

**FISH AND FLOUR FOR GOLD, 1600-1800:  
SOUTHERN EUROPE IN THE COLONIAL BALANCE OF PAYMENTS**

**BY**

**JAMES G. LYDON**  
**Professor of History**

An e-Publication of the  
Program in Early American Economy and Society  
Library Company of Philadelphia  
2008

Copyright 2008. All Rights Reserved.

*The Library Company of Philadelphia*

1314 Locust Street, Philadelphia, PA 19107

ISBN 978-0-914076-47-6

# FISH AND FLOUR FOR GOLD, 1600-1800

## Table of Contents

List of Tables	iii
List of Abbreviations & Short Titles	v
Table of Weights & Measures	vi
Foreword, by Cathy Matson	vii
Introduction	ix
I. Permissive Mercantilism	1
II. Iberian Mercantilists	17
III. English Merchants in Iberia	35
IV. The Barbary States	47
V. Fish for Gold	65
VI. Salem and Bilbao: Symbiosis	89
VII. The Newfoundland Fishery	99
VIII. The Iberian Grain Trade	113
IX. Lisbon and North America	137
X. Carolina Rice Exports	157
XI. The Wine Trade	177
XII. Salt Imports	199
XIII. A Source of Treasure, 1730-1772	213
XIV. "Under Colours of a New Devise"	221
XV. Epilogue	237
Footnotes	253
Appendices	285
Bibliography	289



## Tables

- 2-1. Lisbon Bullion Imports by Packet, 1740-1769
- 3-1. North American Imports, 1768-1772
- 3-2. Anglo-American Importers, 1772-1773
- 5-1. Codfish Consumption in Spain, 1770s
- 5-2. Codfish Exports to Southern Europe, 1701-1774
- 5-3. Massachusetts' Southern European Clearances, 1711-1774
- 5-4. Southern European Destinations, 1752-1773
- 5-5. Registrations of Massachusetts Clearances, 1752-1765
- 5-6. Massachusetts Fish Exports, 1752-1774
- 5-7. Massachusetts Salt Imports (S.E.), 1752-1773
- 5-8. Massachusetts Wine Imports, 1752-1773
- 6-1. Salem Clearances to Southern Europe, 1714-1774
- 6-2. Salem Clearances to Southern Europe, 1768-1772
- 7-1. Newfoundland Fishery Statistics, 1700-1775
- 7-2. Bilbayan Fish Merchants, 1763-1775
- 7-3. Bilbao's Fish Entrances, 1763-1775
- 7-4. Fish Vessels Clearing Bilbao, 1763-1775
- 7-5. Barcelona Fish Imports, 1769-1774
- 7-6. Southern European Fish Sales at Cost, 1768-1772
- 8-1. English Grain Exports, 1701-1800
- 8-2. English Wheat Exports to Portugal, 1700-1770
- 8-3. English and American Wheat Prices, 1720-1774
- 8-4. English/American Wheat Prices Compared, 1720-1774
- 8-5. New York and Pennsylvania Trade to Southern Europe, 1720-1774
- 8-6. New York and Pennsylvania Trade Statistics (S.E.), 1710-1774
- 8-7. American Wheat/Corn Exporters (S.E.), 1768-1772
- 9-1. North American/Lisbon Trade, 1769-1775
- 9-2. Lisbon/Philadelphia Shipping, 1772-1773
- 9-3. Lisbon/Philadelphia Trade by Decade, 1720-1774
- 9-4. Major Pennsylvania Traders to Southern Europe and Lisbon, 1769-1774
- 9-5. Willing & Morris Trade (S.E.), 1766-1775
- 9-6. Lisbon Consignees of American Goods, 1757-1776
- 10-1. Rice Exports to Iberia, 1731-1774
- 10-2. South Carolina Rice Exports to Iberia, 1731-1774
- 10-3. Rice Carriers Entering Lisbon, 1769-1775
- 10-4. South Carolina Rice Exports by Carriers, 1717-1766
- 10-5. London-Based Entries to South Carolina, 1717-1766
- 10-6. Charleston's Southern European Trade, 1717-1772
- 10-7. Lisbon Firms Handling Rice, 1757-1775
- 10-8. Charleston's Southern European Trade in Sterling, 1768-1772
- 10-9. Costs to Ship Rice to Southern Europe, over Time, 1732-1775
- 11-1. Wine Island Entrances, 1710-1774
- 11-2. New York Entrances from Madeira, 1763-1764
- 11-3. Wine Entrances by Ports, 1710-1774
- 11-4. Lisbon Clearances, 1771-1774
- 11-5. North American Wine Consumption, 1768-1772
- 11-6. Wine Imports at Selected Ports, 1768-1772
- 11-7. Estimated Wine Imports, Selected Ports, 1710-1774

- 12-1. Portuguese Salt Sales to English, 1772-1773
- 12-2. Fisheries' Salt Consumption, 1760-1774
- 12-3. Southern European Salt Entering New York, 1715-1772
- 12-4. Boston/Salem Salt Imports, 1753-1756, 1762-1763
- 12-5. North American Salt Imports, 1755-1771
- 12-6. North American Salt Imports, by Area, 1769-1771
- 12-7. Coastal Salt Imports and Exports, 1768-1772
- 13-1. Southern European Clearances, by Periods, 1730-1772
- 13-2. North American Trade to Southern Europe, 1768-1772
- 13-3. Commodity Tonnages to Southern Europe, 1768-1772
- 13-4. Estimated Division of Earnings, 1768-1772
- 15-1. Lisbon/United States Trade, 1783-1788
- 15-2. Lisbon/United States Trade, by Registry, 1783-1788
- 15-3. Bilbao and Lisbon Fish Entrances, 1770-1774, 1783-1794
- 15-4. Bilbao/North American Entrances, 1783-1794

### **Appendices**

- A. Prices of Philadelphia's Exports to Southern Europe, 1720-1774
- B. Prices of Philadelphia's Imports from Southern Europe, 1720-1774

## ABBREVIATIONS & SHORT TITLES

ADM	Admiralty Papers, National Archives, U.K.
AHN-M	Archivo Historico Nacional, Madrid: Seccion de Estado
AHR	<i>American Historical Review</i>
AJ-L	<i>Adams-Jefferson Letters</i> . Ed. Lester J. Cappon. Chapel Hill, N.C. 1959.
AWM	<i>American Weekly Mercury</i>
BL	Baker Library, Harvard Business School
BNL	<i>Boston Newsletter</i>
CPR	<i>Com Privilegio Real</i> , Junta de Comercio records in Arquivo da Torre de Tombo, Lisbon.
CSPC	<i>Calendar of State Papers, Colonial Series</i> . Ed. John William Fortescue et al. 45 vols. London, 1880-1964.
CO	Colonial Office Papers, National Archives, U.K.
EG	<i>Essex Gazette</i> (Salem)
EHR	<i>Economic History Review</i>
HAHR	<i>Hispanic American Historical Review</i>
Hist. Mss.	English Manuscripts in the Office of the Secretary of State, Albany, New York
HSP	Historical Society of Pennsylvania
JEH	<i>Journal of Economic History</i>
MHS	Massachusetts Historical Society
MSR	Abstracts of Massachusetts Naval Office Records
NEQ	<i>New England Quarterly</i>
NEWJ	<i>New England Weekly Journal</i>
NORNY	Naval Office Records of New York, CO 5
NYHSQ	<i>New-York Historical Society Quarterly</i>
PC	Customs data from Pennsylvania magazines, <i>AWM</i> and <i>PG</i>
PEM	Peabody Essex Museum, Salem, Mass.
PG	<i>Pennsylvania Gazette</i>
PMHB	<i>Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography</i>
PSR	Pennsylvania Ship Registries
SPFP	State Papers Foreign, Portugal, National Archives, U.K.
SPFS	State Papers Foreign, Spain, National Archives, U.K.
TDB	Records of Tonnage Duties on Incoming Vessels, 1765-1775, 3 vols., HSP, Cadwallader Collection; Thomas Cadwallader Section.
WMQ	<i>William and Mary Quarterly</i> , 3rd series

“Averia Accounts” Manuals des Ambos Averias, Archivo del Consulado de Bilbao (Archivo Municipal de Bilbao)

*Boston Records* Boston Records XXXII (Aspinwall Notarial Records, 1644-1651). Boston, 1903.

“Livros” Livros das entradas da Marco das Navios, Arquivo Historico Municipal at the Camara Municipal (Lisbon)

## TABLE OF WEIGHTS & MEASURES

Beans:	1 ton = 22.5 blls.; 1 bll. = 100 lbs.
Beef or Pork:	1 ton = 14 blls.; 1 bll. = 160 lbs.
Beeswax:	1 ton = 6.68 blls.; 1 bll. = 335.3 lbs.
Boards:	1 ton = 1,000 board feet
Bread:	1 ton = 16 blls.; 1 bll. = 140 lbs.
Candles:	100 candles = 25 lbs.
Corn:	1 ton = 40 bushels; 1 bushel = 56 lbs.; 1 cask = 4 bushels
Fish:	1 ton = 22.5 hundredweights (cwt. or Qtl. or K) 1 cwt. = 100 lbs.; 2 cwts. = 1 bll. 1 hogshead = 7 cwts.; 1 tierce (cask) = 1.33 blls.
Flour:	1 ton = 11.48 blls.; 1 bll. = 196 lbs. 4.5 bu. of wheat converts to 1 bll. of flour (196 lbs.)
Hides:	1 hide = 15 lbs.
Oil:	1 cwt. = 4 arrobas; 1 arroba = 25 lbs.
Raisins:	1 ton = 11 blls.; 1 bll. = 203.6 lbs.
Rice:*	1 ton = 4.28 blls. = 6 tierces 1 bll. = 8 bu. = 525 lbs. ; 1 bu. = 65 lbs.
Salt (coarse):	1 ton = 22.5 bu. ; 1 bu. = 100 lbs. 1 hhd. = 8 bu. ; 1 moy = 1,500 lbs. ; 1 wey = 40 bu. 1 moyo = 23 bu. ; 1 last = 12 blls. = 2 tons
Shingles :	1 ton = 2,000 shingles
Staves:	1 ton = 1,000 staves; 1 bll. stave = 30 inches
Wheat:	1 ton = 4 quarters = 32.1 bu. =2,240 lbs. 1 quarter = 8 bu. =560 lbs.; 1 bu. = 70 lbs. 1 hhd. = 6.56 bu. 1 fanega (Port.) = 1.56 bu. = 109.5 lbs. 1 alquier (Sp.) = 0.4 bu. – 28 lbs.; 2.5 alquiers = 1 bu. 1 carga (Port.) = 4 fanegas
Wine:	1 ton (Tun) = 2 pipes = 4 hhds. =252 gals. 1 bll. = 32.5 gals.; 1hhd. = 2 blls. 1 cask = 1.33 blls. = 42 gals.; 1 quarter cask = 10.5 gals. 1 pipe = 1 butt = 126 gals.

\*Rice barrels changed over time, increasing in size. See Chapter IX. Weights and measures in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries were not nicely precise. Containers varied somewhat in size. These are the figures used in this study.



## FOREWORD

James Lydon's *Fish and Flour for Gold, 1600-1800* is the inaugural e-publication of the Program in Early American Economy and Society (PEAES) of the Library Company of Philadelphia. It adds an important new dimension to the program's ongoing activities. Now in its ninth year, PEAES promotes scholarly discussion of all aspects of the early American economy. It also brings together people who wish to advance our understanding of the economy under the umbrella of numerous disciplines, methodologies, and subjects. PEAES sponsors a printed monograph series with Johns Hopkins University Press, regular seminars, resident research fellowships, public outreach programs, and conferences on topics of wide interest and publication of their proceedings. The program is also engaged in the ambitious acquisition of print and manuscript sources about the early economy.

Scholars are accustomed to interpreting the development of early modern empires in light of a parade of seemingly endless wars and contests over boundaries. Historians and economists have written scores of narratives about the wars that Western European empires fought for dominion, labor, and the goods that made possible their rise to global power. But seventeenth- and eighteenth-century imperial dominion was also porous everywhere in the Atlantic world. In recent years, historical research has shifted considerably toward studying the additional dimensions of economic and cultural networking that reveal less clear-cut contention between one empire and another; due to this new scholarship, the balance of power and economic maturation can be seen now as a series of shifting networks of negotiated authority over the people and goods that shaped the two hundred years covered in Lydon's study.

This porousness can be traced in part by measuring the commodities that were exchanged over great distances by the 1600s in a commerce that transcended the simple transit of ships in bilateral trade and a predetermined set of relationships among buyers and sellers of goods. The commodities of the Atlantic world, including the fish, flour, and gold at the heart of Lydon's present work, could be found in the regulated trade set up by mercantile authorities as well as in parallel networks, where imperial guidelines were circumvented. Their flow rose and fell over the years, according to changing mercantile policies and their enforcement, supplies available, demand from consumers, and the ability of individual merchants to outfit vessels and coordinate markets for goods. The appearance of not only more commodities of international commerce, but a wider variety of them, in the shops and on the dinner tables of countless people throughout the Atlantic world was a constant reminder of the power of goods to shape the identity of empires as much as wars did.

It is common for economic historians to note that the American balance of trade with Great Britain grew ever more unfavorable during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries; a growing colonial population demanded more imports of finished goods, and the rising incomes of middling urban people and commercial farmers spurred purchases of ever more "necessities" and "comforts." This unbalanced relationship, and the problem of how those debts were paid, has been a perennial subject of historical inquiry.

Many scholars argue that the North American trade to the West Indies was vital for rebalancing trade with the mother country, as North American goods fetched handsome prices in British and foreign West Indies ports most of the time, and payments were in cash and bills of exchange useful for paying debts in Great Britain. Various interest groups within the British empire tolerated illicit trade with foreign powers because the benefits were so great and spread so widely across the growing colonial population. In our familiar narrative, this permissive approach to running the empire was periodically challenged by mercantilists in the home country, but faced a more definitive challenge only after 1763, just when colonists were reaching confident levels of growth.

James Lydon demonstrates the porousness of boundaries through the lens of commodities

exchanged between North American colonial people and southern Europe,-that is, Iberia and its island possessions in the eastern Atlantic. This trade was dominated by the export first of salted codfish, then wheat, rice, and flour from New England, the mid-Atlantic, and South Carolina, and the return cargoes of salt, wine, and, most importantly, gold and silver. Lydon's findings about the networks of trade between North America and southern Europe show that, to be successful, merchants needed special dispensations from the standard mercantile restraints on trade with these countries. His study adds significantly to this narrative about how this particular arena of trade complemented the West Indian trade in balancing Atlantic world indebtedness more favorably for American colonists, as the southern European trade became a vital source of gold and silver for payments to British merchants and manufacturers. Moreover, this trade flourished, as slaves produced rice at record levels in South Carolina by the 1720s, and as farmers produced wheat and millers grinded flour for export from the mid-Atlantic region in unprecedented quantities. Profits from sales in southern Europe were invested in salt and, to a lesser extent, wine, or forwarded as payments to British creditors. No wonder Americans cried out against mercantile policymakers who implemented strict controls on southern European commerce following the Seven Years' War. The porousness among empires that shippers, planters, and consumers habitually enjoyed for so long suddenly came under intense scrutiny, threatening long-held commercial relationships so vital to the North American economy. And no wonder Americans rushed back into this trade quickly after the Revolution, hoping to re-establish themselves as trading partners with southern Europe.

Lydon's research, conducted during the 1970s to 1990s in numerous American and European archives, reveals for the first time a wealth of information about particular commodities and shipping arrangements in a most important arena of international trade. In *Fish and Flour for Gold*, Lydon's has traced the values and quantities of goods moving in the networks he reconstructs, which in itself is of great value to all of us, especially given the notorious dearth of records for many aspects of commerce in this era. His many tables and charts show some eye-opening trends in Americans' increasing reliance on trade with foreign merchants in southern Europe. In all, Lydon shows us a dimension of seventeenth- and eighteenth-century commerce that should figure importantly in future generalizations about British imperial development and, more particularly, the colonial American economy. PEAES is pleased to make Lydon's study available in an electronic format that is fully searchable, as well as to bring this work to the widest number of readers possible at a time when it is of central relevance to the currently flourishing Atlantic studies scholarship.

Cathy Matson, Director  
Program in Early American Economy and Society  
Library Company of Philadelphia  
Spring 2008

## INTRODUCTION

Several decades ago, embarked upon a career in college teaching, I found myself at Lewis College in Lockport, Illinois, at some distance from research facilities. Recalling a comment by S.E. Morison that Emile Dupuy's study *Americains et Barbaresques* deserved translation, I set out to render it into English. That led to further interest in those pirates and in American relations with them.

The central issue became for me: Why did a weak, fledgling nation go to war with those piratic states? Obviously the answer was to protect its trade in the area south of Cape Finisterre. But, was that trade worth the effort and expense? In a chat with Philip White, I raised that question. He commented that his study of the Beekmans of New York indicated that that trade was quite considerable and deserved a closer look. I was off!

Trade between British North America and Iberian ports in dried salted codfish began before settlements were established on the American east coast. Over time various other products were found to be salable in the Wine Islands, Iberia, and "up the Straits." In addition to the *bacalao* in demand there, wheat, flour, rice, corn, and wood products went out in considerable volume, mainly to Spanish and Portuguese outlets. Credits earned by those exports grew over time and returns from southern Europe helped significantly to offset negative colonial balances with the mother country. English mercantilists, aware of this, arranged special exceptions in their regulations to encourage its growth. An understanding of the trade and its fluctuations required a close study of English mercantilism as it applied to this traffic. Also necessary was a reconstruction of the statistics of this trade, as far as possible and reasonable. The various facets of it, as carried on from Newfoundland, New England, the middle colonies, and the Carolinas had to be examined.

Salt and wine came back to North America. What was the balance of trade, exports and imports? How was the surplus, if any, transferred? Were these trade patterns dominated by English merchants and shippers or were they colonial based? Did that relationship change over the years?

Preliminary research during two summers through grants from the Harvard Business School History group, led by Ralph Hidy, fleshed out the topic considerably. It allowed research in Boston and Cambridge libraries and historical depositories. The initial findings led to a paper presented at an AHA Convention, which was published in the *Business History Review*. A Fulbright research grant for Spain permitted the pursuit of data in Bilbao, Seville, and Madrid and, en route, five weeks of pleasant and productive digging in Lisbon. An allocation from the Penrose Fund of the American Philosophical Society saw the extension of the research for six weeks in London depositories. Duquesne University seconded my work with a sabbatical leave and summer research grants.

This monograph, resulting from this support, I believe, fills an important gap in our knowledge of colonial economic growth. It helps to answer the question of how the colonies overcame their negative balance with the mother country. Limitations placed on the trade after 1763 contributed to the colonial unrest leading to the Revolution and, in the post-war period, the new nation's leaders struggled diplomatically to reopen the way to this trade.

The directors, librarians, and staffs of many institutions have provided courteous and encouraging support for these researches. Among them, of special note, are those at Widener, Baker, and Kress Libraries at Harvard; the Massachusetts Historical Society, and Peabody Essex Museum; the British National Archives; the Biblioteca Nacional in Madrid; the Archivo Municipal at Bilbao; and the Torre de Tombe and Arquivo Municipal in Lisbon. My thanks also to the staff of the Duquesne library. These dedicated professionals provide the materials from which studies such as this emerge.

Numerous graduate assistants at Duquesne spent, surely for them, many boring hours dredging up the weekly statistics of colonial trade from the colonial newspapers of Boston, Philadelphia, and Salem. Their

dedication and accuracy is here recognized.

My thanks to Cathy Matson, Director of the Library Company of Philadelphia's Program in Early American Economy and Society, for her encouragement and willingness to sponsor this publication. Also to Chris Van Horne, whose very able assistance in carefully reading the manuscript has saved me from many errors. Those remaining are solely mine.

My appreciation also to my long suffering wife and to my daughter. Concentration upon this work has diverted my attention from their concerns, for that I apologize.

## CHAPTER I

### PERMISSIVE MERCANTILISM

The treasures of gold and silver discovered in Mexico and Peru in the sixteenth century brought Spain unbelievable wealth and extraordinary military power for more than a century. France, England, and the Netherlands also sought such mines in the New World or tried to seize Spanish treasure by piratical raids on her empire. Then, the Commercial Revolution of the 1600s demonstrated that treasure could be won by other means. The title of Thomas Mun's mercantilist tract *England's Treasure by Forraign Trade* emphasized this new concept.<sup>1</sup>

Europe waxed wealthy. Demand for exotic overseas goods expanded and with that change came the growth of colonies to exploit those resources. Mercantilist economic thinkers married traditional bullionist attitudes to the monopolization of overseas goods. Seizing and colonizing production areas, they sought exclusive trading spheres.

In heavily populated Asia, mercantile "factories" or trading centers, protected by military forces, controlled the sources of these rich products. In America, the Spanish and Portuguese overawed and dominated small indigenous populations, forcing production of gold, silver, and other exports. Demand for European goods in America and Asia remained modest. The Iberians excluded foreigners from their colonies and prohibited specie exportation under penalty of death. However, by the early seventeenth century, they had failed to develop their internal economies to the extent needed for home consumption and for export to their overseas colonies. Those needs were supplied at first largely by the Dutch and later by all of the northern European countries.<sup>2</sup>

The rise of nation states in Europe during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries resulted from the effective use of power – economic as well as military. Recognizing the value of economic planning, Europe's rulers mobilized and directed their economies. This system, mercantilism, theoretically assured full development of a nation's potentialities. Mercantilists believed in a static economy.<sup>3</sup> Thus, one nation could advance only at the expense of others. Economic conflict led to military confrontations and to larger armies and navies.

Each country's material resources differed and their mercantilist programs differed as well. No state could achieve a perfect system; control all of its economic resources. Wealth, basic to a successful mercantilist program, meant gold and silver specie. Accretion of specie was the essential purpose of mercantilism. Wealth meant power. It allowed purchase of the necessities of war; the expensive new weapons being developed; the shipping and naval vessels needed to dominate the seas; the manpower to serve national interests in Europe and overseas. Gold and silver also funded the Asian trade, which required large outflows to purchase Chinese and Indian imports. Approximately seventy percent of the outward bound assets were in coin, mainly Spanish and Portuguese silver and gold.<sup>4</sup>

---

1 Thomas Mun, *England's Treasure by Forraign Trade* (London, 1933), 9-12. Written in 1625, this treatise was first published in 1661.

2 Earl J. Hamilton, *War and Prices in Spain, 1651-1800* (Cambridge, Mass., 1947).

3 Eli F. Hecksher, *Mercantilism*, ed. E.F. Soderbund (London, 1955). Lawrence A. Harper, *The English Navigation Laws: A Seventeenth Century Experiment in Social Engineering* (New York, 1939). Charles M. Andrews, *The Colonial Period of American History*, 4 vols. (New Haven, Conn., 1964), IV. George L. Beer, *The Old Colonial System, 1660-1754*, 2 vols. (Gloucester, Mass., 1959). John J. McCusker and Russell R. Menard. *The Economy of British America, 1607-1789* (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1985), Part I.

4 Jean O. McLachlan, *Trade and Peace with Old Spain, 1667-1750* (Cambridge, England, 1940), 4-5.

Increasingly sophisticated mercantilists adapted their systems to assure accretion and retention of wealth. Sumptuary laws discouraged luxury imports. Productivity at home answered internal demands. Population growth encouraged expansion, leading to full employment. Exports competed for foreign markets. Quality controls ensured their salability. Imports faced discrimination.

Spain and later Portugal failed to develop strong internal economies, exposing them to exploitation. Major Iberian ports, by early seventeenth century, had large, permanent factories of Dutch, English, French, Italian, and other merchants who controlled their import/export economies. Laws prohibited specie exports but large amounts of gold and silver were smuggled out. Thus, the American treasure passed into the hands of the northern merchants. They earned their “Treasure by Forraign Trade.” As one author commented, Spain was “the Darling and the Silver Mine of England.”<sup>5</sup>

\* \* \*

Overseas colonies producing goods saleable in Europe were desirable, especially when these goods were brought to the mother country and then reexported, guaranteeing middleman’s profits to metropolitan merchants. A mercantilist state maximized its income if production, transportation, and distribution of colonial goods remained in its own hands.

The first English colonies in the Caribbean, North America, and Newfoundland were intended to gain “treasure” – literally, by mining gold and silver, exploiting the fur trade, or controlling the fisheries. Early colonization attempts did not presume transferal of large populations to America. However, increasing immigration and cultivation of agricultural staples, such as tobacco, sugar, rice, and other cereals, saw large sedentary populations in English America producing those goods. By the early 1700s two kinds of colonies emerged there: first, those producing plantation products in great demand in England and in Europe; second, colonies from the Chesapeake Bay northward, which, except for furs and wood products, exported goods that competed with the farmers and fishermen of the mother country.

Burgeoning populations in England’s American colonies created an important market for the finished goods pouring from English manufacturers. This added a new dimension to mercantilist thinking, the need to maintain and expand consumption of those goods by these colonists.<sup>6</sup> What began merely as bullionism required complicated planning to accommodate often competing interests within the empire.

The Navigation Acts of the 1650s and 1660s laid down basic mercantilist principles. They closed the colonies to foreign trade; required that all colonial imports enter in English vessels; insisted that non-English goods pass through England; and that certain “enumerated” products from America could only be exported through England.<sup>7</sup> English mercantilism aimed at maximizing profits for the mother country, while fostering colonial growth. It required a permissive system which balanced the varied interests in the empire and at the same time encouraged an inflow of specie. To a considerable degree England depended upon a positive balance of trade with southern Europe to propel its economic expansion. Naturally, her American settlers pursued that trade as well.

---

J.H. Parry, *Trade and Dominion: The European Overseas Empires in the Eighteenth Century* (New York, 1971), 66-67.

5 McLachlan, *Trade and Peace*, 6, citing an anonymous author, 1701. Richard Herr, *The Eighteenth Century Revolution in Spain* (Princeton, N.J., 1958), 145.

6 Viola F. Barnes, *The Dominion of New England* (New York, 1960), 136-137.

7 Andrews, *Colonial Period*, IV, 43-48, 134-142.

How did mercantilist economic philosophy affect trade between North America and southern Europe? Northern colonials competed directly with British merchants and fishermen in southern Europe, exporting their fish, wheat, flour, bread, and rice there. Such direct exports should, in theory, have been forbidden; the goods first shipped to England and then reexported. However, markets in Iberia, the Wine Islands, and up the Straits also drew from other sources and American products had to reach them at competitive levels. Englishmen writing on economic principles in this era all but universally recognized colonial dependence on trade to southern Europe to make “returns” for goods purchased from the mother country.<sup>8</sup> Beginning in the mid-seventeenth century, the government in London made exceptions in favor of its American settlers.

English entrepreneurs in the West Country had exploited the Newfoundland fishery as early as the 1580s, if not before. Their vessels went to the fishing grounds and at first carried the sun-dried cod to England, later reexporting it to Spain and Portugal. After 1604 their ships proceeded direct from America to Iberia, then returned with salt and wine cargoes to English ports. First land grants in Newfoundland presumed a monopoly of the fishery there by the patent holders.<sup>9</sup> Shortly, London and Plymouth fishermen intruded in the fishing preserves of the West Country interests, initiating a long-term conflict between those favoring a home-based Newfoundland fishery and those who preferred American-based fishing. The collapse of Sir Fernando Gorges’s scheme to license vessels fishing in New England during the 1630s cleared the way for expansion of the New England branch of the fishery. Opponents of Gorges’s plan, Sir Edwin Sandys and others, insisted it would limit growth of the fishery and *prevent sales to Spain and thus reduce the importation of specie in England*.<sup>10</sup> Very early the connection between Iberian fish sales and accretion of “treasure” can be established.

Apparently through George Downing’s influence, a special exception allowed the New Englanders to export fish directly to Iberia. Downing, a nephew of Governor John Winthrop and a Harvard graduate, again

---

8 Gee to Board of Trade, *CSPS*, XXIX (1716-1717): 271. Cf. William Vaughan, *The Golden Fleece* (London, 1623) and Henry Robinson, *England’s Safety in Trade’s Encrease* (London, 1641) on the Newfoundland fishery as a source of specie. George L. Beer, *The Origins of the British Colonial System, 1578-1660* (Gloucester, Mass., 1959), 294. Fayrer Hall, *The Importance of the British Plantations in America to This Kingdom* (London, 1731), 95-98, 102-103. Thomas Pownall, *The Administration of the British Colonies*, 2 vols. (London, 1774), I: 256-257.

9 Clarence S. Brigham, ed., *British Royal Proclamations Relating to America, 1603-1783*, Transactions and Collections of the American Antiquarian Society, XII (Worcester, Mass., 1911), 87-88. Beer, *Colonial System*, II: 256. Harold A. Innis, *The Cod Fisheries: A History of an International Economy* (New Haven, Conn., 1940) 34-35, 73, 99. Ralph Greenlee Lounsbury, *The British Fishery at Newfoundland, 1634-1763* (New Haven, Conn., 1934), 38. Carew Reynell, *The True English Interest* (London, 1674), 91, noted that the northern colonies competed with English merchants, taking “the bread out of our mouths.” John Collins, *A Plea for the Bringing in of Irish Cattle and the Keeping Out of Fish Caught by Foreigners* (London, 1680). John White, *The Planter’s Plea* (London, 1630). John Collins, *Salt and Fishery* (London, 1682), 95. Collins believed the Newfoundland fishery increased the “Stock of the Nation at least five hundred thousand pounds per Annum.”

10 Brigham, *British Proclamations*, 87-88. Lounsbury, *British Fishery*, 38-39. Innis, *Cod Fisheries*, 73. Beer, *Origins*, 274. Gillian T. Cell, “The Newfoundland Company: A Study of Subscribers to a Colonizing Venture,” *WMQ* XXII (1965): 616-617, 624. Italics mine.

intervened in 1656 to ensure that colonial-owned vessels be treated as equals with those English-owned.<sup>11</sup>

By 1660 English authorities had demonstrated no tendency to interfere with this traffic. The following year, New England successfully petitioned Charles II to endorse their fish and timber exports to Iberia. The Navigation Act of 1663 allowed, an exception to mercantilist principles, direct importation of certain “specified” articles. Salt, a necessity for curing fish, could be carried from southern Europe to Newfoundland and New England. In addition, wine from the Azores and Madeira could enter directly. In each case the two fishery areas received equal treatment.<sup>12</sup> The salt import privilege was later extended to Pennsylvania (1726), New York (1729), and Quebec (1763). Petitioners for these extensions argued spuriously that they would foster fisheries in those colonies. In reality, they sought to encourage American grain exports to Iberia.<sup>13</sup>

Thus early in the history of the American fisheries English policy did not discriminate against New Englanders in favor of the home-based fishery. In fact, both branches received equal privileges and encouragement in their trade with southern Europe and in the importation of salt to cure their fish. New England shippers were allowed to carry their catches direct to European markets. Fish exported from both areas drew specie into the mother country, thus serving mercantilist goals. Competition between London and West Country interests apparently resulted in this equal treatment. Also, those in positions of influence under Cromwell may have sympathized with their fellow New England Puritans.<sup>14</sup> Through the whole colonial period, from the 1630s onward, New Englanders struggled mightily to pay for the finished goods they imported. Among the earliest ways to cover that adverse balance was by tapping the sources of Iberian treasure. West Country fishermen sought the same goal, specie. In any event the English mercantilists did not sacrifice colonial interests to those of the metropolis despite heavy initial pressure from home fishing interests to limit their colonial cousins. By 1660 New England had built “a flourishing industry too strong to contemplate sacrificing to the principles of mercantilism.”<sup>15</sup>

\* \* \*

Colonial exportation of cereals and flour to southern Europe began early in the seventeenth century, though mainly confined to the Portuguese Wine Islands. Since Madeira and Fayal wines did not find great favor in the British Isles, English grain exporters rarely shipped to those smaller markets.<sup>16</sup> Mixed

---

11 Andrews, *Colonial Period*, IV: 60, 87. Beer, *Colonial System*, II: 9. Lounsbury, *British Fishery*, 96. David Ogg, *England in the Reign of Charles II*, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1963), I: 246-247. Michael G. Hall, *Edward Randolph and the American Colonies, 1676-1703* (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1960), 23, 67. Samuel E. Morison, *The Maritime History of Massachusetts, 1783-1860* (Cambridge, Mass., 1921), 14. Bernard Bailyn, *The New England Merchants in the Seventeenth Century* (New York, 1964), 126-127, 219n42. Charles B. Judah, *The North American Fisheries and British Policy to 1713* (Urbana, Ill., 1933), 148-149.

12 Andrews, *Colonial Period*, IV: 109-111.

13 Ibid. George L. Beer, *The Commercial Policy of England toward the American Colonies* (New York, 1948), 37-38. Harper, *Navigation Laws*, 401. William R. Riddell, “Suggested Governmental Assistance to Farmers Two Centuries Ago in Pennsylvania,” *PMHB* LIII (1929): 137-140.

14 Lounsbury, *British Fishery*, 38. Innis, *Cod Fisheries*, 50-52. Bailyn, *New England Merchants*, 78-79. Richard S. Dunn, *Puritans and Yankees* (Princeton, N.J., 1962), 39-42.

15 Judah, *North American Fisheries*, 149.

16 V.M. Shillington, and A.B.W. Chapman, *The Commercial Relations of England and Portugal, 1487-1807* (London, 1907), 237ff. John Cary, *An Essay on Trade* (Bristol, England, 1695), 118-119. Bolton, William, *The Bolton Letters: The Letters of an English Merchant in Madeira, 1695-1714*, ed. André L. Simon, 2 vols. (London, 1928), I: 18, 24, 112.



cargoes from America answered the islanders' needs without arousing the competitive concerns of English agriculturalists. From the 1680s onward, the English concerned themselves with exporting "corn" to southern Europe. Subsidization of this exportation under the Corn Laws was a cornerstone of English mercantilist policy. Wheat sales in those markets maintained a positive inflow of gold and silver to England and to a limited extent to America.<sup>17</sup> Shipments of wheat, flour, and corn from the North American colonies to southern Europe began before 1700, expanded during the War of the Spanish Succession, 1702-1713, but did not reach significant levels until the late 1730s.

The tendency between 1726 and 1740 to foster colonial trade to southern Europe may well have reflected the attitude of the Board of Trade, as expressed in its letter of March 1717.

We observe that the people on the Northern Continent of America, not having sufficient returns of their own production for the goods sent them from Great Britain have been of late years under a necessity of applying themselves very much to the woolen, linen and other manufactures in order to cloathe themselves to the great disadvantage of the Trade of this Kingdom, and we do not see how the same can be prevented otherways than engaging them to turn their thoughts and industry another way to their own profit.<sup>18</sup>

Population in the middle colonies grew steadily after 1720, as did coincident production of cereal crops, which West Indies outlets could not absorb. Following the deep depression of 1721-1723, Pennsylvanians recognized the need to alleviate their economic crisis. Francis Rawle and others sought an alternative market in southern Europe. Funds were appropriated and instructions drafted for the colony's agent in London. Pressure was judiciously employed and in 1726 the salt privilege was extended to Pennsylvania. Iberian salt cargoes provided stabilizing ballast and a small profit on the return passage to the Delaware. Shortly, New York also applied for an exception.<sup>19</sup>

The extension of the salt import privilege and shortages in Iberia encouraged exports to there. By the mid-1730s approximately thirty-five vessels per year carried American grain to Lisbon, Cadiz, Madeira, and elsewhere, returning with salt, some wine, and a scattering of other goods. Between 1738 and 1741, almost two hundred ships from the middle colonies and upper south took perhaps as much as 500,000 bushels of wheat to Iberia.<sup>20</sup>

Increasing American competition in Iberian markets alarmed English grain producers, whose exports fell between 1738 and 1741 by about ninety percent.<sup>21</sup> A movement began in Parliament to halt this competition.

---

17 Donald G. Barnes, *A History of the English Corn Laws from 1660 to 1846* (New York, 1961), chapters 3-4.

18 Board of Trade to Methuen, March 28, 1717, *CSPC*, XXIX (1716-1717): 275.

19 Francis Rawle, *Ways and Means of the Inhabitants of Delaware to Become Rich* (Philadelphia, 1725). Frederick B. Tolles, *Meeting House and Counting House: The Quaker Merchants of Colonial Philadelphia, 1682-1763* (New York, 1963), 106-108.

20 NORNY. Customs Office Reports in *PG*, 1735-1740. Between 1738 and 1741, 197 vessels (12,958 tons) carrying largely grain went to southern Europe. Virginia records show six or seven ships clearing yearly, with up to about 20,000 bushels of grain. See James F. Shepherd and Gary M. Walton, *Shipping, Maritime Trade and the Economic Development of Colonial North America* (Cambridge, England, 1972), 168-169. Virginia petitioned the Crown to permit direct salt importations in 1739. Andrews, *Colonial Period*, IV: 109.

21 English grain exports fell from 3,495,000 bushels in 1738-1739 to 347,196 bushels in 1740-1741. See D. Barnes, *Corn Laws*, 15, Appendices B and C, 297-300.

Appealing to mercantilists, the corn interest demanded protection of its Iberian markets. By late fall of 1740 a bill in Parliament sought to halt exportation of corn and provisions from North America to Spain and Portugal. Other groups supported restrictions on shipments of fish and rice to that area as well. Colonial traders and their allies rallied against these threats. John Penn, proprietor of Pennsylvania, and Richard Partridge, the colony's London agent, with others, defended American interests. Some argued for allowing direct trade only to Portugal and Madeira. However, through the influence of Robert Walpole and William Young, those exceptions were deleted from the bill.<sup>22</sup> In May 1741 a Philadelphia merchant wrote Thomas Hyam in London, an opponent of the bill, that if Parliament prohibited the city's trade to Portugal it would destroy "the chief means by which we pay our debts in England, they would feel it too."<sup>23</sup> In the end, its opponents blocked passage of this restricting legislation.

The grain shortage in southern Europe ended in 1742 and the War of Jenkins' Ear reduced English exports there to low levels. Parliamentary enthusiasm for controlling America's wheat exports declined. During the 1750s trade from North America increased again but peaked in a range which did not alarm those in the mother country. Following the Seven Years War, English population growth combined with lower production made Britain a grain importing nation. By the late 1760s American cereals and flour replaced that of England in Spain and Portugal.

\* \* \*

Mercantilist regulations for rice differed. England produced no rice and thus encouraged American production. Free export of rice from South Carolina began in the last decades of the seventeenth century. Markets for it existed in the Netherlands and Iberia. In 1704 an influential English merchant had legislation introduced in Parliament to make rice an enumerated commodity, arguing that direct trade in rice "was a prejudice to the trade of England" and "a vast loss to the nation."<sup>24</sup> His bill required it to pass through England to the continent, paying English import duties, which were largely returnable upon reexport. However, the increased cost meant that American rice could no longer compete with Italian and Egyptian rice in Iberia. Between 1704 and 1730 American rice sales there all but ceased. Despite periodic protests the prohibition of direct trade in rice to there remained down to 1730. Agents for South Carolina argued that their rice could not bear the weight of the doubled freight and insurance charges resulting from carrying

---

22 Mabel P. Wolff, *The Colonial Agency of Pennsylvania, 1712-1757* (Philadelphia, 1933), 90-92. Leslie Stephen, *The History of English Thought in the Eighteenth Century*, 2 vols. (New York, 1962), I: 151, notes that Bolingbroke, champion of the landed interests, was opposed to Robert Walpole, who did not act to halt American grain competition. Richard Pares, *War and Trade in the West Indies, 1739-1763* (Oxford, 1936), 438n. Embargoes of American grain exports and other goods, passed as a war measure, served temporarily to prevent colonial competition.

23 Samuel Powell, Jr. to Thomas Hyam, May 2, 1741, "Letter Book, III (1739-1748)," III, HSP, as cited in Anne Bezanson, Robert D. Gray, and Miriam Hussey, *Prices in Colonial Pennsylvania* (Philadelphia, 1935), 29.

24 Joshua Gee, *The Trade and Navigation of Great Britain Considered* (London, 1722), 21-22, reported that Captain Michael Cole, disappointed of a rice cargo at Charleston, had a bill introduced to Parliament for the enumeration of rice. See Andrews, *Colonial Period*, IV: 95-97. Harper, *Navigation Laws*, 398. Albert A. Giesecke, *American Commercial Legislation before 1789* (New York, 1910), 6. Richard Champion, *Considerations on the Present Situation of Great Britain and the United States of North America* (London, 1784), 105-106.

it to England and then on to those markets, insisting that it raised its price by more than fifty percent.<sup>25</sup> A contemporary political economist insisted that it was “much more the interest of the English merchant to sell his rice in Portugal and have the money remitted thence.”<sup>26</sup> In 1731 the Board of Trade relented. As a special concession the enumeration was removed; Carolina rice could once more go directly to ports south of Cape Finisterre and compete with Turkish rice shipped from Egypt and Italy. Rice from Georgia received the same concession in 1735 and that from Florida in 1770.<sup>27</sup> Further relaxation of the rice enumeration, allowing shipments to foreign colonies in America and to Africa was denied through the influence of the customs service in the 1740s and again in 1758.<sup>28</sup> Not until the mid-1760s could American rice producers ship to the foreign West Indies.

Again the mercantilist program proved permissive. Exporters to southern Europe obtained special rice licenses and posted bonds, canceled upon proof of delivery in Iberian ports.<sup>29</sup>

\* \* \*

Toward the close of the 1730s, a general perception was abroad in English mercantile circles that their trade was either in stasis or in decline. A major French commercial expansion helped foster that view. French sugar sales had successfully encroached on English sugar markets in Europe generally and in Iberia particularly.<sup>30</sup>

The permissiveness of Walpole’s government during the 1720s and 1730s encouraged West Indian sugar interests to seek relaxation of restrictions requiring English sugar producers to market their goods through the mother country. Thus, in 1739 another mercantile loophole allowed export of British sugars directly to southern Europe, placing them on an even footing with French sugars there. Anticipated sales did not materialize. English sugar factors had managed to hedge direct exports with restrictions and French sugar continued to outsell that from England, except when wartime shortages created abnormal prices.<sup>31</sup>

\* \* \*

Why did Parliament provide special loopholes for those exporting to southern Europe in instance after instance? The New England fishery won equal footing with that of Newfoundland in direct exports to southern Europe and in importation of the curative salt needed. Wheat, flour, and corn exports from America to the Wine Islands, Iberia, and into the Mediterranean faced no strictures and the salt import privilege was extended to Pennsylvania, New York, and later Quebec. In the case of rice, when the enumeration proved destructive, special loopholes encouraged export. Sugar producers were also indulged.

---

25 *CSPC*, XXXVIII (1730): 56. Andrews, *Colonial Period*, IV: 95-97. Shillington and Chapman, *Commercial Relations*, 243-244. William J. Ashley, *Surveys Historic and Economic* (London, 1900), 316.

26 Gee, *Trade and Navigation*, 22.

27 Harper, *Navigation Laws*, 95-97. Andrews, *Colonial Period*, IV: 95-96.

28 McCusker and Menard, *Economy of British America*, 175-181.

29 Harper, *Navigation Laws*, 399n. Oliver M. Dickerson, *The Navigation Acts and the American Revolution* (Philadelphia, 1951), 40, notes that a third of the rice for southern Europe cleared through English ports. Cf. “A List of Licenses and Bonds taken out from the London Customs House,” September 29, 1730-February 29, 1731 (N.S.), Treasury Papers, 64/276a, National Archives, U.K.

30 Pares, *War and Trade*, 61-62.

31 Ralph Davis, *The Rise of the English Shipping Industry in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries* (London, 1962), 268n. Pares, *War and Trade*, 80-81, 506.

In each instance, arguments for a permissive approach favored competition for those markets and allowed the accretion of credits in Iberia for transferal to England to aid colonials in overcoming their adverse balance of payments.

Government mercantile policies endorsed the “Colonial Compact.” America’s settlers confined to buying finished goods from England required sources of specie to avoid choking limitations on their growth.

The main source of such “treasure” during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries lay in Iberia, a fact fully appreciated by the mercantile communities in England, America, and Iberia. Southern European trade offered a source of funds to satisfy America’s creditors. Regulations forbade exportation of English coinage to America but also encouraged importation of foreign coin and bullion.<sup>32</sup>

References to Spanish and Portuguese treasure are common in contemporary writings and mercantile correspondence, for example: “Our fishery if well followed would equal the mines of Potocsi.”<sup>33</sup> Or, “The wines and gold of Portugal have been wholly purchased by our manufactures, fish and other products.”<sup>34</sup> Or, referring to colonial trade to southern Europe: “In this manner do they make their returns, with all the bullion they can scrape together, to pay for their yearly supplies of manufactures and slaves.”<sup>35</sup> In May 1731 Philadelphia John Reynell addressed London creditors requesting a cargo of finished goods, and then, “9 mo. later send a vessel & [I] will load her with Wheat to Carry to Lisbon to Sell for Bills of Exch: I am apt to think it would Answer well enough, & you wou’d have your Returns very nigh as soon, as if they were made in Bills directly from hence.”<sup>36</sup> Correspondence to agents in southern Europe contain the almost constant refrain “and remit the proceeds” to whatever creditor in England the American authors might designate.

An expanding colonial economy required a widespread extension of credit to American merchants. Direct exports to England still left an adverse balance. Returns to cover that overage came from trade with the British and foreign West Indies; through the inflow of immigrant funds; by sales of vessels overseas; and, not least of all, by trade with southern Europe. Funds amassed there could be easily transferred to English creditors.<sup>37</sup>

Late twentieth-century historians held a much more positive view of colonial economic growth than earlier writers. American-based merchants, it appears, were nourished by the beneficial policies of the powerful nation state centered at London. While the Navigation Laws discriminated against foreign shipping, almost no distinction was made between that registered in the colonies overseas and that of

---

32 Andrews, *Colonial Period*, IV: 87n. McCusker and Menard, *Economy of British America*, 71-88. Davis, *Rise of English Shipping*, 230. Francis Brewster, *New Essays on Trade and Navigation* (London, 1702) in his preface commented “for the gain of Fishing is solid, brings in Bullion.” Margaret E. Martin, *Merchants and the Trade of the Connecticut River Valley, 1750-1820* (Northampton, Mass., 1939), 32, cites a letter from Richard Jackson, Connecticut agent at London to Jonathan Trumbull, October 19, 1767, as follows: “But could the colony acquire a share of the Cod Fishery the Sale of this Commodity in Italy, Spain and Portugal would be exactly the same as Money in England & would serve as effectually to pay for a Cargo of British Manufactures.”

33 CSPC, XXVIII (1717): 222-223, quoting Thomas Banister, *An Essay on the Trade of North America*.

34 Anonymous, *A Letter to the Honourable A[rthu]r M[oo]re, Com[issio]ner of Trade and Plantation* (London, 1714), 12.

35 John Rutherford, *The Importance of the Colonies to Great Britain* (London, 1761), 16.

36 John Reynell to P. and J. Williams, May 21, 1731, “Letter Book, 1729-1734,” HSP. Parenthesis mine.

37 Davis, *Rise of English Shipping*, 230, states of Cadiz: “Every ship that called there, whether outward or homeward bound, could expect to take aboard some silver bullion...”

England. Access to imperial markets and to those trading centers outside it remained available on an equal footing. Diplomatic and consular systems assisting and protecting English shippers and merchants served American colonials equally. Suppression of piracy throughout the empire affected all Englishmen. In addition, improvements in communications and increased exchange of information through newspapers and via packet boats and postal systems were utilized by those in the metropolis and by colonials. Lastly, the sound financial structure and solid currency supported by the government contributed to the success of both English and overseas merchants. These varied advantages encouraged a thriving colonial trade with southern Europe in the years before the American Revolution.<sup>38</sup>

\* \* \*

Equitable treatment of English and colonial merchants made the political and economic privileges won by English diplomats available to both. From the 1640s onward, the government negotiated a series of treaties with Portugal and Spain assuring Englishmen important concessions and considerations in those countries. Treaties with Portugal, signed in 1642, 1654, and 1656, established a special relationship between them and provided exceptionally liberal privileges for English merchants resident in Portugal. Duties on English goods were fixed at a maximum of 23% *ad valorem*, with any increase requiring endorsement by resident English merchants. The English ambassador at Lisbon wrote in 1752 that “our Merchants all allow that our Evaluations are so underrated that we do not pay above fourteen percent, on any of the material Articles.”<sup>39</sup>

The treaties also granted uncommon protections, making the merchants semi-independent of the Portuguese legal establishment. These agreements were endorsed in 1661 and an alliance arranged the marriage of the newly restored Charles II and Catherine de Braganza of Portugal.<sup>40</sup> Tensions between the allies at the turn of the eighteenth century saw Paul Methuen negotiate a new treaty in 1702-1703, significantly lowering English duties on Port wines and reendorsing the earlier terms.<sup>41</sup> English consuls had begun service in Portugal by about 1580 and by mid-seventeenth century had assumed the semi-official leadership of the English merchants there. Together the consul and the merchants – the factory – in each port zealously maintained their treaty rights and privileges. The period from 1654 onward has been called “the zenith of the English ascendancy over Portugal.”<sup>42</sup>

English merchants’ offices, warehouses, and homes were off limits to Portuguese officials and all account books, records, and ledgers were exempt from seizure by them, except by permission of the Judge Conservator of the factory. After clearing customs, English vessels could not be searched. Portuguese

---

38 “Resolutions of the Town of Marblehead, December 8, 1772,” as printed in *EG*, December 15, 1772. Edward Channing, *A History of the United States*, 6 vols. (New York, 1905-1925), III, 84. Dickerson, *Navigation Acts and Revolution*, 109, 112. Lawrence A. Harper, “The Effect of the Navigation Acts on the Thirteen Colonies,” in *The Era of the American Revolution*, ed. Richard B. Morris, 3-39 (Gloucester, Mass., 1971). Curtis P. Nettels, “British Mercantilism and the Economic Development of the Thirteen Colonies.” *JEH* XII (1952): 105-114. Beer, *Colonial System*, I, 108. McCusker and Menard, *Economy of British America*, 353-377. Marc Egnal and Joseph A. Ernst. “An Economic Interpretation of the American Revolution,” *WMQ* XXIX (1972): 3-32. Gary M. Walton and James F. Shepherd. *The Economic Rise of Early America* (Cambridge, England, 1979), chapter 8.

39 Tyrawley to Newcastle, June 25, 1752, SPFP 89/48.

40 Shillington and Chapman, *Commercial Relations*, 177ff, 192-195, 199-203, 208-211.

41 *Ibid.*, 223-225. The Portuguese called it *feitoria inglese*.

42 *Ibid.*, 177, 204.

officials were thus prevented from gathering evidence of the widespread smuggling of specie to England. Innovations in the marketing of English imports or in collection of the customs duties were also limited. Vessels had to be unloaded and duty paid within fifteen days. To encourage trade at Lisbon, the Portuguese granted vessels the right to remain in harbor and even to store goods ashore temporarily without paying duties – the so-called *franquia* privilege. Normally vessels using it only checked the Lisbon market and proceeded elsewhere. Each country negotiated with the Portuguese the terms of its *franquia* rights.<sup>43</sup>

A very important concession gave Englishmen extraterritoriality under the Portuguese justice system. A Judge Conservator, elected by the factory and the consul, heard legal cases involving English merchants and adjudicated disputes. The Conservator upheld the treaty rights and privileges. The system worked quite efficiently. Down to 1708 an English consul also served at Madeira, but there and at other ports the prestige and precedents of the factory at Lisbon were lacking. In the other ports English interests were usually served by vice-consuls. The consuls and vice-consuls collected a tax called “consulage” on all English shipping entering the port. This tax paid consular salaries. An added tax provided funds for charitable work among English nationals. At Lisbon it also supported an Anglican clergyman. The consulage tax varied over time and depended on the volume of English and colonial shipping entering a port. After 1703, at Lisbon, it seems to have been set at twelve milreis per vessel. The consul received nine milreis, and the vice-consul the remainder. Total income from the consulage tax in Portugal equaled £2,750, more than half of which paid the Lisbon consul. Vice-consuls at smaller ports were usually English merchants engaged in normal trade. After 1722 consulage fees rose to 200 reis per ton on all tonnage goods except for grain and lumber (100 reis per ton) and fifteen percent on all other goods. Merchants in Portugal complained that it encouraged use of non-English shipping to avoid the tax.<sup>44</sup>

\* \* \*

Spain too surrendered concessions to English mercantile interests. Under the Anglo-Spanish treaty of 1667, renewed in 1713, 1715, and 1750, they also established a most favored nation status. An eighteenth-century Spanish economist likened her position “como a Indias de la Europa.”<sup>45</sup> Spanish duties on English imports remained fixed at the levels during the reign of Spain’s Charles II, despite significant increases in the value of the goods taxed.

The consul-general at Madrid appointed and had oversight over representatives at Corunna (Galicia), Cadiz, Seville, Cartagena, Malaga, Alicante, Barcelona, Mahon, and Tenerife.<sup>46</sup> Spain conceded almost the same rights and privileges wrung from the Portuguese. As Jean O. McLachlan, *Trade and Peace with Old Spain, 1667-1750*, points out, the treaty of 1667: first, guaranteed advantageous terms for English merchants; second, laid down the terms of the trading process; and third, established the rights of English

---

43 Ibid., 246, 230.

44 Ibid., 234-238. Worsley to Stanhope, January 1, 1715; January 21, 1715; March 8, 1715; SPFP 89/23. A milreis fluctuated in value but generally ranged at 66 pence, making 12 milreis about £3.3 per vessel. Early in the eighteenth century the Lisbon consulship was worth about £1,200 per year and the vice-consulship about £400.

45 Jaime Vicens Vives, *Manual de historia economica de España* (Barcelona, 1965), 509, 516-517. McLachlan, *Trade and Peace*, 20-21, 51-52, 68-69, 139.

46 Munroe to Rochford, June 7, 1773, SPFS 94/193, commented on the lack of a consul at Bilbao/Santander. See also Conway to Lords of Trade, September 26, 1765, Original Correspondence of the Board of Trade, CO 388/53, which suggests that merchant Lorenzo Barrow held the post, 1749-1755. He probably served unofficially.

merchants in Spain. The multiplicity of Spanish customs duties was “a financier’s nightmare,” placing the merchant “at the mercy of the greed, dishonesty and caprice of individual tax collectors.”<sup>47</sup> Yet, again Anglo-Spanish treaties limited business proceedings and a “Juez Conservador” at Cadiz arbitrated disputes. After 1715 England enjoyed most favored nation status. The Conservator system in Spain worked less efficiently than in Portugal.<sup>48</sup>

Following the War of the Spanish Succession, Anglo-Spanish relations were constantly complicated by English attempts to guarantee the success of their South Sea Company. The whole period down to 1739 witnessed a series of vexations and acrimonious disputes, frequent threats of war, nearly open conflicts, and finally war once more, 1739-1748.

\* \* \*

Both Iberian nations smarted under their subservience to British trading interests. Portugal, threatened by her more powerful neighbor, depended heavily upon English protection. Spain, angered by English insistence upon customs duties frozen at seventeenth-century monetary levels, was further frustrated by the British occupation of Gibraltar and Port Mahon, as well as by England’s expanding role in the dynastic politics of the western Mediterranean. After 1750 Anglo-Spanish relations improved but the Family Alliance with Bourbon France caused brief hostilities in 1762-1763. In the years after 1750 both Iberian nations strove to reduce England’s commercial dominance through active mercantilist reforms.<sup>49</sup>

Through the whole era, 1650-1800, English policy in Iberia aimed at creating a favorable balance of trade to siphon off specie to England. In each case, treaty terms safeguarded the export of bullion and the “Juez Conservadores” enforced those agreements. In both countries organized bullion smuggling drained them of their gold and silver.<sup>50</sup>

\* \* \*

The English government actively encouraged commercial expansion in this period. Consuls in Iberia ensured adherence to the treaties by local authorities and, jointly with merchants in residence, jealously guarded them, issuing a steady stream of reports on military and naval affairs generally; on local business conditions; on English and foreign trade patterns; and on events of interest to diplomats and merchants. Ambassadors in Iberia remained alert to Spanish or Portuguese attempts to reenter the Newfoundland fisheries or to develop alternative sources of fish. An English observer in Spain reported in detail a Spanish project for a fishery on the north coast of South America. Historian Jaime Vicens Vivas notes the plans of the Bourbons to halt the decay of the Spanish fisheries in the 1730s and 1740s.<sup>51</sup>

In 1773 plans to expand a fishery in the Canary Islands drew the attention of the English representative there. He announced that fishermen from North America were to be brought in to train Spanish workers and

---

47 Vicens Vives, *Manual*, 517, comments that though the price of English products had doubled, they were still paying the same customs duties as in 1667. McLachlan, *Trade and Peace*, 20-21.

48 McLachlan, *Trade and Peace*, 22, 56-57, 69. She notes that the Judge Conservator post was established in the 1667 treaty; its powers were reduced in the 1713 treaty but reinstated in 1715.

49 Ibid., 132, 139.

50 Consul William Cayley at Cadiz commented on specie smuggling from Spain. Cayley to Newcastle, September 30, 1738, SPFS 94/222.

51 Grantham to Rochford, March 11, 1773, SPFS 94/192; Magra to Rockford, February 15, 1774, SPFS 94/195. Vicens Vives, *Manual*, 475.

a government subsidy would allow Spaniards to undersell *bacalao* from America. Consul Magra suggested that the government should “encourage” Morocco to war with Spain. An attack by the Sallee pirates on the fishery might gain them 1,500 slaves and in the process destroy it because “without something of this kind being done [it] will in a short time ruin our Newfoundland fishery.”<sup>52</sup> Lord Rochford’s answer recognized this problem as “an Object of great National Concern” and ordered Magra to keep him apprised of the fishery’s progress.<sup>53</sup>

Almost concurrently the Portuguese were encouraging a fishery in the Algarve, aimed at reducing the “Baccalhao Trade.” The English representative at Lisbon commented, however, “I do not find that our Baccalhao Merchants are much alarmed at it.” He did not foresee enough of a catch to replace the fish from America.<sup>54</sup> When Portugal and Morocco made peace in 1769, an English observer again evidenced concern that “if that Country should be able to furnish much Grain, it [would] affect the Trade of His Majesty’s Northern Colonies in that Article.”<sup>55</sup>

The steps taken by Spain’s Charles II and Portugal’s Marquês de Pombal seeking to free their nations from English domination were rapidly communicated to London by diplomatic pouch. Consuls reported, when possible, movements of Barbary pirate vessels and of potential enemy military and naval units. They kept a watchful eye on Spanish and Portuguese naval building programs. They met periodically with members of the Lisbon and Cadiz factories to deal with infringements of the commercial treaties. They assisted indigent seamen and engaged in charitable works of various kinds.<sup>56</sup> During the summer of 1773, William Dalrymple, Consul at Cadiz, wrote concerning an American seaman imprisoned there. The brig *George*, owned by George Crowninshield of Salem, had been wrecked on the Cuban coast. Her mate William Scott, imprisoned for illegally entering Spanish territory, was taken to Cadiz in chains. Dalrymple and the factory provided support for Scott and other prisoners there. Eventually he and thirty-six other Englishmen were released.<sup>57</sup> The consular system assisted English merchants and seamen in a variety of ways, both directly and indirectly, and American colonials equally.

\* \* \*

The Royal Navy contributed yeoman services supporting the Newfoundland fisheries and Britain’s trade with Iberia and the Mediterranean. Beginning in the seventeenth century elements of the navy annually escorted the English fishermen out to the American Banks and remained there through the season, preventing incursions by Spanish and Portuguese fishermen and providing protection in wartime. At season’s end they accompanied the fish carriers to the Iberian coast and sometimes even into the Mediterranean.<sup>58</sup>

---

52 Magra to Rockford, September 10, 1773; February 15, 1774, SPFS 94/194.

53 Rochford to Magra, December 3, 1773; July 15, 1774 SPFS 94/194.

54 Walpole to Rochford, April 3, 1773, SPFP 89/74.

55 Lyttleton to Weymouth, October 11, 1769, SPFP 89/69.

56 McLachlan *Trade and Peace*, 74-77, 97-98, 140-141. Shillington and Chapman, *Commercial Relations*, 177-178, 192-194, 235-236, 243. A.B. Walford, *The British Factory in Lisbon and Its Closing Stages* (Lisbon, 1940), 16-44. H.E.S. Fisher, “Anglo-Portuguese Trade, 1700-1770” (PhD diss., University of London, 1961). Magra to Rochford, November 1, 1773, SPFS 94/194.

57 Dalrymple to Rochford, July 15, 1773; August 20, 1773, SPFS 94/193.

58 David Macpherson, *Annals of Commerce, Manufactures, Fisheries and Navigation*, 4 vols. (London, 1805), II: 282, reports five vessels protecting the fishing fleet at Newfoundland as early as 1622. In 1718 the Lisbon Consul sent a naval vessel to cruise off and on Cape St. Vincent to warn the fish carriers



Beginning in mid-seventeenth century the navy maintained an almost constant presence in Iberian and Mediterranean waters. In 1661 a treaty with Portugal transferred Tangier on the Moroccan coast to English hands. They held it until 1684.<sup>59</sup> Its defense eventually became too costly and it was abandoned. England seized Gibraltar from Spain in 1704 and a year later captured a Balearic Island base, Port Mahon, retaining it for the next century. Both these bases were victualled largely from North African ports.<sup>60</sup> Lisbon also served as an important naval center. When relations with Spain and France were strained, additional naval units went off to the Mediterranean. In summer 1738, for example, sixteen naval vessels were based at Port Mahon under Admiral Nicholas Haddock.<sup>61</sup> During wartime larger vessels blockaded Toulon and Cadiz and smaller elements, sloops and frigates, cruised the shipping lanes reaching out as far as the Madeiras to protect British and colonial commerce.

Through much of the seventeenth century and periodically after that, England warred with the North African pirates. Naval bases at Tangier, Port Mahon, and Gibraltar supported cruising units pressuring the Barbary states to remain at peace with the English. The threat of retaliation against them was of major assistance to commerce in Iberian seas. Consuls in Barbary ports observed their activities and provided useful reports for diplomatic and military purposes. English vessels bound into those waters carried “Barbary Passes,” protecting them from seizure. These valuable let passes were available to American as well as English shippers.

English officials in southern Europe assisted in the war effort by keeping watch on enemy fleets and their privateers and in other ways. When wars threatened, consuls hurried merchantmen out of Spanish ports to protect them from seizure. William Cayley, Cadiz Consul, moved to Faro, Portugal, in 1739 in order to report on Spanish naval movements out of Cadiz. He also aided English prisoners at Cadiz with “a Royal Plate a Day” for each of the 142 men incarcerated there.<sup>62</sup>

Officials reported, for example, in 1757 that nine Newfoundland fish carriers had been captured on entering the Mediterranean.<sup>63</sup> In October 1760 a £200-subscription was raised to honor Captain Archibald Kennedy, R.N., for suppressing privateers around Lisbon. A year later, informants disclosed that fourteen French raiders had cleared from Vigo, Spain, to cruise against English shipping.<sup>64</sup> Two years later a Lisbon source reported that the British blockade off Cadiz had turned away so many neutral vessels that their wheat cargoes had overstocked Lisbon.<sup>65</sup> In the fall of 1770, when the Falkland Islands crisis brought Spain and England to the brink of war, the acting consul at Cadiz sent letters warning North American merchants of a possible rupture, one of which eventually reached the columns of the *Pennsylvania Gazette*.<sup>66</sup>

\* \* \*

---

to stay clear of Cadiz. They arrived at Lisbon on November 18, 1718, Poyntz to Cragg, October 15, 1718, SPFP 89/26. Cf. Board of Trade Instructions to Captain Hugh Palliser, May 14, 1765, CO 194/27. Palliser was Lord High Admiral of the naval escort at Newfoundland.

59 Macpherson, *Annals*, II: 600, 612. Andrews, *Colonial Period*, IV: 64n.

60 Matthew S. Anderson, *Europe in the Eighteenth Century, 1713-1783* (New York, 1961), 218.

61 Pares, *War and Trade*, 53-55, 144-145. *PG*, October 26, 1738. *CPR* indicates that from 1757 through 1763 at least one British naval vessel patrolled almost constantly on the Portuguese coast.

62 Consul William Cayley, Cadiz, sent a series of reports from Faro, Portugal between 1741 and 1747. See Cayley to Newcastle, July 11, 1741, SPFS 94/226.

63 *PG*, April 28, 1757.

64 *PG*, January 8, 1761; January 21, 1762.

65 *PG*, September 23, 1762.

66 *PG*, January 17, 1771.

Government-sponsored packet services between England and Iberia played a central role in encouraging this trade. Major Iberian ports received the packets on as regular a schedule as the vagaries of the winds and violence of the seas allowed. Four packets commuted regularly between Falmouth and Lisbon in the late 1750s. Between February 1771 and December 1776 packets made 191 voyages between those ports, averaging almost three arrivals at Lisbon per month.<sup>67</sup> Lesser Iberian centers also were connected with England. In 1768 Consul James Banks in Galicia complained that England's trade there had fallen by as much as eighty percent because of the discontinuance of their packet connection after the Seven Years War.<sup>68</sup> Subsidized by the Royal Postal Service, packets carried passengers and commercial, military, and diplomatic dispatches; also bringing information on market conditions. Most important, they regularly carried large consignments of specie home to England. By treaty agreement they could not be searched and their officers were immune from inspection as they smuggled specie down to their vessels.<sup>69</sup> Packets arrived in Iberia in five to nine days but return voyages often took longer, impeded by adverse winds and currents.

All of these government services were available to all shipping flying the English flag. A severely restrictive mercantilist system would not have granted colonial merchants and shipping these competitive advantages. The need to gather specie from southern Europe had a very persuasive impact upon mercantilist thinking.

Expansion of government authority and recognition of its responsibility to serve commercial interests had a direct effect on mercantilist thought. After almost constant warfare with the Barbary States in the 1600s, relative peace reigned in the 1700s. Now the large, heavily manned, well armed vessels required earlier were replaced by smaller, lightly crewed, unarmed ships after 1720, reflecting increased respect for British naval power. Costs of shipping to southern Europe fell significantly. To less well endowed colonial shipowners this meant smaller investments, less risk, and easier entrance into these commercial undertakings.

As the eighteenth century progressed North American colonials carried their produce to southern Europe and the Wine Islands more and more commonly in their own vessels and "on their own hooks." Under the heading "News from England," the *Pennsylvania Gazette* cited an English source in October 1770, as follows:

It is an alarming Truth, that the Portuguese Gold, which used to circulate in this Country, is now wholly carried on by the Americans. It is said they have exported, within these two years, Wheat, Flour, and Indian Corn, from three Provinces only, to the Amount of several Hundred Thousand Pounds, and that many of the Merchants of that Country are so rich, as to have Thousands of Pounds in the Hands of their Correspondents in London, by which they make Eight or Ten per Cent. in Bills of Exchange.<sup>70</sup>

---

67 CPR. By the early 1770s their number had increased to five.

68 Original Correspondence of the Board of Trade, January 27, 1762, CO 388/55. Jordan to Parker, March 18, 1750, SPFP 94/137, reported a packet's arrival at Corunna from Falmouth in sixty-two hours.

69 Shillington and Chapman, *Commercial Relations*, 249. Alan D. Francis, *The Methuens and Portugal, 1691-1702* (Cambridge, England, 1966), 24, citing Thomas Cox in 1700 that the post left London every Tuesday for Spain or Portugal and that an answer was expected in about six weeks. The voyage outward could be made in three or four days but the inward leg took much longer. SPFP 89/62 contains a number of references indicating the Falmouth packet's Lisbon voyage ranged from five to nine days in the 1760s. On average Falmouth cleared more vessels annually to Lisbon than any English port except London. Davis, *Rise of English Shipping*, 243.

70 PG, October 18, 1770.

The tone of this commentary consciously stressed the differences between Englishmen and “Americans.” It was a harbinger of the future. England had indulged her American settlers in their need to trade with southern Europe, assuring them of the credits required to purchase in England the clothing and other necessaries which they needed.<sup>71</sup>

---

71 *CSPC*, XXIX (1716-1717): 271, Joshua Gee to the Board of Trade.



## CHAPTER II

### IBERIAN MERCANTILISM, LATIN AMERICAN TREASURE, AND NORTH AMERICAN TRADE, 1600-1800

King Henry IV of Spain, alarmed at the drain of specie from his country, issued an ukase in 1471 imposing the death penalty on those involved in such exportations. Ferdinand and Isabella, in turn, required foreign importers to export Spanish products of equal value within a year and made exporting more than 500 *castellanos* punishable by death.<sup>1</sup> A codicil added to these laws in 1515 called for inspection every four months of the accounts of bankers and merchants engaged in foreign trade. The financial problems of the early Hapsburgs Charles V and Philip II saw laws against exporting bullion honored in the breach, though still on the statute books. Specie inflow from America to Spain created the price revolution of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. At the same time, the flow of foreign luxuries, despite royal sumptuary laws, “kept the rate of exchange constantly at the specie-export point.”<sup>2</sup> Spain did not develop an integrated national tariff system and the peninsula’s difficult topography made internal transfer of goods extremely problematic. Constant deficits from the expansionistic policies of the Hapsburgs resulted in a steady drain of specie to pay Dutch and German bankers. Spain’s leaders, 1550-1700, had little success in controlling the economy to retain American specie and balance imports and exports. The customs were in the hands of “tax farmers” whose “corruption saw payoffs encourage the growth of foreign trade.”<sup>3</sup> Hope of sharing in Spain’s American treasure attracted merchants from all of northern Europe, England included. An Anglo-Spanish treaty signed in 1630 gave Episcopalians protection in Spain and treaties in 1645, 1665, and 1667 placed England on a most favored nation basis, reduced duties on goods arriving by sea, and gave Englishmen equal trading status with Spaniards.<sup>4</sup> English merchants could establish branches in Spanish ports and own warehouses there. The Treaty of Madrid (1667), especially important, granted both nations freedom from customs visitations and inspections in harbors previous to unloading. Vessels entered and anchored without paying duties until disembarkation.<sup>5</sup> This treaty established the parameters of England’s most advantageous trades in continental Spain, delineating their methodology and, most important, guaranteeing her merchants extraterritorial status. It opened Spain to products from English America; allowed goods entering to be reexported without duty; limited the number of customs guards boarding incoming English vessels (reducing the costs of paying and feeding them). It set up, as well, a special Spanish official – the Juez Conservador – paid by the Cadiz factory, who adjudicated disputes between English merchants and Spaniards and protected them from petty harassments and transgressions of their treaty rights. Sedentary English traders were protected from arbitrary seizure for religious reasons. Most important, it assured that offices and warehouses remained exempt from search and business records from seizure. Consular officials established in ports of consequence in continental Spain and in the Canary Islands materially assisted the

---

1 Earl J. Hamilton, “Spanish Mercantilism before 1700.” In *Facts and Factors in Economic History*, 214-239 (Cambridge, Mass., 1932).

2 Ibid.

3 José Canga Arguelles, *Diccionario de Hacienda para el uso de los Encargados*, 5 vols. (Madrid, 1833-1834), V: 44-45.

4 Jaime Vicens Vives, *Historia social y economica de España y America*, 5 vols. (Barcelona, 1957-1959). III, 318-320, 348-350.

5 Canga Arguelles, *Diccionario*, IV: 154. Francisco Morales Padron, *El Comercio Canario-Americano* (Sevilla, 1955), 199.

mercantile community in resolving problems and encouraging trade.<sup>6</sup>

For thirty years relations remained relatively amicable. The later Hapsburgs proved to be relatively unenlightened rulers. Judicious bribery greased the wheels of trade. Spaniards even served as straw men through whom their English principals traded with Spanish America. When the War of the Spanish Succession began in 1702, all English Protestant traders left Spain and returned only when peace was renewed. However, many of “their Irish Roman Catholic clerks remained behind, and after the war revived the British trade.”<sup>7</sup>

Under Spain’s new Bourbon leadership, the Anglo-Spanish mercantile relationship changed. English trading rights under the 1667 treaty came under review. After 1713 English trade to Spanish America through shadow ownerships was halted. Rights granted earlier were, in theory, renewed but, in fact, changes occurred. English importers now paid the same duties as did Spaniards and received most favored nation privileges. But all attempts to arrange bullion exportations were rejected. Customs inspectors now opened all boxes in the presence of the merchants involved. Duties were sharply increased. Of great import, the position of Juez Conservador was abolished. For a time the Cadiz factory even paid the Spanish governor’s salary, as a gift, hoping for his intervention in their behalf. Angry complaints about the new treaty brought further negotiations. The loss of the Conservador’s protection was of major importance. The chorus of protest from the English resident merchants at Cadiz brought new negotiations in 1715.

A bribe of £9,000 preceded the signing of the new Treaty of Madrid containing most satisfactory terms. Duties were set at earlier levels as under Charles II and the Conservador’s position was reestablished. For the next thirty-five years, Spanish-English relations reflected Spanish anger and rejection of the terms of this treaty. Wars and rumors of war resulted from infractions of the treaty and of the Asiento agreement permitting limited English trade with Spanish America. Nonetheless, “Cadiz was, during the eighteenth century, the richest and most important of British factories in Spain” and English traders flourished despite harassments.<sup>8</sup>

*Trade and Peace with Old Spain, 1667-1750* catalogues the history of Anglo-Spanish relations – commercial and diplomatic – through this era. After 1713 Spanish interference with traditional trading practices became common. Commercial policy commonly reflected Spanish diplomatic goals. In 1716-1717, when an Anglo-Austrian alliance blocked Cardinal Alberoni’s Italian plans, English merchants in Spain were harassed with additional taxes – national, local, and municipal. When they asserted their privileges, troops were quartered in their homes and warehouses, or they were jailed.<sup>9</sup> In the Canary Islands English commerce faced new and costly regulations beginning in 1727 without concern for treaty guarantees. Two years later all Protestants were ordered to leave the islands within two months.<sup>10</sup> The governor introduced a new duty on imports by non-Catholics. Merchants clearing out of Orotava, Tenerife had now to go to the other end of the island for papers. As late as 1733 English traders there were still complaining at the governor’s attempts to “enslave them and their commerce.”<sup>11</sup> Continuing tensions between Spain and England lead again to war in 1739. Benjamin Keene, minister to Spain, ordered all English vessels out of

---

6 McLachlan, *Trade and Peace*, 22.

7 Ibid.

8 Edward Clarke, *Letters Concerning the Spanish Nation: Written at Madrid during the Years 1760 and 1761* (London, 1763), 253. Vicens Vives, *Manual*, 509-517.

9 William Coxe, *Memoirs of the Kings of Spain of the House of Bourbon*, 3 vols. (London, 1813), II: 129-130.

10 *PG*, October 9, 1729. *BNL*, October 23, 1729.

11 *BNL*, July 5, 1733.

Spanish ports “with the utmost expedition.”<sup>12</sup> The English abandoned their businesses at Cadiz, Alicante, Barcelona, and other ports until 1748. Again Irish influence in the factories grew, especially at Cadiz. Many Catholic Irish had become naturalized Spanish citizens and proclaimed their loyalty to England while enjoying the benefits of Spanish citizens. English consuls at Cadiz and elsewhere had considerable difficulty in controlling them after peace returned in 1748 and again in 1763.

After 1748 the British attempted to reestablish the advantageous terms of the treaties of 1667 and 1715. Increasingly aggressive mercantilist sentiments in Spain demonstrated the changing times and enlightenment desires for economic self-sufficiency. The Asiento was surrendered by the English in the 1750s, improving relations which remained relatively harmonious to 1762. The commercial treaty of 1750 guaranteed no new privileges but most terms of the earlier agreements remained in effect. Duties were still pegged at levels in effect almost one hundred years earlier. Price inflation over time had made them unrealistically low, yet the English insisted they remain in effect.

During this century the silting up of the Guadalquivir River caused Cadiz to become the major point of entry from America and the leading port in southern Spain. Cadiz’s trade increased partly because its large harbor allowed foreigners fine opportunities to avoid the vigilance of customs officials.<sup>13</sup> In 1717 Cadiz became the official entrepôt for the treasure fleets and thus attracted bullion, specie, and treasure seekers, just as Lisbon drew them in Portugal.

The beginnings of eighteenth-century reform are observable under Phillip V, during the 1720s and 1730s, with further steps taken by Ferdinand VI (1746-1759). A basic element encouraging change was the rapid population growth of this era, with low agricultural productivity and resultant rise in prices of agricultural goods. Scarcity in the 1720s led to critical shortages in the next decade. A number of authors offered analyses of the grain shortages.<sup>14</sup> Economist Geronimo Uztariz found employment under Ferdinand VI and traveled Europe seeking ways to improve Spanish agriculture and commerce. During Ferdinand’s reign, the Marqués de la Ensenada initiated a broad series of reforms which a contemporary realistically compared with “a rain falling upon a sandy desert, where there was not a seed or plant to be enlivened by it.”<sup>15</sup> Attempts to fix wheat prices lowered significantly Spanish grain production since prices were set too low. Spanish government controls also made it extremely difficult to ship grain from one province to another without onerous special permits to do so, making Spain heavily dependent upon foreign supplies.

Reform programs began to take effect during the era of Charles III. Laws controlling the internal movement of grain were at first altered and then in the 1760s totally abandoned. Productivity improved but continual grain shortfalls and the loss of English sources frustrated reformers. Broadly revised tariff laws attempted to encourage commerce, manufacturing, and the fisheries. Despite the Carlist reforms, only limited successes were achieved. Dependence on foreign supplies of comestibles continued. Efforts at reforming commercial policies put great pressure on Anglo-Spanish diplomatic relations and raised already existing tensions between English merchants at Cadiz and elsewhere, royal officials, and the Spanish public. Reforms threatened the long-term status quo, so strongly undergirded by commercial treaty provisions stretching back to 1667.<sup>16</sup>

Spanish entrance into the Seven Years War followed upon a series of incidents affecting the trade. Late

---

12 *NEWJ*, September 11, 1739. *PG*, December 21, 1739.

13 Vicens Vives, *Manual*, 399.

14 *Ibid.*, 462, 516-517. Herr, *Revolution in Spain*, 48-49, 113ff, 145ff. Jaime Carrera Pujal, *Historia de la Economía Española*, 5 vols. (Barcelona, 1943-1947), III: 310ff.

15 Clarke, *Letters Concerning Spanish Nation*, xxxvi.

16 Vicens Vives, *Manual*, 462, 475, 501, 517. Carrera Pujal, *Economía Española*, III: 151, 157, 310-317, 369, 377.

October of 1761 found English traders at Barcelona “in the greatest consternation.”<sup>17</sup> A merchant at Cadiz complained that Spanish prejudice in favor of the French became

every day more and more notorious. Our invoices and bills of lading are examined with the greatest rigour, our permits detained on the most trifling pretences, our goods frequently obliged to lie in the warehouses for want of being examined by the proper officers, and every method used to our discouragement.<sup>18</sup>

Spain declared war in mid-December 1761 and a number of English ships fell prize to Spanish authorities. A rumor ran that several English ships and a sixty-gun man-of-war had to fight their way clear of Cadiz harbor as the war began.<sup>19</sup>

Again Cadiz factory members went off to England. In late winter 1762 a correspondent recounted eight separate incidents of harassment of English vessels resulting from Spanish sympathy for the French.<sup>20</sup> When this war ended some merchants, discouraged by events, did not return to Spain. Richard Herr has suggested that between 1763 and 1774, Spanish merchants became significantly more active in distributing goods from England and abroad.<sup>21</sup> The subservient position forced on the Spanish by the earlier treaties continued to cause tension. After 1763 the hostility between them saw the Spanish struggle to reduce that domination. The return of food scarcities encouraged further reforms. The Falklands crisis in the early 1770s exacerbated those relations.

\* \* \*

Three major Spanish centers drew American shipping, Bilbao, Barcelona, and Cadiz. Bilbao concentrated on the importation of *bacalao* from the Newfoundland and New England banks, for distribution inland to central portions of Leon and Castille. Through much of the eighteenth century it did not have a resident English consul, so less information is available concerning trade there. The records of the Consulado de Bilbao make obvious that local Basque merchants had taken the fish import business largely into their own hands by the 1760s, if not before. Shipments of wool and iron went out to English ports. Apparently no packet service connected Bilbao with England. Presumably surplus funds left Vizcaya for England through sale of the city’s woolen and iron exports there, and presumably by smuggling. In the closing years of the colonial era, 1770-1773, North American goods reached the Nervion River port aboard 221 vessels; 77 from Newfoundland and 137 from New England, largely from Salem/Marblehead. Only seven brought grain from the middle colonies.<sup>22</sup> Shipping entering Bilbao tended to be of lesser tonnage per vessel because of the bar at the river’s mouth.

In contrast, in the same years Barcelona welcomed 190 such vessels (25,513 tons), an annual average of fifty ships (6,400 tons). Almost half came as fish carriers, mainly from Newfoundland. In an average year, eighteen large grain vessels arrived from America, normally with wheat. Eleven ships (1,370 tons) brought

---

17 *PG*, December 10, 1761.

18 *PG*, April 15, 1762. While some English vessels were seized in Spain when war began, the goods of the British consul and merchants at Alicante were sealed and apparently returned with the peace. *BNL*, April 8, 1762.

19 *PG*, February 4, 1762.

20 *Ibid.*

21 Herr, *Revolution in Spain*, 149.

22 Data on Bilbao arrivals, 1770-1773, are from the “Averia Accounts.”



Carolina rice. Many of these arrivals cleared Barcelona for the British Isles or French Channel ports, with wine, brandy, and other goods.<sup>23</sup>

Cadiz, on the southern coast, served as a major outlet for produce from British North America. In 1759 the English sent 114 ships there, about twenty percent of the total entering the port (618). Only the Dutch, with 155 entries, traded more actively.<sup>24</sup> In 1775, 131 vessels reached Cadiz from North America: fifty-nine from Newfoundland and Nova Scotia, five from New England, and sixty-seven from the grain colonies.<sup>25</sup> Cadiz provided export cargoes of salt.

Other Spanish mainland ports ranked far below these three. All of them took some codfish but did not attract ships from other American colonies to any significant degree. Cartagena had no English merchants in residence, Alicante's major role was as a salt export center. Few English firms did business there. Seville and St. Lucar served as satellites for Cadiz. Corunna, somewhat important in the early eighteenth century, lost its packet connection after 1763 and stagnated. Ferrol, Gijon, Santander, and St. Sebastian in the north took a few fish carriers but few other North American ships.

