

POLITICS, PROPAGANDA, AND THE PHILADELPHIA PRESS, 1767-1770

“**H**OWEVER little some may think of common News-Papers,” observed a writer in the *Pennsylvania Gazette*, January 7, 1768, “to a wise man they appear the ark of God, for the safety of the people.” Behind this sentiment lay a recognition of the bold part which the newspapers had played a few years before in exciting resistance to the Stamp Act. Throwing off their usual timidity, they had allied themselves with the radical leaders, defied Parliament by continuing to publish without stamps, and contributed vitally to the repeal of the hated law.¹ To these exertions the Pennsylvania press had contributed its full share.

As the year 1767 opened, relations with the mother country were again harmonious, and the public prints in Philadelphia once more gave their attention chiefly to provincial politics. For many years Pennsylvania had been embroiled in a quarrel between the proprietary and antiproprietary parties. John Dickinson led the proprietary hosts, while Joseph Galloway, Speaker of the Assembly, headed the opposition group, with Benjamin Franklin, the colonial agent in England, as one of its pillars of strength. If Galloway and Franklin could have had their way, they would have replaced the overlordship of the Penn family with a government directly under the Crown. Each side envisaged the issue primarily in terms of the fancied advantage of the province, not as a factor in a larger framework of imperial relations. Patriots, in the sense of 1775-1776, were to be found in the ranks of both.

Though the antiproprietary party had generally been able to control the Assembly, its leaders were handicapped by the fact that they no longer possessed a newspaper organ.² Indeed, the two papers of the city, William Bradford's *Pennsylvania Journal* and the *Pennsylvania Gazette*, conducted by David Hall and William Sellers, were so bitterly partisan that the Galloway following could not se-

¹ A. M. Schlesinger, “The Colonial Newspapers and the Stamp Act,” *New England Quar.*, VIII (1935), 63-83.

² After Benjamin Franklin's withdrawal from the *Pennsylvania Gazette* as partner in January, 1766, the paper had changed its allegiance to the proprietary party.

cure space in their pages.³ At this moment William Goddard arrived in Philadelphia, ambitious to begin a journal of his own in America's largest city. His extensive newspaper experience in New Haven, New York, and Providence commended him to Galloway and his political circle as just the man for their purposes. Had they scrutinized his record more closely, they might have felt misgivings at his militant course at the time of the Stamp Act;⁴ but of this they either were not aware or else considered it irrelevant to the local political situation. In any case, as practical men they believed they knew how to safeguard their interests and insure the printer's continued loyalty.

In the guise of secret partners Galloway and the wealthy Quaker merchant, Thomas Wharton, formed an agreement with the newcomer, they to furnish half the capital and take half the profits. Goddard was to manage the printing establishment, but must consult with his partners "in every material step, or transaction, relating to the said business." It was further provided that, should Franklin on his return from England care to join the enterprise, he might do so.⁵ If Goddard felt any hesitation in making these commitments, his doubts were offset on the financial side by the promise of a share of the public printing, which Galloway in due course secured for him, and on the editorial side by the stipulation, on which the printer had insisted, that he be allowed to "keep a free press."

It may be supposed that the opportunity to conduct a newssheet in a community which had hitherto denied a hearing to all parties appealed to the knight-errant in Goddard. From the first issue on January 26, 1767, he flaunted the motto: "*Rara Temporum Felicitas, ubi Sentire Quae Velis, et Quae Sentias Dicere Licet*," which without undue violence to Tacitus may be rendered, "Blessed the age in

³ William Strahan to David Hall, April 11, 1767, *PENNSYLVANIA MAGAZINE OF HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY*, X (1886), 229-232; William Goddard, *The Partnership: or the History of the Rise and Progress of the Pennsylvania Chronicle &c.* (Philadelphia, 1770), 6. On Aug. 20, 1768, Thomas Bradford became his father's partner in the *Journal* with an equal share in the profits. Bradford Papers, H. S. P., I. 70.

