The Quaker Party of Pennsylvania, 1755-1765

THE Quaker party in Pennsylvania dominated political life in the province until the American Revolution. Before 1756 its leaders were invariably members of the Society of Friends, thus affording a particular appropriateness to the name of the party. But after that date many of its leaders were non-Quakers or men only nominally associated with the Society of Friends. This leadership, naturally, did not necessarily reflect the opinions of the Society of Friends. It did reflect, however, the anti-proprietary views of the vast majority of the people of the province. This had been and remained down to 1765 the great source of power of the Quaker party.

It has often been asserted that the Quaker party was composed of an oligarchy representing eastern wealth and conservatism in the province, and that its power rested upon limited franchise and the underrepresentation of all but the original eastern counties along the Delaware.[1] A re-examination of the political history of Pennsylvania for this period finds this interpretation unwarranted by an analysis of the facts. If all inequalities in the electoral franchise and representation (and these have been exaggerated in history) had been abolished, the Quaker party, it would seem, would still have maintained a majority in the legislative assembly during this period. The Proprietary party, the political rival of the Quaker party, could not undermine the popularity of the latter mainly because the proprietary issue remained paramount in the minds of the people until after 1765. Significant also is the fact that the Quaker party did not withhold military defense from the frontier as is commonly charged.[2]

[1] This interpretation is presented in Charles H. Lincoln, *The Revolutionary Movement in Pennsylvania, 1760–1776* (Philadelphia, 1901). Authors since the publication of Lincoln's book have generally followed his interpretation.

[2] *Ibid.*

When the passage of urgent defense bills was delayed in the assembly, the outcropping of long-standing disputes between the proprietors and the province, rather than Quaker pacifism, was responsible.

These conclusions may be substantiated by tracing party politics through the decade 1755–1765. Strangely enough at the end of this period, when Quaker party leaders preferred to acquiesce passively to the Stamp Act while the Proprietary party became the spearhead of resistance to the Act, the latter made surprisingly little headway in the provincial elections in the autumn of 1765. This shows the genuine strength the Quaker party derived from the near universal support of its plan to terminate proprietary government and abolish the special privileges of the proprietors as landlords.

Benjamin Franklin, who early associated himself with the Quaker party, became the foremost politician in Pennsylvania during the years under survey. Franklin, who entertained no illusions about reconciling Pennsylvania's developing republicanism with an anachronistic proprietary government, became convinced that the best solution for the colony lay in conversion to a royal province. At that time it was generally believed that this plan would afford a greater degree of self-government in addition to abolishing the special privileges of the proprietors.

Franklin rose to prominence in the Quaker party soon after his election to the assembly in 1750. He had exercised considerable influence previous to this date while clerk of the house, but leadership during the 1740's was largely in the person of John Kinsey, a Quaker of moderate views and policies.[3] Franklin apparently was unable to assume an unrivaled leadership in the Quaker party before the exigencies produced by the French and Indian War thrust the direction of affairs into nonpacifist hands. During the early 1750's, when Franklin was gaining the esteem and confidence of the assembly, that body was led by Isaac Norris and Israel Pemberton, Jr., the latter of whom provided a decided pacifist influence and anti-proprietary spirit to the party.[4]

The principal leader of the Proprietary or Gentlemen's party, as it was sometimes called, was William Allen, a person of great wealth and social importance. In 1727, when but twenty-three, he had

[3] T. Thayer, *Israel Pemberton, King of the Quakers* (Philadelphia, 1943), 50.
[4] *Ibid.*, 56 ff.

become a member of the governor's council and four years later began a long career in the provincial assembly.[5] By 1742 he was recognized as the leader of the small Gentlemen's party, consisting largely of Presbyterians and Anglicans in Philadelphia, who denounced Quaker politics and policies and looked to the proprietors for support. The latter, foremost of whom was Thomas Penn, had abandoned Quakerism for the Anglican Church and were out of sympathy with pacifism. They feared the political ambitions of the Quaker party, and were ready to cast their lot with "gentlemen" who defended the authority of the proprietors and denounced the steady encroachment of the Quakers upon proprietary prerogatives.[6]

Until war broke out in 1755, the Quaker party had found no occasion to fear that its rival, the Proprietary party, would defeat it at the polls. Supported by almost the whole German vote as well as by many non-Quakers among the English and Scots-Irish[7]—who favored a policy of low-cost government, opposition to the proprietors, and peace with the natives—the Quaker party prided itself upon its leadership and strength in the province. Oligarchic as was the character of colonial government, this was truly a people's party if popular support can warrant the use of this term.

With the advent of the war in 1755, Quakers who refused to compromise their pacifism were but a small minority of the assembly. These were presently obliged to resign and churchmen of the Quaker party were chosen in their places. Less unbending Quakers saw fit to retain their seats, along with others on the fringe of the Society of Friends. The assembly in 1756 was still controlled by the Quaker party, but not by pacifists.[8] With this membership Benjamin Franklin moved into leadership, maintaining the party's anti-proprietary sentiments, but undertaking a defense program demanded by the province at large.

5 Edward F. DeLancey, "Chief Justice William Allen," PENNSYLVANIA MAGAZINE OF HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY, I (1877), 202–211.

6 Thayer, *op. cit.*, 41 ff.

7 Division among the Presbyterians, most of whom were Scots-Irish, into "new lights" and "old lights" during the Great Awakening was a factor which turned many of their votes to the Quakers for whom they seemed to hold more respect than for their rival brethren. Guy S. Klett, *Presbyterians in Colonial Pennsylvania* (Philadelphia, 1937), 127; Thayer, *op. cit.*, 73.

8 *Ibid.*, 81 ff. Not until 1760 was there again a majority of members who qualified by the affirmative rather than by swearing. Israel Pemberton to William Logan, Feb. 5, 1761, Pemberton Papers (The Historical Society of Pennsylvania).

The Proprietary party leaders believed that war would now cause the people to turn the Quaker party, traditionally pacifist in its views, out of the assembly. Never overcautious as to facts when political advantages were at stake, the Proprietary leaders now falsely charged the assembly with willful obstruction of defense for pacific reasons and of attempting to lay the blame for its inaction at the door of the proprietors. The assembly, it is true, did hold up the passage of an appropriation bill, but only because Franklin and his party were determined to wring from the proprietors the privilege of taxing their huge estates. Likewise the assembly demanded the passage of a militia bill conforming to the democratic views of the people at large, while the governor insisted upon a measure providing executive control of the provincial forces.[9]

At this juncture the Proprietary party found an able recruit in the person of the Reverend William Smith, Anglican clergyman and since 1754 provost of the Academy and Charity School (College of Philadelphia).[10] In 1756 he published anonymously a tract known as *Brief State*, charging that Quaker pacifism had brought calamity to the frontier and lay at the root of the difference between the governor and assembly. Although the author neglected to explain why non-Quaker colonies had no better defense than Pennsylvania, many were ready to accept his views unquestioningly. Smith also overlooked the fact that the Maryland assembly was engaged in a contest with the Calverts which paralleled that in progress in Pennsylvania. Nevertheless his propaganda was effective and set high officials in London debating what should be done about the Pennsylvania legislature.

