IN THE fall of 1766 the Proprietary party in Philadelphia charged Benjamin Franklin with duplicity in the Stamp Act crisis. The attack was an outgrowth of the controversial provincial politics in 1764 and 1765. The Penn supporters bitterly resented Franklin's success in his campaign to have the Assembly petition the Crown for royal government. When Franklin's recommendation of John Hughes as the Pennsylvania stamp agent was accepted by the Ministry, and when Joseph Galloway wrote in favor of the Stamp Act, the Proprietary party reasoned that Franklin and the Quaker party leaders favored the act as a means of securing the overthrow of the Penn government and of bringing the province under the Crown. Neither the extracts from London letters explaining Franklin's activities in seeking repeal of the stamp duties, which were reprinted in the Philadelphia newspapers, nor the publication of his Examination in September convinced the Proprietary party that Franklin had opposed the act. Franklin's Philadelphia friends were unable to counter the charges until the timely publication of the Pennsylvania Chronicle provided them with a convenient organ in which to refute the charges by reprinting Franklin's London essays written against the Stamp Act.

Colonial historians have often used the Examination to vindicate Franklin's conduct in working for repeal of the "mother of mischief,"

1 The extracts may be read in the Pennsylvania Gazette for Mar. 27, Apr. 10, May 1, 8, and 15, and Oct. 2, and in the Pennsylvania Journal for May 1 and 8, 1766. The Examination, an account of Franklin's testimony before the House of Commons on Feb. 13, 1766, relative to American affairs and to the effects of the Stamp Act in the colonies, was written anonymously by the clerk of the House. See William Strahan's letter to David Hall in "Correspondence between William Strahan and David Hall," The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography (PMHB), X (1886), 221. The announcement of the publication of the Examination from the press of Hall and Sellers appeared in the Gazette for Sept. 18 and in the Journal for Sept. 25, 1766.
but they have neglected or overlooked the Proprietary charges against Franklin. More recently Professor Verner W. Crane has identified in English newspapers a number of Franklin letters written in opposition to the act; moreover, Crane has called attention to the reprinting of these letters in Pennsylvania and elsewhere in the colonies.

William Goddard's reprinting of some of these letters in the *Pennsylvania Chronicle* was a planned campaign to restore Franklin's reputation and prestige. The importance of the *Chronicle* to Franklin's political career, and the relationship between Goddard and Franklin are aspects of a significant change in Pennsylvania colonial history: the evolution of Franklin from the leadership of a divided conservative Quaker party to a position as spokesman for all Pennsylvanians in asserting American rights. Before discussing the role of the *Chronicle* in Pennsylvania politics, it is well to consider briefly the impact which the Stamp Act controversy had on the Quaker party.

The Stamp Act crisis in Philadelphia had revealed a serious division within the ranks of the Quaker party. The former solidarity of this dominant political group had been based on opposition to the Penns and to the Proprietary party over provincial issues, but now the new imperial problem of parliamentary taxation had split the party. The Quaker party had failed to lead the popular protest against the stamp duties; leaders like Hughes and Galloway had been silent or had actually spoken and written in favor of the act. Opposition which had come from both parties, primarily from outside the Assembly, was led by men long associated with the Proprietary

---


4 Prior to 1756, members of the Society of Friends comprised a majority in the Assembly, but in that year the election resulted in a victory for Franklin's supporters and for his program—an adequate defense establishment and the taxation of the Penns' property. Thereafter Quaker members constituted only a minority, but the new political hegemony, despite its evolution, was still referred to as the Quaker party.

5 Although Franklin and Galloway had lost their Assembly seats in the October election in 1764, the Quaker party had elected twenty-six of the thirty-six representatives. In this election the dominant issue had been the petition for royal government. Yet in September, 1765, when this Quaker Assembly had voted to send the Speaker and three members to the Stamp Act Congress, they had carried the motion by only a single vote, 15 to 14. *Pennsylvania Archives, Eighth Series*, VII, 5765-5767, hereafter cited as *Votes.*
party. Franklin, who had been in England as the Assembly agent since December, 1764, was accused by his political enemies in the fall of 1766 of supporting—and even of suggesting—the Stamp Act. The ostensible basis for the accusation was political. His former leadership of the party, his political alliance with Hughes and Galloway, and his own conduct early in 1765 regarding the act offered plausible evidence.