⁴ See L. C. Wroth, *A History of Printing in Colonial Maryland, 1686-1776* (Baltimore, 1922), 121-123.

⁵ The partnership was to continue for fifteen years. Goddard, *Partnership*, 6-10; William Franklin to Benjamin Franklin, Nov. 13, 1766, Benjamin Franklin, *Complete Works* (John Bigelow, editor, N. Y., 1887-1888), IV. 276-278.

which one can think what he pleases and say what he thinks."⁶ Still a young man, he did not realize the incompatibility of editorial independence and economic dependence, nor could he foresee that the revival of difficulties with England would presently put him at desperate odds with the self-interested views of his secret coadjutors.

For a time affairs went smoothly. The *Chronicle* gave its first attention to rehabilitating Franklin in the public esteem by refuting charges in the *Journal* that as colonial agent he had been lukewarm in opposing the Stamp Act. In the issue of February 9 "A Lover of Justice" set forth the case for Franklin, and in four later numbers the writer backed up his assertions by reprinting a group of articles against the Stamp Act which Franklin had contributed under various pen names to the London press during December, 1765, and January, 1766.⁷ These pieces in turn called forth a demand from another scribe in the *Chronicle*, "Publicus," that Franklin's defender abandon his anonymity and make known his true name to the public.⁸ To this, "Bob Squib," speaking in behalf of "A Lover of Justice," returned a vituperative reply.⁹

Thus far Goddard had allowed both sides access to his columns, but for different reasons his impartiality was agreeable neither to his secret partners nor to those members of the proprietary party who saw a political advantage in the continued eclipse of Franklin's popularity. As to the latter group, Goddard declared in the *Chronicle*, March 9, "some *few* Persons, in this City, have taken the Liberty to asperse and vilify the Printer of this Paper, a Stranger to them, behind his Back, and have had the *great Resolution* to *whisper* a Threat that he should be *roughly handled*, for the Freedom of his Publications" He warned "those *heroic Calumniators*" that he would

⁶ In advance advertisements in the *Gazette*, Jan. 1, 1767, and the *Journal*, Jan. 15, Goddard had declared that the *Chronicle* would be conducted with the "greatest FREEDOM, and utmost IMPARTIALITY." He reiterated these assurances in the *Chronicle*, Feb. 9. Recurring to the same theme many months later, he asserted that he had started his paper because "the printers of the *Gazette* and *Journal* had notoriously prostituted their presses" and "drawn upon themselves the resentment of some of the best men in the community, by their *ingratitude* and manifest partiality." See *Pa. Chronicle*, Sept. 26, 1768. Again, in the issue of Nov. 28, he wrote, "I came to Philadelphia expressly to support the liberty of the press"

⁷ *Pa. Chronicle*, Feb. 16, 23, March 9, 23, 1767.

⁸ *Ibid.*, Feb. 23, March 9, 1767.

⁹ *Ibid.*, March 2, 16, 1767.

proceed as he had begun, "*unawed, unbiassed, and alike fearless of the humble Scoundrel, and eminent Villain.*"

At this juncture the *Pennsylvania Journal* projected itself into the argument with an article pertinent to the controversy, which had first been submitted to Goddard who had declined to print it. The pseudonymous penman, "Thomas Jackson, V. S.," singled out for particular abuse "Bob Squib" (who, he hinted, was Franklin's son, the Governor of New Jersey) and Joseph Galloway.¹⁰ Goddard, driven to defend his claim of "unawed, unbiassed" journalist, maintained that he had been justified in rejecting the screed because the author had refused to divulge his real name and that, in any case, liberty of the press did not involve "publishing all the Trash which every rancorous, illiberal, anonymous Scribbler" might send him.¹¹ In the next *Chronicle* (March 23) a new recruit, "Lex Talionis," added to the confusion by a fierce attack on "Jackson." Suggesting that the letters attached to "Jackson's" name signified "VINEGAR SELLER, or VILE SCOUNDREL, or both," he charged that the piece so signed and the earlier articles by "Publicus" had been penned by William Hicks, a magistrate and member of the proprietary party, whom he plainly identified but did not actually name. Goddard refused to publish Hicks's indignant denial, giving as his excuse this time that the magistrate in his reply had gone out of his way "to vilify the Principles and Conduct of the Printer."¹² Hicks and his friends seethed with anger. When the printer ventured into the Coffee House on Saturday, April 4, they first lambasted him with words and then threw him out the door. William Bradford, proprietor of the *Journal*, assisted by lugging Goddard by the hair.¹³