\* \* \*

Sales of American produce in Spain were necessary because of its inability to meet the consumption demands of its burgeoning population. The Portuguese faced almost exactly the same frustrating problems over this period. Spain and Portugal had been united under Phillip II for sixty years down to 1640. During that time English consuls assumed residence at Lisbon and established a factory there. Privileges granted the English by Spanish treaties extended to Anglo-Portuguese trading. In 1640 Portugal threw off the Spanish yoke and soon developed close ties with England. A commercial treaty in 1654 established English merchants at Lisbon and elsewhere in a position of ascendancy. When Charles II married Catherine de Braganza in 1661 a long close relationship was initiated between the two nations. That same year a treaty allied them closely and confirmed English merchants there in carefully stipulated rights and privileges.<sup>26</sup>

During the 1680s and 1690s the Portuguese government grew concerned at the negative trade balance with England and other northern countries. Complaints by the Lisbon factory and by merchants at Oporto led to the negotiation of a new treaty, the Methuan Treaty of 1703, which solidly reestablished English commercial dominance.<sup>27</sup>

The Portuguese reacted to their continuing dependent status by harassing English traders with petty laws limiting imports, by imposing taxes in excess of those established by the treaty, and by other means. They overvalued imports and thus overtaxed them. English merchants questioned the weights used for measuring goods. New official pronouncements forced sales into public markets. Limitations were placed on vessels using the *franquia* system. Taxes were occasionally demanded in kind, causing disputes over values.<sup>28</sup> The tyranny of petty, often corrupt, officials and the multiple layers of customs offices delayed disposal

---

23 Barcelona data, 1770-1773, are from consular dispatches in SPFS 94/193-194. Newfoundland sent 75 vessels (8,830 tons; 154,530 qtls.) out of 107 arrivals (12,340 tons); Quebec provided more than 50 percent of the wheat.

24 *BNL*, May 8, 1760.

25 "A General State of the Vessels entered and cleared from Cadiz Bay for the Year 1775," SPFS 94/200. Total entering was 1,215 vessels. American entries made up a tenth of all entries.

26 Shillington and Chapman, *Commercial Relations*, 199-200.

27 *Ibid.*, 211-220.

28 *Ibid.*, 234-236.

of cargoes beyond limits set by the treaty and led to additional burdensome costs.<sup>29</sup> English merchants and diplomats constantly adhered to the terms of the treaties protecting them from search, exempting their books from seizure, and thus limiting the power of the local courts.

Factory members found it difficult to recover debts in Portuguese courts sympathetic to debtors. Embarrassed by their satellite status, the Portuguese smarted under the dominance of their allies. A general hostility of long duration existed between the English and the Portuguese, complicating the lives of resident Englishmen. Nonetheless, the Anglo-Lusitanian alliance remained a necessity for the smaller nation threatened by its larger and, at times, aggressive Spanish neighbor.

The reform enthusiasm energizing the Spanish in this era had its echoes in Portugal also. Enlightened monarchy and reform were in style. Sebastião José de Carvalho e Melo, marquês de Pombal became minister of foreign affairs in 1750. Shortly, tensions between the allies increased markedly.<sup>30</sup> A long-term problem had centered on Portuguese complaints that English firms at Oporto had gradually engrossed the trade in port wines, fixing prices at extraordinarily low levels. Port suited the English palate and English exporters controlled every facet of that trade.<sup>31</sup> Pombal reasserted local authority by establishing a special trading company aimed at monopolizing this business and closing out the foreign wine merchants.<sup>32</sup>

While, on the surface, the Portuguese minister appeared to be sympathetic to the English, Lord Tyrawley wrote to Newcastle in London: “to expect that difficulties won’t arise here everyday, would be to flatter ourselves too much, where there is so vast a body of his Majesties Subjects that Trade in all that this Globe of Earth produces.”<sup>33</sup> It has been claimed that Pombal possessed in his library only one book in English, *The Privileges of an Englishman in the Kingdom of Portugal*.<sup>34</sup>

During summer 1753 a great scarcity in western Spain saw Spanish officials request two English houses at Lisbon to purchase 60,000 measures of wheat to be sent up the Tagus to Estremadura province. Fearful of creating a shortage at Lisbon, the Portuguese delayed the sale, ostensibly to check on available supplies for local consumption. All trade in wheat stopped. English merchants with grain ships in port protested that their cargoes would spoil and that they faced demurrage charges. Government officials allowed cargoes to land but required storage in public warehouses.<sup>35</sup> Apparently, the government suspected the English sought a monopoly over grain sales in league with Portuguese *Commissarios*, who bought wheat to process into flour. The English consignees tried to blame the local millers, who bought “large Quantities of Foreign Corn” to supply the Brazil fleet with flour. Fearing exposure of their monopolistic practices, the English suppliers then flooded the market.<sup>36</sup>

The following winter local officials discovered factory members clandestinely sending wheat to Spain despite laws making it a capital offense. They identified Stubbs and Taylor as the firm involved; another

---

29 Ibid., 218, 223, 243-245, 254-256. Macpherson, *Annals*, III: 425.

30 Macpherson, *Annals*, III: 426. John Smith Athelstone, Conde da Carnota, *Memoirs of the Marquis of Pombal*, 2 vols. (London, 1843).

31 Shillington and Chapman, *Commercial Relations*, 254, 266ff.

32 Committee of the Lisbon Factory to Newcastle, February 7, 1752, SPFP 89/48. *PG*, May 7, 1752.

33 Tyrawley to Newcastle, June 25, 1752; Lisbon Factory to Holderness, February 7, 1752, SPFP 89/48.

34 William C. Atkinson, *British Contributions to Portuguese and Brazilian Studies* (Edinburgh, 1945), 24. Anderson, *Europe in Eighteenth Century*, 56.

35 Castries to Holderness, September 6, 1753; Castries to Anzard, September 22, 1753, October 6, 1753, November 26, 1753; Castries to Robinson, June 1, 1754, SPFP 89/48.

36 Castries to Anzard, October 6, 1753; Castries to Holderness, January 22, 1754, SPFP 89/48.

firm escaped charges. The guilty merchants threw themselves on the mercy of the Portuguese King, begging his forgiveness.<sup>37</sup>

Then, the Great Lisbon Earthquake occurred, November 1, 1755, directly beneath the Lisbon customs house, devastating the city. Out of a population of about 200,000, an estimated 40,000 died in the quake and its aftermath, a disastrous fire. The English consul at Lisbon wrote:

Our poor factory from a very opulent one is totally ruined at least for the major part and as the calamity fell with the greatest fury upon the trading Quarters of the City, there is hardly one Merchant in a Hundred of any Nation whatever that has saved anything, except for a few parts of their Cash which they have been raking for among the Ruins, as to goods not one of them has been able to save a Rag.<sup>38</sup>

Devastated Portuguese debtors could not pay their debts. A few English firms, Quarry and Mellish and Raymond and Barrel among them, saved their specie in whole or in part but most saw their fortunes “sunk in the common ruin of the inhabitants.”<sup>39</sup> Frightened by aftershocks, important factory members took their families and fled to England.

Prime Minister Pombal recognized in this crisis an unusual opportunity. Justified by the need to bring order out of chaos – with commerce at a standstill, city streets choked with rubble, warehouses in ruins, the customs house in collapse – amid this “entire state of inaction,” Pombal moved. Long an advocate for reform, he assumed exceptional authority and used it to reorder Portugal’s commercial life.<sup>40</sup>

The destruction of the city had left the populace without food or housing. Less than three weeks after the earthquake the annual English fishing fleet arrived from Newfoundland. All were detained and directed to unload their cargoes, a direct contravention of English treaty rights. The ambassador challenged Pombal’s directive, arguing that some vessels usually called at Lisbon and then under the *franquia*, sailed to other markets. Pombal prevailed.<sup>41</sup> Tensions rose further in early 1756 when he levied a special additional entry duty of four percent to provide funds to rebuild the city’s infrastructure, including the customs house. The factory bitterly opposed this innovation. Other changes followed. Customs rates had remained unchanged for almost a hundred years, while prices had inflated. The English had clung to the seventeenth-century evaluations of their imports. Now, since the earthquake had destroyed the old price lists, new values were adopted with a modern and, in English eyes, unfavorable price level.<sup>42</sup>

At about the same time Pombal instituted reforms, which reserved the Brazil trade solely to Portuguese merchants. By the early 1760s, along with the monopoly on Port wine exports, he had reasserted Portugal’s right to control its own commerce. He also moved to make the country independent of foreign food supplies. Local fisheries were fostered. He urged marginal wine producers to shift to grain husbandry.<sup>43</sup> A new duty

---

37 Castries to Holderness, February 4, 1754; Lisbon Factory to Holderness, n.d., SPFP 89/48.

38 Castries to Robinson, November 6, 1755, SPFP 89/50. C.R. Boxer, *Some Contemporary Reactions to the Lisbon Earthquake of 1755* (Lisbon, 1956). Carnota, *Memoirs of Pombal*, I: 87, 103. Hay to Fox, December 28, 1755, SPFP 89/50. Seventy-eight English died but only nine were listed as merchants.

39 Hay to Robinson, November 15, 1755, SPFP 89/50.

40 Hay to Robinson, November 19, 1755, SPFP 89/50.

41 Ibid.

42 Castries to Fox, February 4, 1756, SPFP 89/50. Walford, *British Factory*, 59-60.

43 Shillington and Chapman, *Commercial Relations*, 266n, 281-282. Carnota, *Memoirs of Pombal*, II: 40, 56. Charles Francis Dumouriez, *An Account of Portugal* (Lausanne, 1766), 200-205. PG, March 16, 1758; May 8, 1758; May 28, 1761; June 18, 1761; July 19, 1764; December 6, 1764 (dateline London, Oc-

funded coastal lighthouses. When a new fire destroyed the Lisbon customs offices another two percent duty supported its rebuilding. English merchants and diplomats protested these changes as contrary to treaty agreements, with only limited success. When they threatened to halt shipments to Lisbon, he answered that the trade was still so lucrative that he doubted they would abandon it.

Pombal called for reciprocity on the part of the British. While acknowledging the new duties and other changes, he insisted they recognize his improvements in the Portuguese system. Before 1758 ship captains seeking clearance had visited thirty-five separate officials to process their papers, which sometimes “delayed them for months together.” His reforms, he boasted, reduced all that “to one single book, to one single form, to one single sum without any Augmentation whatsoever.”<sup>44</sup>

Dealing with Portuguese officeholders often tested the patience of English and colonial merchants and shipowners, exposed as they were to their petty harassments. In 1755 the Lisbon consul described them “as a parcel of low, hungry and pitiful wretches.”<sup>45</sup> His comments suggest that they were as venal as those at Cadiz. When the new Lisbon customs house burned again in 1764, English traders complained bitterly at their losses and insisted that the fire had been set by customs officers to cover a theft.<sup>46</sup>

The reforms ran directly counter to English interests. In addition, factory members were angered at steps taken to regulate the Lisbon grain trade during the mid-1760s. Then in 1770 officials arrested and imprisoned Dennis Connell of Connell and Moroney for refusing to accept flour sale controls. When other merchants protested his treatment, they were threatened. Some left for home, “greatly injured in their trade and property.”<sup>47</sup> Eventually concessions were made. The Portuguese Council of State was deeply divided over the efficacy of the Anglo-Lusitanian alliance.<sup>48</sup> English threats to end preferential treatment of Portuguese wines brought concessions. Then a warning that the Bank of England might reject Portuguese money shocked London financial circles, creating fears that its circulation might be “almost intirely stopped.”<sup>49</sup> Denials gave relief but tensions remained high into the mid-1770s. Though marked by constant friction the alliance remained in place. When England and Spain warred, English expeditionary forces went off to defend their reluctant partner from threatened invasions.

The enormous destructiveness of the earthquake, combined with a declining income from Brazil, prevented Pombal from further reforming the state’s commercial life. Ironically, the crisis that gave him all but dictatorial power placed such a heavy burden on the state that his reforms were frustrated. He achieved some successes, especially in agricultural improvements, but his fall from power in 1777 put an end to the reform era. Despite his utmost efforts to loosen the English stranglehold, a contemporary commented: “The commerce of Portugal remained in the hands of the English to whom the Portuguese are no more than brokers or agents.”<sup>50</sup>

\* \* \*

Commercial treaties negotiated with Portugal and Spain had opened them to English trade but they had,

---

tober 6, 1764), refers to a factory report listing twenty-one oppressive Portuguese practices.

44 Lyttleton to Shelburne, October 13, 1768, SPFP 89/66.

45 Castries to Robinson, June 2, 1755, SPFP 89/50.

46 *PG*, September 20, 1764, a letter from a Lisbon merchant, dated June 8.

47 *PG*, December 12, 1770; October 10, 1772; January 20, 1773.

48 *PG*, February 17, 1773.

49 *PG*, March 3, 1773; April 28, 1773.

50 Dumouriez, *Account of Portugal*, 200. Richard Twiss, *Travels through Portugal and Spain in 1772 and 1773* (London, 1775), 1.

as their basic motivation, to guarantee safe transferal of the gold and silver earned there home to England. Since specie export was forbidden on pain of death, the treaties aimed at protecting those engaged in specie smuggling. By exempting the homes, offices, warehouses, and records of merchants from search and seizure, proof of such smuggling was denied the courts. Vessels in port could not be searched after clearing customs, allowing protection of the smugglers. Naval ships and mail packets – official vessels – were fully immune from customs examinations and, since armed, were relatively safe from capture by the Barbary pirates or by other nations. Proof of illegal export became almost impossible to obtain.<sup>51</sup>

Bullion could be exported legally as well as illegally. Illegally it went out on naval vessels or packets or, more informally and in smaller amounts, on individual merchants ships bound to Britain or North America. Gold and silver also went overland from the peninsula. The consul at Corunna reported being “credibly informed” that pack trains of up to eight mules left Spain for Bayonne every four months carrying 320,000 milled dollars.<sup>52</sup> However, Lisbon and Cadiz, the entry points for the American bullion, served as the major, illegal export centers.

Periodically Portuguese leaders became concerned over the large and continuing specie exportation. During the 1720s a Lisbon firm, Wingfield and Roberts, came under attack for exporting money. Its principals were arrested, had their property seized, and faced a death sentence. Yet, both were pardoned, not banished, and had their goods returned to them.<sup>53</sup> Thirty years later, under Pombal, the government moved to halt this traffic or at least reduce its extent. Raymond and Dea of Lisbon had some monies seized, a lawsuit followed, and the funds were not restored. At about the same time three English naval officers carrying bullion to HMS *Lime* fell afoul of Lisbon customs men who attacked them and seized “a very considerable Sum of Money which belonged to Members of the British Factory.”<sup>54</sup> Ambassador Keene wrote London concerning this incident:

[The] Provisions and various Manufactures, which His Majesty’s Subjects send to Portugal, far exceed in Value, the Produce of that Country...The Ballance arising in Favour of that Trade, to the English Merchants cannot be justly satisfied, without conniving at least, at the Exportation of Specie from thence....<sup>55</sup>

This seizure caused dismay and anger in England. One version of the incident had a British lieutenant arrested and sent to Brazil.<sup>56</sup> Diplomacy saw the matter settled. In February 1752 officials demanded access to the ledgers of English merchants and the factory refused to submit them “to public inspection.”<sup>57</sup> The following spring customs officials were ordered to maintain special vigilance to prevent gold exportation.

Diplomats in Portugal sympathized with their merchants there. Lord Tyrawley wrote that the factory members continued to export gold “because the profit...from Sending it away in a clandestine Manner outweighs in their minds...the dangers attending the breach of the Law.”<sup>58</sup> Within a year the consul at

---

51 *PG*, May 7, 1752; May 14, 1752. Allan Christelow, “Great Britain and the Trades from Cadiz and Lisbon to Spanish America and Brazil, 1759-1783,” *HAHR* XXVII (1948): 6-7.

52 Banks to Conway, October 19, 1765, SPFS 94/172.

53 *AWM*, April 12, 1722; May 17, 1722.

54 Tyrawley to Newcastle, June 25, 1752; Lisbon Factory to Holderness, February 7, 1752, SPFP 89/48. Whitehall to Keene, February 20, 1752, SPFS 94/141.

55 Whitehall to Keene, February 20, 1752, SPFS 94/141.

56 *BNL*, May 14, 1752.

57 *PG*, May 14, 1752; June 28, 1753.

58 Tyrawley to Newcastle, June 25, 1752, SPFP 89/48.

Lisbon commented: “gold is the greatest branch of commerce exported from this Kingdom.”<sup>59</sup> At about the same time, Keene cited a conversation with Carvajal, the Spanish prime minister, in which the latter repeated an English diplomat’s comment: “Portugal might lock up its Gates by Land, and stop up its Ports by Sea, yet as long as it wanted and bought the Commodities of Great Britain, Money in return for them, would find its way through the Air.” Carvajal then noted the “absolute Necessity of winking at the Exportation of Money, on Account of the Balance of Trade,” a statement that Keene found extraordinary since “his own Country has the same rigorous Laws.”<sup>60</sup>

In a step aimed at undercutting the smugglers, Lisbon announced in December 1753 the legalization of specie exports upon payment of a two percent *Indulto* by the exporter, in hopes that legalization would discourage smugglers, who would pay the fee to avoid the risks involved. Apparently, this had little success.<sup>61</sup> In two cases in 1754-1755 a merchant and an officer of the *Hanover* packet were charged as smugglers, and men from the *Expedition* packet engaged in a battle with customs officers.<sup>62</sup>

The bulk of the money illegally exported cleared out from Lisbon on the Royal Mail packets connecting the city with Falmouth, but Royal Navy vessels also carried off large shipments. During the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries northern Europeans strove to share in the wealth pouring into Iberia from America. Even during the latter century the Indies were still seen as an inexhaustible source of treasure.<sup>63</sup> In its cruder form mercantilism is bullionism. By the mid-seventeenth century English trade policies assured them a market in Spain and Portugal for their provisions and fish from the British Isles and America. Thomas Mun’s tract *England’s Treasure by Forraign Trade* epitomized the relationship the English established with the Iberian states.

How did the bullion find its way aboard the Royal Navy vessels, mail packets, and merchant ships that carried it away? A merchant who had specie to ship could do it legally. Laws forbidding export had always had loopholes because governments allowed specie payments to foreign bankers to pay their debts. One could apply for an export permit and pay the fees required. Ambassador Keene wrote London in 1751: “I have procured orders for very great sums for several of His Majesty’s Subjects, which shows their Regulations are not so stubborn, as to refuse to bend on proper occasions.”<sup>64</sup> Again in 1764 Lord Rochford commented on the Spanish minister’s willingness to grant permits “for the Extraction of Silver,” if they were moderate, even though “frequent.”<sup>65</sup> In fact, export could be arranged through the Spanish court on payment of a three and one-half percent fee.<sup>66</sup> Rochford even suggested that, if the Spanish enforced specie controls, fee permits would “prevent any future disputes arising from clandestine exports of money.”<sup>67</sup> The Spanish tried to tighten controls with little notable success. In Portugal, within a year of Pombal’s new *Idulto* fee system, an English factory member was arrested for smuggling.<sup>68</sup>

Through the eighteenth century Spain’s trade imbalance with the English suppliers of fish, foodstuffs, and finished goods made it all but impossible to prevent this continuing specie drain. Three-quarters of

---

59 Crowle to Cleveland, May 29, 1753, Letters from British Consuls, ADM 1/3833.

60 Keene to Whitehall, March 20, 1752, SPFS 94/141.

61 *PG*, April 4, 1754.

62 Hay to Holderness, January 15, 1754; March 5, 1754, SPFS 94/228. Castries to Robinson, June 2, 1755; July 15, 1755, SPFP 89/50.

63 McLachlan, *Trade and Peace*, 25.

64 Keene to Newcastle, February 8, 1751, SPFS 94/139.

65 Rochford to Halifax, January 13, 1764, SPFS 94/166.

66 *PG*, June 28, 1753; April 4, 1754 (dateline London, December 22, 1753).

67 Rochford to Conway, February 18, 1766, SPFS 94/173.

68 Hay to Holderness, January 15, 1754; March 5, 1754, SPFS 94/228.

the produce of the Anglo-American fishery went to Spain annually. According to a contemporary political economist, returns from those sales consisted principally “of bullion and bars of silver.”<sup>69</sup> The Spanish still denied the English trading rights to their American territories and prohibited (officially) bullion exportation. As an English commentator early in the century reported, specie export “was always strictly enjoined but the execution universally omitted, and must be so still, or else the Spaniards can never pay for a Tenth part of the Goods they buy.”<sup>70</sup> By his estimate, five-sixths of the silver arriving from America went overseas to pay for foreign imports. England’s consul at Cadiz wrote Newcastle in 1738 that if Spain interfered with specie exportation, “they may as well prohibit all further trade from abroad, and order every foreign merchant out of their country, since without that exportation either permitted or connived at, no trade can be carried on with them.”<sup>71</sup> The food crisis in Iberia during the 1730s increased imports, enlarged bullion exports, and greatly concerned policy makers.

Spanish borders were apparently porous, with specie escaping at Corunna, Bilbao, Barcelona, Cadiz, and elsewhere. But, Cadiz was the major bullion export center at which smugglers operated. “Every ship stopping there outward or homeward bound could expect to take aboard some silver bullion.”<sup>72</sup>

The long term underlying hostility of the Iberians toward English resident merchants is amply evident in Anglo-Spanish relations, which reflected an all but constant antipathy. The abandonment of the Asiento agreement at midcentury did lead to a short era of harmony but tighter specie regulations and problems caused by the Anglo-French wars saw pacific attitudes replaced again by clouds of war. Charles III viewed the new conflict as an opportunity to cancel old treaties and regain lost territory, including Gibraltar. Defeats saw those hopes go glimmering.

No references to packet service from Cadiz have been found. Smuggling from there may have involved only naval vessels and regular merchantmen. Spanish specie restrictions tightened again in the 1760s.<sup>73</sup> An English merchant captain had his ship searched at Tenerife in 1765 and was imprisoned, though no money was found. At Malaga, an English vessel attempting to clear faced a customs search. The consul protested this treaty transgression, assuring the authorities that he opposed smuggling but that treaty rights must be preserved. The last years before the American Revolution witnessed a major campaign by Charles III to reduce specie smuggling.<sup>74</sup>

Cadiz money exports went out mainly on Royal Navy vessels and those from Lisbon on the packets or on naval ships. Should he decide to evade the law and ship specie illegally a merchant notified his consul, who usually contacted the captain of a warship or packet. The specie transferal took place to the captain’s hands at the consular office or elsewhere. The bullion, often placed in slings under the clothing of the ship’s officers, could then be carried on board the vessel. Not subject to visitation, the vessel could then proceed to sea. Because merchant’s and consul’s offices were not open to search, the only danger point was at the last moment before sailing, when the specie was moved to the vessel in the harbor. Exportations on board merchant ships involved significantly more risk and usually smaller amounts of specie.<sup>75</sup>

The commercial world of the day in Europe and America was fully aware of the specie drain from Iberia. Newspapers carried numerous references to bullion arrivals in England, as did diplomatic correspondence.

---

69 Geronimo Uztariz, *The Theory and Practice of Commerce and Maritime Affairs*, trans. J. Kippas, 2 vols. (London, 1751), I: 137.

70 *The Mercator* (London), No. 74 (1713), 2; No. 75, 2.

71 Cayley to Newcastle, September 30, 1738, SPFS 94/225.

72 Davis, *Rise of English Shipping*, 230.

73 *PG*, May 7, 1761.

74 Marsh to Shelburne, April 27, 1770, SPFS 94/183.

75 Christelow, “Trades from Cadiz and Lisbon,” 7.

In 1723 a report from London noted that “two Cart Loads of Spanish Gold and Silver, some Coin’d and some in Ingots, were landed at the Tower.”<sup>76</sup> Two naval ships from Lisbon carried treasure, one £137,000 and the other £27,000 sterling in 1728.<sup>77</sup> HMS *Greenwich* brought home “a large Quantity of Silver on Account of The Merchants” of the city ten years later.<sup>78</sup> Such shipments often included the funds of foreign merchants at Lisbon or Cadiz, who also faced specie surpluses. Armed English vessels going home offered Dutch, German, Swedish, and other nationals transferal under diplomatic immunity from search. During wartime, naval units were much safer than merchant vessels or packets. Tyrawley suggested in 1734: “there is not an English Man of Warr homeward bound from almost any Point of the Compass that does not take Lisbon in their Way home...every Body knows that” these vessels “have no other Business in life here but to carry away Money....”<sup>79</sup>

A wagon “guarded by marines” and bearing “chests and barrels of money” arrived at the Bank of England from Lisbon via Deal in 1748. It came in on HMS *Sheariness* “for the use of the merchants of this city.”<sup>80</sup> A year later HMS *Liverpool* carried \$100,000 to London from Cadiz and in 1750 HMS *Blandford* was reported at Portsmouth with ten wagonloads of Lisbon money, valued at £115,000 sterling.<sup>81</sup>

It was widely recognized that there was always a ship at Cadiz for this purpose. Spanish reformers sought to clamp down on this blatant smuggling. August 1768 found a British captain accused of taking out a shipload of silver from Cadiz, only a small part of it registered for export.<sup>82</sup> Tensions rose the next year when four midshipmen and the surgeon’s mate of HMS *Jersey* were taken at Cadiz and imprisoned for specie smuggling. Consul James Harris based his defense on their youthfulness, ignorance of the law, and good birth. Spanish merchants, he claimed, had led them astray. The court released them. In a charade, back in England they were dismissed from the service but reinstated when Spanish authorities intervened on their behalf.<sup>83</sup> Within a year HMS *Pomono* came from Cadiz “with eight tons of money.”<sup>84</sup> In June 1771 “three wagons, guarded by soldiers, loaded with money to the amount of 1,200,000 dollars, brought home from Cadiz by the *Tweed* Frigate arrived at the Bank for the use of the merchants.” *Tweed’s* captain protested to his superiors that he had in fact “brought less money...than expected” and none “illicitly.” He claimed that had he “hearkened to some of the Merchants and suffered the Gentlemen belonging to [his] Ship to have done what (to the scandal of the Navy) has been too generally practis’d I might have put near (if not quite) £500 in my Pocket.”<sup>85</sup>

In early March 1771 the Cadiz consul requested Captain John Moutray of HMS *Emerald* to delay his departure to take on a shipment of silver amounting to 370,000 hard dollars. Captains happily performed such services – for a carrying fee of one percent. As a personal perquisite of the captains, such fees were a welcome additional income and account for the willingness of these men to call at Lisbon, Cadiz, or other ports. Moutray would have pocketed about £850. However, the government’s increasing concern over the

---

76 AWM, November 21, 1723.

77 Tyrawley to Secretary of State, May 30, 1728, SPFP 89/35.

78 NEWJ, November 7, 1738.

79 Tyrawley to Newcastle, September 29, 1734, SPFP 89/37.

80 PG, January 10, 1749.

81 PG, September 14, 1749. BNL, January 11, 1750. John J. McCusker, *Money and Exchange in Europe and America, 1600-1775* (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1978), 10, values a dollar at £0.23 sterling.

82 Gray to Shelburne, August 25, 1768, SPFS 94/180.

83 Harris to Weymouth, October 6, 1769, SPFS 94/182; Weymouth to Admiralty, September 7, 1770, SPFS 94/184.

84 EG, October 23, 1770.

85 EG, August 27, 1771. Collier to Admiralty, June 16, 1771, SPFS 94/187.



flagrancy of this system saw Moutray lose his command for putting into Cadiz against orders.<sup>86</sup>

The Iberians complained bitterly at the constant presence of English warships in their harbors. Grimaldi, the Spanish minister, argued cogently that captains entering Cadiz faced temptation because of “their interested motives.”<sup>87</sup> In that year Spain refused entrance to ships of war because they were “not subject to Visitation,” had carried off large sums of money, and engaged in the contraband trade.<sup>88</sup> No further export licenses were to be issued to English war vessels, and Dutch and French warships were warned to avoid their ports. The English government, not wishing to surrender the right of its ships to visit those harbors, heard the Spanish complaints with some sympathy. Consul Dalrymple at Cadiz predicted that “the money formerly going on His Majesties ships will now go on Merchant ships a more natural Channel, their number by the help of money freights will augment and of consequence more seamen will be employed.”<sup>89</sup> Spain and Britain reached the brink of war in 1772 over the Falkland Islands. The specie export problem contributed to those tensions.

\* \* \*

England’s mail packet system expanded through the North Atlantic world as the eighteenth century progressed. By the 1750s packet vessels even carried mail and passengers to North American and Caribbean ports. Those connecting England and Iberia began operation under the aegis of the Royal Post Office about 1700. Two vessels connected Corunna and Falmouth; others provided fast service to Portugal. Packets, immune from search, carried enough armament to discourage attacks by the Barbary pirates. Scheduled weekly sailings were difficult to maintain. Before 1720 three vessels ran the route to Lisbon; in the later 1750s four served that route, averaging about two entrances and two clearances per month. By the early 1770s five packets made that run. The out passage took just under nine days; they left Lisbon in about twelve days, completing the round voyage in thirty-three days. The packets made Falmouth a major entrepôt for Iberian specie, while naval vessels carried large sums to London and the Channel ports.<sup>90</sup> The service also connected Barcelona with England. Spain searched a packet on that route in 1770, seeking consular dispatches and mercantile correspondence.<sup>91</sup>

From the beginning packets created diplomatic issues by smuggling out specie. As early as 1720 a packet ship was seized at Lisbon for resisting a customs search.<sup>92</sup> By that era it was recognized that specie was exported by “Packett-boats as regularly as they go out.”<sup>93</sup> A report circulated in 1740 that the Spanish had captured a Lisbon packet with “18,000 Moidores and three Wedges of Gold.”<sup>94</sup> When the *Prince Frederick* went aground in Lisbon harbor in 1759, her crew salvaged ten thousand moidores in her boats. King Joseph X, on learning the amount, is said to have commented that: “She was a very poor Packet, indeed.”<sup>95</sup> *Hanover*

---

86 Hardy to Moutray, March 19, 1771; Moutray to Stephens, April 15, 1771; Rochford to Hardy, April 26, 1771, SPFS 94/186.

87 Prince de Masseras to Weymouth, July 26, 1769, SPFS 94/182.

88 *EG*, September 10, 1771.

89 Dalrymple to Rochford, November 8, 1771, SPFS 94/188. *PG*, May 14, 1772; June 9, 1773.

90 *CPR*, April 19, 1757-June 24, 1759; February 10, 1771-June 24, 1776.

91 *EG*, January 29, 1771.

92 Worsley to Stanhope, February 24, 1716; Petition to Worsley, February 18, 1716, SPFP 89/24. Burnett to Cragg, January 15, 1720, SPFP 89/28. Keene to Bedford, January 9, 1750, SPFS 94/137.

93 Tyrawley to Secretary of State, May 30, 1728, SPFP 89/35.

94 *PG*, September 25, 1740, almost £25,000 sterling.

95 Letter of Robert Wood, May 3, 1759, British Museum, Additional Mss. 36807. *CPR*, June 13, 1759.

packet went down in a wintry sea near Padstow on the Channel bound for Falmouth. Divers recovered about £27,000 by fishing the wreck.

Earlier, an officer of the *Hanover* was arrested at Lisbon, carrying 1,400 moedas in gold to be smuggled for English and foreign firms. When a month later customs men tried to halt and search crew members of the *Expedition*, they “being prepared for their attack,” wounded two of them and put the rest to flight. They threw a third officer into the harbor, delighting the sympathetic “Mob,” which repeatedly urged them “to drown the Rascal of a Malsain [informer]” and shouted that “every Man of them deserved to be hanged.” The English seamen then carried the money, 20,000 moidores aboard the *Expedition*. Consul Castries branded the attack an “outrage” and demanded that the official be punished.<sup>96</sup>

In another incident, Humphrey Bunster of the *Hanover* was stopped in the Lisbon streets and later tried and convicted of smuggling. He appealed, arguing that such seizures would destroy all business in the city. London merchants rallied to his support, demanding that the government arrange his release.<sup>97</sup> Again at Lisbon, officials took the mate of the *Expedition* as he approached the harbor, carrying 3,300 moedas. Consul Edward Hay used the defense that having been taken on shore and not in a boat he had broken no laws. He won his release and that of the gold.<sup>98</sup> Government pressure to reduce or halt the smuggling and English insistence on treaty rights created a state of almost constant tension in Iberia, 1750-1775.<sup>99</sup>

\* \* \*

While the great majority of the funds carried off from Iberia went out on naval vessels or packets, a good part of the surplus from sales of American produce cleared out on the vessels importing those goods. Soft data sources show American shippers regularly ordered captains to bring home Spanish or Portuguese monies. As early as 1688 we have a Salem owner instructing his captain to bring “his effects home in pss. 8/8 either pillar, Civill [Seville] or Mexican.”<sup>100</sup> The widespread circulation of Spanish and Portuguese coins in North America testified to this practice. The schooner *Jolly Robin*, as an example, on two voyages to Bilbao in the 1750s took one-third of her returns home in specie.<sup>101</sup>

\* \* \*

How did such large sums of money consistently escape through Iberian outlets, despite government attempts to halt that drainage? Corruption!

The Spanish customs collected such a multiplicity of duties and fees that it has been aptly described as “a financier’s nightmare.” Special duties and taxes placed foreign merchants “at the mercy of the greed, dishonesty, and caprice of individual tax collectors.”<sup>102</sup> Cadiz officials proved notoriously venal. “An organized corps of bullion smugglers” existed there, known as the *metidores*. They were employed by

---

96 Castries to Robinson, June 2, 1755; July 15, 1755, SPFP 89/50.

97 Hay to Pitt, April 2, 1759, SPFP 89/51.

98 Christelow, “Trades from Cadiz and Lisbon,” 26-27.

99 Ibid., 8.

100 William B. Weedon, *The Economic and Social History of New England, 1620-1789*, 2 vols. (Boston, 1890), I: 384.

101 “Schooner *Jolly Robin*’s Book of Acco’ts for Voyages as Settled by Daniel Staniford,” BL, Heard Collection, AQ1.

102 McLachlan, *Trade and Peace*, 21.

merchants to carry off the money.<sup>103</sup> They were members of the customs service. Depending on the degree of risk involved, they collected fees based on a percentage of the value smuggled. Since the official rate for exporting money was three percent, it was cheaper to pay them than apply for an export license, which was time consuming and might be rejected. With the *metidores* no risk was involved.<sup>104</sup> Honest merchants, who rejected their services, chanced delays by the disappointed and now overly precise customs agents. The English complained of arbitrary Cadiz customs men “stopping and searching in the most violent and indecent manner our Merchants and Masters of Ships.”<sup>105</sup> In one case, French smugglers, bypassing the *metidores*, had their vessel fired on by the Cadiz batteries until the smuggler caught fire and blew up.<sup>106</sup>

Portuguese officials were equally as corrupt. When they apprehended Humphrey Bunster of the *Hanover* for smuggling in 1755, the consul reported to London that the merchant involved had been approached for a bribe and, when it was refused, the seizure occurred. Consul Castries claimed that paying the revenue collectors five, ten, or even twenty moedas based on the size of the shipment involved “only served to encourage them more.”<sup>107</sup> Bunster was released but the money was confiscated and divided, half to the Crown and half to the officer making the seizure. The venality of the officials helps explain the battle between the crew of the *Expedition* and the customs officers six weeks later.

\* \* \*

English diplomats in Iberia were in a difficult position. With the whole system dedicated to encouraging the illegal outflow of gold and silver to England, they had no choice but to connive in the smuggling and, if those engaged in it were caught, to protect and defend them. Since most of the English consuls were merchants as well, they had a vested interest in the success of these smuggling operations. At the same time they had to pay lip service to the desires of the local governments to halt it. The Lisbon consul in 1715 gave asylum to a captain accused of smuggling; arranged bond for him and had his vessel released; even planned his escape should the King refuse a pardon for this capital offense.<sup>108</sup> When their associates fell afoul of the law the consuls presented their treaty rights as a defense. Before midcentury they often claimed those accused were unaware of their illegal actions, and Iberian officials often accepted such spurious excuses. The reform era changed that indulgent attitude, and from the mid-1760s onward officials became less forgiving as the governments seriously sought to halt the specie drain. In the 1760s the Spanish even refused to recognize William Pasley as consul at Tenerife because his firm had a reputation for smuggling.<sup>109</sup>

English ambassadors, one step removed from the problem, could be more sympathetic to Iberian wishes. During the negotiation of the treaty in 1750, Spain abandoned claims to visits aboard packets, accepting them “in all respects as His Majesty’s Ships of War.”<sup>110</sup> In return diplomat Keene, perhaps tongue in cheek,

---

103 Ibid., 14. Corruption had been rife at Cadiz even in the seventeenth century. Cf. Albert Girard, *La Rivalité Commerciale et Maritime entre Séville et Cadiz jusque la Fin du XVIII<sup>e</sup> Siècle* (Paris, 1932).

104 Jean Baptiste Labat, *Voyages du P. Labat en Espagne et en Italie, 1705-1706*, 2 vols. (Amsterdam, 1731), I: 151-152.

105 Grey to Weymouth, January 2, 1769, SPFS 94/181.

106 Labat, *Voyages du Labat*, I: 151-152, 195.

107 Board of Trade to Shelburne, March 10, 1767, SPFP 89/64; Hay to Pitt, April 2, 1759, SPFP 89/51; Castries to Robinson, July 15, 1755, SPFP 89/50.

108 Worsley to Stanhope, November 16, 1715, SPFP 89/23.

109 Grimaldi to Rochford, November 4, 1765, SPFS 94/172.

110 Keene to Bedford, January 9, 1750 and enclosure, SPFS 94/137.

promised packet officers would “guard against illicit trade” and that all malefactors would be harshly punished.<sup>111</sup> The Spanish had complained about smuggling aboard the Corunna packet. When peace came in 1763, the packet *Countess of Leicester* arrived to reestablish the service and was denied admittance. The leading pre-war smuggler had returned as her captain. As a result, bullion exports from Corunna declined sharply and English entries there fell off by eighty percent. This, to the chagrin of Consul James Banks, whose salary depended on consular duties collected from the British shipping arriving there.<sup>112</sup>

Periodically English diplomats counseled merchants, naval officers, and packet captains to be more circumspect in their actions. In one instance, Consul Hay at Lisbon complained that problems arose over gold exports because of merchants’ indiscretion “in the manner of doing their Business in general much to publicly and sometimes to the imprudence of the Captains of the packets when they have effects about them in not taking a proper time to go to their Boats.”<sup>113</sup> He urged the Postmaster General to warn packet captains to be more judicious in their actions.

The tendency of English newspapers to report the arrival of specie shipments by naval transport or packetship remained a recurring problem. Quite early in the century William Poyntz, Lisbon consul, complained about the lack of discretion concerning gold shipments, noting that reports in the British press were reprinted at Lisbon, arousing recriminations against English merchants there. A later consul returned to the same theme in 1749, insisting that news on money shipments should not be printed. Nonetheless, widespread interest in the bullion inflow led to publication.<sup>114</sup>

English officials in London and Iberia guarded their references to smuggling. Even official correspondence could be compromised. The Board of Trade’s “Report on Trade with Portugal” in 1767 discreetly commented: “The Nature of our Commerce with Portugal is so well understood as not to need any particular Discussion.”<sup>115</sup> In fact, the drainage of American bullion through Iberia to the northern nations was universally recognized as an economic fact of life in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. It was so “well understood” among commercial leaders in North America “as not to need any particular Discussion.”

\* \* \*

Estimating the extent of annual bullion and coin shipments to England from Iberia in these years is most difficult. One contemporary newspaper suggested it reached a million pounds sterling in the late 1760s, an acceptable figure in the light of other information.<sup>116</sup> H.E.S. Fisher’s study of trade with Portugal provides data for bullion exports from Lisbon to Falmouth aboard the packets for a number of years between 1740 and 1769. His data deal with exports from Lisbon and only via the packet system, including diamonds and precious stones. Only in 1740-1741 and 1762, when England fought with Spain, did inflows fall below a half million pounds sterling, years when bullion shipments on naval vessels would have been more common. Obviously, if one includes specie from Spanish territory, total imports must have been more than double those entering by Falmouth packets. The early 1750s had witnessed exceptionally large English wheat shipments to Iberia because of a drought there.<sup>117</sup>

---

111 Ibid.

112 Banks to Shelburne, January 27, 1768, SPFS 94/179.

113 Hay to Shelburne, March 25, 1767, SPFP 89/63.

114 Poyntz to Stanhope, March 10, 1716 SPFP 89/24; Russell to Aldworth, September 28, 1749, SPFP 89/47.

115 Board of Trade to Shelburne, March 10, 1767, CO 389/92.

116 *PG*, October 18, 1770.

117 Crowle to Cleveland, May 29, 1753, Letters from British Consuls, ADM 1/3833.

**TABLE 2-1**  
**Bullion Imports by Packet, 1740-1769**

1740-41	£ 447,347	1764	£1,186,714
1757	1,500,000	1765	631,081
1759	787,290	1766	906,286
1760	1,085,559	1767	813,370
1761	548,532	1768	930,461
1762	286,099	1769	902,456
1763	693,676		

Sources: Fisher, “Anglo-Portuguese Trade” (PhD diss.), 51, 184, 224, 230. Bourgoing, *Travels of Duke de Châtelet*, 276, estimated that between 1759 and 1772 the packets brought imports worth £9,319,938 sterling. Data for 1740-1741 cover March 1740 through June 1741.

Foreign merchants often preferred to transfer their funds on efficient and relatively safe packets or on the even more secure naval ships. Fisher suggests that about two-thirds of the specie going to England was the property of British merchants and the remainder that of foreigners. Partly as a consequence of these solid transferal mechanisms and of foreign dependence on them, Europe’s central depository for specie gradually shifted from Amsterdam to London.<sup>118</sup>

If total imports of Iberian treasure ranged at about two million pounds and one third of it was owned by foreigners, then England’s portion was well over a million pounds. After 1766, when English grain exports declined sharply, a large part of those incoming funds resulted from sales of American produce. More than half of that paid for wheat, flour, and corn from the grain colonies; a smaller part, perhaps thirty-five percent, bought Newfoundland and New England fish; about ten percent arose from disposal of Carolina rice there; and the rest from lumber, staves, and miscellaneous goods. Data from James Shepherd and Gary Walton’s study and the Inspector General’s Report, 1768-1772, are based on the value of these exports before leaving North America, while the prices for wine and salt imported are set at their value on arrival in America. Even by this method a very significant balance on the American side remains, £454,346 per year.<sup>119</sup> Given the advanced price of these goods in southern Europe and lower costs for salt and wine bought there, the balance probably reached a million pounds sterling or more, plus freight charges.<sup>120</sup>

Mercantilism as practiced by both Spain and Portugal presumed that the Indies treasure could be immured in Iberia despite the laws of economics. Bullion, undervalued in Iberia and overvalued elsewhere, moved immutably north.<sup>121</sup>

This “prohibitive system” caused the decadence of industry and increasing poverty. By mid-seventeenth century it had been discredited. The treaty rights arranged and jealously guarded by the northern Europeans recognized and accepted conditions in the real world: “export prohibitions were powerless to impound”

---

118 Fisher, “Anglo-Portuguese Trade” (PhD diss.), 230ff. Christelow, “Trades from Cadiz and Lisbon,” 19, 28.

119 Shepherd and Walton, *Shipping, Maritime Trade*, Table 4, Table 7.

120 *PG*, October 18, 1770.

121 Vives, *Historia social y economica*, IV: 42.

bullion “in the face of an adverse trade balance.”<sup>122</sup> Bullion smuggling continued because governments change unproductive policies with snail-like speed. The reform era of the enlightened mercantilist monarchs after 1740 failed to control specie movements “through the balance of trade.”<sup>123</sup> Reformers tried to strip away the special treaty provisions protecting smuggling. Even the long sufferance accorded corrupt officials apparently had reached its limits by the early 1770s. Late in 1771 Consul Dalrymple reported a crackdown on the *metidores*. A “number of decent People known to get their livelyhood by running money on board foreign men of war [were] sent for and banisht fifteen leagues from the Sea Coast.”<sup>124</sup>

\* \* \*

American commercial letter books of the eighteenth century, and hard data as well, demonstrate that the basic purpose of the trade to southern Europe was to dispose of surplus foodstuffs there in order to build credits in merchant ledgers there. Then, those credits in specie or bills of exchange went “home” to England on the packets and naval vessels. The treaty rights and privileges of English merchants in Lisbon, Cadiz, and other ports allowed those transfers despite local laws to the contrary. Anne Bezanson, writing of Philadelphia’s economy, suggested that as early as the 1730s “approximately one third of the trade with southern Europe might be said to have facilitated the settlement for British imports.”<sup>125</sup> Traffic with the West Indies, on the other hand, nearly balanced. By trade to Iberia the colonials remitted payments to Britain. Whether in fish from the northern colonies, or in grain from the middle colonies and Quebec, or in South Carolina rice, the nature and purpose of that trade was certainly well understood. According to the Inspector General’s data, 1768-1772, in an average year 545 vessels cleared North American ports for southern Europe. Almost eighty percent of them went to four major centers there: Lisbon, 165 vessels; Cadiz, 131 vessels; Bilbao, 78 ships; Barcelona, 58.<sup>126</sup>

In these export trades, North American merchants “had the advantages of being on the spot and so able to judge market needs and product quality.”<sup>127</sup> Just before the Revolution this trade flourished. As a result, the choking restrictions of tight money eased and rapid economic growth resulted.<sup>128</sup> Those American cities that led in developing this trade, notably Salem and Philadelphia, enjoyed exceptional prosperity.

---

122 Hamilton, “Spanish Mercantilism,” 239.

123 Ibid.

124 Dalrymple to Rockford, November 8, 1771, SPFS 94/188.

125 Bezanson, Gray, and Hussey, *Prices in Colonial Pennsylvania*, 29.

126 “Inspector General’s Report on American Trade, 1768-1772,” CO 16/1.

127 George Rogers Taylor, “American Economic Growth before 1800: An Explanatory Essay.” *JEH* XXIV (1964): 436.

128 Bezanson, Gray, and Hussey, *Prices in Colonial Pennsylvania*, 316, 325-327.

## CHAPTER III

### ENGLISH MERCHANTS IN IBERIA

Treaties between England and the Iberian nations negotiated between 1603 and 1750 granted and then confirmed special privileges to English merchants residing in the ports of southern Europe. Portugal surrendered those advantages in exchange for a military alliance supporting her independence. England won them from Spain by naval and military victories and then by adroit diplomatic negotiations. In both cases they proved costly sacrifices, guaranteeing, as they did, extraordinary independence to English nationals. Both nations resented the powerful and commercially dominating English. The treaties allowed those merchants to export bullion or transfer credits to England. Lisbon and Cadiz became major centers for illegal exports, but other ports swelled the river of bullion also. North American merchants were well aware of the advantages of this system and sought to share in it.

\* \* \*

Lisbon-bound vessels from North America raised Cape Roxant, skirted the sand bar called North Catchup, and entered the Tagus River by either the Little or Great Passage under pilotage. They bypassed Cascais and dropped anchor off Belem Castle in a depth of about ten fathoms, then entered “pratique,” by sending a smallboat to the customs house there. Three customs men came aboard at each vessel’s expense, until all duties were assessed and paid. A local consignee handled the cargo sales. Normally, settlement of accounts for the goods allowed two, four, or six-month windows before interest might be charged against outstanding balances. Merchants overseeing the sales assisted vessel captains in other ways. They arranged purchase of return cargoes and their insurance; advanced funds to departing captains; remitted the proceeds from sales to merchant houses in England; sought charters for empty vessels; or even arranged their sale at the owners’ directions. For all these services they charged commissions.

Returns on sales in southern Europe could be made in several ways. First, a direct exchange of goods for goods saw wheat, flour, corn, pipe staves, fish, beeswax, and other miscellaneous goods exchanged for salt, wine, and sundry Iberian products. American imports usually exceeded in value exports from there, so credits remained in Lisbon ledgers. When trade flourished American entries often cleared in ballast, since demand in America was limited. Large shipments could depress American salt and wine prices. Excess credits could be transferred with specie export permits or specie could be smuggled out on the vessel. Usually, since the purpose of the trade was credit transferal to England, bullion went to English merchant houses on naval vessels or packets. Commonly a small portion went aboard the clearing vessel; the majority of the excess funds went to England in bullion or bills and some of the proceeds bought salt, Lisbon wines, olives, capers, or citrus fruits.

Studies of Anglo-Portuguese trade indicate three other means of returning the excess funds. Some Portuguese or Spanish wines and fruit went to England. The proceeds of English sales could then be drawn on to pay bills there. Iberian credits also bought real estate or businesses there, or payments could be made to a third country. One author, however, argues that these alternatives were rarely utilized, though English merchants there did extend credit facilities to their Iberian buyers. Nonetheless, the bulk of the overage was regularly settled in bullion.<sup>1</sup> Those dispatching cargoes to Iberia insisted upon “speedy remittance,” an

---

1 Fisher, “Anglo-Portuguese Trade” (PhD diss.), 175. Fisher indicates that silver could be exported under license, but not gold. Yet the *Indulto* of 1755 seems to have included both gold and silver. *PG*, April

almost constant refrain by American suppliers to agents in Lisbon and elsewhere. On occasion, pressed by English creditors, those shipping goods there required exceptionally rapid returns. In 1764, for instance, Caleb Jones sent a partial cargo to Parr & Bulkeley at Lisbon, who were to estimate its value at once and arrange a transfer, Jones being “in great want of Money in England.”<sup>2</sup> In return he paid the Lisbon firm interest on the money until they sold his goods.

As the eighteenth century passed, Lisbon came to be *a*, if not *the*, major outlet of goods purveyed from Philadelphia or other ports of North America. “At Lisbon, Vessels meet with much better Dispatch than at Cadiz,” wrote Stocker and Wharton of Philadelphia in 1773.<sup>3</sup> Vessels usually cleared from there in twelve to sixteen days, while at Cadiz it took four to six weeks or longer. When trade to Iberia peaked, as in 1738-1741, 1753-1754, and after 1766, salt and wine entering Philadelphia flooded the market and many clearing to America went “en lastro,” in ballast, to provide stability. For instance, in 1753 John Reynell ordered a captain to “Get the Vessel well Ballasted with good White and Clean Salt but don’t make her deep.”<sup>4</sup> Salt was always cheap at Lisbon or down the coast at Setubal. To the 1720s Setubal was a popular source of salt but by 1750 was rarely used. Possibly pilotage and extra port costs made it too expensive compared to Lisbon. When an American vessel brought home only salt, or when it came in ballast, almost all the funds from sales could have been remitted direct to America but such transfer mechanisms did not exist. Furthermore, Americans were in debt to English creditors. So the ships went home empty or with a cheap salt lading and the surplus went to England. Low prices for salt and wine at Philadelphia during these years support this view for the two earlier periods, and commercial data sent to England by Lisbon consuls do as well. Shipping reports in *Com Privilegio Real* solidly document it for the later years.<sup>5</sup>

\* \* \*

Cadiz, located about sixty miles northwest of Gibraltar, was the most important coastal city in Spain after 1717. Situated on a narrow, rocky point of land, that year it became the point of deposit for all goods arriving from Spanish America. Its sheltered harbor made it a natural and major port of call for Mediterranean shipping. The English factory there issued instructions to be followed by arriving British vessels.<sup>6</sup>

On entering, vessels hoisted a signal indicating readiness for “practique.” No boat could be sent ashore or to another vessel and no one could board the arriving ship until health inspection had been completed and “Practick” granted.<sup>7</sup> Customs guards then boarded. Within three days English captains must proceed to the consulate with their Mediterranean Pass to be registered. Failure to do so meant that no customs manifest could be entered nor any clearance given. All English vessels submitted a “clear and full manifest,” as required by Parliament, delivered to the consul or his deputy, and swore to its accuracy. Then, on deliverance of their “Contribution” or consulage fees, clearance would be given.

---

4, 1754. Cf. H.E.S. Fisher, “Anglo-Portuguese Trade, 1700-1770.” *EHR* XVI (1963-4): 219-233.

2 Letter to Parr & Bulkeley, April 30, 1764, Thomas Riche “Letter Book, 1764-1771,” HSP.

3 Stocker and Wharton to Champlin, June 18, 1773, *Commerce of Rhode Island 1726-1800*, Collections of MHS, LXIX, LXX. (Boston, 1914-1915), LXIX: 441.

4 Letter to Downell, October 26, 1753, John Reynell, “Letter Book, 1752-1754,” HSP.

5 Bezanson, Gray, and Hussey, *Prices in Colonial Pennsylvania*, 431-432. *CPR*, 1757-1766. In 1766 salt sold at Philadelphia forty percent lower than at New York. Tables A-4.

6 Hardy to Porten, March 12, 1771, “Instructions to be Observed by the Masters of all British Ships and Vessels in the Merch’t Service arriving in the Bay of Cadiz,” SPFS 94/186.

7 Rochford to Halifax, May 28, 1764, SPFS 94/167.



No crew member could be discharged without the consul's consent. All wages had to be paid as English law required. No goods could be transferred from vessel to vessel except by permission of the customs men, on penalty of confiscation and/or imprisonment. Ballast could be loaded or unloaded only with proper license. Foreign tobacco on board was limited to that "absolutely necessary for the Use of the Ship's Company." No cards, soap, sealing wax, "or a Sharp pointed Knife" might be carried ashore on penalty of loss or imprisonment.

Five hard dollars or gold equivalent could be taken on shore by a shipmaster only once daily through the "Gates" to the city and any excess even by a dollar made the whole open to confiscation without redress and, if a lot more, to confinement and to the same penalty as a Spaniard, subject to severe penalties under Article XV of the Anglo-Spanish treaty. Seamen could carry no money ashore and no gold or silver, wrought or unwrought, could be carried out of the city gates without a Crown order. No foreign money could be brought out without a customs permit. The instructions concluded: "All persons whatsoever, subjects of His Britannick Majesty, are strictly charged and enjoined not to offend against the Treaties subsisting between the two Nations."<sup>8</sup> Presumably the same kinds of instructions applied throughout Iberia, though Spanish and Portuguese regulations doubtless differed subtly. Concern over the entrance or clearance of specie is very notable. Yet bullion smuggling was endemic.

While ship captains were responsible for their men and for obedience to the trade regulations, resident merchants oversaw the landing and disposal of cargoes. Consignment trading expanded markedly during the eighteenth century, and that was the role of factory members, who saw to the myriad problems connected to arriving cargoes: measuring, warehousing, transporting, and selling the cargoes; evaluating losses en route; handling insurance claims; seeking and satisfying buyers; and arranging goods transferal. Captains needed aid in making repairs, renewing rigging and canvas, and reprovioning. Merchants had to be familiar with customs regulations and fee payments.<sup>9</sup>

Return cargoes had to be sought, goods measured and delivered, lighterage arranged, clearances negotiated, and fees satisfied. A vessel's captain might be flattered, counseled, and entertained all at the same time. American correspondents might be encouraged with a gift of choice wine, some macaroons, or other exotic viands. Possibly a lovely mantilla or a "singing bird" went aboard for the owner's wife or daughter. These duties were accompanied by a blizzard of paperwork: ledger entries of debits and credits; invoices and cockets of various kinds; letters dispatched to owners or insurance agents. Accounts were kept by bookkeepers, scratch-scratching on their high stools, surrounded by the redolent or offensive odors of trade.

For these complex services agents in these southern European ports earned their fees. At Bilbao the firms of the Gardoquis and Lynch, Kelly, Kelly & Moroney; at Barcelona earlier the Harris Brothers and later Miller & Forrester or else Greene, Ford & Hull; at Alicante the firm of Wombwell, Coxon & Wombwell, or Fletcher, Road & Co.; at Cadiz Macky & Smith during the 1730s and, on the eve of the Revolution, Bewickes, Timerman & Co., or Duff & Welch; while at Lisbon Parr & Bulkeley or Mayne, Burn & Mayne, or Thomas Horne – all these firm members, accompanied by their families, resided in Iberian cities over this century.

Occasionally agents could take advantage of an error in judgment by government officials. In 1715, when the *Alentejo* was caught bullion smuggling, the chief customs officer at Lisbon failed to put guards aboard

---

8 Hardy to Porten, March 12, 1771, "Instructions to be Observed by the Masters of all British Ships and Vessels in the Merch't Service arriving in the Bay of Cadiz," SPFS 94/186.

9 Stuart Bruchey, "Success and Failure in Foreign Trade," *Business History Review* XXXII: 280.

her, perhaps by design. Her agents at once removed specie not yet found on her.<sup>10</sup> Consignment agents aided captains in a variety of ways, being familiar with “practique” etiquette. They knew local officials and the folderol of health inspections and methods for disposing of damaged goods. They might arrange a bribe to venal customs officials when possible and desirable. Pombal significantly tightened controls over the quality of food entering. Previously, generally in Iberia, spoiled foods had been donated to charitable organizations for the poor or sold to them at nominal prices. Now, in Portugal, such food was “thrown into the sea and great quantities of stinking and rotten salt fish with which death itself [had been] sold to those poor wretches was ‘properly disposed of.’”<sup>11</sup>

Tobacco sales had been traditionally a government monopoly there and foreign imports banned. Despite the limits listed in the “Instructions,” tobacco remained a problem: “it is not surprising that the Guards are strict in searching these Ships, there being always found a much larger Quantity of Tobacco on board than the Company can consume in Years.”<sup>12</sup> Crew members had to be watched carefully to halt smuggling that might result in seizure.<sup>13</sup> Yet, there was relatively little smuggling of American goods. Cargoes of Central American logwood in rare instances created difficulties in Spain but, overall, few incidents arose over the entrance of North American goods illegally.

American merchants provided their captains and agents detailed directions for their voyages and on activities at Lisbon, Cadiz, Corunna, or Barcelona. A long voyage, however, placed both captains and agents beyond the purview of the owners. Market conditions might change abruptly. Directions could not foresee problems in advance. Thus, masters and agents had wide discretion with the caveat that errors in judgment or lack of responsibility could result in a captain’s dismissal or an agent’s damaged reputation.

Market timing was most important. Overseas agents understood normal fluctuations in supply and demand. At Cadiz and Lisbon the departure and arrival of fleets from Spanish America or Brazil impacted the marketing of American cargoes. Those fleets had to be victualled for their crews and also took considerable amounts of flour, salt cod, and other comestibles. Parr & Bulkeley wrote from Lisbon, in 1761, to Thomas Clifford that there was little flour at market. The Rio de Janeiro fleet had sailed the previous week and cleaned out the city’s supply.<sup>14</sup> Three years later they wrote again that a “cargo of good flour in clean Barrels arriving in Lisbon just before the Rio de Janeiro fleet sales in June or July would sell at a good profit.”<sup>15</sup> As with the Spanish flotas, the Portuguese in 1690 had required the Brazil fleet to sail from Lisbon and home from Brazil at specific periods of the year, allowing for market timing. However, the system was abandoned by Pombal in 1765.<sup>16</sup>

The arrival of the fleet from Brazil affected the trade since it carried home gold and precious stones important for the transfer of funds to northern Europe. One correspondent wrote in July 1764 from Lisbon: “Money is extremely scarce here,” as the court awaited “with Great Impatience” the arrival of the fleet from Rio.<sup>17</sup> The clearance and return of Spanish fleets at Cadiz had a like effect on trade there. The flour and salt fish consumption of the fleet and the supplies shipped to Spanish America raised market requirements.

---

10 Worsley to Stanhope, November 16, 1715, SPFP 89/23.

11 Lyttleton to Shelburne, July 21, 1768, SPFP 89/65.

12 Coxon to Porten, July 13, 1765, SPFS 94/171.

13 Byron Fairchild, *Messrs. William Pepperrell* (Ithaca, N.Y. 1954), 190-191.

14 Parr & Bulkeley to Thomas Clifford, December 8, 1761, Clifford “Correspondence,” III, HSP.

15 Parr & Bulkeley to Thomas Clifford, February 6, 1764, Clifford “Correspondence,” IV.

16 C.R. Boxer, *The Golden Age of Brazil, 1695-1750* (Berkeley, Calif., 1962), 316-320.

17 Letter to Parr & Bulkeley, April 29, 1766, Riche “Letter Book, 1764-1771.” Cf. Mayne, Burn & Mayne to Samuel Galloway, July 5, 1764, Galloway “Letters, 1760-1768,” Galloway, Maxey, Markoe Family Papers, 1654-1768, Library of Congress.

Treasure shipments from the mines in America in the same way made specie and bullion readily available for export.<sup>18</sup>

Consignment agents in Iberia kept up a steady correspondence with principals overseas. Mayne & Co. in 1763 informed Samuel Galloway at Annapolis that Lisbon wheat prices were unsteady due to a glutted market and because they had no information on the new crop.<sup>19</sup> Parr & Bulkeley forwarded information to American firms on prices of wheat from America, France, Sicily, and local sources.<sup>20</sup> Shipped in December, late winter, or early spring, American wheat usually found a good market, since local supplies were not available until July.<sup>21</sup> North American codfish came to market in good time for the fasting periods in Advent or Lent.

Iberian products also bowed to seasonal schedules. Lisbon salt, evaporated by summer heat, completed its precipitation by late July and scarcity was replaced by plenty in August, when it was “much cheaper.”<sup>22</sup> Obviously, fruit and wine were plentiful following harvest seasons.

The Lisbon *franquia* system gave captains the advantage of testing market prices without committing to duties or port charges. Merchants sending ships there warned captains to take advantage of it in order to have the “choice to accept the price offer’d or goe further.”<sup>23</sup> *Franquia* rules allowed storage ashore for up to three months without paying duties. Also part of a cargo could be sold and then the vessel could proceed.<sup>24</sup>

Ship captains, as constantly directed by owners, carefully avoided escalating port charges, often utilizing techniques like that used by Captain Larken Dodge of the Salem brig *Magna Carta*. He had his vessel stand off and on at Madeira, while he went ashore in a smallboat “to enquire the Markets” there.<sup>25</sup>

Resident merchants remained alert to assure that their treaty rights were protected. Any alteration in the duties or fees charged, or in the traditional manner of marketing imports, brought vociferous protests. Very rarely did changes meet endorsement. The English did accept the Spanish requirement that all foreign merchants register and declare their allegiances, since that forced the Irish merchants to stop shifting their citizenship claims back and forth between Spain and England.<sup>26</sup>

Official correspondence with London is filled with complaints by merchants in Iberia about their hardships. In 1709 the Portuguese factory at Lisbon catalogued a litany of issues. Vessels had been lost because the dock for unloading fish was too dangerous. Fish carriers, without charter party agreements, had to unload at Lisbon or leave at once. Englishmen selling fish and pipe staves “up country” had to buy special licenses not required of the locals. Customs and health officials forced payment of “about forty Dozen of Fish” or else clearances were delayed. When shortages occurred, cargoes had to be sold at fixed prices in the public market.<sup>27</sup>

---

18 McLachlan, *Trade and Peace*, 25. Delves and Duff to Dalrymple, August 13, 1772, SPFS 94/191.

19 Mayne, Burn & Mayne to Samuel Galloway, September 17, 1763, Galloway, “Letters.”

20 Parr & Bulkeley to Thomas Clifford, November 10, 1765; August 26, 1765, Clifford “Correspondence,” IV.

21 Williams and Co. to Champlin, November 1, 1773, *Commerce of Rhode Island*, LXIX: 458.

22 Parr & Bulkeley to Thomas Clifford, May 10, 1764, Clifford “Correspondence,” IV.

23 Parr & Bulkeley to Thomas Clifford, February 6, 1764, *ibid.*

24 Fisher, “Anglo-Portuguese Trade” (PhD diss.), 129.

25 *EG*, January 10, 1769. Letter to Captain John Davidson, May 6, 1764, Riche “Letter Book, 1764-1771,” ordered him to follow the same practice at Fayal.

26 Rochford to Halifax, January 1, 1764, SPFS 94/166. An enclosure identified English allegiance. Cf. Rochford to Halifax, September 17, 1764, SPFS 94/168.

27 “A Representation from the Portugal Merchants,” November 23, 1709, SPFP 89/89.

These and other disputes arose, were diplomatically settled, then reappeared phoenixlike again; many doubtless caused by petty and arbitrary decisions by corrupt officials. However, English insistence on absolute adherence to the regulations and trading methods in use for a hundred years contributed to them also. Iberians smarted at the position of vassalage in which the treaties placed them. When frictions arose, normal tensions heightened. After 1750, during the era of enlightened reforms, when the “old ways” came under attack, they rose sharply. The break with the past raised a storm of complaints from English merchants in residence.

The Iberian leaders tried to lower food costs by forcing importers to sell their goods at public markets in the major cities. English factories at Lisbon, Cadiz, and Barcelona protested bitterly. The English had opposed this approach as early as 1715 because selling directly to the market removed the protection of their agents.<sup>28</sup> A major crisis arose over this issue in 1753, which led to a direct confrontation between the English merchants and Portuguese government officials.<sup>29</sup> The latter evidently suspected that the English merchants were in collusion with local millers, who usually converted the wheat into “Flour, in order to be sent to the Brasils, and the rest of the Portuguese Possessions in America.”<sup>30</sup> The millers faced charges of monopolization in times of scarcity and the English merchants were thus involved peripherally.<sup>31</sup>

After the great Lisbon earthquake, the government fixed all prices on provisions, wages, and rents to halt profiteering. All vessels entering with provisions were forced to unload there. Sales, duty free, were made at levels current before the crisis, resulting in a chorus of protests from English merchants. As shortages continued, in 1758, the government bought grain for the public warehouse at fixed prices. Six years later, when local crops failed, Pombal detained all grain carriers in port despite *franquia* rights. When the market became glutted, importers bemoaned the loss of fine prices available in Spain and Italy. Pombal, they claimed, had justified his actions based on a decree “never heard of before.”<sup>32</sup>

Protests over changes running counter to treaty rights continued, carrying over to the mid-1760s, with wheat carriers detained and *franquia* rights denied. By tradition, local grain had been sold through the public warehouse, the *terreiro*, which had been destroyed in 1755. When rebuilt in 1765, the government insisted *all* grain be sold there. Importers balked, arguing that grain entering had always been sold aboard ship “where the country people” could buy it cheaply.<sup>33</sup> Attempts to claim the *franquia* right and sail to another market saw officials announce that Lisbon was not a free port and that vessels could clear only if forced in in distress. The English consul countered with the claim that vessels had always been allowed a two-day grace period to decide whether to unload or proceed.<sup>34</sup>

These Portuguese changes had long-term impacts on the grain trade. Wheat entering had to be deposited in the central granary. Stored in sacks, it could not be given “either the air or the motion requisite to its preservation from damp & heat or, the consequences of the two, vermin.”<sup>35</sup> When sold, the buyer had to accept the grain delivered. Prices were fixed by the *terreiro* proprietors. When supplies were short, prices remained static. Inferior grain often sold at high prices.

Consul John Hort, reporting to London, noted that “the corn of Great Britain and the British colonys

---

28 Shillington and Chapman, *Commercial Relations*, 243.

29 Castries to Holderness, September 6, 1753, SPFP 89/48.

30 Castries to Anzard, September 22, 1753, *ibid*.

31 Castries to Anzard, October 6, 1753; November 26, 1753, *ibid*.

32 Hay to Pitt, January 30, 1758, SPFP 89/51. *PG*, June 28, 1764, quoting a London report of April 12, 1764. Ibbetson’s “Memorial on Lisbon Trade,” 1765, Correspondence of the Board of Trade, CO 388/95.

33 Hort to Lyttleton, October 8, 1768, SPFP 89/66.

34 Hay to Conway, June 28, 1766, SPFP 89/62.

35 Hort to Lyttleton, October 8, 1768, SPFP 89/66.

being moister and of a lower texture than that of more southern produce, is more liable to the mischiefs of a confined situation.”<sup>36</sup> Under these burdens grain now sold for up to twenty percent less than if sold privately. Previously, most American grain had been shipped in bulk. Pennsylvania merchants believed that sacking grain would be “a needless Expence.”<sup>37</sup> The new Lisbon policy meant that this additional “needless Expence” was on top of a reduced price because of the *terreiro* system. An early economic historian, reviewing a Lisbon voyage by Captain Richard Derby in 1768, wrote: “In Lisbon too, American grain was in sale so dilatory and precarious by some late laws, injurious to the trade of Great Britain and her colonies, that it required a year to turn a cargo of 5,000 bushels. Such hindrance in a warm climate was a virtual prohibition of trade in the article.”<sup>38</sup>

Initially the merchants appealed for aid to the royal government. They caviled at the lack of storage space at the public warehouse and that payment there was made only in copper coins. Twenty-five factory members signed this petition. Pombal answered by providing further storage and payment in gold.<sup>39</sup> Specific complaints referred to American cargoes from Pennsylvania, Maryland, and Virginia, consigned to major merchant houses.<sup>40</sup>

An unrelenting Pombal insisted that sales continue through the public granary. Higher grain prices had resulted from increases in population, shortfalls in Iberian production, and declining English exports, with heavy impact on the lower classes. During summer 1769, Lyttleton requested Pombal’s answer to English protests, threatening to halt grain exports to Portugal. The minister brusquely replied that he was confident that the English would not abandon such a “lucrative trade.”<sup>41</sup> American shippers reacted by sending significantly more flour to Lisbon than before 1769. Shipments of grain to Barcelona rose at about the same time.

American trade data, 1768-1772, show little decline in exports to southern Europe.

**TABLE 3-1**  
**North American Exports, 1768-1772**

	<b>Wheat (bushels)</b>	<b>Flour (barrels)</b>
1768	430,529	74,495
1769	862,924	241,679
1770	588,561	212,513
1771	371,310	141,436
1772	415,433	206,072

Source: CO 16/1, as reported by Shepherd and Walton, *Shipping, Maritime Trade*, Table 4, 220-222. Flour is converted based on 11.48 barrels per ton.

Wheat shipments, except for the famine years, 1769 and 1770, remained near the level of 1768, but flour exports rose.

36 Ibid.

37 Letter to Simpson, May 16, 1728, in Samuel Powell “Letter Book, II (1727-1739),” HSP.

38 Weeden, *Economic and Social History*, II: 759.

39 Lyttleton to Shelburne, October 3, 1768; Hort to Shelburne, October 8, 1768, SPFP 89/66.

40 Ibid. The four cargoes, 17,526.5 bushels, sold for approximately £4,879, at 5.57s. per bushell. They were consigned to Moylan and Forrest, Parr & Bulkeley, and Thomas Horne

41 Lyttleton to Weymouth, October 11, 1769, SPFP 89/69.

When American shippers switched to flour, the Portuguese took a new tack, requiring all flour sales be handled by city brokers, despite vehement factory opposition.<sup>42</sup> His angry opposition saw Dennis Connell of Connell and Moroney, a respected Lisbon firm, imprisoned in 1770 for refusing to accept the new law.<sup>43</sup> The shift to flour importing may have been partly a natural evolution. Shortly, a Portuguese official complained “that the Merchants [had] lately got into the Trade of importing great Quantities of Flour,” which “reduced the livelihoods of Portuguese millers.”<sup>44</sup> Robert Walpole, the English representative at Lisbon, replied that “making the importation of Corn so very difficult & hazardous to the Merchant” had driven them to selling flour, “which is not so liable to be damaged by wet and other accidents.”<sup>45</sup> Logically, flour, which kept “sweeter” in casks than in bags, did not suffer the same losses as grain when shipped in bulk. Heat caused grain spoilage and much was “lost by the weevil.”<sup>46</sup> When one considers American costs to grind the wheat, equal to seven percent of the value per hundredweight, compared to losses to heat and vermin, one could argue that Pennsylvania flour was cheaper than Pennsylvania grain milled in Portugal. A contemporary insisted: “They obliging us therefore to carry it to them in the form of wheat, is a useless loss to both parties.”<sup>47</sup>

At about the same time, American shippers began to send large cargoes of flour to Cadiz. The Spanish reacted by collecting a duty on flour, which had been duty free previously.<sup>48</sup> This innovation irked Cadiz factory members. Charles Delves and James Duff commented that: “Flour was even easier to deal with than Corn,” since like corn (wheat) no duty was levied on entering and, more important, it had no reexportation restrictions. Thus, it was “one of the most staple Articles both from its Bulk, as it fills up the Ships, as well as from the certainty of its Sale” for reexport to Havana or other Spanish colonies. They thought the “new Duty” would halt this trade, “which employs a great deal of Shipping, independent of the Advantages derived from it to No America and consequently to Great Britain.”<sup>49</sup> Delves and Duff also agreed that halting flour exports from Cadiz would lead to increased smuggling in the Caribbean. Spanish officials denied the flour duty was a new levy, announcing that it was an old tax, suspended and now revived. Eventually Lord Grantham wrote: “Therefore let them by upstart Duties or even Prohibitions, attempt to get temporary Revenue, they still stand in absolute need of the foreign Trade.”<sup>50</sup>

Despite these various interferences with the American trade, Lord Grantham proved to be correct; the Iberians depended on American grain, flour, and fish to feed their people. And, as Pombal had noted, this business proved so lucrative that the English did not abandon it. American produce now poured into Cadiz, Lisbon, Barcelona, and the other centers. English merchants handled the exchanges of goods despite many interferences, innovations, and disruptions. The profits earned could be quite large. One diplomat believed that a Portugal trader could earn seven to ten percent by selling goods in Lisbon; fifteen to twenty percent by trading them “in country,” and twenty-five to thirty percent by trading to Brazil.<sup>51</sup>

\* \* \*

---

42 Lyttleton to Weymouth, May 6, 1769, SPFP 89/68.

43 *PG*, December 12, 1770.

44 Walpole to Rochford, May 18, 1772, SPFP 89/72.

45 *Ibid.*

46 Thomas Jefferson to John Adams, November 27, 1785, *A-JL*, 100-101.

47 *Ibid.*

48 Grantham to Rochford, August 27, 1772, with enclosures, SPFS 94/191.

49 Delves and Duff to Dalrymple, August 13, 1772, *ibid.*

50 Grantham to Rochford, December 16, 1772, *ibid.*

51 Lyttleton to Weymouth, January 4, 1767, SPFP 89/67.

What were the terms of exchange between North America and Iberia? Early in the eighteenth century goods sent to Lisbon appear to have been unloaded before sale. However, Parr & Bulkeley, writing in 1764, stated: “it is now customary to sell cargoes on board clear of duty to our Lodge Keepers to pay in a month.”<sup>52</sup> John Reynell wrote his Lisbon connection William Leybourne that his wheat had purposely been loaded last and “it is very good,” while that loaded first was “very ordinary.” Leybourne was to be sure to unload first “without telling anyone.”<sup>53</sup> Wheat loaded last probably stood less chance of dampness from the bilges.

Very often credit terms were negotiated between the buyer and the shipper’s agents, with special arrangements made for payment. Generally, settlements could be made in three to four payments. After clearing customs the first payment might be made at once with the remainder spread out up to six months.<sup>54</sup> Initial funds, often in cash, could purchase a return cargo, or the money carried on to another port, such as Cadiz or Lisbon. Later payments were usually remitted to the shipper’s London creditors or to another English port. Remittances went in bills of exchange drawn on the Lisbon firm’s London agents. The bulk of the receipts reached London in the form of bills, which were then covered by remitted specie. If Lisbon buyers proved dilatory, delaying payment for more than a month or two, they too paid interest.<sup>55</sup>

North American suppliers often took returns partly in a salt cargo for shipment home. Salt was very cheap, so a majority of the returns remained for transferal to English creditors, the basic purpose of this trade. Before the tightening of customs enforcement in 1764, vessels returning to America usually carried some wine and fruit directly to their owners.<sup>56</sup> Where the arrivals in Iberia had been employed under charter, their owners often arranged for freight charges to be forwarded to London with minimal delay. A return cargo could then be shipped on account.

In 1764 Thomas Riche of Philadelphia informed Parr & Bulkeley at Lisbon that he had arranged for a third firm, Samson and Sewell, to consign a cargo to the Lisbon house. Under the terms he had offered, Riche promised that Parr & Bulkeley would remit the net proceeds to London within thirty days of its arrival in Portugal. Riche justified these exceptional terms on the basis that “others in Lisbon promised it.”<sup>57</sup> Essentially terms suited the individual shipper’s circumstances. If a rapid transferal of funds were required, the money would be advanced, with interest paid, until returns from the cargo sales came available.

As indicated, bills drawn on London or Bristol firms depended for payment on specie exportations from Iberia. Here again, the diplomatic corps gave assistance. Through most of the century merchants shipped specie with no identifying invoices. The consul then sent a diplomatic pouch, either on the same vessel or on another. Since the diplomatic pouch was immune from search, identifying documentation passed through the port with no fear of exposure. By the packets “gold in Dust, bars or moedas” could be forwarded. Merchants might as a result turn their money four or five times a year. Bills drawn at thirty days’ sight went jointly with the gold so that “their correspondents are at no disburst or at any inconvenience in paying them.”<sup>58</sup>

Bullion was the only commodity that had its freight charges based upon its value. The rate charged

---

52 Parr & Bulkeley to Thomas Clifford, February 6, 1764, Clifford “Correspondence,” IV.

53 Letter to Leybourne, July 21, 1740, Reynell “Letter Book, 1738-1741.”

54 Walpole to Rochford, July 4, 1774, SPFP 89/77. The Portuguese allowed agents two to six months to pay duties owed. Agents signed “Customs House Notes,” which were punctually paid.

55 Fisher, “Anglo-Portuguese Trade” (PhD diss.), 147-148.

56 Ibid., 130. Stocker and Wharton to Champlin, September 13, 1773; Parr & Bulkeley to Champlin, January 25, 1774, *Commerce of Rhode Island*, LXIX: 478-479, 453.

57 Letters to Parr & Bulkeley, May 20, 1764 and April 30, 1764, Riche “Letter Book, 1764-1771.”

58 Worsley to Stanhope, February 24, 1716, SPFP 89/24.

for carrying it between Iberia and England was one percent.<sup>59</sup> H.E.S. Fisher found that during the Seven Years War English warships, because armed and safe, commanded the “High” rate of one percent, while less secure packets charged only half that amount or even less.<sup>60</sup> American trade declined sharply during wartime, so the large majority of the monies earned from American goods in peacetime probably paid less than the full one percent. Higher rates would have encouraged payment of the two- or three-percent export tax of the government, to avoid the dangers and inconveniences of smuggling. Additional costs arose from moving funds from Falmouth, almost at Land’s End, to London. Naval vessels took their specie further along the Channel, or even to London itself, thus reducing those additional fees.

Resident English merchants provided essential services as agents for those sending finished goods from England or comestibles from Ireland and North America. Those handling American produce performed yeoman duties far from their principals in Salem, Philadelphia, Baltimore, or Charleston. Under normal circumstances Iberian-based firms charged a commission of three percent, levied against goods arriving from the New World and also on any other transactions assisting their overseas employers. If the Anglo-Iberian firm also accepted liability for the bad debts of those buying American goods, an added two percent would be in order. Advancement of funds to a captain saw them assess another half a percent or more.<sup>61</sup>

English creditors sometimes accepted bills drawn on them by their colonial correspondents grudgingly. In the summer of 1772 Lane and Fraser in London informed Joseph Cabot that they had accepted two bills for £800, “although they came upon us at a time when Money was exceedingly scarce and we are like to receive very little Money either from Spain or Portugal.”<sup>62</sup> For the most part English firms realized that “trade to the eastward” was the means by which American merchants covered their indebtedness and thus willingly extended courtesies to them.

\* \* \*

Since consular reports from Lisbon, 1772-1773, contain fairly accurate estimates of the American trade and the prices involved, and the *Com Privilegio Real* lists consignees, it is possible to reconstruct this trade and assign values for the American cargoes consigned to the more prominent Anglo-Iberian firms at Lisbon. Based on estimates, these figures are not precisely accurate. These firms handled miscellaneous goods, which are not included. Since all vessels are treated as if of equal size, that obviously was not the case. Nonetheless, the estimates offer an idea of the kind of commissions to be earned in the trade. Parr & Bulkeley far outshone the others, handling about five-eighths of all goods entering from America and earning commissions of almost £3,000 sterling. Pasley Brothers and Mayne & Co. were important, lesser merchant firms, earning about £1,200 each over this two-year period. Thomas Horne and Company handled sales bringing in approximately £600.

---

59 Davis, *Rise of English Shipping*, 176n. French charges for bullion export were set at the same level, one percent. Freight charges to and from Cadiz ran at one percent each way and merchant commissions were at three percent. See Leon Vignols, *El Asiento Frances, 1701-1713* (Madrid, 1929), 38.

60 Fisher, “Anglo-Portuguese Trade” (PhD diss.), 184.

61 Ibid., 148. “Gardoqui’s Account of Cash supply’d Captain Lovit in the Tryal”; Gardoqui to the Cabots, September 20, 1771, Cabot “Papers,” I, Phillips Library at PEM. They charged one half of one percent. Gardoqui to the Cabots, December 12, 1769.

62 Lane and Son and Fraser to Joseph Cabot, August 12, 1772, Cabot “Papers,” I.



**TABLE 3-2**  
**Some Anglo-Iberian Firms and Lisbon Imports**  
**from North America, 1772-1773**

Firm	Cargoes	Rice		Wheat/Flour			Cargoes	Fish		Sale Commissions at 3%
		Value	%	Cargoes	Value	%		Value	%	
Parr & Bulkeley	1	£ 895	5	64	£ 95,315	34	4	£ 2,940	5	£ 2,974
Pasley Bros.	4	3,580	20	24½	36,488	13	0	—	--	1,202
Mayne & Co.	2	1,790	10	16	23,829	9	19	13,961	23	1,191
White, Houston & Hill	--	---	--	1	1,489	0½	15	11,022	18	375
Thomas Horne	--	---	--	13	19,361	7	2	1,470	2½	625
Christopher Hake	--	---	--	1	1,489	0½	14	10,288	17	352
All Firms	20	£17,901		187	£278,497		82	£60,256		£10,912 <sup>a</sup>

Sources: Values are from Hort to Walpole, May 6, 1774, SPFP 89/77. Consignees are from *CPR*, 1772-1773. <sup>a</sup> Imports also included miscellaneous goods valued at £7,079; total imports £363,733.

These earnings reflect only commissions on sales of American goods. Other income came from purchasing export cargoes for these vessels; from other trades in which they acted as consignees; from investments in shipping, which provided freight earnings; and other income as principals in the American and other trades. Certainly the American trade was very lucrative, as Pombal had recognized – too lucrative to abandon, in spite of all the headaches connected with it.

The *Pennsylvania Gazette*, in 1754, published an extract from a letter documenting factory trading in Portugal. English merchants, it noted, “after enriching themselves in a few years, return home with immense Wealth, leaving their Houses to Relations or Clerks who are their Countrymen.”<sup>63</sup> The Portuguese were jealous of these foreigners who flourished in this business, but did not have the funds to set up as factors because they could not make payments to the English consignors with sufficient dispatch. English factors also had the advantage because the treaties protected them and their records from seizure and their vessels from search by the customs men.

The whole methodology that had been developed to provide England an inflow of gold and silver from Iberia – from the treaties, to the consular service, to the resident merchants, to the strength of the Royal Navy, to the mail packets, to the treaty arrangements with the Barbary Powers – worked exceedingly well.<sup>64</sup> When the North Americans began to ship their surpluses overseas, they too sought Iberian sources of gold and silver to pay for their finished goods from the metropolis, and that system was ready to hand. The colonials fully understood its purposes and from early in the seventeenth century utilized it to make their remittances through exports to Iberia and the Mediterranean.

63 *PG*, July 4, 1754, citing a letter from Amsterdam.