After Franklin’s departure, Galloway had taken over the leadership of the Quaker party. When he became alarmed at the provincial opposition to the tax, he wrote over the pseudonym “Americanus” an essay in defense of the stamp duties, which was published in the Pennsylvania Journal on August 29, 1765. He was compelled, he explained, “at a time when almost every American pen is employed in placing the transactions of the parliament of our mother country in the most odious light . . . to point out the imprudence and folly of such conduct.” Several months later he complained to Franklin that it was difficult to secure the publication of any material which was intended “to allay the violent temper of the Americans, which had been so worked up as to be ready even for rebellion itself.” The colonial printers, he asserted, had combined to print only inflammatory articles and to refuse those that were “rational and cool.”

Since the Philadelphia newspapers were supporting the opposition to the stamp duties, Galloway sought a printer who would establish a press to reflect his and the Assembly’s political views. William Bradford’s weekly, The Pennsylvania Journal, had been a proprietary organ since its establishment in 1742, and David Hall’s paper, The Pennsylvania Gazette, was supporting the Proprietary party’s opposition to the Stamp Act. After the dissolution of the Franklin-Hall partnership in February, 1766, Hall, who had broken with Galloway and the Assembly, joined Bradford in protesting parliamentary taxation.

William Goddard, a printer of Providence, Rhode Island, came to Philadelphia in June, 1766, with the view to establishing a press. He had seen an advertisement in the Gazette of the termination of the Franklin-Hall partnership, and through a friend had secured a letter

---

6 Jan. 13, 1766, in Jared Sparks, ed., The Works of Benjamin Franklin (Boston, 1856), VII, 304.
7 An excellent biographical sketch of William Goddard is included in Lawrence C. Wroth, A History of Printing in Colonial Maryland, 1686-1776 (Baltimore, Md., 1922), 119-146.
of reference from Governor William Franklin to Galloway. Goddard and Galloway quickly reached an agreement to establish a weekly newspaper. By December 1, Goddard had his press and materials in Philadelphia. A secret partnership was formed to include Galloway and Thomas Wharton, who were to pay half the expenses and to share in half the profits; Goddard was to assume the other half of the enterprise. The articles of the partnership also provided that should Franklin on his return to Philadelphia desire to join the business, he might acquire a two-ninths interest in the enterprise, with Galloway and Wharton each controlling two ninths, and Goddard possessing the remaining three ninths.

The Pennsylvania Chronicle and Weekly Advertiser made its first appearance on Monday, January 26, 1767. Goddard soon found himself, as he later expressed it, "in the disagreeable situation of standing, as it were, a victim between two fires." His paper was open to all parties, and he attempted to remain neutral in the controversy between Galloway and those who were writing against parliamentary taxation. Soon each side was writing recriminations against the other, and Goddard's conduct satisfied neither. When he attempted to defend his policies in the Coffee House on April 4, he was forcibly thrown out. His rival publisher, Bradford, aided his ejection by pulling him by his hair.

The annual October election for members of the Assembly in 1766 was the occasion for a renewed attack against Franklin's conduct as agent. In the month prior to the election, he was accused of promoting the Stamp Act. Despite the fact that Hall had secured a copy of Franklin's Examination, and had announced its publication and sale in pamphlet form in his Gazette of September 18, Bradford published on the same day in a special supplement to his Journal, "An ESSAY, Towards discovering the Authors and Promoters of The memorable STAMP ACT." In this essay, the anonymous author declared that public opinion in London credited Franklin with having

8 William Goddard, Partnership: or the History of the Rise and Progress of the Pennsylvania Chronicle, &c. (Philadelphia, 1770), 5-12.
had a “principal hand in promoting the Stamp Act.... He proposed this scheme to General Braddock.” The author endeavored also to prove that “Dr. F[ranklin] not only thought of, but approved, and commended the Stamp Act, as a measure that should be taken with the Americans, several years ago.” In another paragraph of the essay, Franklin was accused of failing to use his talents to oppose the act: “Several pens were employed to plead the cause of America, by every argument that might affect our sense of humanity, justice, or interest. But why does not the Pennsylvania Agent write? He has leisure and a masterly pen; The question was never answered.”