The next numbers of the *Journal* and the *Gazette* contained the article by Hicks which Goddard had rejected, with an added comment by the author attributing Goddard's action to "the Hand of

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, March 12, 1767.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, March 16, 1767.

¹² *Ibid.*, April 6, 1767.

¹³ *Ibid.*, April 13, 1767. As might be supposed, this incident embittered the journalistic relations of the two men. In the *Chronicle*, Sept. 7, for example, Goddard sneered at "the celebrated Bradfordian Journal," adding, "*Bad Work in Printing, by the Typographers in America, is called Bradfordian.*" If such a characterization existed outside of Goddard's imagination, it was not justified by the fact.

superior Direction."¹⁴ Goddard defended his conduct of his paper to the extent of three full columns in the *Chronicle*, April 13. Particularly interesting, in view of the printer's later admissions, is his avowal: "I am under no other *direction* but my own judgment, which has never been bias'd, in the least degree, to the injury of the Public, or the poorest individual." Hicks, replying simultaneously in the *Journal* and the *Gazette*, pronounced Goddard's character now so well known that "it would be trespassing upon the public to continue an altercation with such an *infamous rascal*."¹⁵ The altercation nevertheless dragged on for some weeks more,¹⁶ with other scribblers in the *Journal* and the *Gazette* joining Hicks in sniping at Goddard's journalistic ethics.¹⁷ It was no mere rhetorical gesture when on August 17 Goddard thanked the friends of the *Chronicle* who had "guarded its infant Bark, yet scarcely past the seventh Month of its Age, through the boisterous Gale of a violent and unprovoked Opposition."

Yet Goddard, despite his brave front, cherished no illusions as to the real facts. Though "the Hand of superior Direction" was a matter of common report, Galloway and Wharton had left him to breast the boisterous gale without open aid. The printer, committed in principle to a free and impartial press, had been obliged by his relation to his secret partners to manage his journal in such a way as to make it as flagrantly partisan as that of either of his competitors. From the start his patrons had induced him to make heavy outlays and then had withheld the necessary cash in order to keep him obedient to their wishes.¹⁸ To one of his passionate spirit the position soon became intolerable. Nor was it made easier by letters from his mother,

¹⁴ This piece, signed "H.," appeared in the two newspapers on the same date, April 9, 1767.

¹⁵ Issues of April 16, 1767.

¹⁶ Goddard retorted abusively to Hicks in an advertisement in the *Journal* and the *Gazette*, April 23. In these same issues Hicks, employing the pseudonym "Z," opined that so-called freedom of the press went too far when it enabled the "rage of party animosity" to take revenge on private characters. There were also exchanges between "Lex Talionis" and Hicks in the *Chronicle*, April 27, May 18, and the *Journal* and the *Gazette*, May 7.

¹⁷ See, for example, the remarks of "W. Z." in the *Gazette* and the *Journal*, May 21, and Goddard's replies in the *Chronicle*, May 25, June 1; also the sarcastic comment of "Virgilius" in the *Journal*, Aug. 27.

¹⁸ The account which follows is based on Goddard, *Partnership*, 8-15, which also contains Mrs. Goddard's letter.

