James Hamilton to Thomas Penn, 24 September 1750, POC; Lawrence
A massive inheritance like the Growdons' seldom remained intact for three generations, and Lawrence, too, faced that problem when he was unable to sire any sons. The death of his first wife in 1730 left him with two daughters whom he placed in the care of English relatives. Elizabeth married an influential merchant, but Grace fell in love with the son of a petty customs receiver. When Lawrence heard of the romance in 1748, he ordered Grace to join him in Philadelphia.  

A newcomer of Grace's position must have created considerable competition among upper-class Philadelphia bachelors, but it was Joseph Galloway whom she wed. For two centuries, the only record of their wedding appeared on the rolls of Christ Church in Philadelphia. But a recently discovered letter, penned by Grace only a month following the marriage, sheds new light upon the courtship and the political ramifications. According to the bride her new husband was a promising lawyer who maintained close relations with the Yearly Meeting. She fretted that their wedding "before a Priest" might lower his standing with Society leaders, and she predicted that Joseph would repudiate the ceremony to regain their good offices. Though both Grace and Joseph maintained a warm relationship with the local Meeting, neither ever renounced their Anglican vows.  

This marriage reveals much about Galloway's potential in Pennsylvania politics, his character and social position. For Lawrence Growdon to let his daughter marry into a family so closely associated with the assembly group as the Delaware Galloways may seem

---

21. Joseph probably attended meetings as late as Nov. 1756, when James Pemberton wrote Samuel Fothergill (Pemberton Papers [PP], HSP) that only 2 of 8 Philadelphia assemblymen were "Called Quakers & one . . . was disowned last year" and another "comes to Meeting." Joseph Fox had recently been disowned, leaving Norris as the only known Quaker in that county delegation. Four others were known Anglicans, so that Galloway and Richard Pearne must have been Quakers or attended meetings. Evidence points to Galloway as the one attending meetings. He is not mentioned in the records, but his children are reported. Also, Peters called him a "noisy Quaker lawyer," and practicing Friends were not allowed to take or administer oaths. See Peters to Thomas Penn, 2 October 1756, POC; Grace Galloway to Elizabeth Nickelson, 6 November 1753, GC, HEH; Pennsylvania Archives, 2 ser., 8:97.
strange. Of course, political lines were not so darkly drawn in 1753 as later, and Growdon probably concerned himself more with Galloway’s estate and talent than his father’s politics. Also, Lawrence may have hoped that with Peter Bines gone Joseph would fall under the influence of his Maryland relatives and become a valuable asset of the proprietary, a notion that Galloway may well have encouraged. At any rate, the marriage ceremony was held at the Growdon estate, and the minister was Richard Peters, the Secretary of Penn’s Executive Council. While the service was semi-private, the bride held receptions for scores of noted Philadelphians at her father’s town house. The Galloways’ maid of honor was Grace’s cousin, Polly Penington, the sister of Quaker gentleman, Edward Penington, a distant relative of the Penns who later became an assembly ally of Joseph.22

The marriage was well timed to enhance Joseph’s political fortunes.23 He had already proved an able lawyer at precisely the time when counselors were moving to overcome the charlatan image of their profession. His many cases widened his personal connections and gave him a solid base of support in the political community. His in-laws and Maryland relatives maintained business and social ties with the Penns, while his father’s associates opened doors with the Quaker politicians. In a society where leading Friends tended to think of themselves as a unit on questions of business, family and public affairs, Galloway’s profession, marriage, and associations allowed him the political advantages of membership in the Society of Friends without its limitations. These qualifications proved especially valuable in the turbulent period that fostered his political rise.24

Galloway entered politics in the 1750s, when the popular Quaker party was undergoing a change in leadership. The death of Elder John Kinsey in 1750 had deprived the Friends of their central religious and political figure. His offices were divided