64 Fisher, “Anglo-Portuguese Trade,” *EHR*, XVI: 233



## CHAPTER IV

### THE BARBARY STATES, BRITAIN, AND AMERICA, 1600-1775

Suleiman the Magnificent reigned over the Ottoman Empire, 1520-1566. His generals and admirals extended Turkish influence along the Mediterranean coast as far as Morocco. Over time, Turkish domination over that Barbary Coast became only nominal. Tripoli, Tunis, Algiers, and Morocco offered haven to Moors, Moriscos, and Jews driven from Iberia and eventually attracted a large concentration of desperate and bloodthirsty men seeking revenge against their Christian enemies.<sup>1</sup>

From Tripoli, Algiers, Sallee, and other ports, they sailed out against Christian shipping. At first they utilized row galleys powered by captured slaves, overwhelming enemy vessels with superior manpower. They swarmed aboard European ships, terrifying and paralyzing their crews. As Moslems, the corsairs gained paradise if killed in battle. Captured Christians could choose conversion to Islam and freedom, or hard labor as a slave. Gradually a system for prisoner exchange allowed Europeans to ransom their countrymen. Among the religious groups handling those transactions the best known was the Order of the Holy Trinity. Members lived in Barbary ports, succoring the slaves, arranging redemptions with funds provided by European nations, by relatives and friends, or from church collections and charitable bequests.<sup>2</sup> Relations with European states had by 1600 become formalized. Treaties arranged large scale redemptions and usually included presents for the potentates of the pirate states. Normally they also required tribute payments in the form of vessels, naval stores, guns, and munitions.

The Barbary States lacked political stability. When at peace, their capitals were crowded with violent, combative men, who, bored with inaction, often overthrew or assassinated their leaders. Astute rulers were always at war with at least one Christian nation. Yet, they avoided uniting the Europeans against them. A deft hand at diplomacy kept the corsairs employed and cleverly exploited religious and dynastic rivalries among the Christians. When the Christians warred with one another their commerce lay open to attack. The Barbary States, with few merchant vessels, proved almost invulnerable to attack. On occasion their port cities were bombarded and blockaded but those measures were rarely effective long term.

At their height in the early seventeenth century, the pirates had a combined naval force of 150 ships, carrying 1,000 guns, manned by 20,000 seamen. Fortunately for the Europeans, the Moslems were divided by petty jealousies. Corsair captains were individualists. Investors fitted out the vessels. Owners and crews shared the booty. Pirate rulers also shared in the returns.<sup>3</sup>

As more efficient vessels spread into the Mediterranean from the northern seas, ships replaced lateen rigged row galleys. As large numbers of the northern European vessels were taken by the raiders and captured seamen became renegades, these adopted vessels were utilizable in the open North Atlantic. The change in vessel type and strategy made the Barbary rulers more dependent on Europe for naval stores and artillery and laid the northern trades open to direct attack.<sup>4</sup> Barbary raiders ranged as far as the North Sea.

---

1 David D. Hebb, *Piracy and the English Government, 1616-1642* (Aldershot, England, 1994). Ray W. Irwin, *The Diplomatic Relations of the United States with the Barbary Powers, 1776-1816* (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1931). Salé in Morocco was known to the English as Sallee and its corsairs as Salleteens, pirates from Algiers as Algerines or Argerines.

2 *CSPC*, XLIII (1737): 97.

3 George N. Clark, "The Barbary Corsairs in the Seventeenth Century," *War and Society in the Seventeenth Century*. Wiles Lectures, 1956 (Westport, Conn., 1985), 113. *PG*, August 23, 1750, with reference to the Dey's share of the *Prince Frederick* packet.

4 Adam Anderson, *An Historical and Chronological Deduction of the Origin of Commerce from the*

By 1620 the pirates had reached their peak. Algiers alone possessed a fleet of forty tall ships. European wars, plus increasing mercantile competition, weakened Christian opposition. Between 1609 and 1630 raiders took over a thousand English vessels. Cruising in the English Channel, they scavenged the coasts of England, France, and the Lowlands. Waters off the Scilly Isles at the western end of the Channel were the most dangerous areas for pirate attack. In 1620 James I sent Sir Robert Maunsell against them with a fleet mounting 511 guns. His attack against Algiers failed. During Charles I's ill-starred reign Barbary depredations continued. Though vessels armed by the infamous "ship money" taxes diminished Moorish depredations in the Channel, the corsairs were not defeated.<sup>5</sup>

English envoys made peace in this era, exchanging Moorish captives for English prisoners but also encouraging commerce with the pirates and making gifts of cannon and shot, thus supplying them "with weapons for their own destruction."<sup>6</sup> The French fell into the same trap, carrying out joint actions with the Algerines against the English Channel trade. Piratic successes contributed to the crown's decline in authority under Charles I. He summoned Parliament in the late 1630s partially because of his failure to defeat the "Turks" without its support.

Moriscos, exiled from Spain, established an important pirate center at Salée, near modern Rabat, in 1609. Strategically located outside the Straits of Gibraltar, its raiders threatened along Europe's west coast, harassing vessels at the mouth of the Channel and on the Cornish coasts. A fleet negotiated the redemption of English captives in 1625. Seven years later the Royal Navy blockaded Salée, assisting the Moroccans to put down a revolt there. When the city fell, the Emperor released three hundred Christian prisoners to his English allies. During these years pirates from Tripoli and Tunis were much less active, concentrating their depredations within the Straits.<sup>7</sup>

Partly because of the pirate threat, merchant vessels from North America were required to return direct to an English port but, in order to compete in Iberian markets, the Newfoundland fleet was exempted from that rule. Pirates even crossed the Atlantic to attack the Newfoundland fishery in 1625, carrying off 320 men.<sup>8</sup> In that year, William Vaughan's *The Golden Fleece* complained bitterly about the lack of protection. "Turkish attacks" damaged fishery investors to the extent of "£40,000 besides the loss of 100 pieces of ordinance, and above 1,500 mariners."<sup>9</sup> The Newfoundland fishery suffered a major decline. The number of ships fishing from Poole dropped about eighty-five percent. Pirates also raided ashore, taking 237 captives near Cork in 1631. Algiers alone in the 1630s held 3,000 prisoners enslaved.

English settlements on the American mainland suffered even though distant from these depredations. Investors in the Plymouth Colony planned a fishing base in Maine and in 1625 sent two vessels there. One was "unhappily taken by a Turks man of war" and carried to "Saly."<sup>10</sup> The terror engendered by the pirates was infectious and in the mid-1630s rumors spread that the New England settlements had been surprised by raiders. A shipload of English, Caribbean-bound, also fell into pirate hands. Vessels from England to

---

*Earliest Accounts*, 2 vols. (London, 1764), II: 269. Clark, "Barbary Corsairs," 114, 116-117.

5 Macpherson, *Annals*, II: 284, 308-309. Jasper Danckaerts and Peter Sluyter, *Journal of a Voyage to New York and a Tour in Several of the American Colonies in 1679-1680*, Memoirs of the Long Island Historical Society I, 49 (Brooklyn, N.Y., 1867). Beer, *Origins*, 199. Harper, *Navigation Laws*, 325.

6 Macpherson, *Annals*, II: 321, 336, 340, 410.

7 Clark, "Barbary Corsairs," 108, 113. Macpherson, *Annals*, II: 371.

8 Clark, "Barbary Corsairs," 107-108.

9 Vaughan, *Golden Fleece*, II: 103. Macpherson, *Annals*, II: 338. Innis, *Cod Fisheries*, 62. Judah, *North American Fisheries*, 71. Lounsbury, *British Fishery*, 63.

10 William Bradford, *Bradford's History "Of Plimouth Plantation"* (Boston, 1898), 245. Bailyn, *New England Merchants*, 12.

America sailed as far south as the Azores to catch the prevailing westerlies “when there [were] no reasons to the contrary arising from the Turks.”<sup>11</sup> The Reverend Hugh Peter of Salem was providentially served by the Lord’s intervention. When the crew of a fishing ship harassed and derided him it was, on its return to Europe, “set upon by the Turks and divers of them killed.”<sup>12</sup> John Winthrop reported a vessel bound from Connecticut to the Canaries in 1643 fought a heavily manned Moorish vessel so fiercely that it abandoned the attack. Rumors of pirate raiders off New England saw Massachusetts Bay send a cruiser to seize “any Turkish pirate.”<sup>13</sup>

During the last half of the seventeenth century the Barbary States declined in strength, while the northern European countries increased in power. French, Dutch, and English naval forces carried out extensive operations against the pirate centers and kept fleets in the western Mediterranean. The English and French established enclaves on the North African coast. An English expedition destroyed nine pirate vessels in 1655 and brought Algiers and Tripoli to terms. English relations with the Barbary Moors were mercurial. Between 1655 and 1686 eight treaties were signed with Algiers, which a contemporary noted: “they kept just as long as they stand in fear of our ships of war in the Mediterranean.”<sup>14</sup> Relations with Tripoli and Tunis proved more cordial, the former accepting treaties in 1655, 1662, and 1676, while the latter made peace in 1662 and in 1676. The treaties signed in 1662 established a system of Barbary passes protecting shipping from seizure. Charles II’s reign also saw cash payments to the pirates to maintain the peace.<sup>15</sup>

Other steps also demonstrated the increased authority of the crown. Sir John Finch, a Tuscan resident, reported that the Algerines were sorely tempted because the English habitually sent smaller vessels with rich cargoes to the Mediterranean. Exporters to there now paid heavy penalties for sending vessels of less than two hundred tons, with fewer than thirty-two men and sixteen guns to any port beyond the city of Malaga. In 1670 any captain surrendering a vessel larger than two hundred tons with sixteen guns was to be considered unfit for command. The crown also penalized captains and crews surrendering to the pirates without resistance, since the pirates often just stripped such captures and released the vessel. New legislation rewarded crewmen who fought the pirates.<sup>16</sup>

\* \* \*

England’s permanent naval establishment had grown considerably by the 1690s. Admiral Blake’s

---

11 Beer, *Origins*, 319. John Winthrop, *Winthrop’s Journal*, “A History of New England,” 1630-1649. Ed. James K. Hosmer, 2 vols. (New York, 1908), II: 20, 35, 126. Danckaerts and Sluyter, *Journal of Voyage to New York*, 102.

12 J.D. Phillips, *Salem in the Seventeenth Century* (Boston, 1933), 166.

13 *Winthrop’s Journal*, II: 126. Weeden, *Economic and Social History*, I: 154. Nathaniel B. Shurtleff, ed., *Records of the Governor and Company of Massachusetts Bay in New England*, 5 vols. (Boston, 1853-1854), II: 350.

14 Macpherson, *Annals*, II: 366, 508. Beer, *Origins*, 124.

15 Harper, *Navigation Laws*, 326. Judah, *North American Fisheries*, 71.

16 Ogg, *Reign of Charles II*, I: 232. Macpherson, *Annals*, II: 507, 518. Violet Barbour, “Dutch and English Merchant Shipping in the Seventeenth Century,” I: 228n. and “Marine Risks and Insurance in the Seventeenth Century,” I: 567n, both in E.M. Carus-Wilson, ed., *Essays in Economic History*, 3 vols. (London, 1954-1962). Davis, *Rise of English Shipping*, 59. The penalty amounted to one percent of the cargo’s value. Davis says that all ships in this trade listed crews of thirty-two men, even if lightly manned, well into the 1700s.

bombardment of Porto Farina in 1655 and that of Algiers by Lord Sandwich had awakened the pirates to the changed circumstances. Spragge cut the boom at Bugia Bay and sank seven Algerine frigates and Narborough destroyed a number of Tripolitan and Algerine raiders.<sup>17</sup> The period of Barbary domination had ended. Treaties emphasized the rule of law; passes protected English shipping in principle if not always in fact. After 1686 Algiers and England did not war again until the early nineteenth century. Corsairs no longer congregated in the English Channel. Consuls in the Barbary cities regularized more pacific relations.

The Royal Navy assigned more vessels to convoy duty, patrolling landfalls and strategic ocean sectors. Convoys accompanied Newfoundland fish carriers out from England and back to southern Europe, as the yearly catch neared £400,000 in value. During 1676 the fishing fleet straggled into Lisbon and Cadiz, having lost fourteen ships to the Algerines. When pirates attacked again in 1689, the government announced that the crew of any vessel leaving the convoy early to gain commercial advantage would not be ransomed. These wars often doubled Mediterranean insurance rates.<sup>18</sup>

\* \* \*

The English sought to expand their power by acquiring a North African enclave as a base to overawe the pirates. General Monk suggested procuring Tangier from Portugal, arguing optimistically that a hundred men could garrison it and a few vessels close the Straits to the Algerines and also threaten the Salleteens on the Moroccan coast. When Charles II married Catherine de Braganza, England received Tangier as part of her dowry. A free port, it never succeeded as a trading center. The English built a fine mole and strengthened its fortifications but its defense proved very costly.<sup>19</sup> It never achieved its strategic goals and, after a prolonged siege by the Moroccans, was abandoned in 1684. By the close of the seventeenth century, while the Barbary powers had not declined to a state of insignificance, they were much weaker, partly as a result of internal squabbles.

English Mediterranean policy changed from one aimed at protecting its commerce to a broader concept striving to maintain the balance of power there among all the elements involved – France, Spain, Netherlands, Portugal, the Italian states, and the Barbary powers – in order to prevent the hegemony of any of them. Tangier, as an enclave, foreshadowed later bases at Gibraltar and Port Mahon, which solidified England's influence in that region.<sup>20</sup>

Gradual growth of Britain's American colonies brought vessels bound to and from North America into contact with Barbary corsairs. By the 1670s and 1680s the valuable fisheries had come very largely under English and colonial control. The convoy system, naval expeditions, and the base at Tangier all provided protection to vessels bringing codfish to southern Europe. As the seventeenth century progressed, protection of tobacco carriers from the Chesapeake and later those in the grain trade required care as well. Colonials were guaranteed the same protection enjoyed by English citizens.

---

17 Clark, "Barbary Corsairs," 121-123.

18 Judah, *North American Fisheries*, 129. *CSPC*, VII (1669-1674): 342, 351. Macpherson, *Annals*, II: 579. The fishing fleet carried more than 2,000 guns and 9,100 men in 1676. Godolphin to Williamson, November 18, 1677, SPFP "Newsletters" 101/92. E.M.G. Routh, *Tangier, England's Lost Atlantic Outpost, 1661-1684* (London, 1912), 145. Godolphin to Jenkins, May 5, 1677, SPFP "Newsletters" 101/92. *CSPC*, IX (1677-1680): 329. Davis, *Rise of English Shipping*, 353-355. Beer, *Origins*, 124-125.

19 Macpherson, *Annals*, II: 502-503, 600, 612. Clark, "Barbary Corsairs," 120-128. Davis, *Rise of English Shipping*, 96n.

20 Julian S. Corbett, *England in the Mediterranean, 1603-1713*, 2 vols. (Westport, Conn., 1987), introduction.

Merchant John Hull of Massachusetts Bay left a diary commenting on his mercantile successes and failures. Early in 1664 he wrote: “The Lord brought in a small vessel sent out by myself and others last winter for Alicant; and though several Turks men-of-war of great force came on board them, and broke up their hold, yet they let them go safely without robbing or spoiling them.”<sup>21</sup> Another entry noted that William Foster, master, had been taken by Turks on his way to Bilbao with fish, redeemed, and returned. Again he noted James Elson, a captive of the Algerines in which he “lost only my eighth part of the ship.” In another case his ship under William Condy, bound Boston to London, was taken into Algiers.<sup>22</sup> From these entries it is obvious that in that era a wise merchant limited investments in ships going in harm’s way. In spring 1680 Governor Simon Bradstreet of Massachusetts notified merchants of the threat of “the Algiers men-of-war infesting the seas.”<sup>23</sup> Such a capture and enslavement had social and psychological effects also. Actual and rumored attacks on colonial settlements raised concerns. In June of 1660 a London broadside announced “that 18 Turk men of War” had on the twenty-fourth of January “landed at a Town called Kingsward (alluding to Charles-town) three miles from Boston, killed 40, took Mr. Sims minister prisoner, wounded him, killed his wife and three of his little children, carried him away with 57 more, burnt the Town, carried them to Argier, their loss amounting to 12000 pound, The Turk demanding 8000 pound ransom to be paid within 7 months.”<sup>24</sup> That such a report, supposedly signed by nine ministers, could gain even temporary credence demonstrates the extent to which the image of the bloodthirsty, rampaging Barbary corsair had entered public imagination.

In his journal of a voyage to America in 1679-1680, Jasper Danckaerts definitely feared capture by the “turks.” News of four Dutch vessels taken in the Channel “caused no small apprehension in our ship.” As they left England large ships came in sight increasing “our fear of the Turks.”<sup>25</sup> His vessel took haven at Falmouth when twenty-three Algerines were reported on the coast. Danckaerts reached New York safely but on the return voyage his ship sailed north of Ireland, since the Channel was unsafe. In this same era Governor Bradstreet apologized for his failure to send representatives to England: “The great hazard of the seas creates a backwardness in persons most suitable to be employed as agents, for we have already lost five or six of our vessels by Turkish pirates, and many of our inhabitants continue in miserable captivity among them.”<sup>26</sup> So commonplace were references to the pirates that “sundry old songs and ballads” testified to British “stoutness” in encounters with them.<sup>27</sup>

\* \* \*

As the eighteenth century dawned, the North African states were significantly weaker, remaining, in effect, nuisances rather than real threats. Tunis became a trade center for the western Mediterranean. Tripoli, the weakest, had few cruising vessels. Algiers, though the most powerful, had also declined. One of the great Mediterranean fortresses and heavily populated, the city was difficult to attack and almost impossible to subdue. Morocco remained fairly strong and almost invulnerable to naval pressure. Sallee’s shallow

---

21 John Hull, *The Diaries of John Hull, Mint-master and Treasurer of Massachusetts Bay*, Transactions and Collections of the American Antiquarian Society, III (Worcester, Mass., 1857), 154.

22 Ibid., 231, 245.

23 *CSPC*, IX (1677-1680): 529.

24 John Josselyn, “Chronological Observations of America, 1661,” *An Account of Two Voyages to New England Made during the Years 1638, 1663* (Boston, 1865), 204. *CSPC*, VII (1669-1674): 60.

25 Danckaerts and Sluyter, *Journal of Voyage to New York*, 35, 41, 381.

26 *CSPC*, IX (1677-1680): 544.

27 Hall, *Randolph and American Colonies*, 123. Anderson, *Origin of Commerce*, II: 743.

entrance limited the size of vessels based there but made it difficult to attack. Morocco might have been a greater threat to the Christian states but internal crises created confusion and civil strife.

The pirates aimed their attacks in these years at weaker European nations. Spain, Portugal, Sweden, and Holland ranked at the second level and Malta, Ragusa, Venice, Genoa, Naples, and perhaps Denmark on the third. British influence in southern Europe leaned heavily on its naval power, which undergirded its diplomatic establishment. Her two strategic naval bases at Gibraltar and Port Mahon dominated the western Mediterranean through most of the century. Her large merchant marine was the major carrier to Iberia and in those seas. As the century advanced exploitation of those markets for North American produce contributed significantly to English earnings.

Major wars punctuated the eighteenth century, pitting the larger European countries against one another, distracting them from their concerns with the Barbary nations. The latter profited opportunely from those distractions, harassing their shipping. As early as 1704, despite the peace treaties, a Sallee raider halted a sloop from Philadelphia off the Madeiras and, while pretending “a great deal of friendship for the English, were so kind as that they took only some odd things from them.”<sup>28</sup> Such incursions continued because, despite government pressure to use only heavily armed traders, the size of crews and armaments declined in these years.<sup>29</sup>

The Moroccans caused almost constant problems for the English. During the 1720s they warred simultaneously with the English, Dutch, and Spanish. Naval vessels ranged the seas seeking Tetuan and Sallee pirates. In August of 1720 an English warship ran two Moroccan raiders ashore and retook two English ships. “Pyrates” cut an English merchantman out of the road at Terceira, bringing HMS *Success* to cruise the Wine Islands. Morocco was close to the Cape Verdes and the Wine Islands, important outlets for colonial exports. A peace in 1721 put “a happy End to a troublesome War, so prejudicial to the Trade of Great Britain, and to the miserable Bondage which so many unfortunate English men have long groaned under, who were incapable of Redeeming themselves otherways.”<sup>30</sup> In August that year Admiral Stewart redeemed 267 English prisoners. Shortly, presents for the Emperor worth almost £20,000 reached Tetuan.<sup>31</sup>

Peace proved ephemeral. Six months later a Sallee man took an English ship and enslaved her crew. Relations continued difficult. In the late 1720s Morocco fell into chaos as a multiplicity of heirs struggled over the throne. The English consul at Tangier managed to free a ship full of German immigrants, bound Holland to New York, but then a new rupture occurred. For a time in the early 1730s a combined English/Dutch fleet blockaded Sallee.<sup>32</sup>

Colonial concerns with the pirates were reflected by numerous references to them in colonial newspapers. The precision of those reports was not necessarily important. Merchants sending their ships and vulnerable crews to southern Europe wanted news of events there. Because English shipping near Gibraltar was open to attack from Sallee, HMS *Hector* cruised between Cape St. Mary and Cape St. Vincent. Dutch warships chased pirates in the Azores. Envoy John Zollicoffe took “the first fair Wind for Barbary” in 1734 to ransom 144 English slaves there.<sup>33</sup> Zollicoffe and his entourage were entertained in grand style “with

---

28 Anderson, *Europe in Eighteenth Century*, 221. *BNL*, November 13, 1704.

29 Wescombe to Stanhope, August 4, 1715, SPFS 94/212. Davis, *Rise of English Shipping*, 250.

30 *AWM*, October 27, 1720; December 27, 1720; June 1, 1721; June 15, 1721; June 22, 1721; September 27, 1721; October 22, 1721.

31 *AWM*, January 16, 1722; April 26, 1722; November 8, 1722.

32 Anderson, *Origin of Commerce*, 140. Newcastle to Tyrallow, July 30, 1728, SPFP 89/36. Anderson, *Europe in Eighteenth Century*, 221. Colonial newspapers constantly sought and printed news on relations with the Barbary States.

33 *PG*, August 29, 1734. *NEWJ*, August 12, 1734; August 29, 1734; September 2, 1734; September 23,



the greatest Civility imaginable.”<sup>34</sup> The number of prisoners was so large that additional presents were demanded, the extra funds paid in wheat “of which the Moors were in great want.”<sup>35</sup>

A Lisbon correspondent reported a new crisis in Morocco, adding: “it is fear’d unless the usual Presents from Great Britain be made him the Cruizers will pay no Regard to the British Navigation.”<sup>36</sup> Units from Lisbon went on cruise off Sallee but with few merchantmen at sea and only a few cruisers, plus no coastal towns to bombard, “and our Ships trading in the Way of their Privateers very numerous, it had been found by Experience, a very great Encouragement to our Navigation to keep at Peace with those People.” Holding station on that coast proved difficult and when the navy did so, “the French, Dutch, &c [received] equal Benefit thereby.”<sup>37</sup> Sallee remained incorrigible, warring with the Dutch, Portuguese, and other smaller nations. English naval ships cruised the area showing the flag. When the Dutch carried a Salleeman into Lisbon in 1737, Admiral Sir John Norris and the Lisbon factory ransomed her crew and returned them to Sallee in a British man-of-war, so pleasing the Emperor that he released all the English slaves there.<sup>38</sup>

At midcentury HMS *Crown* brought home twenty-five ransomees, but others remained enslaved for fifteen years or more. A new war in 1750 brought a fleet under Sir Edward Hawke “to scourge the insolence of the Salleemen.”<sup>39</sup> Peace saw a prisoner release but Moslem slave holders were often loathe to free their captives despite the ransoms offered and prisoners carried inland often did not reappear.

Barbary rulers, perfect autocrats, became petulant when denied immediate gratification. Diplomats treated them warily. Muley Abdallah of Morocco threatened Consul William Pettigrew with imprisonment, demanding new presents, artillery, and warlike stores, jewels, superfine clothes, and other valuables. The English refused him the guns and powder and threatened to station two twenty-gun vessels on his coast.<sup>40</sup> When the major European nations fought after midcentury, Barbary potentates grew more obstreperous, more recalcitrant, but when peace returned, more judicious. In 1763 tensions with Morocco flared again. Nine raiders sailed and a New England ship was taken into Mogador, its crew beaten, and cargo plundered. With corsairs cruising off Cadiz, the warning was broadcast that “all ships not having proper passports [were] in danger of being taken.”<sup>41</sup> Then, in 1768 a new treaty was signed.

During this century direct confrontations typical of the 1600s no longer occurred. Divisive issues now often involved piratic searches of English vessels and removal of non-English passengers and goods. The corsairs insisted on those rights. Englishmen found on foreign vessels at war with the pirates were another problem. Major issues arose in connection with the Mediterranean pass system. Most difficulties could be settled by a show of naval force but English threats of war sometimes had no effect. Treaties were renegotiated, terms clarified, ransoms paid, presents distributed.<sup>42</sup>

Algiers and Britain did not war between the 1680s and the early 1800s but relations faced occasional

---

1734.

34 *PG*, June 27, 1734; October 3, 1734. *NEWJ*, September 23, 1734; November 11, 1734; September 30, 1734.

35 *PG*, November 28, 1734. *NEWJ*, November 18, 1734.

36 *PG*, November 13, 1735.

37 *NEWJ*, March 24, 1735.

38 *PG*, April 28, 1737. *NEWJ*, April 12, 1737.

39 *PG*, August 17, 1749; March 6, 1750; March 14, 1750; June 7, 1750; August 23, 1750; January 12, 1751.

40 *PG*, March 27, 1753; September 13, 1753; October 24, 1754.

41 *PG*, October 10, 1763; January 5, 1764; October 18, 1764; June 6, 1765; August 8, 1765. *EG*, November 1, 1768.

42 Shillington and Chapman, *Commercial Relations*, 212.

strains. In 1749 merchants petitioned the King for help against Algerine rovers “who have lately so greatly obstructed the trade to the streights.”<sup>43</sup> In March of that year the Lisbon packet *Prince Frederick*, homeward bound, was stopped, searched, carried into Algiers, and held there for twenty-three days. The pirates claimed she had no pass, that her listed captain was not on board, and that the money and gems she carried were not owned by English citizens. The crew was well treated and the vessel released but the money and jewels, worth £25,000, were condemned. The semiofficial packets had apparently never carried passes. One report hinted that the Dey would have released the ship but her captors had threatened to murder him unless he distributed the booty.<sup>44</sup>

This attack on the pipeline transferring money and gems to London was extremely serious. Outcry from the Lisbon factory brought English demands for the booty’s release. Admiral Keppel’s fleet arrived at Algiers in August to demand satisfaction and release of the spoils. The Dey argued that the packets were not exempt from the treaties requiring passes for all vessels except warships and refused to surrender the goods but offered satisfaction, begged pardon, and assured proper future treatment.

The Algerines, preparing for war with Spain, Portugal, and Naples wished to avoid conflict with Britain, fearful the Christians might unite against them. The Divan voted “to send an ambassador with magnificent presents to England to make satisfaction for the seizure of the *Prince Frederick*.”<sup>45</sup> A letter from an English slave at Algiers indicated that of five hundred Christian slaves there, forty-five were English. During the summer of 1750 Admiral Keppel and Consul Stanyford with four men-of-war negotiated a treaty, which included the following: “All Packets or Express Boats bearing his Britannick Majesty’s Commission to be treated by Algerines as if His Majesty’s ships of War,” and if not so treated “the Captains or Raizes so offending on returning to Algiers will be most severely punished.”<sup>46</sup>

Between 1764 and 1775 the corsairs occasionally failed to respect Barbary pass holders, creating tensions, which were allayed when naval units visited Sallee or Algiers or elsewhere and the pirate leaders promised to be more circumspect. There were, then, alarms and excursions but no wars, all duly reported in the colonial press.

\* \* \*

After 1662 all English treaties with the Barbary States provided for issuance of government licenses, called Mediterranean or Barbary Passes. The first state honoring these “let passes” was Algiers. Every vessel traveling where it might be stopped by a raider had to register with the Admiralty. Dated English passes identified the ship; its home port; its master and owners; the date of its certification; number of tons, guns, and crew members and the nationalities of the latter; where built; where bound and, if known, a second port of call; the point of issuance; and the name and signature of the issuing official. Security had to be posted for its proper use and for its return with the applicant’s signature and to whom surrendered, as well as the date of its return and cancellation. These passes established positively a vessel’s nationality and guaranteed it against seizure by all corsairs. Initially, they covered vessels registered in English and Irish ports, in Jersey, Guernsey, and Tangier, not those registered in the colonies. The Lords of Trade and Plantation, in 1676, rationalized this exception of the colonies, arguing that the New Englanders did “not

---

43 *PG*, August 3, 1749.

44 *PG*, July 20, 1749; September 7, 1749; January 23, 1750; June 7, 1750.

45 *PG*, January 23, 1750; March 27, 1750; April 19, 1750.

46 *PG*, June 7, 1750; November 15, 1750; April 9, 1752; May 31, 1753; January 29, 1754; March 5, 1754.

conform themselves to the laws but take a liberty of trading where they think fit,” but suggested “that some speedy care be taken to come to a settlement and resolution of this matter which is of so great importance to trade.”<sup>47</sup> In fact, two years later the Privy Council arranged a special Admiralty pass for a Boston trader. Since the North Americans were allowed to trade directly to southern Europe, apparently the government did not intend to discriminate against colonial shipping. In fact, some colonial governors created confusion by issuing Barbary Passes.<sup>48</sup>

This matter remained unresolved because in the mid-1680s Governor Cranfield of New Hampshire requested the right to grant passes to protect local vessels from Algerine attacks. Evidently, vessels other than Banks fish carriers had a choice of sailing to southern Europe directly without a pass, or proceeding via an English port to procure one. That remained the case until new treaties were signed with the Barbary powers at the turn of the eighteenth century. Instructions to colonial governors about the issuance of passes came from the commissioners of the Admiralty. During late summer 1700 consuls in five Iberian ports acknowledged receipt of between twenty and a hundred passes, along with the oaths and bonds required to register applicants. Blank passes appear to have been provided to the American colonies at the same time.<sup>49</sup>

Early in 1717 a naval official requested the Colonial Office to indicate the number of blank passes needed in the various colonies “to secure them from the Argerines.”<sup>50</sup> In less than a month he had his answer. Newfoundland-bound vessels applied for passes in England, while other American colonies required forms annually as follows: Virginia 40, Maryland 30, New York and New Jersey 40, New England 100, Leeward Islands 40, and Jamaica 20.

Administration of the pass system and their collection and cancellation proved to be complicated. Copies had to be distributed in America, the British Isles, and to consuls in European ports. For verification each corsair required copies of the passes. On sighting a vessel, the raider brought her to and sent boarders to check the pass. Very often those boarding could not read the passports offered, a problem solved in a novel fashion. The passes usually were embellished with decorative flourishes in the first line of printing. The corsairs carried scalloped pieces of wood called “combs,” carved to match the “cut” or “tops” of the various passes. If the “comb” did not fit the “cut,” the vessel was seized and taken into Barbary. On occasion raiders destroyed a ship’s pass and claimed it as prize. Lack of a pass or travel on a belligerent ship opened English men to capture. Non-English vessels masqueraded under English colors. Consuls may have connived at this, pocketing bribes for issuing their licenses.<sup>51</sup>

At first, passes had to be surrendered after one voyage but that proved too cumbersome. A fee of twenty-five shillings purchased a Mediterranean pass from the Admiralty Office or from naval officers in Britain or its colonies, or from consuls overseas.<sup>52</sup> Issuers exercised due care in granting passes, and governors on their expiration had to cancel and transmit them to the Admiralty. Bonds of one hundred pounds sterling guaranteed that owners returned the certificate indicating surrender of the pass within the eighteen months

---

47 Andrews, *Colonial Period*, IV: 276. *CSPC*, IX (1677-1680): 15.

48 Brigham, *British Proclamations*, 129-130. Phillips, *Salem in Seventeenth Century*, 287-288. Beer, *Origins*, 125.

49 *CSPC*, X (1681-1685): 368; XVI (1699): 196. Leonard W. Labaree, *Royal Government in America* (New York, 1958), 72. *CSPC*, XVII (1700): 528, 528i. *BNL*, September 18, 1704. Robert L. Playfair, *The Scourge of Christendom* (London, 1884), 168-170. August 10-September 28, 1700, SPFS 94/212.

50 *CSPC*, XXVIII (1716-1717): 9, 26. “Admiralty Registers of Mediterranean Passes,” ADM 7/75-103 and ADM 1/3832-3833.

51 Letter to Coventry, November 19, 1675, “Letter Book of Francis Parry, 1668-1680,” Southwell Papers, British Museum, Additional Mss. 35101. Clark, “Barbary Corsairs,” 124.

52 Andrews, *Colonial Period*, IV: 208.

allotted. Israel Pemberton of Philadelphia, surety for a Captain Fellowes bound to Iberia, was deeply distressed when he failed to return the proper certification and the naval officer threatened to put his bond “in suit.”<sup>53</sup> Fifteen shillings sterling bought a vessel’s registry renewal. To verify its description a vessel had to be surveyed and certified at a cost not to exceed thirty pence. By the 1730s a new pass was needed only upon a change in a vessel’s name or description. In Massachusetts officials collected a small fee to cancel a pass. Regulations promulgated in 1730 did not differ significantly from those issued in 1676 and affirmed in 1717.<sup>54</sup>

On sale a vessel’s pass had to be surrendered to the nearest consular official, if overseas, for return to the Admiralty, “so that they may not, to the Prejudice of the Trade of His Majesty’s Subjects fall into the Hands of Foreigners.” Failure to do so brought a vessel’s bond under threat. The government also made it a “Felony, without Benefit of Clergy, if any Erasmment or Alteration whatsoever” be made in a pass.<sup>55</sup> Illegal transfers of passes caused constant problems. Illiterate corsairs encouraged improper use of the licenses and the advantages of sailing under British colors encouraged such risks.

At one point, a group of Irish malefactors at Lisbon and Cork were apprehended for counterfeiting Mediterranean passes. Discovery of the forgeries brought issuance of newly styled passes in spring 1730. When HMS *Argyle* took the King’s presents to the Emperor of Morocco, she also carried “the Heads of the New Mediterranean Passes, according to the New Model.”<sup>56</sup> Yet more than a year later the brig *Neptune* was taken by the Algerines without “a Pass of the new Cut.”<sup>57</sup> So many agents issued the passes that normal distribution was cumbersome. Because of their salability their transmission had to be guarded to assure their credibility. Advertisements appeared periodically in colonial newspapers concerning their availability and their usage.<sup>58</sup>

During wartime passes for captured vessels could be sold to foreigners to shelter their ships under English coloration. After King George’s War ended in 1758, suspicion about such sales saw passes of the “old cut” replaced. Consul Castries at Lisbon warned of twelve to fifteen Algerian and Moroccan raiders cruising off Portugal, Cadiz, Gibraltar, and the Straits. An embassy went off to renew the Moroccan treaty and release British captives there and “to prevent the liberties sometimes taken with vessels of little or no force, on account of some pretended errors in passes, or such other frivolous colors, for the sake of obtaining presents.”<sup>59</sup> Early in 1750 the *Boston Newsletter* published a letter from Lisbon:

We think proper to advise you the Algerines are constantly cruizing this Side the Mediterranean, and search all British Ships, and examine narrowly their passes, and where they meet the least Defect they send the Vessels into Algiers, and Confiscate their Cargoes,

---

53 Letters to Francis Annessly, June 5, 1732; March 16, 1733, Israel Pemberton, “Letter Book, 1727-1735,” G.W. Blount Library, Mystic Seaport (Mystic, Conn.).

54 Entry for September 21, 1732, Peter Faneuil, “Day Book, 1731-1732,” BL. *PG*, August 6, 1730. Giesecke, *American Commercial Legislation*, 102n.

55 Letter to Newcastle, March 5, 1731; letter from Newcastle, April 27, 1731, “Correspondence of Lord Tyrawley,” British Museum, Additional Mss. 23627. Aiskill to Whitehall, July 29, 1755, “Consular Reports,” SPFS 94/228.

56 *PG*, May 28, 1730.

57 *NEWJ*, November 29, 1731.

58 Aspinwall to Cleveland, March 9, 1755, ADM 1/3833. *NEWJ*, May 1, 1735. *PG*, May 1, 1735; May 28, 1734.

59 Castries to Cleveland, May 22, 1749, ADM 1/3833. *PG*, May 11, 1749.

as they have Renegadoes with them that examine all Papers.<sup>60</sup>

Shortly, five English ships were sent to Algiers for discrepancies in their passes. The English crews testified that their passes were legitimate and claimed the “comb” did not fit because the passes had been exposed to dampness or dryness. “As parchment,” they said, “will give in the former and shrink in the latter.”<sup>61</sup> The Dey released the prizes and ordered the raider captain strangled for breaking the treaty. Principle courtiers interceded, begging the Dey’s mercy and “since it was Mahomet’s birthday,” he was pardoned. The Dey expressed the hope that the English King would “look upon this Accident as the Action of a Fool or Madman.”<sup>62</sup> New passes were issued in 1752.

Incidents occurred involving Tangier and Tetuan raiders that insulted the British flag and seized vessels “under the common Pretence of their Passports being insufficient.”<sup>63</sup> Again in the Seven Years War rumors were current in Barbary that English passes were being illegally issued to non-English ships.<sup>64</sup> In fall 1764 a crisis occurred when a Genoese polacre with a British pass was seized at Algiers. Shortly a warship arrived there. Despite the fact that the vessel’s pass had been signed by the governor at Port Mahon and was questionable, the Dey agreed to make compensation. News spread that “the Persons who [had] granted those Passes were to be called to account for it in England.”<sup>65</sup> By late 1764 the Admiralty had prepared a “new sett of English Mediterranean passes – which will not be so liable to be clandestinely made use of as the old ones, duplicates of which were sent to the several Barbary States to prevent further disputes in the Mediterranean.”<sup>66</sup> A circular letter from the Secretary of State ordered that no more written passes were to be issued.

Consuls in Europe were occasionally alerted to enforce the system of pass inspections, though ship masters often failed to present them for endorsement. Passes could be taken up for several reasons. The Leghorn consul took up a pass in 1767 because it had been issued to a completely different English vessel. As the colonies moved toward revolution in the 1770s the government changed the cut of the passes to deny the Americans their protection. Consuls were notified to take special care that bills of sale reflected a vessel’s true nationality.<sup>67</sup>

\* \* \*

As trade from America to southern Europe expanded rapidly, despite the government’s best efforts to supply the necessary passes, it was not always successful. During the 1760s the provincial secretary at Boston reported “being without any, a thing seldom or ever happening before.”<sup>68</sup> A ship captain sent to

---

60 Jordan to Colebrooke, November 10, 1749, SPFS 94/227. *BNL*, March 29, 1750. Stanyford to Corbett, March 31, 1749; Castries to Cleveland, August 7, 1749, ADM 1/3832. *PG*, August 23, 1750; January 8, 1751; March 3, 1752.

61 *PG*, May 3, 1750, citing a letter from Whitehall, dated February 8, 1750; August 23, 1750, citing a dispatch from Admiral Keppel, May 22, 1750.

62 *PG*, May 31, 1750; August 23, 1750.

63 *PG*, July 12, 1753.

64 *PG*, November 2, 1764; December 13, 1764.

65 *PG*, December 13, 1764; December 20, 1764.

66 *PG*, February 21, 1765. Order in Council, December 19, 1764, SPFS 94/169.

67 Burnaby to Stevens, April 10, 1767, ADM 1/3837. Marsh to Rochford, June 9, 1775, SPFS 94/198.

68 Andrews, *Colonial Period*, IV: 276. Letter to Murray, December 2, 1765, Henry Lloyd, “Letter Book, 1765-1767,” BL.

Portsmouth for one, delaying his departure two or three days. A year later the secretary of Rhode Island denied Henry Lloyd two passes because he could not send them out of the province “without sending the Stamp Bonds” also, “which he is determined not to do.”<sup>69</sup> A few months later Lloyd could not obtain a pass because the secretary “has not enough to supply the Trade here but imagine are to be obtain’d at Portsmouth.”<sup>70</sup> Much earlier in the 1730s Israel Pemberton wrote to England that he would send the ship *Molly* to Lisbon if he could “get a pass if not will touch at Ireland.”<sup>71</sup> Peter Faneuil in 1738 asked Lory, Michel & Company to “procure as many passes as you see Convenient.”<sup>72</sup> Late in 1753 John Reynell planned to send the *Mary* to Cadiz, but no passes being available diverted her to Lisbon, on a less exposed route.

Forty-six vessels registered with the consul at Oporto in 1755 to obtain passes, a narrow sample. Only eight had any connection with North American trade. Of those, four had passes, one surrendered a pass, and three had no license at all.<sup>73</sup> Very probably fifty percent represented a high percentage of nonconformance. In one case, colonial seamen refused to sail without a pass, and in another, though assured when enlisted their ship had a pass, the crew discovered they had been deceived. They mutinied, seized the ship, were apprehended, convicted of piracy, and hung.<sup>74</sup>

In 1714 Captain Arthur Savage took the *Province Galley* from Massachusetts to southern Europe. Dependent on wind and weather, he was directed to Gibraltar, Lisbon, Bilbao, or up the Straits. After calling at Cadiz, he wrote: “I having no Mediterranean pass stood over to Mohone to get one having run the risque of myself & family to be made Slaves amongst the Turks for want of one.”<sup>75</sup>

While during the seventeenth century the Barbary pirates had ranged into the North and Arctic Seas and as far west as the Grand Banks, by the eighteenth century the compass of the raiders had narrowed significantly. Increased European naval power limited their actions. After 1700 they rarely operated in the English Channel or raided ashore. Their sphere of influence was confined to the western Mediterranean, the west coast of Iberia, and the Wine Island waters. There Europeans still risked attack, seizure, and imprisonment, whether carrying a pass or not.

\* \* \*

The Barbary Moors, masterful diplomats, ably profited from divisions among their enemies. Religious, dynastic, ethnic, and economic self-interest led the Christians to connive against one another. The lack of unity prevented any effective action against the pirates. Each European state hastened to arrange its own peaceful relations with the pirate states, to open trading opportunities with them and in the western Mediterranean. The French flirted with Algiers and the other pirates, seeking commercial and political advantages. England depended on them to supply bases at Gibraltar and Minorca. Periodically individual European attacks on them weakened them and internal conflicts also reduced their strength. But, the

---

69 Letter to Walter and Samuel Franklin, March 6, 1766, Lloyd, “Letter Book.”

70 Letter to Jacob R. Rivera, June 2, 1766, *ibid.*

71 Letter to Barclay, May 1, 1733, Pemberton, “Letter Book, 1727-1735.”

72 Letter to Lory & Michel, December 14, 1738, Peter Faneuil, “Letter Book, 1737-1741,” BL. Letter to Captain Close, October 25, 1753, Reynell, “Letter Book, 1752-1754.”

73 Jackson to Cleveland, January 8, 1756, ADM 1/3833.

74 Arthur L. Jensen, *The Maritime Commerce of Colonial Philadelphia* (Madison, Wisc., 1963), 59. *PG*, October 21, 1731.

75 Robert E. Moody, “The Last Voyage of the *Province Galley*,” *Transactions of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts* 32 (1933-1937): 137.

Christian nations supplied munitions and naval stores to the pirate states, usually in the form of tribute payments. They made peace rather than organize an international movement to stamp them out, enabling them to continue their blackmail tactics, especially against the smaller European nations. In the 1680s William Petyt complained that the French encouraged attacks on English commerce.<sup>76</sup> Eighteenth-century London traders thought the corsairs a providential blessing because they confined trade to the ships of the stronger powers. Small countries were commercial nuisances, competing with British bottoms for the carrying trade.<sup>77</sup>

While we retain our superiority in the Mediterranean Seas, we shall generally be able to compel all the Barbary piratical states to be at peace with us; therefore, evidently advantageous to us, that they remain, as at present, at war with other Christian powers, in consequence of which we not only undisturbedly carry on our own commerce in those seas but are moreover become, in some measure, the carriers of both the merchandize and treasure of other states at enmity with them.<sup>78</sup>

Other English writers endorsed that view and a Dutch author suggested convoys be used to protect that shipping, adding that the pirates should not be destroyed for “it is best to leave that thorn in the sides of those nations, whereby they will be distressed in that trade.”<sup>79</sup> If practical men favored that policy, others, including Englishmen, favored destruction of the pirates. Daniel Defoe, in *A Plan of the English Commerce*, called for an alliance of the four major European nations to stamp out this threat.<sup>80</sup> When the war ended in 1748, Spain proposed an alliance against the pirates that won the endorsement of the editor of the *Pennsylvania Gazette*, who commented on the depredations of the Algerines: “When this comes to be mentioned in history, what a contemptible idea it must give of those powers which submit so long to the insults of that state.”<sup>81</sup>

Several years later, when France prepared for war with Algiers, the same journal noted its request that England refrain from supplying them with warlike stores. The Algerines, it was said, “can remain at odds with half of Europe’s naval powers because supplied with munitions and warlike stores by the other half.”<sup>82</sup> However, increasingly there were attempts to halt supplies of arms and naval stores bound to Barbary.<sup>83</sup>

\* \* \*

The Barbary States maintained their insolent attitudes because of Europe’s divisions. But, because they enslaved and brutally maltreated those who fell into their clutches, all of the European nations humbled themselves periodically to ransom their fellow countrymen. To the mid-seventeenth century, captured Christians provided the motive power for the galleys contending for dominance in the Mediterranean. Ten

---

76 William Petyt, *Britannia Languens, or a Discourse of Trade* (London, 1680), 258.

77 Weeden, *Economic and Social History*, II, 817.

78 Anderson, *Origin of Commerce*, I: lx. Macpherson, *Annals*, II: 309.

79 Macpherson, *Annals*, II: 472.

80 Anderson, *Origin of Commerce*, II: 577. Daniel Defoe, *A Plan of the English Commerce* (London, 1728), 321-322.

81 *PG*, July 12, 1750.

82 *PG*, June 7, 1750; November 29, 1764; December 13, 1764.

83 *PG*, February 28, 1765; December 26, 1765.

thousand Christian galley slaves were liberated by Don Juan's victory over the Turks at Lepanto.<sup>84</sup> Christian captives, upon seizure, went to the slave marts in the Moorish ports. Owners could decide to ransom them, or not. Conversion to Islam guaranteed a slave's freedom, who then became a renegade. A slave with special skills might not be released. Wealthier captives could expect friends and relatives to buy their freedom. Poorer folk often languished for years before one of the Christian powers might see fit to redeem them. In some cases consuls or non-Moslem residents in North Africa intervened to offer minimal assistance, in the form of a small per diem allotment.

Redemptions were commonplace over the centuries, freeing an estimated 600,000 Europeans.<sup>85</sup> The brutal treatment meted out to prisoners, often capriciously, strongly motivated redemptions. Prisoners were beaten, scourged, bastinadoed, and tortured in other ways. Poorly fed, they were overworked at hard labor, often constructing fortifications or at other heavy tasks. Any evidence of independence brought vicious punishment. Some were burdened with chains to discourage escape. As a result the health of the prisoners was often at risk, and they also faced plague and other deadly diseases. Horror at accounts of their treatment created deep sympathy for their plight and encouraged charitable contributions toward redemptions and deathbed bequests to speed relief.<sup>86</sup>

England alone signed twenty treaties with the Barbary princes during the seventeenth century, each followed by a prisoner release. Peace was short lived; hostilities renewed; new captures led to new ransoms. The wealth and prestige of the prisoners involved dictated the size of the ransom. It varied also from country to country. From 1609-1625 the English apparently lost more than a thousand vessels to the "Turks." Presuming a minimum of nine men in each crew means that ten thousand Englishmen were taken in those years. One redemption in 1646 cost thirty-eight pounds per prisoner. Applying that figure to these earlier captives provides a ransom figure of some £380,000, a vast sum for that era.<sup>87</sup> Redemptions provided a comfortable income for the pirates.

Three hundred and fifty English ships were lost between 1674 and 1680, among them many from North America. In the late 1670s six raiders destroyed seventeen Newfoundland fish carriers, taking forty-one prisoners to Algiers. The crews of thirteen Virginia tobacco ships were taken "at the mouth of the Channel," swelling the captive rolls. Governor Bradstreet of Massachusetts reported the losses of several vessels, adding that "Many of our inhabitants continue in miserable captivity."<sup>88</sup>

One such prize, a "Pincke" owned and captained by Jacob Leisler of New York, strayed into the path of an Algerine pirate. News of his capture, with his two sons, eight crewmen, and a passenger reached New York in midsummer 1678. The Moors demanded 2,050 pieces of eight for Leisler and his children, which he paid personally. The rest, depending on their station, owed up to £250 as ransom.<sup>89</sup> The total rose to £2,280 sterling plus ship and cargo, a very profitable seizure.

On learning the sum demanded, the New York governor ordered that a "brief be granted for the Church Officers (and recommended by the Ministers) to collect the benevolence of well disposed persons...towards the Redemption of those Captives."<sup>90</sup> Such appeals commonly were handled by church leaders. More than

---

84 Lacey Baldwin Smith, *The Elizabethan World* (Boston, 1972), 152-153.

85 Playfair, *Scourge*, 34, 52, 55. Clark, "Barbary Corsairs," 107-108.

86 *CSPC*, XLII (1737): 75

87 Playfair, *Scourge*, 34, 63-65. The 1646 ransom was £9,196.

88 *Ibid.*, 126. Beer, *Colonial System*, I: 123.

89 Hist. Mss. XXVII, 179, 188. James G. Lydon, "Barbary Pirates and Colonial New Yorkers," *NYH-SQ* XLV (1961): 282-284.

90 Hist. Mss., XXVII: 188.



enough money to relieve the prisoners was subscribed and they were quickly redeemed.<sup>91</sup>

South Carolina proprietor Seth Southell, taken on his way to assume the governorship there, also fell prize to the Algerians. He was “forced to carry Mortar, Brick and stone for the Masons,” burdened with heavy chains.<sup>92</sup> The consul at Algiers ransomed him for £375. Again, William Harris, Connecticut emissary to London, suffered captivity and enslavement there in 1680. He begged the colony’s officials to pay his £300 ransom: “If you faile me of the said sum and said time, it is most like to be the loss of my life he [his owner] is soe Cruell and Covetous.”<sup>93</sup> The magistrates paid the sum demanded but, his health broken, Harris died shortly after his release.

Many New Englanders suffered at the hands of the Salleemen and Algerines in the 1690s, some languishing long years as captives. Robert Carver of Salem was held at Sallee for nine years, 1691 to 1700.<sup>94</sup> Famous divine Cotton Mather had a strong devotion to those enchained. His diary records his hopes and efforts on their behalf over a ten-year period. In 1693 his congregation gathered fifty-three pounds to free two persons, “that were in Turkish Captivity.”<sup>95</sup> Two years later, they raised eighty pounds “for three young Men in Turkish Slavery.”<sup>96</sup> The following year, he recorded: “this Day in a very great Congregation, praying for some of our Neighbours, that are in Captivity among the Turks of Zallee, from whence is to any human Prospect, Redemption ceaseth forever, I received and uttered my Assurance that the Lord Jesus Christ, had some wonderful Thing, to do for the Deliverance of our Captives.”<sup>97</sup> Two years later Reverend Mather wrote: “unto these distressed People, A Letter, to establish them in the Christian Faith, and comfort them under their terrible Calamities,” and published it as a broadside entitled ‘A Pastoral Letter to the English Captives in Africa.’<sup>98</sup> Shortly, he rejoiced at the news that four of them had been freed in “very surprising Circumstances.”<sup>99</sup> By March 1703 all the Barbary prisoners had been freed and returned to Boston.<sup>100</sup>

Five New York citizens suffered under the “Infidels” at Sallee. Relatives petitioned Governor Benjamin Fletcher for permission “to collect and Receive the free and bountifull Charity of all good Christians.”<sup>101</sup> Only one hundred pounds was required for two men to be redeemed; extra funds were to be devoted to freeing others. Ministers, church wardens, and constables posted the proclamation and received the funds. Four solid burghers acted as overseers. New York City made the heaviest contribution; the total reached nearly £374. Wealthy merchant Frederick Philipse made the largest donation and may have been the ship’s

---

91 E.B. O’Callaghan and B. Fernow, eds., *Documents Relative to the Colonial History of the State of New York*, 15 vols. (Albany, N.Y., 1853-1887), III: 717; II: 318-319.

92 Beer, *Origins*, 122n, 198-199. Harper, *Navigation Laws*, 216. *CSPC*, IX (1677-1680): 326, Playfair, *Scourge*, 131. William R. Riddell, “From Slave to Governor,” *Dalhousie Review* IX (1930): 475-480.

93 Richard S. Dunn, *Puritans and Yankees* (Princeton, N.J., 1962), 220-221. *CSPC*, IX (1677-1680): 589, 612; X (1681-1686): 65-66. Connecticut collected the ransom from his estate, £459.

94 Sidney Perley, *The History of Salem*, 3 vols. (Salem, Mass., 1924), III: 298. J.D. Phillips, *Salem in the Eighteenth Century* (Boston, 1937), 91.

95 Cotton Mather, *Diary of Cotton Mather*, ed. Worthington C. Ford, 2 vols. (New York, 1957), I: 177n..

96 *Ibid.*, I: 181.

97 *Ibid.*, I: 197.

98 *Ibid.*, I: 260.

99 *Ibid.*, I: 320-321.

100 *Ibid.*, I: 321.

101 E.Y. Corwin and H. Hastings, eds., *Ecclesiastical Records of New York*. 7 vols. (Albany, N.Y., 1901), II: 1061-1063. Hist. Mss. XXXIX: 44. New York (Colony). Council, *Calendar of Council Minutes, 1668-1783* (Albany, N.Y. 1902), 83. E.B. O’Callaghan, ed., *The Documentary History of New York State*. 4 vols. (Albany, N.Y., 1850-1851), III: 416. Lydon, “Barbary Pirates,” 284-289.

owner. Half the population of the colony contributed, motivated by tales of their harsh treatment. More women than men gave and a remarkable number of Negroes.<sup>102</sup> In 1695 an escapee notified New York authorities that “his companions, for whom a fund had been raised, were escaped, dead or had renounced Christianity.”<sup>103</sup> In fact, two were still alive and were redeemed by the new Anglo-Moroccan treaty.

Arrangements to pay a prisoner’s ransom required tortuously involved channels of communication. In the New York case, the fund overseers placed the money in the hands of Amsterdam merchants, who, in turn, employed a Cadiz firm, which presumably consulted a well disposed party in Morocco. As a commercial transaction, commissions were collected by all involved, which perhaps explains why the ransom of William Harris in the 1680s cost a total of £459, when his Algerine owner had demanded only £300 as ransom.<sup>104</sup>

Throughout the years, widespread recognition of the horrors of the Barbary slave pens encouraged charitable giving. In describing commodities available in North Africa, one contemporary commented, “and lastly, excellent Piratical Rascals, in great Quantity, and poor miserable Christian captives of all Nations too too many, God give them comfort, patience, and release in due time, if it be his Blessed Will.”<sup>105</sup> Sympathy opened the way for a confidence man. During the 1730s a traveling mendicant collected alms in Philadelphia. He had been, his “wife” claimed, seven years a “Prisoner of the Turks,” who cut out his tongue and burned his arms, now covered with sores. Exposed as a charlatan, he fled but was jailed a year later in Massachusetts for practicing the same confidence tricks.<sup>106</sup> In another instance, a Boston newspaper played on the theme of sympathy for a freed slave, describing a seaman’s arrival home after three years in a Sallee prison to discover his wife dressed for a marriage ceremony.<sup>107</sup> Another author compared the treatment of Barbary slaves to that of black slaves in America.<sup>108</sup> By the end of the century a literary genre, “Barbary Captive Accounts,” had fully developed. During the eighteenth century the English redeemed Moroccan slaves five times between 1720 and 1750. The first prison delivery in 1721 released twenty-six captains and 241 seamen. On arrival in London, they processed to St. Paul’s Cathedral to offer thanks for their redemption and then to St. James’s to thank the King. Collections for their support brought them £880.<sup>109</sup>

In 1734 Consul Zollicoffe arranged the freedom of 144 slaves at a cost of £10,728 sterling. Again a service at St. Paul’s offered “Thanks to God for their Deliverance,” and a reception at St. James’s to thank the King was followed by gifts from the royal family and Admiralty Board.<sup>110</sup> The deaths of ex-prisoners on the voyage home or at London emphasized the privations of their imprisonment. Many had lived at Mequinez on black bread and water. Slave owners had to agree to release them and then they were gathered from all parts of Morocco. The exact number of prisoners was therefore never precise nor could negotiators be sure that all had been released. In mid-1734 Londoners had speculated that 240 would be freed and only 144 gained freedom.

---

102 Corwin and Hastings, *Ecclesiastical Records*, II: 1063-1065. Hist. Mss. XL: 182.

103 *CSPC*, XIII (1693-1696): 450. I.N.P. Stokes, *The Iconography of Manhattan Island, 1498-1909*, 6 vols. (New York, 1922), IV: 396. Hist. Mss. XL: 182. O’Callaghan, *History of New York*, III: 415-416, 420.

104 See footnote 93.

105 Lewis Roberts, *The Merchant’s Mappe of Commerce* (London, 1700), 65.

106 *PG*, August 7, 1732; May 3, 1733.

107 *PG*, August 14, 1735. *NEWJ*, May 3, 1735.

108 *PG* September 14, 1774. Here the Royal Council in England is referred to as the “DIVAN,” a slighting comparison to the Dey’s council in Algiers.

109 *AWM*, April 26, 1722.

110 *PG*, February 18, 1735; May 2, 1734. *NEWJ*, February 24, 1735; March 10, 1735; March 24, 1735.

At midcentury an English envoy went again to Morocco to renew the treaties and free any British subjects captive there. Sixty prisoners gained release from Tetuan and Fez in fall 1750, most the crew of the privateer *Inspector*, wrecked in Tangier Bay in early 1746.<sup>111</sup> Apparently, the crew of HMS *Litchfield* was captured at Sallee in the last years of the Seven Years War. Peace saw them released. A colonial newspaper commented: “England is now at war only with Savages and Barbarians.”<sup>112</sup>

English merchants petitioned the King in 1749 for aid against the Algerines, who had “lately so greatly obstructed the trade to the streights.” Shortly, the corsairs seized the *Prince Frederick* packet. The desperate hope of escape or redemption was neatly evident in a letter from a prisoner at Algiers, dated January 5, 1750. George Gale, mate, recounted his capture the previous month on the ship *Endeavour*, “off the rock of Lisbon.” He reached Algiers on New Year’s Day and became one more Christian slave. Commodore Keppel’s arrival to treat with the Dey raised his spirits but his departure without an agreement put him “out of all hopes of liberty.” He tried to escape and was more heavily fettered with irons weighing thirty-six pounds and expected to be taken into the interior. Cruelly beaten daily, his life threatened, he still hoped for escape. Somehow he smuggled the letter aboard the HMS *Tryal*.<sup>113</sup>

Few major problems arose with the pirates down to the American Revolution. They were active against the weaker maritime states, but rarely challenged Britain’s naval might. As one London journal commented: “When we are not in Condition to command Respect, Algiers will affront us.”<sup>114</sup> Active elements stationed at Minorca and Gibraltar forced that respect. They kept the peace and enabled Britain to dominate Mediterranean trade and distribute the fish, grain, and rice of North America there. The English became “the Carriers of Europe up the Streights.”<sup>115</sup> Merchants “wanted universal calm, no apprehension of violence, no war, no thieves, no pirates, no Algerines, no Sallee-men, no Tuniziens or Tripolitans – in a word no enemy to be feared.”<sup>116</sup> England’s strength at sea made the difference. Threats or seizures saw fleets appear off their cities as in the fall of 1765, when eight men of war and three bomb ketches arrived to threaten Algiers.

Anglo-Barbary relations underwent a marked sea change between the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Britain during the 1600s was beleaguered and harassed; her coast open to attack; her shipping prey. A bit more than a hundred years later she was the premier Atlantic naval power, overawing the Barbary leaders; suffering the pirates to exist; dominating the Mediterranean up to the mouths of their ports. British shipping now had little to fear. As early as 1722 the British had sent a man-of-war to Algiers, carrying a letter forbidding the Algerines to cruise in British seas and declaring that those doing so would be taken prize. “[N]or are they to take any British ship in the Western Part of the Northern Seas,” even if it carried no Mediterranean pass. The Algerines purportedly agreed to the first proposal but insisted that all vessels carry sufficient passports.<sup>117</sup> Conditions had changed drastically in this relationship. Yet as late as the 1780s the British were paying a yearly tribute to the pirates of \$280,000.<sup>118</sup> They did so to control the destructive force of the pirate states and direct it against those who competed with them commercially. When the Americans declared independence, they sacrificed the protections they had enjoyed within the empire. Mediterranean passes were called in by proclamation in August 1776 – “probably to prevent the

---

111 *PG*, May 11, 1749; August 8, 1751. Eighty-six had reached shore.

112 *PG*, July 7, 1763; October 13, 1763.

113 *PG*, August 3, 1749; June 7, 1750; September 12, 1751.

114 *PG*, April 19, 1750; January 22, 1751.

115 *PG*, September 23, 1731.

116 Andrews, *Colonial Period*, IV: 322. *PG*, April 4, 1765; June 1, 1738.

117 *AWM*, May 3, 1722.

118 J.N. Larned, *History for Ready Reference*, 5 vols. (Springfield, Mass., 1894-1895), I: 263.

Americans from benefiting by those in their possession.”<sup>119</sup> Shortly, the British representatives in North Africa were encouraging the Barbary rulers to add the new nation to their list of potential victims.

\* \* \*

Through the eighteenth century American colonists took a serious interest in the Barbary States, a fact amply illustrated by the plethora of references to them found in their newspapers. Not only did they concern themselves with Anglo-Barbary relations but they also evaluated the impact of the wars the pirates fought with other European states, large and small. Those relationships affected their decisions on trade to the Wine Islands, to Iberia, and into the Mediterranean. In an era when trade, and information, moved much more slowly, the knowledge of events in those seas had an important place in their commercial decision making.

---

119 Macpherson, *Annals*, III: 593.

## CHAPTER V

### FISH FOR GOLD

Historians have traditionally viewed the New England fishery in the eighteenth century as serving market demands in three areas: most important, fish provided a staple for slaves in the West Indies; relatively large amounts of better quality dried cod went to southern Europe, including the Wine Islands; and comparatively smaller shipments fed the increasing slave populations of the tobacco and rice colonies in North America. This characterization is based largely upon analysis of the Boston fish trade, despite the fact that Boston was not the major fish exporting center in New England. The result of this bias in previous studies has been to overemphasize the significance of the West Indian outlets for fish and to undervalue the importance of the Iberian market.<sup>1</sup> A thorough examination of Massachusetts's fish trade with southern Europe demonstrates that the West Indies and southern Europe were of nearly equal importance as market areas and, as the colonials well recognized, neatly complemented one another. "This Valuable Branch of our Trade and nursery for Sea Men, the Fishery, almost if not wholly depends on our Trade to the Foreign Islands in the W. Indies, as we cant cure Fish for the European Markett separate from the other sort we send to the W. Indies."<sup>2</sup> To Iberian and other outlets in the south of Europe, Massachusetts sent so-called greater merchantable fish – well dried, unbroken codfish that was not salt burned. "Lesser merchantable," smaller cod was sent to the Portuguese Atlantic Islands and to Jamaica, while the cheapest, refuse grades of cod, plus pickled mackerel and other fish – "trash fish – went to other markets in the Americas.<sup>3</sup> The use of the terms "merchantable" and "trash" speaks for itself.

Fish was exported to southern Europe for three separate and distinct reasons. First, shipments developed credits to cover negative balances resulting from other trades, notably that with the mother country. Second, shippers acquired liquid assets, representing capital growth. Third, vessels returning from southern Europe brought goods in demand in Massachusetts and elsewhere in the colonies.

Analysis of the southern European branch of the colony's fish trade requires an examination of many factors: principal markets in Iberia; specialization within Massachusetts in the various branches of the fish trade; and an overview of the importance of the European market. Research is based on English diplomatic and mercantile correspondence, but most important are Massachusetts trade statistics of various kinds and data from Iberian port records. These sources provide enough material for a quantitative study of this traffic. Unfortunately, however, the majority of the statistically employable evidence comes from the eighteenth century: emphasis is on the period from 1713 to the disruption of the trade on the eve of the Revolution.<sup>4</sup>

---

1 Max Savelle, *A History of Colonial America*. Rev. by Robert Middlekauff (New York, 1964), 429-433. Curtis P. Nettels, *The Roots of American Civilization* (New York, 1963), 262. Innis, *Cod Fisheries*, 161, 167. This chapter appeared in *NEQ*, LIV: 539-558 and is reprinted by permission.

2 Edward Payne, "Observations on the Acts of Trade (1763)," MHS, Ezekial Price Collection.

3 Innis, *Cod Fisheries*, 118. Raymond McFarland, *The History of the New England Fisheries* (New York, 1911), 69, 95. Curtis P. Nettels, *The Money Supply of the American Colonies before 1720* (Madison, Wisc., 1934), 78. A significant price differential existed between fish sent to southern Europe and that shipped to the West Indies. In December 1763 prices were listed as 17s. per quintal for merchantable and 12s.8d. per quintal for Jamaica fish. See Edward Payne, "Account of Costs and Returns from the Marblehead Fishery," MHS, Ezekial Price Collection.

4 Reconstruction of eighteenth-century trade statistics is a difficult task. Those contained here are, therefore, not precise but are exact enough to warrant conclusions. Newfoundland data came from *CSPC*, 1701-1738 and Original Correspondence, Secretary of State, Newfoundland CO 194/25, 27-32. The Na-

Although the period of the study is limited, any examination of the Massachusetts fish trade reflects the colony's economic growth. The "Sacred Cod" was fundamental to its expansion.

\* \* \*

Dried salt cod or, as the Spanish called it, *bacalao*, possessed properties that made it valuable to both the merchant serving and the consumer living in tropical or semitropical areas. Sun-dried and dehydrated by constant application of salt, the cod toughened and hardened. Maintained in that condition, it was easily transported and, because it withstood the extraordinary heat of Iberian and other climates, provided a relatively cheap source of protein for mass consumption. Control over the North Atlantic cod fisheries thus became a significant prize in the struggle for empire in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. By 1700 Britain dominated the major cod sources and had also forced grants of special trading privileges for her merchants in southern Europe.<sup>5</sup> The English fishery was divided into two major branches, Newfoundland and New England. Newfoundland was, in the main, fished by English vessels that went to the Banks yearly and returned home via southern Europe when the season ended. The New England fishery, on the other hand, developed as a shore-based enterprise and thus competed with the home-based Newfoundland operation, especially in the southern European market.

The demand for *bacalao* in Spain, Portugal, their island dependencies, and even in Italy rose in this period as a result of population growth. Authorities differ as to its extent but generally agree that Iberian population grew fairly sharply in the sixteenth century, then paused or even declined until 1650, and in the next century and a half increased between fifty and one hundred percent. The greatest growth occurred during the eighteenth century.<sup>6</sup> By the 1770s the southern European market demanded almost 650,000 quintals of English salt cod annually.<sup>7</sup>

---

val Office Records for Massachusetts in the PRO, were excerpted and photostated in the 1930s under the title *Massachusetts Shipping Records (MSR)* and are listed under that title at MHS, PEM, The Library of Congress, and Wisconsin State Historical Society, Madison, and elsewhere. Salem material may be found in *MSR*, 1714-1717 and 1751-1765; in Salem Light Money Accounts, 1751-1771, at PEM; and also in *EG*. Boston statistics are from *MSR*, 1718-1719, 1752-1765, and customs reports in *BNL*, 1714-1773; also in *NEWJ*, 1730-1739. The "Inspector General's Reports" (CO 16/1) have been utilized for 1768-1772.

5 Bernardo de Ulloa, *Rétablissement des manufactures et du commerce d'Espagne* (Amsterdam, 1753), 45-55. McLachlan, *Trade and Peace*, 14.

6 Anderson, *Europe in Eighteenth Century*, 48. Herr, *Revolution in Spain*, 86-87. Vicens Vives, *Historia social y economica*, 809; *Manual*, 440-444. Joseph Townshend, *A Journey through Spain in the Years 1786 and 1787*, 3 vols. (London, 1792), I: 118; II: 369, 418; III: 11, 122, 169, 236. Pedro Voltes Bou, "Aspectos economicas del siglo XVIIIe," *Cuadernos de Arqueologia e Historia de la Ciudad* (Barcelona), III (1962): 143.

7 See Table 5-2. Codfish is estimated at 100 pounds per quintal (qtl.); 22.4 qtls. per ton. This figure for 1770-1773 is from CO 16/1. The actual average for these years is 646,920 qtls. These figures may well overstate exports.

**TABLE 5-1**  
**Annual Consumption of English Codfish**  
**in Spanish Ports during 1770s**

<b>Port</b>	<b>Population</b>	<b>English Fish (qtls.)</b>
Barcelona	92,000	57,000
Valencia	100,000	10,000
Denia		9,000
Alicante	17,000	50,000
Cartagena	60,000	15,000
Almeria		4,000
Malaga	42,000	14,000
Cadiz	70,000	110,000
Ferrol		20,000
Vigo	6,000	
Corunna		
Gijon	6,000	
Santander	2,000	
Bilbao	12,000	90,000
San Sebastian		2,000
Canary & Balearic Is.		5,000
Misc. Ports		<u>20,000</u>
		406,000

Sources: For fish consumption, see SPFS 94/180-181, 194/96, 213, Consular Reports. Records of the Consulado de Bilbao. Townshend, *Journey through Spain*, III: 169, provides Alicante, Denia, and Valencia data in 1784-1785. Miscellaneous ports are estimated. For population figures see footnote 6. Blanks indicate unavailable data.

Spanish markets consumed perhaps three-quarters of the total, approximately 485,000 quintals per year. Figures in Table 5-1 are incomplete and are significantly lower than the 487,500 quintals suggested by Harold Innis; the higher figure is supported by data in Table 5-2.<sup>8</sup> From coastal centers Barcelona, Alicante, Cadiz, and Bilbao, *bacalao* was distributed through the local market areas or transported inland to feed the people of the central plain. Barcelona's imports fed its large population and the interior parts of Catalonia. Alicante, with a much smaller population than neighboring Valencia, nonetheless took a larger yearly quota of fish because it was located on a traditional land route to Murcia and the central plain of Castille. Cadiz served its own market and acted as entrepôt for Seville and Andalucia. Codfish was also in demand to provision outward bound vessels.

Perhaps the most striking example of the importance of the inland market is Bilbao. Located on the banks of the Nervion River in Vizcaya, Bilbao had a population of only ten to twelve thousand and yet offered a port of entry for centers in Old Castille via Vitoria and Burgos. Even today, the province of Vizcaya is

<sup>8</sup> Ulloa, *Rétablissement*, 46-48. Cf. Innis, *Cod Fisheries*, 195n and Table 5-2. Southern European exports rose sharply in the late 1760s, which may account for the discrepancy between figures.

sometimes called “tierra del Bacalao.”<sup>9</sup>

\* \* \*

In the eighteenth century Portugal apparently consumed approximately one-third the amount of dried cod taken by the Spanish, although this ratio may have changed over the century. During the 1770s Portuguese consumption approached 175,000 quintals per year; the two major centers, Lisbon and Oporto, imported about 88,200 quintals and 42,000 quintals per year, respectively, and several smaller ports took the balance.<sup>10</sup> Lisbon, which enjoyed a commercial revival in the eighteenth century because of the development of Brazil, was the fourth largest city in Europe with some 200,000 people.<sup>11</sup> The city’s fish sellers distributed their imports inland via the Tagus River and even reached into Spanish territory. The port was also a center for export to Brazil and for ship provisioning. Oporto, located in the north on the Douro River, also served interior markets.

English traders, facing heavy French competition, also found markets in Italian ports, including Leghorn, the primary center, Naples, and Civita Vecchia. Sales in Italy probably totaled 27,000 quintals of English fish yearly.<sup>12</sup>

---

9 See chapter VI.

10 Minor port consumption included Vianna (17,000 qtls./yr.), Figuera (13,600 qtls.), Aveiro (2,400), Caminha (2,700), Madeira (4,000). SPFP 89/77 and Board of Trade Papers, 6/62, for consulate correspondence on 1770s imports. Cf. Fisher, “Anglo-Portuguese Trade” (PhD diss.), 79, 146. Jean-François Bourgoing, ed., *Travels of the Duke de Châtelet in 1777 and 1778 in Portugal*, 2 vols. (London, 1809), I: 264-265. Some sources suggest a decline in Lisbon’s imports in the 1770s from earlier in the century. In 1729 a figure of 80,000 quintals was reported. Possibly the earthquake of 1755 caused the decline. See Compton to Newcastle, August 6, 1729, SPFP 89/35. Ibbotson to Board of Trade, August 3, 1765, Consular Reports on Trade 388/95.

11 Twiss, *Travels through Portugal*, 26. Francis, *Methuens*, 13.

12 Innis, *Cod Fisheries*, 180. Dick to Board of Trade, July 11, 1765; Consular Reports on Trade 388/95. Dick to Board of Trade, Consular Reports on Trade 388/53.



**TABLE 5-2**  
**American Codfish Exports to Southern Europe, 1701-1774**  
**(in Quintals)**

	<b>Newfoundland</b>	<b>Salem</b>	<b>Boston</b>	<b>Total</b>
1701	154,370			
1714	129,888	43,925a	10,020	168,945
1715		58,079	6,197	153,898
1716		58,566	14,674	161,709
1717	92,680	19,780a	12,394	146,164
1718	92,730		25,786	
1719	94,479		16,217	
1720	94,080		14,484	
1721			8,607	
1722	106,940		9,794	
1723	72,990		7,515	
1724	92,090		9,474	
1725	108,220		13,261	
1726	174,670		19,688	
1727	207,530		15,030	
1728			30,891	
1729	163,450		22,604	
1730	242,150	41,520	20,871	304,541
1731	98,680	37,679	20,550	156,909
1732		53,863	14,864	
1733		52,717	14,579	
1734	297,650	46,583	13,487	357,720
1735	404,725	40,125b	14,899	459,749
1736	299,030		22,058	
1737			19,102	
1738	380,000		21,061	
1739			14,994	
1740			9,984	
1748	418,850	32,000	10,756	461,606
1749	462,070			
1750	445,970		14,543	
1751	358,310	76,160		
1752		80,485	11,018	
1753		90,534	25,140	
1754		94,406	26,209	
1755		115,868	39,803	
1756		122,584	20,840	

**TABLE 5-2 continued**  
**American Codfish Exports to Southern Europe, 1701-1774**  
**(in Quintals)**

	<b>Newfoundland</b>	<b>Salem</b>	<b>Boston</b>	<b>Total</b>
1761		74,402	6,040	
1762		35,469	8,364	
1763	561,310	80,908	14,556	656,774
1764	470,188	92,314	14,367	576,869
1765	493,654	118,932	13,017	625,603
1766	523,636	76,451	14,933	615,020
1767	533,620	123,894	9,778	667,292
1768	533,087	109,491	14,886	657,464
1769	544,718	111,978	11,186	667,882
1770	610,910	103,018	8,245	722,173
1771	560,204	128,979	11,615	700,798
1772	481,347	107,554	5,940	594,841
1773	489,665	75,062	5,143	569,870
1774	516,358	117,488	c	633,846

Sources: Newfoundland: CO 194/25-32, 390/6. Figure for 1768 is an average for years 1764-1775; *CSPC* (1734-1738). Macpherson, *Annals*, III: 423. Salem: *MSR*, 1714-1717, 1751-1765; Salem Light Money Accounts, 1751-1771; *NEWJ*, customs reports, 1729-1735; *EG*, customs reports, 1772-1774. Salem utilization of fish estimated at 85.3% (1730-1735), 100% (1751-1774), where actual fish cargo is not available. Cf. Innis, *Cod Fisheries*, 161-162. Boston: *MSR*, 1718-1719, 1752-1765; CO 16/1, 1768-1772; *BNL*, customs reports, 1711-1774; *NEWJ*, 1730-1739. Boston utilization of tonnage for fish, 53% (1714-1750), 65% (1752-1761), 56.4% (1763-1767), and 52.9% (1768-1773).

Notes: a indicates only data for two quarters; b indicates three quarters; c indicates port of Boston closed. Blank spaces indicate data not available. Conversion based on 22.4 quintals per ton; 2 quintals per barrel; 7 quintals per hogshead; 1.33 barrels per tierce.

These figures provide a fair estimate of annual consumption of *bacalao* in the southern European market, as reported by Iberians, English merchants, and consular officials there. Data in Table 5-2 suggest that they understated the actual market.

\* \* \*

Since the New England and Newfoundland cod fisheries competed for Iberian sales, statistics gathered from a variety of sources on the exports of both areas, 1701-1774, are valuable. They indicate broad fluctuations in production but general growth during this period.

Demand in southern Europe increased with population growth, but other factors affected production: Newfoundland's periodic severe winters dropped water temperatures below zero degrees centigrade, straining its economy. The harsh winter of 1713-1714 depressed Newfoundland production for more than a decade since the cod did not return to their usual feeding grounds. During the early 1750s severe weather again affected Newfoundland.<sup>13</sup>

13 Angeles Alvarino and Olegario Rodriguez, *La Merluza et el bacalao y especies afines* (Madrid,

Such occurrences gave New England fish shippers an advantage in Iberian outlets. When Newfoundland production fell, New England producers may well have sent poorer grades of fish to southern Europe but charged the higher prices of merchantable grades, as attested to by complaints from English merchants in Iberia in the late teens.<sup>14</sup> On the other hand, when Newfoundland production boomed, more mainland fish was forced into West Indies and coastal outlets, where excess supplies caused falling prices. When the Newfoundland fishery recovered, as it did in the mid-twenties, New Englanders faced heavy competition. In those years Spanish prices reached the lowest level of the century.<sup>15</sup>

In addition to climate, the wars and rumors of war, which punctuated the period from 1700 to 1774, also seriously affected the fish trade with Iberia. Three major conflicts occurred, in 1702-1713, 1739-1748, and 1756-1763. A minor squabble in 1719-1720 and threats of war in the twenties, thirties, and again in 1754-1756 and 1770 also concerned merchants and shippers. The northern fishery appears to have suffered more than that of New England, though both were distressed. One source suggests that in 1742 only 120,000 quintals of fish went from America to the south of Europe.<sup>16</sup> When France and England fought, fishermen were threatened by warships and privateers based in French Canada, and carriers bound to ports in southern Europe were open to seizure. Traffic to Bilbao, deep in the corner of the Bay of Biscay, lay wide open to French attack. Thus, both Massachusetts and Newfoundland shippers concentrated their cargoes on Portuguese mainland ports during the war years, and in some cases the fish was reshipped in Spanish and Portuguese bottoms to Spanish markets.<sup>17</sup> The trade suffered even greater dislocation when the English and Spanish went to war, for then the large Spanish market was closed to English suppliers.<sup>18</sup> During the years 1739-1744, when Spain and England engaged in the War of Jenkins' Ear, French fisheries expanded rapidly and replaced English cargoes at Cadiz and elsewhere. News of this usurpation encouraged New Englanders to attack and destroy their prospering competitors. The Louisbourg expedition in 1745 was largely motivated by a desire to crush the fishery based there.<sup>19</sup> Massachusetts statistics suggest that during the French and Indian War, the New England branch suffered less than did the northern fishery, except in 1762 and 1763, when war with Spain broke out. After both conflicts, the fisheries recovered rapidly. In 1749, for example, forty-seven fish carriers landed cargoes at Bilbao (twenty-two from Newfoundland, nineteen from New England, four from England, and two from Lisbon).<sup>20</sup>

Prices obviously played a part in encouraging production for the southern European market. Earl J. Hamilton's index of fish prices for Spain indicates a long-term rise in prices from a level of 90 in 1700 to 128.5 by late 1774.<sup>21</sup> Liquid assets derived from fish sales were especially desirable, given the economic dislocations within the British system. In fact, those dislocations were sufficiently critical to encourage

---

1955), 47, 52, 58, 68. Innis, *Cod Fisheries*, 149, 171. *PG*, April 16, 1752. *BNL*, April 26, 1752.

14 "Report on the State of the Fish Trade to Portugal," September 17, 1718, SPFP 89/26.

15 Hamilton, *War and Prices*, 264-267.

16 Innis, *Cod Fisheries*, 180.

17 See Table 5-4. For fish transported to Spain in Portuguese vessels, see "Averia Accounts," 1756-1763, which indicate a relatively large number of small vessels carrying fish entering from Corunna and Lisbon.

18 Poyntz to Cragg, October 15, 1718; Rowe to Hubbert, April 19, 1762, SPFP 89/26. Fairchild, *Pepperrells*, 102-103.

19 Henri Sée, "Documents sur le Commerce de Cadix (1691-1752)," *Revue de l'Histoire des Colonies Françaises* XV (1926-1927): 61. William Shirley, *Memoirs of the Principal Transactions of the Last War* (London, 1757), 7-10. Innis, *Cod Fisheries*, 173-175.

20 "Averia Accounts," 1749.

21 Hamilton, *War and Prices*, 264-267. Base years for this index of fish prices were 1726-1750.

colonials to ship fish cargoes even when markets in Europe were depressed. A classic example of this occurred in 1771-1772, when New Englanders dumped fish on a Bilbayan market already badly depressed by oversupplies, despite the warnings of the city's major firm, Joseph Gardoqui & Sons.<sup>22</sup>

Except when its production was at a low ebb, the Newfoundland trade answered almost eighty percent of the demand from southern points; Massachusetts shipments satisfied less than twenty percent and other areas perhaps five percent. The data are not completely dependable, but even given a wide margin for error, it is obvious that Newfoundland fish dominated Iberian markets. Average annual exports from the two English fisheries, 1761-1773 (for those years for which statistics are extant) reached 641,280 quintals.<sup>23</sup> Overall growth of this market seems to have been from about 250,000 quintals per year at the turn of the eighteenth century to about 640,000 per year by the American Revolution. Demand increased because of population growth, but English fish sales rose because they now dominated fish sources. By the close of the period under discussion, French and Spanish fishermen no longer provided significant amounts of fish for the Iberian markets.<sup>24</sup>

\* \* \*

In 1614, after exploring along the New England coast, Captain John Smith of Virginia fame took a cargo of codfish to Spain. This is one of the earliest references to a fishery in New England, but there are numerous others. During the economic crisis of the 1640s, Massachusetts established solid connections with the southern European market with exports of fish, lumber, and grain.<sup>25</sup> The first statistics available are for the years 1661-1662: nine clearances (790 tons) to southern Europe as opposed to eight vessels (580 tons) to the West Indies.<sup>26</sup> During the 1680s Boston exported at least 16,000 quintals of fish to Bilbao and other southern European outlets yearly, and by 1700 Boston and Salem shipments combined had risen to about 25,000 quintals a year.<sup>27</sup>

The real expansion of the Massachusetts trade came in 1713, after Queen Anne's War ended. Unfortunately, Naval Office data for the colony are all but nonexistent until 1750. Boston's trade statistics can be developed from the few years of Naval Office material available and from customs information reported consistently in the *Boston Newsletter* and other newspapers. Information for Salem, the major outlet to Iberia, is scarce for the first half of the eighteenth century. A customs office had been established there in 1676, but only three years of records (1714-1717) remain. Less reliable data come from customs

---

22 Cabot "Papers," I. Beginning in May 1771 the Gardoquis warned of a glut of fish at Bilbao and continued to do so as late as May 1773.