Meanwhile the Proprietary party made gains, especially among the Germans and Scots-Irish. The latter, who were rapidly becoming politically conscious, no longer were so willing to allow others to represent them in the provincial legislature. The change is seen even

[9] *Ibid.*, 84 ff. Charles J. Stillé pointed out as long ago as 1886 that the assembly did not refuse the province defense. See Charles J. Stillé, "The Attitude of the Quakers in the Provincial Wars," PENNSYLVANIA MAGAZINE OF HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY, X (1886), 294. Politically the militia question was thought to be of major importance. The assembly declared: "The Militia will vote for Members of Assembly, and being dependent on their officers, would probably be influenced by them. . . ." *Votes of the Assembly, Pennsylvania Archives, Eighth Series* (8 vols., Harrisburg, 1831–1935), VI, 4642.

[10] Now the University of Pennsylvania.

in the strong Quaker county of Chester, where the Scots-Irish raised in 1755 a petition against the Quaker assembly.[11] In February, 1756, a petition to the King was sent by the Proprietary leaders praying that the Quakers be barred from ever again holding political offices in Pennsylvania. The first signature on the petition was that of William Allen, supported by the names of the principal men of his party, among them Gilbert Tennant, William Shippen, Thomas Cadwalader, Samuel McCall, and William Coxe.[12] Clearly revealing the spirit of the Proprietary party, the petition stated: "If we look into their Militia Bill, we shall find them usurping, the power of the Militia, which by Law, is solely in the Crown,—& which, by the Charter, is delegated to the Proprietor, whom the King has made Captain Genl. there, into the Hands of the People."[13] It is to be wondered that the Proprietary men failed to perceive that so long as Franklin put the power "into the Hands of the People," the majority of the people of Pennsylvania would choose his politics to theirs.[14]

The assembly, however, lost for a time its sense of balance when it attempted to crush opposition by penalizing the Reverend William Smith and William Moore for their criticism of legislative conduct. In 1758 both men were charged with seditious libel and breach of the privileges of the house and committed to jail.[15] When Smith refused to bow to the assembly and pray forgiveness, Proprietary leaders loudly applauded his fortitude and determination. Some of these, among whom were William Allen, Lynford Lardner, Richard Hockley, William Peters, John Wallace, John Bell and James Young, were straightway fined by the house for their impudence.[16] Crown attorneys considered the whole affair and declared that the assembly had brazenly disregarded his Majesty's prerogatives and acted beyond its legal powers.[17] But the Quaker party, with the likelihood of crown intervention past, paid little attention to ministerial reprimand.

11 William R. Riddell, "Libel on the Assembly," PENNSYLVANIA MAGAZINE OF HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY, LII, (1928), 253–254.

12 Stillé, *op. cit.*, 294–297.

13 *Ibid.*, 302.

14 See Thayer, *op. cit.*, 88.

15 Riddell, *op. cit.*, 253–259; *Pennsylvania Colonial Records: Minutes of the Provincial Council, 1683–1776* (10 vols., Philadelphia, 1851–52), VIII, 17.

16 Riddell, *op. cit.*, 261.

17 *Ibid.*, 342; *Acts of the Privy Council, Colonial Series* (6 vols., London, 1908–1912), IV, 383–384.

Hugh Roberts wrote to Franklin, who was then in England, that the action against Moore and Smith "has had the happy effect to make the Scots clan who were very public in their Clamours against the Conduct of the House, now communicate their thoughts to each other in whispers under the Thistle."[18]

With the termination of hostilities on the Pennsylvania border, many voters who had forsaken the Quaker party during the war returned to its support.[19] In fact in 1761, when Samuel Foulke entered the assembly, the Proprietary faction had shrunk to a mere shadow. Only William Allen opposed the resolution to keep Franklin, who had become Pennsylvania's colonial agent, in England.[20] No wonder that Allen greeted Foulke with all the grace at his command which the latter "look'd upon as an Artifice" to win him to his party.[21]

Every indication seemed to show that the Proprietary party was rapidly losing the following won during the stirring years of border warfare. Indeed only William Allen, the arch champion of proprietary government, seemed determined to drag politics into every question under consideration. Alone in the house he argued for the proprietary prerogative.[22] When the report from the Indian treaties at Easton was presented, he defended the proprietors in "such a torrent of Obstreperous Jargon as might have been heard in a still morning to ye Jersey shore, in vindication of Sir William's [Sir William Johnson's] conduct. . . ."[23]

But if war and frontier unrest were needed for the political ascendancy of the Proprietary leaders they had not long to wait. Hardly had the frontier recovered from the havoc wrought by the

18 "Selections from the Correspondence between Hugh Roberts and Benjamin Franklin," PENNSYLVANIA MAGAZINE OF HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY, XXXVIII (1914), 288.

19 Wayland F. Dunaway, *Scotch Irish of Colonial Pennsylvania* (Chapel Hill, N. C., 1944), 122.

20 "The Pennsylvania Assembly in 1761–2, A Memorandum Kept By Samuel Foulke," PENNSYLVANIA MAGAZINE OF HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY, VIII (1884), 408. Foulke came from Bucks County.

21 *Ibid.*, 407.

22 *Ibid.*, 412. The governor naturally proved the main defense of proprietary prerogative. Governor James Hamilton informed the assembly in March, 1761, that he would sanction no bill naming officers to execute the law which did not provide for his voice in choosing the men. *Pennsylvania Colonial Records*, VIII, 578–579.

23 "Fragments of a Journal Kept by Samuel Foulke, of Bucks County," PENNSYLVANIA MAGAZINE OF HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY, V (1881), 63.

French and Indian War when the Indians, led by the Ottawa chief, Pontiac, again brought terror and destruction to the Pennsylvania frontier. General Jeffrey Amherst, commander-in-chief of the British forces in North America, having received a warning from Colonel Henry Bouquet of the intentions of the Indians, urged Governor James Hamilton by a letter of June 12, 1763, to send aid at once to the frontier.[24] By a letter of June 25, General Amherst confirmed his warning and advised Pennsylvania to act promptly.[25]

On July 6, only two days after being called together by Governor Hamilton, the assembly answered his message by resolving that the governor should "take into the immediate pay of his Province" upwards to seven hundred men, exclusive of those already in the service. If the public treasury had insufficient funds to defray the expense thereof, the house promised to supply the deficiency at the next meeting.[26] The western members seemed satisfied with this and David McConnaughy and James Galbreath of York and Cumberland Counties took the message to the governor.