22. Grace Galloway to Elizabeth Nickelson, 6 November 1753, GC, HEH.
23. The importance of a good marriage on political success cannot be overestimated. Washington, Hamilton, John Adams, and several members of the Shippen family are just a few leading colonials who benefited greatly from advantageous marriages. See Klein, Portrait of an Early American Family (Shippens), p. 7. For greater detail on Grace’s personality and marriage to Joseph see Bruce R. Lively, “The Speaker and His House: The Impact of Joseph Galloway Upon the Pennsylvania Assembly, 1755–1776,” (Ph.D. Diss., University of Southern California, 1975), pp. 107–11.
between quietist Israel Pemberton, who became clerk of the Yearly Meeting, and political lieutenant Isaac Norris, who took over the speakership of the assembly. This division of responsibilities not only accentuated the old Quaker dichotomy between doctrinaires and political realists, but gave heart to the small proprietary party. While Quaker politicians never lost control of the electoral process, the worsening crisis over defense gradually forced Speaker Norris to court non-Quakers such as Franklin and later Galloway for political aid. These outsiders became insiders by sitting on key committees, framing major legislation, and working in heated election campaigns.\(^{25}\)

In spite of its troubles, the Quaker coalition was still vastly stronger than its rivals.\(^{26}\) Native Pennsylvanian, James Hamilton was lieutenant governor, and he realized that nothing could be accomplished without the cooperation of assembly Friends. When the independent Franklin tried to defuse the defense and Indian trade controversy in 1754 by endorsing the solution of an intercolonial congress, Norris led an overwhelming assembly rejection of the so-called Albany Plan. Thereupon Franklin learned the valuable lesson that his support among the Friends was based on expediency rather than choice and that he was their ally, but not their leader. They controlled politics in the province and refused to gamble on an intercolonial legislature. Franklin felt powerless when the Quakers took a firm stand and complained to a friend of being able only “now and then to influence a Good Measure.” Galloway, too, recognized the magnitude of Quaker influence by taking pains to serve Isaac Norris, John Smith, and other leading Friends.\(^{27}\)

As the French and Indian threat heightened on the frontier, the pacifist assembly Quakers came under increasingly bitter attacks. In January 1755, proprietary partisan William Smith published *Brief State of the Province of Pennsylvania*, which accused them of grasping for power, neglecting their obligation as magistrates,

\(^{25}\) Hanna, *Franklin and Politics*, pp. 10–11.

\(^{26}\) Isaac Norris to Robert Charles, 29 April 1755, INLB; William Smith to Thomas Secker, October 22 1755, Horace W. Smith, *Life and Correspondence of the Reverend William Smith* (2 vols., Philadelphia, 1879), 1:118; John Fothergill to Israel Pemberton, 16 March 1756, PP.

\(^{27}\) Benjamin Franklin to Peter Collinson, 26 June 1755, Labaree, *Franklin*, 6:86; Charles Willing to Thomas Willing, 6 October 1754, Willing Letterbooks, HSP; Israel Pemberton to John Fothergill, 5 April, 1 July 1757, PP.
and encouraging French advances. Incumbent Friends defended
their actions in September 1755 on the basis of conscience and
provincial peace, and entreated voters to discharge any member
who violated the public trust. Nevertheless almost two-thirds of
the seats decided in October were awarded to Quaker party can-
didates.  

Galloway busied himself in 1755 with building a law practice
and helping Grace recover from the infant death of their first son.
He also claimed to have helped to manage the Growdon estate
and to have cultivated the friendship of his father-in-law, but the
young lawyer was no follower of Thomas Penn. In December he
joined with William Franklin and George Bryan to write a vicious
anti-proprietary piece entitled Tit for Tat. It insisted that Penn’s
friends were actually in league with the French to overthrow the
popular assembly and that Smith’s provostship at the College of
Philadelphia was merely a sinecure to reward him for political
writing.  

Mounting pressure from the French and their Indian allies in
early 1756 forced Franklin and Norris to ally with liberal Quakers
and others who recognized the need for defense. The result was a
bill creating a voluntary militia that was controlled by the
assembly. About this time, William Smith delivered another
pamphlet bombast against the assembly Friends, entitled Brief
View of the Conduct of Pennsylvania (London, 1756). Galloway later
disputed Smith in two “incontestable answers” that have not
survived, but Parliament responded by initiating oath and test
legislation for Pennsylvania. English Friends were able to divert
this action only by promising that American co-religionists would
withdraw voluntarily from politics. London Meeting elder,
Hinton Brown, wrote James Pemberton in March 1756 that the
only way to escape this crisis was for Society members to decline
public service temporarily and unite “in the Choice of prudent