Bradford continued the attacks against his political foes, although in the Journal of September 25, his attack was against Galloway rather than Franklin. This time he selected extracts from Franklin’s Examination and from Galloway’s “Americanus” essay, publishing them in an article headed “CONTRADICTIONS.” Galloway was quoted as writing that the “PROTECTION OF AMERICA has in no small degree, contributed to this burthen of the mother country,” while Franklin’s statement that British troops were sent only to protect British property and trade had led him to declare that “THE TROOPS WERE NOT THEREFORE SENT FOR THEIR DEFENCE.” In a similar manner, other quotations were selected to show the differences in belief of the two men. The obvious intent was to strengthen the Proprietary party at the expense of Franklin, Galloway, and the Quaker party, to show the divergent views between the two political leaders, and to capitalize in every way possible on any advantage that might be useful in the provincial election to be held the first of October. But Bradford’s campaign was not successful; Franklin was re-elected agent, and Galloway was re-elected to the Assembly and subsequently chosen Speaker by the victorious Quaker party.

10 The anonymous writer did not explain the circumstances under which Franklin allegedly proposed the stamp duties. Franklin had written Richard Jackson, the Assembly agent, June 25, 1764, that he did not believe the Americans would ever apply to Parliament for a stamp tax. “Tho’ if a gross Sum were generally requir’d of all the Colonies, and they were left to settle the Mode of raising it at some general Congress, I think it not unlikely that instead of settling Quotas, they would fall on some such general Tax, as a Stamp Act, or an Excise on Rum, &c. or both.” Carl Van Doren, ed., Letters and Papers of Benjamin Franklin and Richard Jackson, 1753–1785 (Philadelphia, 1947), 168, hereafter Franklin-Jackson Correspondence.

Whether Galloway had intended to use the *Chronicle* as the agency for republishing Franklin's London letters and for rehabilitating his reputation is difficult to determine; however, "A LOVER OF JUSTICE" (Galloway?) set forth Franklin's vindication in the third issue of the *Chronicle* on February 9. The following week Goddard reprinted three of Franklin's Stamp Act letters to the English press. He continued to publish the letters, inserting two on February 23 and two on March 9, and concluded the series with two on March 23. Goddard introduced each group with a brief reference to the agent and placed the letters in a position of honor, beginning each insertion in the left-hand column of page one. He printed the date, source, and Franklin's pseudonym for each letter except the last, which was identified only by the initials "F. B."

These letters had been published in London between December 19, 1765, and January 15, 1766, either in the *Public Advertiser* or in the *Gazetteer*, except the last letter which was reprinted on March 23 without date or source. Goddard identified it as a Franklin letter, and in an introductory sentence explained that "our Correspondent thinks these are sufficient to invalidate the Charges of the anonymous Author of the Essay in Mr. Bradford's *Journal*, No. 1241 . . . [and] we shall conclude with one wrote and published by the Doctor, while the Act of Indemnification was under Consideration in Parliament."

The letters were all *ad hoc* in character, written to defend Americans against British ignorance or misrepresentation. In these essays, Franklin voiced American opinions and ideas more frequently than he asserted his own. He was the reporter of American thought on contemporary issues. His thinking and writing were pragmatic, his goal was to secure a favorable hearing for the American case in the British press. He undertook to dispel the persistent British assumption that the French and Indian War had been fought in defense of the colonies and to make conquests for them. The war had been started in America to protect the British trade being carried on with British manufactured goods among the Indians, Franklin declared, not for the "immediate protection" of Americans, as a newspaper adversary had maintained.\(^\text{12}\) Americans had supported the war, and

\(^{12}\) In these essays Franklin repeated many of the arguments he had used in his Canada pamphlet published in 1760. The text of the pamphlet is included in Albert H. Smyth, ed., *The Writings of Benjamin Franklin* (New York, 1906), IV, 32–82.
Franklin reminded his readers that except for Georgia and Nova Scotia, the colonies had been settled at no expense to Parliament, and from the beginning had had their separate assemblies. “How far, and in what particulars, they are subordinate and subject to the British parliament; or whether they may not, if the King pleases, be governed as domains of the crown, without that parliament, are points newly agitated, never yet, but probably soon will be, thoroughly considered and settled.” Franklin asserted that the colonies had always contributed their share toward “common burthens,” and that in the future, “the ancient established method” of requisition would be sufficient to meet the need for funds. In answer to another letter, Franklin suggested that if taxes be levied upon the colonists, then the colonies should be joined with Britain in a union and enjoy all the consequent privileges and advantages.13