Governor Hamilton thanked the assembly and signified that he was well satisfied with the action of the house "in the present Exigency."[27] On September 12 he informed the assembly that the companies had been raised and sent to the frontier where their presence permitted the saving of a "great Part of the Harvest." And "for the two last Months," continued Hamilton, "we have been very little, if at all, infested by the Enemy."[28] On September 19, 1763, the assembly resolved to continue eight hundred men in the provincial service and voted £25,000 for the cost thereof.[29] Word came from Cumberland County, a region hard-hit by the war, that the people "are very sensible of and gratefully acknowledge, the Care of the Legislature, in granting a Number of Men for the Protection of the Frontier."[30] Upon this record it is difficult indeed to find grounds for charging the assembly with a denial of military protection.[31]

24 *Votes*, VI, 5428.
25 *Ibid.*, VI, 5428–5429.
26 *Ibid.*, VI, 5430–5431.
27 *Ibid.*, VI, 5431.
28 *Ibid.*, VI, 5425. At this time Bouquet defeated the Indians at Bush Run.
29 *Ibid.*, VI, 5438–5439.
30 *Ibid.*, VI, 5438.
31 For this point of view see: Lincoln, *op. cit.*; Arthur D. Graeff, *The Relations Between the Pennsylvania Germans and the British Authorities, 1750–1776* (Norristown, Pa., 1939); Lily Lee Nixon, *James Burd, Frontier Defender, 1726–1783* (Philadelphia, 1941).

The first ripple of an impending storm came on September 29 when Governor Hamilton returned a supply bill for £25,000 because it provided for the issuance of that amount in legal tender bills of credit, contrary to the interest of the proprietors and their instructions to the governor.[32] Benjamin Franklin was now back from England and again personally directing the course of action in the assembly. Three times in the next few days the house sent the supply bill to the governor, each time to meet his refusal to accept it without amendments, whereupon the bill died by the expiration of the term of the assembly. The new legislature, composed of about the same membership as the preceding, resolved on October 18 to raise the funds in conformance to the amendments demanded by the governor. The latter gave his assent to the measure and the threat to harmony seemed past.[33]

But Amherst's requisition of one thousand Pennsylvanians for his Majesty's forces in November, with the additional expense which this entailed, spelled trouble for the ensuing year in a province which believed that the proprietors were not contributing a fair share to the public treasury.[34] However, financial trouble was preceded by the December massacre of a few Indians under the protection of the province at Conestoga and Lancaster by irate frontiersmen, an act of lawlessness setting in motion a train of events which ignited party and sectional animosities as never before in the history of the province.[35]

Indians under the care of the Moravians in Northampton County, who were charged with having given aid to the enemy, had already been brought to Philadelphia and placed under guard on an island in the Schuylkill. The massacre of the Conestoga Indians now seemed to raise old hatreds for the Indians into a wild fury. Indigna-

32 *Votes*, VI, 5436. Hamilton's message reads: "You will be pleased, Gentlemen, to remember, that among the several Provisions in the supply Bill of One Thousand Seven Hundred and Fifty nine, to which you Proprietaries objected, one was that the Bills of Credit to be thereby issued were made a legal Tender for the Discharge of all Debts and Contracts whatever, at the Rates at which they were emitted, by which they conceived themselves liable to a great Injustice in the Payment of their Rents and Quitrents. . . ." *Ibid.*, VI, 5456.

33 *Ibid.*, VI, 5478, 5484.

34 *Ibid.*, VI, 5490. Franklin and his associates may also have aimed through taxation of the proprietary estates to force the Penns to sell large blocks of land which they withheld from sale for speculative purposes.

35 *Ibid.*, VI, 5497 ff; Klett, *op. cit.*, 253–254.

tion knew no bounds when it became known that over a hundred "savages" were being provided for in Philadelphia at public expense while their brethren killed and carried off the people on the frontier. "The disaffection," wrote Foulke, "appearing to Spread like a Contagion into the Interior parts of ye province and Even ye City itself, That ye Government became in some measure intimidated by the threats of ye back inhabitants . . .," whereupon plans were made to send the Indians to New York.[36]

Presently the assembly prepared a bill for bringing the murderers of the Conestoga Indians to Philadelphia where it was felt justice could be done, but again "such a Clamour [arose] in ye House and out-of-doors that the house thought proper to let it lye after ye first reading. . . ."[37] Already it was noised about Philadelphia that a large body consisting of several hundred westerners was coming to the city to kill the Indians on Province Island.[38] The rioters, as they were called—most of whom were Scots-Irish—declared they would also kill Joseph Fox, a prominent member of the Quaker party, and Israel Pemberton. They believed the latter had, among other things, incited the Indians to resist white settlers.[39] Although the rioters were turned back peaceably at Germantown, the affair demonstrated that it was not within the power of the province to bring the murderers of Indians to trial.[40] The whole affair became a violent political dispute, with the Proprietary party emerging once again to prominence as the champion of western discontent. Scots-Irish everywhere rallied to the call of the Proprietary leaders and many Lutherans and Calvinist Germans saw fit to join them. The predominantly German county of Berks, however, refused to be associated with the movement.[41] Nor were the Scots-Irish able to turn the majority of the

36 Foulke's Journal, *op. cit.*, 67. See also Jared Sparks, ed., *The Works of Benjamin Franklin* (10 vols., Boston, 1840), I, 276–277.

37 *Ibid.*

38 *Pennsylvania Colonial Records*, IX, 108, 127–128.

39 Thayer, *op. cit.*, 187–189.

40 Foulke's Journal, *op. cit.*, 70; Penn MSS: Official Correspondence, IX, 238, 252 (Historical Society of Pennsylvania).

41 Graeff, *op. cit.*, 205; *Votes*, VII, 5598–5599. It was reported in 1760 that in Berks County twelve persons to one were Germans. Henry M. Keim, "The Episcopal Church in Reading, Pa." PENNSYLVANIA MAGAZINE OF HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY, IV (1880), 69.

people in the politically strategic county of Lancaster from their support of the Quaker party.