28. Many doctrinaires were disenchanted with the lukewarm devotion of Norris to
pacifism and undecided until the last moment whether to stand for re-
election. See William Smith, Brief State Province of Pennsylvania (London, 1755);
James Pemberton to Richard Partridge, 7 October 1755, Willing Letterbooks, HSP;
Richard Bauman, For the Reputation of Truth (Baltimore, 1971), pp. 44-45, 66-69;

29. Richard Peters to Thomas Penn, 16 March 1752, 2 October 1756, POC;
Joseph Galloway to Thomas Nickelson, 1 July 1774, GC, HEH; Newcomb,
Partnership, pp. 29–30; Hanna, Franklin and Politics, pp. 51, 87.
Men of Moderate principles who are not restricted by them from acting suitably to the present unhappy state of the world.” They could then return to the assembly when the hostilities ceased.\(^{30}\)

If the militia act and the London agreement were not enough to awaken Quakers to the seriousness of the defense crisis, on 15 April 1756 Lieutenant Governor Robert H. Morris declared war on the Delaware Indians and offered bounties for their scalps. This first declaration of war in the history of the “Holy Experiment” convinced six Friends that they could no longer serve as representatives.\(^{31}\)

The departing members ranked among the oldest and most devout Quaker assemblymen, but Norris responded to their principled action and pressure that he too resign simply by calling a special June election to fill the vacant seats. Though none of the successors was a Friend and only one of them was well known, each promised to preserve the rights of the people against the prerogatives of the Penns. Thus, the June election became one in a series of incremental revolutions that reduced the philosophical impact of Quakerism on the assembly without diminishing its anti-proprietorial strength.

In these shifts of power Galloway’s name was undoubtedly part of the deliberations, but his youth and relative inexperience weighed against him. He was at least three years the junior of any member who remained from October 1755. Moreover, unlike the Philadelphians chosen, he held no political or religious position of trust that might have prepared him for legislative service. Less than a month after the June contest, however, Galloway joined such future non-Quaker lower house leaders as Joseph Richardson and Charles Thomson in their political debut as signers for a defense-related currency issue. He also joined fellow legalist Richard Smith, the brother of the influential John Smith of Burlington, to serve assemblyman John Hughes as witness for

\(^{30}\) Samuel Smith to John Smith, 9 November 1755, Smith Papers, HSP; James Pemberton to John Fothergill, 27 November 1755; Hinton Brown to Pemberton, 11 March 1756; Samuel Fothergill to James Wilson, 13 March 1756, PP; Isaac Norris to Robert Charles, 12 January 1757, INLB; Pennsylvania Colonial Records, 6:729; Pennsylvania Archives, 8 ser., 5:4100-04; Bauman, Reputation of Truth, pp. 25, 40, 103.

\(^{31}\) James Pemberton to John Fothergill, 26 June 1756, Etting-Pemberton Papers, HSP; Pemberton to Samuel Fothergill, November 1756, PP; Pennsylvania Archives, 8th ser., 5:4225, 4245.
his father's will. At the same time, he kept his options open with the doctrinaires by enlisting in their Friendly Association to treat with the Indians.  

In the weeks that followed, new frontier attacks further strained the politics of the Quaker assembly and enhanced Galloway's opportunities. By September, each faction believed that the October elections would break the deadlock and vindicate its position. Given a "good Assembly," Thomas Penn believed that Governor Morris might secure his rightful influence on the proposed militia, reassert his voice in the framing of money bills, and force a re-apportionment of house representation. His proprietary allies expressed similar optimism about the chances of their party.  

On the other side, the Pembertonites entreated Friends to renounce their seats as a testimony to their principles and let trusted non-Quakers carry the anti-proprietary banner. Isaac Norris simply discounted the criticism of idealists and insisted that his coalition would prevail as usual.  