After completing the reprinting of these letters, Goddard continued to reprint Franklin’s articles, either as originally printed or as extracts, and also to print extracts of Franklin’s letters to his Philadelphia friends. In May, Goddard directed his attention toward reporting Franklin’s activities in working for an expansion of paper money. One of the agent’s most important projects in 1766 and 1767 was his attempt to secure a repeal of the restraints imposed by the Currency Act of 1764. The demand for expansion of paper money was shared by Proprietary and Quaker party supporters alike. As early as January, 1766, the Assembly had drawn up a memorial to the House of Commons requesting a repeal of the prohibitory currency legislation and had sent it to Franklin for presentation.14 Franklin’s efforts in 1766 to secure repeal had been unsuccessful, but when the London Merchants Trading to North America early in March, 1767, expressed an opinion that the authorization of paper money for America should be of advantage to both countries, they had asked Franklin to furnish them with his sentiments upon the

---

13 The letters, except three printed in Smyth, IV, 393–398, are included in Crane, Franklin’s Letters to the Press, 38–59, with succinct introductions.
14 Votes, VII, 5818–5820, 5824–5827.
Board of Trade’s adverse report of 1764. This Franklin had done on March 11 in a paper titled “Remarks and Facts.”

Goddard reprinted the text of the Board’s report in the Chronicle on May 25, and announced that “Dr. B. F’s Remarks on the foregoing Report will be inserted in our next.” In the same issue, Goddard also printed an extract of a letter from a London merchant, dated March 14, which probably was a paraphrase of a lost letter from Franklin to Galloway. In this letter Franklin explained the merchants’ interest in an expansion of colonial currency and told of his own activities in the matter. He was not optimistic because he realized that only by a determined effort on the part of the merchants could such a proposal be accepted in Parliament. “There is, however, such a general Clamour at present, and so much Ill-humour, against America,” he wrote, “that I doubt very much our Success in getting the Restraint taken off, if the Merchants here do not make it their own Cause.”

When he reprinted Franklin’s “Remarks and Facts” on June 1, Goddard devoted the entire first page to the essay. All parties in Philadelphia approved of Franklin’s “Remarks.” Samuel Smith, whom Deborah Franklin in 1765 had accused of asserting that her husband had planned the Stamp Act, said that all the provinces in North America should unite to pay Franklin sufficiently well to keep him in England as long as he lived. In London several merchants told Franklin that his argument was a full answer.

Townshend’s announcement in January, 1767, that he knew of a way to derive revenue from the colonies and yet not offend them, coupled with the resistance of Massachusetts and New York to the Mutiny Act, made Franklin wary of success for the paper money scheme. “The Clamour has been, by Grenville’s Party, with much Art and Industry, rais’d against America in general,” he wrote Galloway. Franklin’s friends thought it prudent to delay pushing the repeal until the last possible moment in the current session of Parliament. Meanwhile, he had written several papers “to abate a

15 Benjamin Franklin to Joseph Galloway, Apr. 14, 1767, Franklin-Galloway Correspondence, The Clements Library (CL).
16 Deborah to Benjamin Franklin, Sept. 22, 1765, and William to Benjamin Franklin, June 10, 1767, William Duane, ed., Letters to Benjamin Franklin from his Family and Friends, 1751-1790 (New York, 1859), 16-18, 32-34.
little if possible the Animosity stir’d up against us, and flatter myself they may be attended with some Success."\(^{17}\)

Franklin’s reference was to several essays, two of which were printed in the *London Chronicle* on April 9, and a third on April 11, 1767. In one essay Franklin used materials from a projected Stamp Act pamphlet he had never published. His purpose had been to refute accusations against the colonies made by officers of the British government residing there. The companion piece was an attack upon “our coffee-house orators,” who, Franklin asserted, were clamoring for war—“Fleets and troops should be sent”—because New York had refused to comply completely with the Mutiny Act and because the merchants there had petitioned for a removal of commercial grievances.