The rioters had carried with them to Philadelphia a petition from York, Cumberland, and Lancaster Counties which expressed the views of the Scots-Irish and deplored the fact that the west was underrepresented in the provincial assembly. To this latter situation they ascribed misfortunes which had befallen the frontier. A representation of only ten from the five western counties was considered "oppressive, unequal and unjust, the cause of many of our Grievances. . . ."[42]

That proportional representation did not exist in Pennsylvania at this time no one can deny. But some historians have therefore concluded that this uneven representation proceeded from a premeditated design on the part of the Quaker party to keep the opposition from gaining control of affairs.[43] There is reason to believe, however, that the new counties at the time of their establishment had adequate representation in the legislature in terms of either numbers or property. The people of York and Cumberland Counties, created in 1749 and 1750, respectively, had not been concerned about the number of representatives allotted them until the outbreak of war. Mindful of the expense involved, at times they had neglected to elect members to the assembly or chose Philadelphians to represent them.[44] Furthermore, the main reason advanced for the creation of new counties at the time was not one of affording better representation but rather the distance of the western communities from the courts and public offices, and the difficulty of keeping order so far from the seat of government.[45]

If any party thought of the creation of western counties as a clever piece of gerrymandering, it was apparently the Proprietary and not the Quaker. When the five western counties were created, three at

42 *Pennsylvania Colonial Records*, IX, 138.

43 See Lincoln, *op. cit.*, 44 ff. Also consult Charles H. Lincoln, "Pennsylvania Assembly, Prior to the Revolution," PENNSYLVANIA MAGAZINE OF HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY, XXIII (1899), 27 ff.

44 See the entry of members of the Assembly in *Votes*, vols. V–VII. William Allen of Philadelphia was invariably elected by one of the frontier counties to the legislature.

45 *Statutes at Large of Pennsylvania, 1682–1801*, W. S. Ray, State printer (Harrisburg, 1898), V, 70–72.

least were mainly inhabited by Germans, of unquestionable loyalty to the Quaker party. In 1750 Dr. Thomas Graeme informed Thomas Penn that he believed the creation of western counties with few representatives would be beneficial to the Proprietary interest. "They would by this division," he wrote, "Comprehend to a triffle the whole Body of the Dutch [Germans], and consequently forever exclude them from becoming a Majority in the assembly for Allow Lancaster, York and the two not yet appointed Countys to send all Dutch it would make but ten Members in 38 [36]. . . ."[46]

In 1765 Benjamin Franklin admitted that it was possible that the western counties should be granted more representatives. The six penny tax of 1757 affords a measure of comparing the tax burdens of the counties, although it is not indicative of the relative county populations.[47]

County	*Tax*	*Representation*
Philadelphia	£3,281	8
Chester	2,180	8
Bucks	941	8
Lancaster	1,185	4
Northampton	424	1
Berks	497	1
Cumberland	73	2
York	no return	2

A tax table for 1760 shows the eastern counties still paying nearly double the taxes of the western, but significantly enough the table shows the west to have a population almost equal that of the east.[48] From the standpoint of population, therefore, the west could definitely claim by this time to be underrepresented in the legislature. But although there occasionally was some talk of asking for a re-

[46] "Letter of Dr. Thomas Graeme to Thomas Penn, 1750," PENNSYLVANIA MAGAZINE OF HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY, XXXIX (1915), 446–447. Concern for the loyalty of the Germans to crown and province was common in Pennsylvania at this time.

[47] The frontier war is partly accountable for the low returns or lack thereof from Cumberland and York Counties. However, western assessors purposely rated property low to avoid paying a full share of provincial taxes. Lincoln, *op. cit.*, 49–50; *Votes*, VI, 4659. The city of Philadelphia, whose tax was large, is included in the county return.

[48] *Ibid.*, VI, 5141.

apportionment, the majority of the people seemed undisturbed until agitation arose during the Indian war of 1763–64.[49]

The charge that eastern conservatives intentionally put the suffrage qualification beyond the reach of many people likewise is a questionable one. It is true that the requirement of a possession of £50 in property in the city of that Philadelphia for the electoral franchise excluded many. Elsewhere in the province, the ownership of fifty acres of land with twelve acres cleared was a qualification fairly liberal for the age. These provisions, made in the days of William Penn, had for their purpose the placing of political power in the hands of men of property. But they were not made to exclude national or religious groups, or to discriminate against sections of the province. Neither the Scots-Irish nor the Germans were present in the province in large numbers when the laws were made. In 1763 a more liberal franchise in the city would doubtlessly have strengthened the Proprietary party there; but over the province at large it is doubtful that it would have altered political power to any appreciable degree. There is no reason for believing that all or most of the disenfranchised were waiting to vote the Proprietary ticket.[50]

The petitions to the Assembly from western counties in 1764 are usually cited as sufficient proof that the province was at the time controlled by a minority through an unfair system of representation. But petitions from certain people in several counties do not prove that a majority of the people of the province opposed the Quaker party. Lincoln estimates that in 1760 the eastern counties had six votes too many and the west and the city of Philadelphia twelve votes too few.[51] If it is assumed that his judgment in this is fair enough, it does not follow that the Proprietary party would have gained by the reapportionment to the extent of controlling the assembly. Berks County, for instance, remained steadfast in the interest of the Quaker party all through the upheaval of 1764, while only one of Lancaster's four votes was given to the Proprietary

[49] The Reverend John Elder wrote to Richard Peters, July, 1757: "It's well known that Representatives from the back Inhabitants, have but little weight with the Gentlemen in power, they looking on us, either as uncapable of forming just notions of things, or as bias'd by selfish Views. . . ." Klett, *op. cit.*, 250.

[50] See Lincoln, *op. cit.*, 44 ff.; Albert E. McKinley, *The Suffrage Franchise in the Thirteen English Colonies in America* (Philadelphia, 1905), 279–294.

[51] Lincoln, *op. cit.*, 48.

party. Lincoln's table for reapportionment based on taxables and the actual election returns for 1764[52] for a ratio of the party strength in the province yield an alignment in the House as follows:

	Proprietary party	*Quaker party*
Philadelphia County	3	5
Philadelphia City	4	0
Chester	0	6½
Bucks	0	4½
Lancaster	2	6
York	5	0
Berks	0	4½
Cumberland	2+	0
Northampton	3	0

Thus the Quaker party, with the support of the majority of the people in the province, would have still controlled the assembly under this arrangement. Furthermore, the above analysis fails to reveal the true strength of the Quaker party, which, the next year after the excitement of war had abated, recovered almost all the votes of the assembly.