Mrs. Sarah Goddard, who had charge of his former paper, the *Providence Gazette*, in Rhode Island. "With aching heart and trembling hand" the aged woman urged upon him "the impropriety of publishing such pieces as *Lex Talionis*, let the authors be ever so great and dignified, for every one who takes delight in publicly or privately taking away any person's *good name* . . . are in the gall of bitterness, and in the bonds of iniquity, whatever their pretences may be for it." She implored him to extricate himself from his "unhappy uncomfortable situation." Bitter quarrels took place between Goddard and his two associates. From their point of view he was "imperious and obstinate"; from his they were "arrogant and supercilious." Again and again he demanded a dissolution of the partnership. Each time, however, they smoothed matters over and, wielding the financial whip hand, induced him to continue.

Relations behind doors reached a new crisis, however, as the quarrel with England over the Townshend Acts came to eclipse provincial disputes in the public mind. This legislation was enacted in June, 1767, to go into effect in November. It directly affected the colonial printers by including among the new imperial taxes import duties on sixty-seven grades of paper. This provision involved heavier charges for carrying on their business not only as newspaper publishers but also as job printers and stationers. The autumn of the year found the Philadelphia press filled with reverberations of the movement of resistance which the Bostonians were attempting to initiate. The "dirty trade of borrowing," practised by the journals in the absence of a news-distributing agency, presently began to have its effect on local opinion.¹⁹ Then, quite unexpectedly, the Philadelphia radicals richly repaid their debt to their Massachusetts brethren by giving to the world the "Letters from a Farmer in Pennsylvania to the Inhabitants of the British Colonies."

John Dickinson, the pseudonymous author, provided the colonists with a plausible theoretical basis for opposing the Townshend Acts, and urged them "to exert themselves, in the most firm, but most peaceable manner, for obtaining relief."²⁰ He did not fail to mention the special stake which the printing fraternity had in combating the

¹⁹ For the quoted phrase, see letter of Nov. 5 in the *N.-Y. Journal*, Nov. 26, 1767.

²⁰ Letter No. 3, *Pa. Chronicle*, Dec. 14, 1767.

legislation.²¹ Goddard, outstripping his fellow editors in zeal, commenced the momentous series of twelve essays in a special number on December 2. The *Journal* and the *Gazette* followed in their next issues, and soon the public prints in all the colonies were communicating Dickinson's sentiments to their readers.²² For nearly three months the "Farmer's Letters" formed the principal mental pabulum of the colonial reading public.

Nothing could have been more bitter to the taste of the secret partners. Not only was the "Pennsylvania Farmer" the leader of the proprietary party in the province, but the sentiments he set forth seemed pregnant with the possibility of disturbances such as had alarmed them at the time of the Stamp Act. On the earlier occasion Galloway, writing as "Americus" in the *Pennsylvania Journal*, January 9, 1766, had admonished his countrymen to cease their seditious conduct and had praised the mother country for her tenderness in withholding enforcement of her rightful authority. Goddard, called upon the carpet, defended his publication of the "Farmer's Letters" both as a stroke to increase circulation and as a service of first importance to the colonial cause. His associates were not to be appeased. In the printer's words,²³

Mr. Galloway ridiculed my notions about liberty and the rights of mankind, and observed that 'the people in *America* were mad . . . that such factious pieces would answer for the selectmen of *Boston*, and the mob meetings of *Rhode-Island*, but he was sure they would soon be despised here, *Pennsylvanians* (a few hot-headed people excepted) being of a different make, of more solidity, none of *your* damned republican breed . . . that such performances would injure the province at the *British* court, and shew that they were as refractory as the other colonies, and that they might thereby destroy their *best hopes centered in their agent*.'

This time, however, Goddard stood his ground. As a stranger to Pennsylvania he had had little real interest in the local political antagonisms, though he had been forced to become an involuntary sharer in them. But the crisis with England transcended provincial boundaries and, by recalling his own ardent rôle at the time of the

²¹ Letter No. 2, *Pa. Chronicle*, Dec. 7, 1767.

²² According to P. L. Ford, editor of *The Writings of John Dickinson* (H. S. P., *Memoirs*, XIV, Phila., 1895), 283, all the papers throughout the continent "with but four known exceptions" carried the "Farmer's Letters." The essays were not published in pamphlet form until nearly a month after the *Pennsylvania Chronicle* had printed the last one.