Franklin also informed Galloway that he had written his articles to answer the “groundless Charges, and state aright all the mistaken Facts that I heard argued in the Debates at the House of Lords.”\(^{18}\) The propriety of parliamentary taxation had been advocated by writers unfamiliar with American conditions, he wrote in the letter published on April 11. He listed eight reasons given by the scribblers for parliamentary taxation; then he answered each in phraseology and content similar to the ideas and expressions he had used in his earlier writings. In his answer to the last reason, Franklin again raised the issue of internal and external taxation. The distinction was considered “groundless and frivolous” in Britain, he declared, but Americans reasoned differently.\(^{19}\) All three of these letters were reprinted by Goddard in the *Chronicle* on June 8.

In the same issue Goddard included extracts from two of Franklin’s letters dated April 11 concerning his part in the currency affair. After his “Remarks and Facts” had been approved by the merchants’

\(^{17}\) Apr. 14, 1767, Franklin-Galloway Correspondence, CL.

\(^{18}\) Ibid.

\(^{19}\) James Otis in *The Rights of the British Colonies Asserted and Proved*, written in 1764, had maintained that there is “no foundation for the distinction some make in England [Richard Jackson?], between an internal and an external tax on the colonies.” Jackson, friend of Franklin, agent for the Massachusetts House, and soon to be selected the Pennsylvania Assembly agent, had used the term “internal taxes” in a letter to Franklin, Dec. 27, 1763. Van Doren, ed., *Franklin-Jackson Correspondence*, 124. For a discussion of American views on internal and external taxation, see Edmund S. and Helen Morgan, *The Stamp Act Crisis* (Chapel Hill, N. C., 1953), 114-115, and Lawrence H. Gipson, *The Coming of the Revolution, 1763-1775* (New York, 1954), 173.
committee, the members drew up a new memorial to be presented to the Ministry early in April. Franklin reported in one of these letters that his own paper was to be presented separately. Yet success seemed unlikely. "The Strength of the Opposition, the daily Expectations of new Changes in the Ministry, and the present Resentment against America," he wrote, "keep Minds so agitated, that there can be but very little Progress made in American Affairs." In the second letter he referred to the temper in the House of Lords, where he had recently listened to the debates on American affairs. He forecast more parliamentary taxation, and announced that he had heard a report that a "Project is on Foot, to render all the Governors and Magistrates in America independent of the annual Support they receive of their several Assemblies."

Despite disappointment, Franklin continued to work for repeal. He still hoped that the Ministry might be "prevail'd on to espouse the Measure," but he now feared that the Ministry might be changed and "our Hopes & all our Labour will again be frustrated." In May he secured a copy of the merchants' memorial and sent it to Galloway. The memorial, together with an extract from a Franklin letter, dated May 22, were printed in the *Chronicle*, July 27. In the extract, either a paraphrase of a letter to Galloway of May 20, or more probably an extract from a lost Franklin letter which went by the same ship, he asserted that the Board of Trade was "extremely averse" to repealing the act; yet he hoped that "we shall get over all, the Ministry being at length prevailed on to espouse the Measure, that the Colonies may have something to give on a Requisition from the Crown." The merchants believed that the most prudent way to restore commerce with the colonies would be to repeal the Currency Act. They declared that "such Repeal cannot hurt the British Merchants, provided a Clause be inserted in the Act for the said Repeal, declaring Paper Bills of Credit shall not be a legal Tender in Payment of any Sterling Debts or Contracts whatsoever, already made or to be made by or with or in the Name and Behalf of any Person residing in the Kingdom of Great-Britain."

In the summer and fall of 1767, Franklin's interest in the repeal agitation waned. His letters, although they contained references to continued activities, were more concerned with other matters which were assuming paramount importance. Several letters written to

---

20 Apr. 14, 1767, Franklin-Galloway Correspondence, CL.
Pennsylvania friends, including one to Galloway on August 8, show his concern over the generally unfavorable political situation. Three extracts from these letters, dated a day or two before the date of his letter to Galloway, were printed in the *Chronicle* on October 12. The extracts may have been from the Galloway letter and revised by Goddard, or they may have been taken from other Franklin letters which came by the same packet. The tenor of the extracts was that an increasing opposition to colonial interests was not promising for the future of American affairs. The supporters of the Duke of Bedford and of Grenville were particularly zealous to maintain the sovereignty of Parliament over the colonies.