Essentially there was nothing new in either the dispute involving the taxation of the proprietary estates or the militia bill of 1764. General Amherst had asked for men and money, and Benjamin Franklin and his party were willing to supply both according to the mode preferred by the people of the province at large. Foulke wrote in his diary that the "house was much at a Loss how to proceed being desirous to avoyd disputes and altercation with the Governor" but upon seeing the latter's instructions "the House had ye Mortifi-

[52] *Ibid.*, 47; *Votes*, VII, 5669. Lincoln's table as found on page 47 is as follows:

	Taxables	*Members by Taxables*	*Actual Members*
Philadelphia County	5,678	8	8
Philadelphia City	2,634	4	2
Chester	4,761	6½	8
Bucks	3,148	4½	8
Lancaster	5,635	8	4
York	3,302	5	2
Berks	3,016	4½	1
Cumberland	1,501	2+	2
Northampton	1,989	3	1

Note: Lincoln also computed the membership on the basis of taxes paid.

cation to find him under greater restraints than any of his predecessors had been, in regard to paper Currency & Taxing ye Prop'ies Lands."[53] Determined that the huge proprietary estates should pay taxes on the same terms as ordinary citizens, the assembly drafted a bill accordingly, whereupon there ensued months of bitter altercation with the new governor, John Penn.[54] Thus both governor and assembly disregarded the urgency of making an appropriation. In March the house adjourned until May 14, with a note to the governor that it would be pleased to convene whenever he was ready to sign the bill and reminding him that if "any ill Consequences ensue . . ." it will "add to that load of Obloguy and Guilt the Proprietary Family is already burdened with. . . ."[55] But it was the assembly and the Quaker party which finally gave in rather than allow defense to suffer longer.[56] By way of summing up its position on the supply bill, the assembly inquired: "Is it consistent with Justice to the good People of this Province, to insist on taxing the best and most valuable of the Proprietaries' Lands no higher than the worst and least valuable of People's Lands in a common Tax, to be levied for the defenses of the whole?"[57]

While this dispute over the supply bill was in progress, disagreement over a militia bill became an issue nearly as vexatious. Franklin and the assembly demanded a law similar to the one enacted in 1755,[58] allowing the choice of officers by the common soldiers and barring the use of court-martial.[59] The governor contended that the

53 Foulke's Journal, *op. cit.*, 68.

54 Sparks, *op. cit.*, I, 281; John Bigelow, ed., *The Works of Benjamin Franklin* (12 vols., New York, 1904), IV, 57–92.

55 *Pennsylvania Colonial Records*, IX, 164; Foulke's Journal, *op. cit.*, 73. The assembly had given in to the governor on several points already but refused to yield regarding the proprietary demand that their best lands be taxed no higher than the people's poorest lands. William Logan to John Smith, March 25, 1764, Smith MSS (Ridgway Library, Philadelphia).

56 *Votes*, VII, 5604, 5616–5617.

57 *Pennsylvania Colonial Records*, IX, 187–188.

58 The act was disallowed by the Crown in 1756.

59 Sparks, *op. cit.*, I, 280: Bigelow, *op. cit.*, IV, 67–68. Pennsylvania had long demanded loose militia laws. Cadwallader Colden of New York in a letter to Governor George Clinton in 1747/8 said "Several have been attempting to introduce the practice of the men's choosing their own officers as has been lately done in Philadelphia. . . . These attempts will help to demonstrate the inclinations of the People in America to deprive the King of the power of the Militia." "Colden Papers, IV (1748–54)" *New-York Historical Society Collections* (1920), 4, 22.

bill violated both the prerogatives of crown and proprietaries and withheld his assent.

While these disputes were in progress, the assembly prepared a petition to the King praying for the conversion of Pennsylvania into a royal province. Benjamin Franklin had for many years advocated this change, which he now pushed forward with all his ingenuity. It is possible that Franklin hoped for some personal gain from the measure, for it is not improbable that a favorable ministry would have granted him an office, perhaps even the governorship of the province. But to hold that this was the key to Franklin's actions would be unjust to a man who so often proved his devotion to the welfare of the people. There is hardly room to doubt that his reasons for opposing proprietary rule were those of a statesman who clearly perceived the incongruous nature of combining the principal landholder and the chief executive in one person.[60] When the question had arisen before he had not received sufficient support from the Quaker faction, but now he found a large and influential number of the Society of Friends heartily in agreement with him. Without this support he could not have proceeded with the program.

Quaker reluctance to initiate a movement for a change of government had not been due to any sympathy for the pretensions of the proprietor. Their chief reasons rested upon the fact that the charter protected their religious views and had afforded them opportunity to direct, in times of peace at least, the political affairs of the province.[61] The rapidity with which Quakers associated themselves with the new movement in 1764 reflected the seriousness with which they viewed the rise of a powerful Scots-Irish faction, which, though but a minority group, might become the leaders of a majority, if they could win over the Germans and others. From this time on, the Quakers generally opposed granting more representation to the west. James Pemberton summed up the fears of the Quakers in a letter to Samuel Fothergill in June, 1764, when he wrote that "The fearful apprehensions of their [Presbyterians] getting the Legislature as well as the Executive part of the government into their hands . . ." had aroused

60 Bigelow, *op. cit.*, IV, 49, 53.

61 Thayer, *op. cit.*, 135; John Fothergill to Israel Pemberton, Sept. 11, 1759, Etting Collection, Pemberton Papers, II, 41.

the Quakers as never before.[62] In April he informed John Hunt of London that it was believed a conversion to a royal province was the best means "of restor[g] peace to the Province & curbing the Insolence of Presbyterian Cabals. . . ."[63]

Gilbert Tennent, Francis Alison, and John Ewing, Presbyterians, described the assembly's plan to change the government as "no more than an artful scheme to divide or divert the attention of the injured frontier inhabitants from prosecuting their petitions, which very much alarm them."[64] In answering this charge the Quaker party insisted that the demand for greater representation for western counties was prompted by a desire to cover up the blame for the Conestoga massacre and Paxton riot. The westerners, said the Quakers, pretended that they were driven by despair to acts of violence, and thus tried to throw the blame on the assembly.[65] The crux of the matter was that each party at the time controlled one department of the government and each feared that its rival would gain control of both the executive and legislative branches of the government.

While deadlocked with the governor over the supply bill, the assembly unanimously adopted a set of resolves in March, 1764, stating the case of the province against the proprietors, whereupon it adjourned for seven weeks in order to consult constituents regarding the question of a change in government.[66] Meeting again in May, the assembly adopted a petition penned by Benjamin Franklin praying the crown to assume the government of Pennsylvania.[67] The petition had thirty-five hundred signers from all groups and most sections of the province.[68] On the committee of eight which considered the petition in the house, the frontier was represented by John Tool of Northampton, John Ross of Berks, John Montgomery

62 James Pemberton to Samuel Fothergill, June 13, 1764, Pemberton Papers, XXXIV, 30.

63 James Pemberton to John Hunt, April 11, 1764, Pemberton Papers, Box 3.

64 Sparks, *op. cit.*, VII, 282.

65 James Pemberton to John Fothergill, March 7, 1764, Pemberton Papers, XXXIV, 128.

66 *Votes*, VII, 5591–5595; Charles J. Stillé, *The Life and Times of John Dickinson* (Philadelphia, 1891), 57–58.