²³ Goddard, *Partnership*, 16. The agent, of course, was Franklin.

Stamp Act, deeply engaged his emotions. For any other attitude he had, in Galloway's phrase, "too much of the damn'd *New-England* spirit."²⁴ Besides publishing the full series of "Farmer's Letters," Goddard defiantly admitted kindred political writings to the *Chronicle*. Forget provincial differences in the interests of American liberty, declaimed "A. L." in the issue of May 30, 1768: "Where will be the difference between being slaves under a Proprietary or Royal Government?" On July 4 Goddard opened an old sore by reprinting parts of a pamphlet, written by Dickinson in 1766, which accused Franklin and other colonial agents of having been "READY TO RIVET on their native land . . . the fatal fetters" of the Stamp Act in return for "*oppressive offices* for THEMSELVES and THEIR CREATURES."²⁵

Already the secret partners had prevented Goddard from issuing the "Farmer's Letters" in pamphlet form; now, goaded beyond endurance, and fearful of the political consequences of Dickinson's rising fame, they let loose a "host of angry scribblers" to hatch articles to discredit him with the Pennsylvania public. "I found myself obliged to publish them," Goddard later ruefully disclosed, "tho' I was very averse to it, and was confident it would terminate in the loss of many good customers, which was really the case."²⁶

In regard to Dickinson's allegations concerning Franklin, "A Countryman" asserted that the warmed-over accusations against the Pennsylvania agent and his official brethren had already been fully disproved to the satisfaction of anyone but an "INFAMOUS CALUMNIATOR and A DECEIVER OF THE PEOPLE."²⁷ As for Dickinson's part in the movement to resist the Townshend Acts, the

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 21.

²⁵ The pamphlet was titled *An Address to the Committee of Correspondence in Barbados . . . By a North-American* (Philadelphia).

²⁶ It is not surprising that the course which Goddard, at his partners' dictation, now felt forced to adopt incensed his fellow editors, though it might have been expected to satisfy his own attachment to the principle of a free and impartial press. Referring to Goddard's surprising change of front, the *Journal* and the *Gazette*, Sept. 22, 1768, denounced in identical language the *Chronicle's* "unprovoked abuse, and low scurrility," adding that "it serves to characterize the tool our enemies made choice of . . . for discharging their envenomed filth . . ." Though, of course, they could know nothing of it, Goddard did avoid publishing a series of articles, falsely purporting to have been sent from Virginia, which was designed to be a complete refutation of the "Farmer's Letters." Goddard, *Partnership*, 16-17, 18-19.

²⁷ *Pa. Chronicle*, Aug. 1, 1768. See also "A Barbadian" in issues of Aug. 1, 8, 15.

pseudonymous scribes pictured "*our City-Farmer*" not as a champion of moderation, but as a restless, ambitious politician who sowed seeds that could ripen only in bloodshed and anarchy.²⁸ One feverish imagination saw America about to recapitulate the history of Rome. A triumvirate composed of Octavius (Dickinson), Lepidus (James Otis of Massachusetts) and Antony (Daniel Dulany of Maryland) would divide the Western Hemisphere among them, and then, in due course, would follow a new battle of Actium from which Octavius would emerge triumphant. Octavius would reign until, time having laid him prone, his body was placed on a "funeral Pile, raised of *factious Letters* and *fulsome Addresses*."²⁹ As if such contentions proved too much, another contributor, resorting to rhyme, sought to belittle Dickinson's rôle in the movement of opposition:³⁰

A Fly all alive,
On a Coach-Wheel full drive,
"What a Dust," cries, "*I raise to the Sky!*"
Why the FARMER reproach?
Since *Faction's* the Coach,
And He but the "pitiful" FLY.