Not only did the *Pennsylvania Chronicle* serve as the channel through which Franklin's writings were made available to Pennsylvania readers, but his letters and essays provided provincial writers with valuable ideas and materials. An essay which Franklin had written in the fall of 1767 was printed in the *London Chronicle*, January 7, 1768, and reprinted in the *Pennsylvania Chronicle*, April 25, 1768. He had endeavored, he said, “to palliate matters” for the Boston merchants by explaining to British readers the reasons for their nonimportation agreement of October 28. Franklin complained that the editor of the *London Chronicle*, Griffith Jones, had “drawn the teeth and pared the nails of my paper, so that it can neither scratch nor bite. It seems only to paw and mumble.” The changes, however, were apparently not numerous.21 As it was a letter to the press, it had no title, but Franklin used as a motto: “The Waves never rise but when the Winds blow.”22 Later editors have called it “Causes of the American Discontents Before 1768.”

In the essay Franklin reasserted the American belief that the colonies could not be taxed but by their consent. The Mutiny Act, requiring the assemblies to furnish quarters, bedding, candles, beer or rum, and sundry other articles, was considered a tax. The object of the Townshend program, to raise a fund to support a civil list, Franklin did not dispute; instead he showed that American opinion opposed it. Because of the general trade restrictions, Americans had been forced to economize in order to pay their British debts. More

---

21 To William Franklin, Jan. 9, 1768, Smyth, V, 89–90. Franklin identified himself as the author in a letter to Thomas Wharton, Feb. 20, 1768, Sparks, VII, 387.

22 Franklin had used almost the same wording in a concluding sentence to a paragraph in the Canada pamphlet (1760) when he asserted that “the Waves do not rise but when the Winds blow.”
significantly, he wrote, a new loyalty had been demanded, "a loyalty to Parliament; a loyalty that is to extend, it is said, to a surrender of all our properties, whenever a House of Commons (in which there is not a single member of our choosing) shall think fit to grant them away without our consent."

The same day that Goddard reprinted this essay, John Dickinson addressed a meeting of merchants at the London Coffee House. A comparison of Franklin's essay with Dickinson's speech indicates that Dickinson borrowed extensively both from its arguments and its phrases. At a meeting held at the State House on July 30, an address was given which again used Franklin's phraseology and ideas. One sentence is almost identical with a part of Franklin's "Causes of the American Discontents Before 1768." It read: "But a new kind of loyalty is required of us; a loyalty to a British Parliament; a loyalty that is to extend to a surrender of all our property, when a British house of commons, in which there is not a single member of our own choosing, shall think fit to give and grant it without our consent." The speaker referred to the "Farmer," but he did not identify Franklin or his essay. Two weeks later "A MILLER" asked why the speaker had referred to the "Farmer's Letters" but not to Franklin's essay or his other writings. He reminded his readers that Franklin's essay had been considered "as much to the purpose, and as well calculated to serve the colonies" as anything that had been published at the time.

Goddard's reprinting of Franklin's Stamp Act letters, extracts from his letters to Philadelphia friends, and his currency paper did

---

23 Dickinson's speech was not printed in the Philadelphia newspapers, but it was printed in the Gentlemen's Magazine (September, 1768), 418-421.

24 I have been unable to determine who wrote or who made the speech. Possibly Charles Thomson was the author and Dickinson the speaker. The event is not discussed in P. L. Ford, ed., The Writings of John Dickinson, 1764-1774 (Philadelphia, 1895), in C. J. Stillé, The Life and Times of John Dickinson, 1732-1818 (Philadelphia, 1891), or in L. R. Hawley, Life of Charles Thomson (Philadelphia, 1900).


26 Ibid., Aug. 15, 1768. Meanwhile, Franklin had secured on June 1 the publication of Dickinson's "Farmer's Letters." These letters, originally printed in the Pennsylvania Chronicle beginning Dec. 2, 1767, and completed on Feb. 15, 1768, were the most effective statement of the American case. Although Franklin did not agree with Dickinson's legalistic doctrine, he saw the value of having this contemporary statement of American opinion made available to British readers. See Franklin's letter to his son William, dated Mar. 13, 1768, Smyth, V, 114-116.
much to restore the agent’s reputation in Pennsylvania and to silence his critics. The question might be raised as to precisely what Franklin’s relationship to the *Pennsylvania Chronicle* was. Undoubtedly Franklin was appreciative of the service which Goddard’s paper had rendered him in 1767, but neither Franklin’s published correspondence nor his available manuscripts reveal any specific connection with the newspaper.