Franklin worried even less than the speaker about the retirement of so many "Stiffrump" doctrinaires, but he refused to gamble on the fickle Norrisites. Rather, he chose sure gains for his personal faction by entering a pact with some non-Quaker leaders. This compromise ticket for Philadelphia included five anti-proprietary candidates, two proprietary favorites and a neutral. Galloway's name was not mentioned. Franklin must have discredited the proprietary rumor that propaganda from the

32. Acting as a currency signer on this bill (Pennsylvania Archives, 8th ser., 5:4262) was typical of the activities that Galloway could engage in as an ally, but not a member of the Society of Friends. All paper money issued in Pennsylvania has to be signed by an officer of the colony. Since paper money was printed only occasionally, the post of currency signer was a temporary appointment. This currency was issued in response to defense needs, but granted only for the "King's use." The would-be signers never mentioned defense and promised to donate their commissions to the Pennsylvania Hospital.

Hughes, at this time probably a nominal Anglican, was from one of the oldest Quaker families in Pennsylvania and lived in the famous Welch Tract. He maintained close contact with Quaker leaders and later took as his political apprentice, the moderate Quaker assemblyman Jonathan Roberts. See Anna M. Holstein, Swedish Holsteins in America . . . (Norristown, 1892).

33. Thomas Penn to Robert H. Morris, 22 March 1756, Penn Letterbooks, HSP; Edward Shippen Sr. to Edward Shippen, Jr., 14 September 1756, Shippen Papers, HSP; Smith, Life of Smith, 1:132.

34. Philadelphia Quarterly Meeting to London Meeting for Sufferings, 5 May 1756. Labaree, Franklin, 6:55n; Isaac Norris to Robert Charles, 16 June 1756, INLB: Hinton Brown to James Pemberton, 16 March 1756; Pemberton to Samuel Fothergill, November 1756, PP.
JOSEPH GALLOWAY IN HIS LATER YEARS.
Courtesy of the Henry E. Huntington Library.
doctrinaires might force Norris out, but the defeat of the speaker could only have strengthened his position in the coalition. It had already been reported that “Many People think their mighty Favorite Mr. Franklin has a Design to Dupe” the Quakers as well as the proprietor.35

The roots of this Franklin-proprietary compromise ticket were deep and gnarled. In a January 1756 letter, Peters had described a definite distinction between the allies of Franklin and the main Quaker group, and several Friends agreed. At that time, Peters sought a pact with the “decent” Quakers against the Norrisites and followers of Franklin to enhance the proprietary interest in the house. In the months that followed, negotiations between the proprietary and the doctrinaires broke down, possibly under pressure from the English Quakers upon American Friends to refrain from wartime politics, or because of an old personal feud between Israel Pemberton and the proprietary master politician William Allen.36

By late summer, 1756, the proprietary leaders and Franklin had reluctantly decided that their best interests lay in a compromise ticket. Whatever prompted this decision did not prevent the defeat of the slate by a Quaker-supported list which included Galloway. Some scholars have surmised that Franklin agreed to the pact to bring down his opponents’ guard, then deserted them to support Galloway and the other winners in Philadelphia County. But Franklin was probably not yet committed to any faction. A year earlier he had confessed opposition to both the assembly Quakers and the Penns in the controversies of the day.37 His popular following was expanding and the Quaker pacifism which Galloway had countenanced by joining the


Friendly Association exasperated him. Furthermore, Franklin’s relations with Norris were never so smooth as to rule out either taking independent action against the other.\textsuperscript{38}

Franklin disliked Penn in 1756, but their quarrel did not insure that he would injure the moderate anti-Quaker candidates on the compromise ticket. He counted William Coleman, Henry Pawling and Jacob Duché among his oldest friends. Coleman and Pawling had worked with him in the old Philadelphia Junto. Duché was considered one of his disciples. Why would he forsake them for less familiar men such as Galloway, Richard Pearne and John Baynton? The evidence indicates that he may have held his alliances at least until late September, when leading Quakers vetoed existing compromises in favor of their own assembly slate.\textsuperscript{39}

Everyone knew who had the ultimate power to select assemblymen in Pennsylvania. Peters and Franklin both hoped that most Friends would stay home on 1 October out of principle, but the Secretary refused to predict any gains until the Yearly Meeting adjourned at the end of September. On 19 September, Edward Shippen reported that some leaders favored Duché and Coleman, while others boosted Galloway and Baynton, though nothing could be settled until the “result of the Yearly Meeting . . . is known.” Peters reported three days later that the Franklin-proprietary ticket, which included Duché and Coleman instead of Galloway was finally fixed.\textsuperscript{40}