This campaign of invective and depreciation probably helped to defeat the "Pennsylvania Farmer" for the Assembly in October, 1768, but, though Goddard had indulged his partners' hatred of Dickinson, he did not relinquish his right to battle against the Townshend Acts as a threat to American liberty. If he must reject the man, his self-respect at least demanded that he act upon the man's principles. Joining forces to this end with the *Journal* and the *Gazette*, both unhampered by financial entanglements, he labored to mobilize sentiment for economic measures against England. Week after week "A Freeborn American," "Agricola" and other scribblers in the three

²⁸ See especially "Frank Meanwell," *Pa. Chronicle*, July 25, 1768; "A Barbadian," Aug. 1; "Country Farmer," Aug. 22; and "Machiavel," Aug. 22, 29.

²⁹ "Machiavel," *Pa. Chronicle*, Aug. 15, 1768. The sarcasm in regard to letters and addresses was a reference to the resolutions of gratitude for the "Farmer's Letters," which poured in on Dickinson from all parts of the continent and which were then being printed in the Philadelphia press. A versified parody of one such address was contributed by "Little John" to the *Chronicle*, Aug. 22.

³⁰ "The Fly on the Coach-Wheel," *Pa. Chronicle*, Aug. 15, 1768. The confusion of thought, betrayed by Dickinson's assailants, moved "Anti-Machiavel" to ask in the *Chronicle*, Aug. 22, how the "Farmer" could be both a tyrant Octavius and an innocuous fly, though he opined that the one rôle was as credible as the other.

papers exhorted the people to cast off the "chains of slavery," disuse British goods, promote domestic manufacturing and, through an aroused public opinion, force the reluctant merchants to emulate the nonimportation stand of their mercantile brethren in Boston and New York.³¹ Letters printed in the newspapers from London friends of colonial rights strongly reënfirmed the propaganda.³² Victory crowned these exertions when the merchants on February 6, 1769, adopted the desired regulations.

Little wonder that the popular chieftains exulted in this impressive exhibition of the power of the press—their press. Yet their path had been easier than that of their brothers in Boston and New York where the governmental authorities, however unsuccessfully, invoked the law against the radical agitation. The Philadelphians benefited from the absence of a royal governor and an aggressive Assembly. Liberty of the press was never in danger, for, in the legal sense of the term, liberty of the press does not preclude owners from managing their papers in accordance with their political prepossessions. In their way Galloway and Wharton were no more bigoted than the radical editors were in theirs. Goddard's personal difficulties do not alter the legal aspects of the matter. For a time it appeared that the popular cause might receive reënforcement from the establishment of a new journal. On January 9, 1769, Benjamin Mecom began a triweekly, the *Penny Post*, with a press belonging to his uncle, Benjamin Franklin, which he had brought with him from New Haven where his paper, the *Connecticut Gazette*, had come to an end on February 19, 1768. But Mecom lacked both proper financial support and a good business head, and his ambitious venture did not outlast the month.

More significant from the standpoint of the radical party was a fresh tension in the internal affairs of the *Chronicle*. Goddard's "unnatural alliance" (as he called it) with "men who were enemies to their country" had increasingly chafed his high-strung nature, while

³¹ In an effort to counteract this agitation, Joseph Galloway, hiding behind the pseudonyms, "A Chester County Farmer" and "A. B.," defended the merchants in the *Pa. Chronicle*, June 16 and July 25, 1768. The first piece was answered by "Martinus Scribblerus" in the *Pa. Gazette*, July 21, and the second by "C." in the *Gazette*, Aug. 4. "C.," admitting the inconvenience of a nonimportation agreement to the merchants, pointed out that "The good of the whole community is the supreme law," and that "No Thief ever voluntarily subscribed the penal laws against Felony."

³² See, for example, the *Pa. Journal*, Jan. 26, March 2, 1769; *Pa. Chronicle*, April 3.

assertions of independence on his part had drawn from his partners constant reprimands and threats of financial reprisal. The printer reported Thomas Wharton as saying to him, on one occasion, "I tell thee, whosoever we set up, is set up—and whosoever we pull down, is pull'd down—therefore take care how *thee conducts* thyself. . . . We are able to crush thee in a moment."⁸³ Misunderstandings over business accounts created additional bitterness and mutual distrust. Stormy scenes occurred with ever greater frequency. "Nothing would please them," Goddard later declared, "but an entire submission to their will . . ."⁸⁴ As a result, he began keeping out of their way and, so far as possible, avoided consulting them.