An examination of the correspondence of David Hall, Franklin’s former partner in the *Gazette*, confirms the belief that Franklin had no business interest in the *Chronicle*. The day following the publication of Goddard’s first issue, Hall wrote Franklin that Goddard’s office was in one of Franklin’s houses, that the newspaper was printed on Franklin’s new press, and that William Franklin was “the first Mover of his coming this way.” He had heard also that Franklin was a “Partner in the House.” Although Hall knew that Galloway and Wharton were backing Goddard, and that they were allied with Franklin in provincial politics, he refused to believe that Franklin was directly connected with them in the *Chronicle*. “And my real belief is,” he assured Franklin, “that you would not countenance any other Printer to my Disadvantage; but would be of any Service to me in your Power; and your Friendship, you may depend upon it, I shall always value, and endeavour to deserve.”

Franklin’s answer to this letter is not available, but Hall’s correspondence with William Strahan, friend to both Hall and Franklin and printer of the *London Chronicle*, reveals Franklin’s personal comments to Strahan about it. Four days after writing to Franklin, Hall wrote Strahan and presumably told him of the circumstances under which Goddard was printing his newspaper. When Strahan replied to this letter, he informed Hall that Franklin had “shewed me your Letter to him,” and also that Franklin had told him that “he was quite ignorant of the whole Affair till the Paper was set on foot; that he has no Concern in it.” He reassured Hall that Franklin had never spoken of him in an uncomplimentary manner, “nor did I ever hear him, in an Instance whatever, find the least fault with any part of your Conduct.”

28 Apr. 11, 1767, “Correspondence Between William Strahan and David Hall, 1763–1777,” *PMHB*, X (1886), 229–232.
Moreover, there is no evidence that Franklin ever took advantage of the opportunity to become a partner in the *Chronicle*. When Galloway and Wharton sold their interest in the paper to Benjamin Towne on May 19, 1769, Wharton recorded in his daybook that “Joseph Galloway & myself (TW) having totally closed our affairs with Wm Goddard & burnt the Articles, We sold our half to Benjamin Towne who takes the same off our hands from the beginning.” After Goddard had broken with Galloway, he publicly revealed in the summer of 1770 the details of the original partnership and on several occasions later attempted to defeat Galloway’s election to the Assembly. In 1772, Franklin wrote to his son William, “I cast my eye over Goddard’s Piece against our friend Mr. Galloway, and then lit my Fire with it. I think such feeble, malicious Attacks cannot hurt him.”

The *Pennsylvania Chronicle* served as the means of reprinting Franklin’s letters and essays at a critical period in his political life. By the time the crisis over the Townshend revenue program developed, Franklin’s writings in the Stamp Act crisis had removed all doubt of his alleged duplicity. By this time also, he was aligning himself in political matters with Charles Thomson, the leader of the radical merchants and mechanics, rather than with Galloway. The controversy between the colonies and Britain henceforth overshadowed the Assembly-Penn struggle; and both the Quaker and Proprietary parties ceased to have significant meaning in terms of provincial politics. Just as the crisis had bridged the gap between the two political parties, so too had former political rivals like Franklin and Dickinson found a common ground in opposing parliamentary taxation.

29 Thomas Wharton Daybook E, 262, Leonard T. Beale Collection, The Historical Society of Pennsylvania. The daybook, 240–242, contains an itemized account of Wharton’s expenditures in behalf of the *Chronicle* from December, 1766, until July 9, 1767. See also pages 267 and 322.

30 Jan. 30, 1772, Smyth, V, 380. There is in the Franklin Papers in The Historical Society of Pennsylvania a bond signed by William and Mary Catherine Goddard for £120, dated Dec. 15, 1769, and payable to Benjamin Franklin. Possibly the loan was for printing materials, for rent of a building, or for some other financial transaction. Franklin remembered the loan and included the bond among the assets which he granted to Richard Bache, his son-in-law, by the terms of his will drawn July 17, 1788. Carl Van Doren, ed., *Benjamin Franklin’s Autobiographical Writings* (New York, 1945), 689.