\textsuperscript{39} According to Richard Peters, the proprietary faction was lukewarm toward the compromise and consented to Franklin’s nomination only out of expediency. Also, since Penn’s friends had only two places on the compromise ticket and four were defeated, some of the losers must have been “Franklinists.” Peter had written Penn in April that many of the Anglican faith, including three of the losing compromise candidates, had deserted traditional principles to support Franklin. Moreover, Peters ignored Galloway, a winner, in his report of Anglicans who had defected to Franklin, though the Secretary had recently married the young lawyer in an Episcopal service to the daughter of a leading proprietary figure. See William Peters to Thomas Penn, 4 January 1756; Richard Peters to Penn, 15 April, 1 June, 22 September 1756, POC; Ketcham, “Conscience, War and Politics,” \textit{WMQ}, 3rd ser., 20 (1963):432.

\textsuperscript{40} Richard Peters to Thomas Penn, 22 September 1756, POC; Edward Shippen, Jr. to Edward Shippen, Sr., 19 September 1756, Shippen Papers, HSP.
In the end, the Quaker leaders of 1756, like their predecessors, ignored the ideas of non-Quakers and selected their own slate. Franklin's popularity was on the upswing. By the end of the year he would join Norris as the dominant figure in the legislature. But there was a difference between leadership in the assembly, where the Quakers frequently deferred to knowledgeable non-Quakers, and power at the polls. Franklin still could not control house elections in the older counties without the support of influential Friends who endorsed Galloway.

The Philadelphia return mirrors the competitive nature of the campaign. Estimates of the voter turnout by veteran political observer, William Logan, confirm that three candidates gained near unanimity. Following these consensus leaders, a cluster of Quaker party favorites, which included Galloway, completed the elected slate. Finally, finishing far behind the winners was a third group running without assembly party support. Most of these losers had been mentioned in discussions of a Franklin-proprietor ticket. The popular former printer, nevertheless, retained his own seat with a handy victory in the city election a day later. The Bucks County totals, though much closer than in Philadelphia, evidence a similar bipartisan campaign.

It would have been very much in Franklin's character to adjust quickly to the 1756 assembly group, even if he had not known them well. His genius was always to take the political situation as it was and use it to his best advantage. As one old Quaker put it, everyone knew that Franklin never made an enemy in any majority. See William C. Bruce, *Benjamin Franklin Self-Revealed* (2 vols., New York, 1917), 2:98n.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHILADELPHIA</th>
<th>BUCKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Isaac Norris</td>
<td>Griff Owen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Fox</td>
<td>Richd Walker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Leech</td>
<td>Mah. Kirkbride</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan'l Roberdeau</td>
<td>Jos. Hampton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Hughes</td>
<td>Wm. Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jno Baynton</td>
<td>Jas. Melvin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jos Galloway</td>
<td>Gabl. Van Horn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richd Pearn</td>
<td>Wm. Hoge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wm Coleman</td>
<td>Gilbt. Hichs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob Duché</td>
<td>Alexr. Graydon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Pawling</td>
<td>Jos. Hart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phineas Bond</td>
<td>Nicl. Wynkoop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jno Lukens</td>
<td>John Henry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaac Hall</td>
<td>Hez. Anderson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

41. It would have been very much in Franklin's character to adjust quickly to the 1756 assembly group, even if he had not known them well. His genius was always to take the political situation as it was and use it to his best advantage. As one old Quaker put it, everyone knew that Franklin never made an enemy in any majority. See William C. Bruce, *Benjamin Franklin Self-Revealed* (2 vols., New York, 1917), 2:98n.

42. William Logan to John Smith, 1 October 1756, Smith Papers, HSP and *Pennsylvania Archives*, 6th ser., 11:118–19 report returns of:
Peters blamed the defeat entirely on the Quaker party without reporting any defection by Franklin from the compromise ticket. The secretary wrote Penn that, outside of some doctrinaires who stayed home, the Friends had never been more assiduous. Younger "broadbrims" had worked particularly hard for Galloway and the rest of the winning ticket, and their efforts had seated men "bitter on the side of the [Quaker] Party" in almost every county. Circumstances had left the Friends the choice of an alliance with trusted allies such as the lawyer for the West Jersey Society or an unfriendly house majority. Before the election, anti-Quaker partisan Thomas Willing had doubted that voters would support his associates. Afterwards his allies saw no practical difference between the new assembly and its predecessors.43