In order to tighten their control over the paper, Goddard's associates now compelled him to take as partner Benjamin Towne, a journeyman printer in the *Chronicle* office. They threatened Goddard that, if he did not consent, they would withdraw their support and set up Towne as conductor of a rival sheet. The new arrangement went into effect on May 19, 1769, though it was not until November 20 that the imprint of the *Chronicle* recorded the fact. While relinquishing thereby their own status as partners, Galloway and Wharton believed they had strengthened their hold on the publication, for the penniless Towne signed a note to them for £ 526 and, as their creature, he would always be present in the office to prevent the adoption of policies contrary to their interests.⁸⁵

Towne did his best to carry out his end of the bargain, but relations between him and his former master were impossible from the start. Soon each was accusing the other of underhanded dealings, of neglect of the business and of financial irregularities, with appeals from time to time to the sheriff to compose their differences.⁸⁶ Affairs rapidly drifted from bad to worse. Though the erstwhile secret partners lent Towne aid at every turn, Goddard was not to be deterred from following out his own editorial policy, and he made life so miserable for Towne that in February, 1770, the latter "eloped" from the business. An acrimonious aftermath of words raged between the two men, each buying advertising space in the *Journal* and the *Gazette* to blacken

⁸³ Goddard, *Partnership*, 24.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, 22-23.

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, 28, 33-36.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, 36-51.

the character of the other, and Towne appealing to the *Chronicle's* subscribers to pay their arrears to him.³⁷

In thus ridding himself of one enemy Goddard did not forget his more powerful one.³⁸ Determined to prevent the return of Joseph Galloway to the Assembly, he published a pamphlet, *The Partnership: or The History of the Rise and Progress of the Pennsylvania Chronicle, &c.*, shortly before the election in October in order to expose to the public Galloway's baleful conduct as secret partner.³⁹ And Goddard might have succeeded in this purpose had not Galloway circumvented him by leaving Philadelphia and standing for election from Bucks County where he was a landed proprietor.⁴⁰

While this fight for control of the *Chronicle* went on, the journalistic assault against the Townshend Acts had continued full blast, Goddard contributing his due share. The stirring political events in Massachusetts were chronicled for Philadelphia readers; and the street affray in Boston on March 5, 1770, was portrayed as the "bloody Massacre."⁴¹ When definite word arrived of Parliament's repeal of all the Townshend duties but that on tea, the major effort of the press became to prevent the merchants from deserting the nonimportation. A contributor to the *Chronicle*, May 7, declared that the merchants would betray the cause of America if on so slight a pretext they now resumed trade. Other journalistic penmen harped on the same theme, exhorting the public to make themselves heard, and vindicating the

³⁷ This controversy can be conveniently followed in the *Pa. Journal*, July 19, 26, Aug. 9, 16, 30, Sept. 6, 1770. Towne's name did not disappear from the imprint of the *Chronicle* until July 16, 1770.

³⁸ To his earlier counts against Galloway, Goddard now added the accusation that the "Junto," after two weeks of consultation and "much *inkshed*," had sent forth Towne "with a STINK-POT in his hand." Towne denied this charge of "so profligate a calumniator." *Pa. Journal*, Aug. 9, 30, 1770.

³⁹ Of himself Goddard wrote in the introduction, "I don't pretend that I am an angel, and beg only to be thought a man, though with like passions as my neighbours." Benjamin Franklin, hardly unprejudiced in the matter, wrote from London to his son William on Jan. 30, 1772, "I cast my eye over Goddard's Piece against our friend Mr. Galloway, and then lit my fire with it." Franklin, *Writings* (A. H. Smyth, editor, N. Y., 1905-1907), V. 378. This point of view of a contemporary is reflected in Wroth, *History of Printing in Colonial Maryland*, 125-127.