23 It is impossible to reconcile the various figures for fish exports in the early 1770s. CO 16/1 provides a figure of 538,613 quintals for total North American exports to southern Europe in 1771, while British Museum, Additional Mss. 38345, folios 136-137 sets the total at 736,877 quintals. My data show that Newfoundland and Salem shipped 689,183 qtls. that year. According to CO 194/25-32, the CO 16/1 data seriously understate Newfoundland exports; CO 16/1, therefore, exaggerates the Massachusetts share of that market. My statistics for Salem (Table 5-2) show exports of 128,979 quintals in 1771, as opposed to CO 16/1 figures of 119,028 quintals. In the absence of any firmer data, Boston export figures have been taken from CO 16/1 for 1768-1772.

24 Innis, *Cod Fisheries*, 174, 183-185. The French supplied their own market but rarely competed in Iberia after 1700.

25 Morison, *Maritime History*, 9. Innis, *Cod Fisheries*, 72.

26 "The Names of such Ships and Masters that have come in and gone out of our Harbours & Given Bond for His Majesty's Customs, August 16, 1661 to February 25, 1662," MHS.

27 MSR, March 25, 1688 to September 29, 1688. Twenty vessels (1,100 tons) carried 16,080 quintals of fish to Iberia and the Wine Islands. See also Nettels, *Money Supply*, 79.

reports in the *New England Weekly Journal* for some years in the 1730s. Information on shipments from Boston and Salem is quite solid after 1750.<sup>28</sup>

Major ports on the Iberian mainland commonly took full fish cargoes. Mixed cargoes of fish, provisions, and lumber went to Wine Island ports and to Gibraltar. In peacetime Salem sent about sixty percent of its cargoes to Spain, most of the rest to Portugal, and relatively few to Gibraltar or “up the Straits.” Salem rarely cleared more than eight percent of its fish to the Wine Islands. Bilbao consistently drew heavily on North Shore exports, more than thirty-three percent before 1750 and subsequently in peaceful eras close to fifty percent. Salem merchants maintained close relations with Bilbayan firms, such as Parminter & Barrow; Lynch, Lynch, Kelly & Moroney; or Joseph Gardoqui & Sons.<sup>29</sup>

**TABLE 5-3**  
**Vessels Cleared, Massachusetts to Iberia and Wine Islands, 1711-1774**

Year	Salem Mainland		Wine Islands		Total		Boston Mainland		Wine Islands		Total	
	Vessels	Tons	Vessels	Tons	Vessels	Tons	Vessels	Tons	Vessels	Tons	Vessels	Tons
1737							17	1,241	8	368	25	1,609
1738							18	1,314	10	460	28	1,774
1739							11	803	10	460	21	1,263
1740							9	657	4	184	13	841
1741							7	511	2	92	9	603
1742							13	949	3	138	16	1,087
1743							8	584	3	138	11	722
1744							7	511	4	184	11	695
1748							8	584	7	322	15	906
1749												
1750												
1751	44	3,320	1	80	45	3,400	13	949	6	276	19	1,225
1752	42	3,449	2	102	44	3,551	8	597	1	40	9	637
1753	49	3,830	4	190	53	4,020	20	1,598	3	116	23	1,714
1754	48	3,873	5	210	53	4,083	27	2,250	4	215	31	2,465
1755	59	4,583	4	255	63	4,838	28	1,803	1	50	29	1,853
1756	69	5,178	4	250	73	5,428	28	1,770	1	40	29	1,810
1757	51	3,754	4	232	55	3,986	18	1,005	2	135	20b	1,140
1758	52	3,882	4	140	56	4,022	12	640	2	85	14b	725
1759	56	4,391	0	0	56	4,391	6	347	3	120	9	467
1760	35	3,070	3	250	38	3,320	13	907	1	50	14	957
1761	47	3,220	3	180	50	3,400	13	755	1	30	14	785
1762	22	1,575	4	235	26	1,810	11	588	1	60	12	648
1763	49	3,345	4	180	53	3,525	14	1,040	4	260	18	1,300
1764	51	3,924	2	100	53	4,024	14	937	6	445	20	1,382
1765	64	4,758	1	125	65	4,883	8	556	2	110	10	666
1766	36	3,070	4	343	40	3,413	15	1,020	3	162	18	1,182
1767	62	5,311	3	220	65	5,531	9	612	3	162	12	774
1768	54	4,572	3	306	57	4,878	16	1,088	5	270	21	1,358
1769	58	4,945	1	54	59	4,999	8	544	5	270	13	814
1770	49	4,419	2	180	51	4,599	9	612	3	162	12	774
1771	64	5,509	4	249	68	5,758	11	748	7	378	18	1,126
1772	53	4,563	3	238	56	4,801	5	340	6	324	11	664
1773	38	3,272	1	79	39	3,351	4	272	3	162	7	434
1774	60	5,166	1	79	61	5,245		Port Closed				

28 *BNL*, 1714-1774; *NEWJ*, 1730-1739; and *EG*, 1768-1774, provide customs data. Newspaper runs are quite complete but for 1749 and 1751, where a number of issues are missing. Occasionally editors omitted data when short of space but often the next issue had returns for two weeks. Winter omissions reflected weather closure of ports. Checked against *MSR*, newspaper data ran about twelve percent below official statistics.

29 See chapter VI and Table 5-1.

**TABLE 5-3 continued**  
**Vessels Cleared, Massachusetts to Iberia and Wine Islands, 1711-1774**

Year	Salem		Wine Islands		Total		Boston		Wine Islands		Total	
	Vessels	Tons	Vessels	Tons	Vessels	Tons	Vessels	Tons	Vessels	Tons	Vessels	Tons
1711							15	1,095	13	598	28	1,693
1712							3	219	16	736	19	955
1713							3	219	13	498	16	717
1714	25	2,288	1	40	26a	2,328	4	292	12	552	16	844
1715	39	2,929	0	0	39	2,929	4	292	5	230	9	522
1716	39	2,849	5	260	44	3,109	10	730	11	506	21	1,236
1717	14	946	3	121	17a	1,067	8	584	10	460	18	1,044
1718							14	1,022	25	1,150	39	2,172
1719							8	584	17	782	25	1,366
1720							6	438	17	782	23	1,220
1721							3	219	11	506	14	725
1722							5	365	10	460	15	825
1723							3	219	9	414	12	633
1724							4	292	11	506	15	798
1725							9	657	10	460	19	1,117
1726							9	657	23	1,058	32	1,715
1727							6	438	18	828	24	1,266
1728							18	1,314	28	1,288	46	2,602
1729	27	2,079	2	94	29	2,173	16	1,168	16	736	32	1,904
1730	25	1,925	1	47	26	1,972	14	1,022	16	736	30	1,758
1731							22	1,606	16	736	38	2,342
1732	36	2,772	1	47	37	2,819	14	1,022	5	230	19	1,252
1733	34	2,618	3	141	37	2,759	8	584	14	644	22	1,228
1734	28	2,156	6	282	34	2,438	8	584	12	552	20	1,136
1735	23	1,771	7	329	30b	2,100	9	657	13	598	22	1,255
1736							16	1,168	15	690	31	1,858

Sources: Salem: Data for 1714-1717 from *MSR*. Clearances for 1729-1735 from *NEWJ*, tonnage statistics, estimated using averages in 1714-1717 data (vessels to mainland averaged 77 tons; to Wine Islands 47 tons). Data for 1751-1771 from *MSR*; gaps in those years have been filled in from the Salem Light Money Accounts. Clearances for 1772-1774 from *EG* customs reports; tonnage statistics estimated from Salem Light Money Accounts, 1766-1771 (vessels to mainland averaged 86.1 tons; to Wine Islands 79.5 tons). Boston: Clearances for 1711-1750 from customs reports in *BNL*; tonnage estimated as 73 tons to mainland and 46 tons to Wine Islands. Data for 1752-1773 from *MSR*; where there are gaps in these records, I have used customs records from the *BNL* for vessels and estimated tonnage from *MSR* (vessels to mainland averaged 68 tons; to Wine Islands 54 tons). Official data ends in 1765, so years 1766-1773 have all been estimated in this manner. The *BNL* made no customs reports of clearances in 1757 and 1758. These gaps in *MSR* could not be filled in by using the customs data; one quarter is missing for each of these years.

Note: a signifies only two quarters; b signifies only three quarters. Not enough data are available for Boston in the *BNL* in 1749 and 1751 to be statistically viable, thus they have been left blank. Blanks indicate data unavailable.

Before 1750 more than half of Boston's clearances were bound for the Wine Islands; after midcentury, the figure fell to about one-fifth.<sup>30</sup> Boston shippers had more interest in ports within the Straits, such as

<sup>30</sup> Boston trade to the Wine Islands declined significantly over time. Between 1711 and 1735, on average, over 60% of Boston's clearances in the fish trade went to the island ports. Between 1735 and 1750 that

Alicante, Malaga, Barcelona, or Port Mahon, than did their Salem neighbors. About ten percent of Boston's fish carriers went to Bilbao. Exact destinations are somewhat difficult to ascertain since Boston merchants, and those from Salem to some extent, often cleared vessels under the vague heading of "Europe."<sup>31</sup>

**TABLE 5-4**  
**Destinations of Fish Carriers**  
**from Massachusetts to Southern Europe**

Area	Pre-1752		1752-1773		War Years		Peacetime	
	Salem	Boston	Salem	Boston	Salem	Boston	Salem	Boston
Spain	60.4%	23.9%	49.2%	31.1%	17.4%	16.0%	61.9%	38.1%
Portugal	25.9	55.3	30.0	39.3	41.7	48.2	25.3	35.3
Europe, Straits, & Gibraltar	13.6	20.6	20.6	29.3	40.7	35.7	12.6	26.5
Vizcaya (Bilbao)	35.0	10.7	36.4	7.4	6.4	2.6	48.3	9.6
Wine Islands	7.7	52.0	5.5	18.0	6.4	9.8	5.2	21.6

Sources: See Table 5-2. War years are 1756-1762; peacetime, 1752-1755, 1763-1773; Spain and Portugal include islands.

Given the various centers demanding fish in southern Europe, it seems apparent that Massachusetts shippers, Bostonians especially, dominated the Wine Island outlets and met very heavy competition from the Newfoundland fisheries elsewhere. Bilbao was the sole exception. There Massachusetts fish equaled and at times exceeded in quantity supplies from the northern fishery.<sup>32</sup>

Wine Island traders were smaller than those bound to the mainland. Salem vessels between 1751 and 1768 averaged about seventy-nine tons when mainland-bound and sixty-one tons if sailing to the Wine Islands.<sup>33</sup> Thus, an even greater proportion of tonnage went to the mainland than figures for numbers of vessels would suggest. Boston, in the fifties and sixties, dispatched vessels to the mainland averaging about seventy-two tons and to the Wine ports at about sixty tons each.<sup>34</sup> After 1752 the proportion of tonnage assigned to carrying fish from Boston to southern Europe declined markedly. Fish cargoes fell from an average of 1,400 quintals per vessel to less than 600.<sup>35</sup> Fish traders clearing Boston also seemed

---

percentage fell to about 35%, and after 1750 declined to about 18%. Salem percentages were 7.1% (1714-1717), 10.3% (1729-1735), and 5.2% (1751-1774).

31 The circumlocution may have been used to mask market strategies and during wartime to conceal information from the enemy. For the same reason, Boston newspapers did not list clearances between 1744 and summer 1747 and again from early 1757 through 1759.

32 "Averia Accounts," 1732-1738, 1749-1754, 1758, 1763-1774. Identifiable ships from Newfoundland numbered 642 and from New England 661. After 1763 Massachusetts dominated the market.

33 Average tonnages have been derived from *MSR*, 1752-1765 and from Salem Light Money Accounts, 1751-1768.

34 Average tonnages of vessels sailing Boston to southern Europe were: 1718-1719, 30 vessels, 1,971 tons, average 65.7 tons; October 1752 to October 1756, 114 vessels, 8,007 tons, average 70.2 tons; 1762 and 1764, 29 vessels, 648 tons, average 65 tons. Data from CO 16/1 were, 1768-1772, 80 vessels, 4,895 tons, 61.1 tons.

35 *MSR* and CO 16/1 provide utilization ratios for Boston vessels taking fish to southern Europe, as

to be smaller, but statistical weaknesses in the data and the questionable accuracy of tonnage figures in the “Inspector General’s Report” (CO 16/1) render this no more than a possibility.<sup>36</sup>

As has been tacitly suggested by the separation of Boston and Salem, a proper understanding of the Bay Colony’s trade with southern Europe is possible only by considering the two ports individually. During the seventeenth century Boston merchants acted as agents arranging fish cargoes for English correspondents or sent shipments in their own vessels; however, during the next century a strong mercantile community emerged on the North Shore as Salem, Marblehead, and other towns gradually asserted their independence from Boston.<sup>37</sup> From 1714-1774 fish exportations to southern Europe came more and more to be centered at Salem, until that port almost engrossed the traffic. As a result, Boston had to concentrate on West Indies and coastal markets. Because of their control over fish sources, North Shore leaders were able to organize vertically and profit not only from sales in the Iberian market but from the fishery and shipping as well. Boston’s loss of dominance over fish exports to the European market was compounded by losses in the intercolonial wine trade caused by increasing competition from Philadelphia, New York, and Charleston. After 1730 other colonies expanded their trade, shipping grain, flour, rice, and other products to southern Europe in exchange for wine, salt, and bills of credit.

By the 1730s a much larger portion of the fish went out in North Shore ships, and Bostonians’ profits as middlemen for English merchants had been sharply curtailed. In answer, the latter invested in the Nova Scotia fishery and built close contacts with Newfoundland, exporting provisions to Canso in Nova Scotia, and later Halifax, as well as to St. John’s, Newfoundland, in exchange for fish which could be taken to European ports.<sup>38</sup>

The role of Boston’s merchants as English agents is mentioned as early as the 1640s, and sparse statistics for the seventeenth century provide confirmation.<sup>39</sup> Vessels clearing to southern Europe from Boston, 1686-1688, were about equal in number between Boston-registered and English-registered carriers. But the English ships were significantly larger. Totals were Boston 855 tons and England 1,460 tons. English vessels carried full fish cargoes directly to mainland ports (23 vessels, 1,380 tons). Boston was already deeply involved in the wine trade and sent 13 vessels (435 tons) there. Only 10 Boston vessels (420 tons) went to peninsular ports.<sup>40</sup> Salem records, 1714-1717, still show a heavy dependence on shipping registered in Britain (66.2% of the shipping clearing to Europe) or Boston (22.5%). Less than one-tenth of the tonnage sailing to southern European ports was registered in Essex County.

---

follows: 1752-1756, 65%; 1762-1764, 56.4%; 1768-1772, only 47.3%.

36 Official data are lacking to provide a comparison with CO 16/1 statistics, but Salem Light Money Accounts allow comparisons for number of vessels and tonnage. A small discrepancy exists for vessels (4.3%), with CO 16/1 having fewer clearances. The difference in tonnage cleared is, however, not acceptable (17.3%) over the years 1768-1771: Light Money Accounts, 235 vessels, 20,244 tons; CO 16/1, 225 vessels, 16,748 tons. As a spot check, tonnages of individual vessels identifiable in both Light Money data and in *MSR* were compared. This analysis confirmed the accuracy of the Light Money figures for tonnages. Serious questions are thus raised concerning the accuracy of CO 16/1. The weakness of the tonnage statistics affects average tonnage for vessels in this source and also utilization factors for fish carried. In the latter case, utilization factors from CO 16/1 would be significantly overstated.

37 James G. Lydon, “North Shore Trade in the Early Eighteenth Century,” *The American Neptune*, XXVIII (1968): 261-274.

38 *Ibid.*, 273-274.

39 *Boston Records*.

40 *MSR*, Boston clearances: May-September 1686; March-September 1687; March-September 1688. Total cleared were 51 vessels, 2,553 tons: Boston-registered vessels, 23; English 25; Salem 2 vessels, 120 tons total; West Indies 1 vessel, 18 tons.



Care must be taken in dealing with ship registrations. They only indicate the port at which a vessel was last registered. Figures contained in Table 5-5 show that North Shore shipowners had pushed English vessels out of the fish trade by the 1750s. Boston's share, averaging almost twenty percent of tonnage clearing to Iberian and Wine Island points, remained steady until 1757, but then fell sharply, perhaps because of a shortage of fish. After the French and Indian War, Boston-registered vessels again entered the trade, increasing their share to about thirty-eight percent by 1765. On close analysis, however, those registrations did not necessarily reflect an owner's residence. Of the fifty-one clearances to southern Europe, 1763-1765, and not registered at Salem (forty-seven Boston, three Southampton, and one Portsmouth), the owners of thirty-seven of the vessels are positively identifiable as of North Shore origin: Robert Hooper (five), Jeremiah Lee (five), Isaac Smith (ten), Richard Derby (fourteen), Azor Orne (four), and others. Another eight vessels were probably owned by Essex County investors, so only perhaps six vessels were actually owned by Bostonians. For the nine quarters of 1763-1765 for which there are Naval Office data, the actual percentage of vessels owned on the North Shore appears to have been more than ninety-five percent, rather than the approximately sixty percent suggested by Table 5-5.<sup>41</sup>

**TABLE 5-5**  
**Vessel Registrations of Clearances to Southern Europe, 1752-1765**

Year	Salem				Boston				England			
	Vessels	Tons	Per-centage of Vessels	Per-centage of Tons	Vessels	Tons	Per-centage of Vessels	Per-centage of Tons	Vessels	Tons	Per-centage of Vessels	Per-centage of Tons
1752a	7	605	70.0	75.1	2	150	20.0	18.6	1	50	10.0	6.2
1753	37	2,705	69.8	67.3	11	765	20.7	19.0	1	100	1.9	2.5
1754	42	3,263	79.2	79.9	9	600	17.0	14.7	1	100	1.9	2.4
1755	43	3,385	68.2	69.9	16	1,143	25.4	23.6	0	0	0	0
1756	57	4,300	78.0	79.2	12	838	16.4	15.4	1	100	1.4	1.8
1757c	31	2,090	88.6	86.2	2	135	5.7	5.6	1	50	2.8	2.0
1758c	31	2,112	73.8	72.7	7	403	16.7	13.9	2	150	4.8	5.1
1759	47	3,691	83.9	84.0	6	450	10.7	10.2	2	150	3.4	3.3
1760b	19	1,505	86.3	83.8	2	190	9.0	10.6	1	100	4.5	5.6
1761	45	2,995	90.0	88.0	4	305	8.0	9.0	1	100	2.0	2.9
1762	23	1,570	88.4	86.7	3	240	11.5	13.2	0	0	0	0
1763	26	1,675	49.0	47.5	26	1,750	49.0	49.6	1	100	1.9	2.9
1764b	21	1,340	75.0	70.8	6	452	21.4	23.9	1	100	3.6	5.3
1765c	<u>27</u>	<u>1,900</u>	<u>61.4</u>	<u>57.8</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>1,165</u>	<u>34.0</u>	<u>35.5</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>2.2</u>	<u>3.0</u>
Total	456	33,136	75.0	74.2	121	8,586	19.9	19.2	14	1,200	2.3	2.7

Source: *MSR*. Percentages do not total to 100 because an additional category of vessels registered at miscellaneous ports has been omitted. These totaled 17 vessels, 1,680 tons, and amounted to 2.8% of vessels and 3.8% of tonnage. In only one year (1753) did this category exceed 10% tonnage.

Note: a indicates three quarters missing; b two quarters missing; c one quarter missing.

By midcentury, using this questionable sixty percent measure as a minimum limit, North Shore merchants carried at least three-fourths of their fish in their own vessels. (The percentage rose even higher in the 1760s and 1770s.) In fact, North Shore control over fish exports may have approached a monopoly. It is also to be noted that as the fish trade fell more and more into colonial hands, the average tonnage of

41 For example, Robert Hooper's vessel, the *Hooper*, was built at Portsmouth, N.H., registered there but sailed from Salem through the period. Vessel registries were not changed unless a change in ownership occurred or the vessel itself was structurally altered.

shipments declined.<sup>42</sup>

While Boston's trade share steadily declined, so did its fishery. Attempts were made to resuscitate its fishing fleet in the mid-1750s, but by 1763 only ten fishing vessels sailed, with an estimated annual catch of perhaps 18,500 quintals, compared with 196 vessels employed on the North Shore, taking approximately 200,000 quintals yearly.<sup>43</sup>

From quite early in the century, Boston's merchants had centered their fish exports on West Indian outlets. Unfortunately, the customs officials did not record shipments within a colony unless enumerated items were involved, and not always then. However, Boston's volume of low-grade fish indicates that much of it came from the North Shore. As the century progressed, Salem and Marblehead traders expanded contacts with the West Indies and their vessels carried an increasing volume of fish there. Since most of them returned home with salt, it can be assumed that Essex County merchants built credits in that trade as well. Boston's increasing imports of trash fish from Nova Scotia and other northern points may well have resulted from her inability to procure sufficient quantities from traditional North Shore sources.<sup>44</sup> By the close of the colonial period, Salem controlled about forty-five percent of New England's fish exports to the West Indies, Boston about thirty-five percent, and Rhode Island about twenty percent.

Selling merchantable fish to Iberia was the premier sector of the fish business.<sup>45</sup> Massachusetts won an important part of that market and, after 1750, North Shore investors enjoyed the lion's share of its profits. Utilizing available data and employing techniques of statistical analysis, it is possible to make fairly accurate estimates of the profits from this trade.<sup>46</sup>

---

42 Colonial owners used small vessels to spread their risk. Although their vessels increased in size over the century, they did not approach the larger vessels that were forced out of the traffic. By 1768-1771 vessels were carrying about the same amount of cargo as in 1714.

43 Report of Edward Payne, December 1763, MHS, Ezekial Price Collection. For fishery development, see *BNL*, June 14, 1753, February 21, 1754, August 29, 1754.

44 CO 16/1. West Indies fish exports (dried fish in quintals; pickled fish in barrels), 1768-1772, were: Salem 439,521 qtls. and 15,090 blls.; Boston 290,955 qtls. and 38,880 blls.; and Rhode Island 85,940 qtls. and 63,216 blls.

45 Innis, *Cod Fisheries*, 118. Weedon, *Economic and Social History*, II: 750.

46 Shepherd and Walton, *Shipping, Maritime Trade*.

**TABLE 5-6**  
**Massachusetts Fish Exports to Southern Europe, 1752-1774:**  
**Estimates of Value, Charges, and Surplus Remaining after Sale**

Year	Fish Price	Fish in qtls.	Boston				Salem				Mass. Surplus	
			American Value	European Value	Charges	Surplus	Fish in qtls.	American Value	European Value	Charges		Surplus
1752	9.2s.	11,018	£ 5,068	£10,136	£ 3,448	£ 6,688	80,485	£37,023	£ 74,046	£25,199	£ 48,847	£ 55,535
1753	9.0	25,140	11,313	22,626	7,805	14,821	90,534	40,740	81,480	28,109	53,371	68,192
1754	9.5	26,209	12,449	24,898	8,310	16,588	94,406	44,842	89,684	29,932	59,752	76,340
1755	9.1	39,803	18,110	36,220	12,410	23,810	115,868	52,720	105,440	36,124	69,316	93,126
1756	9.7	20,840	10,107	20,214	6,662	13,552	122,584	59,453	118,906	39,188	79,718	93,270
1757	10.8	19,477 <sup>b</sup>	10,518	21,036	6,508	14,528	87,488	47,243	94,486	29,237	65,249	79,777
1758	12.6	13,810 <sup>b</sup>	8,700	17,400	4,943	12,457	88,242	55,592	111,184	31,582	79,602	92,059
1759	13.5	1,625	1,097	2,194	602	1,592	93,264	62,953	125,906	34,483	91,423	93,015
1760	14.5	8,821	6,395	12,790	3,377	9,413	69,430	50,337	100,674	26,585	74,089	83,502
1761	15.3	6,040	4,621	9,242	2,376	6,866	74,402	56,918	113,836	29,273	84,563	91,429
1762	13.9	8,364	5,813	11,626	3,137	8,489	35,469	24,651	49,302	13,301	36,001	44,490
1763	13.8	14,556	10,044	20,088	5,439	14,649	80,908	55,827	111,654	30,236	81,418	96,067
1764	13.0	14,367	9,339	18,678	5,218	13,460	92,314	60,004	120,008	33,523	86,485	99,945
1765	13.1	13,017	8,526	17,052	4,745	12,307	118,932	77,900	155,800	43,348	112,452	124,759
1766	13.5	14,933	10,080	20,160	5,651	14,509	76,451	51,604	103,208	28,267	74,941	89,450
1767	11.8	9,778	5,769	11,538	3,395	8,143	123,894	73,097	146,194	43,035	103,159	111,302
1768	12.7	14,886	9,453	18,906	5,346	13,560	109,491	69,526	139,052	39,330	99,722	113,291
1769	13.2	11,186	7,383	14,766	4,092	10,674	111,978	73,905	147,810	40,961	106,849	117,523
1770	13.6	8,245	5,607	11,214	3,059	8,155	103,018	70,052	140,104	38,225	101,879	110,034
1771	13.6	11,615	7,898	15,796	4,311	11,485	128,979	87,705	175,410	47,859	127,551	139,036
1772	13.4	5,940	3,980	7,960	2,190	5,770	107,554	72,061	144,122	39,626	104,496	110,266
1773	11.4	5,143	2,932	5,864	1,760	4,104	75,062	42,785	85,570	25,678	59,892	63,996
1774	9.8	Port Closed				Port Closed	117,488	57,569	115,138	37,713	77,425	77,425

Sources: See Tables 5-2 and 5-3. Fish prices are in shillings sterling per quintal, taken from Cole's commodity price index for Jamaica fish. Since fish sent to southern Europe was mainly "greater merchantable," worth approximately 25% more than Jamaica fish, Cole's prices have been converted directly to sterling. European prices are based on Bilbao prices, which were generally 100% higher than Boston prices. American value, European value, charges, and surplus figures are all in pounds sterling. Charges are estimated to have been about 30% of European value during peacetime and 33.3% during wartime. For explanation of charges see footnote 53. See Table 13-2.

Note: b signifies data for three quarters only.

\* \* \*

An examination of Massachusetts fish exports in this trade over the years 1752-1773 (Table 5-6) discloses fluctuations in the market and the volumes exported by the two centers, Salem and Boston. During the first five years Boston exported about twenty percent of the total shipped and Salem the remainder; during the last five years Boston shipments were sharply reduced at 8.5 percent, with Salem exporting more than ninety percent of the total. Because of its involvement with the Wine Islands and consequently its use of smaller vessels, Boston initially cleared 29.8 percent of the vessels bound to Iberian ports but only 27.9 percent of the total tonnage; in the last five years those figures fell to 18.7 percent of the vessels and 16.8 percent of the tonnage.

Salem's Naval Office records for the years 1714-1717 reflect a fish utilization level of about eighty-five percent, and, given the comparative value of fish over other cargoes and Newfoundland's decline in production in these years, the level suggests an excess of demand over supply and an excess of shipping

capacity.<sup>47</sup> In the data from CO 16/1 for the years 1768-1772, one finds a higher utilization (115.4%), but the statistics understate the tonnage of vessels clearing in the fish trade. Overall, Salem utilization ranged above one hundred percent, but that figure has been used where the actual volume of the fish shipments is unavailable.

Boston vessels bound to mainland ports usually carried full cargoes of fish. Data on eight voyages from Boston in the second decade of the century indicate a utilization for fish of 112 percent, but for the remaining twenty-two cargoes cleared to southern Europe that year, the amount of fish was not specified, although it is known that the vessels carried other goods.<sup>48</sup> The limited availability of fish at Boston and the emphasis on the Wine Islands dictated more mixed cargoes. Naval Office records and CO 16/1 show a decline in fish utilization from sixty-five percent (1752-1756) to about fifty-six percent (1762-1764), to less than forty-eight percent (1768-1772).<sup>49</sup>

Several factors might have caused that decline. First, better markets for Boston's fish might have existed elsewhere, although this seems improbable since Salem merchants would have shifted to them as well. Second, Boston merchants may have cleared an increasing proportion of their vessels from Salem. Such an increase has been noted, however, most of these Boston-registered vessels seem to have been owned in Essex County. Third, perhaps Bostonians found better profits in shipping lumber and other goods to island and Iberian ports. Boston did ship fairly large amounts of the more exotic woods – logwood, dyewood, mahogany, and *lignum vitae* – during this period. It also exported plantation goods – sugar, cocoa, coffee, and rum – captured from the enemy. But once the French and Indian War ended, these commodities were no longer available. Furthermore, after September 1764, lumber for shipbuilding was enumerated by the British government and could not, therefore, be sent to southern Europe. As early as 1706 masts and yards had been placed under the same enumeration ban.<sup>50</sup> Thus the more valuable lumber products could not be shipped in this trade. Large amounts of staves, shingles, and boards did find an outlet in southern Europe, but even tightly packed these materials were not a valuable cargo. For example, a ton of hogshead staves was not worth one-fourth the value of a ton of codfish, which, in theory, would have occupied the same space.<sup>51</sup> Except for wartime prize goods, no product provided an attractive and valuable alternative to a fish cargo. The fourth possibility for Boston's decline, and the only acceptable one, is that Boston merchants reduced their fish exports because Salem shippers all but engrossed the grades of fish in demand in southern Europe.

The significance of this trade was, of course, the surplus credits amassed from it for transfer to England. By referring to the figures for fish shipments in Table 5-2, it is possible to make some estimates concerning the surplus. Using Arthur Cole's figures for fish prices at Boston and data available at Bilbao among the port records of the Consulado, then subtracting costs for transportation, insurance, customs, brokerage commissions, and other expenses, one can reach some conclusions as to the extent of the surplus.<sup>52</sup> All

---

47 *MSR*. Tonnage to Iberian ports: 1714-1717 was 9,433 tons, with 180,350 quintals in 126 vessels; October 1752-September 1756, 17,407 tons, 405,228 quintals in 228 vessels; 1759 and 1762, 5,508 tons, 115,383 quintals in 72 ships; 1763-September 1765, 11,466 tons, 257,761 quintals, 149 ships. Fish utilization estimates are based on 22.4 qtls./ton carrying capacity. Note that carrying capacity was understated in the eighteenth century to avoid port charges based on tonnage.

48 *MSR*, June 25, 1718-June 24, 1719.

49 *MSR*, October 1752-September 1756; 1762-1764 (one quarter in 1763 is missing). CO 16/1.

50 Harper, *Navigation Laws*, 398-399.

51 Shepherd and Walton, *Shipping, Maritime Trade*, 239-240.

52 Arthur H. Cole, *Wholesale Commodity Prices in the United States, 1700-1861*, 2 vols. (Cambridge, Mass., 1938), II: 2 and Statistical Supplement. "Averia Accounts" and Cabot "Papers" both indicate that fish sold at Bilbao for approximately twice its New England value.

shipping expenses for the New England-to- Bilbao run have been fixed at 30 percent of the value of the fish on sale in Europe during peacetime, and 33.3 percent during wartime.<sup>53</sup> Table 5-6 illustrates the surpluses for Boston and Salem and the total for both. The figures effectively demonstrate why, on the eve of the Revolution, some North Shore merchants were referred to as “the Marblehead gentry.”<sup>54</sup>

The surpluses resulting from fish sales at Bilbao and elsewhere in southern Europe from 1752 to 1774 reached the rather astonishing total of £2,046,365. Shipments from the North Shore accounted for more than seven-eighths of the total, £1,800,775, whereas Boston’s credits apparently came to only £245,620. Profits accrued from shipping, insurance, return cargoes, or from other goods exported are not included in these figures. Since most fish exports to southern Europe left Salem, Marblehead, Gloucester, and other local ports aboard locally owned vessels, it can be assumed that those surpluses accrued largely to the accounts of the Lees and Hoopers, Cabots and Pedricks, Ornes and Crowninshields, and other merchants of those same towns.

\* \* \*

This trade provided not only a source of liquid assets, in cash or for transfer to England, but a means of purchasing goods in demand in New England. Some of the surplus left after payment of shipping expenses bought wine, salt, and other goods. Sold in Boston or Salem, those cargoes returned additional income and thus must be calculated into the overall profitability of the fish trade. Goods imported came via two routes, either by direct return voyages or indirectly by way of English ports. Before the passage of the American Act in April 1764, most vessels trading to southern Europe came home directly, rarely via English ports. However, passage of the discriminatory tariff against the produce of Spain, Portugal, and the islands created a new trade pattern that was supposed to assure more effective customs collection by heavily taxing direct importations of wine, fruit, and other goods.<sup>55</sup> Though impossible to ascertain precisely, it appears that less than eight percent of the vessels returning to Salem took the English route to reduce customs charges against their cargoes. Boston, more deeply into the wine trade, sent more than twenty-five percent of its returning vessels by the indirect route.<sup>56</sup>

The colonials vehemently opposed these limitations on the southern European trade. “By these means such voyages are greatly prolonged, and an extraordinary expence, from insurance, wear of the vessel, victualling, manning, etc. is needlessly heaped on the owner.” Salem and Boston merchants saw it as a

---

53 Costs are figured as follows: prime cost (PC) of merchantable fish in Massachusetts, 1752-1772, equaled on the average 11.65s. sterling/qtl. Sale price (SP) in Europe was double the American price. Freight charges (F) cost about 3.6s./qtl. Insurance in peacetime was 2.5% of PC or 1.25% of SP. War insurance rates were much higher. Customs duties (H) in Europe added some 12% to PC. Transferal costs (T) to send funds to England were apparently 2%; providing cash to captains, 0.5%. Estimating three-fourths of the funds were transferred, T equals 1.62% of SP. Loss (L) on goods through damage (broken or damaged fish was commonly donated to charities) or losses uncovered by insurance equaled 2% of PC. Shipping/handling costs (SH) amounted to 29% in peacetime (6.75s.) or 33.3% in wartime (7.68s.). I have rounded peacetime costs to 30%. PC plus SH when subtracted from SP gives the surplus figure (S).

54 *EG*, January 26, 1773.

55 Bernhard Knollenberg, *Origin of the American Revolution, 1759-1766* (New York, 1961), 164, 262. A very small percentage of vessels returned via the West Indies.

56 Salem Light Money Accounts, 1764-1771 and *EG*, 1768-1773. Apparently 40 vessels entered indirectly and 479 directly to Salem. Boston data from *BNL* indicate 205 direct and 83 indirect entrances in these years.

“great and uncommon grievance.”<sup>57</sup> For vessels clearing customs at Falmouth and other British ports, their cargoes initially stood as debits against the credits for fish sold in southern Europe. Data are available for the years 1768-1772; during those five years about ten percent of the salt and forty-three percent of the wine from southern Europe came to America via English ports. Using these percentages allows estimation of the indirect shipments during 1764-1767 and 1773, years for which there are no figures, which totaled 12,128 hogsheads of salt (£3,032) and 466.8 tons of wine (£18,672). Total indirect entrances for the whole period, 1764-1773, were at cost £6,415 for salt and £ 34,748 for wine, a total debit against export credits of £37,629. Boston, because of its interest in the wine trade, took a much larger percentage of indirect shipments than did Salem. According to CO 16/1, ninety-four percent of the salt and more than seventy-seven percent of the wine reaching Massachusetts indirectly entered at Boston.

Vessels returning directly from the south of Europe carried three kinds of goods. Salt, which could be directly imported under the Navigation Laws, was almost always in demand since ten hogsheads of salt were needed to cure one hundred quintals of fish.<sup>58</sup> Solar salt from southern Europe, produced by a managed process of evaporation, was preferred to that from the West Indies, which was naturally deposited and often of poorer quality.<sup>59</sup> Madeira and other wines from the Portuguese islands could also be imported legally.<sup>60</sup> Under a third category can be included smuggled goods of all kinds, though it should be noted that some of these came in by “grace” under the heading of “ship’s stores.” This class of imports included mundane articles, such as olives, capers, cork, olive oil, raisins, and citrus fruits; finished goods, such as mirrors and other furnishings often purchased on the account of a vessel’s owners; and goods of special concern to the government, such as mainland wines and silk handkerchiefs. Obviously, there are no statistics on the volume of this third class of imports.<sup>61</sup>

Tables 5-7 and 5-8 attempt to quantify and attach a value to direct importations of salt and wine. Price indexes provide clues to value, and space utilization factors have been developed and a value placed on the quantities of goods estimated as an offset to surplus credits from fish sales. Table 5-7 offers an overall view of direct salt imports and statistics on vessels entering Boston and Salem from southern European ports, 1752-1773.

Southern European salt entered both directly and indirectly via England. It is estimated to have been worth £253,213, based on Cole’s price index for Boston. Salt brought into Boston was worth £75,713, and Salem took cargoes worth £177,500.<sup>62</sup> Well over eighty percent of the salt entering New England from Iberian sources went to these two Bay Colony ports, and Salem alone took almost seventy-five percent of the total entering between 1768 and 1772.<sup>63</sup>

---

57 “Resolutions of the Town of Marblehead, December 8, 1772,” in *EG*, December 15, 1772. Payne, “Observations on Acts of Trade.”

58 Harper, *Navigation Laws*, 401. *CSPC*, XLII (1735-1736): 109.

59 Innis, *Cod Fisheries*, 161. See Lloyd, “Letter Book” for salt prices. Salt was normally packed in hogsheads (hhds.), holding eight bushels. Prices varied but usually southern European salt was more expensive than that from the West Indies.

60 Madeira and wine from the Azores (Western Islands) could enter directly. Colonials also imported Canary wines under the law of 1664, though they were often challenged by customs officials. See Harper, *Navigation Laws*, 248, 401, 265n.

61 Newspaper advertisements and merchant letter books contain many references to both personal importations and smuggled goods.

62 See Table 5-7. Indirect entrances numbered Boston 73, Salem 40. Salt entering Boston indirectly was worth £10,821 sterling and to Salem £700.

63 CO 16/1. Massachusetts imported 95.5% of the total salt, 954,476 bushels, entering New England,

Salt was exceptionally cheap in Iberia, notably at Cadiz, Lisbon, Setubal, and in the Cape Verde Islands.<sup>64</sup> Government policy in Spain and Portugal generally encouraged salt sales to foreigners, while heavy salt taxes were levied on native consumers.<sup>65</sup> A number of references to Portuguese and Spanish salt prices occur in soft data sources. Table 5-7 compares New England and Iberian salt costs. The prime cost of Boston's salt was then £33,491, and that of Salem £88,808, a total of £122,299 for direct shipments. Salt freight rates were significantly lower than for more valuable wine cargoes.<sup>66</sup>

The average price of salt in the Boston area (1763-1773) was apparently 9.2s. sterling per hogshead. Its cost at Lisbon and Setubal was approximately 5.76s. per hogshead, on board, all taxes paid. Freight and handling costs to Massachusetts were minimal, perhaps amounting to 2s. per hogshead, leaving a profit for the importer of almost 1.44s.<sup>67</sup> Boston and Salem merchant ledgers gained credits from this traffic, 1752-1773, of £36,937 sterling. The larger share, £25,683, was earned by Salem traders.<sup>68</sup> Nevertheless, these profits were not substantial and salt often served as little more than ballast for returning ships.<sup>69</sup>

---

and Salem took 696,814 bushels, or 73%, of this. The figure for salt entering Boston, 1769 has been corrected to 52,000 bushels.

64 Bourgoing, *Travels of Duke de Châtelet*, I: 235-237.

65 Vicens Vives, *Manual*, 517. The Spanish paid twenty-two reales for a fanega of salt that foreigners bought for five reales.

66 Cole, *Wholesale Commodity Prices*, II. Boston prices are converted to sterling as one-third in advance of sterling. For Portuguese prices see June 26, 1729, SPFP 89/25; "Estimate of Trade between England and Portugal, 1768," SPFP 89/64. This source estimates salt prices at 12s. per moyo, which is very high. Cf. SPFP 89/77, which contains trade data for various Portuguese ports, 1772-1773, and has salt prices for Lisbon and Setubal, which average 130 pence sterling per moyo of 1,500 pounds. A moyo equaled 15 bushels. Kenneth Wiggins Porter, ed., *The Jacksons and the Lees: Two Generations of Massachusetts Merchants, 1765-1844*, 2 vols. (Cambridge, Mass., 1937), I: 406. Townshend, *Journey through Spain*, III: 169, prices salt at Alicante at 12s. per ton, which compares favorably with the Portuguese prices. The large majority of Massachusetts vessels came either from Cadiz or Lisbon/Setubal, with the former preferred in peacetime.

67 For Lisbon/Setubal prices see note 66 above. For Boston costs, see Cole, *Wholesale Commodity Prices*, II, reduced to sterling.

68 Salem imports were 355,233 hhds. direct and 1,470 indirect, total 356,703 hhds. Boston imports were 133,964 direct and 23,735 indirect, total 157,699. Boston profits were £11,354 sterling.

69 *MSR*, 1761-1763, for Salem indicates that 92 salt cargoes entered from southern Europe, a total of 30,000 hhds., an average of 333.26 hhds. per ship. Each cargo valued at approximately £83, prime cost.

**TABLE 5-7**  
**Direct Salt Importations, Massachusetts from Southern Europe, 1752-1773**

Year	Boston				Salem				Mass. Value	Prime Cost
	Entrances Vessels	Tons	Salt hhd.	Value	Entrances Vessels	Tons	Salt hhd.	Value		
1752	11	990	2,575	£ 914	36	2,676	12,740	£ 4,523	£ 5,437	£ 3,829
1753	25	2,023	8,190	2,977	43	3,180	13,890	5,049	8,026	5,520
1754	35	2,613	10,910	4,293	44	3,330	16,810	6,615	10,908	6,930
1755	27	1,928	9,920	4,166	57	4,424	20,160	8,467	12,633	7,520
1756	37	3,035	16,040	7,539	64	5,163	26,170	12,300	19,839	10,553
1757	21	1,795	8,647	4,700	55	4,062	18,470	10,038	14,738	6,779
1758	13	705	3,040	2,362	39	3,350	15,324	11,907	14,269	4,591
1759	14	995	2,920	1,821	52	4,138	18,930	11,803	13,624	5,462
1760	10	820	4,470	2,847	48	4,024	14,333	9,130	11,977	4,701
1761	19	1,115	4,650	3,069	38	2,690	12,085	7,976	11,045	4,184
1762	7	428	2,450	2,026	29	1,895	7,978	6,598	8,624	2,607
1763	14	950	4,462	2,543	37	2,640	12,735	7,259	9,802	4,299
1764	24	2,223	7,582	4,170	37	2,691	12,650	6,957	11,127	5,058
1765	12	860	4,967	2,384	49	3,753	20,428	9,805	12,189	6,349
1766	20	1,340	6,311	2,651	37	2,958	13,144	5,520	8,171	4,864
1767	20	1,490	6,732	2,649	48	4,101	18,223	7,171	9,820	6,239
1768	22	1,871	6,002	2,881	64	4,753	14,392	6,908	9,789	5,099
1769	31	2,129	6,500	2,730	58	4,466	18,570	7,799	10,529	6,268
1770	23	1,640	6,005	3,024	53	4,073	19,150	9,642	12,666	6,289
1771	17	1,055	2,770	1,173	45	3,596	18,635	7,892	9,065	5,351
1772	20	1,343	5,575	2,696	45	3,552	16,355	7,908	10,604	5,483
1773	13	970	3,246	1,277	43	3,311	14,061	5,533	6,810	4,327

Sources: Data are from *MSR*, Salem Light Money Accounts, CO 16/1, and customs reports in *EG* and *BNL*. For Boston, where vessel tonnage is not known, it is estimated based on average in the PRO material: mainland vessels 80 tons; Wine Islands 70 tons; Salt Islands 100 tons. Wine Islands vessels are presumed to carry no salt. Conversion to hogsheads is based on 8 bushels per hogshead; 22.5 bushels per ton; a bushel is 100 pounds. Value is based on Cole's Boston index for salt converted to sterling on the basis of Boston prices being a third in advance of sterling. Tonnage utilizations for salt entering Salem were 1750s at 171%, 1760s at 182%; 1768-1772 at 151%. These are used where cargoes are unknown. Boston utilizations were 1750s at 100%, 1760s at 187%; 1768-1772 at 119%. The CO 16/1 figure for Boston salt entries for 1769 is obviously incorrect (152,000 bushels); 52,000 bushels or 6,500 hogsheads has been substituted. At a price on board in Europe of 5.76s. per hogshead, subtracting commissions of 3%, duty 10%, and handling 2%, makes the prime cost about 5s. per hogshead

The other major import from southern Europe was wine. Legally wine from the Azores, Cape Verde Islands, and the Madeiras could enter Massachusetts directly. Of the two Bay Colony ports, Boston was much more deeply involved in this trade. Bostonians began to traffic in wines early in the seventeenth century.<sup>70</sup> A hundred years later, about twenty-five percent of all tonnage arriving from southern Europe carried wine, and the city not only answered its own needs but increasingly profited from supplying the other North American colonies. However, burgeoning traffic between the middle and southern colonies and southern Europe after 1730 caused a decline in Boston's wine trade. In addition, competition from Salem grew, and after 1764 customs regulations penalized all wine entering directly.<sup>71</sup> During the 1750s, only ten

70 Bradford, "Of Plimouth Plantation," 191n.

71 George Louis Beer, *British Colonial Policy, 1754-1765* (Gloucester, Mass., 1958), 280n. Wine coming in direct faced a differential penalty of £3 sterling/ton.



percent of the tonnage entering Boston directly from Iberia and the island ports was devoted to wine, and on the eve of the Revolution space utilization for wine had fallen to less than five percent of the tonnage coming to Boston from that area.<sup>72</sup> Salem never developed an important coastal trade in wine, but its wine imports rose during the eighteenth century. From midcentury on, two or three vessels entered from the Wine Islands yearly, but by the 1770s wine filled less than one percent of the tonnage entering from southern Europe.<sup>73</sup>

Close examination of the statistics available for both Boston and Salem suggests that over time entrances from the Atlantic islands declined in proportion to those from the Iberian peninsula, and the amount of wine carried by vessels bound in from there declined as well. Data for the years 1768-1772 show that of the approximately 1,100 tons of wine entering Massachusetts in those years, most, five-sixths, entered at Boston. The impact of the American Act of 1764 is evident when the sources of the wine are examined. Forty-six percent of it entered directly from the Wine Islands, but another forty-two percent of it came via British ports.<sup>74</sup> The wine trade was apparently less profitable than earlier in the century since many shippers were willing to take the indirect route to avoid excess customs charges. Comments in commercial correspondence in the years preceding the Revolution indicate that minimal profits were gained in this phase of the southern European trade.<sup>75</sup>

---

72 *MSR*, October 1752-September 1756. CO 16/1. Between 1752 and 1773 twenty percent of the vessels entering Boston from southern Europe came from the Wine Islands.

73 *MSR* for Salem and CO 16/1 have full data for eleven years of Salem entrances. In those years, wine never filled more than seven percent of the tonnage arriving.

74 CO 16/1. Boston entered 910.66 tons of the total (1,086.21) and Salem 175.55 tons. Additional wine came from West Indies and coastal ports.

75 Letters dated May 20, 1765, September 30, 1765, November 11, 1765, November 23, 1765, March 3, 1766, Lloyd "Letter Book." Dickerson, *Navigation Acts and Revolution*, 176-179. Bezanson, Gray, and Hussey, *Prices in Colonial Pennsylvania*, 230-235. Jensen, *Maritime Commerce*, 61.

TABLE 5-8

## Direct Entrances to Massachusetts from Wine Islands and Value of Wine Imported, 1752-1773

Year	Boston				Salem				Mass. Totals		
	Vessels	Tons	Wine in Tons	Value	Vessels	Tons	Wine in Tons	Value	Wine in Tons	Value	Prime Cost
1752	3	220	92.7	£ 5,562	0	0	0	£ 0	92.7	£ 5,562	£ 3,708
1753	10	485	220.0	13,200	3	130	54.5	3,270	274.5	16,470	10,980
1754	9	578	206.8	12,408	2	75	12.5	750	219.3	13,158	8,772
1755	0	0	0	0	2a	130	54.0	3,240	54.0	3,240	2,160
1756	1	120	5.0	300	1	84	28.0	1,680	33.0	1,980	1,320
1757	0	0	0	0	2	110	41.0	2,460	41.0	2,460	1,640
1758	2	85	52.0	3,120	3	177	74.0	4,440	126.0	7,560	5,040
1759	6	255	177.1	10,626	2	60	54.5	3,270	231.6	13,896	9,264
1760	1	70	30.1	1,806	3	210	85.1	5,106	115.2	6,912	4,608
1761	4	190	76.2	4,572	2	130	35.1	2,106	111.3	6,678	4,452
1762	0	0	0	0	3	215	125.9	7,554	125.9	7,554	5,036
1763	2	140	24.4	1,464	2	125	69.0	4,140	93.4	5,604	3,736
1764	6	660	175.1	10,506	4	261	85.9	5,154	261.0	15,660	10,440
1765	0	0	0	0	3	240	28.7	1,722	28.7	1,722	1,148
1766	2	140	28.0	1,680	1	125	41.6	2,496	69.6	4,176	2,784
1767	3	210	42.0	2,520	3	205	68.3	4,098	110.3	6,618	4,412
1768	6	420	58.4	3,504	2	152	22.1	1,326	80.5	4,830	3,220
1769	5	350	68.7	4,122	3	252	43.0	2,580	111.7	6,702	4,468
1770	4	280	21.0	1,260	1	96	5.7	342	26.7	1,602	1,068
1771	8	560	158.4	9,504	3	232	45.9	2,754	204.3	12,258	8,172
1772	7	490	110.9	6,654	0	0	0	0	110.9	6,654	4,436
1773	7	490	98.0	5,880	2	154	51.3	3,078	149.3	8,958	5,972
Total	89	5,743	1,644.8	£98,688	47	3,163	1,026.1	£61,566	2,670.9	£160,254	£106,836

Sources: Boston data are from *MSR* and CO 16/1. If vessel tonnages are unavailable, average tonnage from Wine Islands (70 tons) is used. Cargo utilization for wine is 43% pre-1763 and for 1763-1773 is estimated at 20%, if official figures are unknown. Salem: *MSR*, CO 16/1, and Salem Light Money Accounts. Tonnage is available except for 1773, where data are from *EG*, vessel size estimated at 77 tons. Cargo utilization for wine is 33.3% where amounts are not available.

Notes: a includes vessel from Cadiz with 35 pipes of wine. Wine figure is in tons. Conversion: 1 tons is 4 hogsheads, is 252 gallons, is 2 pipes; 1 barrel is 32.5 gallons; 1 cask is 42 gallons. Prime cost of Madeira is £40 sterling per ton. Wine imported indirectly 1764-1767 and 1773 is estimated at a value of £28,008, based on the ratio between direct (46%) and indirect (42%) wine entrances for 1768-1772 in CO 16.1. Total indirect wine imports equal £52,122.

The British consul at Lisbon in 1774 estimated that wines exported from Madeira were valued at twenty pounds sterling per pipe (commonly estimated as a half a ton).<sup>76</sup> Freight charges to Massachusetts amounted to three pounds per ton and, with other costs, brought the wine on arrival to a value of about sixty pounds sterling per ton.<sup>77</sup>

76 "British Exports to and Imports from Portugal in 1773," January 13, 1774, SPFP 89/77. "Report on the Consul and Factory of British Merchants on the Trade of Madeira," Thomas Cheap, Consul, to Halifax, July 1, 1765, Consular Reports on Trade, Board of Trade Papers 388/95. Wine prices varied widely, based on the quality of the vintage. Azores and Canary wines were more reasonably priced than Madeira, as were mainland vintages.

77 Shepherd and Walton, *Shipping, Maritime Trade*, 124, Table 7.4, "Average Freight Rates per Registered Ton by Route, 1768-1772." Prime cost of a ton (tun) of Madeira was £40 sterling; freight £3/ton; com-

Using the data available on wine imports, one can develop space utilization ratios that can be employed to estimate imports for years where statistics are not available. Table 5-8 provides a view over time, 1752-1773, of the volume and value of wine imported. The total value of the wine legally imported evidently reached £212,376. Though probably not the case earlier in the century, profits were very low, perhaps nonexistent, so that one can only estimate that, on sale, the prime cost, shipping, and other charges were recovered.<sup>78</sup> Thus the funds expended to purchase wine in southern Europe, since they were recovered when it was sold in America, should not be deducted from the credits arising from southern European fish sales.<sup>79</sup>

The third class, illegal importations, remains to be considered for its effect on the balance of trade. Smugglers leave few records to quantify; however, customs officials recognized from the seventeenth century onward that this trade offered fine opportunities for unlawful trading. The papers of John Hancock, Peter Faneuil, Henry Lloyd, the Cabots and Lees, and others indicate that illegal trading was endemic. Between spring 1757 and late 1759, 102 vessels cleared Lisbon for New England ports. All but a few of them carried salt, but more than ninety-two percent also carried wine, oil, and other goods which it was illegal to import directly into British North America. Three-quarters of them carried illegal wine.<sup>80</sup> In 1769 Salem customs officers were warned by Boston officials to watch carefully for “great Quantitys of wine and other dutyable Goods being frequently run on shore by vessels arriving from Madeira & the Azores & other foreign islands.” On another occasion they received instructions to search the salt cargo of the brig *Louisa*, Captain Joseph Lee, arriving from Setubal, “as some Goods may be found secreted.” A customs letter book for the years 1763-1772 contains at least ten references to illegal trading between southern Europe and the Bay Colony.<sup>81</sup>

Smuggling was a universal problem in Europe and America during this period. Doubtless American goods found illegal outlets in southern European ports, though there are relatively few references to such traffic. In 1773 the Gardoquis of Bilbao approached the Cabots of Beverly with an elaborate smuggling scheme involving the movement of a flour cargo from Philadelphia to Santander in northern Spain and thence to Havana. The Cabots smuggled hundreds of dozens of silk handkerchiefs into Salem, and it seems logical to presume that they were not above shipping sugar, tobacco, or other American goods to their correspondents in Bilbao or elsewhere in Iberia.<sup>82</sup> Smuggling to Europe was, however, apparently only occasional. Goods coming in illegally from Iberia – wine, raisins, olive oil, and other merchandise – were not balanced by merchandise smuggled in the other direction. The value of the goods smuggled in on

---

mission and brokerage at 3% equals £1.2; insurance peacetime was 3% or £1.4; handling and losses equal 4% (32s.); Portuguese duties were 10% on export from Madeira or £4; English duties were £7 on wines directly imported; and handling and local duties brought the cost of a ton of wine, after 1764, to about £60 on arrival in New England. Cf. Bezanson, Gray, and Hussey, *Prices in Colonial Pennsylvania*, 235.

78 Shepherd and Walton, *Shipping, Maritime Trade*, 233. Arthur Meier Schlesinger, *The Colonial Merchants and the American Revolution, 1763-1776* (New York, 1968), 88, 98, 101, 103.

79 Wine imported directly was worth £160,254, indirectly £52,122.

80 Data are from the weekly *CPR*, April 1757-November 1759, an official journal of Lisbon shipping activity. Additional issues are in PEM, covering February 1771-December 1776. Large amounts of mainland wine illegally run into Massachusetts may well have driven down the price of wine entered legally. The English consul at Tenerife estimated in 1773 that only one-eighth of the wine shipped thence to America passed American customs. Magra to Rochford, September 10, 1773, SPFS 94/194.

81 Entries for April 10, 1769; April 17, 1769, “Book of Records of the Salem Customs House, September 28, 1763-July 17, 1772,” PEM. Quotations by permission.

82 Gardoqui to Cabot, May 15, 1773, Cabot “Papers,” I. In 1771 the schooner *Premium* imported 720 dozen silk handkerchiefs and the schooner *Tryal* 501 dozen.

vessels from southern Europe cannot, of course, be established.

Many products other than fish were exported from Massachusetts to Spain, Portugal, and “up the Straits.” Staves of various kinds, hoops and headings, lumber, shingles, timber, and other goods were transported. Prefabricated houses reached a ready market in Lisbon following its great earthquake in 1755. Desks, bookcases, and finished woodenware also sold well in those ports, as did wheat, flour, beeswax, and a wide variety of other commodities.<sup>83</sup> Arriving at precise valuations for the exports from Salem and Boston listed in the Naval Office records for 1752-1765 is all but impossible; but a fairly accurate estimate would be £90,000 over the fourteen years. Shepherd and Walton have placed a figure of about £42,000 on these goods for the years 1768-1772, and overall these exports probably totaled about £150,000 in value.<sup>84</sup>

\* \* \*

The trade of Salem and Boston with Iberia and the Wine Islands can be viewed on two levels: first, simply as a source of cash and credits for transfer; and second, as a separate trading operation involving the exchange of goods between Iberia and Massachusetts. Over the twenty-two-year period from 1752 to 1773, Salem and Boston accrued credits amounting to £2,046,395 through fish sales to southern Europe. To this sum must be added credits, about £200,000, generated from the sale, after deductions for costs, of other products in southern Europe.<sup>85</sup> Total credits equaled some £2,246,395. From this total the prime cost and overhead for wine and salt returned directly and indirectly to America must be deducted, which reduces the surplus to £1,976,087, an annual average of £89,822. Salem credits from the traffic averaged £78,116 per year, whereas those of Boston only amounted to £11,707 per year.<sup>86</sup> In the midst of war and peace, the fish trade to Iberia and the Wine Islands was an extraordinarily advantageous source of transferable funds. The great bulk of these credits were transferred to England to cover part of the colony’s adverse balance of payments. In addition, some gold and silver was exported from Spain and Portugal directly to Massachusetts to help relieve the Bay Colony’s specie scarcity.<sup>87</sup>

If one views the southern European trade as a distinct operation, independent of the credit system with the mother country, overall profits from it are somewhat greater, £2,523,830, or an annual average of some £114,720. These figures presume the recovery of the prime costs and overhead of the salt, plus a small profit from salt sales (£37,070). Little or no profit resulted from wine importations, but all costs were recovered. Salem again far outstripped Boston in profits; its share of the income was approximately £2,010,840 (79.7%), an average of £91,402 per year, as compared to Boston’s £512,990, an average of £23,318 per year.

The above figures do not include any profits from shipping. Shepherd and Walton suggest that New England shipping from the southern European trade amounted to £230,000 over the years 1768-1772. Since 65.7 percent of that shipping entered and cleared through Salem-Marblehead and 21 percent to and from Boston, Salem would appear to have earned £151,110, or annually £30,222, and Boston gained £48,300,

---

83 *MSR*, 1756, Boston exports.

84 Shepherd and Walton, *Shipping, Maritime Trade*, 220, Table 4; actual total listed is £42,070.

85 Using the ratio between Boston and Salem that applied between 1762 and 1765, £42,000 of the exports would be assigned to Salem and £108,000 to Boston shippers.

86 Salem credits totaled £1,856,775; deducting salt PC £89,193 and wine PC £49,036 leaves £1,718,546. Salem’s twenty-two-year average was £78,116. Boston credits totaled £389,620, deducting salt and wine PCs, £39,521 and £92,548, leaves £257,551, a yearly average of £11,707.

87 “Schooner Jolly Robin’s Book of Acco’ts for Voyages.” See also Cabot “Papers.”

## CHAPTER VI

### SALEM AND BILBAO: SYMBIOSIS IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

In August 1771 Nicholas Gordon took the ship *Gardoqui* out of Salem harbor bound for Bilbao, Spain with a cargo of dried salt cod.<sup>1</sup> Gordon, no stranger to this trade, sailed on his twenty-first voyage to Iberia as captain, stretching back at least to summer 1752.<sup>2</sup> His vessel had a capacity of 120 tons; had served in this trade since the early 1750s and now made her twenty-third voyage to an Iberian destination.<sup>3</sup> After a six- or seven-week passage Gordon would deliver his cargo to Gardoqui & Sons and then, in ballast or with a cargo of iron bars, proceed to Lisbon or Cadiz; deliver the iron and load salt for Salem. The voyage, barring any disaster, would take five to eight months. In fact, the *Gardoqui* came home from Cadiz in mid-June 1772, an exceptionally long voyage.<sup>4</sup> Within a month her owners again dispatched Gordon to Bilbao with another cargo of merchantable cod.<sup>5</sup>

Except for a few West Indian and coastal voyages, Nicholas Gordon found steady employment in this trade for twenty years. Innumerable other Essex County seamen profited from such employment. Captain Thomas Dixey, for example, made twenty-five voyages to southern Europe, 1751-1770, twenty-two of them to Bilbao. In this era, every North Shore mariner with any experience at sea had voyaged to Iberia several times. In peacetime Salem's mariners apparently spent as much time ashore in Spain as they did at home in Essex County.<sup>6</sup>

The numerous Iberian voyages of Nicholas Gordon and his fellow seafarers from the North Shore towns demonstrate the importance of this outlet in the eighteenth century.<sup>7</sup> Essex County was a major source of fish exports to southern Europe, the West Indies, and coastally. Both areas of Massachusetts engaged in the fish trade but Boston concentrated on trade to the West Indies. Salem sent large supplies there but dominated the lucrative trade to Spain and Portugal. Between 1768 and 1772 Salem exported 528,701 quintals of fish to the West Indies and 518,356 quintals to southern Europe. Shipments to Bilbao and other markets were of greater merchantable quality and much more valuable.<sup>8</sup> While North Shore merchants profitably wholesaled fish to Bostonians for West Indian sales, more important, they built solid credits by shipping salt cod to Spain and Portugal in their own vessels. By the last years of the colonial era twenty-five to thirty-five percent of Salem's overseas tonnage cleared to Iberia, the bulk of it in merchantable codfish. Approximately half of it went to Bilbao in northern Spain. That port attracted one-eighth of the North Shore's overseas trade and was the most important outlet for Essex County exports. References to

---

1 *EG*, August 27, 1771.

2 *EG*, November 22, 1768, July 11, 1769, May 1, 1770, November 27, 1770, August 27, 1771. Harriet S. Tapley, ed., *Early Coastwise and Foreign Shipping of Salem; a Record of the Entrances and Clearances of the Port of Salem, 1750-1769* (Salem, Mass., 1934), 28, 73, 109, 127, 142-143. Tapley's data on Salem trade is from the Salem Light Money Accounts, 1751-1771.

3 Tapley, *Early Coastwise*, 72-73.

4 *EG*, June 16, 1772.

5 *EG*, July 14, 1772.

6 Tapley, *Early Coastwise*, 7, 19, 92, 115, 129. *EG*, September 13, 1768; September 19, 1769; June 26, 1770.

7 The real significance of the southern European fish trade was the opportunity it offered North Shore merchants to accumulate capital rapidly.

8 By mid-eighteenth century the North Shore towns had virtually engrossed the southern European trade and were rapidly expanding West Indian fish sales as well. See CO 16/1.

the Salem/Bilbao relationship abound in colonial commercial records and correspondence, but it has gained little attention. Why did North Shore shippers concentrate on the Iberian market rather than seeking full scale domination of the West Indies trade? Why was Bilbao such an important market for those shippers? Apparently Salem and Bilbao enjoyed a symbiotic relationship.

\* \* \*

As early as the 1620s Bilbao imported fish caught by English fishermen on the New England Banks.<sup>9</sup> Even that early, Vizcaya was known as the “tierra del bacalao,” the land of the codfish. In the 1630s temporary fishing centers at Richmond Island and other Maine coast points established solid connections with merchants there.<sup>10</sup> Over time these fisheries fell under the domination of the shore-based fishermen from Essex County. Naturally, their exports followed established routes to northern Spain and Portugal.

Data is so scattered for that era that the extent of this traffic is all but impossible to ascertain. It was fostered by a government decision to exempt fish from the list of enumerated products to be shipped through England to European markets and by the liberty granted to import Iberian salt directly into New England.<sup>11</sup>

By the 1650s three or four vessels loaded annually on the North Shore for Bilbao, others went off to a variety of southern European ports.<sup>12</sup> Ordinarily in this era Salem, Marblehead, and other towns provided fish for English vessels which had carried supplies to Boston and then picked up codfish cargoes for Iberia.<sup>13</sup> In 1667 William Browne, Sr. and Captain George Corwin of Salem, probably because of their familiarity with Bilbayan merchants, were commissioned to purchase cannon there to fortify the colony against attack.<sup>14</sup> The trade expanded gradually. Seven vessels sailed from Massachusetts to Bilbao in spring and summer of 1687. Relatively small vessels, they averaged about forty-five tons, but the Iberian trade was extremely important because it produced credits to offset the adverse balance of payments resulting from the importation of finished goods.<sup>15</sup> Cargoes carried by New Englanders to Iberia, on sale, paid for a cheap salt cargo. Any excess funds went to merchants in London and elsewhere. Fish was the only great staple that the country produced.

By the 1690s this trade flourished to the extent that Salem investors shared ownership of two fish carriers with merchants in Boston, London, and Bilbao.<sup>16</sup> The records of the Consulado de Bilbao testify to the regular arrival of New England fish, and the English factory there prospered by serving merchants shipping fish there.<sup>17</sup> Southern European exports by 1700 reached 50,000 quintals of *bacalao* annually with Bilbao taking three-quarters of the fish shipped. However, “the greater part of New England’s fish” still went to

---

9 John J. Babson, *The History of the Town of Gloucester* (Gloucester, Mass., 1860), 28. Innis, *Cod Fisheries*, 72.

10 [Robert] Trelawney, *The Trelawney Papers*, ed. James P. Baxter. Maine Historical Society Collections, 2nd ser., III (Portland, 1884), lxxxiv, 198-199, 273, 288.

11 Beer, *Colonial System*, I: 9.

12 Bailyn, *New England Merchants*, 76-86. “The Names of Such Ships and Masters that have come in and gone out of our Harbours,” August 1661-February 1662, *Boston Records*.

13 Nettels, *Money Supply*, 79.

14 Phillips, *Salem in Seventeenth Century*, 209.

15 MSR, Part I. Nettels, *Money Supply*, 79n.

16 Phillips, *Salem in Seventeenth Century*, 288. Barnard Bailyn and Lotte Bailyn, *Massachusetts Shipping, 1697-1714* (Cambridge, Mass., 1959), 37.

17 “Averia Accounts.” Data for the eighteenth century are more easily utilized and contain important information on cargoes entering, consignees, tonnages, as well as valuations of arriving cargoes.

Iberia in English bottoms until well after 1700.<sup>18</sup>

\* \* \*

The War of the Spanish Succession, 1702-1713, caused a long interruption in Salem/Bilbao relations. It marked the beginning of the decline of the English factory at that port and seriously dislocated the economy of the North Shore towns.<sup>19</sup> The Reverend John Barnard described the poverty of Marblehead's fishermen just after this conflict.<sup>20</sup> Beginning in 1714, a series of circumstances conjoined to expand the North Shore fishery and, therefore, the Salem/Bilbao trade. The Newfoundland catch fell off sharply and did not fully recover for several years, creating such a demand for *bacalao* that poorer grades of fish seem to have been sent to Spain and Portugal.<sup>21</sup> At about the same time Massachusetts merchants and especially North Shore shippers moved to seize control over fish exports, rather than acting as middlemen for English fish carriers.<sup>22</sup> North Shore entrepreneurs also struggled to escape the control of their Boston neighbors. By the mid-1730s Boston merchants sputtered in anger at the excessive prices demanded on the North Shore for fish suitable to the Iberian markets.<sup>23</sup> Salem, Beverly, and Marblehead merchants shipped more and more of the local catch on their own vessels. Freight earnings, seamen's wages, and additional profits resulting from delivery in Europe now all remained within the North Shore economy. The area enjoyed increasing prosperity.

Table 6-1 demonstrates the steady increase in export volume to southern Europe and the expansion of the Bilbao trade as the eighteenth century progressed.<sup>24</sup> The sources searched vary in dependability, providing scattered material to 1750 and then solid data until the American Revolution. Salem's Naval Office Records contain specific figures on the cargoes carried and thus reveal utilization factors of fish per ton applicable where only tonnage statistics are available.<sup>25</sup>

---

18 Nettels, *Money Supply*, 79. Phillips, *Salem in Seventeenth Century*, 287.

19 McLachlan, *Trade and Peace*, 74-75. Uztariz, *Theory and Practice of Commerce*, II: 126-127. He estimated Spanish codfish consumption at 487,500 quintals and the Portuguese areas at 150,000 in the 1770s. See Tables 5-1 and 5-2.

20 William H. Bowden, *The Commerce of Marblehead, 1667-1775*. Essex Institute Historical Collections, LXVIII (Salem, Mass., 1932), 121-123.

21 William Douglass, *Summary Historical and Political of the British Settlements in North America*, 2 vols. (London, 1755), I: 291. *CSPC*, XXVII (1712-1714): 243; XXVIII (1714-1715): 143, 295; XXIX (1716-1717): 207.

22 Bailyn, *New England Merchants*, 81. Lydon, "North Shore Trade," 273-274.

23 Nettels, *Money Supply*, 79. Carl Bridenbaugh, *Cities in the Wilderness* (New York, 1966), 330.

24 *MSR*, Part II. They include data on entrances and clearances, cargo destination, owners, size of crew, registry, and other material. Salem Light Money Accounts, 1751-1771, provide names of captains, vessels, and tonnage figures. They supplement CO 16/1 and *EG* customs data for the 1760s and 1770s.

25 Since shipowners purposely understated the tonnages of their vessels to cut port taxes, actual capacity of colonial vessels significantly exceeded the carrying capacity listed in customs records. Analysis of Naval Office Records indicates that Salem vessels carried, on average, fish weighing about sixteen percent more than the listed tonnage. Thus, for those years where actual volume of fish exports is not available, estimates of exports have been based on the ratio of 116.4 to 100. A quintal is presumed to be 100 pounds.

**TABLE 6-1**  
**Salem Clearances for Southern Europe, 1714-1774**

Year	Southern Europe			Bilbao			Bilbao % Fish
	Vessels	Tons	Fish(qtls.)	Vessels	Tons	Fish	
*1714-15	34	2941	56325	10	673	13180	23.4
*1715-16	41	2904	56611	14	836	15384	27.1
*1716-17	51	3588	67414	14	899	18962	28.1
1729-30	29	2173	41520	16	1232	23540	56.7
1730-31	26	1972	37679	16	1232	23540	62.5
1732	37	2819	53863	14	1078	20598	38.2
1733	37	2759	52717	13	1001	19126	36.3
1734	34	2438	46583	8	616	11770	25.3
1751	45	3400	79152	17	1485	34570	43.6
1752	44	3551	80485	25	2227	51845	64.4
*1753	53	4020	90534	22	2100	47650	52.6
*1754	53	4083	94406	29	2580	60700	64.2
*1755	63	4838	115868	9	664	18100	15.6
1756	73	5428	122584	4	321	7300	5.9
1757	55	3986	87488	2	210	4889	5.6
*1758	56	4022	88242	--	--	--	--
*1759	56	4391	93264	4	325	7800	8.4
1760	38	3320	69430	4	343	8050	11.6
1761	50	3400	74402	7	594	13850	18.6
*1762	26	1810	35469	--	--	--	--
*1763	53	3525	80908	18	1300	31937	39.5
1764	53	4024	92314	32	2643	62179	67.4
1765	65	4883	118932	28	2387	59050	49.7
1766	40	3413	76451	21	1879	43743	57.2
1767	65	5531	123894	33	2719	63298	51.1
1768	57	4878	109491	33	3080	71702	65.5
1769	59	4999	111978	27	2405	55988	50.0
1770	51	4599	103018	33	3013	70143	68.1
1771	68	5758	128979	29	2523	58735	45.5
1772	56	4801	107554	42	2982	69421	64.5
1773	39	3351	75062	15	1255	29216	38.9
1774	61	5245	117488	45	3767	87696	74.6

Sources: Asterisk indicates *MSR* from CO 5 in PRO. Figures for 1752, 1756-1757, 1760-1761, 1764-1765 are partly from that source, supplemented by data from the Salem Light Money Accounts, using utilization ratios for fish volume. Figures for 1751 and 1766-1771 are from the Light Money data, using fish ratios. Material for 1729-1734 is from *NEWJ* customs references and that for 1772-1774 from like data in *EG*; tonnage and fish figures derived from other sources as above. The *NEWJ* data, for example, use vessels to mainland at 77 tons; to Wine Islands at 47 tons. Fish figured at 22.4 quintals per ton. Fish utilization in those years is estimated at 85.3%.

War disrupted the trade 1702-1713, 1739-1748, and again 1754-1763 but during peacetime Salem shippers poured fish cargoes into Bilbao. Between 1751 and 1754 and again after 1763, the Vizcayan port took more than fifty-five percent of Salem's shipments bound to Iberia. By the 1760s those towns in Essex County sent more *bacalao* to Bilbao than they had shipped yearly to all Iberia before 1740.

Why did Salem fish find such great demand at Bilbao? That port had been an important center for codfish imports for many years. Basque fishermen actively pursued the Newfoundland fishery in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, until driven out by the English.<sup>26</sup> Though Bilbao had a small population,



less than 12,000 at the end of the eighteenth century, its location on a comparatively easy route to the plains of Castille was a major advantage.<sup>27</sup> The Spanish road system was quite primitive in this era but from Bilbao it reached far into the interior. Goods, including *bacalao*, transported on mule back to Vitoria went either over the mountains to Burgos and Madrid or eastward toward Lograno and Ebro Valley.<sup>28</sup> Demand for American codfish rose as the Spanish population grew, reaching approximately 400,000 quintals per year by the 1770s. Bilbao took about 90,000 quintals and the North Shore shippers provided some sixty percent of its requirements.<sup>29</sup>

The inland market created the basic impetus to the trade but both Santander and Saint Sebastian were almost as well placed geographically to supply the interior. A second factor, the initiative of Bilbao's mercantile community, helped it gain a dominant position in the fish trade. In the sixteenth century aggressive merchant leaders improved Bilbao's port facilities, dredged the Nervion River, and built a mole at Portugalete, the city's outer port. Vessels entering paid taxes for the harbor's upkeep. The city's merchant guild, the Consulado de Bilbao, took pains to assure all traders fair treatment. Harassment by minor officials, common in many Spanish ports, remained at a minimum.<sup>30</sup>

The availability of interior markets gave Bilbao a major advantage but, despite heavy expenditures to improve the port, it still lacked an excellent harbor. A sand bar at its entrance limited the size of the ships entering. At high tide vessels drawing over eighteen feet were assisted over the bar with "camels." At low water in the winter the river entrance could be very difficult.<sup>31</sup> The aggressiveness and entrepreneurial skills of the Consulado members really overcame the inadequacies of the port.

\* \* \*

In the late seventeenth and early eighteenth century the English established consulates in many Iberian ports but failed to obtain that privilege at Bilbao. When William Frankland went there after the War of the Spanish Succession in 1716, he met the constant opposition and "the obstinacy of these people."<sup>32</sup> One reporter stated: "These People are jelous of thier pretended previlidges and Municipal Laws; and abuse the rights of Strangers under the Notion of Distinction."<sup>33</sup> The Bilbayans, an independent lot, sought now to gain control over the importing business, then largely in the hands of foreigners.<sup>34</sup> Lawrence Barrow, long-term resident and partner in the most powerful fish importing firm prior to 1739, served as English agent

---

ture,"

Canadian Historical Association *Report* (1925): 64ff. Innis, *Cod Fisheries*, 23.

27 Federico de Zabala y Allende, *El Consulado y las ordenanzas de comercio de Bilbao* (Bilbao, 1907), 13.

28 Innis, *Cod Fisheries*, 97n, 161. Vicens Vives, *Manual*, 332-333. Gardoqui to the Cabots, June 1, 1772, Cabot "Papers."

29 "Averia Accounts."

30 Robert S. Smith, *The Spanish Guild Merchant: A History of the Consulado, 1250-1700* (Durham, N.C., 1940), 77n. Zabala y Allende, *Consulado de Bilbao*, 114n. Teofilio Guiard de Larrauri, *El Historia de la Noble Villa de Bilbao*, 3 vols. (Bilbao, 1908), II: 94ff.

31 Smith, *Spanish Guild Merchant*, 83. J. de Lazurtegui and V. de Larrea, *Merchants and Shipmaster's Practical Guide to the Port of Bilbao* (Bilbao, 1882), 68.

32 Frankland to Stanhope, July 3, 1716, SPFS 94/213. Bubb to Stanhope, August 12, 1715, SPFS 94/84.

33 Reynolds and Harvey to Stanhope, March 13, 1716, SPFS 94/213.

34 Guiard de Larrauri, *Noble Villa de Bilbao*, III : 319n.

there.<sup>35</sup> After his death, Joseph Brodiens, a naturalized Spaniard, acted for the English, assisting prisoners in wartime and handling other mercantile and maritime problems.<sup>36</sup> The absence of an English consul may have helped expand the port's trade, since colonial vessels could easily carry on illicit trade there. They could, as an English diplomat noted: "purchase all kinds of European goods at a very low price" without "the inspection of anybody."<sup>37</sup> In addition, no consulage duty was collected from English and colonial vessels at Bilbao.<sup>38</sup>

\* \* \*

Given the market for American codfish at Bilbao, how did the Essex County merchants come to provide such a large proportion of the fish imported there? And, why did those North Shore exporters favor the Bilbao outlet? New England fish competed effectively with that from Newfoundland because of certain qualities it possessed and also because of market timing. Bilbayan merchants preferred larger, well cured codfish called "greater merchantable." Smaller or "lesser merchantable" fish went to other Iberian ports, while so-called "middling" or "Jamaica" fish sold in the Wine Islands or in Jamaica. Since the cod appeared earlier on the New England Banks, the season there began earlier. The catch, salted and dried in the late winter and early spring, was termed "winter cured" fish, Bilbayan merchants paid a premium for it as "best suited to stand inland transport to Madrid."<sup>39</sup> New England fish often brought more than a shilling per quintal premium over that from Newfoundland.<sup>40</sup> The last shipments of North Shore fish usually reached Bilbao in November or early December, a month or more before those from St. John, Bay of Bulls, Trepasey, or other northern fishing areas. Earlier arrival allowed Bilbayan fish buyers to ship fish inland before the winter weather created transportation problems.<sup>41</sup> Vizcayan fish merchants preferred New England fish because of its high quality, its size, and its time of arrival at market, while North Shore shippers appreciated the premium price they received for their salt cod.

Fish wholesaling at Bilbao had fallen largely into English hands very early in the seventeenth century. During the 1640s Thomas Bensum and Joseph Chapan handled consignments at the port and most of the fish from New England and Newfoundland evidently was consigned to resident English merchants. By 1700 at least eight English merchants carried on business at Bilbao. Dutch and French nationals also shared the fish-importing business. One history of Bilbao notes that the port's trade was so dominated by foreigners "that Bilbao seemed to be a colony of other nations."<sup>42</sup> Through the next fifty years Bilbayans struggled to control their own destinies.

As enemy aliens when war occurred, Englishmen left Spain. Such an exodus followed in 1702, and when the merchants returned after 1713 they met solid opposition. While their government could not appoint a

---

35 Keene to Bedford, March 11, 1749, SPFS 94/137. Original Correspondence to the Board of Trade, September 26, 1765, CO 388/53.

36 Porten to Halifax, March 22, 1764, SPFS 94/166.

37 Brusby to Weymouth, February 13, 1769, SPFS 94/181.

38 The consulage duty, paid by all British vessels, supported consuls in foreign ports. In 1768 it was 200 reales in Spanish ports, payable to the consul on arrival. Gray to Shelburne, September 12, 1768, SPFS 94/180.

39 Innis, *Cod Fisheries*, 118. McFarland, *New England Fisheries*, 69. Nettels, *Money Supply*, 78.

40 McFarland, *New England Fisheries*, 69.

41 Judah, *North American Fisheries*, 69.

42 "Court Records" in the Library of the Provincial Disputacion, Bilbao, Spain, Legajo 218, No. 15. Bailyn and Bailyn, *Massachusetts Shipping*, 37. Guiard de Larrauri, *Noble Villa de Bilbao*, III: 319n.

consul at Bilbao, English merchants apparently managed to withstand local pressures and regained a major share of the fish business.<sup>43</sup> By the 1730s the firm of William Parminter and Lawrence Barrow dominated the fish trade. More than half of the New England fish passed through their hands, and they took thirty percent of the city's total fish imports. Arthur Lynch, an Irish merchant, disposed of six or seven shipments yearly. The rest of the incoming fish went to Spanish merchants mainly or to naturalized Spaniards such as Peter Beckwelt or Joseph Brodiens.<sup>44</sup>

In 1739 Anglo-Spanish relations collapsed into war, lasting until 1748. English merchants again left Bilbao. Parminter and Barrow transferred their headquarters to Lisbon but evidently did not prosper there. Barrow shortly returned to Bilbao, so greatly esteemed by "the Inhabitants and Magistrates that they admitted him to his Residence" there.<sup>45</sup> Arthur Lynch, on the other hand, accepted Spanish citizenship, as did many other Irish Catholic merchants.<sup>46</sup> Peace returned in 1748 and Barrow again set up as a fish merchant. However, despite the friendship of his neighbors, he faced very stiff competition. Lynch, Lynch, Kelly and Moroney, as well as Beckwelt and Son, and Joseph Brodiens & Company, along with local Spanish houses, challenged for control of the business. A rising star in the Bilbayan firmament, Joseph Gardoqui soon developed close relations with New England and Newfoundland shippers. The trade suffered another interruption during the Seven Years War, but in the era before the American Revolution the Casa de Gardoqui all but engrossed the trade between Salem and Bilbao.<sup>47</sup> American business records still extant solidly confirm the importance of the Gardoqui connection.<sup>48</sup> The firm's success meant that the Vizcayans had escaped overseas dominance, at least in the importation of *bacalao*. The replacement of English by Spanish fish wholesalers at Bilbao had, however, no effect on the traditional pattern of the business.

\* \* \*

North Shore clearances for Vizcaya depended naturally upon the success of the fishery. Vessels sailed for Bilbao monthly but two-thirds of them left Salem during May, June, July, August, and November. A six-to-eight-week voyage brought them to the bar at Portugalete. There the consignee oversaw landing, weighing, grading, and warehousing the cargo; paid the averias and other duties; and assisted the captain with any other problems. Bilbao exported nothing legally importable into British North America, thus New England vessels often cleared in ballast, going home empty directly from that port. However, others proceeded to Setubal (St. Ubes), Lisbon, Cadiz, or some other port to load salt for the home market. Salt to dehydrate the

---

43 Reynolds and Harvey to Stanhope, March 13, 1716, SPFS 94/213.

44 "Averia Accounts." During the years 1732-1737 a total of 344 fish cargoes entered Bilbao. Parminter and Barrow acted as consignees for 116 full and partial cargoes. Of 123 New England fish cargoes, they handled 68 full and 4 part cargoes. From 1732-1735 John Archer took 11 full and 2 part cargoes, while Arthur Lynch received 27 full and 4 partial shipments.

45 Keene to Bedford, March 11, 1749, SPFS 94/137. Letter fragment, dated March 17, 1741, Faneuil "Letter Book."

46 McLachlan, *Trade and Peace*, 140-141. Colebrooke to Bedford, July 14, 1750; August 11, 1750, SPFS 94/227. Guiard de Larrauri, *Noble Villa de Bilbao*, III: 319n.