67 Isaac Norris, the speaker, opposed the petition and resigned from the assembly, whereupon Benjamin Franklin was chosen speaker.

68 Stillé, *op. cit.*, 59.

of Cumberland and John Douglas of Lancaster County.[69] In all only four members of the assembly voted against the petition.[70] One of these, John Dickinson, had been associated with the Quaker party but felt that the measure was constitutionally inexpedient.[71]

If one can judge by the vote of the assembly, the Quaker party was backed solidly by the majority of the people. Admittedly the Proprietary party controlled Cumberland and York Counties, but in May, 1764, there was little indication that it could count on more, regardless of the statement of an Anglican clergyman of Lancaster, the Rev. Thomas Barton, that nine-tenths of the frontier supported the Scots-Irish.[72] A letter from Easton, Northampton County, reveals that the "Petition for an alteration in the Government meets with considerable Success, particularly on the frontiers, who are made to believe they will then be better protected."[73] As for Berks County, the Germans not only remained steady for the Quaker party but denounced the Paxton rioters in the loudest terms.[74]

Strangely enough not a few powerful and influential Quakers now saw fit to join with the Proprietary leaders in launching a "new ticket" by which they hoped to unite all opposition to the proposal for a change in government. These Quakers were for the most part of the strict Friends, led by Israel Pemberton, who had tenaciously held to a rigid interpretation of their pacific and other religious principles.[75] They shared the fear expressed by the Presbyterians that the Church of England might endeavor to place restrictions on

69 *Votes*, VII, 5607: Bigelow, *op. cit.*, VI, 97. Some of the members of the committee, it is true, may have opposed the petition.

70 Stillé, *op. cit.*, 62.

71 *Ibid.*, 61. Dickinson was first elected to the assembly from Philadelphia County, May, 1762. *Votes*, VI, 5343.

72 Bigelow, *op. cit.*, IV, 95–96; Dunaway, *op. cit.*, 126.

73 *Pennsylvania Archives, First Series*, 1664–1790, Samuel Hazard ed. (12 vols., Philadelphia, 1852–56), IV, 175.

74 *Votes*, VII, 5599; Graeff, *op. cit.*, 204. Berks County, however, along with the others, asked for a reapportionment of representatives.

75 Thayer, *op. cit.*, 202–203; Israel Pemberton to David Barclay, Nov. 6, 1764, Pemberton Papers, XVII, 103; John Churchman to James Pemberton, June 1764, Pemberton Papers, XVII, 68; David Barclay to Israel Pemberton, July 5, 1764, Cox, Parrish, Wharton Papers, XI (The Historical Society of Pennsylvania). The Quaker Meeting for Sufferings, Philadelphia, decided not to take a stand on the issue inasmuch as Friends were so divided in opinion. Minutes of the Meeting for Sufferings, Sept. 13, 1764 (Friends' Book Store, Philadelphia).

religious liberty if Pennsylvania became a royal province.[76] Inasmuch as the vote in October, 1764, in Philadelphia (city and county) proved to be very close, the stand taken by these Quakers may have been the deciding factor in throwing five seats to the Proprietary party.[77] Their influence with the Moravians of Northampton County, where a Proprietary man was returned, was likewise strong.

Notwithstanding the fact that the Proprietary ticket had found new champions in the persons of John Dickinson and Israel Pemberton, William Allen and his "gentlemen" politicians, many of whom were administrative or judicial officers with a definite interest at stake, were still considered the principals of the party.[78] As formerly, the proprietaries were ably supported by the Reverend William Smith and other Anglican leaders, who counted upon the votes of about one half of the churchmen in the city.[79] The College of Philadelphia had fifteen Presbyterian teachers and lent its weight to proprietary politics.[80] Presbyterian ministers, seldom reluctant to voice their political opinions, sent circular letters throughout the province exhorting church members to vote the "new ticket."[81] Recovering from division wrought by the Great Awakening, the Presbyterians were no longer handicapped politically by religious dissension within their church, a factor of no little importance in pre-Revolutionary history.[82]

The Proprietary party was confident not only of defeating Franklin, but of bringing "about a general change through the whole

[76] Quaker leaders in England generally favored keeping the proprietary charter. Dr. John Fothergill warned Israel Pemberton in 1759 that loss of the charter might prove harmful to the interests of Pennsylvania and the Society of Friends. John Fothergill to Israel Pemberton, Sept. 11, 1759, Etting Collection, Pemberton Papers, II, 41; David Barclay to Israel Pemberton, July 5, 1764, Cox, Parrish, Wharton Papers, XI.

[77] *Votes*, VII, 5669.

[78] James Pemberton to John Fothergill, Oct. 11, 1764, Pemberton Papers, XXXIV, 104.

[79] William Allen to Thomas Penn, Penn MSS: Official Correspondence, IX, 270.

[80] Klett, *op. cit.*, 230; Joseph Jackson, "A Philadelphia Schoolmaster of the Eighteenth Century," PENNSYLVANIA MAGAZINE OF HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY, XXXV (1911), 322. The Presbyterians, it was said, were endeavoring to get exclusive control of the college.

[81] Bigelow, *op. cit.*, IV, 96: Klett, *op. cit.*, 133.

[82] Klett, *op. cit.*, 133; Lewis R. Harley, *The Life of Charles Thomson* (Philadelphia, 1900), 61–62.

province. . . ."[83] But, as alarming as were its gains to the Quaker party, results fell far below expectation, especially in Lancaster County where the Proprietary men had entertained high hopes.[84] There the exasperated Presbyterians, failing to elect the sheriff, assaulted the successful German candidate and drove him from his home.[85]

The political tension in Pennsylvania during the fall of 1764 was probably higher than ever before in the province. Both sides resorted to propaganda in which no particular pains were taken to abide by the facts and in which personal abuse and slander were virulent. William Allen paid a schoolmaster named Dove £25 for a print with verses derogatory to the character and reputation of Benjamin Franklin. John Hughes, a prominent member of the Quaker party, offered to give £10 to the Pennsylvania Hospital for proof of the charges made.[86]

Nevertheless, the writings of Benjamin Franklin, Joseph Galloway, and John Dickinson upon the question of a change in government were of high caliber, provoking a deep consideration of the constitutional issues involved.[87] Franklin, especially, refrained from personal abuse and made, with an abundance of humor, wit, and sarcasm, the strongest case for his views.[88] By drawing from the history of other colonies—both proprietary and royal—he made his argument as pragmatic and objective as possible.[89] Galloway, however, charged Dickinson—whose pen had become the chief rhetorical instrument of the proprietaries—with looking to political rewards. The latter replied that he had scrupulously avoided remunerative

83 Thomas W. Balch, ed., *Letters and Papers Relating Chiefly to the Provincial History of Pennsylvania* [Shippen Family] (Philadelphia, 1855), 205. "Our friends in Chester county are very sanguine in hopes of carrying the election, and we scarce admit doubt of it here [Philadelphia]. We are this day taking measures for Bucks county. . . ." Samuel Purviance to Col. James Burd, Sept. 10, 1764. *Ibid.*

84 William Allen to Thomas Penn, Penn MSS: Official Correspondence, IX, 270; Balch, *op. cit.*, 206–207.

85 Sparks, *op. cit.*, VII, 280; Balch, *op. cit.*, 204.

86 Jackson, *op. cit.*, 322, 329, 331; "Letters of William Franklin to William Strahan," PENNSYLVANIA MAGAZINE OF HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY, XXXV (1911), 441–443.