During the 1756 campaign, the Quaker coalition had convinced voters that Penn was taking advantage of an imperial war to undermine their traditional friends in the house. Incumbents insisted that assembly politics had not changed. Uncontrollable events from without—the war, expanding foreign populations, and instructions from London—had threatened the ability of the Quaker group to preserve a popular government. They now depended on new allies to retain political freedoms until the French menace subsided. As Norris put it, the departure of the doctrinaires had "Thrown our Disputes from being a Quaker Cause, to a Cause of Liberty." The imperial nature of war issues, moreover, demanded spokesmen who understood the sophistication of trans-Atlantic communication. Assembly remonstrances which ignored the political writings of the empire would be ignored in England.44

In Philadelphia, election returns indicating bipartisanship were the rule. See Joan de Lourdes Leonard, "The Organization and Procedure of the Pennsylvania Assembly," (Ph.D. Diss., University of Pennsylvania, 1947), pp. 46, 76; John Smith Diary, 2 October 1751, HSP; Newcomb, Partnership, p. 124n; William Franklin to Thomas Penn, 12 September 1771, Society Collection, HSP. For greater detail on Bucks see Lively, "Galloway," pp. 77-79.

43. Thomas Willing to Thomas Willing, 1 October 1756, Willing Letterbooks, HSP; Richard Peters to Thomas Penn, 2, 30 October 1756; Robert H. Morris to William Alexander, 10 October 1756, POC.

44. Quakers had resigned in favor of trusted nonFriends during defense crises in the 1740s only to return when hostilities ceased. Friends did so again in the mid-1750s, but Society members were unable to regain control within the assembly when they finally returned. See Isaac Norris to Robert Charles, 18 May 1755, INLB; Hinton Brown to James Pemberton, 11 March 1756; Pemberton to Samuel Fothergill, 4 July 1756, PP.
Galloway was precisely the man to aid the Friends in this dilemma. Though his sole political experience had been as a currency signer, he had proven a capable agent for the Society. He was well-connected, well-to-do, and free from parental restraints and pacifist pressures. He knew parliamentary procedures and political theory as well as established leaders, and he had a reputation as a talented political writer. Undoubtedly, these skills originally attracted the Quakers to the young counselor and later encouraged leaders such as Franklin, Thomas Penn, and Joseph Reed to seek his influence for their programs. 45

Galloway’s Quaker in-law, the influential John Smith of Burlington, seems to have been a molding force in his pre-assembly years. By the early 1750s Smith had placed his personal legal affairs in Galloway’s care, appointed him counsel for the West Jersey Society, and later invited him into the elite Friendly Association. Grace Galloway had predicted success for Joseph as early as 1753 because leading Friends were “very fond of him” as “the only lawyer they have that practices.” Smith probably introduced his talented kinsman to other leaders, such as Norris, the Coxes, the Pembertons, and even Franklin. When Galloway began taking students, his best known apprentice had been a younger brother of the noted Burlingtonian. The same Richard Smith served with him as executor for the will of John Hughes’ father. There can be little doubt that these favors were critical benchmarks in the early career of Galloway. 46

The role of Isaac Norris, too, should not be underestimated. He had employed Galloway as his lawyer and borrowed from his library. He had appointed Galloway a currency signer in July 1756 and must have supported the Galloway candidacy in October. Within three months after the election, Norris recommended the young lawyer to an English Friend for his public writing on behalf of Quaker party policies. He called Galloway a “friend of poor Philadelphia” and praised an unknown pamphlet


46. Samuel Smith to John Smith, 10 May 1753; Will of Hugh Hughes, 1 April 1756, Hughes Papers, HSP; Obligations of the Friendly Association, 26 July 1756, Smith Papers, HSP; Galloway to J. Smith, June 1756, YI/2/7291/Fi, HSP; William Franklin to Benjamin Franklin, 12 June 1772, Labaree, Franklin, 19:171; Smith, Burlington Smiths, pp. 18, 133.
Norris considered Galloway's polemics as an integral part of the assembly "Design to show incontestably that Proprietary Instructions have been" the chief "cause of all provincial woes." In the months that followed, the speaker nominated Galloway for thirty-two of fifty-two possible committees, the third most in the house and only three behind the leading member, former Quaker William Masters.47