47 "Averia Accounts," 1749-1756. Over these years 506 fish cargoes entered Bilbao. The three major fish houses were Joseph Gardoqui (215 full and 34 part cargoes), Lynch, Lynch, Kelly & Moroney (44 full and 8 part cargoes), and Pedro Beckwelt (91 full and 11 part). From 1770-1774 some 189 vessels reached Bilbao from New England. The Casa de Gardoqui acted as consignees for 148 full and 13 partial shipments. Of the New England arrivals 184 came from Salem and Marblehead.

48 The Cabot "Papers" contain considerable material dealing with the Casa de Gardoqui.

cod was in constant demand. When so directed, the consignment agent at Bilbao provided a freight, usually iron, for a port in southern Iberia. Income from such a loading almost covered the cost of the cheap salt cargo home. If no freight offered, the Bilbayan firm advanced the captain funds to purchase salt and very often cash as well.<sup>49</sup> Most important, almost the whole value of the fish sold at Bilbao was available for remission to England.

Fish carriers often made two voyages to Bilbao annually and an exceptionally fast, well operated vessel could raise the Vizcayan landfall three times in a year.<sup>50</sup> It was a rare North Shore mariner who had not crossed the bar at Portugalete a half a dozen times or more. Seamen and officers enjoyed the privilege of carrying small amounts of fish on their own account.<sup>51</sup> Doubtless profits from their ventures went for Bilbayan mirrors, tortoiseshell combs, or other knick-knacks to please wives and family at home. Those goods entering as ship's stores acquainted stay-at-homes with Bilbao's goods.

The Bilbao/Salem connection was the North Shore's blue chip trade. Not only did that market consume Essex County's best grades of merchantable fish but it also allowed its merchants to turn their fish into cash credits quickly. By the 1770s the volume of this traffic had grown so great that significant capital growth blessed the Essex County area.

**TABLE 6-2**  
Salem Clearances, 1768-1772

Year	So. Eur.		West Indies		Overseas		So. Eur. To Overseas	
	Ves.	Tons	Ves.	Tons	Ves.	Tons	Ves.	Tons
1768	57	4016	137	7781	194	11797	29.4%	34.0%
1769	48	3526	107	6010	156	9634	30.7	36.6
1770	53	4193	156	8659	209	12852	25.3	32.6
1771	67	5013	152	8818	221	14051	30.3	35.6
1772	58	3290	185	10073	244	13488	23.7	24.3
Avg.	57	4008	147	8268	205	12364	27.8	32.4

Source: CO 16/1, "Inspector General's Ledger, 1768-1772."

Firms that shipped several cargoes a year to the Nervion, such as the Hoopers, Cabots, Lees, and others, waxed prosperous, nay wealthy, from this business. Six of Robert "King" Hooper's vessels sailed to Spain on twenty-six separate voyages between 1752 and 1756. The Lees, over the same period, dispatched twelve ships, brigs, snows, and schooners on a total of thirty-five voyages.<sup>52</sup> Isaac Smith of Gloucester also engaged actively in it, five vessels, ten voyages. Numerous other North Shore families tried this trade with good success. They corresponded constantly with Bilbayan agents, developing close and cordial relationships, often exchanging personal gifts.<sup>53</sup> The names of some of their vessels reflect the close ties between the ports.

49 Pickman to Captain Cabot, May 30, 1767; October 8, 1766, Cabot "Papers."

50 "Averia Accounts" list the arrival of the brigantine *Tartar*, Benjamin Warren, on three separate voyages in 1768.

51 Freight bill for the voyages of the *Tartar* to Bilbao, 1766-1767, Cabot "Papers."

52 MSR, Part II, Salem Port Records, 1752-1756. Hooper owned the *Bilbao*, *Haley*, *Hooper*, *Joseph*, *Prince William*, and *Swallow*. The Lees (Jeremiah, John, Richard, Samuel, and Seaward) owned *Eunice*, *Storke*, *Gardoqui*, *Lucretia*, *Susanna*, *Hannah*, *Dolphin*, *Lynn*, *Two Brothers*, *Boston*, and *Champion*. Smith owned *Gloucester*, *Industry*, *Mermaid*, *Nancy*, and *Molly*.

53 Letter to Lory & Michael of Bilbao, December 14, 1738, Faneuil, "Letter Book." They had sent

A snow name *Bilbao* made seventeen voyages from 1750 through 1766. Two large vessels carried the name of the founder of the Casa de Gardoqui, one of them that led by Nicholas Gordon.<sup>54</sup> The ports enjoyed an exceptional long-term business association.

In ten years, 1765-1775, Salem shipped more than 600,000 quintals of cod to Bilbao, worth at cost perhaps £280,000 sterling and on the mole at Portugalete double that figure, £560,000 sterling.<sup>55</sup> It was a vast sum but, of course, not all profit. After North Shore commercial leaders freed themselves from English shippers and Boston commission agents, they shipped fish on their own vessels, manned by their own seamen. Most of the expenditures involved placed funds in the hands of the local population. Given the cheapness of returning salt cargoes, Salem shippers built relatively huge credits with their Bilbayan agents for transferal to England. The trade offered outstanding opportunities for capital expansion.

Basque wholesalers also profited enormously from North American fish imports. If Salem shipments were worth £560,000 sterling, then commissions for handling the fish at perhaps five percent ran to almost £28,000 sterling, and that represented only part of their profits from this trade.<sup>56</sup> The sons of Joseph Gardoqui, for example, rose to exalted positions in Spanish society in the army, church, and diplomatic service.<sup>57</sup> A goodly portion of Bilbao's population certainly found employment in receiving and distributing the flood of American codfish.

If North Shore merchants were called "nabobs" in the 1770s, the neighbors of the Gardoquis must certainly have described them as "ricachos." If Massachusetts and especially Essex County honored the "Sacred Cod," so Vizcaya and its capital Bilbao enshrined *bacalao*. The two ports truly enjoyed a symbiotic relationship, much of their mutual prosperity dependent upon traffic in merchantable cod.

---

Faneuil chocolate, champagne, and other gifts and he answered: "Am exceedingly mortified that I know of nothing from these parts that will be of any Pleasure to you."

54 Tapley, *Early Coastwise*, 19-20, 72-73.

55 See Table 6-1. For codfish prices in this era, see Cole, *Wholesale Commodity Prices*, II. Fish prices in Bilbao were about double Salem's.

56 The Gardoquis charged a three-percent commission for handling fish cargoes and added commissions to transfer funds, arrange freights, advance cash, and other services. "Account of Sales of the Cargo of the Schooner *Salley*," George Cabot, January 29, 1770, Cabot "Papers."

57 Francisco de Ygartua y Landecho, *Diego de Gardoqui, primer embajador de Espana en los Estados Unidos de Norte America* (Bilbao, 1964), 7-8.



## CHAPTER VII

### THE NEWFOUNDLAND FISHERY AND SOUTHERN EUROPE

Gaspar de Corte-Real's discovery of the Newfoundland fisheries in 1501 began the competition for this Atlantic treasure house, which lasted down to modern times. From very early the profits from taking codfish on the North American Banks and their sale to European customers excited the avarice of fishermen and merchants. Spain, Portugal, Holland, France, and England competed for hegemony there.

Initially Spain had claimed a monopoly of all New World assets, including the fisheries. As time passed, Europe's religious conflicts heightened its economic rivalries. By mid-sixteenth century dominance of the cod fishery by Portuguese and Breton fishermen was challenged by Basque, English, and Dutch fishing interests. The French put forth a major effort, and the Anglo-Spanish conflict from the 1580s onward allowed them to expand their fishery share significantly. Until 1600 they held the major advantage. Queen Elizabeth I, warring with Philip II, encouraged her sea dogs to attack Spanish and Portuguese fishermen on the Banks.<sup>1</sup>

Among earlier enterprises attracting English overseas investors, the Newfoundland fishery loomed large. As the new century dawned, Spanish power began its long decline. The long conflict, 1588-1604, had weakened Spain's hold on North America but provided scant satisfaction to fishermen from Devon and Cornwall as they saw the French and Dutch middlemen profiting from the fisheries. Dutch traders even wholesaled English fish, carrying cargoes directly from the Banks to Iberia, as early as the 1590s. For a time after their truce with Spain in 1609, they actually controlled the fish trade to Iberia and the Mediterranean.<sup>2</sup>

French fishing interests retained a share of the Iberian markets partly because the Spanish were co-religionists. Protestant Holland and England at odds with the Catholic southerners controlled fish supplies but not the markets. Expansion-minded English leaders influenced the thinking of the new King James I, who sought peace with Spain. A treaty in 1604 opened Spanish and Portuguese ports to English fish.<sup>3</sup>

West Country fishermen were geographically as close to the Banks as any competitor. Earlier catches had been taken home to England and then on to southern Europe; now English ships carried the catch directly to Spanish and Portuguese buyers. Soon London merchants competed with those from western fishing centers over how best to exploit the American fishery. Londoners favored territorial control in Newfoundland and New England and settlements there, which would consume goods from the metropolis and produce fish for export to Europe aboard English vessels. The West Country interest preferred seasonal settlements there by fishermen and salters and tenders of the fish flakes, who would return to England at season's end. New England represented a victory for the London policy. Newfoundland eventually saw a mixture of the two programs. Permanently land-based settlers produced one-fourth to one-third of the Newfoundland fish. The rest were caught by fishing ships or by small-boat fishermen who returned to the British Isles when the winter closed in.<sup>4</sup>

Because cod had excellent keeping qualities, the English prepared and preserved their catch by the dry

---

1 Innis, *Cod Fisheries*, 30.

2 Ibid. Beer, *Origins*. Judah, *North American Fisheries*. Lounsbury, *British Fishery*. All provide solid studies of the fisheries. For Dutch competition, see Innis, *Cod Fisheries*, 68-69, as well as Judah, 113-114. Barbour, "Dutch and English Merchant Shipping," 230.

3 Lounsbury, *British Fishery*, 36. Innis, *Cod Fisheries*, 49-50.

4 On the London/western England conflict, see Innis, *Cod Fisheries*, 49-52; Lounsbury, *British Fishery*, 35-40, 53; Judah, *North American Fisheries*, 86-90; Beer, *Origins*, 56-63, 115, 185 and *Colonial System*, II: 201, 205, 207, 210-213, 220-231. Cf. Cell, "Newfoundland Company," 617.

fish method. Cleaned and split, it was placed on racks, or flakes, and dehydrated by heavy application of salt. Demand for *bacalao* grew and production increased, creating a need for greater shipping capacity and a larger pool of seamen for the fishing vessels and those taking fish to market. From Iberia vessels sailed home to England with cheap solar salt to cure next year's catch. Citrus fruits, wine, and other Mediterranean goods came also. Most important, the trade transferred specie from bullion-rich Spain into English hands. As Harold Innis noted: "The rise of prices in Spain, following the influx of specie from the New World, had its part in the consolidation of the West Country fishing industry in Newfoundland and its expansion to New England." And again: "Cod from Newfoundland was the lever by which [England] wrested her share of the riches of the New World from Spain."<sup>5</sup> English treasure was earned by trade's increase.

\* \* \*

Wars periodically disrupted the fish trade. During the early 1600s the English came under heavy attack by the Barbary corsairs. The internal Civil War also discouraged the Newfoundland fishery, and wars with France, Spain, and Holland affected it as well. London merchants blamed losses on the vulnerability of small, weakly armed fish carriers. Nevertheless, the need to compete with French and Portuguese, who traded directly to Iberia, saw English shippers permitted to take cargoes direct to Bilbao, Cadiz, Malaga, Lisbon, Oporto, and other centers. That reduced fish costs by as much as fifty percent in contrast to supplies going through England.<sup>6</sup> Where previously only about thirty fishing ships went out to Newfoundland yearly, by 1610 more than two hundred English ships fished there. The 1620s saw Barbary raiders take a heavy toll of English shipping and even attack fishermen on the Banks. Clearances to Newfoundland fell precipitously. After 1660 relations with the pirate states improved, and all English ships bound south of Cape Finisterre carried Barbary Passes and even then met harassment.

Between 1587 and 1781 England fought several wars with Spain, six with France, and five with Holland. Through the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries these conflicts affected the southern European trade. Banks fishermen suffered losses and fish cargoes European-bound faced constant threats from privateers and naval vessels. Spanish ports were often closed. Wartime required larger armed vessels and bigger crews. Insurance costs mounted. Wars meant a decline in vessels fishing, exports, and income.<sup>7</sup> Because of wartime dangers, direct fish shipments to Iberia came to be carried in larger vessels. Called "sack" ships, they often brought wine, salt, and other supplies to the fishermen from Spain and Portugal. Arriving in midseason, or later, they collected fish cargoes usually by arrangement. After the 1660s, when the season ended in early or mid-October, the fishing fleet returned to England and the fish carriers were convoyed to the Portuguese coast. During wartime, they might even be escorted to final destinations.<sup>8</sup>

In 1615 the English sent out 250 fishing ships, manned by 5,000 men, which caught an estimated 300,000 quintals of fish, priced at Newfoundland at eight shillings per quintal. In southern Europe their value probably exceeded £200,000.<sup>9</sup> With Charles II's restoration in the 1660s, peace with the Barbary States, and the passage of the Navigation Laws, a new expansion began. Two hundred or more fishing vessels left England for the Banks. By the 1670s English fish sold in Iberia for more than £250,000. The

---

5 Innis, *Cod Fisheries*, 51-52.

6 Beer, *Origins*, 199, 213.

7 Ibid., 292-293. Lounsbury, *British Fishery*, 210. Nettels, *Money Supply*, 145.

8 *CSPC*, VIII (1675-1676): 316. Captain John Berry, HMS *Bristol* reported arriving at Livorno (Leghorn), Italy in December 1765, having convoyed forty sail from Newfoundland.

9 Beer, *Colonial System*, II: 227-228, and *Origins*, 292-293. McFarland, *New England Fisheries*, 69. *CSPC*, VIII (1675-1676): 179. Brewster, *New Essays on Trade*, 75.



number of fishing ships had declined from between 250 and 300 to half that number.<sup>10</sup> As the fleet shrank, crews increased, signaling a rise in tonnage. Fish prices in America depended on available supply and on market demand. Demand might raise prices to twenty shillings per quintal or drop it to eight shillings. War meant high prices and less fish. During the 1690s France and England fought, the area became a battleground, and fish production fell off sharply.

After 1650 the English fishery suffered from French and New England competition, though some argued that the cod were less plentiful than formerly. West Country interests caviled against the increasing population of settlers, “inhabitants,” who competed with their fishermen. Nevertheless, Newfoundland best fitted the mercantilist conceptions of English leaders and was “the most valuable of the English dominions beyond the seas.”<sup>11</sup>

Government policies fostered the fisheries. The Navigation Laws permanently barred the Dutch from carrying English fish to Spain and Portugal, guaranteeing the English monopoly of that trade. Previously, as an encouragement, the government had granted the right to carry salt and Portuguese island wines directly to Newfoundland and New England. After Charles II returned, naval escorts protected the fishing fleet and saw it safely to the Iberian coast. Treaties with Spain and Portugal guaranteeing commercial and legal privileges in Iberian ports contributed in a major way to the trade’s success. Annual reports by the commodores of the Newfoundland fleet contain data on the vessels, their tonnage, and the men involved, as well as the number of their passengers going out to Newfoundland yearly and those returning. The volume of the catch and its sources around Newfoundland were also noted, dating back to 1675. Record keepers carefully distinguished between fishing and sack ships, which carried the catch to markets.<sup>12</sup>

---

10 Lounsbury, *British Fishery*, 210-211. McFarland, *New England Fisheries*, 69-70. See Newfoundland Fishery Statistics, 1675-1731, CO 390/6.

11 Beer, *Colonial System*, II: 294 and *Origins*, 212.

12 One official described “the scheme of the fishery” as “more a matter of speculation than certainty.” See Byron to Weymouth, November 25, 1769, Correspondence of the Secretary of State (Newfoundland), CO 194/28. Cf. Newfoundland Fishery Statistics, 1675-1731, CO 390/6. These annual reports in condensed form are found in *CSPC* down to 1739. The “sack ships” commonly brought wine to answer the demands of the fishermen. “Sack” was strong white wine from southern Europe, including sherry.

**TABLE 7-1**  
**Newfoundland Fishery Statistics, 1700-1775**

Year	Fish Ves.	Ships Tons	Sack Ves.	Ships Tons	Catch in Qtls.	Exports to So. Eur. Qtls.	% of Total	Util./T Sack Ves.	Price		Value at
									Nfd. So. Euro.	So. Euro.	Cost in So. Eur.
1700	171		49						12.0		
1701	75		46		216320	154370	71.4		13.0	20.33	£156917
1702	16		25	1330	82140	56590	68.9	2.13	13.0	20.33	57524
1703	23		40		75000	72000	96.0		13.0	20.33	73188
1704	23		42		68000						
1705	20	2400	20		78000						
1706	46		37		106270						
1707	70		30		120682						
1708	49	10995	33		135934						
1709	35		57		90364	80600	89.2		13.0	20.33	81930
1710	49	5748	26		172528	137226	79.5		13.0	20.33	139490
1711	62	6880	55		120546	118900	98.6		13.0	20.33	120862
1712	66	8000	17		64430	57550	89.3		13.0	20.33	58500
1713	46	5520	40		104750	78860	82.6		13.0	20.33	80161
1714	85	8000	45		115000	129000	112.2		13.0	20.33	131129
1715	108	11525	38		89622						
1716	86	8070	30		88469						
1717	89	7530	33		113990	92680	81.3		13.0	20.33	94209
1718	95	7902	35		100823	92730	92.0		13.0	20.33	94260
1719	69	9835	28		94599	94479	99.9		13.0	20.33	96038
1720	73	5940	42	4750	80230	94080	117.3	0.99	13.77	21.24	99913
1722	87	6870	37	4300	107880	106940	99.1	1.24	14.0	21.51	115014
1723	144	10300	53	6130	139750	72990	52.2	0.60	14.0	21.51	78501
1724	130	8993	42	4710	109530	92090	84.1	0.98	13.87	21.33	98214
1725	103	7578	44	4860	119998	108220	90.2	1.11	14.35	21.96	118826
1726	94	5240	55	5530	174670	174670	100.0	1.58	14.11	21.67	189255
1727	128	10956	42	4470	207530	207530	100.0	2.32	13.39	20.75	215312
1729	121	7428	27	2590	170220	163450	96.0	3.16	12.69	19.87	162388
1730	154	10820	57	5480	250040	242150	96.8	2.21	12.69	19.87	240576
1731	107	7880	41	5500	191550	98680	51.5	0.90	12.625	19.79	97644
1734					314545	297650	94.6		11.00	17.74	264016
1735					419075	404725	96.6			20.5	414843
1736					292410	299030	102.3		10.25	16.79	251036
1742						121365				16.79	101886
1748	58		101		483800	418850	86.6		12.69	19.87	416127

**TABLE 7-1 continued**  
**Newfoundland Fishery Statistics, 1700-1775**

Year	Fish Ves.	Ships Tons	Sack Ves.	Ships Tons	Catch in Qtls.	Exports to So. Eur. Qtls.	% of Total	Util./T Sack Ves.	Price		Value at Cost in So. Eur.
									Nfd.	So. Euro.	
1749	146		125		506406	462070	91.2		12.625	19.79	457218
1750					448070	445970	99.5		12.00	19.00	423672
1751					358310	358310	100.0		13.25	20.58	368701
1764	140	14819	97	11924	561310	470188	83.0	1.97	11.25	18.05	424345
1765						493654			11.25	18.05	445523
1766	204	20535	104	12452	559985	523636	93.5	2.10	11.25	18.05	472581
1767	258	23419	92	10532	553310	533620	96.4	2.53	11.00	17.74	473321
1768*					573450	533087	93.0		11.75	18.49	492839
1769	354	23047	117	12071	578014	544718	94.2	2.26	12.50	19.63	534641
1770	368	22045	123	13363	649498	610910	94.1	2.29	12.00	19.00	580365
1771	369	21954	120	10995	644919	560204	86.9	2.55	12.75	19.95	558803
1772	306	20950	146	14508	759843	481347	63.3	1.66	12.50	19.63	472442
1773	262	18855	93	8553	780328	489665	62.8	2.86	11.00	17.74	434333
1774	254	22182	149	15179	695866	516358	74.2	1.70	11.50	18.37	474275
1775	314	21843	142	12378	658315	600220	91.2	2.42	12.00	19.00	570209

Sources: Statistical data is from CO 194/25-32 and 390/6 and from *CSPC* XLI (1734-1735), XLII (1736). Figures for 1768 are averaged from the years 1764-1775. Prices are in shillings per quintal.

During the eighteenth century the English exploited the rich Newfoundland fishery more intensively. Again wars and rumors of war influenced the enthusiasm of investors. Increasing populations in southern Europe and the West Indies encouraged growth. Three major conflicts, 1702-1713, 1739-1748, and 1756-1763, reduced normal activities by English fishermen. Naval expeditions and privateer raids disrupted enterprises, with control of the fishery a major economic prize. Now, Spanish fishermen rarely came out to America, facing British harassment or seizure. In wartime Spanish ports were closed to English and American traders, and fish carriers bound to Portugal risked capture as well.

From 1715 through 1725 fishermen had limited success, as the cod did not appear in usual numbers. After 1725 and between the wars the English fishery flourished, and after 1763 an era of major expansion occurred. Loss of Canada sharply reduced French competition, and down to 1775 more than four times as much English fish was shipped to southern Europe as sent there annually in the years before 1726.

Annual fishery reports provide prices for a number of years and disclose the proportion taken to southern Europe. For forty-two years between 1701 and 1775 reports on such exports have been utilized. Using Newfoundland prices and shipping costs, it is possible to estimate minimum southern European prices, allowing recovery of costs involved. The minimum average value of Newfoundland fish sales there in the eleven years before the American Revolution would have been £498,923 annually.

The Newfoundland fishery in this era was served by distinct groups of fishermen. Following long tradition, fishing vessels came out from the ports of western England; secondly, "bye boat" men, who fished in small boats, came as passengers with them. Then "inhabitants," permanent Newfoundland residents, also small-boat fishermen, sought fish, despite periodic discouragement.<sup>13</sup> The share of the catch won by each

13 New Englanders also fished at Newfoundland but contributed few exports from that fishery.

group changed over time. From 1720-1731 English fishing ships took almost half the yearly catch (44.5%). Bye boatmen landed almost thirty percent (28.9%), and the inhabitants a bit more than twenty-five percent (26.5%). By the 1760s and 1770s bye boatmen took less than twenty percent (19.1%), while local fishermen took almost forty-five percent (44.9%), and the catch of the fishing vessels had fallen to about thirty-six percent. Overall, the yearly take grew greatly but the distribution of profits differed. Where earlier about three-quarters of the fish had been taken by British Isles fishermen, by the 1770s only fifty-five percent of the earnings went into English pockets.<sup>14</sup>

During the seventeenth century English fishing entrepreneurs investing there adamantly opposed Newfoundland colonization, warning that settlement there would see a repetition of what had happened in New England, where English fishermen lost control of the fishery. As early as the 1670s Sir Joseph Williamson complained that English traders had been cut out of the Newfoundland market by New Englanders, with the result that “Fish is dearer and New England supplies the market.”<sup>15</sup> Opponents argued that the “more it prospered, the lesse it would be to the advantage of Old England, but they would all adhere and depend on New England, Yielding his Maj’te no more obedience, Seamen or Shippis at his neede than those doe.”<sup>16</sup> Behind these concerns lay the real issue, the potential loss by English fishing interests of the profits from the sale of goods to Newfoundland and, most important, control of the trade to Iberia. By the late 1760s their predictions approached realization. New England dominated the supply trade to Newfoundland and settlers there had all but gained a parity in the production of fish for export.

While local fishermen increased their share of the catch, the inhabitants did not control Newfoundland’s export trade to Spain and Portugal, or to the West Indies. While Salem and Marblehead entrepreneurs originally gathered the fish to sell to English shipowners for export and then later integrated the New England fishery vertically, Newfoundlanders did not follow that course. Most local fishermen there remained small producers, selling fish to European-bound ships. New Englanders took the lower grades of Newfoundland fish to the West Indies. The Newfoundland fishery was not integrated either vertically or horizontally by local entrepreneurial efforts. Local earnings from the southern European trade were mainly from export fish sales. English investors there did vertically integrate their share of the business, catching the fish and arranging its carriage to Iberia. They profited from shipping earnings, from insurance and handling charges, plus the profits realized on its sale at Bilbao, Lisbon, Cadiz, or elsewhere.

Fishing at Newfoundland was at peak from May through July, tailed off in August, recovering somewhat in early September. By late summer, these northern latitudes turned decidedly colder. Ice formed in the coastal bays by mid-September. Most fishermen went out to Newfoundland in March and sailed home in late September. Properly handled, the split, cleaned cod had to be salted, turned a number of times, and protected from dampness to produce a hard, dry cure and then prepared for shipping. The curing process, taking some weeks, usually ended by early to mid-October.

English merchants handling fish sales in Iberia often complained of poorly cured fish. In 1718 and again in the mid-1730s English consuls in Iberia grumbled to the Board of Trade about the poor quality of the fish coming to market.<sup>17</sup> New Englanders had established official cullers of fish, assuring a quality product. Newfoundlanders were urged to follow their lead. Consuls reported that the system of charter agreements

---

14 See Table 4-1. For Newfoundland population, see McCusker and Menard, *Economy of British America*, 112.

15 As cited in Beer, *Colonial System*, II: 210-213.

16 Ibid., 220-221. “Notebook of Sir Joseph Williamson,” *CSPC*, VIII (1675-1676): 159.

17 “Report on the State of the Fish Trade,” September 17, 1718, SPFP 89/26. *CSPC*, XLI (1734-1735): 276; XLII (1735-1736): 5, 108-109, 280, 396-397.

for fish carriers allowed too little time in America for the fish to be properly “wrought.” If scheduled deliveries were delayed, shipowners collected demurrage fees to cover additional costs. Sack shipmasters were warned to carry “only merchantable fish, the only way to prevent complaints.”<sup>18</sup>

The fishing fleet brought out salt and other necessities in the spring. Later in the year sack ships delivered supplies as well as goods for local consumption. In the seventeenth century most of these vessels came from West Country ports but later from London and other English centers. Relatively few New England ships carried fish from Newfoundland to southern Europe. New Englanders did sometimes buy fish there and then resell it to English exporters, even underselling local producers to obtain English bills, saleable for a premium on the mainland.<sup>19</sup>

Since Newfoundland fish carriers set sail for markets by mid-October, New Englanders held a competitive edge in this trade. Their fishery began earlier and ended later. Some believed also that New England fish was firmer. Bilbayan merchants often offered a premium of up to five shillings per quintal for it.<sup>20</sup>

Few Newfoundland fish carriers braved winter seas in the North Atlantic to seek markets in Iberia. Of 239 vessels bound thence to Lisbon only twelve sailed before June first. About eighty-five percent of them left America in the last five months of the year. When bitter weather came early, convoys left Newfoundland in mid-October, while a mild fall saw Royal Navy commodores delay clearance until mid-November.<sup>21</sup> Passage to Lisbon took about twenty-five days and a voyage from Salem or Boston about thirty-two days.<sup>22</sup> An additional week at sea should have meant a slightly heavier freight from New England. Fish carriers from those ports reached the warmer Gulf Current after a day or two at sea, thus winter weather did not deter them. They sailed for southern Europe in all seasons. The fact that Yankees could fish earlier and later on their coast probably offset the disadvantage of a longer voyage to markets.

Shortly before Charles II regained the English throne in 1660, a petition to the Privy Council claimed that England had previously sent fifty or sixty fish carriers to Vizcaya every year, forty more to Cadiz and St. Lucar, and twenty to Malaga and Velez. Another twenty or thirty vessels sailed to Alicante, Valencia, Cartagena, and other Spanish ports. Further shipments went to the Balearic Islands and Italian outlets. At a minimum, 131 fish carriers went to Spain and up the Straits, not including Portugal and its island territories.<sup>23</sup> From that level, the English fisheries expanded significantly during the next century. Chapter V assesses the annual demand of southern European markets a hundred years later.<sup>24</sup> The same ports depended heavily on Newfoundland producers and less upon New England exports. Bilbao was the exception to this rule. Iberia’s internal transportation system changed very little over these two centuries. However, demographic growth increased demand and the English dominated the fisheries following the end of the French and Indian War. About seventy percent of the codfish from English America went to Spanish outlets. Portuguese territories took perhaps twenty-six percent. The remainder was sold in Italian ports.

---

18 Lounsbury, *British Fishery*, 317-318.

19 Nettels, *Money Supply*, 78.

20 Henri Louis Duhamel de Monceau, *Traité Général des Pêches et Histoire des Poissons*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1772), II: 49.

21 Lists of Lisbon arrivals in *CPR* indicate length of time at sea and thus give clearance data for them.

22 *CPR. PG*, February 3, 1763, seamen’s wages had fallen to thirty shillings per month. Differential for a crew of eight would have amounted to two pounds in wages.

23 As cited in Innis, *Cod Fisheries*, 97n.

24 Cf. Rochford to Halifax, January 1, 1764, SPFS 94/166. Rochford to Halifax, September 17, 1764, SPFS 94/168.

Partial records for importations by three major Iberian markets are still available, covering the years between 1763 and 1775. An examination of the fish trade to Bilbao, Barcelona, and Lisbon proves fruitful.

The records of its Consulado show Bilbao was a major market for American fish, much of which went over the Picos de Europa to Vitoria, Pamplona, Burgos, Madrid, and the north central plain. By the 1770s about sixty percent of the port's yearly consumption arrived from New England. Bilbayans preferred New England fish because it was better cured, but another contributing factor was market timing. Much of it reached Bilbao in late summer and early fall and could thus be transported over the mountains before winter weather closed roads to the interior.<sup>25</sup>

Newfoundland fish came to Bilbao on sack ships and also in smaller fishing vessels. A third, much smaller group of arrivals, mainly fishing smacks, came in via English ports, after taking fishermen home to Jersey, Guernsey, Exon, Poole, Plymouth, and Falmouth, en route. Four or five vessels each year called at another Iberian market to try the market and then came on to Bilbao.<sup>26</sup> Relatively few of these smaller vessels went to Iberian ports south of Cape Finisterre. Statistics on indirect fish shipments to Portugal from England during the 1760s and 1770s support this view. Normally only one or two vessels per year followed that routing.<sup>27</sup>

Over these years, 1763-1775, more than half the arrivals at Bilbao from Newfoundland had been consigned to Francisco de Gomez de la Torre. His total fish imports valued at £329,232

**TABLE 7-2**  
**Major Bilbayan Fish Merchants, 1763-1777**

Firm	Newfldd.		New Eng.		Canada		Old Eng.		Iberia & Unknown		Totals	
	Carg.	Value	Carg.	Value	Carg.	Value	Carg.	Value	Carg.	Value	Carg.	Value
Gomez	137	229,345	4	9,685	24	41,273	34	45,413	1	3,516	200	329,232
Gardoqui	30	55,364	367	858,794	6	6,888	22	22,839	23	39,581	448	983,466
Lynch, Kelly	16	23,046	78	105,552	3	4,549	7	8,906	10	11,303	114	153,356
St. Aulary	48	89,361	3	11,377	1	1,779	12	16,754	1	2,153	65	121,424
Others	<u>34</u>	<u>51,281</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>3,235</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1,934</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>8,617</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>8,414</u>	<u>78</u>	<u>73,481</u>
Total	265	448,397	477	988,643	35	56,423	84	102,529	44	64,967	905	1,660,959

Source: Cargoes include both full and partial shipments handled. Value is in pounds sterling, based on taxes paid. Data are from the "Averia Accounts," 1763-1775. Firm Lynch, Kelly is actually Lynch, Lynch, Kelly & Moroney. Iberian fish arrivals equaled 38 vessels, £55,526 and unknown 6 vessels, £9,441.

25 "Averia Accounts," 1763-1775.

26 Twenty-two of the twenty-seven vessels from Iberian ports with fish came from Lisbon and seem to have been mainly Newfoundlanders. Between 1763 and 1775 the origins of only five shipments are not identified.

27 "Account of Goods Exported from Great Britain to Portugal, 1761-1786," Board of Trade Papers, 6/62. Annual imports never exceeded £3,500.

brought him £16,462 in commissions, £11,467 from handling Newfoundland fish alone. Joseph Gardoqui & Sons converted Newfoundland fish worth £55,364 and pocketed £2,768 for its services. The firm led by Thomas de St. Aulary took delivery of Newfoundland fish worth £89,361 and earned £4,468. These three houses together disposed of more than eighty-three percent of the Newfoundland “poor jack” arriving.<sup>28</sup>

The English factory at Lisbon was very much larger and more influential than that at Bilbao. On the Tagus, marketing of American codfish was largely in English hands, in contrast to Bilbao. Firms of Irish merchants at Cadiz, Bilbao, and elsewhere enjoyed a kind of limbo status that their Anglo-Catholic status provided. During peacetime the Spanish-Irish claimed English citizenship but when war occurred argued that their Catholicism guaranteed neutrality.<sup>29</sup> The firm lead by Thomas de St. Aulary seems to have been of French origin. Importers named Gomez, Gardoqui, Arechaga, and Larralde all appear to have been Basques.

A Newfoundland fish carrier on arrival at Bilbao had several options as to further employment. It could go home empty. It might take a cargo to London or some other English port, or go on charter to an Iberian seaport to earn freight charges. These decisions were circumscribed by the English Navigation Acts. Bilbayan iron and raw wool were available for export but finished ironware could not be carried to England nor could iron of any kind be imported into North America. Spanish wool was in demand in England but not in America. A salt cargo could be purchased but more dearly than at Lisbon, Cadiz, or Alicante. Sack ships reaching Bilbao from Newfoundland were English owned as were those coming in indirectly. Thus, they normally sailed for home. Most of them, when clearing Bilbao, left no records of their destinations. They sailed empty and thus paid no Averia tax. More than three-quarters of the Newfoundland fish carriers arriving and more than sixty percent of those coming indirectly via England apparently cleared in ballast. Less than fifty percent of New England fish importers did so. Shipping for which we have no clearance data evidently sailed for home. At least New England vessels that cleared empty from there went home directly to Salem, Marblehead, or Boston, according to Naval Office Records.

**TABLE 7-3**  
**Bilbao Fish Entrances from North America, 1763-1775**

Year	Newfoundland			Canada			New England			Old England			Iberia			Unknown			Totals		
	Ves.	Qtls.	Value	Ves.	Qtls.	Value	Ves.	Qtls.	Value	Ves.	Qtls.	Value	Ves.	Qtls.	Value	Ves.	Qtls.	Value	Ves.	Qtls.	Value
1763	13	21269	23396	1	1863	2050	22	53680	59048	10	14607	16068	2	3454	3799	2	5604	6164	50	100477	110525
1764	29	43156	47472	6	8463	9310	33	74240	81664	5	2585	2844	5	7340	8074	---	---	---	78	135784	149364
1765	12	18654	20520	1	1617	1779	34	78975	86873	5	5058	5564	1	1706	1877	3	2978	3276	56	108988	119889
1766	28	40712	44783	2	2520	2772	31	68456	75302	6	8415	9256	7	11371	12508	---	---	---	74	131474	144621
1767	22	37280	41008	3	5072	5579	32	72426	79669	5	5266	5793	1	1125	1238	---	---	---	63	121169	133287
1768	24	35878	39466	3	4124	4537	46	91038	100142	5	4796	5254	---	---	---	---	---	---	78	135816	149399
1969	11	15899	17489	2	3893	4282	28	59377	65315	3	4260	4686	-1	1033	1136	---	---	---	45	84462	92908
1770	14	31068	34175	1	1966	2162	35	82401	90641	2	2250	2475	2	5402	5942	---	---	---	54	123087	135395
1771	16	22601	24861	2	2844	3129	41	92783	102061	4	5523	6075	2	4683	5151	---	---	---	65	128434	141277
1772	23	35787	3931	4	5821	6403	38	69036	75940	2	2577	2835	2	2959	3255	---	---	---	69	116190	127810
1773	16	24948	27442	1	1817	1999	23	43510	47861	7	8198	9018	1	4727	5200	---	---	---	48	83200	91520
1774	26	32614	35876	4	4522	4975	52	80121	88133	12	13609	14970	---	---	---	---	---	---	94	130866	143954
1775	23	46990	51690	3	4508	4959	22	39042	42946	7	13936	15330	3	4239	4663	---	---	---	58	108715	119588
Total	257	406866	447555	33	49030	53936	437	905085	995595	73	91060	100168	27	48039	52843	5	8532	9440	832	1508662	1659537
Avg. Cargo (Qtls)		1583			1486			2071			1247			1779			1716			1813	
Avg. Tons/Ves.		79			74			104			62			89			86			91	
Avg. Value		1741			1634			2278			1372			1957			1888			1995	

28 “Averia Accounts,” 1763-1775.

29 Crosse to Holderness, July 12, 1753, SPFS 94/228.

Source: "Averia Accounts," 1763-1775. This tax was based upon the value of the goods imported or exported. Fish paid a double Averia (Averia Ordinaria plus Averia Extraordinaria). Iron paid only the Averia Ordinaria. The tax was levied on the basis of one maravedi per ducado of value. One ducado equals 375 maravedis. One reale equaled 34 maravedis or 4.5 pence. The Averia Ordinaria multiplied by 7.0313 provides the value of the goods in sterling. Prices for the goods involved proved to be £22 per ton for *bacalao*; £16.55 for iron per ton; and £43.45 per ton for wool. A saca of wool weighed 3,647 pounds; 6.18 sacas per ton.

About two-thirds (fifty-nine) of the English-based fishing vessels that carried away goods went to English Channel destinations. Seventeen sailed to other Iberian ports and only two took salt to Newfoundland. Ten of them went to London and Bristol, carrying wool and iron. Channel-bound vessels took almost solely iron bars. Evidently ironware found heavy demand at Cadiz, probably for export to Spanish America. Few went out to Lisbon. While not many English fish carriers went on to Iberian ports, more than half of the New England fish arrivals did so.<sup>30</sup>

Dividing the fish arrivals by ports of arrival exposes their differing patterns of destination upon clearing from Bilbao. (See Table 7-4.) Vessels from Newfoundland sailed very largely to English ports. Their Averia taxes indicate exports valued at £23,939. Channel ports took goods worth £12,849, aboard thirty-five Newfoundland vessels.<sup>31</sup> Just nine such ships sailed to Iberian cities (£9,581). Ships from New England departed in small numbers to Old England (eighteen), mainly to London (eleven). A few ships arriving from Canada (eight) took £11,748 in goods to Channel ports.

Indirect arrivals via England (fifty-two) returned in the main to Channel centers (£4,815), none to London or Bristol. These were Banks fishermen, based on the size of their cargoes. They exported slightly more than ten tons of cargo each. In fact, ships from Newfoundland, Canada, and Old England (sixty-five) that went back to the West Country, carried iron cargoes of about fourteen tons. Wool exports, less than ten percent of the total, went without exception to London and Bristol.<sup>32</sup> In contrast, very large numbers of New England-owned ships sailed for Iberian outlets almost exclusively. Spain attracted 182 of them and Portugal 40, mostly with iron products. Cadiz was the preferred destination; Lisbon drew most of those Portugal bound.

The Averia taxes paid at Bilbao provide a means of measuring the import and export values of cargoes aboard English fish carriers, entering and clearing from the Basque port, 1762-1775. See Table 7-4, which balances the value of fish imports against the goods exported.

---

30 "Averia Accounts," 1763-1775. In large percentages fish carriers chose to sail from Bilbao without cargoes. Those from Newfoundland did so 77.8% of the time, from Canada 64.7%, from New England only 45%, from Iberia 69.25%, from Old England 61.6%; overall 58.3%

31 Ibid.

32 The average vessel took 14.3 tons of iron. Exports divided into 7.3% wool and 92.7% iron. Three-quarters of the wool went to London. Poole took wool worth only £141.



**TABLE 7-4**  
**Fish Vessels Clearing Bilbao, 1763-1775**

Origin	Channel Ports		London		Bristol		Spain (Cadiz)		Portugal (Lisbon)		Newfoundland	
	Ves.	Value	Ves.	Value	Ves.	Value	Ves.	Value	Ves.	Value	Ves.	Value
Nfld.	35	9034	6	11085	4	3820	7 (7)	6849 (6849)	2 (2)	2732 (2732)	3	229
Canada	8	11748	---	---	---	---	3 (3)	10273 (10273)	---	---	1	0
New Eng.	2	630	11	17974	5	4109	182 (170)	181359 (174697)	40 (37)	32495 (30746)	---	---
Old. Eng.	22	4815	---	---	---	---	4 (4)	3815 (3815)	2 (2)	1528 (1528)	---	---
Iberia	1	781	---	---	---	---	2 (2)	2596 (2596)	5 (4)	3441 (3275)	---	---
Unknown	1	241	---	---	---	---	1 (1)	165 (165)	---	---	---	---
Totals	69	27249	17	29059	9	7929	199 (184)	205057 (198395)	49 (45)	40196 (38281)	4	229

	Imports		NCL	Exports		Balance
	Ves.	Value		Ves.	Value	
Newfoundland	257	447555	200	57	33749	413806
Canada	33	53936	21	12	22021	31915
New England	437	995595	197	240	236567	759028
Old England	73	100168	45	28	10158	90010
Iberia	27	52843	19	8	6818	46025
Unknown	5	9440	3	2	406	9034
Totals	832	1659537	485	347	309719	1349818

Source: "Averia Accounts," 1763-1775. Values are in pounds sterling. NCL signifies no clearance listed. Vessels bound out to Newfoundland took small amounts of iron worth £229, plus some salt, which paid no Averia and therefore its value is unknown.

It at first appears that eighty percent of the fish import earnings were converted into cash or credits for transfer. Such a fine positive balance £1,349,818, repaying government efforts to foster fisheries, certainly encouraged the jealousy of the other European states, especially as it resulted from trade to only one Spanish port. However, these figures do not disclose the whole story. Bilbao's exports to America over these years proved to be miniscule, valued at £229, plus some salt. Those to British ports went in ninety-five ships, reaching £64,237. The major drain on the fish earnings, however, appeared to be from exportation of iron goods to Iberian centers. They amounted to £245,253, almost ninety percent of them posted against New England fish sales. This was a chimerical expenditure. Exports to America other than salt were banned by the Navigation Laws, so more than half the New England captains that off-loaded their fish on Bilbao's mole then offered their vessels for hire. Shippers arranged charters at reasonable rates because of the excess of shipping at the port. Approximately 14,342 tons of iron goods cleared to Iberian markets on these fish vessels. Cheap Cadiz and Lisbon salt sources beckoned. Such an iron charter often paid for the returning salt cargo. In any event, charging these iron exports against fish returns is not warranted. In consequence, credits left in the hands of Gomez, Gardoqui, and others would be increased by £245,253. The lion's share of that sum (£213,854) would have been retained in the accounts of New Englanders, raising New England's positive balance to about £973,000, or about £95,000 annually.<sup>33</sup>

33 Bilbayan records list iron in quintals, which, converted at twenty per ton, gives a figure of 14,342 tons over these years. Voyages from America to Iberia took a minimum of seventy days, including port time in both areas. Freight rates varied between £1.85/ton for wheat and £3.5/ton for codfish. A Cadiz passage from Bilbao probably averaged about ten days plus port time, probably at least fourteen days more. Total time would have been about one-third of that from America. At a minimum freight rate of ten shillings/ton, these ships would have earned an additional £7,171.

Newfoundland fish dominated the markets at Lisbon, Cadiz, Barcelona, and the other Iberian fish markets. At those points, cheap salt cargoes were available. Yet most of those carriers cleared in ballast.

At Lisbon major fish wholesale merchants such as Christopher Hake (seventy-seven cargoes) or Parminter & Montgomery (thirty-six) or Parr & Bulkeley (sixteen), all handled several shiploads of Newfoundland cod yearly. Between 1771 and 1775 these three firms, with Mayne, Burn & Mayne (forty-three) received more than seventy percent of the fish shipments reaching Lisbon. Shipping time from Newfoundland was seven days shorter than from New England, which could have shaved freight costs by about twenty percent.<sup>34</sup>

Between 1769 and 1775, Lisbon consumed about thirty-two shipments of Newfoundland fish yearly, more than eighty percent of them arriving in the Tagus estuary after August first. Only eight New England cargoes were sold there per year.<sup>35</sup>

Many of the fish carriers from the northern fishery then took cargoes to the English Channel or to London and Bristol. Channel towns took salt for future fishery use. Only eight or nine fish carriers came to Lisbon indirectly through Channel ports. All of Portugal received only 1,500 quintals of cod per year indirectly compared to the 7,100 quintals sent to Bilbao.<sup>36</sup> Vessels clearing from the Tagus for Newfoundland carried salt almost universally. Salt exports peaked April to July. Some of these salt carriers had entered Lisbon from other points in southern Europe, including Sicily and Livorno. Others had come in from the British Isles or from northern European ports.<sup>37</sup>

Lisbon's Marco records report entries, 1769-1774, of 188 Newfoundland vessels capable of carrying about 24,500 tons of cod. Of those, 133 (16,939 tons) cleared again to Newfoundland. Almost half the others (25 ships, 3,400 tons) sailed for English fishing ports. Eleven (1,733 tons) went to Ireland. London drew four; Liverpool two; North America four; and others cleared to Gibraltar, Malaga, and Terceira.<sup>38</sup>

In these years Lisbon entered eighty-one ships (9,227 tons) from other ports, which then went on to Newfoundland. Twenty-four came around from Setubal and then cleared. Several delivered iron from Bay of Biscay ports. All arrived, some in ballast only, took on salt, and sailed for the Newfoundland Banks.

The continued leadership of Channel port merchants is very evident from Lisbon's Marco records. Many ships initially bound directly for Newfoundland are indicated as later going on to Dartmouth, Portsmouth, Swanzy, Poole, or other fishing centers in England. Relatively few entering or clearing in this trade were London, Bristol, or Liverpool bound.

Newfoundland dominated American fish shipments to Barcelona, answering two-thirds of its demand. Consular reports from the Catalonian center list arrivals from America.

---

34 *CPR*, 1771-1774. Freight charges were 3.6s./qtl. A one-fifth reduction would be 8.64pense/qtl. See Table 4-6.

35 *Ibid.* Almost 90% arrived after August first.

36 "Account of Goods Exported from Great Britain to Portugal, 1761-1786," Board of Trade Papers, 6/62.

37 *CPR*, 1757-1775.

38 "Livros."

**TABLE 7-5**  
**Barcelona's Fish Imports, 1769-1774**

	Vessel	Tons	Tons/Ves.	Quintals	Qtls./Ves.	%Utilization	Value (£Stl.)
Newfoundland	88	10,200	116	175,823	1,998	86.2	193,405
New England	15	1,410	94	23,507	1,567	83.4	25,858
Canada	24	2,790	116	43,400	2,170	77.8	47,740
Iberia	<u>13</u>	<u>1,330</u>	<u>102</u>	<u>20,352</u>	<u>1,566</u>	<u>76.5</u>	<u>22,387</u>
Total	140	15,730	112	263,082	1,879	83.6	289,390

Source: Letters and enclosures, dated October 2, 1773; December 3, 1774, Reports on British trade to Barcelona by Consul James Miller in SPFS 94/193-194 and 94/196. Fish are valued at 22 shillings per quintal, the Bilbao price.

Robert Forrester, deputy consul at Barcelona, wrote to Lord Halifax in 1765 concerning fish arrivals there, which had slackened, he felt, because of Norwegian and Russian competition. Newfoundland fish, he wrote, were “in General too small and thereby not so much esteemed here for eating nor so fit for carriage from hence into the Inland places of this Province.” In contrast, fish from Quebec, Gaspé, and Bay of Chaleur “seems to take vastly at this Market due to its Largeness, Stoutness and Goodness of quality.” Such larger fish would “always obtain a much better price than Newfoundland small Codfish at the Spanish Markets.”<sup>39</sup> These reports identify the registries of 110 arrivals. If the registration and ownership were synonymous, ninety-one (11,040 tons) were owned in the British Isles and only nineteen (1,670 tons) in North America.<sup>40</sup> Of them, forty-one (5,190 tons) were owned in Channel ports, twenty-nine (3,440 tons) in the Channel Islands, and some sixteen (1,410 tons) in Massachusetts. Fish carriers came directly from America or after checking on markets in Iberian ports (Cadiz, six; Alicante, five).

These vessels cleared from Barcelona carrying wine, brandy, and hazelnuts, or a considerable number of them cleared empty. Fourteen of the New Englanders went in ballast to load salt. In fact, sixty fish carriers (5,890 tons) left Barcelona in ballast, fifty-six of them to Iberian salt sources, mainly Alicante and Valencia. Thirty-two sailed to English Channel ports, laden with 4,620 pipes of brandy, 500 pipes and 800 hogsheads of wine, plus other goods. More than half of these went off to Guernsey and Alderney in the Channel Islands, while fifteen others went to French and Dutch Channel ports. London (three) and Bristol (two) attracted few vessels, carrying cork, wine, and “nutts.” Only one cod vessel sailed for North America in ballast.

Lack of particulars on the cost of brandy, wine, cork, and nuts at Barcelona prevents estimation of the balance between imports and exports there. The many vessels clearing empty suggests a strong positive balance in favor of the English and American importers. Yet, shipments of brandy and wine could have reduced it considerably. James Miller, the Barcelona consul, was convinced that wine and brandy cargoes

<sup>39</sup> Forrester to Halifax, February 16, 1765, SPFS 94/169. This report was also signed by Greene, Ford, and Hall and by Irish Brothers and Company. Forrester was a partner in the firm of Miller and Forrester. James Miller was consul.

<sup>40</sup> SPFS 94/193-194; 94/196. These contain reports by Consul James Miller on British trade at Barcelona.

taken to the Channel were being smuggled.<sup>41</sup>

Barcelona annually imported North American fish estimated at £57,878. Newfoundland's yearly share would have been £38,681; Canadian fish brought £9,548; and that from New England only £5,172. Vessels arriving indirectly were mainly from Newfoundland. Ships owned in the British Isles were larger (116 tons) than those owned in America (94 tons). British Isles carriers brought eighty-five percent of the fish entering; those from America only 39,307 quintals, fifteen percent.

**TABLE 7-6**  
**Codfish Sales in Southern Europe, at Cost, 1768-1772**

Area	1768-1772			Annual Average	
	Quintals	Sale Value	% Total	Quintals	Sale Value
Newfoundland	2,746,474	£2,852,364	79.3	549,295	£570,473
Canada	140,620	146,041	4.1	28,124	29,208
New England	<u>575,787</u>	<u>597,986</u>	<u>16.6</u>	<u>115,157</u>	<u>119,597</u>
Total	3,462,881	3,596,391	100.0	692,576	719,278

Source: CO 16/1.

Almost eighty percent of the North American fish sold in southern Europe on the eve of the American Revolution came there from Newfoundland. One-sixth of it arrived aboard New England vessels. Annual fish sales, at a minimum, brought nearly three-quarters of a million pounds sterling into English and colonial hands. Additional earnings from insurance, sales, and handling charges raised the minimum to nearly £850,000 sterling. For well over a hundred years British decision makers strove to control and foster fisheries off North America, recognizing their importance as a source of treasure. Britain, by 1763, dominated that resource, having ousted Spanish and Portuguese competitors and sharply reduced that of France. The fisheries expanded the number of seamen in the British merchant marine; encouraged investment in mercantile adventures; and codfish shipped to Iberia and the Wine Islands assisted in the transfer of the treasure earned in Latin America into English and colonial pockets.<sup>42</sup> The colonial share of this bonanza materially aided in offsetting their negative balance with the mother country.

41 Miller to Rochford, March 31, 1773, SPFS 94/193; October 2, 1773, SPFS 94/194; October 7, 1774, SPFS 94/196. Codfish here is priced at 22s., the Bilbao price. In March 1773 the English government was concerned over widespread smuggling of foreign goods from Guernsey and Jersey in the Channel Islands into England. See *PG*, May 5, 1773.

42 The price of codfish here is 20.77s./qtl., which is the minimum required for sale at cost, including all expenses for freight, insurance, handling, losses, duties, and commissions in Iberia. See Table 15-2.

## CHAPTER VIII

### BRITAIN, AMERICA, AND THE IBERIAN GRAIN TRADE, 1600-1774

The seventeenth and eighteenth centuries witnessed the commercial integration of the Atlantic world. This relatively huge market community stretched from South and Central America to Scandinavia, Poland, and Russia, and from eastern North America to Italy and West Africa. Improvements in ocean transportation allowed suppliers within this broad area to compete for markets, which fluctuated depending on climatic changes, insect plagues, and the vagaries of international relations and national policies. Demand in one sector affected supplies elsewhere within the Atlantic world, as regional surpluses expanded to supply this interrelated market area. Southern Europe proved exceptionally dependent upon other regions for its basic necessities.

Surplus producers near the center of this market had faster communications with southern Europe and thus earlier awareness of demand there. They reacted rapidly to opportunities and profited from lower shipping and insurance costs.

Rapid population growth in western Europe, 1650-1800, seriously affected the size of the market surplus in grain, placing increasing demands on traditional sources. Europe's population grew by perhaps two-thirds partly because no major epidemics limited that expansion. Iberian population almost doubled. France and Italy increased by nearly seventy percent and England and Wales by perhaps eighty percent.<sup>1</sup> Southern European demand centered in Iberia and to a lesser degree in Italy and southern France. Iberia commonly faced production shortfalls. Peninsula grain sources had previously been located close to individual centers, which also drew on supplies from Sicily and North Africa, but production in the western Mediterranean declined and imports from the Barbary Coast faced constraints because of religious tensions and periodic quarantines. At times, French farmers provided wheat and flour for Catalonia and Italy, and grain from Nantes and Bordeaux found outlets in Vizcaya and Galicia.<sup>2</sup>

Iberian-bound grain cargoes from northern Europe were exchanged for salt and wine, normally leaving a tidy balance in the pockets of the grain sellers. Shippers on occasion even accepted small profits or took small losses to convert their produce into specie credits.<sup>3</sup> Major expenses from trading in bulk cargoes centered in first costs – in commissions and transportation charges. Ocean freights to southern Europe represented only a part of the equation. Early market information proved advantageous, but, when shortages drove prices to exceptionally high levels, peripheral producers could compete.

Dutch shippers, in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries brought grain from Baltic ports in Poland and Russia to Iberia, taking back solar salt in demand for the Dutch fisheries and generally in northern Europe. Efficiently designed Dutch vessels dominated the bulk carrying trades. However, these sources

---

1 Anderson, *Europe in Eighteenth Century*, 48-50. A. Lloyd Moote, *The Seventeenth Century: Europe in Ferment* (Lexington, Mass., 1970), 6. Herr, *Revolution in Spain*, 132.

2 Vicens Vives, *Historia social y economica*, III: 162-163; IV: 8-9; and *Manual*, 440-444. Albert Girard, *Le Commerce Français à Séville et Cadix au temps des Habsbourg* (Paris, 1932), 386-387. Hardy to Shelburne, December 31, 1767, SPFS 94/178, reported many vessels expected from the Morea with wheat. *PG*, August 11, 1737, included news from London that Islamic conservatives in North Africa threatened a "Scourge from Heaven," if grain sales to European Christians continued. Cf. *PG*, February 24, 1730, scarcity in Sicily and June 22, 1738, drought in Barbary. Cf. Dumouriez, *Portugal*, 202.

3 Discussion with Professor Fritz Redlick at Harvard Business School, July 15, 1965. Percy W. Bidwell and John I. Falconer, *The History of Agriculture in the Northern United States, 1620-1860* (Washington, D.C., 1925), 134.

often suffered serious disruptions.<sup>4</sup> During the late seventeenth century, the English, fervent converts to mercantilism, fought a series of wars with the Netherlands and replaced the Dutch as the major maritime power in the Atlantic world. English grain exports were then reserved to vessels of the nations directly involved, destroying the Dutch middleman role.<sup>5</sup>

English leaders also passed the Corn Laws during the 1660s and 1670s. Revived again in 1689, they remained in effect down to 1840. Fostering exports, the Corn Laws provided an export bounty of five shillings per “quarter” of wheat and also closed English markets to foreign grain producers. To guarantee supplies for local consumption the bounties could be suspended when wheat prices reached levels which caused suffering among English consumers. Bounties also encouraged export of other grains and later legislation extended them to flour as well. These measures stabilized English grain prices.<sup>6</sup>

With such encouragements, English grain exports dominated Iberian and western Mediterranean markets from the late seventeenth century onward. English shippers all but engrossed her trades with Spain and Portugal. Diplomatic and military actions strongly seconded them. Treaties with the Iberian states gave the English special advantages, protecting their merchants there in a variety of ways.<sup>7</sup> Between 1700 and the early 1750s, the average annual exports of wheat and flour from England to southern Europe increased by more than 620 percent.<sup>8</sup> See Table 8-1.

**TABLE 8-1**  
**English Grain Exports Averaged for Five-Year Periods, 1701-1800**

<b>Years</b>	<b>Exports(bu.)</b>	<b>Years</b>	<b>Exports(bu.)</b>	<b>Years</b>	<b>Exports(bu.)</b>
1701-1705	770,584	1736-1740	2,411,058	1771-1775	(1,285,325)
1706-1710	852,106	1741-1745	2,030,646	1776-1780	862,386
1711-1715	1,221,336	1746-1750	4,044,253	1781-1785	1,008,744
1716-1720	625,200	1751-1755	3,180,594	1786-1790	(23,754)
1721-1725	1,404,675	1756-1760	932,322	1791-1795	(1,603,050)
1726-1730	283,438	1761-1765	2,601,898	1796-1800	(5,224,051)
1731-1735	2,263,499	1766-1770	(895,714)		

Source: D. Barnes, *Corn Laws*, Appendix C, 299-300, citing *Customs Tariffs of the United Kingdom from 1800-1897* (c.-8706), 256-258. Parentheses indicate importations. Davis, *Rise of English Shipping*, 191,

4 C. R. Boxer, *The Dutch Seabourne Empire, 1600-1800* (London, 1966), 5-6, 85-86, 282-283. Jared Eliot, *Essays upon Field Husbandry in New England and Other Papers, 1748-1762*, ed. Harry J. Carman (New York, 1934), 81. A. H. John, “Agricultural Productivity and Economic Growth in England, 1700-1760,” *JEH* XXV (1965): 25. Penfield E. Roberts, *The Quest for Security, 1715-1740* (New York, 1947), 25. *PG*, September 12, 1734; February 23, 1737, for Polish grain shortage. Moote, *Europe in Ferment*, 6.

5 Davis, *Rise of English Shipping*, 48-51. Harper, *Navigation Laws*, 288-292. Ogg, *Reign of Charles II*, I: 37-42.

6 D. Barnes, *Corn Laws*, 10-11. Thomas S. Ashton, *Economic Fluctuations in England, 1700-1800* (Oxford, 1959), 58-61. M. W. Flinn, “Agricultural Productivity and Economic Growth in England, 1700-1760: A Comment.” *JEH* XXVI (1966): 93-98. Ogg, *Reign of Charles II*, I: 37-42, 46-50, 65-67. Harper, *Navigation Laws*, 277-278, 405, 411. A quarter of grain equaled eight bushels (560 lbs.).

7 McLachlan, *Trade and Peace*, 20-21, 52-57, 139. Shillington and Chapman, *Commercial Relations*, 192, 199-204, 223. Fisher, “Anglo-Portuguese Trade,” *EHR*, 219-233.

8 D. Barnes, *Corn Laws*, 12-15, 30-32. Annual exports rose from 21,662 to 134,400 tons.

questions this data.

Following the War of the Spanish Succession, 1702-1713, English grain prices fell. Then, in the 1730s, with small grain harvests in southern Europe prices surged. Between mid-1732 and mid-1733, a London source reported exports of 800,000 quarters of wheat to Portugal, Spain, Italy, and western France “for which they paid (including the Freight made by our Ships which carried it) one million pounds Sterling, to the great Advantage of this Kingdom in general, and of the Landed Interest in particular.”<sup>9</sup> A year later high demand continued after poor harvests in Italy, while England enjoyed fine weather and bountiful crops.<sup>10</sup> In one day “108,000 quarters of wheat,” plus rye, barley, and beans left the port of London “chiefly to Spain.”<sup>11</sup> In 1737 a fine crop in England answered heavy Portuguese demand caused by “incessant Rains and bad Weather.” A “great Drought all over Spain” created “the greatest Scarcity of Bread Corn that ever was known since the Memory of Man.” Desperate Spanish peasants subsisted “chiefly on Herbs.”<sup>12</sup> Exports pushed English wheat prices ever higher. Rioters there looted wagons carrying grain bound for Iberia. A Londoner commented that the “Farmers and Cornfactors of Great Britain [were] grinding the Face of the Poor to fatten and plump up that of the Farmer.”<sup>13</sup> Iberian demand peaked 1739-1741. The War of Jenkins’ Ear, 1739-1748, cut off trade with Spain, though that to Portugal continued and some English wheat reached Spain through Lisbon.

In 1740-1741 English grain shortages pushed prices there to unprecedented levels. Calls for relief lead to major riots in Newcastle, as corn factors refused to sell at prices set by local authorities. Granaries were plundered and public buildings destroyed. Troops restored order. Southern European demand fueled this crisis.<sup>14</sup> Between 1742 and 1748 English “corn” prices remained low but once peace returned scarcities in Iberia and western France brought new calls for English supplies. In the early 1750s English wheat exports peaked. One fine harvest succeeded another, yet corn prices rose sharply, pushed by exports. In 1752 a great drought “entirely destroyed” the Spanish harvest and Portugal also suffered in dire straits.<sup>15</sup>

The Seven Years War began in 1756 and trade declined, but Spain and England warred for only thirteen months, 1762-1763. Thus, the Spanish trade remained viable for most of this conflict, though often a chancy business. By spring 1757 “almost every Vessel bound up the Streights [fell] into the Hands of the French.”<sup>16</sup> Shortages drove up English prices in 1757 and North American wheat partially answered that demand. Surpluses reappeared by 1759 but at lower levels because of increasing home consumption, which kept

---

9 *BNL*, October 4, 1733, cited a London report dated July 19, 1733. Much the same figures appear in the December 6, 1733 issue.

10 *PG*, May 16, 1734; May 23, 1734; August 8, 1734; September 19, 1734. *NEWJ*, November 4, 1735, reported from London, August 19, “The Monopolizers of Corn have met with the greatest Disappointment.” Prices fell by one-third. Pares, *War and Trade*, 61-62.

11 *PG*, February 18, 1735, citing a London correspondent, November 5, 1734.

12 *NEWJ*, January 11, 1737; June 7, 1737. *PG*, February 17, 1737; March 31, 1737; July 28, 1737.

13 *PG*, July 28, 1737; August 11, 1737; August 25, 1737; April 20, 1738; July 27, 1738.

14 Pares, *War and Trade*, 124. D. Barnes, *Corn Laws*, 298-299. Flinn, “Agricultural Productivity,” Table 2, 96. *PG*, September 30, 1740; October 2, 1740; September 17, 1741. Jensen, *Maritime Commerce*, 91.

15 See Table 8-1. Valentin de Foronda, *Cartas Sobre Los Asuntos Mas Exquisitos de la Economia*, 2 vols. (Madrid, 1789-1794), II: 87. *PG*, July 5, 1750, drought hit Spain as early as February 1750. *BNL*, February 20, 1752. *PG*, March 3, 1752; August 9, 1753; September 6, 1753; October 25, 1753; December 13, 1753. John, “Agricultural Productivity,” 32-33.

16 *BNL*, February 3, 1757; February 10, 1757; April 14, 1757.

prices in a higher range.<sup>17</sup>

A severe English crop failure occurred in 1766 and, from that time on, home demand usually exceeded supply. Poor wheat harvests in Europe in 1767, 1769, and 1771 caused major supply dislocations, compounded by the fact that England's surplus was no longer available. From 1765-1775 grain imports to England exceeded exports in six of these eleven years. Three times as much grain entered English ports as cleared from them.<sup>18</sup>

English grain exports to Iberia, 1720-1765, employed an enormous amount of shipping and significantly increased English bullion reserves. In 1750, year of greatest exports to Iberia, shipments reached 950,203 quarters of wheat worth £1,330,284. Freight charges would have brought English carriers £237,551 in addition. Donald G. Barnes refers to the years 1689-1765 "as the golden age for the English wheat grower," adding that "the most valuable part of the corn trade under the bounty act was the exportation of wheat to Spain, Portugal and the Straits."<sup>19</sup>

\* \* \*

The Iberian states produced grain marginally on soil of limited arability. Farming methods remained backward and wheat yields low.<sup>20</sup> Spain and Portugal thus depended heavily on importation of wheat, flour, and Indian corn to supplement local production. Before 1650 Spanish regional production usually provided surpluses, notably from Castile and Aragon, but periodic droughts made foreign supplies critical. Primitive transport networks limited internal movement of bulk produce. River systems were not easily navigable and mountain ranges complicated land transport. During some periods in the eighteenth century wheat exports from one province to another were forbidden except for the King's use. While local populations had remained low, regional surpluses could answer most needs. Then, Iberian populations expanded significantly, absorbing excess food crops. Castillian and Andalusian surpluses became irregular. Coastal areas relied on foreign imports from Sicily, Italy, Barbary, and France. As the European market economy became integrated, the Iberians consumed grain from Poland and other Baltic states and, from the late 1600s on, for almost a hundred years, from England. Over the eighteenth century Spain's population more than doubled, rising from five to more than ten million, and that of Portugal grew by perhaps fifty percent to three million.<sup>21</sup>

---

17 *BNL*, April 28, 1757. Demand was so great that vessels were diverted from the Spanish market to Bristol. *BNL*, May 19, 1757.

18 Rains and flooding reduced the harvest and threatened to halt grain exports from England in 1764; see *PG*, May 3 1764; June 28, 1764. Gilbert C. Fite and James E. Reese, *An Economic History of the United States* (Cambridge, Mass., 1959), 64. Jensen, *Maritime Commerce*, 91. Mary Alice Hanna, *The Trade of the Delaware District before the Revolution* (Northampton, Mass., 1917), 320. *EG*, August 30, 1768, reported riots in London to halt exportations. Dickerson, *Navigation Acts and Revolution*, 15. *PG*, October 24, 1773. For twenty of the years between 1765 and 1800 England imported more grain than it exported.

19 In 1750 English wheat prices reached 42 pence per bushel. The bounty for export was at 5 shillings per quarter. Freight costs to Iberia are estimated at 7.5 pence per bushel. D. Barnes, *Corn Laws*, 11, 26n.

20 Spain in the twentieth century had ten million acres in wheat, which yielded only a third as much as France raised on the same acreage. *The World Book Encyclopedia*, 18 vols. (Chicago, 1957), XV: 7613-7614. Clarke, *Letters Concerning Spanish Nation*, 284, described primitive threshing methods, which this author observed in use in the summer of 1967. The government in the 1700s insisted that local grain be sold at low prices, while imports were not so limited. Hamilton, *War and Prices*, 187-194. Herr, *Revolution in Spain*, 132.

21 Vicens Vives, *Manual*, 376-377, 440-442; *Historia social y economica*, III: 8-15; IV: 8-9. Herr,



What was the annual consumption of grain and flour per capita in Iberia in the eighteenth century and what proportion of it came from foreign sources? One estimate places consumption at 11.2 bushels of wheat per person in the early 1800s, an excessively high figure, making Iberian consumption more than 151 million bushels. Another source suggests that Spain produced only 1.04 bushels of wheat per capita during the 1750s, a very low level. David Klingaman has argued that Americans consumed between 4.3 and 4.9 bushels of wheat each in the late eighteenth century.<sup>22</sup> Given depressed conditions in Iberia that level of consumption would have been high. An educated guess puts wheat consumption there at about three bushels per capita, meaning that the peninsula required about twenty-one million bushels in 1700 and more than forty million in 1797.

How much grain was needed to cover shortfalls in Iberia? Jaime Vicens Vives indicates that between 1756 and 1773 Spain imported 18.72 million bushels of wheat, more than a million bushels annually.<sup>23</sup> Except for Madrid with 150,000, the large Spanish cities lay on her eastern and southern coasts. Barcelona, Valencia, and Cadiz all contained 100,000 people or more; Seville and Grenada about 80,000 each; Cartagena 60,000; and Malaga 50,000.<sup>24</sup> Examining Spain by province provides a view of importations. Vizcaya by the 1770s, along with Galicia and Asturia, took perhaps 140,000 bushels of wheat imports per year.<sup>25</sup> Cadiz, the major entrepôt for Andalusia, also served fleets outbound to the Americas. During an extended drought in 1749-1750 a huge demand there drew 250 grain carriers, leading to a glut and depressed prices. On the other hand, a fine harvest in that province could see Cadiz ship wheat to Spanish America.<sup>26</sup> Joseph Townshend reported in 1787, an exceptionally poor crop year, that Cadiz imported 2.26 million bushels. Normally the city probably took fifty grain cargoes, about 400,000 bushels.<sup>27</sup> Inside the

---

*Revolution in Spain*, 29, 86.

22 Herr, *Revolution in Spain*, 132. Canga Arguelles, *Diccionario*, III: 296, estimates annual consumption at 7 fanegas (about 11 bushels). Another reference (V: 217) sets consumption (1797) at 50.6 million bushels. If population was at 13.5 million that meant 3.75 bushels per capita. Cf. Vicens Vives, *Historia social y economica*, IV: 161-163. In 1797 Spain produced about 50 million bushels. Foronda, *Cartas Sobre*, II: 98. David Klingaman, "Food Surpluses and Deficits in the American Colonies, 1768-1772," *JEH XXXI* (1971): 559, uses 4.9 bushels per capita and cites Marvin W. Towne and Wayne D. Rasmussen, *Trends in the American Economy in the Nineteenth Century* (Princeton, N.J., 1960), 294, which accepts 4.3 bushels.

23 Vicens Vives, *Historia social y economica*, IV: 8-9, 14, 161n. One fanega is 1.56 bushels; *Manual*, 442-444, 461. Clarke, *Letters Concerning Spanish Nation*, 284.

24 Vicens Vives, *Historia social y economica*, III: chapter I. His data are for the early seventeenth century; population later shifted toward coastal sections.

25 "Averia Accounts," 1770-1775, list twenty-four grain carriers from North America arriving. Grain paid no tax so values cannot be estimated. Other nations doubtless also sent grain. James Banks, consul for Galicia/Asturia, reported English vessels there, 1768-1772. See Banks to Board of Trade, January 27, 1768, Original Correspondence of the Board of Trade, CO 388/55; Banks to Rochford, July 25, 1772, SPFS 94/190; Banks to Weymouth, September 20, 1769, December 27, 1769; August 31, 1770, SPFS 94/182. No data have been found for Santander or St. Sebastian. One barrel of flour equals 4.5 bushels of wheat.

26 One source indicates that such exports totaled 780,000 bushels in 1755, an exaggerated figure. *BNL*, August 23, 1750. Carrera Pujal, *Economia Española*, IV: 38. Delves and Duff to Dalrymple, August 13, 1772, SPFS 94/191, data on Cadiz reports, 1771-1773.

27 Townshend, *Journey through Spain*, II: 421-422. Consul's reports from Cadiz cover the full year 1771 and six months of 1773. The Falklands crisis of 1771 limited shipments but 1773 saw heavy demand, and it is presumed that the two years together reflect an annual average. Beawes to Richmond, July 8, 1766 SPFS 94/174, noted that Moroccans opposed exports to there. San Lucar and Seville were satellites of Cadiz. Christelow, "Trades from Cadiz and Lisbon," 17, notes that Lisbon was "the more treasured and profit-

Straits of Gibraltar, Valencia and Murcia grew their own foodstuffs.<sup>28</sup> Barcelona's English consul, 1770-1774, reported more than 130 vessels bringing North American produce there. Other supplies came from the western Mediterranean and elsewhere. Total yearly wheat imports probably came to 300,000 bushels.<sup>29</sup>

The Balearic Islands in the western Mediterranean seem to have answered their own needs. The Canaries in severe drought took up to 85,000 bushels, but in normal years imported about 25,000 bushels from America in mixed cargoes.<sup>30</sup>

Spain and Portugal suffered shortages through the eighteenth century. Hunger stalked them in 1709, 1723, 1728-1729, 1734, 1739-1741, 1749-1750, 1752, 1763-1764, 1773, and 1784-1793. Riots over high grain prices occurred. During winter 1765 Madrid faced three days of mob action.<sup>31</sup> The annual Spanish shortfall in this century apparently ranged from about 1,100,000 bushels to a maximum of twice that amount. English wheat and flour, or that from North America, answered perhaps a third of Spain's overseas imports.

\* \* \*

Portugal in this century enjoyed cordial commercial relations with Britain, as a satellite in her sphere of influence, because of her need for English wheat, flour, and other foodstuffs. Portuguese export and import statistics are lacking. An earthquake in 1755 destroyed much of Lisbon and a major fire gutted the city's customs house in the 1760s. Some data remain from English records.<sup>32</sup>

---

able traffic.”

28 Townshend, *Journey through Spain*, III: 11-32, 122-135. Bannester to Halifax, SPFS 94/167, notes that only thirty-six English vessels reached Valencia from February 1763 to June 2, 1764. Marsh to Rochford, February 11, 1774, SPFS 94/195, does not indicate grain or flour traded there. Townshend makes no reference to the volume of grain entries at Alicante and Valencia, III: 169, 179, 265-270.

29 Miller to Rochford, October 1, 1769; April 3, 1773; September 30, 1773; September 30, 1774; October 7, 1774, SPFS 94/193-194, 196. In 1773-1774 some forty-three vessels arrived there with grain and flour from other than American ports, though several appear to have been Americans arriving indirectly. Townshend, *Journey through Spain*, I: 118.

30 Collins to Bradshaw, June 29, 1769, SPFS 1/474. Some supplies reached there via Barcelona. See Miller to Halifax, May 1, 1764, SPFS 94/167. Morales Padron, *Comercio Canario-Americano*, 201.

31 Vicens Vives, *Manual*, 463. Carrera Pujal, *Economía Española*, III: 369. Herr, *Revolution in Spain*, 20-21. *New York Mercury*, September 17, 1753. *PG*, September 13, 1753. Anderson, *Europe in Eighteenth Century*, 56. Rochford to Conway, March 24, 1766, SPFS 94/173.

32 CO 16/1. Average exports of wheat and flour to southern Europe reached 1,340,216 bushels per year.

**TABLE 8-2**  
**English Wheat Exports to Portugal**  
**in Five-Year Averages, 1700-1770**

Years	Exports(bu.)	Value(£)	Price/bu.	% Eng. Exp.	Total Exp.
1700-1705	328,000	56,000	40.9d.	47.2	698,151
1706-1710	472,000	80,000	40.6	55.7	852,106
1711-1715	---	---	---	---	1,221,336
1716-1720	56,000	9,000	39.6	9.2	625,200
1721-1725	312,000	53,000	40.7	22.4	1,404,675
1726-1730	---	---	---	---	283,438
1731-1735	736,000	124,000	40.4	32.6	2,263,499
1736-1740	672,000	114,000	40.7	28.1	2,410,852
1741-1745	352,000	59,000	40.2	17.4	2,030,646
1746-1750	544,000	92,000	40.5	13.5	4,044,253
1751-1755	520,000	88,000	40.6	16.4	3,180,594
1756-1760	424,000	71,000	40.1	45.5	932,322
1761-1765	720,000	121,000	40.3	28.2	2,601,898
1766-1770	40,000	7,000	40.2	---	(895,714)

Sources: Fisher, “Anglo-Portuguese Trade” (PhD diss.), 43. D. Barnes, *Corn Laws*, Appendix C, 299-300. Parenthesis indicates importations.

The Marquês de Pombal, Portugal’s famous mercantilist prime minister, estimated his country’s wheat imports at 1.2 million bushels per year.<sup>33</sup> If so, the consumption rate was quite low. English diplomats in the 1760s believed Portuguese wheat could feed only one-third to one-half of its population, about three million people.<sup>34</sup> At a rate of three bushels per capita, Portuguese production lagged by between two and six million bushels, a very high shortfall, making Pombal’s estimate questionable.<sup>35</sup> English customs data found in H.E.S. Fisher’s study provides insight on Anglo-Portuguese trade. English grain exports to Portugal before

33 For Lisbon imports, see Fisher, “Anglo-Portuguese Trade” (PhD diss.). Ibbetson to Board of Trade, August 3, 1765, CO 388/95. Oeyrus to Lyttleton, July 21, 1768, SPFP 89/65. Portugal imported 150,000 quarters (1,200,000 bushels) annually, worth £300,000 sterling; Hort to Shelburne, October 8, 1768, SPFP 89/66; Portugal produced one-third of its grain needs. Hort to Walpole, May 6, 1774, “An Account of all Goods, etc. Imported into or Exported from Portugal in 1772,” SPFP 89/77. *PG*, July 20, 1738, in 1736 Lisbon entered 669 vessels with grain and flour, mostly English. Hort’s “Report on Lisbon Trade, 1772-1773,” SPFP 89/77. Average entrances 228,247 bushels of wheat; 1,085,505 bushels of Indian corn; 66,298.5 barrels of flour. None came from England or Ireland. For small Portuguese ports, see SPFP 89/77; few specifics except for fish.

34 Pombal to Lyttleton, July 21, 1768, SPFP 89/65, says imports of 150,000 quarters went yearly. Cf. Carnota, *Memoirs of Pombal*, II.

35 Hort to Lyttleton, October 8, 1768, SPFP 89/65, estimated that Portugal grew one-third of its wheat. Ibbetson to Board of Trade, August 3, 1765, CO 388/95, noted that Portugal produced enough for six months consumption. The remainder came from England, the American colonies, the Mediterranean, and, when grain was cheap there, France. In that year one hundred grain carriers arrived at Lisbon.

1766 were probably twice those dispatched from other sources.<sup>36</sup> Portuguese demand centered at Lisbon, which took large shipments and also served interior markets up the Tagus River as far as the Extremadura region of Spain. The city also sent provisions overseas, notably to Brazil. Oporto, on the Douro River, and several other small centers also attracted English imports. Portugal's Cape Verde, Madeira, and Azores Islands took mixed American cargoes in exchange for salt or wine.<sup>37</sup> Major import centers then taking English and British wheat, flour, and corn were Lisbon (200,000), Oporto (110,000), and the Madeiras (130,000). Annual English and American shipments to Lisbon, 1760-1775, ran at about 67,000 barrels of flour, 230,000 bushels of wheat, and 104,000 bushels of corn. The Madeiras took 12,000 barrels of flour, 100,000 bushels of wheat, and 50,000 bushels of corn. Oporto took in only a few hundred barrels of flour and 13,000 odd bushels of wheat. Other small ports received one or two cargoes annually. In total, Portuguese imports probably averaged close to a million bushels of wheat per year, or its equivalent.<sup>38</sup>

At three bushels of wheat per capita, Iberian needs would have approximately doubled from 1700 to 1800, and the shortfall would have doubled. However, mercantilist reforms in Spain and Portugal apparently raised productivity, maintaining an output of about ninety percent of the grain required.<sup>39</sup>

To 1766 England remained the dominant grain supplier for southern Europeans because of her ready surplus; mercantilist program of bounties and controls encouraging grain exports; her diplomatic and military support for her merchants overseas; and the all but constant shortfalls of Iberia. By the late 1760s, England's inability to produce a surplus opened the way for American exporters.<sup>40</sup>

\* \* \*

Did North American grain and flour compete successfully in Iberia against English and other cereal sources? Governor William Cosby of New York wrote to the Board of Trade in 1734:

...whenever a market in Spain, Portugal or other parts of Europe, have encouraged the sending it thither in grain, the Adventurers have often suffered by the undertaking. For at this remote distance, the intelligence of a demand reaches us so late, that the markets are supplied before our vessels come there, and even if it were otherwise our merchants lye under vast and certain disadvantages besides for the freight of wheat from hence in time of war was at least two shillings and six pence, and in time of peace is eighteen pence sterling pr. bushel, and by the length of the passage it often grows musty.<sup>41</sup>

Historian Richard Pares doubted American ability to compete there. He believed that, though the English

---

36 If Portugal's population was 2.4 million by 1770, with consumption at 3 bushels per capita, the nation needed 7.2 million bushels in a normal year, and local production would have been about 6 million bushels.

37 Thomas Cheap's "Report on the Trade of Madeira," July 1, 1765, SPFP 89/77. Madeira raised one-fourth of its needs, so consumption was at about 1.66 bushels per capita. The Azores occasionally exported surplus grain, English traders sold goods there, and took wheat on to Madeira. Cary, *Essay on Trade*, 118.

38 SPFP 89/77.

39 Dumouriez, *Portugal*, 202-205. Carnota, *Memoirs of Pombal*, I: 87; II: 33-40. Bourgoing, *Travels of Duke de Châtelet*, I: 284. Vicens Vives, *Historia social y economica*, IV: 161; *Manual*, 462, 517. Foronda, *Cartas Sobre*, II: 72, 90.

40 See Table 8-1. Vicens Vives, *Manual*, 516-517.

41 *CSPC*, XLI (1734-1735): 322-323.

farmer had conceded the West Indian grain market to Americans by the 1690s, Atlantic Ocean transport costs prevented their competition in Europe. If American grain had competed there, he argued, England's agricultural interest would have demanded protection against it. Agricultural historians Percy W. Bidwell and John I. Falconer saw North American grain exports to southern Europe as a losing venture. Arthur L. Jensen's study of Philadelphia's commerce endorses that view.<sup>42</sup>

When English "corn" prices are compared to those for American "wheat," 1720-1774, one finds American prices consistently lower. See Table 8-3. Minus the export bounty of the Corn Laws, American grain did compete. It was at least competitive levels during the years 1743-1744, 1749-1750, 1754, and 1760-1763.