87 Stillé, *op. cit.*, 38–39; Paul L. Ford, ed., *The Writings of John Dickinson*, (Philadelphia, 1895), I, 34–35, 44–45, 61–63, 90, 96.

88 Franklin considered his preface to Galloway's speech among the best of all his writings.

89 Bigelow, *op. cit.*, IV, 53–96.

public offices and had not "juggled in dirty cabals, about the offices of *chief justice* and *attorney general*. . . ."[90] But Dickinson, unfortunately, also marred his brief by resorting to charges against Franklin, especially regarding the latter's handling of provincial funds in his care while in England, a matter which even William Allen had agreed was properly performed.[91]

The Proprietary party elected eleven men out of the thirty-six to the assembly at the 1764 elections. In Philadelphia County three of the eight members were Proprietary partisans; the city of Philadelphia filled its two seats with Proprietary men. Two of the defeated men were no less persons than the very leaders of the Quaker party, Franklin and Galloway.[92] In the west the Proprietary party carried the counties of Cumberland, York, and Northampton,[93] and elected one of the four members from Lancaster County.[94] This result, disappointing as it was to the Proprietary party, represented great gains over previous years. Furthermore it represented a greater degree of political division in the province along racial and sectional lines than ever before.[95]

With the convening of the new assembly in October, 1764, the majority resolved to present the petition to the crown and to send Franklin, now out of the assembly, to London to assist Richard Jackson in the presentation thereof.[96] The Proprietary party doggedly fought his appointment: "First, Because we believe him to be the Chief Author of the Measure pursued by the late Assembly. . . . Secondly, Because we believe his fixed enmity to the Proprietors, will preclude all Accommodation of our disputes with them. . . ."[97] Furthermore the petition was said to be untimely and dangerous to

90 Ford, *op. cit.*, I, 108.

91 *Ibid.*, I, 153.

92 Franklin stood for election in the city of Philadelphia, and Galloway in the county. Bigelow, *op. cit.*, IV, 122–123.

93 Northampton County is north of Bucks County in the east but because it was a frontier county it is generally included within the term western counties.

94 *Votes*, VII, 5669–5670.

95 *Ibid.*, VII, 5682–5683. The Proprietary supporters in the assembly were Dickinson, Strettell, Keppele, Willing, Bryan, Sanders, Allen, Montgomery, McConaughy, Blackburn and Taylor.

96 *Votes*, VII, 5682 ff.; John Penn to Thomas Penn, Oct. 19, 1764, Penn MSS: Official Correspondence, I, 274. The petition was never officially presented to the crown.

97 Ford, *op. cit.*, I, 151–152.

the interests of the province and in disregard of overtures of the proprietors for settlement. The assembly lacked funds for sending Franklin off, but within two hours merchants had subscribed a loan of £1,100. In November, amid waving flags, roaring cannons, and the plaudits of a throng of friends, he left again for England.[98]

Although failing to attain their political goal in 1764, the Proprietary leaders did not lose heart. Samuel Purviance wrote Colonel James Burd that they must unite Germans, Baptists, and Presbyterians against the Quakers.[99] Again the Proprietary partisans were to see the course of events come to their aid. In 1763–64 the Proprietary party derived political benefit from the criticism of the Quaker party's policies toward defense and taxation. In 1765 Parliament by its Stamp Tax inadvertently created a condition in Pennsylvania which placed the Quaker party in an embarrassing position and offered the Proprietary party a chance to make further gains. In England Franklin did his best to prevent the passage of the bill but, failing in this, decided that the colonies must submit to it until a favorable occasion occurred to have it repealed.[100]

Franklin obtained for John Hughes, a staunch member of the Quaker party, the position of stamp collector for Pennsylvania, and advised the recipient of his favor that he should scrupulously carry out the terms of the act regardless of provincial opposition.[101] Here was all that the Proprietary party needed for political fuel when the storm over the tax broke in America. During the summer, to the immense satisfaction of the Proprietary men, John Hughes even had the temerity to oppose the sending of delegates to the Stamp Act Congress in New York. Writing to Colonel James Burd, Samuel Purviance said:

> Our interest is greatly increased amongst several societies who last year were divided in their views, and particularly strengthened by the opposition lately made

98 Bigelow, *op. cit.*, IV, 17–18; Ford, I, 163; Peter Reeve to William Rodman, Nov. 10, 1764, Rodman Papers (Private Collection belonging to Norris S. Barrett, Jr.).

99 Lincoln, *op. cit.*, 38.

100 Benjamin Franklin to Charles Thomson, July 11, 1765, *New-York Historical Society Collections*, XI (1878), 5; John C. Miller, *Origins of the American Revolution* (Boston, 1943), 122, 126. James Pemberton, on hearing that Parliament was contemplating a stamp tax in July, 1764, wrote that he thought it should not prove as burdensome to the colonists as it would be valueless to the English exchequer. James Pemberton to Samuel Fothergill, July 11, 1764, Pemberton Papers, XXXIV, 130.