Regarding Franklin's role in the political genesis of Galloway, several mysteries persist. The massive correspondence of Franklin and other Philadelphians reveals neither his feelings about the election nor any political association with Galloway before October 1756. Galloway undoubtedly knew the elder Franklin because William had read law at his office in 1753. Nevertheless, his close association with the West Jersey Friends and vigorous anti-proprietary writing had already associated him too closely with Penn's enemies to gain approval from proprietary supporters of any Franklin-proprietary ticket. Any political alliance between the two gentlemen must have developed after the idea of a compromise slate was discarded.48

As one of three winning Philadelphia candidates who belonged to the Society of Friends or attended its meetings, Galloway was an obvious favorite of the politicians who sat down at the Yearly Meeting and decided Quaker endorsements. In fact, the first mention of Galloway as a candidate in 1756 appeared concurrently with the Yearly Meeting, less than two weeks before the election. After the voting, Secretary Peters described Joseph as a son of Peter Galloway and a "noisy Quaker lawyer," without mentioning Franklin. Quaker William Logan wrote John Smith of Burlington that the election had been hardly a "struggle," as no coalition on the "court side" could approach the popularity of their "country" ticket that included Galloway.49

47. Isaac Norris to Joseph Galloway, 18 February 1753; Norris to Robert Charles, 12 January 1757, INLB.
48. Edward Shippen to Joseph Shippen, 17 January 1753, Shippen Papers, American Philosophical Society. Galloway is not even mentioned in the Franklin papers before late November 1756. There is also less evidence that Franklin was associated with the other non-consensus victors in Philadelphia than with the losers on his compromise ticket. See Richard Peters to Thomas Penn, 26 June POC; Labaree, Franklin, vols. 1-4.
49. Grace Galloway to Elizabeth Nickelson, 6 November 1753, GC, HEH; Edward Shippen Jr. to Edward Shippen Sr., 19 September 1756, Shippen Papers, HSP;
Joseph Galloway had used his family connections, education, and abilities wisely. Buoyed by the patronage of influential Quakers he later lent valuable assistance in Norris’ drive to deemphasize the influence of the Society on assembly politics. By October 1756 he had become a partner in an expanded anti-proprietary coalition born out of the defense crisis of the French and Indian War. Now he longed to strengthen the associations and master the procedures that would someday make him the leader of this party and the speaker of the Pennsylvania house.

Galloway obviously realized that the provincialism, anti-intellectualism, and pacifism of traditional Quaker politics was unmanageable baggage in the coming era of international war and trans-Atlantic politics. Franklin’s impressive first place finish in the city election and his emergence as Speaker Norris’ most valuable ally in the house must also have affected him. In January 1757, when the proprietors refused once and for all to pay their just share of needed defense taxes, Franklin proposed that he and Norris deliver a bold personal protest to King George II. With the political interest of the Quaker doctrinaires on the wane and Norris in guarded agreement with Franklin’s program, Galloway eagerly endorsed the agent to be. 50 Their partnership bonded quickly, for Franklin also needed an able confidante to keep the independent viewpoint before the house and to keep him informed of local events. 51 Thus developed perhaps the most fruitful trans-Atlantic political partnership of the colonial period.

William Logan to John Smith, 1 October 1756; Smith Papers, HSP; Richard Peters to Thomas Penn, 2 October 1756, POC.

50. Norris declared himself too ill for trans-Atlantic travel. See Labarce, Franklin, 7:100, 117; Hanna, Franklin and Politics, p. 120.

51. It is interesting that the first known biography of Franklin, the Tory Memoirs of the Late Dr. Franklin (London, 1790), p. 24, reports that “possessed of every accomplishment to acquire popularity, he [Franklin] obtained a seat in the Assembly and united his efforts, with Mr. Joseph Galloway, against the proprietary interest . . . .” Although the statement that Galloway was Franklin’s equal in 1756 evidences more Galloway’s influence on the author than the truth, this anonymous writer mentions no association previous to 1756 and infers that the “partnership” was made during the 1756 assembly session.