TABLE 8-3  
Comparative English and American Wheat Prices, 1720-1774

Year	Phila. stlg./bu.	English stlg./bu.	English (Minus Corn Bty.)/stlg.	Diff.	Year	Phila. stlg.	English stlg.	English (Minus Corn Bty.)/stlg.	Diff.
1720	2.31sh.	4.09sh.	3.46sh.	1.15	1748	2.89	4.10	3.47	0.58
1721	2.29	4.16	3.53	1.24	1749	3.28	4.10	3.47	0.19
1722	2.23	4.00	3.37	1.14	1750	2.63	3.60	2.97	0.34
1723	1.79	3.85	3.22	1.43	1751	2.50	4.28	3.65	1.15
1724	2.52	4.10	3.47	0.95	1752	2.62	5.09	4.46	1.84
1725	---	5.39	4.76	---	1753	2.66	4.95	4.32	1.66
1726	---	5.10	4.47	---	1754	2.65	3.85	3.22	0.57
1727	2.18	4.66	4.03	1.85	1755	3.65	3.74	3.11	(0.54)
1728	2.26	6.03	5.40	3.14	1756	2.51	5.03	4.40	1.89
1729	2.46	5.28	4.65	2.19	1757	2.28	6.66	6.03	3.75
1730	2.42	4.05	3.42	1.00	1758	2.44	5.55	4.92	2.48
1731	1.61	3.66	3.03	1.42	1759	3.20	4.40	3.77	0.57
1732	1.67	2.95	2.32	0.65	1760	3.18	4.05	3.42	0.24
1733	1.85	3.14	2.51	0.66	1761	2.88	3.35	2.72	(0.16)
1734	---	4.18	3.55	---	1762	3.21	4.33	3.70	0.49
1735	2.36	4.78	4.15	1.79	1763	3.50	4.51	3.88	0.38
1736	1.96	4.48	3.85	1.89	1764	2.66	5.19	4.56	1.90
1737	2.31	4.19	3.56	1.25	1765	2.73	6.00	5.37	2.64
1738	2.07	3.94	3.31	1.24	1766	3.46	5.39	No Bty.	1.93
1739	1.65	4.14	3.51	1.86	1767	3.76	7.16	No Bty.	3.40
1740	1.98	6.10	5.47	3.49	1768	3.79	6.90	No Bty.	3.11
1741	3.07	5.20	4.57	1.50	1769	3.46	5.03	No Bty.	1.62
1742	2.24	3.55	2.92	0.68	1770	3.84	5.44	No Bty.	1.60
1743	1.77	2.76	2.13	0.36	1771	4.09	5.39	No Bty.	1.30
1744	1.48	2.75	2.12	0.64	1772	4.80	5.80	No Bty.	1.00
1745	1.47	3.03	2.40	0.93	1773	4.47	5.83	No Bty.	1.36
1746	1.60	4.33	3.70	2.10	1774	4.08	6.01	No Bty.	1.93
1747	1.78	3.86	3.23	1.45					

Sources: Philadelphia prices from Anne Bezanon *Prices*, 431-432, converted to sterling. English prices from D. G. Barnes, *Corn Laws*, 297-298 Appendix B. Prices are for Winchester quarters converted to bushels. Corn Law export bounty is figured at .63sh./bu.

42 Richard Pares, "The Economic Factor in the History of the Empire," I: 419-422, in Carus-Wilson, *Essays in Economic History*. McLachlan, *Trade and Peace*, 4. V. Barnes, *Dominion of New England*, 140-141. Barnes sees the English pushed from West Indies provision markets by 1675. Bidwell and Falconer, *Agriculture in Northern United States*, 134. Jensen, *Maritime Commerce*, 63.

Sources: Philadelphia prices from Bezanson, Gray, Hussey, *Prices in Colonial Pennsylvania*, 431-432, converted to sterling. English prices from D. Barnes, *Corn Laws*, 297-298 Appendix B. Prices are for Winchester quarters converted to bushels. Corn Law export bounty is figured at .63s. per bushel.

When population growth ended English surpluses, Iberian wheat and flour prices rose significantly, making this trade more profitable for American shippers. During the midcentury wars embargoes at times blocked American exports, and English military forces in America offered an alternative market for colonial surpluses. English harvests in 1749 and 1750 proved so bounteous as to limit American shipment to Iberia. Though temporary aberrations saw exceptions to this general rule, American cereals did challenge effectively. See Table 8-4.

**TABLE 8-4**  
**Comparative Prices of English and American Wheat**  
**Shipped to Lisbon, by Decade, 1720-1774, Estimated**

Year	Philadelphia					England				
	1st Cost sh/stlg	Frts. 14d./bu.	Com. + Hand. 7%	Ins. 2.5%	Price Lisbon	1st Cost sh/stlg	Frts. 7-1/2d.	Com. + Hand. 7%	Ins. 1%	Price Lisbon
1720s	2.26	1.17s.	.24	.07	3.74	4.04	.63	.33	.04	5.04
1730s	1.99	1.17	.22	.06	3.44	3.32	.63	.28	.03	4.26
1740s	2.16	1.17	.23	.07	3.63	3.35	.63	.28	.03	4.29
1750s	2.61	1.17	.26	.08	4.12	4.09	.63	.33	.04	5.09
1760-64	3.07	1.17	.30	.09	4.63	3.66	.63	.30	.04	4.63
1765-69	3.44	1.17	.32	.08	5.03	5.94	.63	.46	.06	7.09
1770-74	4.26	1.17	.38	.13	5.94	5.69	.63	.44	.06	6.82

Sources: Philadelphia prices are from Bezanson, Gray, and Hussey, *Prices in Colonial Pennsylvania*, 432, Table VIII; English prices from D. Barnes, *Corn Laws*, 297-299. They are reduced by .63 for the Corn Law bounty. Prices have been averaged by decade to 1759 and by five-year periods after that. Freight costs come from contemporary mercantile correspondence. Commissions on Lisbon sales ran generally at five percent. Handling costs were two percent. Insurance varied but is set at peacetime levels since few vessels sailed during wartime.

The long voyage to Iberia did not confine Americans to West Indian markets, nor did English mercantilist policies.<sup>43</sup> True, English exporters had information very quickly from the peninsula, in perhaps ten days, and reacted in another week or two. Proximity to market guaranteed advantages in timing but they were often considerably mitigated by Iberian grain shortfalls, which were very large and almost constant and could not be filled within a month's time. The *franquia* privilege at Lisbon also relieved the pressure of heavy port charges coincident with market shopping from port to port. At Lisbon, news of the current needs at other ports in the area was available to both British and American shippers. American wheat and flour found outlets in Iberia throughout the eighteenth century, and especially after 1766.

43 Pares, "Economic Factor," 419-422. For voyage length from England, see *CPR*, November 17, 1759, January 1, 1763, January 15, 1763, January 23, 1763, and March 19, 1763.

From the periphery of the Atlantic world, North Americans early on found outlets in Iberia and the Wine Islands. New Englanders produced a grain surplus as early as 1636 and reached out to supply the Portuguese and Spanish islands in the 1640s, bringing home cargoes of wine and salt.<sup>44</sup> In the next decade Edward Johnson's *Wonder Working Providence* noted that "Portugal hath had many a mouthful of bread and fish from us in exchange of their Madeara liquor, and also Spain."<sup>45</sup> Other colonies too answered the need for island wines by exporting to the Atlantic islands. Instructions to American colonial governors in 1663 referred to trade from "... Virginia, Mariland and other of His Majesties Plantations...unto Spain."<sup>46</sup> In 1684 New York gave local shippers an advantage by imposing lower duties on wine they imported. Jacob Leisler engaged in that business. The letters of William Bolton, an English merchant in Madeira, make numerous references to trade from North America, 1695-1714. He sold Madeira, Vidonia, Malmsey, Verdelho, and Tinto wines to New York-, New England-, Pennsylvania-, and Virginia-bound vessels.<sup>47</sup>

The English government did not limit grain exports. Enumeration of wheat, flour, and bread, requiring its exportation indirectly through England, would have ended direct competition from America. In fact, trade from the colonies received an important impetus during the War of the Spanish Succession, when the English government temporarily halted grain exports, expanding America's Iberian market opportunities.<sup>48</sup> The English commercial system allowed colonial producers to share in the Iberian trade. Its permissiveness is evident in the passage of special exceptions for the direct importation of salt and Portuguese island wines into America. These, first granted to Newfoundland- and New England-bound vessels, gave them the right to import salt for the fisheries. In the eighteenth century, Pennsylvania, New York, and Quebec successfully petitioned for the same salt privilege, under the cloak of developing their own fisheries. Robert Walpole believed in balancing the varied interests within the empire. He and other English officials recognized the need for a return cargo after grain deliveries in southern Europe. More important, grain exports provided credits for transferal to England, something deserving encouragement.<sup>49</sup> By 1700 the middle colonies had become the major grain producing area in British North America and trade to the Wine Islands was at least partly in local hands.

Three decades later Iberian demand was attracting supplies from Maryland and Virginia, as well as

---

44 Darret B. Rutman, "Governor Winthrop's Garden Crop: The Significance of Agriculture in the Early Commerce of Massachusetts Bay." *WMQ* XX (1963): 396, 402, 405. Marion H. Gottfried, "The First Depression in Massachusetts." *NEQ* IX (1936): 672. *Boston Records*, 395, reports on September 14, 1645 on *Edmond and John* of London taking 3,000 bushels of corn, wheat, and "pease" to Bilbao. *Winthrop's Journal*, II: 154, 245, 341.

45 John Franklin Jameson, ed., *Johnson's Wonder Working Providence, 1628-1651* (New York, 1910), 247. Black stem rust ended the exportability of New England's wheat.

46 Beer, *Colonial System*, I: 265.

47 Lyman Carrier, *The Beginnings of Agriculture in America* (New York, 1923), 185. Rutman, "Winthrop's Garden Crop," 44. Giesecke, *American Commercial Legislation*, 22. Virginia D. Harrington, *The New York Merchants on the Eve of the Revolution* (New York, 1935), 276. *Bolton Letters*, I: 8, 16-17. He noted so much grain sent from America that "Wheate cannot be shipped from England." I: 156. Lawrence H. Leder, *Robert Livingston and the Politics of Colonial New York* (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1961), 17.

48 Tolles, *Meeting House*, 87.

49 Harper, *Navigation Laws*, 401. Pennsylvania's permission was granted June 24, 1727; New York's June 1, 1730. Andrews, *Colonial Period*, IV: 109. Lounsbury, *British Fishery*, 96, on the role of George Downing. *CSPC*, XLI (1734-1735): 255, 269, on Maryland's request to import salt. Wolff, *Colonial Agency of Pennsylvania*, 31.

from New York and Pennsylvania. New York's trade with southern Europe was limited by the size of its hinterland, but exportable surpluses were gathered from up the Hudson and from Long Island, and considerable amounts of grain and flour came to the city from Lewes and Newcastle on the Delaware.<sup>50</sup> Northern New Jersey exports centered at Perth Amboy and New York vessels commonly loaded there. Philadelphia drew upon the whole Delaware basin and even overland from the Chesapeake.

The grain trade to the south of Europe divided naturally into two sectors: that to the Wine Islands exchanged provisions, wheat, flour, lumber, staves, beeswax, and other goods for the wines of Madeira, the Canaries, and the Azores. Colonial thirst for wine was its motivator. Trade to the mainland ports and into the Mediterranean exchanged grains, flour, and wood products for salt, specie, and transferable credits. Its goal was to build credits for transfer to the metropolis to help cover the adverse balance of payments. Mid-Atlantic trade with the Iberians was limited at first by English competition and also by limitations on cargoes returning. When the right to import salt was extended to Pennsylvania (1727) and New York (1730), trade expanded. Droughts in Iberia and population growth created strong demand. The new salt imports lowered middle colony prices for it by the early 1730s. The strong demand in southern Europe drew about twenty-five percent of the tonnage clearing Philadelphia by late in the 1730s. It was profitable enough to warrant shippers "dead heading" their vessels back to America. When southern Europe demand peaked, up to one-fifth of the grain carriers came home in ballast.<sup>51</sup>

Statistics for the southern European trade of the middle colonies, both branches, have been developed from a variety of hard and soft data sources. See Tables 8-5 and 8-6.

**TABLE 8-5**  
**New York and Pennsylvania Trade with Southern Europe, 1720-1774**

Year	Entrances				Clearances				Year	Entrances				Clearances			
	New York		Penna.		New York		Penna.			New York		Penna.		New York		Penna.	
	Ves.	Tons	Ves.	Tons	Ves.	Tons	Ves.	Tons		Ves.	Tons	Ves.	Tons	Ves.	Tons	Ves.	Tons
1720	6	320	3	190	8	360	7	350	1748	19	1057b	10	760	14	690b	17	930
1721	4	188	3	230	4	183	11	530	1749	-	-	21	1,410	-	-	23	1,430
1722	4	193	6	420	7	353	9	490	1750	-	-	37	2,510	-	-	37	2,550
1723	6	370	0	0	3	195	9	490	1751	-	-	30	2,080	-	-	29	2,030
1724	5	250	4	260	10	483	11	730	1752	-	-	42	3,020	-	-	35	2,450
1725	5	325	2	120	10	750	11	810	1753	6	210c	42	3,140	8	295c	47	3,190
1726	8	445	4	200	6	355	16	1,140	1754	23	1,010	47	3,350	14	410	32	2,100
1727	7	420	2	180	3	175	8	500	1755	15	750a	34	2,380	13	645a	29	1,850
1728	13	715	8	580	15	910	15	850	1756	-	-	23	1,550	-	-	18	1,300
1729	6	345	6	420	15	1,080	18	1,340	1757	-	-	18	1,360	-	-	7	450
1730	6	395a	4	240	3	320a	13	810	1758	-	-	24	1,720	-	-	11	810
1731	11	935a	12	820	1	90c	23	1,490	1759	-	-	23	1,570	-	-	7	570
1732	10	611	6	400	7	355	11	830	1760	-	-	31	1,990	-	-	14	980
1733	13	726	15	970	4	185	16	980	1761	-	-	40	2,540	-	-	13	670
1734	23	1,491	16	1,060	7	395	33	2,190	1762	-	-	36	2,040	-	-	18	940
1735	23	1,246	21	1,550	14	694	33	2,470	1763	25	1,461	45	2,490	13	645	28	1,620
1736	8	460b	23	1,650	14	676b	32	2,280	1764	37	2,281	47	3,270	22	1,274	48	2,920
1737	19	1,320a	26	1,800	23	1,475a	45	2,990	1765	12	710	37	2,450	-	3,190	48	3,080
1738	15	860	18	1,220	16	935	28	1,820	1766	-	-	45	3,090	-	-	36	2,580
1739	21	1,265a	32	2,100	16	900	53	3,910	1767	-	-	42	2,940	-	-	62	4,020
1740	16	895	50	3,440	21	1,120	49	3,390	1768	31	1,500	57	3,750	46	2,385	79	5,050
1741	18	1,233	15	950	9	633	5	250	1769	39	2,700	100	6,280	78	3,278	134	8,840
1742	2	110c	15	1,030	2	40c	25	1,610	1770	44	3,124	150	10,040	58	2,920	118	7,960
1743	-	-	17	1,370	-	-	19	1,410	1771	27	1,344	53	3,790	43	2,142	70	4,720
1744	-	-	11	690	-	-	24	1,600	1772	38	2,480	78	5,580	51	2,564	84	5,790
1745	-	-	14	880	-	-	12	780	1773	-	-	89	6,570	-	-	93	6,930
1746	-	-	6	340	-	-	16	780	1774	-	-	113	8,230	-	-	127	8,910
1747	-	-	11	730	-	-	22	1,200									

50 The extant NORNY cover the period June 1717 through March 1742 fairly thoroughly, though a number of quarter reports are missing in CO 5/1222-1227. Folio 1228 contains about ten quarters in the early 1750s and eight quarters, January 1, 1763-January 5, 1765. Sections of the records are badly stained and in part illegible.

51 NORNY, 1225-1227 (March 1731-March 1742).



Sources: New York data come from NORNY, 1222-1228. Missing quarters are indicated as follows: a=1, b=2, c=3. Harrington, *New York Merchants*, Appendix F, 328, gives data for 1765-1766. Appendix G, 359-368, gives data for 1768-1772, as does CO 16/1. Philadelphia data come from newspaper customs records in *AWM* and *PG*. Tonnages are based on averages for vessel types found in NORNY, as follows: ships 90 tons, brigs 50 tons, snows 70 tons, sloops and schooners 30 tons, miscellaneous other types 50 tons. New York figures include entries for northern New Jersey, where available.

**TABLE 8-6**  
**New York and Philadelphia Entrances and Clearances with Southern Europe, 1710-1774**

Philadelphia:		Entrances														Tons/ Vessel	
Years	Madeira	Other Wine Is.		Salt Is.		Mainland		Totals		Lisbon		Gib & Sts.		Cadiz			
	Ves.	Tons	Ves.	Tons	Ves.	Tons	Ves.	Tons	Ves.	Tons	Ves.	Tons	Ves.	Tons	Ves.	Tons	
1720s	33	2210	-	-	2	140	3	250	38	2600	3	250	-	-	-	-	68.4T
1730s	57	3670	7	330	5	410	104	7400	173	11810	64	4480	7	530	26	1860	68.3T
1740s	40	2600	2	80	3	210	125	8710	170	11600	106	7380	7	610	5	310	68.2T
1750s	64	4240	48	3340	1	90	207	15010	320	22680	135	9750	11	710	36	2700	70.9T
1760s	87	5030	65	3350	3	250	325	22210	480	30840	207	13930	47	3310	35	2630	64.3T
1770s*	50	3100	15	770	-	-	418	30340	483	34210	252	17780	53	4090	61	4450	70.8T
Philadelphia:		Clearances															
1720s	77	4270	-	-	-	-	38	2960	115	7230	29	2250	7	530	-	-	62.9T
1730s	56	3500	12	500	-	-	219	15770	287	19770	135	9670	43	3070	38	2610	68.9T
1740s	77	4230	8	340	-	-	127	8810	212	13380	114	7820	11	850	2	140	63.1T
1750s	56	3860	42	2540	-	-	154	10900	252	17300	107	7610	22	1460	13	970	68.7T
1760s	94	5160	27	1430	-	-	359	24110	480	30700	252	16600	54	3980	35	2410	64.0T
1770s*	54	3060	3	250	-	-	435	31000	492	34310	307	22100	19	1270	67	4710	69.7T
New York		Entrances															
1710sx	20	1145	1	90	2	280	0	0	23	1515	-	-	-	-	-	-	67.6T
1720s	55	2851	2	115	6	475	2	150	65	3591	1	60	1	90	-	-	55.8
1730s	60	3422	16	655	18	1105	55	3927	149	9309	28	2117	8	495	11	745	62.5
1740sa	13	603	-	-	-	-	23	1635	36	2238	15	1065	4	330	-	-	62.2
1750sb	14	560	8	295	8	460	13	640	43	1955	8	375	1	40	4	225	45.5
1760sb	30	1349	10	490	1	70	21	1833	62	3742	9	803	4	410	8	615	60.4
New York		Clearances															
1710sx	27	1500	-	-	-	-	9	615	36	2115	4	195	-	-	-	-	58.8
1720s	59	3199	-	-	-	-	22	1645	81	4844	19	1455	1	100	-	-	59.8
1730s	39	1700	6	210	1	20	59	4095	105	6025	23	1500	26	1735	8	640	57.4
1740sa	12	618	-	-	-	-	20	1175	32	1793	14	860	1	60	-	-	56.0
1750sb	16	515	6	205	-	-	13	630	35	1350	6	330	5	185	2	115	38.6
1760sb	14	542	4	210	-	-	17	1167	35	1919	3	230	9	692	5	245	54.8

Source: NORNY, 1222-1228. CO 16/1, "Inspector General's Report," 1768-1772. PC, 1720-1774. TDB, 1766-1774. \*=5 years only; x=17 quarters only; a=9 quarters only; b=8 quarters only.

Between June 1715 and December 1729, New York entered only eighty-eight vessels (5,146 tons) from southern Europe. Only two (150 tons) arrived from the mainland, in ballast. Seventy-five (3,990 tons) came from Madeira. Three brought wines from Fayal and Tenerife. Eight carried salt from the Isle of May (755 tons). Isle of May salt was exempt from the import ban.<sup>52</sup>

Vessel registrations reveal that the wine trade was largely in the hands of New Yorkers. Down to 1730, of 4,201 tons of shipping coming from the wine outlets, eighty-seven percent was New York-registered. Through the years this domination reached to almost one hundred percent and through the whole colonial period never fell below seventy percent.

Madeira remained the wine of choice for Manhattan importers, though in the late 1730s Canary wines suddenly became popular. Sixteen wine carriers arrived from there, 1735-1739, then that trade was choked off by the war. An occasional Canary wine shipment came in in the 1750s and in 1763-1764 seven arrived,

52 NORNY, 1222-1224 (March 1717-September 1730).

possibly motivated by the new, heavier wine taxes. New York's wine imports averaged slightly under two hundred tons of wine yearly from 1715-1734. In the later 1730s imports rose to about 300 tons; increased slightly in the 1740s but in 1763-1764 shot up to more than 750 tons annually, influenced by the American Act's new wine taxes.<sup>53</sup>

Since exchange of American products for Madeira and Canary vintages rested largely in the hands of local New York merchants, profits from it and freight returns redounded almost totally to their advantage. From the colony's Naval Office Records the merchants involved can be identified. Familiar families owning vessels in this trade, 1715-1765, included Livingstons (thirteen vessels), Depeysters (eleven), Delanceys (ten), Schuylers (nine), Waltons (nineteen), and Van Hornes (nineteen).

Britain's colonists in North America found no natural source of salt here before 1770. Solar salt was widely available in southern Europe: in western France, on the Iberian coasts, and on the islands in the western Mediterranean, as well as in the Cape Verde Islands. Alternative supplies existed at several of the West Indian islands.

Facing a depressed economy in the 1720s, Pennsylvania's representatives sought permission from the Crown to import salt directly from Iberian salinas, arguing that development of a Pennsylvania fishery would require such supplies. Shortly, New Yorkers, in turn, sought a relaxation of the salt controls. Actually both colonies hoped a return freight for their grain carriers going to southern Europe would allow their effective competition against English grain exports to there.

New York received only eight salt carriers, 1715-1729, all from the Isle of May. Then, relaxation of the salt controls saw such imports rise rapidly. Where previously ten percent of returning vessels brought salt, now fifty percent did so. From 1730-1734 almost 90,000 bushels of salt came in. Then, as salt prices dropped, imports fell off sharply. Demand for grain and flour from the middle colonies rose because of Iberian shortages, but now returning vessels came home in ballast. Between 1736 and 1740 more than forty percent of the tonnage returning to New York entered empty. When war cut off West Indian salt imports, shipments from Iberia rose again to nearly 20,000 bushels annually and stayed at that level into the 1750s. After the second war, 1756-1763, pent-up demand saw Iberian salt entries at 54,000 bushels. Between 1768 and 1772 New York consumed about 43,000 bushels of this salt yearly.<sup>54</sup>

New York's Iberian salt came largely from Lisbon, with the Isle of May and Cadiz of about equal secondary importance. Occasional shipments arrived from "up the Straits," from Cagliari, Ivica, or Alicante. Wartime, of course, meant that Spanish imports halted.

While trade with the Wine Islands was largely handled by local shippers, salt importation differed. Before 1730 salt carriers arriving were British owned. But, with the granting of the salt privilege, New Yorkers became involved. Down to 1735 locals brought home more than half the salt entering. But, as salt prices dropped, the locals stopped bringing home salt and entered more often in ballast. During the 1750s and 1760s local shippers again dominated. In those years imports were limited and salt prices held at levels allowing a small profit on sale at Manhattan.

Import/export data on the salt trade indicate that tonnage from the mainland exceeded that cleared to there by a considerable extent. The discrepancy, almost thirty percent, resulted from British-owned ships which entered from Iberia then cleared elsewhere, triangular traders. Many sailed from Ireland to the mainland or the Isle of May with provisions; then to New York with salt, taking flaxseed back to Ireland. Others were fish carriers from the Channel ports, which brought salt to New York, provisions to Newfoundland, and then fish to Iberia. New York vessels rarely followed such routings.

---

53 NORNY, 1222-1225.

54 NORNY, 1225-1228.

Were exports to mainland markets initiated by New Yorkers or arranged from the metropolis? If vessel ownership paralleled cargo ownership, the data suggest that during the years 1715-1719 and in the early 1730s English shipping filled tonnage needs to the mainland. In other years New Yorkers led in exporting there. Salt imports came in about equally divided aboard shipping owned in the British Isles and locally.

British salt and wine carriers were significantly larger than those American-registered, averaging almost seventy-three tons in the wine trade and nearly eighty-four tons to the mainland. American wine carriers averaged forty-four tons and salt importers sixty-one tons. Cargoes going New York to Iberia went on larger vessels. Wine Island traders shrank in size over time. They took mixed cargoes to avoid breaking demand at limited markets. Salt carriers arrived normally deeply loaded; wine carriers brought less than full loadings. Wines, especially Madeiras, were expensive. Cheap, saleable, Iberian salt, a necessity, also helped to stabilize returning vessels.

The four major exports from New York in this trade were wheat, flour, provisions, and staves. These products consistently filled more than ninety percent of the tonnage going to southern Europe. Demand for the first two fluctuated in relation to grain shortages and, at times, Portugal limited flour imports to encourage local millers. Other goods in small amounts included rum, meats, leather, tar and pitch, shingles, and lumber. Logwood and cocoanuts went to Leghorn and other points up the Straits. During wartime Gibraltar drew provisions, naval stores, and prize goods from New York.

Hudson River exports, down to the mid-1720s, went in very large majority to Madeira. Between 1720 and 1724, not a single vessel cleared to a mainland port. By 1729, encouraged by demand and by the right to bring salt home, two-thirds of the tonnage went to the mainland outlets. Slackening demand and a glut of salt reduced exports, till the major crop failures saw it boom again. Shipments peaked, 1738-1740. Wheat remained the blue chip. Yearly volume ranged from 13,000 bushels in the early 1730s to 38,000 bushels in the early 1760s, then 1768-1772 jumped to 53,000 bushels annually.<sup>55</sup> On the eve of the Revolution, wheat, flour, and corn filled more than ninety percent of shipping bound to the south of Europe.

Staves always found demand in those markets. Barrel, hogshead, cask, pipe, puncheon, and keg staves were all required. Pipe staves were a basic commodity in the Wine Island traffic. During the 1720s the colony shipped a few thousand pipe staves annually; demand rose to 55,000 in the 1730s; to 120,000 in the mid-1750s; 211,000 in the 1760s; and 325,000 yearly just before the Revolution.<sup>56</sup> By the close of the colonial era a ton cost about four pounds in America. An awkward, bulky cargo, stowed with difficulty, freighted at ninety shillings per ton, pipe staves were valued in southern Europe at almost ten pounds per ton.

Despite gaps in coverage, data from the New York Naval Office Records (NORNY) allow comparisons of the colony's sales in southern Europe against expenditures for wine and salt purchased there. During the early 1730s this traffic produced small, positive balances annually, perhaps reaching £2,200. Increased demand, in 1737-1741, saw credits build to more than £10,000 per year, including export and import freights. Lower volume in the mid-1750s dropped income by a third or more. Wars sharply diminished trafficking and after them wine imports were above normal. The combination of unanswered demand, 1756-1763, and impact of new, heavy wine taxes in the American Act, resulted in a negative balance of perhaps £6,400. Rapid expansion with the decline of English grain exports created an upsurge in New York trade, earning a positive balance, 1768-1772, of more than £40,000, as this trade flourished.

\* \* \*

---

55 NORNY, 1223-1227.

56 NORNY, 1223-1228. CO 16/1

Trade statistics for Pennsylvania have been gathered from newspaper shipping reports beginning in 1720. Specifics as to cargoes are lacking but the names of vessels and captains provide continuity. Rig types disclose vessel sizes. Tonnage ratios for goods carried can be projected from the NORNY records. Pennsylvania exports entered this trade in the late seventeenth century, initially to the Atlantic islands. Cargoes carried were similar to those shipped from New York.

The rising productivity of the Quaker colony, along with its population growth, saw it dominate the grain trade to Iberia as the century progressed. In the early years to 1740, three-quarters of American exports to there found sale in Portugal. Mediterranean markets attracted few cargoes pre-1740 but fifty-eight clearances went to Gibraltar. Mediterranean statistics may be skewed by vessels seeking market news at Lisbon or Gibraltar.

Imperial warfare, 1739-1748 and 1756-1763 disrupted this traffic, following peak years, 1737-1740. Privateers and naval vessels threatened mainland voyagers, though Wine Island traders were less vulnerable. Government embargoes prevented grain exports in the 1740s and again in 1757 and 1759. Surplus colonial grain helped feed English and colonial expeditionary forces in the war years. By 1759 Britain had won the war at sea and the trade enjoyed a slight increase. Then, war with Spain caused a new reduction, until peace in 1763. From the mid-1760s until 1775 colonial grain exporters enjoyed boom times. New York sent fifty-one ships (2,542 tons) to southern Europe each year and entered forty-two vessels (2,596 tons), while Pennsylvania entered and cleared about ninety-eight sail (6,862 tons) annually.<sup>57</sup> A disastrous English crop failure in 1766 opened the Iberian market fully to American shippers. Exports peaked 1769-1770 and again 1773-1774.

American imports remained pretty much confined to salt and wine. Small amounts of other goods did enter, often as ship's stores for merchant owners. To 1734 entrances from Madeira outnumbered all other ports of origin at New York. After that Philadelphia merchants challenged New Yorkers for leadership in the Madeira trade, but New York constantly imported proportionally more wine than Pennsylvania.<sup>58</sup> Demand in England, Asia, and America drove Madeira prices steadily upward. From a prime cost of about £7.5 in 1720 it rose to £25 per pipe in the 1770s, though prices varied based on quality and availability.<sup>59</sup> Other island wines were cheaper and varied widely in quality.<sup>60</sup> Entries from the Azores and Canaries increased in the late 1730s and in the 1760s, perhaps because of escalating Madeira prices. The American Act (September 1764) choked off other alternatives.<sup>61</sup>

England had early negotiated special advantages for salt imports from the Isle of May in the Cape Verdes.<sup>62</sup> Salt also entered from Setubal and Lisbon, Cadiz, and points inside the Straits. Solar salt was extremely cheap almost everywhere. The Spanish sold it at 7.5 pence per bushel of one hundred pounds.<sup>63</sup>

---

57 CO 16/1.

58 Stuart Bruchey, *The Colonial Merchant* (New York, 1966), Table 2, 12. CO 16/1.

59 Madeira prices are from mercantile correspondence.

60 No price runs have been found for other wine. First cost has been set at £6 per pipe to 1740; at £10.4 per pipe to 1764; and £15.2 per pipe, 1765-1774.

61 Beer, *British Colonial Policy*, 280-281. Island wine entering directly now paid £3.5 per pipe. If my price is accurate, the tax represented a levy of more than 25% of first costs.

62 Andrews, *Colonial Period*, IV: 109. T. Bentley Duncan, *Atlantic Islands; Madeira, the Azores, and the Cape Verdes in Seventeenth-Century Commerce and Navigation* (Chicago, [1972]), for comments on English privileges at the Isle of May.

63 Vicens Vives, *Manual*, 517, prices Spanish salt at 5 reales per fanega (109.5 lbs.) to foreigners, equal to 9 shillings per bushel, which is very, very high. Board of Trade Papers 6/266, gives a Setubal price

Ratios may be established to contrast wheat prices in southern Europe in relation to salt and wine. The relationship changed as commodity prices increased. Though wine was much more costly than salt, its imports were constant through the whole period.<sup>64</sup> Products other than wine, salt, and cereals were also carried. Beeswax for candles or used to seal wine casks found sale. Various wood products went out. Provisions made up a considerable portion of cargoes down through the 1750s but declined and had limited sales in the 1770s.<sup>65</sup> Imports other than salt and wine included citrus fruits, olive oil, nuts, candied fruits, and small amounts of other goods. The New York records and the “Inspector General’s Report” show a significant shift from wheat to flour exports in the 1760s, as a result of Portuguese policies toward foreign importers.<sup>66</sup> Corn found scarce demand in southern Europe to 1760, then grew in popularity. Rising prices for wheat and flour may have made cheaper corn more attractive.

Over the fifty years, 1720 through 1770, Philadelphia’s entrances from southern Europe annually rose from 14 vessels (960 tons) to 483 vessels (34,210 tons). Clearances to that area also boomed from 47 ships (2,590 tons) to 492 vessels (34,310 tons). The Anglo-Portuguese alliance remained a fixture through these years. Lisbon, after 1729, became the major outlet for North American grain traders, during peacetime. Its large population and location on the Tagus estuary gave easy access to the interior. The *franquia* privilege encouraged this traffic. Fleets bound to Brazil also took a “great quantity of Flour.” Lisbon became Philadelphia’s premier trading partner.<sup>67</sup>

These vessels trading from Philadelphia significantly advanced in size down to 1774. New York, on the other hand, employed vessels of about the same capacity through the whole period because it concentrated on the wine sector of the trade. Pennsylvania merchants trafficked more with the mainland ports. The Delaware basin’s extensive hinterland and connections to the Chesapeake region provided a larger volume of wheat and flour. New York’s hinterland limited growth and the bar at Sandy Hook hindered large vessels from using the port.

\* \* \*

Merchant entrepreneurs constantly sought alternative trade patterns in order to make returns for the finished products flowing out from England. American debtors and English creditors wrestled with that issue. Trade to the south of Europe helped solve that conundrum. The data available offer insights on New Yorkers and Philadelphians engaged in this trade. The NORNY material on southern European entries and clearances discloses that for the whole period, 1715-1764, some sixty-one percent of the tonnage involved was owned in New York. Tonnage owned outside the colony was registered to British residents, who controlled about thirty percent of the tonnage.<sup>68</sup> New York vessels averaged 53 tons each; British-owned 82.5 tons.<sup>69</sup>

---

of 3.75 pence per bushel, including export taxes, which is quite low. An acceptable figure for all salt sources would be 7.5 pence per bushel or 14.04s. per ton, on board.

64 Wheat-to-salt ratios varied over time from a low of about 8.4 bushels of salt (1720s) to 15.3 bushels (1760s) to one bushel of wheat. Wine ratios ranged from 2.12 tons of wheat to more than 5 tons (1770s) per ton of Madeira.

65 NORNY. CO 16/1.

66 Ibid. Lyttleton to Shelburne, October 3, 1768; Hort to Shelburne, October 8, 1768, SPFP 89/66.

67 Mayne, Burn & Mayne to Galloway, July 5, 1764, Galloway Papers.

68 NORNY, 1222-1228.

69 Note 62.6% of entrances and 68.9% of clearances took place before 1740. New York-registered vessels often had non-New York owners.

Material for tracing Pennsylvanians' ownership patterns exists in newspaper customs listings and in the colony's Ship Registers, presuming that the registries signify location of ownership.<sup>70</sup> During the years 1729-1737, 35 vessels of a total of 130 in this trade have been found in the registries. They made almost thirty percent of the voyages (63). Vessels owned elsewhere thus made almost seventy percent (142) of the southern European voyages. Non-Pennsylvanians also owned about one-fourth of the locally registered tonnage.<sup>71</sup> Many of the unidentified carriers were larger types – ships, brigs, or snows. An educated guess then is that, between 1728 and 1737, eighty percent of the tonnage in the southern European trade was owned outside the colony. In this era of the trade, the city's merchants served mainly as export agents for English principals.

A second sample of data covered the years 1750-1755. Here 178 vessels made a total of 303 voyages. Now vessels in the trade divided almost evenly between local and non-local owners. Philadelphia ownership had increased to a marked degree, while the proportion owned by British residents declined. Non-Pennsylvania ownership had fallen to less than sixty percent.<sup>72</sup> The number of large vessels locally controlled rose and the number owned outside the colony declined.

The third period, 1770-1775, saw the situation in the 1730s nearly reversed. Local owners now held almost seventy percent of the shipping in the trade. Their vessels made eighty-two percent of the voyages (626). English and Irish investors still held onto about ten percent of the traffic.<sup>73</sup>

The Pennsylvania Tonnage Duty Books are an alternative data source, covering entrances 1766-1775. They endorse the same conclusions. Local vessels (253) made 915 voyages (82.9%) out of a total of 1,104. The 120 ships consigned to local merchants or to their captains were presumed to be owned elsewhere. Local vessels made on average 3.6 voyages; consigned vessels only 1.57 voyages. Consigned ships were almost seventeen percent larger than those owned locally.<sup>74</sup>

\* \* \*

“Dispatch is the lifeblood of trade,” is an eighteenth-century maxim. Over the years 1720-1763 vessels bound for the south of Europe spent six to seven weeks in Philadelphia readying for the voyage, but after 1765 the turnaround time dropped to only about four weeks, a very significant productivity increase.<sup>75</sup> Shorter port times saved wharfage fees and other expenses. Between 1720 and 1763 the dispatch time did not differ for locally owned shipping and that registered elsewhere; both cleared in six to seven weeks. However, in the third period, local vessels went to sea about ten days more rapidly than those of other

---

70 Reference is to the PSR, 1729-1737, 1750-1755, and 1770-1775. For a description of this source, see Thomas M. Doerflinger, *A Vigorous Spirit of Enterprise: Merchants and Economic Development in Revolutionary Philadelphia* (Chapel Hill, N.C. 1986), 386-387.

71 Data on the voyages come from PC. British and Irish owners held about twenty percent of locally registered vessels. PSR, July 1729-October 1731; January 1736-December 1739.

72 PC, 1750-1755. PRS, 1750-1755. Non-Pennsylvania ownership was at 56.2%.

73 PC, 1770-1774. PSR, 1770-1775.

74 The tonnage duty, six pence per measured ton, supported a lighthouse at the Delaware entrance. Duties were paid on entrance to the port. TDB list vessel names, rigs, masters, arrival dates, points of origin (for about two-thirds of entries), and names of owners or consignees. New vessels were treated as if entering. These are the most accurate figures for tonnages. Combined with PC data, they provide clearance statistics for this period.

75 Philadelphia newspapers were weeklies, so customs data are accurate to within seven days. PC, 1720-1774. *PG*, January 26, 1764.

registries.<sup>76</sup> Local merchants either planned more efficiently or answered their own needs before those of others. When consigned vessels took longer to put to sea the locals gained advantage since their vessels discharged their crews in port and saved wages and food costs. Captain Bartholemew Putnam wrote his owner, Andrew Cabot, from Philadelphia in 1772 in regard to local business practices: “the march’t Here are Determin’d to hurt every Stranger that comes here.”<sup>77</sup>

Voyage lengths varied. Wind, weather, and distance to destination were key factors. Winter voyages took longer; three-masted ships tended to be slower than two-masted brigs and snows. Larger vessels took longer to load and unload. Time spent in a European port depended on demand for a cargo and on the speed with which a ship’s agent moved the process along. Market timing and competing supply at market played roles as well.

A voyage to the Wine Islands required about 116 days before a return could be expected. Ships, brigs, or snows bound to Lisbon took only a few days longer. In the late 1750s and early 1760s twenty-nine vessels arrived at Lisbon from Philadelphia, crossing to the Tagus in a bit less than thirty-seven days on average.<sup>78</sup> If the return voyage took the same length of time, a captain could expect to spend six to seven weeks in port there. Shopping port to port materially lengthened a voyage, escalating costs as well. Ships bound up the Straits required nearly six months to go to Alicante, Barcelona, Genoa, Cagliari, or Leghorn and return. Voyages took almost two weeks less time in the 1770s than they had 1729-1737.<sup>79</sup> Again this represented an important productivity improvement.

Arrival of a large shipment of goods at a small Wine Island market could break its price level, so that trade almost always loaded mixed cargoes. Large supplies of wine, on the other hand, arriving at New York or Philadelphia could have the same effect. Normally returning vessels carried less than full cargoes of wine. In contrast, demand for salt was constant and large shipments could be worked off. Early in the eighteenth century, a vessel to Lisbon or Cadiz might load two or three thousand bushels of wheat, plus some flour and pipe staves. By the 1770s ships to the Iberian mainland ports often carried ten or twelve thousand bushels. Ralph Davis notes that the rapid growth of a trade meant a speedy transition to the use of very large vessels. Philadelphia’s trade to Iberia blossomed in the years after 1766.<sup>80</sup>

The combination of industrious merchant investors, experienced sea captains, and dedicated agents overseas boded well for these investments. As an example, Reese Meredith and Samuel Neave of Philadelphia owned the snow *Betsey*, commanded by Captain John Bolitho. Between March 1751 and December 1753 *Betsey* made seven voyages to Madeira. The average voyage lasted 101 days and her owners turned her around at Philadelphia in less than three weeks.<sup>81</sup> Meredith, Neave, Bolitho, and the Madeira agents obviously interacted very harmoniously.

---

76 PC, 1764-1774. Local vessels cleared in 27.5 days; others in 37.5 days. PC, 1729-1737, 106 vessels cleared on average in 45.5 days; PC, 1750-1755, 114 vessels on average 48 days; PC, 1770-1775, 225 vessels, 28.2 days.

77 Bartholemew Putnam to Andrew Cabot, March 9, 1772, Cabot “Papers,” I.

78 The weekly commercial newspaper at Lisbon *CPR* reported 29 entries from Philadelphia over the years 1757-1759. The average voyage lasted 36.8 days. The longest took 60 days, the shortest 14.

79 PC. During the first time period vessels (60) took on average 139.1 days and in the third period, vessels (300) only 125.4 days. Even by the 1750s voyage lengths had dropped to 129.4 days. Apparently, familiarity with the trading pattern increased productivity. Of 71 voyages to the Wine Islands in the 1750s and 1770s, average length was 116.1 days. Some 194 voyages to Lisbon in those years averaged 119.1 days.

80 Davis, *Rise of English Shipping*, 72-73.

81 PSR, August 7, 1751. The snow *Betsey* was registered at sixty tons but probably measured out at more than one hundred tons. *PG*, December 17, 1751-December 13, 1753.

\* \* \*

Demand for American wheat and flour spiked up after 1763. Philadelphia merchants dominated shipments to the southern European markets, gathering product where a surplus existed locally and from Virginia and Maryland and, beginning in the 1770s, from Quebec. City merchants had drawn on Delaware and Maryland for grain as early as 1711-1715. Now they carried Chesapeake exports directly to southern European outlets. Various sources suggest the conclusion that about one-third of the vessels clearing to Iberia from Virginia and Maryland were Philadelphia owned. A number of Scottish cargo carriers also participated there, returning to North Britain via southern European points.<sup>82</sup> Philadelphia merchants and Scottish factors then helped to encourage the shift from tobacco to grain in the Chesapeake area. Virginia and Maryland had been denied the right to import salt directly from Iberia. Thus, Philadelphia vessels taking Chesapeake cargoes either carried salt home to the Delaware or returned to the Chesapeake in ballast.<sup>83</sup>

Canadian grain went out from Quebec, beginning in the 1760s. Arthur Jensen argues that Canadian wheat was inferior to Philadelphia's; that freight charges were higher; and such shipments a very risky business.<sup>84</sup> Yet the volume grew rapidly. Between 1771 and 1775 twenty-one vessels (4,276 tons) arrived at Lisbon from the Saint Lawrence and four (854 tons) cleared for Quebec from there.<sup>85</sup> Barcelona too was an important outlet for Canadian wheat. By 1766 almost 40,000 bushels reached Catalonia from Quebec.<sup>86</sup> In the five years 1770-1775, sixty-three wheat carriers raised Barcelona with 447,760 bushels of wheat from Canada. The English consul there endorsed Canadian wheat as a hardier variety, better suited to produce whiter bread.<sup>87</sup> A number of these vessels had sailed Philadelphia to Quebec to Barcelona and then went home to the Delaware. Colonial newspapers have numerous items about Philadelphia vessels on this routing. The *habitants* had a taste for wine and the Barcelona data for 1773 refer to six ships taking Spanish wine to Canada after first calling at Falmouth to pay the duties.<sup>88</sup>

\* \* \*

In sum then, the eighteenth century saw merchants in Britain, New York, and Philadelphia expand the trade from America to southern Europe, which had begun with the sale of lumber, provisions, fish, and grain

---

82 Jensen, *Maritime Commerce*, 72, 77, says Philadelphia took up to 100,000 bushels of wheat in coastwise, mainly from the Delaware counties. As only one example, *BNL*, January 31, 1754, refers to two Philadelphia vessels bound from Chesapeake Bay for Lisbon. William Bell Clark, ed., *Naval Documents of the American Revolution*, 15 vols. (Washington, D.C., 1964-2005), I: 1361-1394, provides some Naval Office data for Virginia and Maryland.

83 SPFS 94/176 and 94/196, Barcelona Consular reports from James Miller for the late 1760s and early 1770s.

84 Jensen, *Maritime Commerce*, 75, 92.

85 "Livros," 1770-1775.

86 Miller to Shelburne, January 3, 1767, SPFS 94/176, reported American wheat imports in 1766 as 149,188 bushels: from Maryland 51,750 bushels; from Philadelphia 36,993 bushels; from Quebec 38,980 bushels.

87 Miller to Rochford, October 2 1773, SPFS 94/194, on wheat qualities. Cf. CO 16/1 and Shepherd and Walton, *Shipping, Maritime Trade*, Appendix, 168-169.

88 Ibid. John Baker Holyrod (Lord Sheffield) in *Observations on the Commerce of the American States* (London, 1784), 45, indicates that in 1774 a hundred ships carried Canadian wheat to southern Europe.



to the Wine Islands as early as the 1640s. American grain and flour could compete there with exports from England. The traffic to the mainland had good growth, 1734-1740, then war disrupted it. Clearances fell off by almost fifty percent in the 1740s. After a recovery in the next decade, it dropped by almost two-thirds during the Seven Years War. A major expansion followed after 1766.

On the eve of the Revolution, British North America annually exported to southern European consumers 175,216 barrels of flour, 533,751 bushels of wheat, and 258,333 bushels of Indian corn.<sup>89</sup> Quebec, New York, Pennsylvania, Maryland, and Virginia exported the vast majority of these products. See Table 8-7 for their prime costs and minimum break-even prices paid overseas. Pennsylvania ranked first in exports, far exceeding second place Maryland. Twenty-five percent of the Quaker colony's total export tonnage went to Iberia. Her flour monopolized the markets there, bringing £173,500 annually. New Yorkers had fallen far, far behind. Though Quebec's shipments rose sharply after 1772, Pennsylvanians still dominated the Peninsula markets for grain, handling more than sixty percent of American exports there. In addition to sales and freight earnings, Pennsylvania merchants gained income from importing wine and salt to the Delaware region.

Pennsylvania vessels also carried about a third of the produce sent there from Maryland, Virginia, and Quebec. Between 1768 and 1772 those three colonies sent 361,524 bushels of wheat, 28,359 barrels of flour, and 131,895 bushels of corn to those markets.<sup>90</sup> The first costs of those goods shipped by them, plus the commissions paid to purchase them, remained in the hands of their local suppliers. Profits from their sale at Lisbon and elsewhere, plus freight earnings for their carriage and whatever insurance premiums were underwritten in Philadelphia, all accrued to the Pennsylvanians.<sup>91</sup>

---

89 CO 16/1. Shepherd and Walton, *Shipping, Maritime Trade*, 211-226. Tons of flour are converted on the basis of 11.48 barrels per ton.

90 CO 16/1. Joseph A. Ernst, "The Political Economy of the Chesapeake Colonies, 1760-1775," in Ronald Hoffman et al., eds. *The Economy of Early America: The Revolutionary Period, 1763-1790* (Charlottesville, Va., 1988), 215-218. As early as 1765 Baltimore shipped 120,000 bushels of wheat to those markets.

91 Clark, *Naval Documents*, I: 1361-1394. Freight charges were at 5s. per bushel for wheat and 1.11s. per bushel for corn. Pennsylvanians probably earned about £12,000 annually for carrying goods from other colonies to Iberia.

TABLE 8-7

## Major Wheat, Flour, and Corn Exporters to Southern Europe and Sales at Cost, 1768-1772

	Quebec	N.Y.	Pa.	Md.	Va.	S.E. Exports	Total Exports
<b>Wheat</b>							
Volume (bu.)	278071	264047	570558	769546	760011	2668757	3334455
Amer. Costs (£)	54641	51885	112115	151216	149342	524411	
Eur. Sales (£)	79445	75438	163008	219859	217135	762422	
Percent of S.E.	10.42	9.89	21.38	28.83	28.48	--	
Percent of Total	8.34	7.92	17.11	23.08	22.79	80.04	
<b>Flour</b>							
Volume (bll.)	598	95151	625137	93152	48044	876079	2227028
Amer. Costs (£)	587	93438	613885	91475	47179	860310	
Eur. Sales (£)	830	132041	867503	129267	66671	1215732	
Percent of S.E.	0.00	10.86	71.36	10.63	5.48	--	
Percent of Total	0.00	4.27	28.07	4.18	2.16	39.34	
<b>Corn</b>							
Volume (bu.)	1440	178412	379841	265541	392492	1291665	4229584
Amer. Costs (£)	140	17395	37034	25890	38268	125937	
Eur. Sales (£)	246	30437	64801	45315	66959	220400	
Percent of S.E.	0.01	13.81	29.41	20.56	30.39	--	
Percent of Total	0.00	4.22	8.98	6.28	9.28	30.54	
<b>Totals</b>							
Amer. Costs (£)	55638	162718	763034	268581	234788	1484759	
Eur. Sales (£)	80521	237916	1095312	394441	350763	2158953	
Eur. Sales (yr.)	16104	47583	219062	78888	70153	431790	
Percentage of Eur. Sales	3.74	11.02	50.73	18.26	16.25		

Sources: Volume figures are from CO 16/1. American costs are from Bezanson, Gray, and Hussey, *Prices in Colonial Pennsylvania*: wheat=3.93s., flour=19.64s., corn=1.95s. European sales are figured at cost with no advance: wheat=5.714s., flour=27.754s., corn=3.413s. See Table 14-2. These five colonies exported 90% of the wheat, 98.4% of the flour, and 94.3% of the corn sent to Europe.

During the late 1730s the trade to the eastward probably earned Pennsylvanians credits in excess of £40,000 annually. By 1753 they probably still exceeded £25,000 per year. War intervened and large wine imports, 1763-1764, reduced income. Then the boom in the trade followed.

North Shore nabobs in Massachusetts dominated codfish exports to the south of Europe and reaped major profits. In like manner, wealthy Quakers and other Delawareans, from their counting houses in Philadelphia, monopolized the export of flour and shipped lesser amounts of corn and wheat to contacts in southern Europe. By the 1770s the capital inflow from this trade certainly approached £230,000 a year. It covered a major part of the colony's negative balance of payments. In 1769, one of its peak years, it employed 89 vessels of 10,434-ton capacity, employing 1,460 men. They made more than 100 entrances and 134 clearances that year. A year later, 86 vessels (10,098 tons, 1,400 men) made 148 entrances and

121 clearances.<sup>92</sup> Clearances to Iberia in the 1730s had attracted about twenty-five percent of the colony's overseas tonnage. Midcentury wars truncated it, but from 1765 onward one-fourth of the colony's trade was again devoted to it.<sup>93</sup>

Demands for foodstuffs to feed the Iberians gave steady employment to Pennsylvanians and New Yorkers. The call for shipping in the halcyon days after 1766 even drew New England fish carriers to the Delaware to take off the wheat and flour cargoes. Colonials happily substituted American wheat for English "corn." Credits amassed in Iberia materially advanced the economies of Pennsylvania and the other grain producing colonies.

Flour, wheat, corn, staves, and other exports fueled economic growth. Farm production expanded rapidly. Goods moving by land or along the Hudson, Delaware, and Chesapeake river systems fostered the growth of transport facilities – wagons and smallcraft especially – and employed laborers, farm workers, carters, draymen, ferrymen, stevedores, and watermen of all types. Horses, mules, oxen, and the wagons they hauled expanded the colonial infrastructure. Pennsylvanians shifted from bulk wheat shipments in the 1760s to export more and more flour, the rapid growth of the milling and bolting manufactories followed, with ripple effects into packaging in the form of barrels, casks, and hogsheads. Pipe staves found heavy demand in southern Europe's wineries. The production and exportation of all types of staves, hoops, and headings employed coopers and woodsmen. Building larger and larger vessels for the trade made ready work for colonial shipwrights, journeymen, and apprentices. It required as well the hands of riggers, chandlers, ironsmiths, sail and rope makers. As trade flourished, it created multiplier effects throughout the Delaware basin and beyond.

Increased business in southern Europe improved relations with English creditors. Availability of funds from Lisbon, Cadiz, Barcelona, and other centers made for easier credit in London, Bristol, and elsewhere. Coastwise exports of wine and salt and imports of cereals for reexport provided means for indirect profits and opened avenues to other business ventures. Southern European trading stood a strong second to West Indian commerce in volume. Eighty percent of the wheat exported from British America, thirty-one percent of the corn, and thirty-nine percent of the bread and flour found sale in southern Europe.<sup>94</sup> The Quaker colony led the way, with major emphasis on flour exports. It can be argued that Philadelphia's amazing commercial growth in these years before the Revolution resulted, in the main, from her control of this business.

The hopes that had brought the colony's leaders to seek a new Iberian trading sphere in the mid-1720s, as an antidote to its static economy, proved prescient, even though those aspirations did not achieve full realization until the last decade before 1775.<sup>95</sup> In the eighteenth century colonials and Englishmen, familiar with the then current system of trade, readily recognized that Iberia was a treasure house where gold and

---

92 PC and TDB data allow creation of ship histories. For the manning of vessels, see Davis, *Rise of English Shipping*, 71-73. Larger vessels managed with fewer hands. NORNY provides ratios for vessel classes, as follows: ships 8.02 tons/man; brigs 6.41 tons/man; snows 7.68 tons/man; sloops 4.55 tons/man; schooners 5.64 tons/man. Overall the yearly average was 76 vessels, 8,907 tons, 1,246 men, and 7.15 tons/man. New York tonnage was understated by at least one-third, increasing the ratio to 10.72 tons/man.

93 PC, 1730-1739, southern European ports took 287 vessels, 19,670 tons, out of a total clearing of 1,469 vessels and 87,510 tons. From 1766-1770 the colony cleared 429 vessels, 28,450 tons to those points out of a total going overseas of 1,867 vessels and 111,580 tons.

94 See Table 8-6. CO 16/1. Pennsylvania carried about 57.2% of the total tonnage going there and owned 55.3% of the vessels clearing to there.

95 Wolff, *Colonial Agency of Pennsylvania*, 31. Henry C. Hunter, *How England Got Its Merchant Marine* (New York, 1935), 254-255. Tolles, *Meeting House*, 106-108. Andrews, *Colonial Period*, IV: 109.

silver from Latin America or other points remained only briefly before being funneled on into northern Europe. It should not surprise us, then, that the grain-producing colonies sought a share of “the most valuable part of the [English] corn trade.”<sup>96</sup> The decline of English competition during the 1760s opened the way.

---

96 D. Barnes, *Corn Laws*, 11, 26.

## CHAPTER IX

### LISBON AND NORTH AMERICA, 1700-1775

Close diplomatic and military ties existed between Portugal and England from the 1640s onward, providing extraordinarily fine profits for the English mercantile community there. Lisbon, one of Europe's larger cities, enjoyed prosperity for much of that period. On the eve of the great Lisbon earthquake in 1755, it had a population of nearly 200,000 and required a constant supply of comestibles.<sup>1</sup> The Tagus estuary offered a route to the interior, even into Spain's western provinces. The city, entrepôt for Portugal's overseas empire, supplied victuals for the fleets connecting them, as well as foodstuffs in demand overseas. These varying requirements and Portugal's inability to answer its own needs made her heavily dependent upon imports.

The fourth largest city in western Europe, Lisbon imported grains, meat, dairy products, and codfish from England, Ireland, and British North America.<sup>2</sup> It also attracted vessels from a dozen other European and Mediterranean nations. Its prosperity rested primarily on gold and diamonds arriving from Brazil, 1680-1760, and on its overseas trade with Asia and Africa. Lisbon was the focal point of all Portuguese trade. The city consumed two-thirds of the English goods imported to Portugal.<sup>3</sup>

Solar salt, produced from manufactories on the river above Setubal, about fifteen miles from the capital, made up the bulk of her exports. For centuries sun-dried salt had either been exported from Setubal (St. Ubes the English called it) or loaded aboard small coasting vessels (naos) and sailed north around Cape Spichell to Lisbon. It went out to North America, England, Dutch ports, and Scandinavian and Baltic countries.<sup>4</sup> The city's merchants also shipped fairly large amounts of "Lisbon wine," which undersold more expensive Wine Island exports. Citrus fruits, anchovies, capers, olives, olive oil, and cork helped fill the holds of departing vessels.

Lisbon, in this era, offered a fine market for British or North American goods. At the turn of the eighteenth century, an informed English diplomat estimated that Englishmen owned property in Portugal worth some £600,000.<sup>5</sup> Lisbon's English population was estimated at two thousand souls, as early as 1732.<sup>6</sup> Twenty years later the same contemporary wrote that "a great body of His Majestys subjects reside at Lisbon, rich, opulent, and every day increasing their fortunes and enlarging their dealings."<sup>7</sup> At least a hundred English merchants, members of the Lisbon factory, resided there in the 1750s, along with their dependents. On occasion, a hundred English ships crowded the port and a thousand seamen from them swelled the normal complement of English residents.<sup>8</sup> Lisbon's English visitors and residents then numbered close to three thousand. The English were said to own all the choicest wine land near Oporto, Lisbon, Setubal, and Faro.<sup>9</sup> English shipwrights sold their skills to government recruiters. English pilots served on

---

1 *PG*, May 1, 1755.

2 Twiss, *Travels through Portugal*, 26.

3 Fisher, "Anglo-Portuguese Trade" (PhD diss.), 97.

4 Gaff-rigged, single-masted vessels, carrying perhaps twenty tons of salt, were unloading cargoes at the Caix do Sodre along the Tagus as late as 1967. Brawny stevedores shoveled the salt into burlap bags, carried it ashore, dumped it into warehouses, and took the bags back to be refilled.

5 Francis, *Methuens*, 114.

6 Tyrawley to Newcastle, June 6, 1732, SPFP 89/37.

7 Boxer, *Reactions to Earthquake*, 6.

8 *CPR*, 1771-1776.

9 Dumouriez, *Portugal*, 203.

the Tagus and Englishmen owned taverns in the city.<sup>10</sup> In Lisbon they were all but ubiquitous.

Though only a small portion of its inhabitants, they had a major influence on Lisbon's commercial life, their investments representing a solid stake in Portugal's economy. English shipping carried not only goods arriving from America and Britain, but also a large proportion of the overall trade of the city. *Com Privilegio Real*, the city's government-sponsored commercial organ, documents English dominance over the Lusitanian capital.<sup>11</sup> With other sources, it offers statistics on Lisbon's overseas trade. Arrivals at the port fluctuated through the century partly because of periodic harvest failures and because wars periodically depressed trade. Over the eighteenth century, annual Lisbon entrances rose fairly consistently from six hundred to more than a thousand vessels.<sup>12</sup> The advantages guaranteed by Anglo-Portuguese treaties allowed the English to dominate Portuguese trade through these years. "Lisbon was a far livelier port than Cadiz, it was visited by a greater number of British vessels."<sup>13</sup> English entrances to the Tagus reached about two hundred in 1700. By midcentury the exceptionally large demand for English grain raised that number to about five hundred vessels a year.<sup>14</sup> At the same time those vessels had increased in carrying capacity. English shipping carried perhaps a third of the goods reaching Lisbon through the century.

As seen, foodstuffs arriving from North America assumed more importance in Lisbon's trade. Well before 1700 American fish, grain, and wood products found sale there. In the fall of 1709 the *Rachel* took a cargo of wheat and bread from Pennsylvania to Lisbon, consigned to John and Thomas Butts. England had halted grain exports during the war with Spain, 1702-1713, allowing an opening for American produce.<sup>15</sup> In 1711 Isaac Norris commented on the advantages of the Lisbon market to the Delaware colony: "We have now going seven or eight vessels some of them large."<sup>16</sup>

Lisbon proved even more attractive after the Crown granted Pennsylvania and New York permission to import salt directly in the 1720s. Fayrer Hall, in *The Importance of the British Plantations in America to This Kingdom* (1731), commented on the grain trade via Pennsylvania, which he described as a "pretty constant Practice."

A Londoner, or any Englishman, lays out here in our Manufactures to the Value of 500£. It will purchase there 6666 Bushels of Wheat; which sent to *Lisbon* at four Shillings *per* Bushel, will come to 1333£ 4s. which is sure to be sent home to England at last, if not immediately, and is of the same Advantage for Remittance or Exchange as any such Sum produced by Goods or Merchandize sent from hence directly: And I would be glad to know what we could send hence to any *Part of Europe* to make such Gain. It is obvious that Portugal in this Case pays the whole Sum, and our Seamen and Merchants divide it. It is pretty common for the Captain, if the ship be Plantation built, to have Orders to sell the Ship,

---

10 *PG*, June 28, 1753; May 1, 1755. Hort to Rochford, August 4, 1771, SPFP 89/71; Walpole to Rochford, March 21, 1772, SPFP 89/72; Walpole to Rochford, August 19, 1772, SPFP 89/73.

11 *CPR* records entrances and clearances, general cargo descriptions, names of consignees, and lists of vessels in port.

12 *PG*, July 20, 1738. Bourgoing *Travels of Duke de Châtelet*, 271. Fisher, "Anglo-Portuguese Trade" (PhD diss.), 79-81, 105.

13 Christelow, "Trades from Cadiz and Lisbon," 17.

14 Fisher, "Anglo-Portuguese Trade (diss.)," 105. British Museum, Additional Mss. 23726, in 1699 more than 200 entered; in 1700, 207 entries. *CPR*.

15 Tolles, *Meeting House*, 87.

16 Bezanson, Gray, and Hussey, *Prices in Colonial Pennsylvania*, 9, cites Norris to Pike, June 1711. By the 1720s approximately forty American vessels entered yearly, the majority with Newfoundland fish.

if he can get a certain Price for it, which often happens, and in that Case generally, the whole produce of Ship and Cargoe is sent to *England*; and if it is not the Property of *Englishmen* (I mean those who live in England) before, it is always ordered to be laid out in Goods, all of the Manufacture of this Kingdom, or such as are imported here and sent to *Pensilvania*.<sup>17</sup>

During the mid-1730s John Reynell of Philadelphia suggested the building of a vessel for the Lisbon trade. “I mean to carry Wheat Flower & Pipe Staves there & so have our Remittances from thence in Bills of Exchange the chief view I ever had or have in the thing is to find a way to make Returns to Advantage.”<sup>18</sup> Large inflows of bullion arriving from Brazil meant that specie was available at Lisbon for export to England, despite the Portuguese government’s prohibition of such transactions.

American clearances to Lisbon from Newfoundland, New England, the middle colonies, and the South had increased significantly by the early 1730s. The end of rice enumeration saw Carolina shipments expand rapidly and exceptional demand from Iberia encouraged the dispatch of wheat cargoes from the Chesapeake, Hudson, and Delaware regions. By late in the 1730s annual arrivals from America had risen to more than seventy. Funds to cover adverse balances in London and other English centers motivated this outpouring. A Philadelphia merchant commented in 1740: “we not only have such Commoditys as will make remittances for European goods not only for the most part without loss, but often wi’th a considerable profit & I can well observe that Phila. is as much or more oblidge to Lisbon than any port whatsoever, London excepted.”<sup>19</sup>

Embargoes on American food products, other than fish and rice, enforced early in King George’s War checked this traffic. In spring 1741 John Reynell, angry about the governor’s embargo on food exports, wrote an English correspondent concerning Lisbon’s status as a neutral port. Legal experts had informed him that supplies could be sent to Lisbon, since local decisions did not have the authority of a Parliamentary act. He added: “if Governors be once Permitted to Shutt up Ports at their Pleasure, we shall be in a miserable Situation.”<sup>20</sup> Despite this brave comment, he did not test his claim. Dangers posed by Spanish and later French privateers discouraged voyages to Iberia. Clearances to southern Europe fell abruptly in 1741 and 1742. When the French joined the war in 1744, even the fish trade faced straitened circumstances. English fish did reach Lisbon and some *bacalao* was transshipped to Bilbao and other Spanish destinations aboard neutrals but only a few shiploads of staves arrived at Lisbon from the grain colonies during those years.

The Peace of Aix la Chapelle in 1748 reopened the trade. Newfoundland and New England fish once more poured into Bilbao, Cadiz, and other ports, but huge English harvests, 1749-1750, kept Iberian prices at levels which frustrated American grain exporters. Wheat from New York and Pennsylvania came to market at Lisbon after 1752. Just before the outbreak of the Seven Years War, eighty-five vessels entered Lisbon from North America annually.

The new conflict impacted this traffic after 1755. New embargoes forbade export of victuals of various kinds. Trade to Lisbon plummeted. American merchants complained angrily at “a most tedious Embargo,” which had led “to the total Ruin of some and great injury to the Merchant & Farmer.”<sup>21</sup> They were “useless

---

17 Bezanson, Gray, and Hussey, *Prices in Colonial Pennsylvania*, 93-94, suggests that Hall understated Pennsylvania prices, though he may have presumed a small profit on the original outlay of £500. The Lisbon price of 4s. per bushel appears quite accurate.

18 Letter to M.L. Dicker, June 5, 1736, Reynell, “Letter Book, 1734-1737.”

19 Letter to Williams, September 11, 1740, Till “Papers, 1735-1744,” as cited by Jensen, *Maritime Commerce*, 59. Such exports now required a bond of £1,000, assuring delivery at an English port.

20 Letter to Flexney, April 12, 1741, Reynell, “Letter Book, 1738-1741.”

21 Letter to Thomas Willing, July 1, 1757, Charles and Thomas Willing. “Letter Book, 1754-1761,”

Prohibitions,” which did “irreparable damage to the Colony where has been the greatest plenty of Grain ever known & no export for it.”<sup>22</sup> The war forced resumption of the indirect fish trade from Lisbon. Neutral shipping carried American codfish to Corunna, Santander, Bilbao, and other ports.<sup>23</sup>

Iberian trade reached a low point in 1761-1762, as England and Spain warred again. Aggressive Bourbon privateers all but ended American shipments to Lisbon, though English naval units based there cruised on and off the coast and English privateers sought prizes there as well.<sup>24</sup> In fall 1760 Captain Archibald Kennedy, R.N. received a piece of plate from the Lisbon factory for action against enemy privateers. Three British frigates in 1761 opened the port, which had been “blocked up for sev’l weeks,” bringing “great Joy to the Factory.”<sup>25</sup> English naval elements stationed at Gibraltar periodically ranged among the Portuguese Wine Islands to limit English and colonial shipping losses.

The Peace of Paris brought the war to a close. Trade flourished anew. Shortly, American grain shipments to Lisbon expanded to fill demands there. American imports dominated Portuguese markets for fish, wheat, corn, flour, and rice. American forests provided the universal packaging of the day, staves and headings. Wood products of lesser value also contributed to remittances. The city became a very, very important outlet for colonial exports. In the seven years immediately before the American Revolution, at least 1,237 North American vessels arrived at Lisbon. The fisheries sent 311 cargoes; Carolina dispatched 129 vessels with rice and lumber; other colonies contributed 797 ships laden mainly with wheat, corn, and flour.<sup>26</sup> Consul John Hort at Lisbon wrote Lord Rochford in 1775: “Such a number of Ships have lately come in here from all the colonies of British America, as certainly in an equal period of time never before appeared in this port.”<sup>27</sup>

---

HSP.

22 Letter to Perks, April 27, 1758; letter to Scott, Pringle & Cheap, September 21, 1757, *ibid.*

23 *CPR*, April 10, 1757-December 31, 1759. In these years fifty-six fish vessels entered from New England and seventy from Newfoundland.

24 *Ibid.*, in 1758 Admiral Osborn cruised with his fleet on the Spanish coast to protect the fish carriers from America. Walter L. Dorn, *Competition for Empire, 1740-1763* (New York, 1940), 104.

25 Frankland to Cleveland, May 20, 1761, Consular Letters to the Admiralty, ADM 1/3836. *PG*, January 8, 1761; February 12, 1762.

26 “Livros,” 1769-1775. North American vessels entering reached 1,064. An added 173 arrived but went to other ports. See Table 9-1. Sixty fish carriers were franked.

27 Hort to Rochford, March 23, 1775, SPFP 89/79.



**TABLE 9-1**  
**North American Entrances at Lisbon, 1769-1775**

Colony	1769		1770		1771		1772		1773		1774		1775		Totals		Franked Vessels
	Ves.	Tons	Ves.	Tons	Ves.	Tons	Ves.	Tons	Ves.	Tons	Ves.	Tons	Ves.	Tons	Ves.	Tons	
Newfoundland	27	3,216	30	3,954	31	4,465	39	5,213	44	5,364	29	4,564	31	4,736	231	31,512	48
Quebec	--	--	--	--	3	627	7	1,174	4	985	5	1,036	2	454	21	4,276	7
Nova Scotia	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	75	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	75	1
New England	--	--	1	179	2	255	6	840	1	80	6	736	3	259	19	2,349	11
New York	5	994	8	1,449	3	447	10	1,839	5	766	12	1,678	9	1,719	52	8,892	4
Pennsylvania	89	16,544	122	24,600	40	8,184	54	11,854	41	9,504	38	7,750	55	12,871	439	91,307	45
Maryland	11	1,822	24	3,909	10	1,614	16	3,206	10	2,208	16	3,068	14	2,537	101	18,364	15
Virginia	7	1,065	20	3,014	7	1,684	14	2,153	13	2,263	19	4,192	7	1,199	87	15,570	23
Carolina	19	3,799	25	5,948	12	2,785	12	2,484	10	2,192	17	3,112	15	3,600	110	23,920	19
Georgia	--	--	1	62	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	461	3	523	--
Totals	158	27,440	231	43,115	108	20,061	159	28,838	128	23,362	142	26,136	138	27,836	1,064	196,788	173

**Lisbon Clearances to North America, 1769-1775**

Newfoundland	39	3,964	36	4,578	29	4,078	39	4,965	27	3,288	29	3,818	24	3,876	223	28,567	10
Quebec	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	594	--	--	2	260	--	--	4	854	--
Nova Scotia	1	135	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	100	2	235	1
New England	1	62	2	274	6	934	15	1,553	4	389	16	2,180	9	1,361	53	6,753	3
New York	8	1,793	5	1,194	2	340	8	1,568	1	104	5	894	8	1,422	37	7,315	--
Pennsylvania	80	15,048	118	22,223	42	8,755	47	10,266	43	9,789	37	7,263	43	9,923	410	83,267	4
Maryland	7	1,244	16	3,159	4	453	6	1,163	3	723	6	905	3	659	45	8,306	1
Virginia	5	879	13	1,895	2	373	4	548	4	706	10	1,383	5	724	43	6,508	--
Carolina	18	3,345	13	2,843	1	278	5	1,026	1	248	6	1,082	4	586	48	9,408	1
America	1	189	--	--	1	101	2	357	--	--	1	79	--	--	5	726	3
Totals	160	26,659	203	36,166	87	15,312	128	22,040	83	15,247	112	17,864	97	18,651	870	151,939	23

Source: "Livros," 1769-1775. Franked vessels arrived at the port but proceeded to other destinations without paying the tonnage duty.

Lisbon data in this period come from the *Livros da Marco*, providing information on vessel origins and their tonnages. *Com Privilegio Real* discloses, in addition, the names of the consignees of arriving vessels. With contemporary estimates by the consuls and English factory members on the volume of English-American shipping, this material effectively underlines the importance of the city's connections with British North America (Table 9-1).

Over the six years, 1769-1774, the marco tax was collected from 6,231 arrivals at Belem Castle. Of them, 926 entered from North America, carrying 168,952 tons of goods. An additional 153 American vessels took advantage of the *franquia* permission. Thus, about one-sixth of the entries from the colonies went on to other southern European points. A check of the combined entrances for 1770 and 1771 reveals that Philadelphia was the major trading partner of the Lusitanian port, followed by Sweden, Sicily, Bahia, and Amsterdam.<sup>28</sup> Carolina ranked seventh; Newfoundland eighth; Maryland thirteenth; Virginia sixteenth; and the other North American colonies were well down the list.<sup>29</sup> A comparison of the various sources does show some differences.<sup>30</sup>

28 "Livros," 1769-1774. Philadelphia in the years 1770 and 1771 sent 162 vessels (32,321 tons) to Lisbon; Sweden 41 vessels (13,287 tons); Sicily 48 (11,917 tons); Bahia 28 (11,140 tons); Amsterdam 47 (10,641 tons); Carolina 37 (8,734 tons); Newfoundland 60 (8,329 tons); Maryland 34 (6,123 tons); Virginia 26 (4,529 tons); New York 11 (1,896 tons).

29 Enclosure in Walpole to Rochford, "List of the Merchant Ships entered and cleared at the Port of Lisbon for the Years 1772 and 1773," June 6, 1774, SPFP 89/77. Some 734 English ships entered and 752 cleared; 257 entered from North America. "The Maritime Commerce of Lisbon in 1765, 1766, 1767 and 1768," March 13, 1769, SPFP 89/67. In those years North American entries were 119, 115, 84, and 151, respectively

30 "Livros," 1772-1773. CPR, 1772-1773. Hort to Walpole, May 6, 1774, SPFP 89/77.

**TABLE 9-2**  
**Lisbon/Philadelphia Shipping, 1772-1773**

	Entrances				Clearances			
	1772		1773		1772		1773	
	Ves.	Tons	Ves.	Tons	Ves.	Tons	Ves.	Tons
<i>Marcos</i>	159	28,838	128	23,363	128	22,040	83	15,247
<i>CPR</i>	152		136		114		72	
Report of Consul	133		131		---		---	

Sources: “Livros,” 1772-1773; *CPR*, 1772-1773; Hort and Factory to Walpole, May 6, 1774, SPFP 89/77. The Factory Report lumps all English vessels clearing under one heading with no attempt to differentiate vessels clearing to North America. In 1772 one issue of *CPR* is missing, April 25. In 1773 one issue is missing, June 26.

Statistics for Philadelphia clearances correlate closely with Lisbon arrivals during these two years.<sup>31</sup> Discrepancies exist in Consul Hort’s report on Lisbon’s trade, 1772-1773. North American arrivals are understated by almost ten percent. The accuracy of his lists of estimated imports is also in question. Hort had been asked to “form an Estimate” of the increase or decrease of British trade to the city. Thus his figures were *estimates*. He concluded that there had been “a considerable Decrease in the Importation of the manufactures of Great Britain.”<sup>32</sup> Imports from North America totaled £199,629 in 1772 and £164,104 for 1773. Freight earnings, he felt, were £48,000 and £42,113, respectively. Unfortunately, exports to the American colonies were lumped together with those to all “English Dominions.” Hort concluded that the trade of the colonies amounted to £315,677 out of the total English trade for the two years of £526,717, making the American share just about sixty percent of the total. He noted also that this trade “consisted of absolute necessities for the Reception of which Great Britain is not obligated to Preference or Friendship.”<sup>33</sup>

\* \* \*

How were these North American exports initiated? Earlier in the century the dispatch of a cargo to Portugal had resulted largely from the entrepreneurial actions of English merchants in close touch with American suppliers and with demand in Iberia.<sup>34</sup> On their orders colonial correspondents gathered cargoes for Iberia. In time, American entrepreneurs developed connections with Lisbon firms and became familiar with that market. The role of initiator shifted more and more into American hands. By the 1750s American merchants had taken over a significant portion of the decision making in the wheat, flour, and New England fish sectors of the traffic. They acted not just as suppliers of cargoes for English investors but as controllers of it. Philadelphia’s leaders directed the trade in wheat and flour to Lisbon. (See Table 9-1.)

31 TDB, Philadelphia cleared 102 vessels (13,453 tons) to Lisbon in 1772-1773 and had 87 entries from there (10,795); comparison of number of vessels is acceptable, figures for tonnage are not. The *Marcos* data is probably more accurate.

32 Hort and Factory to Walpole, May 6, 1774, contained Walpole to Rochford, May 6, 1774, SPFP 89/77.

33 Ibid. Emphasis mine.

34 Newfoundland was an exception to this rule. That branch of the fishery was based mainly in England, but fish sold in Lisbon still resulted in remittances to England.

On October 5, 1734, Israel Pemberton of Philadelphia wrote Lawrence Williams, a merchant correspondent in London, rejecting part ownership of a vessel in “the London trade.” Then he added: “Pray advise me the Price of Wheat at Lisbon, and if any great Exportation from London to those Parts.”<sup>35</sup> His letter, one of hundreds written by American merchants, sought marketing information for fish, grain, flour, rice, and other goods in Portugal. Comparing Philadelphia data by decade in Table 9-3, one recognizes at once that a consistently high proportion of the vessels going to mainland ports in southern Europe went to the city on the Tagus and that when that trade flourished, more than sixty percent of Philadelphia’s arrivals from that area came in from Lisbon. In fact, for much of this century, Philadelphia’s preferred trading partner was the Portuguese capital.

**TABLE 9-3**  
**Lisbon/Philadelphia Trade by Decade, 1720-1774**

Decade	Philadelphia				Philadelphia				Philadelphia	
	to Main.		from Main.		to Lisbon		from Lisbon		to Lisbon	from Lisbon
	Ves.	Tons	Ves.	Tons	Ves.	Tons	Ves.	Tons	Tons(%)	Tons(%)
1720s	38	2,960	5	330	29	2,250	3	250	76.0	75.8
1730s	219	15,770	110	7,880	135	9,670	64	4,480	61.3	56.9
1740s	127	8,810	128	8,920	114	7,820	106	7,380	88.8	82.7
1750s	154	10,900	208	15,100	107	7,610	135	9,750	69.8	64.6
1760s	359	24,110	328	22,460	252	16,600	207	13,930	68.9	62.0
1770s*	435	31,000	418	30,340	307	22,100	252	17,780	71.3	58.6

Sources: Data are from *AWM*, 1720-1729; *PG*, 1730-1774, with tonnages estimated. \* indicates five years only.

\* \* \*

For the early years, the ability to identify individuals or firms in America doing business with Lisbon merchants is limited. Letter books, waste books, and other records are extant and are very valuable in reconstructing trade patterns, but, preserved by happenstance, no overall view of those shipping goods is available. The Pennsylvania Ship Registry Books provide the names of merchants and others in Philadelphia and elsewhere who owned ships, which are also identifiable in newspaper customs entries.<sup>36</sup> For the years just before the Revolution, they are supplemented by the city’s Tonnage Duty Books, listing the owners or consignees of arriving vessels, 1766-1776. Presuming that vessel owners were shippers of the goods they carried, speculation as to the extent of their investments is possible. Three periodic divisions have been analyzed; 1729-1737, 1750-1755, and 1769-1775. In the first era, the large majority of the shipping involved was owned in the British Isles, which limits information on owners in the trade. In those years the initiative came from English, not American, investors. The second period was one of transition, while the third era saw leadership shift into American hands.

During the first period, only eighteen vessels trading to Lisbon were found in the local registries. They made thirteen entrances from Lisbon and twenty clearances to there. Eight were round voyages. Among

35 Letter to Williams, October 5, 1734, Pemberton, “Letter Book, 1727-1735.”

36 *AWM*, 1729-1737. *PG*, 1729-1737. *PSR*, 1728-1740.

the early Pennsylvania investors, William Allen stands out as part owner of at least three vessels, which made ten voyages to southern Europe, four of them to Lisbon. Joseph Turner owned shares in two vessels with Allen. Alexander Woodrop shared in parts of four vessels that made eight separate voyages, five of them making calls at Lisbon.<sup>37</sup> Daniel Flexney of London held a portion of the *Debby Galley* with three Philadelphians, Isaac Norris, junior and senior, and James Parrock.<sup>38</sup>

Between 1750 and 1755, 197 vessels traded from Philadelphia to and from the south of Europe. The ship registers list 105 vessels that were probably locally owned. They engaged in ninety-three voyages that touched to Lisbon. Forty-seven were round voyages; twenty-five saw clearances only; and twenty-one ships entered in from Lisbon. Customs and registry data for them show that 5,033 registered tons came in from Lisbon and 5,396 tons cleared to there. The ship registries identify 155 owners. Residents on the Delaware shared in 110 of them; twenty-eight came from the British Isles and seven from southern Europe.<sup>39</sup>

A number of the city's vessels plied regular routes. The brig *Shirley* made six Lisbon voyages, 1751-1755. James Pemberton and Thomas Crosby sent their snow *Rachel* there on four voyages. With Abel James they also invested in the brig *Marlborough* and sent her to the Tagus four times as well. John and Joseph Stamper and William Bingham shared in vessels making multiple voyages there.<sup>40</sup> Pennsylvania owners sent vessels carrying 4,220 tons of goods to Lisbon and outside owners 1,176 tons. Local Owners brought home 3,727 tons from there, compared to 1,306 tons by those residing elsewhere.<sup>41</sup>

By the 1750s ownership had become fairly widely distributed. Those holding a share in only one such vessel numbered 162. Thirty-four owned parts of two ships; ten owned portions of three; and only two shares in four. William Blair shared in five of these vessels. Though the sixty-eight ships trading to Lisbon were divided into almost two hundred parts, surprisingly, twenty-five percent of them had a single owner.<sup>42</sup> Six English merchants at Lisbon held shares in Pennsylvania vessels, where none had been found in the earlier period.

At mid-eighteenth century those owning the most tonnage in this traffic were Samuel McCall, Sr. (255 tons), John Erwin (180 tons), John Wilcocks (140 tons), William Griffiths (115 tons), and William Masters and John Rowan (100 tons each), all of Philadelphia. Large holdings represented full ownership of a vessel, usually. Rowan owned the *Dursley Galley* (100 tons) alone, while John Erwin held the *Boyne* (130 tons) and shared in two other ships. Masters owned the ship *Eurydale* (100tons).<sup>43</sup> If the tonnage owned by McCall, Erwin, Wilcocks, and Griffiths, respectively, is converted from registered to measured (actual) tons, an increase of about forty percent, a more accurate picture of shipping investments evolves: McCall (375 tons), Erwin (252 tons), Wilcocks (196 tons), and Griffiths (140 tons). With a valuation of £5 per ton, their investments are disclosed as: McCall £1,785; Erwin £1,260; Wilcocks £980; and Griffiths £805. These were considerable sums to put at risk.<sup>44</sup>

---

37 Ibid.

38 PSR, May 22, 1730.

39 PSR, 1748-1755. *PG*, 1750-1755. Fifteen resided in English ports; thirteen in Ireland; seven in southern Europe; five in the West Indies; three in other colonies, and two at unknown locations.

40 PSR, Snow *Rachel*, November 24, 1750. *PG*, October 17, 1751-November 13, 1755. Brig *Marlborough*, PSR, March 28, 1750; *PG*, October 4, 1750-April 4, 1754. Ship *Halifax*, PSR, November 2, 1749; *PG*, April 19, 1750-October 24, 1751.

41 PSR, 1748-1755; *PG*, 1750-1755.

42 PSR, 1748-1755.

43 PSR, *Dursley Galley*, December 8, 1750; Ship *Swanzey*, March 24, 1755; Ship *Union*, November 29, 1753; Ship *Industry*, March 1, 1749; Ship *Boyne*, April 30, 1750; Ship *Eurydale*, June 27, 1755.

44 John J. McCusker, "Sources of Investment Capital in the Colonial Philadelphia Shipping Industry,"

Most shipping investments in the Lisbon trade involved partnerships among these Philadelphia merchants. Occasionally investors from two or more geographic areas joined forces. Each investor oversaw mercantile operations locally. The ship *Jane* belonged to Charles Mayne and Edward Burn of Lisbon, John Mayne of London, and to her captain William Kelly of Philadelphia.<sup>45</sup> The ship *Union* cleared Philadelphia for Lisbon in 1753. She had two Lisbon owners, John Ayrey & Co. and Thomas Parr, and two Philadelphia shareholders, William Griffiths and her captain Jonathan Crathorne. She went out to Lisbon again in 1757 with tar, pipe staves, and beeswax, consigned to Ayrey. In late February 1758 she brought a salt lading home, then crossed again to the Tagus in August 1758. This time she brought home wine and citrus fruits.<sup>46</sup> Such an investment by Lisbon factory members assured them a source of supply by tying American partners to them. The American investors had greater care taken of their goods and faster dispatch of the vessel. A London firm profited when the proceeds of the Iberian sales were transferred into its hands and by goods purchased and shipped to the overseas partners. Welcome commissions were entered into all of the ledgers.