⁴⁰ E. H. Baldwin, "Joseph Galloway, the Loyalist Politician," *PENNSYLVANIA MAGAZINE OF HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY*, XXVI (1902), 301. For later attacks by Goddard on Galloway and Wharton, see the *Pa. Chronicle*, Sept. 23, 1771, Feb. 24, April 27, May 11, 25, July 13, 1772.

⁴¹ *Pa. Gazette*, March 22, 1770; *Pa. Chronicle*, March 26, July 30.

Boston merchants against charges of duplicity in carrying out their agreement.⁴² Supported in this campaign by the small tradesmen and mechanics of the city, the newspapers stiffened the resolution of the merchants for the time.

But the news of New York's abandonment of the nonimportation on July 9 hampered the further success of such efforts.⁴³

Amaz'd!—Astonished!—what *New-Yorkers* flee!
Those *once boasted Sons of sweet Liberty!*
Surely it can't be so!—I dream!—I stand!
What!—*Yorkers* join with curs'd *oppression's-band!*

Thus "A True Son of Liberty" introduced his poetic condemnation of the faithless New Yorkers, while "A Jersey Man," "Nestor" and others wheeled into line the heavier artillery of prose. Though most writers in the press continued to urge a maintenance of the Philadelphia agreement unchanged, dissenting voices now began also to be heard. Such contributors, inspired doubtless by the leading merchants, argued the futility of an economic boycott which New York had deserted and, it was charged, Boston had sabotaged.⁴⁴ On September 20, the day of the meeting of the merchants to decide on a future course of action, the *Gazette*, at the request of "Civis," reprinted from the *New-York Gazette and Weekly Mercury* a summary of importations into Boston from January 1 to June 19, 1770, emanating from the Customs Commissioners there. Over the protests of a strident minority the assemblage took the expected action. Following New York's example, they limited the nonimportation to tea alone.⁴⁵

The three years had seen the Philadelphia press shift its principal interest from provincial politics to imperial affairs. Thanks to his ingrained obstinacy, the unhappy Goddard had rescued his newspaper from financial subjection to the conservative party, and the combined exertions of the *Journal*, the *Gazette* and the *Chronicle* had been a major factor in pushing the people into a commercial combination

⁴² For defense of the Boston merchants, see especially "A House Carpenter" in the *Pa. Chronicle*, June 18, 1770, and "Justice" in the *Pa. Gazette*, June 21. The merits of the Boston enforcement are canvassed in A. M. Schlesinger, *The Colonial Merchants and the American Revolution* (Columbia Univ., Studies, LXXVIII, 1918), 156-183.

⁴³ *Pa. Journal*, July 26, 1770.

⁴⁴ See particularly "Philo-Veritas" in the *Pa. Gazette*, July 19, Aug. 2, 1770, and "A Philadelphian," Aug. 16.

⁴⁵ *Pa. Gazette*, Sept. 27, Oct. 11, 1770; *Pa. Chronicle*, Oct. 1.

against the Townshend Acts in union with the seaports to the north. When at last the radical prints lost their control of public opinion, the event was due less to wavering on their part than to the crumbling of opposition in other colonies, notably New York. These were odds which with the best of will they could not overcome. Though the success of their propaganda while it lasted was one in which they might well have taken pride, the final outcome disheartened both them and the popular leaders with whom they were allied. The direction of public affairs returned to the conservatives, the newspapers relaxed their watchfulness, and, as Dickinson wrote Samuel Adams in Boston, "political lethargy" fell upon the community.⁴⁶ Not until Parliament alarmed the colonies with the passage of a new tea act in the spring of 1773 did the press again spring into action and the people awaken from their sleep.

Harvard University

ARTHUR M. SCHLESINGER

⁴⁶ Letter of April 10, 1773, reprinted in W. V. Wells, *The Life and Public Services of Samuel Adams* (Boston, 1865), II. 60-61.