101 Thayer, *op. cit.*, 204.

by John Hughes and his friends,[102] against sending commissioners to attend the Congress at New York in order to remonstrate home against the Stamp Act. This unpopular action has greatly damped the Faction [Quaker party] . . . and even brought over some of their members in the House to our party, by which means they carried the vote.[103]

In June, Galloway wrote Franklin, "I cannot describe to you the indefatigable industry, that has been, and is constantly taken, by the Proprietary party . . . to prevail on the people to give every kind of opposition to the execution of this law; to incense their minds against the King, Lords, and Commons. . . ."[104]

Proprietary leaders, however, were to be disappointed again by election returns. Notwithstanding the unpopular attitude taken by many prominent members of the Quaker party toward the Stamp Act, the Proprietary party lost much of its following of the previous year. It remained not much more than a Scots-Irish faction. Every representative returned from Philadelphia and Bucks Counties was sympathetic with Franklin, while Chester County remained his staunch supporter, and Lancaster turned out "That [Proprietary] sycophant J. Sander and placed a better man in his room."[105] John Dickinson, the new-found defender of the proprietary charter, was defeated in Philadelphia County.[106] In the city of Philadelphia the Proprietary party also lost ground, James Pemberton tying George Bryan for office and carrying the district at the second election.[107] The Quaker party did not go so far, however, as to put Hughes up

102 Galloway, especially, opposed the Stamp Act Congress.

103 Balch, *op. cit.*, 208.

104 Sparks, *op. cit.*, VII, 298.

105 Hugh Roberts to Benjamin Franklin, Oct. 12, 1765, PENNSYLVANIA MAGAZINE OF HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY, XXXVIII (1914), 296. Proprietary leaders, interestingly enough, had mapped out strong tactics for Lancaster County. Samuel Purviance included the following instructions to Colonel Burd: "Don't attempt to change any of your members save Webb. If you can run Dr. Kuhn . . . and can keep Mr. Saunders, you will do great things." The news should be spread "that your party intend to come well armed to the election, and that you intend, if there's the least partiality . . . you will thrash the sheriff, every inspector, Quaker and Mennonist to a jelly . . . that not a Mennonist nor German should be admitted to give in a ticket without being sworn that he is an naturalized and worth £50 . . ." When an offender was found "deliver him up to the mob to chastise him . . . which will certainly keep great numbers of the Mennonist at home." Balch, *op. cit.*, 211.

106 "The desire to change the proprietary government was so strong and general that Dickinson, for a time at least, became so unpopular by advocating its retention that he lost his seat in the assembly. . . ." Stillé, *op. cit.*, 69. He was not returned again until 1770.

107 *Votes*, VII, 5788.

for re-election. That tenacious gentleman was enjoined in October by a committee of citizens to resign his new-found office of stamp collector. He reluctantly complied after blaming the Proprietary party with no little reason for inciting the people against the Act.[108] The election demonstrated the fundamental loyalty of the great majority of the people of Pennsylvania to the Quaker party. It was proof enough that the people at large supported the movement for a change in government, and that the widespread disaffection of the previous year was caused mainly by dissatisfaction accompanying the Indian war and the handling of the frontier issue.

During the struggle over the Stamp Act, the Quaker party put a definite quietus on popular demonstrations while the Proprietary group encouraged them on all occasions. Benjamin Franklin's wife wrote in September that there were eight hundred men ready to defend her or anyone else who might be molested.[109] James Pemberton declared that the Presbyterians would have turned to violence as in Massachusetts if they had not been held down by people of moderation.[110] Benjamin Rush, Proprietary man, confirmed Pemberton's views when he wrote: "Philadelphia is cursed with a sett of men who seem resolved to counteract all our efforts against ye Stamp Act . . . You know, I mean ye Quakers."[111] When word of the repeal of the Stamp Act arrived in the spring of 1766, the Quaker party, following instructions from Franklin, again exerted every effort to keep the city as quiet as possible. "We opposed," wrote Galloway to Franklin, "the intended fireworks, illuminations, and firing of cannons. . . ." But the Proprietary party was not to be restrained. "The chief justice [William Allen], mayor, and recorder with several others of the magistrates, were spoken to, but to no purpose, the city was illuminated by the proprietary party."[112]

Benjamin Franklin, although still in London, received as usual more abuse from the Proprietary men than did any other leader of the popular party. He was rightfully considered their most dangerous and capable political foe whether in the province or in England.

108 Harley, *op. cit.*, 65–66.

109 Bigelow, *op. cit.*, IV, 172.

110 James Pemberton to John Fothergill, Dec. 17, 1765, Pemberton Papers, XXXIV, 137.

111 Nathan G. Goodman, *Benjamin Rush, Physician and Citizen, 1746–1813*, (Philadelphia, 1934), 13.

112 Sparks, *op. cit.*, VII, 317.

Pennsylvania Presbyterians, especially, were his bitter enemies, believing him engaged in doing all in his power to "blacken and stigmatize" their society in England.[113] But Franklin soon found an opportunity to ward off the blows of his political enemies in Pennsylvania and recover his standing among the people at large. This he accomplished by his unequivocal defense of American rights and views upon taxation before the bar of Parliament early in 1766; by this action he provided his friends in Pennsylvania with a powerful weapon.[114] Galloway informed Franklin that George Ashbridge, member of the house from Chester, had "spared no pains to acquaint the country members of everything, which would tend to rivet their affections for thee . . ." whereupon "the storm, which was threatened by the [Proprietary] party vanished."[115]

In the election of 1766 the Proprietary party failed to awaken much enthusiasm or support outside its known bailiwicks. Israel Pemberton, it is true, despite the privy council's coolness toward the assembly's petition for a royal government for Pennsylvania, still entertained fears of its success and again supported the Proprietary party, much to the dissatisfaction of many of his friends.[116] His fears, it seems, were well founded, for notwithstanding the Stamp Act episode, the people at large still favored the conversion of Pennsylvania into a royal province, and only the presence of an unfavorable ministry caused Franklin to withhold the petition. The temper of the province is revealed in the defeat again of John Dickinson by Joseph Galloway, who presently was chosen speaker by the assembly.[117]

Like its rival, the Proprietary party, the Quaker party was led mainly by men of wealth and education from the eastern part of the province. But, unlike the Proprietary party, it had under Franklin's leadership, and with its anti-proprietary policies, succeeded in maintaining the support of the great mass of the voters of Pennsylvania

113 Balch, *op. cit.*, 209.

114 Bigelow, *op. cit.*, IV, 210–211.

115 Sparks, *op. cit.*, VII, 314; Culver H. Smith, "Why Pennsylvania Never Became a Royal Province," PENNSYLVANIA MAGAZINE OF HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY, LIII (1929), 156.

116 John Drinker and Stephen Collins to Israel Pemberton, Sept. 25, 1766, Pemberton Papers, XIX, 5.

117 Ernest H. Baldwin, "Joseph Galloway, Loyalist Politician," PENNSYLVANIA MAGAZINE OF HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY, XXVI (1902), 295.

during the period under study. The issues, however, which had given rise to the Quaker and Proprietary parties were soon to pass away. Within a few years events caused a general reshaping of provincial politics during which both parties disappeared as political entities, and men came to be identified as radicals, moderates, or loyalists in the Revolutionary struggle. In the realignment, leaders as well as followers of all the new political divisions were drawn from the Quaker and Proprietary parties alike.

Ithaca College THEODORE THAYER