\* \* \*

A variety of sources exist for the period 1757-1776, including Portuguese and American official records *Com Privilegio Real* and Lisbon customs reports. During the third period covered, 1769-1775, trade between Lisbon and the colonies flourished with a large and relatively steady demand for colonial food. Over these years 1,064 vessels (196,848 tons) entered the Tagus from British America and 894 (151,939 tons) cleared out to the colonies. In addition, 173 vessels from America called at Lisbon and used the *franquia* and proceeded to other ports, paying taxes on small parcels of goods.<sup>47</sup>

Philadelphia enjoyed the lion's share of Lisbon's business. Her merchants were also very active in shipping goods from Quebec, Maryland, and Virginia to there. Philadelphia waxed wealthy in the years pre-1775 in large part from credits accruing from these sales. Though the trade fluctuated through the century by the 1750s Lisbon was attracting, except in wartime, about fifty percent of Philadelphia's exports to Iberia. More than forty percent of the entrances to Lisbon from America in these years, 1769-1775, entered from the Quaker city.<sup>48</sup> Pennsylvania vessels arriving from other American grain centers added seventy ships (12,800 tons) to its totals, raising the full share to about fifty percent.<sup>49</sup>

Lisbon/Philadelphia trade enjoyed phenomenal growth 1769-1774. Ships' histories reveal that the 166 Pennsylvania-registered vessels made 546 voyages between southern Europe and Pennsylvania in those years. Round voyages numbered 299; another 247 crossings went in one direction only (135 cleared

---

*JEH* XXII (1972): 147-148, estimates vessels in service at £5 sterling/ton. Registered tonnage at Philadelphia discounted measured tonnage by about forty percent.

45 PSR, April 2, 1752; April 16, 1752.

46 PSR, November 29, 1753. *PG*, December 6, 1753. *CPR*, January 15, 1758; February 27, 1758; August 8, 1758; September 16, 1758.

47 *CPR*, 1769-1775. "Livros," 1769-1775.

48 See Table 9-1.

49 Lisbon/Philadelphia trade data are not precisely comparable. *PG* and *TDB* should and do coincide quite well on entrances from Lisbon. They do not match figures from *CPR* and the "Livros" Lisbon arrivals because of the elapsed time between Philadelphia clearances and Tagus River arrivals. The same was true of trade Lisbon to America. Missing issues also cause minor difficulties. Recorders of tonnage duties failed to enter point of origin for a considerable number of arrivals. *PC* reports answer those discrepancies. Vessels clearing had already paid tonnage fees.

Philadelphia; 112 entered there).<sup>50</sup> Of these vessels 126 traded in Lisbon markets. They made 320 clearances to there (33,138 tons) and 282 entrances (26,724 tons) from there. Larger vessels had always been employed in this traffic. Now the proportion of topsail vessels was very high, nearly a hundred percent.<sup>51</sup> Ship sizes had also increased considerably. In these peak years, ships sailing for there averaged 144 tons; smaller vessels in the trade about 108 tons each.

Vessels of unknown registry made 243 voyages between southern Europe and Delaware. Of a total of 186 clearances to the eastward, 114 of them went to Lisbon. Of 155 entrances from southern European ports, sixty-eight entered from the Portuguese capital. Lack of local registry suggest they were in the main owned outside of the Delaware region. However, Tonnage Duty Records challenge this belief, disclosing that almost half of those entering (65) had their tonnage duties paid by the vessel's owners. Fourteen more were consigned to their own captains and fifty-five to merchants in the Quaker city. Thus it is possible that half of them had local owners.<sup>52</sup>

Tonnage data from the Ship Register Books, 1769-1774, indicate that increasingly Philadelphia merchants expanded control over the shipping of goods to Lisbon and other Iberian ports. Combining shipowners and merchants paying duties allows a solid analysis of those engaged. Some 192 owners, eighty percent, resided in the Delaware River basin, the very large majority at Philadelphia. An additional forty-nine shareholders were located elsewhere, or their place of residence is unknown.

The twenty most active investors or firms handling this trade controlled more than half of the tonnage engaged in both the overall trade and that with Lisbon. The other 221 owners divided the remainder. The sums invested are significantly greater than during the 1750s. In consequence, partnerships are more common with groups of investors more or less permanently allied rather than joining together temporarily. They shared risks and profits. Alliances very often linked family groups, such as the Penroses, Chevaliers, Fishers, and Pembertons. Investments could be made outside of the family as well as within. Larger investors were connected all but permanently, for example Willing & Morris, Baynton & Wharton, Conyngham & Nesbitt, the Fisher family group and many others.<sup>53</sup> All invested heavily in this trade.

---

50 PSR, 1769-1774. PC, 1769-1775. TDB, 1769-1774.

51 Ships carried 57.25% of the tonnage; brigs and snows, 42.0%. The rest went on fore and aft sloops and schooners.

52 TDB, 1769-1774. PC, 1769-1774. English, Spanish, and Portuguese records of these years reveal that a considerable number of the 283 vessels identified in the trade also made voyages from other North American points to those centers. In all 72 carriers held Pennsylvania registries; 18 were of unknown origin.

53 See Table 9-4.

**TABLE 9-4**  
**Pennsylvania's Southern European and Lisbon Tonnage**  
**Handled by the Twenty Largest Owners, 1769-1774**

Owner	Southern Europe		Lisbon				
	Entered Tons	Cleared Tons	Entered Tons	Cleared Tons			
Willing & Morris	4,436	Willing & Morris	4,998	Thomas Penrose & Co.	1,836	Baynton Wharton Co.	2,661
Baynton Wharton Co.	2,915	Baynton Wharton Co.	3,194	Chevalier Bros.	1,750	Willing & Morris	1,811
Thomas Penrose Co.	2,057	Conyngnam-Nesbitt Co.	2,187	Robert Wain	1,605	Thomas Penrose Co.	1,671
Chevalier Bros.	2,053	John Ross	2,135	Baynton Wharton Co.	1,531	John Warder Co.	1,591
John Ross	2,022	John Warder Co.	1,836	Willing & Morris	1,377	Chevalier Bros.	1,523
Conyngnam-Nesbitt Co.	1,632	Thomas Penrose Co.	1,746	Reese Meredith	1,239	Robert Wain	1,445
Jacob Winey	1,550	Reese Meredith	1,689	John Fisher Co.	954	Jacob Winey	1,315
Reese Meredith	1,543	James Pemberton Co.	1,676	Samuel Carson Co.	922	Conyngnam-Nesbitt	1,240
Robert Wain	1,530	Chevalier Bros.	1,613	William Davis	880	Reese Meredith	1,164
Craig & Morell	1,516	Robert Wain	1,488	John Ross	855	James Pemberton Co.	1,112
James Pemberton Co.	1,372	John Fisher Co.	1,451	James Pemberton Co.	814	Samuel Carson Co.	1,062
Archibald McCall	1,280	Jacob Winey	1,268	Samuel Mifflin	752	Parr & Bulkeley*	980
John Warder Co.	1,262	Craig & Morell	1,260	Jacob Winey	745	William Davis	880
Samuel Mifflin	1,128	Anthony Stocker Co.	1,180	Archibald McCall	720	John Fisher Co.	801
John Fisher Co.	1,106	Samuel Carson Co.	1,162	Robert Whyte	600	Craig & Morell	800
William Davis	1,100	Archibald McCall	1,120	Craig & Morell	600	Archibald McCall	800
Samuel Carson Co.	1,042	Parr & Bulkeley*	1,020	Benjamin Gibbs Co.	504	Anthony Stocker Co.	783
Anthony Stocker Co.	923	William Davis	990	John Warder Co.	500	Samuel Mifflin	782
Benjamin Gibbs Co.	840	Samuel Mifflin	910	Anthony Stocker Co.	495	Shewell Bros.	733
Parr & Bulkeley*	780	Samuel Howell Co.	832	Shewell Bros.	467	John Ross	675

Sources: Data are from PSR in this period and from TDB, 1769-1774. Owners are presumed to have held equal shares in their vessels. Tonnage owned is multiplied by the number of entrances and clearances found in *PG* and TDB. Clearances have been checked against tonnages found in TDB. Tonnages listed in the latter source are usually twenty percent higher than those for the same vessels listed for the tonnage tax, when found in the registers. Registered tonnage has been utilized, except in cases where only the TDB figures are available.

\*   \*   \*

Earlier, organization and dispatch of a cargo to Portugal resulted largely from entrepreneurial actions by English merchants in close touch with North American suppliers and with demand in Iberia. American correspondents acted as agents. Newfoundland was the exception to that rule. Now in large majority it appears that investments were initiated by colonial-based investors. Since almost sixty percent of the American tonnage reaching Lisbon carried grain and flour, it pays to trace such a shipment.

Merchant owners reacted to information current on the Delaware or arriving from overseas and, if Lisbon demand warranted risk of a cargo to that port, the enterprise proceeded. Such a venture required a solid knowledge of Delaware markets and of the dependability of suppliers to assure minimum costs, good quality, and delivery in a timely fashion. Commodities had to be properly packaged; identified by markings; carried aboard; and stowed safely and systematically. Barrels of flour had to be branded and nailed. Wheat and corn had to be gathered into storage ashore, measured, and transported on board. These went directly into the hold, divided by partitions, called "corn rooms," to prevent shifting at sea. Pipe and barrel staves, an awkward cargo to stow, had to be culled, and piled for loading on top of the grain. That helped keep the grain from shifting in the rough Atlantic seas. Mats also stabilized the loose grain, which in turn rested on "dunnage" protecting it from dampness in the bilges. Depending on market requirements, flour might be preferred to wheat. In later years before the Revolution, flour was favored by shippers to Lisbon. Packed

in barrels, it traveled better, avoiding losses suffered by wheat from heat, dampness, and insects.<sup>54</sup> In addition to the organization of the cargo, the crew had to be recruited and their victuals and other necessities purchased and then stowed on board.

Merchants began planning well in advance of a proposed shipping date. It took considerable time to gather a cargo and shipowners demanded rapid loading and dispatch of their vessels. Arthur H. Cole has emphasized the slow pace of mercantile life during the eighteenth century.<sup>55</sup> That was not the case with Philadelphia/Lisbon trading in the late 1760s and early 1770s. The size of Lisbon's demand encouraged rapid dispatch and allowed early planning by merchants. A vessel's charter agreement limited the days for loading and unloading a cargo. Layover times at Philadelphia declined significantly in this period. Lisbon also had a reputation for rapid dispatch. Failure to complete loading or unloading of a ship within the scheduled time resulted in financial penalties for the charterer called "demurrages," high enough to be onerous. In one case, they were set at five pounds sterling per day.<sup>56</sup> Rapid turnarounds at Philadelphia also reduced problems of crew recruitment.

The ship loaded, customs officials were apprised of its contents. Cockets, certificates, and bonds were submitted and verified. The governor's minions produced the required Barbary Pass; and the crew warped the vessel out into the Delaware; dropped the pilot off Lewes; and ship, crew, and cargo set sail for Lisbon. South of Nantucket she caught the northeastward flow of the Gulf Stream and was pushed on by winds from the south-southwest quadrant. As John Reynell wrote: "Vessels keeping to the N'ward at that time of year have the quickest passage."<sup>57</sup> Ships from Philadelphia reached Lisbon in about thirty-seven days.<sup>58</sup>

Consider the ship *Commerce*, Charles Alexander, master, crewed by twelve men, and owned by Thomas Willing, Robert Morris, and John Nixon, all of Philadelphia. Pennsylvania-registered, she was rated at 140 tons carrying capacity, though on voyage in 1771 she loaded 342 tons of wheat. *Commerce* made eight voyages to southern Europe between early 1771 and early 1775. On one, she cleared from Philadelphia on or about July 16, 1772, and raised the Rock of Lisbon on August 19, a passage of thirty-three days. Reaching soundings on the Portuguese coast, she carefully crossed the dangerous bar at the mouth of the Tagus and anchored off Belem Castle, half a league from the city, for customs inspection. Portuguese customs officers stayed aboard at the expense of the cargo owners, costing 300 reis per day each. They levied a tonnage duty, the Marco, based on a vessel's carrying capacity and taxed the *Commerce* at 310 tons.<sup>59</sup>

On this voyage *Commerce* carried a flour cargo to be delivered to Edward Burn & Sons. Assisted by them, she quickly landed her cargo; paid the Portuguese *aduaneiros* their due; and on September 2, two

---

54 A-JL, 100-101. Invoice for goods loaded on the *Agnes and Betty*, John Brome, master, July 3, 1739, Reynell "Letter Book, 1738-1741." Charges included branding and nailing barrels, 20 1/2d. each; measuring wheat 9d. per 100 bushel; portering, measuring, and loading wheat 5/6 per bushel; culling and piling pipe staves, 2/6 per 1,000.

55 Arthur H. Cole, "The Tempo of Mercantile Life in Colonial America." *Business History Review* XXXIII: 277-299.

56 Instructions to Captain David Stewart, brig *Nancy*, May 6, 1757, Willing "Letter Book."

57 Letter to Flexney, June 8, 1743, Reynell "Letter Book, 1741-1744."

58 *CPR*, 1757-1776, refers to 276 voyages from Philadelphia to Lisbon. The average crossing took 37.4 days.

59 PSR, July 9, 1771. Miller's report on shipping to Barcelona, October 1, 1770-March 31, 1771, SPFS 94/193. *CPR*, August 11, 1772, entrance; September 2, 1772, clearance. Board of Trade to Shelburne, Report on Anglo-Portuguese Trade Problems, March 10, 1767, SPFP 89/64. Three customs guards cost £2.5 sterling per day. "Livros," August 1772. Clarke, *Letters Concerning Spanish Nation*, 354.



weeks after her arrival, set sail for home. She crossed the bar with ease, carrying only ballast. The full value of her cargo, less commissions and port charges, had been left for transferal to England. Captain Alexander brought his vessel in on October 28, 1772, having made the round voyage in about 103 days.<sup>60</sup> Willing, Morris, and Nixon had already gathered a new flour lading and, two weeks later, the *Commerce* sailed again for Lisbon under a new master, Alexander Henderson. She went to the same consignees, made the passage in twenty-eight days, and then cleared from Lisbon in sixteen. She again returned in ballast, leaving her proceeds in the hands of the Burn family for remittance to London.<sup>61</sup>

The costs to purchase, transport, and sell these cargoes in Portugal can be broadly estimated. The tonnage utilization ratio of vessels carrying goods to southern Europe from Philadelphia in 1772 was about 1.9 tons of cargo for each declared ton of shipping. Registered at 140 tons, *Commerce* could have carried 266 tons of flour on each voyage.<sup>62</sup> A ton of flour equaled 11.48 barrels, making a cargo total of 3,054 barrels. Flour sold for 14.4 shillings per barrel at Philadelphia and 25 shillings per barrel at Lisbon, both sterling. Philadelphia first costs then equaled £2,199. Add £763.5 for freight at five shillings a barrel; £66 for cargo insurance (3%); and £110 (5%) for other port costs, cargo damaged, loading and unloading, and the flour represented expenditures of £3,138.5 sterling. Flour paid no duty in Portugal. Burn & Sons' commissions added £190.9 (5%) and total costs reached £3,329.4. Sales brought £3,817.5, leaving a profit of £488 on this venture. Since the *Commerce* went home in ballast both times, crew costs should be entered against this balance, but if Willing & Morris freighted their own ship, freight earnings, less costs, would have meant further income for the partners. As both voyages were essentially the same, profits from their cargoes could have risen to more than £976.

Table 9-4 presents a list of the firms investing in this sector of Philadelphia's trade, 1769-1774. Most prominent among them was the partnership of Thomas Willing and Robert Morris, widely recognized for its enormous success. Morris had arrived in Philadelphia from Liverpool in 1754 at the age of twenty and took a position with the merchant house of Charles and Thomas Willing. On the eve of the Revolution, he and his now partner Thomas Willing were wealthy men, their fortunes amassed from a variety of enterprises, not the least of which was investment in Iberian trade. Over these six years Willing & Morris led the field of speculators in this business. They were very active participants in its Lisbon branch. Their vessels often returned indirectly from the Tagus.<sup>63</sup>

Between 1766 and 1775 sixteen vessels, fully or partially owned by Willing & Morris, trafficked with southern Europe, making fifty-six voyages to ports in Iberia, the Wine Islands, and up the Straits. Sixteen of them entered Philadelphia from Lisbon (1,377 tons) and twenty-one cleared there (1,811 tons). Another six ships had been consigned to them at Philadelphia for purchase or disposal of cargoes. Peak years for clearances occurred in 1769 (fourteen) and 1773 (eleven).<sup>64</sup> Scattered Iberian port statistics indicate that Willing & Morris vessels engaged in at least sixteen other voyages from North American ports outside the Delaware region.<sup>65</sup> Lisbon and Barcelona data show that sixteen out of a total of forty-four of their vessels came home to Philadelphia in ballast. The firm in these years sent eight vessels to the Wine Islands and

---

60 *PG*, October 28, 1772. *CPR*, August 19, 1772, entered; cleared in ballast, September 2, 1772.

61 *PG*, November 11, 1772. *CPR*, December 5, 1772; December 21, 1772.

62 CO 16/1, Philadelphia's exports to southern Europe converted into tons, in relation to the tonnage of this vessel.

63 See footnote for Table 9-6. Letter to Bacon, April 12, 1757, Willing "Letter Book," referred to Morris becoming a partner on May 1, 1757.

64 Presumably consignees disposed of arriving cargoes and arranged for those clearing to southern Europe.

65 *CPR*, 1766-1775. Consular Report on English Shipping to Barcelona, SPFS 94/193.

entered nine ships from there.<sup>66</sup> As the Iberian grain trade expanded the firm shifted more emphasis to that area than had been the case during the middle 1760s.

Willing & Morris employed twenty-three different captains, who took their commands on eighty-eight voyages to the south of Europe. Twenty-nine voyages touched at Lisbon. Several of them proved dependable and highly prized masters. Captain John Green commanded three of the firm's vessels, 1768-1775, *Stirling*, *Nesbitt*, and *Pomona*. He crossed to southern Europe twenty-two times, to the Tagus six. John Wilson served the firm for almost ten years, on the *George*, *Patty*, and *Stirling*, on sixteen voyages, seven to Lisbon. Ralph Davis notes that captains contracted for each voyage. Between voyages they received half pay for homeport layovers. Willing & Morris vessels made relatively rapid turnarounds at Philadelphia, keeping those costs to a minimum.<sup>67</sup>

**TABLE 9-5**  
**Philadelphia/Southern European Trading**  
**Willing and Morris, 1766-1775**

Vessel (Type)	% Owned	Reg. Tons	Voys. No.	Southern Europe				Lisbon				In Empty
				In		Out		In		Out		
				Ves.	Tons	Ves.	Tons	Ves.	Tons	Ves.	Tons	
Britannia (sh)	All	270	3	2	540	3	810	1	270	1	270	1
Chester (sh)	All	130	6	6	780	4	520	2	260	1	130	2
Commerce (sh)	2/3	140	7	7	653	5	467	2	187	3	280	2
Crawford (sh)	2/3	200	6	3	400	6	800	--	--	--	--	--
George (br)	2/3	70	8	8	376	6	280	6	280	6	280	3
Hope (sh)	2/3	100	3	1	67	2	133	--	--	2	133	--
Maria (sh)	All	140	1	1	140	1	140	--	--	--	--	--
Molly (sh)	60	160	1	1	96	1	96	--	--	--	--	--
Nancy (br) <sup>a</sup>	All	70	1	--	--	1	70	--	--	--	--	--
Nesbitt (sh)	50	100	9	8	400	6	300	4	200	3	150	3
Patty (br) <sup>a</sup>	All	98	4	3	294	4	392	--	--	1	98	--
Pomona (sh)	3/4	200	1	--	--	1	150	--	--	1	150	--
Recovery (br)	All	80	1	1	80	1	80	--	--	--	--	--
Stirling (sn) <sup>a</sup>	All	120	3	1	120	3	360	--	--	--	--	--
Tiger (sh)	All	180	1	1	180	1	180	1	180	1	180	--
Thomas & Robert (sh)	All	150	1	1	150	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Consigned Vessels												
Kitty (br)	--	90	1	1	90	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Lovely Betsey (br)	--	70	1	1	70	1	70	--	--	1	70	--
Nancy (br)	--	80	1	--	--	1	80	--	--	--	--	--
Two James (br)	--	90	1	--	--	1	70	--	--	1	70	--
Totals			60	46	4436	48	4998	16	1377	21	1811	11

Sources: PSR, TDB, *PG*, *CPR*, 1766-1775. <sup>a</sup> signifies tonnage is from TDB.

*Com Privilegio Real* provides the names of firms to which Willing & Morris directed their ships. They apparently had no fixed allegiance to one merchant house there, though Paul George received ten cargoes by the brig *George*. No other of their ships went consigned to him. Other cargoes went to Edward Burn & Sons (six), Mayne & Co. (five), and to Pasley Brothers (two), but only one to the leading Lisbon firm, Parr & Bulkeley.

\* \* \*

66 Six vessels entered from Madeira and five cleared to there. The remainder traded to Tenerife.

67 *PG* and *CPR*, 1766-1776. Davis, *Rise of English Shipping*, 128.

A total of 254 vessels carried goods from Pennsylvania to Lisbon, 1771-1776. They went consigned to twenty-four business houses there. Parr & Bulkeley was far and away Lisbon's premier firm, receiving 103 ½ Philadelphia cargoes. A distant second was Berthon & Irmaos, taking twenty-six shipments; then Robert and John Pasley (twenty-three); and Edward Burn & Son (twenty-three). These four firms disposed of almost seventy percent of the Pennsylvania goods arriving, with Parr & Bulkeley, alone, acting for forty percent of them. Parr & Bulkeley in 1772 boasted of their ability to manipulate flour prices at Lisbon.<sup>68</sup>

Immersed in a foreign culture, English and Irish merchants in Iberia existed in an uncertain environment. Diplomatic and commercial ties between England and Portugal mitigated the natural hostility toward foreign merchants at Lisbon, in sharp contrast to the antipathy evident for most of this century between England and Spain. Yet, even in Portugal tension remained because of the commercial arrangements endorsed by treaty, which guaranteed the English a dominant position in trade.

Factory members overseas at Lisbon and elsewhere resided on a temporary basis and normally expected to return home eventually. The corporate relationships of English factory members at Lisbon fluctuated over time. Alliances formed in one generation gave way as partners aged or retired. A major figure among English merchants about the turn of the century was William Browne. The Lisbon factory at that time contained ten or twelve important English houses, including the firm of Milner, Bulreel & Baudowin, which acted for William Pepperrell's fish sales there. In late 1709 members of the factory forwarded a "representation" to London, complaining of the hardships they suffered. Thirty-nine names affixed to this petition included those of William Browne, James Bulreel, and John Milner. The latter held the post of Consul General in Portugal.<sup>69</sup>

By 1727 the Pepperrells employed as agents there Gibbs, Lewen & Potter. The 1709 petition had also been signed by Henry Gibbs and Charles Lewen. Because of the amicable relations between England and Portugal the English mercantile community at Lisbon was comparatively sedentary and English merchants in the Viana/Oporto community were also relatively long-term resident businessmen.<sup>70</sup> In Spain wars and rumors of war forced English merchants to leave from time to time, creating much more mobility than was the case in Portugal.

David Barclay, an important London merchant in the 1730s and 1740s, carried on an active correspondence with Israel Pemberton of Philadelphia during those years. Pemberton purchased wheat on orders from Barclay, who specified the price he was willing to pay and set limits on what he was willing to pay for freight. In early summer 1733, Pemberton shipped 1,500 bushels of wheat to Lisbon consigned to Edward Maine [sic] & Co. Another active factory member at the time was John Ayrey.<sup>71</sup>

John Reynell of Philadelphia acted as agent for another Londoner, Daniel Flexney. In 1740, during the period of desperate need in Portugal, Reynell bought two separate shipments of wheat for Flexney. One, 2,270 bushels, went on the brig *Ranger*, Thomas Brye, master, and was valued at £361.9. A second lading, on the brig *Dolphin*, George Barracote, was invoiced to Flexney at £397.15 Both were consigned to William Leybourne & Co. at Lisbon. On sale they probably brought more than £1,000. Shortly, however, Leybourne notified Reynell that they wanted no more half loads of wheat but would require that whole cargoes be sent

---

68 *CPR*, 1771-1776. Doerflinger, *Vigorous Spirit*, 109.

69 Francis, *Methuens*, 60. British Museum, Additional Mss. 23726, folio 25. Fairchild, *Pepperrells*, 42. "Representations from the Portugal Merchants," November 23, 1709, SPFP 89/89. Tolles, *Meeting House*, 87.

70 Fairchild, *Pepperrells*, 103-105. Gerald Cobb, *Oporto Older and Newer* (Chichester, Eng., 1965), 72-81.

71 Letters to Barclay, February 14, 1732; June 1, 1733, Pemberton "Letter Book, 1727-1735."

them and the vessel consigned to them.<sup>72</sup> Soon, with the government embargo, the wheat trade to Lisbon collapsed and Flexney was reduced to sending a cargo of pipe and barrel staves to Leybourne, valued at £201.55.<sup>73</sup> By early summer of 1747 Leybourne & Co. had become Leybourne & Stubbs and by 1753 had metamorphosed into Stubbs & Taylor.<sup>74</sup>

Merchant houses established themselves and their credibility by introductions through third parties, who recommended them to their own clientele. Letters also provided connections, such as that addressed to Thomas Hancock of Boston by Thomas Horne & Co. of Lisbon.

27th May 1754

Sir,

The freindship subsisting between this house & Mr. Hungerford Spooner of London, who has promised to write you in our behalf, Occasions our Taking the Liberty of mak'g You a tender of our best Services in these parts under the assurance of y'r Commands being Executed with strict honour & punctuality.

Horne then emphasized his familiarity with the Lisbon fish market, indicating current fish prices and the supply at hand, as well as prices of Lisbon wine, salt, and fruit.<sup>75</sup>

Others hoping to establish themselves as Lisbon agents might visit the colonies personally, as did Charles O'Neil in 1765, carrying with him letters of introduction from colonial merchants in one city on to those in the next.<sup>76</sup> Keys to success were honest dealing; rapid dispatch of the vessels consigned to one's care; knowledge of the market; simple sagacity; and skill at personal relationships.

By the early 1750s the merchant leaders who would dominate the Lisbon market for American produce for the next generation were solidly positioned there. Edward Mayne's firm had been handed on to his heirs, Charles and John Mayne, and by 1752 they had combined with Edward Burn to form Mayne, Burn & Mayne. Charles Mayne and Edward Burn managed the business at Lisbon, while John Mayne set up residence in London.<sup>77</sup> Thomas Parr had begun his six-year apprenticeship to the firm of John Ayrey & Co. as early as 1734. John Bulkeley, founder of the house of Bulkeley, was well established at Lisbon, marrying there in 1752. In the mid-1750s Parr and Bulkeley joined in a long-term partnership, which would enjoy a phenomenal success. John Parminter, a middle level merchant married there in 1747 and shortly allied himself with John Montgomery. Edward Brome and Christopher Hake, Jr. were well enough established in 1752 to vote for the new Judge Conservator. A number of these firms invested in shares of Philadelphia-registered vessels in 1752 and 1753. John Ayrey & Co., with Thomas Parr, purchased part of the ship *Union* and Ayrey also invested in the snow *Charming Jenny*. Mayne, Burn & Mayne owned part of the ship *Jane*.<sup>78</sup>

In the late eighteenth century, the center of Lisbon was located between Santos and São Paulo and the Cais do Sodré. Many English merchants had warehouses and shops along the Rua São Paulo, Rua das

---

72 Letters to Flexney, May 23, 1740; May 31, 1740; June 13, 1740; July 14, 1740; October 10, 1740, Reynell "Letter Book, 1738-1741."

73 Letters to Leybourne & Co., August 13, 1742; August 21, 1742, Reynell "Letter Book, 1741-1744."

74 Letter to Leybourne & Stubbs, June 17, 1746, Israel Pemberton "Letter Book, 1744-1747," American Philosophical Library, Philadelphia. Letter to Stubbs & Taylor, October 26, 1753, Reynell "Letter Book, 1752-1754."

75 Horne to Hancock, May 27, 1754, Thomas Hancock "Papers," VII, BL.

76 Letter to Carter & Wentworth, August 12, 1765, Lloyd "Letter Book."

77 *Report of the Historical Association (Lisbon Branch)*, I (1937-1945): 162-166. PSR, April 2, 1752.

78 Walford, *British Factory*, 43-45. PSR, November 29, 1753; April 2, 1752; April 9, 1752.

Flores, Rua do Alecrim, Rua dos Ourioes, and the Rua dos Fanqueiros. The headquarters of Parr & Bulkeley were in the Rua do Alecrim.<sup>79</sup>

Following Lisbon's disastrous earthquake in 1755, the Portuguese government levied a special four-percent duty to assist in rebuilding the city and specifically the Customs House. Factory members protested this innovation bitterly as a breach of the treaty agreements.<sup>80</sup> Increasing tensions between English merchants there and the Portuguese government under the brilliant Marquês de Pombal continued to impact business at the port over the years 1750 through 1778. A variety of tensions, real or fancied, contrasted with the relatively irenic relations of earlier days as Pombal's efforts to reform commercial life led to confrontations with the merchant community.

Nevertheless, the Lisbon factory continued to prosper. Members complained vociferously to their officials in Portugal and to those at home in England; they submitted depositions to the Crown insisting that their treaty rights had been transgressed. In 1768 twenty-five factory members petitioned for redress of their grievances. They included representatives of the Mayne, Horne, Parr, and Hake families and those of newer firms such as Peter Garnault, David Parry, and William Lucas.<sup>81</sup> Despite constant complaints, merchants involved in the American trade enjoyed extraordinary prosperity, especially after grain imports from England all but stopped.

The *CPR* records disclose the extent of this traffic and involvement in it of competing members of the factory.<sup>82</sup> See Table 9-6. The mobility of merchants complicated matters, as they shifted from one partnership to another. As seen, Edward Mayne had established himself as a Lisbon agent in 1733, by the 1750s his heirs had taken Edward Burn in as a partner. Burn died in 1755 and the company continued as Mayne & Co. By early 1771 two firms appear as Mayne & Co. and Edward Burn & Sons. At about the same time Parminter & Montgomery parted ways and emerged in 1773 as John Montgomery and Daniel Parminter. Some divisions evidently occurred when heirs replaced originally amicable partners. In other cases, individuals joined in only temporary alliances. This seems to have been the case with a firm headed by one Morrogh (Murray?), who handled rice shipments in the 1750s. In 1770 Andrew and Patrick Murrogh took consignment of a rice cargo. Galloway & Murrogh disposed of two rice cargoes in the mid-1770s and then two more Carolina shipments came to a firm entitled Murrogh, Irmaos & Sons. these changes probably involved two generations of Murroghs but demonstrate the problem of following the fortunes of merchant families.<sup>83</sup>

---

79 Walford, *British Factory*, 16.

80 *Ibid.*, 59-60.

81 Lyttleton to Shelburne, October 3, 1768; Hort to Shelburne, October 8, 1768, SPFP 89/66. Depositions, November 29, 1764; November 30, 1764, Correspondence of the Board of Trade, CO 388/53.

82 *CPR*, 1757-1776. Seven cargoes were delivered to unknown firms and one disposed of by its captain. Two rice cargoes also came to unknown consignees. Lumber products, mainly staves, entered as incidental added imports with other goods.

83 *CPR*, 1757-1776. Letter to Mayne, Burn & Mayne, August 5, 1755, Willing "Letter Book," expressed condolences at news of the death of Edward Burn. Matters are further complicated by various spellings of Burn (Burne, Burns) or Murrogh (Murray, Morrogh, Morrow).

**TABLE 9-6**  
**Major Consignees of North American Cargoes Entering Lisbon, 1757-1776**

Firm	Grain	Nfdld	Fish NEng.	Other	Rice	Totals
Parr and Bulkeley	158	21	--	--	6	185
Christopher Hake & Co.	--	77	5	2	--	84
Mayne & Co.	40	36	1	--	6	83
Robert & John Pasley	58	8	--	--	16.5	82.5
Edward Brome	--	10	62	--	--	72
Paul Berthon	45	3	--	--	7	55
(Berthon & Irmaos)						
Mayne, Burn & Mayne <sup>1</sup>	6	7.5	5	--	31	49.5
White, Houston & Hill	--	3	36	--	4	43
(James Houston)						
Edward Burn & Sons	34	--	--	--	--	34
Jackson, Branfill, Goddard & Hudson	--	23	1	2	1	27
Parminter & Montgomery <sup>2</sup>	--	22	1	--	1	24
Connell & Maroney	4	5	--	--	14	23
Thomas Horne & Co.	17	--	--	3	2	22
(Horne & Sill)						
Peter Garnault's Sons	10.5	9	--	1		20.5
John French	16	--	--	--	3	19
Roche & Arthur	--	8.5	6	--	2	16.5
John Montgomery	--	16	--	--	1	17
Nicholas Connolly	14	--	--	--	2.5	16.5
(Bandeira & Connolly)						
Raymond & Dea	15	--	--	--	--	15
Paul George	14	--	--	--	--	14
Miscellaneous	<u>75.5</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>--</u>	<u>31</u>	<u>137.5</u>
Totals	507	274	123	8	128	1,040

Source: These data come from reports of entrances in the *CPR*, 1757-1759, 1762-1763, 1771-1776. <sup>1</sup> Mayne, Burn & Mayne divided into Mayne & Co. and Edward Burn & Sons in 1771. <sup>2</sup> The firm Parminter & Montgomery stopped handling cargoes in 1772 and was replaced by firms operated by John Montgomery and by Daniel Parminter.

\* \* \*

The firm founded by Thomas Parr and John Bulkeley became far and away the leading entrepreneurial entity in Lisbon's trade with North America, 1757-1776. The grain trade subsumed the vast majority of its efforts. During the 1770s the partners also dabbled in the Newfoundland fish trade and in rice imports, perhaps as a result of an oversupply problem in the grain and flour business. Of twenty-seven fish and rice cargoes consigned them, twenty entered the city between 1774 and 1776. Over this whole period Parr & Bulkeley handled 185 of the 1,040 vessels from British North America, more than double the business of other firms. Their injudicious letter to Keppelle & Steinmetz in 1772, boasting of their ability to manipulate

the Lisbon flour market, reflects an arrogance arising from their leadership position. Between 1771 and 1776, Parr & Bulkeley received 144 grain and flour cargoes from North America, about thirty percent of the business. Along with the next four ranking houses, Robert & John Pasley, Berthon & Irmaos, Mayne & Co., and Edward Burn & Sons, they controlled about two-thirds of the American grain imports. The remainder came assigned to thirty-three other firms.<sup>84</sup>

Newfoundland fish dominated the Lisbon market for American *bacalhau*, which in the 1770s consumed about 65,000 quintals per year, arriving on board approximately forty vessels. Newfoundland fish answered seventy percent of the demand; New Englanders the remainder. Merchants importing fish conceded the leadership position to a firm suitably named, Christopher Hake & Co. Ninety percent of the ships consigned to them came from *Terra Nova*. Hake & Co. did not hold the kind of monopoly position that Parr & Bulkeley did over grain and flour sales.<sup>85</sup> During the war years, 1757-1763, Edward Brome held the lead in importing New England fish, handling sixty-two entering ships, along with ten from Newfoundland. By the 1770s, however, Christopher Hake led the field. The firm of White, Houston & Hill replaced Brome in attracting cargoes from Salem and Boston.

Carolina rice shipments came to Lisbon consumers mainly through three English resident firms, Mayne, Burn & Mayne (31), Robert & John Pasley (16.5), and Connell & Moroney (14). Together they received almost half the rice entering. Mayne took charge of more than half the cargoes entering before 1763. The Pasleys replaced them in the next decade but did not attain as high a market share as had the Maynes earlier.

Market specialization in the mercantile world of the late eighteenth century became an increasingly common business strategy. A survey of the *Com Privilegio Real* data, 1771-1776, discloses how effectively Parr & Bulkeley had employed this approach so that over these six years they drew twice as many American cargoes to their warehouses in Lisbon as did their closest competitors, Mayne & Co. Third in ranking was the house operated by the Pasleys, with Garnault, Burn, and Hake companies as also-rans. If we extend our view to include consignments arriving at Lisbon from northern Europe and the Mediterranean basin the picture changes. Because of close contacts with North Sea and Baltic shippers, as well as with Britain over these years, the Maynes handled more total cargoes than did Parr & Bulkeley.<sup>86</sup> The latter's heavy dependence on North American trade meant that the onrush of events in the colonies collapsed that business in 1775-1776, forcing them to face a difficult period of repositioning. Many firms faced that difficulty but the Maynes, by expanding their other involvements just before the Revolution, adapted to those changes more successfully than did the others.

*Com Privilegio Real* identifies fifty-seven Lisbon firms or individuals who received 1,016 American cargoes; another twenty-one shipments went to unidentified consignees; and three were consigned to ship captains. In large majority these were English-owned firms. Their names appear on petitions directed to London or they are otherwise recognizable as loyal English subjects. A dozen or more appear to have been of Irish extraction. The extent to which English merchants engrossed the trade with Britain and the colonies is underlined by limited consignments to Portuguese houses. Only six individuals receiving cargoes appear to be native citizens, and two firms apparently had Portuguese partners. One, Berthon & Irmaos, actively imported from America. Bonifaz Irmaos and his English partner John Berthon disposed of fifty-three

---

84 See Table 9-7.

85 Newfoundland sent about 44,200 quintals of cod to Lisbon; New England 19,500. Hort to Walpole, May 6, 1774; June 6, 1774 and enclosures, SPFP 89/77.

86 *CPR*, 1771-1776. In these years Parr & Bulkeley handled 225.5 cargoes; Maynes 245 cargoes; Pasleys, 134; Garnaults, 89.5; Hake 81; Burn 75. Those from North America were Parr & Bulkeley 76.5%; Hake 66.7%; Pasleys 58.2%; Burn 42.6%, Maynes 36%; and Garnaults 22.9%.





## CHAPTER X

### CAROLINA RICE AND SOUTHERN EUROPE, 1700-1774

American rice was a marketable commodity in the Atlantic community; not an English staple; only small amounts were consumed there; a much larger demand existed in Holland and Germany.<sup>1</sup> A secondary consumption area existed in Iberia and the western Mediterranean. English North America answered its own needs and helped feed slave populations in the West Indies.<sup>2</sup> Until the late 1600s European consumers depended on two major rice production areas in the Mediterranean region. At first, Turkish sources in Egypt supplied them. Then, rice cultivation took root in the plains of Lombardy and became a major cash crop in the Po River valley. Rice cultivation also developed in Spanish Aragon and Valencia. Valencia alone produced 22,500 tons of rice in 1753, about two-thirds of which was exported.<sup>3</sup>

Introduction of rice as a staple in North America occurred in the 1680s, as the new Carolina colony sought economic viability. Rice growing there had been suggested as an option as early as 1666. It had its origin in the Indian Ocean. Conflicting accounts assign it to Madagascar or via the British East India Company. Others credit African familiarity with rice-growing techniques. Production for export dates at least to 1684. As early as 1691 Carolina authorities patented a machine to husk rice. Exports had been solidly established by 1700.<sup>4</sup>

Initially the colony's rice went to market through North American shippers. At least three hundred tons of rice went to England in 1700 and another thirty tons to the West Indies. Colonial proprietors assured buyers it was "better than any foreign rice by at least eight shillings the hundred-weight."<sup>5</sup> A few years later John Oldmixon described it as "the best Rice in the known World, which is a good Commodity for returns Home," suggesting an awareness of the Iberian market.<sup>6</sup>

Planting and marketing techniques were acquired over time. Separation of husks from the grain proved a major obstacle. A slave with a mortar and pestle cleaned four to six pecks per day and knowledgeable observers reckoned each slave produced four or five barrels of rice weighing about 500 pounds annually.<sup>7</sup> Rice cultivation extended along the rivers of the Carolina low country. Tidal action of the Waccamaw,

---

1 Beer, *Commercial Policy*, 54. France required an import license.

2 United States, Bureau of the Census, *Historical Statistics of the United States, Colonial Times to 1970*, 2 parts (Washington, D.C., 1975), 486-492, 1193. Kenneth Morgan, "The Organization of the Colonial Rice Trade," *WMQ* LII (1995): 433-452.

3 Townshend, *Journey through Spain*, III: 236. Canga Arguelles, *Diccionario*, I: 234-235. Angel Ruiz y Pablo, *Historia de la Real Junta Particular de Comercia de Barcelona, 1758-1847* (Barcelona, 1919), 127-128. In the eighteenth century rice cultivation was halted in Aragon as deleterious to the rice growers.

4 Robert Horne, "A brief description of the province of Carolina," in Alexander S., Salley, ed., *Narratives of Early Carolina, 1650-1708* (New York, 1911), 69. Macpherson, *Annals*, II: 723-724. Peter A. Coclanis, "Distant Thunder: The Creation of a World Market in Rice and the Transformation It Wrought," *AHR* 98 (1993): 1056. Peter H. Wood, *Black Majority: Negroes in Colonial South Carolina* (New York, 1974), 35-36.

5 Nettels, *Money Supply*, 113-114. Duncan C. Heyward, *Seed from Madagascar* (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1937), 7.

6 John Oldmixon from the "History of the British Empire in America," in Salley, *Narratives of Carolina*, 369. R.C. Nash, "South Carolina and the Atlantic Economy in the Late Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries," *EHR* XLV (1992): 677-702.

7 Leila Sellers, *Charleston Business on the Eve of the American Revolution* (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1934), 151. Heyward, *Seed from Madagascar*, 4. Macpherson, *Annals*, II: 723-724.

Pedee, Black, and Santee rivers allowed planters to flood their fields at high tide and drain them at low tide, as they wished. Intensive labor built levees along the rivers to prevent flooding by sea water. Though Georgetown, South Carolina was closer to the rice plantations, its harbor took only shallow draught vessels, thus most of the crop going out overseas had to be ferried along the shallow river network, up to sixty-five miles, to Charleston. Even there the size of vessels was limited by a sand bar.

Rice growers faced a number of serious risks. Destructive hurricanes ranged along the eastern coast. High tides burst levees, heavily damaging the paddies with salt. In October 1762 a South Carolina writer commented: "Our immense Crop of Rice may now be said to be secure, the hurricane Season being passed off in very moderate Weather."<sup>8</sup> The crop could also be reduced by droughts and by rice birds eating the mature grain in the fall.

Rice production in South Carolina had expanded and offered even greater potential for growth by the first years of the eighteenth century. Those expectations were frustrated because an English merchant had failed to find a rice cargo at Charleston. His captain reported that others had taken the rice directly to Portugal. To vent his frustrations the owner introduced a bill into Parliament, calling for enumeration of rice on the grounds "that carrying rice directly to Portugal was a prejudice to the trade of England."<sup>9</sup> Thus, the "Disappointment of a private individual became the cause of rice being made an enumerated article," which now had to pass through England to reach a European market.<sup>10</sup> Support for enumeration by English wheat exporters shipping to Iberia may also have pushed this legislation.

Rice was enumerated in 1704 and a prohibitive duty placed on its English consumption. When reexported, fifty percent of the duty was returned as a drawback. Sir Joshua Gee believed that this step caused "a vast loss to the nation."<sup>11</sup> By raising the shipping costs of rice as much as fifty percent, it seriously limited its cultivation in the Carolinas and closed Iberian outlets to it. The duties charged, plus expenses to ship and insure the rice between England and southern Europe, added to expensive port charges in England, were a prohibitive burden. As a result it could no longer compete in Iberia against Egyptian and Italian rice. The rice export trade, Gee wrote, was not "one third part of what it might have been," adding that if the "gentleman who brought in that clause had understood the nature and circulation of trade, he would then have known, that it is much more the interest of the English merchant to see his rice in Portugal, and have the money remitted hence..."<sup>12</sup> Indirect shipments to Iberia could only compete when Mediterranean crops failed. Enumeration forced almost all American rice exports into northern European markets, resulting in lower prices and less profitability. Protests against the rice regulations began soon after news of the law reached Charleston, seconded by English merchants who previously carried about twenty percent of the colonial rice to Portuguese centers.<sup>13</sup>

Smuggling of bulk goods, such as rice, is rarely worth the effort and risk involved. Smugglers concentrate on valuable, not bulky, cargoes. Some evasions of the enumeration regulations did occur. The rice shipper had to give bond to guarantee its discharge in an English port. In one case rice went first to

---

8 PG, November 4, 1762.

9 Gee, *Trade and Navigation*, 21-22.

10 Champion, *Considerations on Situation of Great Britain*, 105-106. C. Robert Haywood, "Mercantilism and South Carolina Agriculture, 1700-1763," *South Carolina Historical Magazine* LX (1959): 15-27.

11 Gee, *Trade and Navigation*, 22.

12 Ibid. Morgan, "Colonial Rice Trade," 438-440. Changes to regulations in 1764-1765 allowed reexportation without unloading and reloading the rice, cutting costs and speeding the process. For Italian rice production and competition, see Nash, "South Carolina and Atlantic Economy," 682-686. Gee, *Trade and Navigation*, 22.

13 Ashley, *Surveys Historic and Economic*, 316.

Rhode Island, was landed, the bond canceled, and then reshipped to Portugal. This scheme was reported to the Board of Trade in 1708. Again two Carolina sloops took rice, pitch, and tar to the Bahamas and landed it as authenticated by a false certificate, then carried it on to a “great markett” at Madeira.<sup>14</sup> Thomas Riche of Philadelphia, who evaded duties whenever possible, sent rice to Lisbon in 1765 on his schooner *Young Nancy*, packing it in flour barrels. Parr & Bulkeley were instructed to land it and “save the duty.”<sup>15</sup> Riche avoided paying both English and Portuguese customs fees. In 1766 an English consul reported an illicit trade. Rice went direct from Boston and New York to Hamburg with tea sent back to America. Thus, some rice smuggling did occur.<sup>16</sup>

Attempts to recall the law limiting rice sales began as early as 1711, when members of the Oporto factory presented “a humble Representation to the Crown calling for a return to direct trade in rice from America.”<sup>17</sup> Four years later the Lisbon factory addressed the issue to the Board of Trade and Plantations:

whereas the Italians doe carry on a very considerable Trade by importing Rice into this Kingdom, there being Six Thousand Tunn Spent in the port of Lisbon yearly, we humbly conceive this trade might in a great measure be brought over to the British merchants if Rice were imported directly from Carolina that Rice being much better than the Italian.<sup>18</sup>

They claimed also that, since fish and wheat could enter direct from America, rice and other commodities should also be allowed, which would assist those trading with the Carolinas to make returns. They added: “we are fully persuaded that if his Majesty is pleased to grant this liberty, that in a few years we should gain the greatest part if not the whole Rice trade and drive the Italians out of it.”<sup>19</sup> Their petition had no immediate effect. During the 1720s Joshua Gee added his considerable influence to these arguments again, emphasizing that rice sales would offer an easier means of remitting funds to cover Carolina’s purchases in England.

South Carolina’s colonial agent Joseph Boone appeared before the Board of Trade in 1721 and cited the inability of American rice to gain a foothold in southern Europe, calling for permission to ship it directly. Though supported by merchants trading to southern Europe and South Carolina, the Board evinced little interest. In 1727 the Collector of Customs at Bermuda endorsed this idea with no result. Some sympathy with the rice growers’ complaints emerged in 1728 and, at last, in 1729 some movement occurred. Finally, in the following year, Parliament grudgingly allowed direct shipments south of Cape Finisterre in northwest Spain, where supplies from the Mediterranean could not undersell American rice.<sup>20</sup> English

---

14 Oliver M. Dickerson, *American Colonial Government, 1696-1765: A Study of the Board of Trade* (Cleveland, Ohio, 1912), 296n. Andrews, *Colonial Period*, IV: 95-96. Harper, *Navigation Laws*, 262. Robert Quary, “Report on New England Commerce, 1708,” *Proceedings of MHS*, 2nd ser., IV (1888): 154. Quary was a Vice Admiralty judge at Philadelphia and then surveyor of the customs.

15 Letter to Parr & Bulkeley, April 8, 1765, Riche “Letter Book, 1764-1771.”

16 Woodford to Grafton, February 13, 1766, Correspondence of the Board of Trade, CO 388/53. Dickerson, *American Colonial Government*, 67, 296n, argues that this was rarely the case.

17 “A Humble Representation of the Oporto Factory,” August 30, 1711, SPFP 89/89.

18 Lisbon Factory to Board of Trade, July 31, 1715, SPFP 89/23. Six thousand tons of rice equaled 25,714 barrels at 525 pounds per barrel.

19 Ibid.

20 Andrews, *Colonial Period*, IV: 94-97. Channing, *History of United States*, II: 495. *PG*, August 6, 1730. *CSPC*, XXXVII (1730): 56. Harper, *Navigation Laws*, 262, 398-399. Direct exportation to southern Europe was extended to the Carolinas (1730), Georgia (1733), and West Florida (1770).

merchants and English shippers continued to dominate trade through England. Exports to West Indian and African ports were still forbidden. Direct trade south of Finisterre was carefully regulated. Rice carriers had to obtain a license available only at an English port. When issued, the applicant posted a bond, guaranteeing proper delivery of the rice cargo. When loaded in America, the license and bond certificate had to be presented for perusal by the customs officials. Upon sale in southern Europe the relevant consul, or two reputable English merchants, signed a certificate attesting to its legal disposal. Certificate and license had then to be returned to an official at the point of issuance and the duty paid, equivalent to the English duties on a rice cargo landed there and reexported.<sup>21</sup> Rice sent to southern Europe thus escaped the burdens of extra shipping and insurance charges and also costs of unloading and reloading the rice for reexport.

These complex regulations had several purposes. First, they allowed American rice to compete with Italian rice in western Iberia.<sup>22</sup> At the same time the license-bonding system protected the northern European market from smuggling by direct traders, who were confined to outlets in southern Europe. The Treasury enjoyed the same income collectable under pre-1731 regulations. Voyages could not be initiated in America unless owners previously obtained a license in England. Since licenses and bond certificates could be canceled and the duties paid only by their return to the English point of origin, merchants and shipowners there gained advantage over their opposite numbers in America. The *Pennsylvania Gazette* announced the change in the enumeration law, adding that export would be confined to “Ships built and belonging to Great Britain.”<sup>23</sup> As a result, the carriage of rice to southern Europe remained largely in the English hands down to the Revolution.

The new rules definitely affected American merchants seeking rice outlets. In January 1743, when Daniel Flexney’s *Mary* arrived at Philadelphia, his agent could have freighted her with rice for Lisbon but she was “not properly bonded to do that.”<sup>24</sup> On another occasion, Charles and Thomas Willing wrote Charles Mayne at Lisbon concerning a rice cargo for there, “But you know our Vessels are incapacitated from take’g a Fret. of Rice to the South of Finistere as they have no License not being owned in England.”<sup>25</sup> In 1775 James & Wilson of Charleston complained of the difficulty of making returns through Lisbon, “as we have few vessels that go there for want of a Rice License & those that do will not take freight.”<sup>26</sup>

The English import duty on rice was normally five percent; rice to Iberia paid half of that, the same rate as rice passing through English customs and reexported. In reality, the salability of rice in England was manipulated in the interest of English wheat exporters, by raising or lowering the duty on rice entering the home market. High wheat prices in Europe meant low rice duties. Cheaper rice in England shifted consumption from wheat to rice, allowing entrepreneurs to export wheat at premium prices. Insider traders, aware of Parliamentary plans, speculated, winning inordinate profits.<sup>27</sup>

Certain English ports received special advantages because rice reexportations could be arranged only at those points. In 1765 six ports, as well as Glasgow, received that privilege and in 1772 four others joined the list. Cowes and London handled a large proportion of rice bound through England, Cowes reshipping the

---

21 Morgan, “Colonial Rice Trade,” 439.

22 Ibid., 439-440. Nash, “South Carolina and Atlantic Economy,” Table 3, 684.

23 *PG*, August 6, 1730.

24 Letter to Flexney, January 20, 1743, Reynell “Letter Book, 1741-1744.”

25 Letter to C. Mayne, September 14, 1764, Willing “Letter Book.”

26 Letters from James & Wilson, February 15, 1775; May 10, 1775, Henry Keppelle & Joseph Steinmetz “Correspondence,” HSP, Jasper, Yeates, Brinton Collection.

27 Sellers, *Charleston Business*, 158-159. On occasion that rate rose as high as 6.33 shillings sterling per barrel.

large majority of that going to northern Europe.<sup>28</sup> On occasion, when northern prices remained low, some reshipments went to better markets at Oporto or Lisbon.

The reopening of a direct rice trade to southern Europe in 1731 created considerable enthusiasm. The governor of South Carolina praised the King's beneficence, characterizing it as a "peculier Favour," which "had a very good effect."<sup>29</sup> This action had "shewn how beneficial such an indulgence has been (and if enlarged may further be) to Great Britain."<sup>30</sup> As one author commented, these were "judicious indulgences."<sup>31</sup>

How was this new rice supply integrated into the Atlantic economy? How did Italian and North American productivity compare? Most commentators on the Carolina rice trade accept a periodization system, presuming four time divisions: from initiation to 1695; growth until the early 1740s; a third era, 1742-1760; and then further mature expansion 1761-1776. R.C. Nash subdivides the second period at 1720, arguing that real expansion did not occur until the 1720s, when American rice planters easily exceeded Italian production. During the 1730s their rice shipments more than doubled Italian exports. By the 1770s they had reached a level almost six times the combined output of Lombardy and Piedmont.<sup>32</sup>

In late spring 1731 a glowing account appeared in at least two colonial newspapers concerning the Lisbon arrival of a Captain Price in March 1731. It continued: "His Cargo proved exceedingly good, and sold for 3,500 Reis per 128 l, and if the like Care be taken of that Commodity, and if it can be imported from thence a little earlier, no other Rice can interfere with it."<sup>33</sup> Another vessel was said to be bound from Charleston for Lisbon and five more for Oporto. Price's cargo sold at Lisbon for £3.95 sterling per barrel, a total sale of £2,370.

The reopening of the rice trade direct to Iberia coincided with other economic events encouraging its rapid expansion. Portugal and Spain suffered a series of drought years in the 1730s, causing significant shortfalls in grain production. Rice helped answer the demand for staples. Production in the Carolina area rose sharply as American rice held the Portuguese market. American prices rose steeply during the 1730s and early 1740s, but remained competitive. Through the 1730s Iberia took twenty percent or more of the colony's exports.<sup>34</sup>

---

28 Ibid., 157.

29 PG, April 8, 1731. CSPC, XLI (1734-1735): 367.

30 CSPC, XLI (1734-1735): 372.

31 Macpherson, *Annals*, III: 156.

32 Russell R. Menard, "Slavery, Economic Growth and Revolutionary Ideology in the South Carolina Low Country," in Hoffman et al., *Economy of Early America*, 249-255. Nash, "South Carolina and Atlantic Economy," 680-681; Table I, 680; Table 4, 684, both converted to 525-pound barrels. *Historical Statistics*, 481-485, 1192. Nash compares Italian and American production.

33 NEWJ, May 17, 1731. PG, June 3, 1731. Arrival in Iberia before Lent, the fasting time, was most important.

34 Converse D. Clowse, *Measuring Charleston's Overseas Commerce, 1717-1767* (Washington, D.C., 1981), 57-60.

*Historical Statistics*, 1164. Naval Office Records cover much of the 1730s, then only five years to 1767, though CO 16/1 is valuable for 1768-1772. Reconciling data in pounds, hundredweights, and changeable barrels is a problem. Barrels varied from 450 pounds in the 1730s to 525 pounds post-1754. Hundredweights also varied from Charleston, 100 to 112.5 pounds, elsewhere and in Portugal to 128 pounds. Where practicable data are standardized, barrels 525 pounds; hundredweights 112.5 pounds. References to an annual crop of rice sometimes mean crop years, November to November. McCusker and Menard, *Economy of British America*, 177n. NEWJ, May 17, 1731. PG, June 3, 1731. American rice prices are from Cole, *Wholesale Commodity Prices*, II: 154.

**TABLE 10-1**  
**Rice Exports South of Cape Finisterre, 1730-1738**

1730-1731 <sup>a</sup>	5,971 blls.	1731 <sup>b</sup>	5,489 blls.
1731-1732	8,092	1732	8,107
1732-1733	9,099	1733	---
1733-1734	9,734	1734	9,085
1734-1735	12,862	1735	12,873
1735-1736	11,752	1736	9,935
1736-1737	4,440	1737	3,667
		1738	3,302

Sources: <sup>a</sup>“An Account of the Quantity of Rice Carry’d directly from Carolina to the Southward of Cape Finisterre,” Treasury Papers in PRO, T 64/276B, folio 327a. <sup>b</sup>Clowse, *Charleston’s Overseas Commerce*, CO 5 data. Both converted to 525 lbs. per barrel.

If rice prices in Iberia ranged at about £4 per barrel of 525 pounds, the average annual rice sales there reached to about £37,000 in the early 1730s.

The initial rise in exportation following deregulation lasted until the mid-1730s; then southern European demand tailed off with the temporary return of good weather there. But at the end of the decade a new shortfall in supplies encouraged increased shipments. By 1742 the peninsula’s food crisis had ended; total rice exports declined by more than forty percent.

War with Spain in 1739 did not curtail Iberian exports immediately, but when the French Bourbons joined with their Spanish cousins, trade to Portugal came under heavy attack. Rice prices in America fell abruptly in 1743, as war began. Peace in 1748 brought more orderly business; excessive wartime costs declined and overall rice exports rose fairly steadily into the 1750s. The end of overdependence on northern rice markets and alternative outlets in the West Indies saw better price levels. Total exports reached 112,491 barrels in 1755. Then the new conflict reduced rice shipments. Iberia’s annual share of the trade by the late 1750s rested at about 14,000 barrels. Wartime embargoes on American exports had an impact, and the temporary opening of the foreign West Indies did as well, as the British seized enemy islands there.<sup>35</sup> After the short war with Spain, 1761-1762, Portuguese demand pushed exports that way even higher. By the mid-1760s English rice cargoes shipped to southern Europe had almost doubled. Dislocations in the cereal supply forced dependence on rice as an alternative food.

The “Inspector General’s Report” covering 1768-1772 indicates that annually 24,359 barrels of rice went to southern Europe. But the data for 1771 and 1772 were skewed by the Falkland crisis, and an additional 5,286 barrels went from England to Iberia in those years – meaning that Iberian consumption of American rice ran at about 30,000 barrels per year.<sup>36</sup>

Down to the Revolution rising productivity answered greater demand, and rice growers and exporters rode a wave of prosperity, even opulence. After 1764 food shortages plagued southern Europe; prices rose.

<sup>35</sup> *Historical Statistics*, 481-485, 1192; 493-499, 1193.

<sup>36</sup> Cole, *Wholesale Commodity Prices*, II: 15-68. McCusker and Menard, *Economy of British America*, 177.

South Carolina waxed wealthy. English creditors were easily satisfied as annual exports were double the debts owed.<sup>37</sup>

**TABLE 10-2**  
**Charleston's Rice Exports to Iberian Centers, 1731-1774**

Year	Vessels <sup>a</sup>	Tons	Lisbon Blls	Oporto Blls	Figueira Blls	Cadiz Blls	Others Blls	Totals Blls	Barrels/ Tons	% to S.Eur.
1731	15	1,185	4,171	769	343	----	206	5,489	4.63	13.3
1732	20	1,665	6,060	1,233	429	171	214	8,107	4.87	24.2
1734	22	1,830	5,889	2,373	823	----	----	9,085	4.96	28.5
1735	30	2,685	7,699	3,722	377	706	369	12,873	4.79	33.9
1736	(22)	(1,885)f.	6,953	1,447	----	1,360	175	9,935		22.9
1737	8	645	2,666	423	----	407	171	3,667	5.69	11.7
1738	(7)	(627)f.	2,108	1,008	189	----	----	3,302		11.9
1757	11									
1758	13	(2,357)f.	8,125	3,974	----	----	325	12,424		19.4
1759	17	(2,800)f.	9,260	4,768	240	----	490	14,758		28.0
1760		(2,874)f.	8,016	6,533	595	----	----	15,144		24.0
1762		(2,090)f.	9,281	1,733	----	----	----	11,014		12.9
1763	17	(2,721)f.	8,312	4,937	1,093	----	----	14,342		13.7
1766	43	5,019	12,631	11,669	596	2,149	1,206	28,251	5.63	30.5
1768 <sup>b</sup>	48	5,515						30,027	5.44	27.2
1769 <sup>b</sup>	56	5,773						31,755	5.50	26.7
1770 <sup>b</sup>	53	6,291						34,429	5.47	25.6
1771 <sup>b</sup>	26	2,882		3,998 <sup>c</sup>			400 <sup>e</sup>	15,875	5.51	12.5
1772 <sup>b</sup>	16	1,774	3,704	4,064 <sup>c</sup>			555 <sup>e</sup>	9,708	5.47	9.0
1773			6,579	4,014 <sup>c</sup>			516 <sup>e</sup>			
1774							1,150 <sup>e</sup>			

Sources: <sup>1</sup> All barrels have been converted to 525-pound units to make them comparable.

<sup>a</sup> Data for vessels and tons come from CO 5/508-511 for 1731-1766 and from

<sup>b</sup> CO 16/1 for 1768-1772. Cf. Clowse, *Charleston's Overseas Commerce*, 60; adjusted barrels used, 1731-1738.

<sup>c</sup> Figures for Lisbon and Oporto imports for 1771-1772 are from Whitehead to Rochford, April 30, 1774, SPFP 89/76.

<sup>d</sup> Percentages of rice to southern Europe are taken from *Historical Statistics*, 481-485, 1192.

<sup>e</sup> Figures under "other" for the years 1771-1774 are those arriving at Barcelona from Reports of Miller to Rochford, SPFS 94/176; 94/193-194; 94/196. See especially reports dated January 1, 1773; October 2, 1773; and September 30, 1774.

<sup>f</sup> These tonnage figures are estimates based on the average figure per ton of 5.27 barrels for years of known tonnage.

37 CO 16/1. In a normal year perhaps 3,000 barrels of rice came out to Spain and Portugal, usually from Cowes or London.

Though data on this trade is limited, some analysis is possible. Most modern historians have agreed that it consumed about one-fifth of the rice exported from North America. However, this was a volatile business. When grain prices peaked, rice cargoes to Iberian ports rose to almost thirty percent of total exports. On the other hand, the stresses of wartime, especially 1745-1747 and 1756-1757, led to lower export volume and lower prices in America. Rice exports to Iberia approximately tripled between the early 1730s and the years before the Revolution. The number of rice barrels carried per ton of shipping increased, rising from an average of about 4.9 barrels per registered ton during the 1730s to 5.5 barrels per ton after 1766. Vessel sizes in the trade increased from about 84 to 113 tons, about one-third. Lisbon entrance records, 1769-1775, show the actual size of American rice arrivals was fifty percent higher than indicated by CO 16/1.

Carolina enjoyed a positive trade balance with England from 1712 onward, except for wartime dislocations in the mid-1740s and during the Seven Years War, 1756-1763. Rice returns from sales in southern Europe were significant but only a minor factor compared to large surpluses earned from rice sold in northern Europe via the mother country. However, the availability of an alternative Iberian market helped stabilize prices in Holland and Germany.<sup>38</sup>

**TABLE 10-3**  
**Lisbon Port Records, 1769-1775**

Year	Entrances from						Clearances to			
	South Carolina		North Carolina		Georgia		Carolina		In Ballast	
	Ves.	Tons	Ves.	Tons	Ves.	Tons	Ves.	Tons	Ves.	Tons
1769	19	3,799	---	---	---	---	18	3,345	4	653
1770	25	5,948	---	---	1	62	13	2,843	4	901
1771	12	2,785	---	---	---	---	1	278	1	278
1772	12	2,484	---	---	---	---	5	1,026	5	1,026
1773	10	2,192	---	---	---	---	1	248	1	248
1774	17	3,112	---	---	---	---	6	1,082	5	872
1775	14	3,480	1	120	2	461	4	586	4	586

Source: Data are from the “Livros,” 1769-1775.

Though producers argued that their rice could not compete in Iberia if shipped there indirectly, in fact, it was not uncommon to find it shipped there via England. Between 1716 and 1730, the era of full enumeration, eleven percent of the rice went through England to southern Europe. After that control was lifted, some reexportation there continued. From 1732-1774 more than 136,530 barrels of rice went to Iberian markets indirectly.<sup>39</sup> In 1765, for example, rice valued at £8,588 went from England to Spain.<sup>40</sup> Wars between Britain and her Bourbon enemies resulted in sharply falling Iberian exports. During the Falkland

38 Charles Whitworth, *The State of the Trade of Great Britain in its Imports and Exports Progressively from the Year 1697 to 1773* (London, 1776), 53-54. Francis B.C. Bradlee, *Colonial Trade and Commerce, 1733-1774*. Essex Institute Historical Collections, LXIII (Salem, Mass., 1927), 12.

39 Nash, “South Carolina and Atlantic Economy,” Table 5, 680, 686. *Historical Statistics*, 493-499, 1193.

40 Report to James Gray, July 1767, “Observations on the Exports and Imports to and from Spain and England, Christmas 1750 to Christmas 1765,” SPFS 94/177. Annual reports, 1763-1765, were £984, £2,565, £8,588.



crisis years, only 10,066 barrels of rice (6.46%) went to Iberian outlets directly.<sup>41</sup>

\* \* \*

Portugal was the major market for American rice in the south of Europe. Lisbon (20,000 bls.) received approximately two-thirds of the rice shipped; Oporto took most of the remainder (4,500 bls.). Relatively small amounts went to Spain.<sup>42</sup> Madeira consumed about 1,300 barrels yearly and small Portuguese ports possibly a thousand. Total Portuguese consumption by the 1770s probably ranged at about 27,000 barrels annually.<sup>43</sup> Anglo-Spanish tensions discouraged this trade, and Spain was conveniently located to receive rice imports from Mediterranean sources. Carolina rice also faced heavy local competition there. Valencian rice fields, as early as 1609, “Largely supplied Spain.”<sup>44</sup> Cadiz apparently had most of its needs met by Spanish producers. Incomplete data available for 1771 and 1773 show that Cadiz entered only five rice carriers; four directly and one via Falmouth. Eight other vessels from the Carolinas brought staves.<sup>45</sup> Spain’s annual consumption of Carolina rice probably held at 3,000 barrels.

Barcelona took thirteen rice cargoes, approximately 7,135 barrels, 1770-1774.<sup>46</sup> Other Spanish port centers took only an occasional rice ship. In northwest Spain, a distance from Mediterranean sources, American rice competed. Cities there occasionally consumed a few hundred casks but a shipment of six hundred barrels to Ferrol-Corunna caused a glut.<sup>47</sup> Salem traders in the early 1770s, with fish in glut in Bilbao, sold rice there through the Gardoquis, picking up cargoes at Charleston for Vizcaya. Small shipments went there: 159 barrels in 1769, 250 in 1770, 87 casks in 1771. By spring 1773, when the brig *Union* brought a full cargo, the Gardoquis wrote that it “being too great an amount meets no sale so that tho’ better than fish yet it cannot render any great profit.”<sup>48</sup> Late in 1774, with Boston closed by government fiat and codfish markets oversupplied, North Shore merchants sought opportunities at Philadelphia and Charleston, trading rice, wheat, and flour in southern Europe. Joseph Lee and his partners began to ship

---

41 For 1771-1772, see CO 16/1. *CPR*. “Livros.” Clowse, *Charleston’s Overseas Commerce*, 57-64. Barcelona in 1773 took three cargoes from Cowes, 1,570 barrels. Miller to Rochford, October 10, 1773, SPFS 94/194. Dickerson, *Navigation Acts and Revolution*, 40, reports indirect shipments that year of 24,684 hundredweights.

42 Clowse, *Charleston’s Overseas Commerce*, 60. Barrels adjusted to 525 pounds. CO 16/1. “Livros,” 1769-1772. *CPR*, 1769-1772. Rice is estimated at 5.39 barrels per ton, calculated from CO 16/1. Hort to Walpole, May 6, 1774, “Report on the State of the Trade between the British Dominions and the Port of Lisbon, 1772-1773,” SPFP 89/77.

43 For Oporto, see Hort to Walpole, May 6, 1774, SPFP 89/77. For Madeira, see Cheap and Madeira Factory to Board of Trade, July 1, 1765, SPFP 89/77. Ibbetson to Board of Trade, August 3, 1765, CO 388/95.

44 Earl J. Hamilton, “The Decline of Spain,” I: 219, in Carus-Wilson, *Essays in Economic History*.

45 “A Report on the Trade of Cadiz for 1771,” SPFS 94/193, indicates that of ten vessels from the Carolinas and Georgia, only three carried rice. Another “Report of the Trade of Cadiz, January 1, 1773-September 30, 1773,” notes one rice vessel and three with staves entering. A printed circular in SPFS 94/200 titled *Estado General de las Embarcaciones...en Bahia de Cadiz, 1775*, dated December 31, 1775, reports eleven arrivals from Carolina but not cargoes carried.

46 Consul Miller’s reports on English vessels reaching Barcelona, 1769-1774, to Rochford, SPFS 94/193 and 196. Two other vessels went on to Cette in southern France.

47 Burchmore to Joseph Lee, March 14, 1775, Porter, *Jacksons and Lees*, I: 402.

48 Gardoqui to Joseph Cabot, May 15, 1773, Cabot “Papers.” Earlier shipments are noted in letters dated December 12, 1769; April 6, 1771; and September 30, 1771.

those products to Spain and Portugal. The voyage in November 1774 of their brigantine *Union*, Zachariah Burchmore, master, is instructive. Lee dispatched her to Charleston with rum and some cash, an investment of £838.3 sterling.<sup>49</sup> Crouch & Gray handled sales of the rum and laded her with rice at fifty shillings (S.C.) per hundredweight.<sup>50</sup> Warned that Cadiz, Lisbon, and Straits markets were overdone, Burchmore sailed to Corunna. After a fast twenty-seven-day passage, he learned a rice cargo had just sold there. After canvassing Vizcaya and Galicia, he made way for Cascais at the mouth of the Tagus and sought market news of James Houston & Co. at Lisbon. With negative reports on other outlets and more rice ships entering, he sold his cargo at three milreis per hundredweight, giving ten days' credit. With a hundred moys of salt he sailed to Falmouth and sold it there through Joseph Banfield. He paid the rice duty, as required, and cancelled his rice license and bond. Then, harkening to the warnings of an impending "sivell war" in America, he went off to the West Indies, rather than returning home.<sup>51</sup> His voyage's proceeds, Salem to Charleston to Corunna to Lisbon to Falmouth, amounted to £877.6 against an original outlay of £838.3.

\* \* \*

South Carolina rice exporters differed from colonial merchants elsewhere who shipped goods to Iberia. Through the whole colonial period they leaned heavily on non-Carolinians for shipping services. By the mid-eighteenth century, local merchants in Philadelphia, New York, and New England had taken the majority of their trade with southern Europe into their own hands, but Charleston wholesalers to the close of the era still depended on British shipping to carry off the colony's produce. Again the rice license requirements had their effect.

Converse D. Clowse's study provides tables dealing with South Carolinian vessel ownership to 1739 and again 1757-1766. Prominent shipowners in the first era to 1739 included Samuel Wragg, Benjamin Godin, and Richard Shubrick. During the later years Benjamin Smith, George Ingles, Henry Laurens, Miles Brenton, John Edwards, and George Austin owned fully or in part seven or more vessels each. Very probably all of them shared ownership of vessels in the rice trade to Portugal and Spain.<sup>52</sup>

One study of rice exports notes that almost half of the cargoes disposed of by an Oporto firm were owned by Charleston merchants and about twenty-five percent by English residents.<sup>53</sup> If so, Carolinians may have played a larger role in the Iberian rice trade just before the colonial period ended than is suggested by the ownership of the vessels that delivered cargoes before 1767, when much more Charleston rice went out on vessels of English registry. In the earlier years, vessels entering Charleston from southern Europe were also largely London owned. See Tables 10-4 and 10-5. Carolinians may have enjoyed closer ties to Iberian merchants than to those in the northern branch. The fact that the shipping carrying rice was English registered did not preclude American partnerships, nor their being colonial chartered. Lacking further data from the Naval Office Records for Carolina or from other sources for the years 1767-1775, these connections with Oporto can only be noted.

---

49 Cabot "Papers." Cf. Worthington C. Ford, "Colonial Commerce, 1774-1776," *Proceedings of MHS* LIX (1926): 210-220. Porter, *Jacksons and Lees*, I: 397n.

50 Burchmore to Joseph Lee, January 19, 1775, Ford, "Colonial Commerce," 214. Note these barrels averaged 534 pounds each.

51 Ford, "Colonial Commerce," 210-220. Porter, *Jacksons and Lees*, I: 402-404.

52 Clowse, *Charleston's Overseas Commerce*, Table C-61, 141-142; Table C-62, 143-144.

53 Morgan, "Colonial Rice Trade," 442-443, refers to the accounts of Holderness, Olive & Newman at Oporto, 1755-1771. Charleston merchants owned 46.1%, Londoners 18.6%, Bristol 6.9%, Captains 5.7%, and Portuguese firms 2.5%.

**TABLE 10-4**  
**Percentages of Rice Exported from Charleston**  
**by Vessels Based in Selected Areas, 1717-1766**

Year	London	Other Britain	Total Britain	Charleston	Boston	Other N. America	West Indies
1717-1720	36	19	55	17	17	8	5
1724	39	32	71	6	12	8	4
1731-1732	41	40	81	4	4	7	4
1734-1738	41	45	86	1	7	5	2
1758-1760	18	51	69	11	3	11	6
1762-1763	21	31	52	14	4	18	13
1766	24	46	70	15	2	4	10

Source: Taken from Clowse, *Charleston's Overseas Commerce*, Table C-42, 124-125. Numbers are rounded so do not add to 100%.

**TABLE 10-5**  
**Percentages of Tonnage, London-Based,**  
**Arriving at Charleston from Southern Europe, 1717-1766**

Entered from	1717-1718	1724	1731-1732	1734-1738	1758-1760	1762-1763	1766
Lisbon	---	*	38	51	19	45	87
Gibraltar	---	---	*	---	76	76	---
All Southern Europe	---	*	66	53	37	54	51
Madeira	36	56	46	46	19	44	64
Canaries	---	---	---	---	37	55	52
All Wine Islands	39	56	42	38	25	50	46

Source: Clowse, *Charleston's Overseas Commerce*, Table C-51, 128. Gibraltar was important during wartime only. Asterisk indicates insignificant amounts.

Reinitiation of the southern European trade during the 1730s resulted in heavier involvement of English-owned vessels than earlier. Bostonians, active before 1730, saw their share of rice exports drop precipitously. Charleston had employed seventeen percent of the rice shipping locally registered, 1717-1720, and did not recover its share until the end of the colonial era.<sup>54</sup> As for entrances to Charleston from Iberia and the Wine Islands, Clowse's data effectively demonstrates the tight hold that Londoners retained over the shipping.

No close relationship existed between the two branches of the southern European trade. Vessels very rarely carried a cargo to Iberia and then proceeded to the islands to load wine for North America, and vice versa. A glance at Table 10-6 on Charleston's entrances from and clearances to the southern parts of Europe indicates that incoming shipping from the Wine Islands was usually bound out from the British Isles. Those

<sup>54</sup> Clowse, *Charleston's Overseas Commerce*, Table C-51, 128-129. Thomas Amory, "Account Book, 1720-1728," MHS. He traded with the Wine Islands and South Carolina.

vessels sailed southward to catch the westerly winds and currents, which wafted them towards America, often making a landfall in the Azores or at Madeira, en route. Despite laws to the contrary, some salt also entered the Lower South directly.<sup>55</sup>

**TABLE 10-6**  
**Charleston's Southern European Trade, 1717-1772**

Mean Year	Entrances						Overseas		Southern Europe	
	S.E. Mainland		Wine Islands		Total Trade		Trade Only		% Total	% Total
	Ves.	Tons	Ves.	Tons	Ves.	Tons	Ves.	Tons	Tonnage	Tonnage
1717-1718	---	---	6	437	144	7,639	102	6,363	5.7	6.9
1724	1	80	6	430	138	8,441	98	6,583	6.0	7.7
1731-1732	6	450	5	374	185	10,748	141	8,758	7.7	9.4
1734-1738	13	1,163	6	485	218	12,952	140	9,156	12.7	18.0
1758-1760	8	909	9	868	248	17,397	167	12,958	10.2	13.7
1762-1763	21	2,358	9	792	364	23,494	259	18,091	13.4	17.4
1766	21	2,707	11	1,355	370	28,271	269	22,762	14.4	17.9
1768-1772	19	2,103*	---	---	455	30,531	309	25,176	6.9	8.4

**Clearances**

1717-1718	---	---	1	24	143	7,274	100	5,929	0.3	0.4
1724	---	---	3	100	129	7,892	103	6,994	1.3	1.4
1731-1732	17	1,375	---	---	191	11,358	158	10,311	12.1	13.3
1734-1738	17	1,540	---	---	218	12,978	154	10,739	11.9	14.3
1758-1760	27	2,559	---	---	235	16,887	170	14,381	15.2	17.8
1762-1763	22	2,273	---	---	341	21,886	265	18,620	10.4	12.2
1766	43	5,019	---	---	385	29,610	289	24,695	16.4	20.3
1768-1772	40	4,447*	---	---	457	30,531	318	26,198	14.6	17.0

Source: Clowse, *Charleston's Overseas Commerce*, Table C-11, 97-106 ; Table C-13, 110. \*Includes Wine Island traffic. These data are figures for the mean year of these periods and thus differ from those in Table 10-2.

\* \* \*

Soft data sources, while not as persuasive as statistical material, reveal day-to-day operations of Charleston rice traders. Correspondence received by the Philadelphia firm of Keppelle & Steinmetz is informative.<sup>56</sup> Active in the grain and flour trade with Lisbon and in the immigrant traffic, this firm's vessels brought immigrants from the Dutch ports. During the years 1748-1754 large immigrant carriers often proceeded from Philadelphia to South Carolina apparently to take rice on to England and the Lowlands or

55 CO 16/1.

56 Doerflinger, *Vigorous Spirit*, 59, 92.

to go directly to Lisbon. Over those years, seventy-one large topsail vessels cleared to Charleston. Sixty-six sailed between September and December and another five from January to April, prime months for rice exporting. This pattern ended after the Seven Years War.<sup>57</sup> German immigrants usually arrived in America by late summer or early fall; rice was ready to ship by November or early December. The timing matched neatly. After a short coastal voyage, immigrant carriers took rice to Europe.

Over four years, 1771-1775, two Charleston firms, Powell, Hopton & Co. and James & Wilson, corresponded with Keppelle & Steinmetz of Philadelphia, perhaps in hopes of reviving that trading system. Late in 1771 John Hopton wrote indicating the terms for shipping rice from Charleston to Cowes and Holland. Presumably the methodology did not differ materially if shipped instead to southern Europe. Rice sold at the price current on the day loaded and cargo had to be loaded and the ship dispatched within thirty days. The city's merchants added commissions and shipping charges to the invoice. Cargo was consigned at the shipper's discretion. Rice damaged by the ship, not amounting to an average, was chargeable to the ship at cost. The Carolina invoice and freight charges could be paid in London or Bristol at the owner's discretion.<sup>58</sup>

The same firm wrote Henry Keppelle in March 1772. When shipping a rice cargo, they noted, bills were not drawn against the buyer until the ship had cleared Charleston and "seldom against the whole in less than two months." Bills from Carolina were payable in London. Should the buyers send specie to pay for a cargo, "tis often to be had 2/6 to 3/9 per cwt. under the Market price and always Commands a Preference in quality." Rice was available there all year but was "most Plenty" in November. Hopton promised quick dispatch and low port fees. "[T]he expence of shipping Rice [was] about 7<sup>d</sup> Sterling per Bll." exclusive of commissions.<sup>59</sup>

James & Wilson also sought business with Keppelle & Steinmetz. Their commission was also five percent, plus other additional expenses. Rice barrels cost about seventeen pence sterling, plus six pence cooperage; wharfage and portage not included. A cargo purchased before a ship arrived involved warehousing fees, described as not too burdensome. Some shipmasters snugged down a cargo by using 250 pound half-barrels to fill up the hold at a cost of 1.75 shillings sterling each. Port charges ran to £5.57 sterling, plus powder money at five pence a ton. A ship taking eight hundred to one thousand barrels, drawing fifteen feet of water, paid £5.35 sterling for pilotage. James & Wilson would draw bills on London or Philadelphia at thirty days' sight. If drawn on Philadelphia, exchange problems could arise. Rice was usually sold at two-months' credit, after which cash had to be paid, which created difficulties in a largely cashless society. Rice buyers might face interest charges if they failed to meet debts promptly.

A ship of 185 to 235 tons could be cleared in ten to twelve days, if her cargo gathered before arrival. Best months to secure a lading were December through April. After that, time should be allowed, since it took longer to gather a shipment in late summer and early fall when rice was "Often very Scarce."<sup>60</sup>

John James continued to report to the Philadelphia merchants on the Charleston rice trade. Bankruptcies in England led to stagnancy in that business in fall 1772. With a 150,000-barrel crop expected, prices would be low, offering a good opportunity to speculate.<sup>61</sup> Almost a year later, he commented on the scarcity

---

57 *PG*, 1748-1774. In the late fall and early winter 1763-1764 ten vessels followed this pattern but after that few ships cleared for the Carolinas.

58 Letter from John Hopton, December 12, 1771, Keppelle & Steinmetz. "Correspondence." Agreements for chartered vessels set a vessel's destination and agents to be employed and laid down allowed time for loading and unloading. Morgan, "Colonial Rice Trade," 448.

59 Powell & Hopton to Keppelle, March 30, 1772, Keppelle & Steinmetz. "Correspondence."

60 James & Wilson to Steinmetz, April 2, 1772, *ibid*.

61 John James to Keppelle & Steinmetz, September 23, 1772, *ibid*.

of shipping there.<sup>62</sup> Again in February 1774 he believed rice prices would decline as few vessels sought freights and “no vessels expected they having suffered so the last year.”<sup>63</sup> Prices for rice peaked in 1772 and then were off sharply to 1774.

Data from *Com Privilegio Real* prove that a Charleston-to-Lisbon voyage took forty-two days in the 1770s.<sup>64</sup> Presuming that sales there were settled in a few weeks, funds transferred aboard the Falmouth packets or on naval vessels would have covered bills drawn by Charleston rice factors in a timely fashion. This source also offers data on the time rice ships were in port at Lisbon. During the years 1757-1763 the average layover time was about six and a half weeks. Between 1771 and 1776 vessels cleared in less than five weeks, a savings of about twenty-five percent. This change probably reflects the earlier wartime impact on shipping costs as vessels waited for convoys or news of enemy threats.<sup>65</sup>

American rice dominated at Lisbon and throughout Portugal. A rapid survey of *Com Privilegio Real* for rice entrances disclosed only three Danish vessels that brought rice cargoes from Genoa and Leghorn in 1758. Significantly, just before 1769 rice began to arrive from Maranhão in Brazil. Two or three vessels came per year, 1772-1774, but in 1775 eight arrived. Ten years earlier, an English official in Portugal commented that American rice competed with Italian and other imports and then added, “this Trade is rather in decline.”<sup>66</sup> Scattered data for Lisbon seem to belie that statement. Possibly he recognize the competitive potentialities of Brazilian rice that early. In the era of Pombal, Portugal strove to advance its commerce wherever possible.

\* \* \*

---

62 John James to Keppelle & Steinmetz, October 16, 1773, *ibid.*

63 James & Wilson to Keppelle & Steinmetz, February 8, 1774, *ibid.* McCusker and Menard, *Economy of British America*, 177.

64 *CPR*, 1757-1759, 1763, 1771-1775. Some 120 voyages averaged 42.05 days.

65 *Ibid.*

66 Lyttleton to Weymouth, January 14, 1769, SPFP 89/67. The Portuguese sought Carolina advice on the best methods for preparing Brazilian rice for market. *CPR*, 1772-1774. Ibbetson to Board of Trade, August 3, 1765, CO 388/95.

**TABLE 10-7**  
**Firms Handling American Rice Cargoes at Lisbon, 1757-1775**

Firms	1757	1758	1759	1763	1771	1772	1773	1774	1775	Total Cargoes
Mayne, Burn & Mayne	4.5	7.5	9	10	---	---	---	---	---	
(Mayne & Co.)	---	---	---	---	1	2	---	1	2	37
Robert Pasley & Co.	---	---	---	0.5	7	2	2	3	2	16.5
Connell & Moroney	---	1	2	1	2	1	4	3	---	14
Paul Berthon	1	---	---	---	---	1	---	2	3	7
Morrogh & Connolly	2	2	1	---	---	1	---	1	---	7
Parr & Bulkeley	---	---	---	1	---	---	1	2	2	6
Roberts & Moylan (Henry Roberts)	---	---	1	2	1	---	1	---	---	5
Stephanson, Holford	1.5	2.5	1	---	---	---	---	---	---	5
John French	---	---	---	---	1.5	1	1	1	---	4.5
Parminter & Montgomery	---	---	1	---	---	1	---	---	2	4
White & Houston	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	1	3	4
Galloway & Morrogh	---	---	---	---	---	---	1	1	1	3

Source: *CPR*, 1757-1759, 1763, 1771-1775.

Lisbon's commercial newspaper also provides the names of merchants who handled American rice sales. See Table 10-7. Again English factory members controlled disposal of American rice as brokers for arriving vessels. Mayne, Burn & Mayne and its successor Mayne & Co. acted for almost one third of the cargoes arriving. With Pasley Brothers (12.8%) and Connell & Moroney (10.9%), they brokered more than half the American rice shipments in these years.<sup>67</sup> Between 1772 and 1773 twenty-one vessels landed 10,283 barrels of this rice at Lisbon. These three firms acted for eleven ships, 5,386 barrels. Mayne & Co. handled approximately 979 barrels; Pasleys 1,959 barrels; and Connell & Moroney 2,448 barrels. These cargoes would have sold for £3,881; £7,762; and £9,702 and their commissions (5%) earned them £194, £388, and £485, respectively.<sup>68</sup>

Rice vessels clearing Lisbon went to various European and American ports. Between 1769 and 1775 forty-eight cleared directly to deep South ports, more than forty-two percent of the total. A number of them had brought cargoes of staves and lumber and did not have to clear a license at an English port. Almost half the arrivals did go on to England to pay the rice duty, surrender the license, and cancel their bonds. Vessels bringing rice through England to Lisbon had presumably paid the duties, procured new licenses, and could sail to rice ports for a new cargo. During 1774 and 1775 New York, Philadelphia, and New England skippers brought mixed cargoes including rice and returned direct to America. Half the shipping sailing from the Tagus to the Lower South left with only ballast for stability. Vessels bound to the British Isles or for northern Europe carried full loadings of salt, wine, and fruit. The requirements to return endorsed licenses to England for surrender and to pay the rice duty remained an important influence on the structure and

<sup>67</sup> *CPR*, see Table 10-7. Data for Mayne, Burn & Mayne and for Mayne & Co. have been combined.

<sup>68</sup> Hort and Factory to Walpole, May 6, 1774, SPFP 89/77. *CPR*. Prices are from Table 10-9, averaged for 1771 and 1772, amounting to £3.96 per barrel. Total rice sales at minimum £40,721; commissions (5%) £2,036. Added income arose from delivery and transfer of excess funds.

movement of this trade.<sup>69</sup>

\* \* \*

What level of return did the rice trade to Iberia offer? Did it provide a means of transferring funds to the mother country? And, if so, how large were those returns and how were they apportioned between the metropolis and the rice country?

Data from the “Inspector General’s Report on American Trade” are presented by Shepherd and Walton in a manner allowing the balancing of exports from the Lower South to southern Europe against imports from that area.

**TABLE 10-8**  
**Trade Between the Lower South and**  
**Southern Europe and the Wine Islands, 1768-1772**

Year	Exports	Rice Alone	Percent	Imports	Salt	Wine	Percent	Balance
1768	£73,505	£70,387	95.7	£10,922	£ 57	£10,865	99.5	£62,583
1769	68,152	63,217	92.8	7,697	402	7,295	94.8	60,455
1770	65,809	62,538	95.0	10,441	---	10,441	100.0	55,368
1771	31,902	30,100	94.4	9,476	---	9,476	100.0	22,426
1772	<u>31,467</u>	<u>28,669</u>	<u>91.0</u>	<u>14,290</u>	<u>172</u>	<u>14,118</u>	<u>98.8</u>	<u>17,177</u>
Totals	£270,835	£254,911	94.1	£52,826	£631	£52,195	98.8	£218,009

Sources: Shepherd and Walton, *Shipping, Maritime Trade*, Table 4, 220-222; Table 7, 228. This source uses Bezanson, Gray, and Hussey’s price index for Philadelphia’s Madeira wine prices but the figures for the Lower South wine imports vary from that index; see Appendix, Table A-4. Rice exports in 1771 were 16,481 barrels.

Again, this analysis is based on New World prices, where American produce was cheap and European salt and wine dear. To this total should be added the American value of the 5,286 barrels of rice, which, because of the Falkland crisis in 1771-1772, went through England to Iberia. Its price in South Carolina in 1771 was at a minimum £2.3 per barrel, which would add another £12,158 to the colonial side of the ledger, raising the favorable balance to almost £230,167.<sup>70</sup>

Over these five years the Lower South dispatched to southern Europe 124,929 barrels of rice, worth a total of £254,911 in America. The average prime cost in America ran at a bit more than two pounds sterling per barrel. Consular reports from Lisbon and Oporto estimated their Portuguese selling price at £1.69 to £1.87 per barrel.<sup>71</sup> Yet exports continued there over these years, though falling off in 1771 and 1772, a decline resulting from the war crisis. If the Lisbon/Oporto consular reports are to be believed, rice exports

69 “Livros,” 1769-1775. Carolina entrances totaled 120 vessels, 23,920 tons. See Table 10-3. *CPR*, 1771-1775. CO 16/1 noted such small shipments, 1768-1772.

70 Shepherd and Walton, *Shipping, Maritime Trade*, Table 7, 228. See Table 10-9. £228,981.

71 Hort to Walpole, May 6, 1774, with reports on Lisbon and Oporto trade submitted by Hort and Whitehead for 1772 and 1773, SPFP 89/77.



probably fell because such low prices meant no chance of profits. Yet, indirect shipments to southern Europe reached almost 5,300 barrels. Possibly rice in both northern and southern Europe was in glut. Or, for some reason, the consul's reports understated rice prices in Portugal. The discrepancy is in the price of Portuguese rice. The consular compiler of the Portuguese lists stated: "I have valued them [the goods] according to a medium price of what they usually cost in England [and expect] the total value will prove as near the truth as can be expected where the qualities are not mentioned to determine the value by."<sup>72</sup> English prices, where it was not in demand, would certainly have been lower than in the Portuguese cities.

**TABLE 10-9**  
**Estimated Costs for Shipping Rice to Iberia, 1732-1775**

Year	Prime Cost <sup>1</sup> 525 lb. bl.	Commission <sup>2</sup> 5%	Handling <sup>3</sup> 7d. stlg.	Freight <sup>4</sup>	Insurance <sup>5</sup> 3%	Value <sup>6</sup> C.I.F.	Duties <sup>7</sup> 3%	Handling <sup>8</sup> 2%	Commission <sup>9</sup> 5%	Eng. Duty <sup>10</sup> 2.5%	Cost S.E.
1732	£1.58	£0.08	£0.03	£0.85	£0.05	£2.59	£0.08	£0.05	£0.14	£0.07	£2.93
1733	1.50	0.08	0.03	0.85	0.05	2.51	0.08	0.05	0.13	0.07	2.84
1734	2.26	0.11	0.03	0.85	0.07	3.32	0.10	0.07	0.17	0.09	3.75
1735	2.18	0.11	0.03	0.85	0.07	3.24	0.10	0.07	0.17	0.09	3.67
1736	1.92	0.10	0.03	0.85	0.06	2.96	0.09	0.06	0.16	0.08	3.35
1737	2.52	0.13	0.03	0.85	0.08	3.59	0.11	0.07	0.19	0.10	4.06
1738	2.78	0.14	0.03	0.85	0.08	3.88	0.11	0.08	0.20	0.11	4.38
1739	1.63	0.08	0.03	0.85	0.05	2.64	0.08	0.05	0.14	0.07	2.98
1740	1.42	0.07	0.03	1.05	0.20	2.77	0.08	0.06	0.15	0.08	3.14
1741	1.94	0.10	0.03	1.05	0.30	3.42	0.10	0.07	0.18	0.09	3.86
1745	0.60	0.03	0.03	1.05	0.10	1.81	0.05	0.04	0.10	0.05	2.05
1749	2.26	0.11	0.03	0.80	0.07	3.27	0.10	0.07	0.17	0.09	3.70
1750	2.36	0.12	0.03	0.80	0.07	3.38	0.10	0.07	0.18	0.09	3.73
1751	1.71	0.09	0.03	0.80	0.05	2.68	0.08	0.05	0.14	0.07	3.02
1752	2.07	0.10	0.03	0.80	0.06	3.06	0.09	0.06	0.16	0.08	3.45
1753	2.49	0.13	0.03	0.80	0.08	3.53	0.11	0.07	0.19	0.10	4.00
1754	1.63	0.08	0.03	0.80	0.05	2.59	0.08	0.05	0.14	0.06	2.93
1755	1.52	0.08	0.03	0.80	0.25	2.68	0.08	0.05	0.14	0.07	3.02
1756	1.29	0.07	0.03	1.17	0.20	2.76	0.08	0.06	0.15	0.08	3.13
1757	1.26	0.06	0.03	1.17	0.20	2.72	0.08	0.05	0.14	0.08	3.07
1758	1.63	0.08	0.03	1.17	0.25	3.16	0.09	0.06	0.17	0.09	3.57
1759	2.47	0.12	0.03	1.17	0.35	4.14	0.12	0.08	0.22	0.11	4.67
1760	1.94	0.10	0.03	1.17	0.30	3.54	0.11	0.07	0.19	0.10	4.01
1761	1.44	0.07	0.03	1.17	0.20	2.91	0.09	0.06	0.16	0.08	3.30
1762	1.26	0.06	0.03	1.17	0.20	2.72	0.08	0.05	0.15	0.08	3.08
1763	1.71	0.09	0.03	0.74	0.25	2.94	0.09	0.06	0.15	0.08	3.32
1764	1.63	0.08	0.03	0.74	0.05	2.53	0.08	0.05	0.13	0.07	2.86
1765	1.68	0.08	0.03	0.74	0.05	2.64	0.08	0.05	0.14	0.07	2.96
1766	2.15	0.11	0.03	0.74	0.06	3.09	0.09	0.06	0.16	0.09	3.49
1767	2.10	0.11	0.03	0.74	0.06	3.04	0.09	0.06	0.16	0.08	3.43

**TABLE 10-9 continued**  
**Estimated Costs for Shipping Rice to Iberia, 1732-1775**

Year	Prime Cost <sup>1</sup> 525 lb. bl.	Commission <sup>2</sup> 5%	Handling <sup>3</sup> 7d. stlg.	Freight <sup>4</sup>	Insurance <sup>5</sup> 3%	Value <sup>6</sup> C.I.F.	Duties <sup>7</sup> 3%	Handling <sup>8</sup> 2%	Commission <sup>9</sup> 5%	Eng. Duty <sup>10</sup> 2.5%	Cost S.E.
1768	£2.44	0.12	0.03	0.74	0.07	3.40	0.10	0.07	0.18	0.09	£3.84
1769	2.26	0.11	0.03	0.74	0.07	3.21	0.10	0.06	0.17	0.09	3.63
1770	1.81	0.09	0.03	0.57	0.05	2.53	0.08	0.05	0.13	0.07	2.86
1771	2.07	0.10	0.03	0.57	0.06	2.81	0.08	0.06	0.15	0.08	3.18
1772	3.07	0.15	0.03	0.57	0.09	3.89	0.12	0.08	0.20	0.11	4.40
1773	2.47	0.12	0.03	0.57	0.07	3.24	0.10	0.06	0.17	0.09	3.66
1774	1.94	0.10	0.03	0.57	0.06	2.68	0.08	0.05	0.14	0.08	3.01
1775	1.86	0.09	0.03	0.57	0.06	2.59	0.08	0.05	0.14	0.07	2.93

72 Ibid. For rice exports see *Historical Statistics*, 481-485, 1192; an economic contraction occurred in Europe, 1772-1775. Thomas S. Ashton, *Economic Fluctuations in England, 1700-1800* (Oxford, 1959), as cited by McCusker and Menard, *Economy of British America*, 62-63.

Sources: <sup>1</sup> Prime costs are from Cole, *Wholesale Commodity Prices*, II: 154. Converted to prices in sterling per barrel of 525 pounds.

<sup>2</sup> The commission fee charged at Charleston was 5%.

<sup>3</sup> Handling costs at South Carolina were reported by Powell, Hopton & Company at seven pence sterling. See letter to Keppelle & Steinmetz, March 30, 1772, Keppelle & Steinmetz "Correspondence," Box A-20.

<sup>4</sup> Freight charges fluctuated, based upon shipping availability. Wartime wages and high insurance costs raised shipping rates often to prohibitive levels. Morgan, "Colonial Rice Trade," 434, notes a decline in freight costs from £1.16 per barrel in 1700 to between £0.58 and £0.64 per barrel in the 1750s and to £0.37 to £0.44 by the early 1770s. Wartime rates were significantly higher. Morgan's estimates and a scattering of references in soft data have been combined to arrive at these figures.

<sup>5</sup> Insurance rates also rose during wartime. Peacetime rates to southern Europe were about 3%. Wartime saw them rise to 15%, 1740-1748 and 1756-1763.

<sup>6</sup> Costs, insurance, and freight charges raised the price of a barrel of rice significantly by the time it arrived at Lisbon, Cadiz, or elsewhere.

<sup>7</sup> Duties in southern European ports have been based on those in effect at Bilbao, amounting to 3%. See letters from Gardoquis, December 12, 1769, September 20, 23, 26, and 30, 1771, Cabot "Papers."

<sup>8</sup> Handling costs at Bilbao ran to about 2%. Same source as in <sup>7</sup>.

<sup>9</sup> In general, commissions charged on sales in Iberia were 5%, with an additional ½ of 1% added to cover the delivery of funds to a ship's captain. To arrange transferal to England charges could reach 2%. Same source as in <sup>7</sup>.

<sup>10</sup> The rice duty paid in England was set on one-half of the "old subsidy," or 2.5%. Macpherson, *Annals*, III: 463.

Table 10-9 examines shipping costs from America to southern Europe over the years 1732-1775 to establish probably minimum levels of return per barrel of rice. Wars escalated prices to a point at which American rice probably could not compete in those markets, notably 1744-1747 and 1756-1757. However, during peacetime the minimum cost of rice in Iberia rarely exceeded four pounds sterling per barrel, unless a shortage of wheat and flour intervened to raise prices. Ten references in mercantile correspondence to Iberian prices over the years 1763-1776 range from a low of £3.03 per barrel to £5.39, with the average falling at £4.23.<sup>73</sup> They suggest that rice sales there brought a return of almost nineteen percent profit, compared with minimum price data in Table 10-9. Rice sales are estimated to have been approximately £444,697 at a minimum.

Even subtracting the values of the salt and wine at their sale prices on arrival in America (£52,826) would have left a surplus of about £392,000 or an average per year of £78,374. Thus, the rice trade to southern Europe also proved to be an eldorado for rice exporters seeking a means to make remittances to their English creditors.

Since the large majority of the rice exports went out in English or Scottish bottoms, perhaps only one-fourth of that total devolved to the North American shippers and insurers. English investors, in the main, gained that income from cargoes going out to Iberia.<sup>74</sup> Local merchants and planters did, of course, build credits by selling them their share of the goods exported, and factors in America arranging these transactions

---

73 Cabot "Papers." These references come from Gardoqui letters to the Lees and Cabots, 1769-1775, and from Parr & Bulkeley letters to the Cliffords and to Keppelle & Steinmetz.

74 Clowse, *Charleston's Overseas Commerce*, Table C-61, 141-142; Table C-62, 143-144. Morgan, "Colonial Rice Trade," 443.

collected their five-percent commissions.

Southern European consumers took only about one-fifth of all the rice exported from English America, thus earnings from this branch of the trade did not compare to the sums arising from the fish sent from New England and Newfoundland, or to the earnings produced by colonial wheat and flour sales to those outlets. Kenneth Morgan cites Arthur Young's estimate in 1784 that the rice trade brought Britain £1,000,000 sterling per year just before the Revolution. If so, then the trade to Iberia would have been worth about £200,000.<sup>75</sup>

If the Iberians consumed about 30,000 barrels of Carolina rice yearly, it seems very possible that this direct sale of rice might have reached £150,000 annually, plus freight and insurance earnings. In this light Young's estimate was very accurate.

This area of the trade was normally limited to less than fifty vessels per year in the 1770s, and some of them carried lumber and other goods. Though the trade to Germany and the Netherlands was four times as large, nevertheless, the availability of an alternative market in Iberia and increasingly the West Indies helped maintain price levels in all three areas. Mercantilist controls over rice exports limited, with licensing and bonding strictures, the direct rice trade to Iberia and effectively slowed the entrance of locally owned shipping into the carriage of rice cargoes down to the end of the colonial era.

---

<sup>75</sup> Morgan, "Colonial Rice Trade," 452, citing Arthur Young's *Annals of Agriculture and Other Useful Arts* (London, 1784), I: 13-14. His is a high estimate. With the exception of two years, 1771 and 1772, southern Europe evidently took about twenty percent of the rice exported.



## CHAPTER XI

### THE SOUTHERN EUROPEAN WINE TRADE, 1600-1774

Sweet “fortified” wines, their alcoholic content increased by brandy, became increasingly popular by the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Also called “dessert” wines, they included Malaga, Sherry, Port, and Madeira. Their production centered in southern Spain, Portugal, and the Atlantic Wine Islands.

The first wines carried out to North America, destined for laborers in the fishery, undoubtedly were of cheaper quality available in Iberia and elsewhere. But by the 1630s sedentary populations in Virginia and New England began to show a more sophisticated taste for the fruits of the vine. Mercantilists, concerned with the balance of payments, had expected that viniculture would be profitably pursued in eastern North America. Those hopes failed of fruition through the whole colonial period.

Wines from Aveiro and Malaga attracted early patrons in America, as did those from St. George and Fayal in the Azores. Quite early vintages from Madeira arrived from Funchal and Canary wines from Terceira. As early as December 1639 sack ships from the islands flooded the Boston market.<sup>1</sup> Canary wine shortly gained an edge on the others. Madeira did not become a major wine producer until the mid-seventeenth century, until then concentrating on its major cash crop, sugar. Down into the 1670s Canary wines led in popularity in the North American market. Fayal wines ranked second.

John Winthrop’s *Journal* and other contemporary works make numerous references to the Canary wine traffic. The American market’s increasing sophistication became evident in 1645, when Massachusetts Bay instituted wine duties on Sherry, Sack, Malaga, Canary, Muscatel, Malmsey, Bastard, Tent, and Alicant wines at ten shillings a pipe. Favored Madeira paid 6s./8d., and weaker French wines 2s./6d.<sup>2</sup> During the mid-1640s, eight hundred butts were imported.<sup>3</sup> William Bradford added a postscript to an earlier entry in his *History of Plimouth Plantation*:

for what is now more plentiful than wine? and that of the best, coming from Malaga, Cannaries, and other places, sundry ships in a year. So as ther is now more cause to complaine of excess and abuse of wine (through mens corruption) even to drunkenness, then of any defecte or want of same. Witness this year 1646.<sup>4</sup>

The Aspinwall Notarial Records, 1645-1650, contain references to six wine shipments from Tenerife alone.<sup>5</sup> So much wine entered Boston in this decade that the colony forbade merchants from paying laborers in wine and workmen from selling it.<sup>6</sup>

Canary wine became so popular that an English company was founded to monopolize trade to there and islanders appealed to the Spanish government to pressure the English to allow entry of Canary wines to Barbados, which “was understood in the Canaries to mean to all of British North America.”<sup>7</sup> It failed because of English smuggling between the Canaries and Spanish America and also because of close Anglo-

---

1 *Trelawney Papers*, III: 191-192, 202. Anderson, *Origin of Commerce*, II: 261.

2 Dean Albertson, “Puritan Liquor in the Planting of New England,” *NEQ* XXIII: 482. *Winthrop’s Journal*, II: 269.

3 Weeden, *Economic and Social History*, I: 148. A butt and a pipe were equal.

4 Bradford, “*Of Plimouth Plantation*,” 191.

5 *Boston Records*, 254, 397, 400-401, 418-419.

6 Weeden, *Economic and Social History*, I: 183.

7 Morales Padron, *Commercio Canario-Americano*, 194-195.

Portuguese relations.

In the 1660s government legislation restricting colonial trade, especially the Canary trade, created major problems between the colonies and the mother country. The Stuart-Braganza connection solidified by Charles II's marriage opened the way for Madeira wine to replace Canary vintages on North American tables. The Staple Act of 1663 specifically excepted Madeiran and Azorean wines from the requirement that wines were to enter America only through England.<sup>8</sup>

Within one week in June 1676 Edward Randolph wrote his English superiors of two ships arriving at Boston carrying seventy-four pipes of French wine and three others with well over 130 pipes from the Canaries.<sup>9</sup> Wine tariffs favored vessels of local registry over those from other colonies and from Britain itself. English wine carriers complained that they were treated as "forainers in their own Colonies."<sup>10</sup> Massachusetts officials defended the colony's trading system but adverse reports on the Canary trade continued. In 1679 Robert Holden, a customs officer, notified his commissioner that ships loaded wine at Canary ports, touched at Madeira, or one of the Western Islands, and "there take about a tun of their wines which they put in the hatchway coming home." "'From whence your ship?' 'From Madeira with their lading wines,' and 'so draw of the upper casks for a taste.'" The whole cargo then passed "without further inquiry."<sup>11</sup> By 1680 the duty on imported wines paid sixty percent of the Massachusetts budget of £1,500.<sup>12</sup> Despite complaints about illegal trade, Canary wines and French commodities were "more plentiful in Boston than ever."<sup>13</sup> The condemnation cases of the Andros regime, 1685-1688, all "seem to have been for attempting to import illegally European products, usually wines or brandies."<sup>14</sup> John Hull's "Journal" contains multiple references to imports of "St. George's" and "Persala" wines entered by him.

The colonial predilection for Canary vintages continued. Vessels coming out from England often called at Terceira and loaded Spanish wines. New England customs laws, written in the 1680s under Governor Edmund Andros, taxed Madeira wines at ten shillings per pipe, while others paid 13s.4d. Massachusetts duties in 1692 again favored Portuguese island wines.<sup>15</sup> Merchants argued that Canary wines, more reasonably priced, should be identified as the product of Africa to circumvent the Navigation Laws.<sup>16</sup> Those merchants were also loathe to lose that market for codfish, clapboards, and pipe staves. Despite Edward Randolph's dedicated efforts to halt this traffic, and complaints by later officials, it continued down to 1775.

Not all the wines entering New England found consumption there. As early as the 1640s Boston vessels carried wines off to Virginia and the West Indies and later to other English colonies. George L. Beer reported that wines from New England were heavily consumed in the West Indies.<sup>17</sup> To the late seventeenth century French wines remained popular in England. Relatively cheap, they sold despite duties doubling first costs. Then, England's close ties to Portugal, solidified by the Methuen Treaty of 1703, saw taxes on Portuguese wines lowered to one-third those levied on French imports. Shortly, Portuguese vintages

---

8 Giesecke, *American Commercial Legislation*, 5.

9 Randolph to Coventry, June 17, 1676, *CSPC*, VIII (1675-1676): 408.

10 *CSPC*, IX, (1677-1680): 156-157.

11 Holden to Commissioners of Customs, June 10, 1769, *CSPC*, IX, (1677-1680): 372-373.

12 George F. Cheever, *Some Remarks on the Commerce of Salem, 1626 to 1740*. Essex Institute Historical Collections I (Salem, Mass., 1859-1860), 81.

13 Entries for October 31, 1685; November 9, 1685; December 4, 1685; December 29, 1685, John Hull, "Journal, 1685-1689," BL. V. Barnes, *Dominion of New England*, 158.

14 Cranfield to Lords of Trade, May 14, 1684, *CSPC*, X (1681-1685): 1683.

15 Weeden, *Economic and Social History*, I: 239, 354.

16 Bailyn and Bailyn, *Massachusetts Shipping*, 149.

17 Beer, *Origins*, 416-419.

replaced French wines.<sup>18</sup>

As England's American settlements grew in the eighteenth century, Boston's leadership in the wine trade suffered erosion, first by New Yorkers and later Pennsylvanians. Though the latter's involvement occurred only after expansion of its grain trade during the 1730s and after 1763.

American settlers had become familiar with a broad variety of wines – Verdelho, Tinto (Tent), Malmsey, and Vidonia included.<sup>19</sup> William Bolton represented the principal English merchant house at Madeira. His correspondence, 1695-1714, has been published and allows a view of an English merchant's life there. He dealt extensively with shipping going to the English colonies and was a connoisseur of local wines, which then ranged in price between six and eight pounds per pipe.<sup>20</sup>

The smuggling techniques cited earlier by customs officer Robert Holden frustrated royal appointees and colonial customs collectors, who faced a real problem in identifying varieties of wine. It was relatively easy to dissemble the origins of that entering. At least one colony made it a misdemeanor to do so.<sup>21</sup> Colonials taxed wines at different rates but, in general, favored locally registered vessels and encouraged direct shipment from point of origin.

Analysis of wine import data, 1711-1774, allows a tenuous estimation of the business of importing wines from southern Europe. Down to 1763 Britain's official regulations allowed only wines from the Azores (Western Islands) and Madeira to enter her colonies directly. All wines entering "legally" directly were presumed to be from those areas. Canary wines were "officially" beyond the pale but enjoyed sufferance as the produce of Africa, or entered on the basis of long historical tradition. Though recognized under a number of names, these three types were lumped together as "island" wines. Quality was the key in assessing the prices they would bring on sale.

Major centers importing island wines were Boston, New York, Philadelphia, and Charleston. Salem, a satellite of Boston down to the 1760s, then rose in importance. Following its conquest, Quebec, with its large French population, joined the others. Table 11-1 presents a tentative estimation of entrances from the Wine Islands, 1710-1774. Boston held the leadership position before 1740 and then declined down to the Revolution. In contrast, New York, lacking a large staple crop, turned early to wine importing and distributing. The opening of the grain and flour trade encouraged New Yorkers during the 1730s and Philadelphia merchants also. The latter, ranked third in the 1730s, weathered the depressed years of the 1740s and in the next twenty years took over the lead. Rhode Islanders did not trade extensively to southern Europe.

---

18 Ralph Davis, "English Foreign Trade, 1660-1700," *EHR* VII (1954-5): 156.

19 *Bolton Letters*, I: 16-19. Vidonia wine (Canary) was "of a pale colo'r tastes harsh and is inclined to look thick," William G. Saltonstall, *Ports of Piscataqua* (Cambridge, Mass., 1941), 30, citing Birkett.

20 *Ibid.*

21 *CSPC*, IX, (1677-1680): 372-373. Giesecke, *American Commercial Legislation*, 14-26.

**TABLE 11-1**  
**North American Entrances from the Wine Islands to Selected Ports, 1710-1774**

Years	Salem			Boston			New York			Philadelphia			Totals		
	Mad-eira	Azores	Can-aries	Mad-eira	Azores	Can-aries	Mad-eira	Azores	Can-aries	Mad-eira	Azores	Can-aries	Mad-eira	Azores	Can-aries
1710-1714				28	73	4									
1715-1719	0	8	0	34	37	7	20	1	0						
1720-1724				32	20	10	23	0	1	14	0	0			
1725-1729	0	10	0	48	23	9	31	0	1	19	0	0	98	33	10
1730-1734	0	14	0	44	13	11	30	0	1	27	5	1	101	32	12
1735-1739	0	5	0	31	2	20	30	0	18	30	0	0	91	7	38
1740-1744				21	5	0	29	0	0	12	0	0			
1745-1749				17	9	1				28	0	2			
1750-1754	2	2	0	3	23	3	38	10	10	36	19	4	79	54	17
1755-1759	4	3	1	3	2	4				27	16	8			
1760-1764	3	7	0	5	3	5	78	20	5	45	29	20	131	59	30
1765-1769	10	2	0	10	3	3				42	8	8			
1770-1774	5	2	0	9	8	9				50	8	7			

Sources: Data in this table come from a variety of sources. When available statistics cover less than a five-year period, they are extrapolated. Salem figures for 1715-1719 and 1750-1770 are from *MSR*. Salem data for 1725-1739 are from *NEWJ*; for 1770-1774 from *EG*. Boston statistics are from *BNL* and *NEWJ* for 1710-1750 and 1765-1773 and from *MSR* for 1751-1769. New York data are from *NORNY 1222-1228* (1715-1764) and are very scattered after the 1730s. Figures for 1760-1764 are skewed because of numerous arrivals in 1763 and 1764, the only years available. Philadelphia material is from *AWM* and after 1730 from *PG. Clowse, Charleston's Overseas Commerce*, provides data for some years of arrivals for the port, which indicate that entrances there ranged at about six vessels annually during the period 1715-1724; had risen to nine per year 1755-1764; eleven during 1765-1769. Clowse's data are not easily comparable with the figures in this table.

Sparse Naval Office Records make reconstructing the Atlantic wine trade difficult. However, when supplemented by newspaper customs reports enough data is available to provide its general outlines. Madeira was most popular but over the eighteenth century much of the wine entering still was from Azorean and Canary sources. Wars periodically closed off the Canary imports. Through these years Portuguese wines continued to enjoy preferential treatment. An acceptable rule is that Madeira filled about sixty percent of the cargo space allotted to island wines; that from the Azores almost twenty-five percent, and Canary vintages about one-eighth. As demand for Madeira rose, prices increased and colonial merchants sought alternatives. Large importations from non-Madeiran sources occurred between 1700 and 1719 and after 1750. Azorean wines gained popularity between 1710 and 1729 and during the 1750s. Canary wine entered through the whole period but more during the 1730s and after the 1750s. Thirty-five or forty wine carriers entered annually during peak periods down to 1774.



**TABLE 11-2**  
**Madeira Entrances at New York, 1753-1755, 1763-1764**

Year	Vessels	Tons	Listed in	
			Pipes	Gallons
1753	2	95	104.61	12,751
1754	7	275	320.58	29,470
1755	4	210	251.67	29,887
1763	11	581	833.65	111,523
1764	16	618	1,028.10	112,353
Total	40	1,779	2,588.61	295,984

Source: NORNY, 1228. Rated utilization 72.75%; actual utilization 66.02%. Loss due to leakage, pilferage, or inaccuracy 6.73%.

Wine carriers normally followed two possible trade patterns down to 1774. Ships bound from England or Ireland picked up partial cargoes in the islands en route; or American goods went to the islands, the ships returning with wines. Full wine loadings were rather uncommon. A large, expensive cargo could glut an American market. Scattered New York Naval Office Records, 1715-1764, show wine vessels carried about two-thirds of their rated capacities.<sup>22</sup> Since tonnages were understated, actual wine tonnage was probably less than fifty percent of the space available.

New York, an active importer of Madeira, competed with Boston by the second and third decades of the century. On average more than two hundred tons of Madeira entered Manhattan yearly and that volume continued during the 1730s with few entrances from other island groups. Suddenly the Canary trade came alive. Between 1734 and 1739 seventeen ships (860 tons) arrived. Four came in ballast only. About five hundred tons of Canary entered on eleven vessels. Wine utilization levels came very close to one hundred percent.<sup>23</sup>

Canary and Azores wines sold at significantly lower prices than Madeira. As demand put pressure on supply, canny merchants turned to cheaper imports. Upon war with Spain in 1739, only Madeira and Azorean wines were available. Wartime exigencies obstructed the trade to 1748. By the early 1750s New York's wine imports stood at more than 325 tons of wine, fifty-eight percent of it Madeira; fourteen percent Canary and twenty-eight percent from the Azores. Ten years later, 1763-1764, annual imports from Funchal had risen again to more than 550 tons; Canary wines reached 160 tons and Fayal wines were at 25 tons.<sup>24</sup>

Missing customs records for Boston and Philadelphia can be filled out with newspaper customs data. Boston's decline is amply evident, from a dominant position earlier to also-ran status by the late 1760s. In contrast, middle colony cities New York and Philadelphia by midcentury vied for leadership; Charleston held third position. Salem has been included because, along with Newport, Portsmouth, New London, and other smaller ports, it took one or two wine carriers per year. By the close of the period, merchants in Chesapeake Bay also received wine shipments. See Table 11-3. Total tonnage of wine arriving at these four or five entry points per decade appears, at first, fairly large, ranging upwards from 6,400 tons (12,800 pipes)

22 NORNY, 1222-1228.

23 Ibid. Wine island vessels, arriving in ballast, were viewed skeptically by customs officials.

24 NORNY, 1228.

in the 1740s to 18,163 tons (36,326 pipes) during the 1760s. However, these are data for ten year periods. The “Inspector General’s Report, 1768-1772,” indicates that average annual imports reached just above 1,550 pipes. During this time indirect imports significantly increased because of the American Revenue Act, 1764. CO 16/1 provides the only comprehensive statistical overview of the North American wine trade, as well as a picture of intercolonial exchange. It does not, unfortunately, distinguish between vessels from the mainland and those from the Wine Islands and in some cases lumps all island wines together under the heading “Azores wine.” But, as it includes wine shipments to and from the British Isles and the West Indies, it allows examination of the legal wine trade in those years.<sup>25</sup>

**TABLE 11-3**  
**Southern European Wine Entering Selected North American Ports, 1710-1774**  
**(Yearly Average by Decade)**

Years	Salem			Boston			New York			Philadelphia			Charleston Wine/T
	Ves.	Tons	Wine/T	Ves.	Tons	Wine/T	Ves.	Tons	Wine/T	Ves.	Tons	Wine/T	
1710-1719	1.33	83.7	38.2	16.0	635	343.4	4.9	300	240.0				
1720-1729				14.2	653	507.5	5.9	310	250.8	3.3	221	142.4	152.0
1730-1739				12.0	557	388.0	8.5	473	325.0	6.7	421	284.8	175.2
1740-1749				5.3	244	190.2	6.2	290	226.2	4.2	269	222.8	
1750-1759	1.88	95.8	39.8	3.7	211	124.2	16.5	450	325.0	11.1	749	619.0	292.3
1760-1769	2.6	191.5	60.5	3.0	198	24.9	15.5	695	548.5	15.2	838	789.3	460.3
1770-1774	1.4			6.5	455	282.4				6.2	374	337.0	

Sources: Salem data are from *MSR*; 3 years in the teens; 8 years in the fifties; 5 years in the sixties. Data for 1770-1774 are from *EG*. Boston data are from *MSR*; 1 year in the teens; 8 years in the fifties; and 5 years in the sixties. Entries in other years are from *BNL* customs reports with tonnage and wine cargoes estimated. Seventies data cover only 1770-1773. New York figures are from *NORNY*; data extant are 4.25 years in the teens; 9.75 years, twenties; 8.75 years, thirties; only 2 years in the forties, fifties, and sixties. Philadelphia statistics are from customs reports in *AWM* and *PG*; tonnages of vessels are estimated as are wine cargoes, based on New York figures. Philadelphia figures for the 1750s and 1760s appear badly skewed. Charleston figures for wines entering are taken from Clowse’s *Charleston’s Overseas Commerce*, Table A-31, 34. Extant data cover 2 years in the teens; 1 year in the twenties; 7 years, thirties; 2 years, fifties; and 4 years in the sixties.

\* \* \*

Wine prices varied widely. By 1772-1773 Lisbon wine sold there at twenty to twenty-two pounds per ton, while Oporto wines found buyers at about twenty-nine pounds, and an average Maderia brought, at first cost, forty pounds per ton.<sup>26</sup> English buyers bought about 3,000 tons of Lisbon wine yearly in the 1770s; approximately 10,500 tons of Port and 4,000 tons of Maderia, along with 2,000 tons of Canary wine for consumption in the British Isles, the West Indies, North America, and India.

Boston early in this century and Philadelphia after 1750 concentrated on Azores and Canary vintages to a greater degree than New York. Boston’s arrivals from Madeira answered less than half (49.1%) its needs,

<sup>25</sup> CO 16/1. In these five years Virginia took 128.6 tons of wine on average.

<sup>26</sup> Whitehead to Rochford, April 30, 1774; SPFP 89/76; Hort to Walpole, May 6, 1774, SPFP 89/77. “An Account of Madeira’s Trade,” Board of Trade 6/62.

with entrances from the Azores of seventy-one wine carriers.<sup>27</sup> In 1764 Willing & Morris of Philadelphia sold a selection of expensive Madeiras at between £70 and £130 per pipe, plus “a large Quantity of Teneriffe, Fayal and other Wines.”<sup>28</sup> With rare exceptions the best Madeiras fetched the highest prices. Rich American merchants desired the “best old amber Coloured high flavored nut Wine of the best kind Shipt to the Lonon market,” as Henry Lloyd wrote Scott, Pringle & Cheap in December 1765.<sup>29</sup> Consumers with discriminating taste were highly esteemed. Gerard G. Beekman commented: “such differences our Connesseurs makes in Madera wine.”<sup>30</sup> Variances in the kind and quality of the wines shipped caused constant complaints.

In the early 1730s Philadelphian John Reynell warned correspondents that they should buy only good quality Madeira wines: “ordinary Wine will not sell here.” He complained again that a parcel of wines was “mostly red wines which are very unsaleable here,” calling for “pale old Wines.”<sup>31</sup> Inferior vintages could be fobbed off to West Indian outlets. Serving a fine Madeira definitely enhanced one’s social status. In March 1738 Peter Faneuil, *nouveau riche*, ordered “five pipes of your very best Medera Wines of an Amber colour of the same sort W’h you send to our good friend Mr. Stephen DeLancey of New York – as this Wine is for the use of my house you will be careful that I have the best I am not over fond of the Strongest sort.”<sup>32</sup> The following winter he ordered “five more pipes of the best wine, of an amber Collour” and then added, “I have recommended my good friend, Mr. Peagram the Surveyor generall of his Majesty’s Customs here to you for some Wines.”<sup>33</sup> Shortages of specific wines forced prices higher and Faneuil noted: “Vidonia Wines if good will go nigh to fetch fifty a pipe.”<sup>34</sup>

In September 1765 Henry Lloyd wrote a Philadelphia firm of his desire for “old rich Lisbon Wines as you describe” at the price quoted, adding that it was “probable [he] could run off a Quantity pretty soon (tho Wines are generally a dull Article) Success in the Sale will depend as much or more on the quality as the price, indifferent Wines is the worst Article can be imported & will not Sell at any rate.”<sup>35</sup> Sherries did not attract importers. One firm noted: “Sherry wine is an Article so seldom sold here that ‘tis hard to say whereabouts it would fetch.”<sup>36</sup>

The capacity of a pipe (126 gallons) was a problem. Additional costs resulted from decantation into smaller containers. A pipe was a large purchase for a household. NORNY material indicates a tendency to smaller casks (42 gallons), or quarter casks (10.5 gallons) as the century progressed. During the 1760s Willing & Morris offered Lisbon wine, Tenerife, and Fayal in quarter casks at prices ranging between £5.75 and £16.<sup>37</sup>

---

27 See Table 11-1.

28 PG, August 30, 1764.

29 Letter to Scott, Pringle & Cheap, December 16, 1765, Lloyd “Letter Book.”

30 Philip L. White, *The Beekmans of New York, 1647-1877* (New York, 1956), 220-221.

31 Letters to Deeble, April 19, 1731; September 30, 1732; letter to Dicker, December 4, 1733, Reynell “Letter Book, 1729-1732.”

32 Letter to Pope & Company, March 1, 1738, Faneuil “Letter Book.”

33 Letter to Pope & Company, December 15, 1738, *ibid.*

34 Letter to Peter Lynch, September 10, 1738, *ibid.*

35 Letter to Baynton, Wharton & Morgan, September 30, 1765, Lloyd “Letter Book.”

36 Letter from Reed & Pettit, August 11, 1763, Thomas Fayerweather “Papers,” New England Historical and Genealogical Society, Boston.

37 Letter to Willing & Morris, October 17, 1765, Lloyd “Letter Book.” James & Wilson of Charleston wrote them, July 29, 1774, that they had not sold their wine “owing to its being in Pipes was it in Qr. casks could vend some.” Keppelle & Steinmetz “Correspondence.”

Retailers repackaged spirits in smaller containers. In 1737 Jonathan Williams sold wines at the “Sign of the Black Boy and Butt” in Boston, as follows:

Choice Madeira.....10s./gal.  
Rich Canary.....10s./gal.  
Green Canary.....7/6gal.  
Vidonia.....7/0gal.  
Red Wine.....7/0gal.  
Fayal.....6/0gal.<sup>38</sup>

In 1763 Campbell, Scott & Company in Water Street, Philadelphia were selling “Madeira, Teneriffe, Fayal, Lisbon, Mountain and choice Port Wine, as well as Claret, Burgundy, Champaigne, Hermitage, Fontiniac & excellent old port and Pruneac Wines.”<sup>39</sup>

Wine merchants did not stick at chicanery. A Philadelphia shipper sent wines to Shirley & Martin in South Carolina, commenting that they were “four years old Wine Strong body and good Colour’d with age – but should you like them higher put as much of the Colouring and Brandy in as you think proper,” adding that he sold “these wines for 20 to 25£/pipe to the duch [Dutch] as Mediria.”<sup>40</sup>

Importers faced a number of concerns. Vintage wines were not cheap even early in the century and a cargo involved a significant investment.<sup>41</sup> Pipes or casks, if not carefully handled, leaked. Wine also turned “Sower.” Loading and unloading a vessel, drayage, storage, insurance, customs, and commissions all escalated wine prices. Merchants often complained that wine merchandising was a losing enterprise. Long-term relationships between island wine houses and American importers did not guarantee profits. Arthur Jensen, however, lays complaints to the eternal pessimism of merchants.<sup>42</sup> Wine markets might be easily overstocked. Governor Robert Hunter of New York reported to the Board of Trade in 1714 that the colony had been overstocked for a whole year.<sup>43</sup>

In September 1773, Parr & Bulkeley loaded the ship *Charming Nancy* with 1,200 quarter casks of Lisbon wine for Keppelle & Steinmetz at Philadelphia. First costs reached £3,094.4 sterling. Captain Davidson cleared Lisbon to Falmouth, paid duties there of £711.8, and sailed for the Delaware. There he paid colonial duties of £73. Insurance cost £118; freight charges rose to £272.73. Seventy-two quarter casks were lost to leakage. The remaining 1,128 quarter casks before sale stood at about £4,280.<sup>44</sup> In early December the *Pennsylvania Gazette* advertised:

Brought in on this day on the Ship Charming Peggy, Samuel Davidson, from Lisbon: A Quantity of the best genuine Lisbon WINE in Pipes and Quarter Casks, the Pipes contain upwards of 140 Gallons each. Also fresh Lisbon Lemmons, Sweet Oil, Olives, and a Quantity of best long Velvet Corks, which they are determined to sell on the most reasonable

38 *NEWJ*, March 8, 1737. John Reynell sold wine in flasks, *PG*, November 2, 1738.

39 *PG*, August 4, 1763.

40 Letter to Shirley & Martin, August 1, 1764, Riche “Letter Book, 1764-1771.”

41 White, *Beekmans*, 326.

42 Jensen, *Maritime Commerce*, 61-62.

43 *CSPC*, XXVIII (August 1714-December 1715), xxvi, 15.

44 Letter from Parr & Bulkeley, September 2, 1773, Keppelle & Steinmetz “Correspondence.” *Charming Peggy* also carried one hundred boxes of lemons, ten barrels of sweet oil, and thirty casks of corks. Total cargo cost at Lisbon 11,115\$554 reis at 66.75d. per milreis was £3,094.39 sterling.

Terms, for Cash, or short Credit.<sup>45</sup>

Additional charges resulted from the landing, transport, storage, and commissions on the wine. Hopefully, it brought a profit.

\* \* \*

In her study of New York merchants, Virginia L. Harrington cites this comment on New York's devotion to Bacchus.

America in general complains of the high prices of Madeira, indeed I was at a loss what to attribute it to, that instead of [diminishing] they annually increased in value upon us, but my eyes were opened, and if the sons follow in the footsteps of their fathers which they d[rink] enough to do I make not the least doubts in a few years to read the Province of New York consumes the whole vintage of [Madeira]. Never did I see the like, Never do I believe there [existed a] city more thoroughly devoted to Bacchus. He orders [where]ever they meet. But what amazes me the more [they devote] themselves to him the healthier they appear – Madeira is the remedy for all disorders and they tell me [if I would but] turn off my doctors and drink more of it, it would be better for me.<sup>46</sup>

William Cawthorne, Madeira wine seller, listed the various grades of wine available. The premier vintages or “London best pillar Wines” cost £26 per common cask; second quality or “New york” wines sold for £23.75; “Jamaica Wine (best merchantable West Indian wines)” at £18.98; and fourth quality “common West Indian wines” at £17.05.<sup>47</sup>

Wine prices rose gradually down to the Revolution. When wine was in glut, prices fell, while shortages, especially wartime shortages, pushed prices higher. Embargoes on the export of North American provisions stopped this trade during the war years. By the early 1760s Madeira had risen to about fifty pounds per pipe. In 1764 news that heavier duties on direct wine shipments had been imposed drove the price to sixty pounds.<sup>48</sup> Then, a rush to bring in wine before the new imposts took effect saw prices drop. Some authorities suggest that this decline reflected increased smuggling but tighter controls and active naval oversight coincided. Madeira prices peaked again in the 1770s at sixty to seventy pounds per pipe. Despite the new taxes and their enforcement, the demand for wine continued.<sup>49</sup>

Island-bound cargoes usually contained foodstuffs, fish, and lumber of various kinds. The right to export one thousand tons of foodstuffs from Madeira to Brazil had been granted by the Portuguese crown before 1748. About half those exports had been North American produce, which encouraged American trade there but, by the mid-1760s, that exportation had been halted. Provisions brought to the islands paid no duties but on reexport could be taxed eleven percent *ad valorem*. Goods other than foodstuffs paid a ten percent duty.

English representatives complained of violations of their treaty rights in the Portuguese and Spanish

---

45 *PG*, December 8, 1773.

46 Harrington, *New York Merchants*, 201-202, citing William Gordon to William Allen, March 9, 1754.

47 Letter from Cawthorne at Madeira, February 24, 1763, Fayerweather “Papers.”

48 Bezanson, Gray, and Hussey, *Prices in Colonial Pennsylvania*, 231-235.

49 *Ibid.* White, *Beekmans*, 473, notes James Beekman making fine returns on two Madeira cargoes, though apparently after the Revolution began.

islands. Consul Thomas Cheap was a partner in the firm of Scott, Pringle & Cheap, which had been in business in Madeira since the 1730s. With eleven other English merchants he appealed for protection of their rights in 1765, by which time the island's population had reached 120,000. The seventeenth-century trading pattern had seen English vessels deliver wheat and flour and then proceed to America with wine. With the advent of colonial grain surpluses, American vessels exchanged them at Funchal for wine. Demand for Madeira grew in the eighteenth century until local vintages could hardly satisfy demand. By the 1760s it had become a seller's market answering demands from the colonies, India, and the British Isles. Madeirans now demanded pay in bills of exchange drawn on London or Lisbon; became their own importers; and answered their own needs, reducing the importation of finished English goods. Cheap's report on the island set annual wine production at 15,000 pipes. England and America, in total, took 8,000 pipes per year. He estimated American consumption at 5,333 pipes annually.<sup>50</sup> There is a question as to the volume of wine produced. Andre L. Simon, editor of *The Bolton Letters*, believed that in 1700 the Madeiras made 28,000 pipes yearly. Locals consumed 8,000 pipes and the rest, he believed, was exported.<sup>51</sup>

Traders to Madeira in the mid-1700s, because Pombal fostered Portuguese commercial independence, faced the same difficulties as did Englishmen at Lisbon or Oporto. Since goods reexported paid heavy island taxes, ship masters often used a smallboat "to enquire the markets" before officially entering. In 1764 Thomas Riche warned the captain of his *Sally* to "send in a boat to Fayal before anchoring" in order to discover if wines he had ordered from William Street were ready for shipment.<sup>52</sup> Eight years later three vessels arriving at Fayal "with no intentions of" selling anything there paid heavy duties to "export" their original cargoes.<sup>53</sup> Merchants alerted their captains to such dangers. Funchal, the main Madeira port, provided a poor anchorage from storms. Vessels anchored there often had to put to sea because gales made it untenable.<sup>54</sup>

\* \* \*

Merchant correspondents normally exchanged letters establishing the terms on which they engaged in business; their credentials vouched for by other American merchants already respected in the mercantile world. In the same way colonial merchants recommended well established island firms to those wishing to trade there. Occasionally overseas firms wrote potential colonial shippers offering their services and providing references who could endorse their honesty, credibility, and diligence. A reputation for attention to detail was hard earned and jealously guarded. Merchants often undertook long, taxing voyages to insure that their connections would be founded on solid, personal relationships. John Reynell, a Philadelphian and long-term investor in the Madeira wine trade, wrote a correspondent in 1731, thanking him for "his kind Treatment when at Madeira."<sup>55</sup> An American merchant might take up residence in the islands as an exporter, depending upon his reputation and connections in America to recommend him. Such was the case with Stephen Winthrop, who moved to the islands in the mid-seventeenth century. Francis Bolton served as Madeira agent for a London firm from the 1690s to 1714.<sup>56</sup>

---

50 Report of Consul Cheap and Madeira Merchants, July 1, 1765, SPFP 89/77. *CSPC*, XLIII (1737): 183. Weeden, *Economic and Social History*, II: 643-644.

51 *Bolton Letters*, I: 20.

52 Letter to Captain Davidson, May 6, 1764, Riche "Letter Book, 1764-1771."

53 *EG*, January 10, 1769; September 15, 1772.

54 Letter from Boswell, January 12, 1765, Fayerweather "Papers." *PG*, March 3, 1775.

55 Letter to Lawrence, May 21, 1731, Reynell "Letter Book, 1729-1734."

56 Weeden, *Economic and Social History*, I: 150. *Bolton Letters*.

During the 1730s American traders at Funchal dealt with Pope & Company, or with James Scott & Company, a forerunner of Scott, Pringle & Cheap, which prospered there to the 1760s. Merchants with English political connections often sought consular positions. Consulage fees paid a tidy sum; brought prestige in trading circles; and protected them from officious local leaders. Thomas Cheap held that post at Madeira in the 1760s and 1770s, succeeding another Funchal resident, Matthew Hiccox of Chambers, Hammond & Chambers.<sup>57</sup>

Madeira wine exports faced the usual costs associated with trading in that era. Israel Pemberton reported on costs associated with Madeira exports in 1728. He paid twenty pounds a pipe for the “best Madeira.” Cooperage, decanting, and carriage to the ship cost four shillings. Export duties added ten percent to his first costs. In a long letter he described the trade:

When we have a Vessel for Madeira we generally agree to fill her here, and likewise to load her at the Madeira either for this place or some part of the West Indies, and then we give 40/ to 50/ per Pipe frt for the Wine, and have the wheat carried to the Madeira frt free, but its very rare a vessel can be got, to go to the Madeira without engaging a full frt back – But when there is an opport’y of frt only for the Madeira we usually give from 18<sup>d</sup> to 20<sup>d</sup> per Bushel its not very frequent that Wine can be got on frt from the Madeira to this place, because those that use that trade from hence, either have Vessels of their own or hire Vessels to carry their Graine thither and bring their wine back – Madeira wine at this time is exceeding low and not worth an p’sons while to send it here, that does not live in this place – for when Strangers comes with Wine they offer for present pay sell from 12 to 15£ per Pipe. Some times under- when our merch’t that trade that way get 20£ or 22£ p Pipe but then they trust from 12 to 24 mos. and often times meet with very bad Chaps that never pay.<sup>58</sup>

Freight charges and insurance added to a trader’s outlay. As early as 1684 freight from Madeira to Boston had reached one pound per pipe.<sup>59</sup> A good general figure for the eighteenth- century freights is £1.5 per pipe. Shippers often negotiated rates dependent upon the quantity of goods involved; or on whether the shipowner would accept payment in kind for the freighting fees. Insurance during peacetime cost about 2.5 percent; war escalated it to seven or eight percent.<sup>60</sup>

Wine on arrival in America bore other expenses. At Philadelphia Pemberton employed a porter and dray to carry it to his store for 2.5 shillings. He stored it for a one-percent fee and charged his buyers a five-percent commission.<sup>61</sup>

The working of a ship at sea often loosened staves on wine barrels. Evaporation and pilferage had to be guarded against. Merchants occasionally refer to leakage in correspondence.<sup>62</sup> Henry Lloyd in one letter added six shilling to an estimate “for leakage.” In 1765 Thomas Riche complained to Parr & Bulkeley that of ninety-nine quarter casks they had sent him “14 was empty on Landing here.”<sup>63</sup> Charles Willing sold

---

57 Report of Consul Cheap and Madeira Merchants, July 1, 1765, SPFP 89/77.

58 Letter to Dicker, October 7, 1728; letter to Corsley & Rogers, June 4, 1728, Pemberton “Letter Book, 1727-1735.”

59 Entry for December 23, 1684, Hull “Journal.”

60 Letter to Champion, December 10, 1756, James & Drinker “Letter Book, 1756-1762,” in HSP.

61 Letter to Corsley & Rogers, April 6, 1728, Pemberton “Letter Book, 1727-1735.”

62 Letter to Baynton, Wharton & Morgan, September 30, 1765, Lloyd “Letter Book.”

63 Letter to Parr & Bulkeley, July 31, 1765, Riche “Letter Book, 1764-1771.”

Lisbon wines at Philadelphia in 1755 “at 95/ unfilled as they come on shoar.”<sup>64</sup> In commenting on wine trade negatives, Arthur Jensen cited leakage, high interest rates, and low prices.<sup>65</sup>

Pipes varied in size despite attempts at standardization, ranging in size from 110 to 140 gallons. Apparently for a number of reasons – leakage, pilferage, container size variations, and perhaps evaporation – New York customs officials began, at least as early as 1753, to list arriving Madeira wine cargoes in pipes and in gallons. NORNY data for four years are available in both forms. See Table 11-2. The forty Madeira shipments so listed contained 295,984 gallons, almost seven percent less than fully gauged containers.<sup>66</sup> The officials were only interested in Madeira arrivals; Azores and Canary wines were not measured. Discrepancies in container sizes were common in this era; measurements were normally figured so as to reach a level equitable to buyer and seller. Arthur H. Cole measured a pipe as containing 110 gallons, rather than the 126 gallons specific measure. Merchants also complained about wine that had “sowered” or “turned eager,” making it unsalable. In such cases they sought rebates on duties already paid.<sup>67</sup>

Handling, measurement, and storage of wine and salt concerned colonial government. Legislation controlled charges for those services. In Massachusetts during the 1730s wine portorage to storage cost twelve pence per pipe. Rates for such services were also precisely spelled out in Pennsylvania. Wine portorage for up to a half mile cost 18d. per pipe and longer distances 21d. per pipe. Heavy wine containers, tapered at both ends, were awkward to move. Thus the storage method determined the charges if moved in “endways” rather than “length ways,” the colony set a 6d. premium per pipe. Portorage charges for quarter casks of wine were prorated depending on the number moved; one cask eight pence; two for one shilling; three for fifteen pence; and more at five pence per quarter cask.<sup>68</sup>

\* \* \*

Shepherd and Walton seem to suspect that trade between North America and the Canaries was fairly uncommon in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. That trade had certainly strained the relationship between Edward Randolph and Massachusetts Bay merchants during the 1670s and 1680s.<sup>69</sup> Nonetheless, the Canary trade attracted investment through the whole pre-Revolutionary period. See Table 11-1. At least one or two vessels arrived at Boston from Tenerife every year. By the mid-1730s their numbers had risen. Annual Canary entrances at New York reached five per year in the late 1730s. Needing wheat and flour to feed their population of more than 100,000, the islands paid for those necessities with wine. By that date islanders required 55,000 fanegas of wheat annually from abroad. Tenerife was said to then export 16,000 pipes of wine yearly, one-fourth of which was sent to British America.<sup>70</sup>

Located off Africa’s northwest coast, those islands lay dangerously near the Moroccan pirate center at Sallee. As late as the 1760s that trade had been “much infested by three Barbary corsairs – who had made many captures, seizing all those not provided with a Mediterranean Pass.”<sup>71</sup> The number of English merchants at Tenerife was limited. Only six affixed their signatures to a report by Consul Thomas

---

64 Letter to Connell & Moroney, August 5, 1755, Willing “Letter Book.”

65 Jensen, *Maritime Commerce*, 61.

66 NORNY, 1228. Cargoes of four vessels from Madeira were not listed in both measures.

67 Cole, *Wholesale Commodity Prices*.

68 *NEWJ*, July 25, 1738. *PG*, April 16, 1771; September 29, 1770.

69 Shepherd and Walton, *Shipping, Maritime Trade*, 103n. Andrews, *Colonial Period*, IV: 111-112. Weeden, *Economic and Social History*, I: 238.

70 Morales Padron, *Commercio Canario-Americano*, 201, 218.

71 *AWM*, June 1, 1721. *PG*, August 25, 1763.



Trowbridge in 1713. Anglo-Spanish tensions made this a chancy business and, in 1731, all English merchants were ordered to leave there.<sup>72</sup> Yet, peace prevailed and the trade continued.

Periodically the Spanish sought to bring resident foreign traders in their ports under tighter controls. By the mid-1750s a new royal governor at the Canaries had instituted strict controls over the whole trading process. When Consul Nesbitt resigned, he was replaced by a relative of the Pasley family, Lisbon merchants. Pasley listed the few English merchants there as White Brothers, David Lockhart & Sons, and J.W. Collogan. Seven years later only Lockhart & Son remained.<sup>73</sup>

\* \* \*

Information about the exchange of American goods for Azorean wines is limited. Yet for much of the colonial period those islands rivaled the Madeiras as sources for wine consumed in North America. Between 1710 and 1730 New Englanders had more truck with the Portuguese at Fayal, Terceira, and St. Georges than with Madeira wine producers. Again few English merchants resided in those small centers. Trade was mainly through Portuguese nationals. North American entrances from the Azores reached the highest levels before 1720 then declined until the 1750s, when the trade enjoyed a renaissance. See Table 11-1. Consul Magra estimated in the 1770s that fifty English vessels traded there annually from all points.<sup>74</sup>

\* \* \*

Prompted in part by weaknesses exposed by the Seven Years War, the government began a major overhaul of the imperial system, which had a significant impact on the southern European trade. New legislation pushed through the Parliament aimed at efficiency, a more equitable system of taxation, and a closer adherence to the principles of mercantilism. Parliament needed to increase imperial revenues, reduce wartime debts, and provide for the larger military establishment the empire now required. London leadership, recognizing that America enjoyed a flourishing economy overall, strove to reapportion the tax burden between the metropolis and the colonies. Royal officials were convinced that smuggling was endemic.

The customs system in America was reorganized beginning in 1763, providing for active enforcement and more efficient collection of duties. As early as 1763 Thomas Riche reported Philadelphia “Surrounded by men of War.”<sup>75</sup> The following spring George Grenville, Chancellor of the Exchequer, introduced legislation to increase revenue flows from the colonies. The American Act (Sugar Act) cast a broad shadow over the various trades pursued by the American colonists. New duties were levied and others sharply raised. Among the latter were import taxes against wines from the Portuguese and Spanish islands. These steps represented a radical departure from the rather relaxed era before the war, often referred to as the Era of Salutary Neglect.

The changes were expected to increase revenues and at the same time to encourage wine shipments by an indirect route through England to America. These goals were to be achieved by raising the duties on

---

72 Report of Consul Trowbridge and Factory, July 9, 1714, SPFS 94/82. *PG*, October 9, 1729; October 23, 1729; July 5, 1733.

73 *PG*, June 27, 1754. Letter to Jesson, February 8, 1765, SPFS 94/169; Halifax to Rochford, March 22, 1765, 94/170; Pasley to Conway, September 7, 1765, 94/171. Hort to Porton, January 16, 1772, SPFP 89/72.

74 Magra to Rochford, February 8, 1773, SPFS 94/192.

75 Letter to Parr & Bulkeley, November 16, 1763, Riche “Letter Book, 1748-1764.”

wine shipped directly and by allowing a rebate of customs duties on that reshipped at an English port for America. In effect, the law subsidized English merchants who handled the wines and other merchandise and then reshipped it. Vessels from southern Europe bound for North America had always brought goods other than the officially recognized wine and salt, including citrus fruits, olive oil, capers, anchovies, and other more exotic items. Some entered doubtlessly as ship's stores. Customs agents for years had closed their eyes to this harmless, though illegal, traffic.

The new legislation provided for strict enforcement and thus had a severe impact upon these categories of goods. If they entered through English ports, the fruit spoiled because of the additional weeks en route. Landing and once again reloading caused damages to it. Wine shipments entering America indirectly paid £3/10/0 per ton in England and ten shillings on arrival in the New World; direct shipments were taxed more heavily at seven pounds per ton.<sup>76</sup> Parliamentary legislators were convinced that the lower tariff charges on indirect shipments would encourage that trade and thus sharply reduce smuggling. Encouragement of English merchants at Falmouth or elsewhere was an added advantage. The American Act passed Parliament on March 10, 1764, but, allowing for time to assure its proper dissemination, took effect on September 29, 1764.

Initially the American Act encouraged merchants to rush as much wine as possible to America before the deadline, in expectation of rising prices.<sup>77</sup> Thomas Riche wrote Captain John Davidson to take the *Sally* from Lisbon to Fayal; land his salt there and load wine; then sail for Philadelphia with all speed. He added: "Should you arrive at Cape Henlopen on the 26 or any day before the 29 & think you cannot reach up before the time be up you must enter with the Collector [there]."<sup>78</sup> By late September, on the eve of the new controls, Riche wrote: "the Town is full of wine Such a Quantity never was here Since I can remember."<sup>79</sup> Madeira prices at Philadelphia fell, 1764-1765, owing to the glut. At New York too the market was glutted as large shipments were rushed in to beat the duty.<sup>80</sup>

The new wine duties did swell government coffers. Between October 1764 and mid-November 1766 the new excises raised income to £25,000, three-fourths of it resulting from 3,209 pipes of Madeira entering, while another £859 was levied on port wines.<sup>81</sup> In an economy constantly suffering a specie shortage, the fact that wine duties had to be paid in hard money also raised colonial ire. Oliver M. Dickerson viewed this tax as more onerous than that on molasses. To 1769 direct wine entrances to Philadelphia fell by more than fifty percent.<sup>82</sup>

From 1768-1772, as a result of these changes in taxation, island wines entering British North America now came by three routes: *directly* from the Wine Islands (4,232 tons); *indirectly* after passing through Britain (3,516 tons); and in very small amounts on board vessels *via the West Indies*. In fact, more wine was reshipped from the northern colonies to the Caribbean than arrived from there. Charleston was the major

---

76 *PG*, May 10, 1764; May 17, 1764; June 7, 1764.

77 Letter to Parr & Bulkeley, April 30, 1764; letters to Searle, May 20, 1764; May 22, 1764; June 11, 1764; June 16, 1764; letter to Sweat, June 22, 1764, Riche "Letter Book, 1764-1771."

78 Letter to Captain Davidson, June 22, 1764, *ibid*.

79 Letter to Searle, September 23, 1764, *ibid*. Bezanson, Gray, and Hussey, *Prices in Colonial Pennsylvania*, 232-235.

80 Harrington, *New York Merchants*, 201.

81 Beer, *British Colonial Policy*, 283. Duties on wine entering England at this time were four pounds per ton (French wines eight pounds per ton). Dickerson, *Navigation Acts and Revolution*, 176-177.

82 Dickerson, *Navigation Acts and Revolution*, 177. Wine Island entries, 1760-1764, were 153; 1765-1769, reached 74.

port of wine exports to and wine imports from the West Indies.<sup>83</sup>

When the wine shipped indirectly to England landed there, the shipper signed a bond guaranteeing delivery to an English port. On arrival in America, customs officers endorsed the bond certificate. If not returned to the mother country within eighteen months it could be forfeited.<sup>84</sup>

The American Act altered the system under which the wine trade had proceeded for well over a century and also affected all other goods coming in from southern Europe. One historian, noting the impact of this legislation, suggested that the tensions it created placed wine, and many of those concerned with it, at the center of a rapidly changing kaleidoscope of events, which finally led to the Revolution.<sup>85</sup>

\* \* \*

Falmouth at the western reaches of the English Channel was ideally positioned to profit from this new legislation, as the logical point at which vessels from southern Europe could pass customs. It also possessed other facilities necessary for reshipping their cargoes. It already profited by its role as the terminus for the packet services to Lisbon, the Caribbean, and other points.

Lisbon packets made the passage to Falmouth in twelve to fourteen days. Slower merchant vessels took longer. In addition, unloading and loading the vessel meant lost port time there. The differential between direct and indirect shipments probably exceeded thirty days. Port charges and commissions had to be paid. Crew's wages and those of the captain were increased by a month or more. The new system raised overall cargo costs by perhaps fifteen percent. Dickerson believed that these additional expenses were offset by savings from lower wine duties charged on this route. The relative balance between the volume of wine sent to America directly and indirectly, 1768-1772, tends to endorse his viewpoint.<sup>86</sup> However, the extra month involved made the shipment of fruit impossible.

Falmouth's increased trade to America offered excellent opportunities to local merchants in Cornwall. Hardly had the ink dried on the American Act before firms there were offering their services to colonial merchants. Joseph Banfield & Co. actively courted Keppelle & Steinmetz of Philadelphia, offering its services.<sup>87</sup> Newspaper custom reports for Boston and Philadelphia disclose Falmouth's new importance. From 1750 to 1763 no vessels entered Boston from Falmouth, while in the next nine years fifty-four entered from there. Much the same change is evident in Philadelphia's trade. Three ships came in, 1750-1763; six in 1764; and forty-seven over the next ten years.<sup>88</sup> Lisbon's port records disclose that between 1769 and 1775, twenty-eight vessels in from America left the Tagus bound to Falmouth, totaling 5,031 tons. Half of them had brought rice from Carolina and were bound back there via the Channel. Four more brought fish in and were also going back to America.<sup>89</sup>

Lisbon records also show that between 1756 and 1763 vessels clearing direct for North America in many cases carried cargoes that did not square with England's mercantile policies. Yet in the later years, 1769-1775, vessels so clearing conformed to customs regulations much more commonly. A much higher

---

83 Wine arriving from the West Indies, 1768-1772, totaled 161.11 tons, about 2% of the total. Charleston exported 81.14 tons to there and entered 103.93 tons. CO 16/1.

84 PG, June 14, 1764. Beer, *British Colonial Policy*, 280-281. Dickerson, *Navigation Acts and Revolution*, 175-179.

85 Schlesinger, *Colonial Merchants*, 98.

86 Dickerson, *Navigation Acts and Revolution*, 176. CO 16/1.

87 Letter from Banfield, December 5, 1772, Keppelle & Steinmetz "Correspondence."

88 See customs reports in *BNL*, 1750-1773 and in *PG*, 1750-1774.

89 "Livros," 1769-1775.

percentage also went out to America in ballast, indicating that the tighter regulations had had a healthy effect.<sup>90</sup>

**TABLE 11-4**  
**Lisbon Clearances, 1771-1775**

Year	Direct to North America Cargoes			To Falmouth, England Cargoes		
	Legal	Illegal	In Ballast	Salt, Wine, Oil, Fruit	Salt Only	In Ballast
1771	59	1	16	5	1	-
1772	61	3	48	8	1	-
1773	48	5	19	11	1	-
1774	64	6	17	16	1	3
1775	<u>50</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>26</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>1</u>
Totals	282	26	126	47	11	4*

Source: *CPR*, 1771-1775. \*One vessel cleared to Falmouth with no cargo listed.

Over the years just before the Revolution 263 vessels brought American wheat, fish, rice, flour, and wood products to Barcelona, direct from North America. Only thirteen cleared for Falmouth (1,570 tons); seven of them bound eventually for Quebec, laden with 1,700 pipes of wine. The vast majority of these vessels went elsewhere, over a hundred to Spanish and Portuguese ports carrying ballast. Alicante was the next port of call for two-thirds of them. About one-eighth of them, Newfoundland fish carriers, took Catalan brandy to Guernsey, Jersey, or Alderney or to French Channel ports. Barcelona's English consul believed that they were smugglers.<sup>91</sup>

\* \* \*

The "Inspector General's Report, 1768-1772," shows that total wine imports amounted to 7,908.6 tons over these years, while small amounts went out to the British Isles and the West Indies. The areas importing the most wine from overseas were now, in descending order, Quebec, Philadelphia, New York, Charleston, and Boston. Wine was also an important commodity in intercolonial trading. Quebec and Charleston drew such imports, while New York led in exporting wine. Boston now shipped out little more than it received coastwise. Despite William Gordon's tribute to New York's wine consumption, Quebecois far outdrank Manhattanites.<sup>92</sup> Canadian wheat bought southern European wines. Evidence from the European shipping data strongly suggests that much of the wine arriving at Quebec came from mainland sources of lower price and quality.

90 *CPR*, 1771-1775.

91 Miller to Rochford, January 1, 1773; March 23, 1773; October 2, 1773; October 10, 1773; September 10, 1774, Barcelona Consular Reports, SPFS 94/193-196.

92 Salem sent out 88.27 tons coastal. CO 16/1. Letter to Rochford, October 2, 1773, SPFS 94/194. The consul at Barcelona noted annual shipments of 2,000 pipes (at £5) to Quebec, but CO 16/1 indicates that entrances for the whole period to the northern area only reached an average of 714.17 pipes per year.

**TABLE 11-5**  
**North American Wine Consumption, 1768-1772**

	Entrances				Clearances			Consumption	
	Southern Europe	England	West Indies	Coastal	Total	West Indies	British Isles	Coastal	Total
No. Colonies	79.07	1,785.43	2.06	265.72	2,132.28	0.12	0.22	16.42	2,115.52
New Eng.	562.67	514.78	74.76	296.83	1,449.04	10.68	5.75	325.21	1,107.40
Hudson R.	1,052.58	150.41	2.14	114.02	1,319.15	37.97	110.20	550.31	620.67
Delaware R.	759.16	618.71	--	197.08	1,574.95	91.00	53.74	385.40	1,044.81
Upper So.	813.98	193.24	14.89	224.98	1,247.09	11.68	48.69	84.29	1,102.43
Lower So.	839.28	196.63	67.26	325.22	1,428.39	10.24	20.98	208.35	1,188.82
Fla., etc.	125.12	56.43	--	81.89	263.44	6.84	32.39	40.81	183.40
Total Tons	4,231.86	3,515.63	161.11	1,505.74	9,414.34	168.53	271.97	1,610.79	7,363.05
Pipes	8,463.72	7,031.26	322.22	3,011.48	18,828.68	337.06	543.94	3,221.58	14,726.10

Source: CO 16/1. In tons.

**TABLE 11-6**  
**Wine Imported from Overseas at Selected Cities, and Entrances and Clearances Coastal, 1768-1772**

	Overseas Imports				Coastal		Consumption	
	Southern Europe	England	West Indies	Totals Entered	Imports	Exports	Balance	Total
Quebec	35.92	1,674.88	--	1,710.80	144.29	13.54	130.75	1,841.55
Boston	352.60	422.88	4.29	779.7	108.70	128.72	(20.02)	759.75
New York	987.16	150.41	2.14	1,139.71	114.02	550.31	(436.29)	703.42
Philadelphia	753.22	618.71	5.00	1,376.93	197.31	385.40	(188.09)	1,188.84
Charleston	728.81	163.02	96.35	988.18	240.87	182.56	58.31	1,046.49

Source: CO 16/1. In tons.

In 1763 Thomas Fayerweather received a letter from William Cawthorne at Madeira, suggesting that wines sent him via the West Indies “wou’d meliorate, gain great reputation, & thereby enable [him] in process of time to become the sole or principal vender of this Article” in his Province.<sup>93</sup> That North American merchants rarely routed their wines through the West Indies in order to reduce their harshness is borne out by the Inspector General’s figures. Only 32.22 tons entered yearly from the Caribbean.

The average annual consumption of wine in all of British North America is fixed by that source at approximately 1,550 tons (3,100 pipes). That was wine legally entered.

\* \* \*

Wine exports from the Canary Islands reportedly totaled 16,500 pipes yearly at this time and the Azores and Madeira were said to send 12,000 pipes each year to English buyers everywhere. Englishmen also consumed large supplies of Lisbon and Oporto wines and Spanish vintages as well.<sup>94</sup> What was North American consumption? How much went there from the Wine Islands? Wine consumption fluctuated year

93 Letter from Cawthorne, February 24, 1763, Fayerweather “Papers.”

94 Morales Padron, *Commercio Canario-Americano*, 218. Report of Consul Cheap and Madeira Merchants, July 1, 1765, SPFP 89/77. Letter to Shelburne, March 10, 1767, Board of Trade Papers, CO 389/32. England and her possessions took 5,800 pipes of Lisbon wine yearly (1772-1773); Hort to Walpole, June 6, 1774, SPFP 89/77.

to year. Wars discouraged the trade absolutely. Employing the data for wine entrances in Table 11-1, it is possible to postulate some broad answers to these questions.

As early as 1719 one observer estimated that English North America (population 500,000) imported 900 tons of Azores, Canary, and Madeira wines yearly.<sup>95</sup> The estimates in Table 11-7 come from a variety of sources but are based firmly on extant Naval Office Records, as informed by newspaper customs data. The table endorses this estimate as fairly accurate. Most interesting, however, is that the data strongly suggest that, while North American population grew very rapidly to 2,500,000 by 1775, wine importations rose only slightly and not much at all after the 1730s. The war, 1739-1748, depressed the wine trade; a recovery followed, 1748-1755. Then war slowed it again to 1763. Hardly had its growth renewed when the American Act altered its patterns. It should be noted that the 900 tons consumed in 1719 did not include Quebec, then under French control. The Inspector General's data covered all of the British colonies including Quebec. By then official wine imports averaged 1,500 tons per year. Minus Quebec's consumption (342 tons), imports for the other colonies are seen to have risen less than twenty percent.<sup>96</sup>

**TABLE 11-7**  
**Annual Estimated Legal Wine Imports at Selected Cities by Decade, 1710-1774, in Tons**

Area	1710s	1720s	1730s	1740s	1750s	1760s	1770s
Quebec	---	---	---	---	---	342	342
Boston	400	508	388	190	124	156	156
Hudson River	181	239	328	243	325	241	241
Delaware River	140	181	291	206	450	275	275
Charleston	299	145	150	30	292	198	198
Totals	1,020	1,073	1,157	669	1,191	1,212	1,212

Sources: See note for Table 11-1. Hudson River includes New York and northern New Jersey. Delaware River includes Philadelphia, southern New Jersey, and Delaware ports.

If total Wine Island exports reached 14,500 tons annually, it is patently obvious that not all of it went out to North America. Some went to mainland Europe; a goodly amount to the British Isles; and a portion to the Caribbean. British East Indiamen carried some off to Asia also.

The wine trade to the British West Indies began in the early seventeenth century. However, Wine Island shipments to Barbados and Jamaica had been limited because Madeira concentrated upon sugar production till later in that century. Some North American produce sent on to Funchal, Fayal, and Tenerife bought wines to be taken on to the West Indies. *The Bolton Letters* make several references to that traffic. Late in 1697 Bolton reported on seven wine carriers with 515 pipes of wine departing Madeira for the Caribbean.<sup>97</sup>

By spring 1730 Israel Pemberton at Philadelphia opposed a voyage to Madeira to Jamaica to Philadelphia, describing it as a "roundab't Voyage" resulting in high freight costs. In the same year he opposed such a routing, claiming shippers would not have their vessels "proceed to Jamaica on any

<sup>95</sup> Andrews, *Colonial Period*, IV: 112n.

<sup>96</sup> Savelle, *History of Colonial America* (1964), 446. Oliver P. Chitwood, *A History of Colonial America* (New York, 1961), 337.

<sup>97</sup> Beer, *Origins*, 416-419. *Bolton Letters*, I: 34-35, 91.

Terms.”<sup>98</sup> Fifteen years later his letter book shows that, though he had sent cargoes via the Wine Islands to Antigua and Jamaica, he still did not have any “inclination to engage Largely in adventures that way the Risque being great and remittances from thence very tedious.”<sup>99</sup> Despite his reluctance, Pemberton and John Reynell sent goods to Madeira during the 1730s and 1740s and shipped wine from there to Antigua and Jamaica. Madeira sold in the West Indies at thirty to forty-five pounds per pipe.<sup>100</sup>

Consumption in the Caribbean was quite considerable, sufficiently so that a type of wine was named for the quality of Madeira sold there. In 1733 Antigua imported almost 515 tons of Madeira. A few years later St. Kitts merchants purchased 289.25 tons of it, plus French and Spanish vintages. Over a nearly ten-year period English settlers at Barbados imported 6,609.5 tons.<sup>101</sup> Thus three of the four large English populations in the Caribbean received, as annual imports, upwards of 1,538.65 tons of wine. If fairly heavily populated Jamaica took a further 600 tons, then the yearly West Indian intake cannot have been much below 2,300 tons.<sup>102</sup>

\* \* \*

From the late 1760s onward, wine exports to English consumers everywhere, legal and illegal, seem to have totaled about 8,000 tons per year from Spanish and Portuguese Wine Islands. Additional Iberian wines would have raised that figure significantly. Legal wine imports to mainland American colonies averaged about 1,500 tons yearly and to the West Indies perhaps another 2,300 tons of legal imports; that left a very sizeable amount unaccounted for. Part went to consumers in the British Isles and some to British India. Royal officials believed a significant portion was smuggled into the West Indies and Atlantic coast colonies.

Consular officials assigned to southern European posts, government leaders in England, and American customs officers reported widespread avoidance of customs duties in British America. Those beliefs had been heightened by the activities of American merchants during the French and Indian War, who traded with England’s enemies in wholesale fashion. In the early 1760s customs enforcement was reviewed and strengthened through the British Atlantic world, from the English Channel to the farthest reaches of North America and the West Indies. That these reforms had an effect on the southern European trade is evident in the shipping reports of Lisbon’s commercial newspaper. The two series of the newspaper extant divide in 1763. Before that date, with enforcement casual, ship captains America-bound apparently were unconcerned with government controls. This journal regularly reported illegal goods being carried from Lisbon on their vessels. In the later period transgressions were few and far between. Captains either did not carry illegal merchandise or dissembled by not listing it. Now, in 1771-1775, a much larger percentage of North American clearances went in ballast.<sup>103</sup> Yet, as early as December 1768 Lord Weymouth had warned the various consuls that the American customs commissioners believed that “many vessels arrive in America with Madeira and Azores wines” and “landed them without paying duties & carry enumerated goods to

---

98 Letter to Dicker, April 18, 1730, Pemberton “Letter Book, 1727-1735.”

99 Letter to Hill, April 9, 1745, Pemberton “Letter Book, 1744-1747.”

100 Letter to Fernandez, May 28, 1745, *ibid.* Letter to Lawrence, June 9, 1732; letter to Dicker, July 18, 1732, Reynell “Letter Book, 1729-1734.”

101 For Antigua in 1733, see *CSPC*, XLI (1734-1735): 208; for St. Kitts, see *CSPC*, XLIII (1737): 262, covering nineteen months; over a nine-year period, 1723-1732, imports for Barbados are in *CSPC*, XLI: 288.

102 Since the white population of Barbados declined in this century and that of Jamaica rose, sales of Madeira in the West Indies may have remained static.

103 *CPR*, 1757-1759, 1763, and 1771-1775.

Europe.”<sup>104</sup> In the next year a diplomat at Lisbon wrote Weymouth, noting that merchants there customarily sent “Wines to the Amount of 250 Pipes per Annum to the British Colonies,” paying no duties there. However, he felt that since the passage of the American Revenue Act, no more wines were “sent thither from hence;” and argued that American demands for relief be rejected.<sup>105</sup>

Diplomats in southern Europe were ordered to notify the Treasury of arrivals and departures in the American trade and to provide accounts of the cargoes they carried.<sup>106</sup> Their reports do not disclose a broad pattern of smuggling to and from the colonies. However, these same officials were merchants usually engaging in this trade.

Consul Magra at Tenerife sent several strongly worded reports to Lord Rochford in London, beginning in the winter of 1772, disclosing a tea and brandy smuggling operation to America from French and German ports via Tenerife and the Azores. Smugglers put the tea up in “Wine pipes,” then topped off the cargo with a few tons of island wine. He added: To “my certain knowledge the Americans are supplied with the greatest quantity of Tea they make use of thro’ this channel.”<sup>107</sup> Since his arrival in the Canaries, he claimed, a hundred pipes of tea had been smuggled to New York, Rhode Island, and Boston. Of all the wine shipped to America, he believed, “not above one fifth part pay any duty.”<sup>108</sup> In several other letters he catalogued illegal practices utilized to defraud the government. Shipmasters, he said, “keep their destinations secret for smuggling purposes & also from jealousy of other Merchants.”<sup>109</sup> He proposed that shippers be required to submit a manifest listing their cargoes, endorsed by resident consuls in southern European ports, upon their arrival in America. He rejected the suggestion that consuls could send reports to colonial customs officers when they suspected illegalities. Such letters, if sent on American-bound vessels, would, he insisted, only be “thrown over board.”<sup>110</sup> Most illegal goods were run before the smuggler entered a colonial port and the vessel then entered “in ballast” only. Since a consul could discover “within a mere trifle” what a vessel carried, an endorsed manifest would transmit accurate information to the American customs.<sup>111</sup>

Was Consul Magra merely an officious civil servant, seeking recognition and advancement by pandering to the illusions of his supervisors? No! In fact, he understood the nature of the trade quite thoroughly. He presented a cogent argument for reducing the wine duty from £3.5 to £1.5, claiming that “above treble the money would be collected in the Customs houses.”<sup>112</sup> He believed that 4,000 pipes of wine left the Canaries for America every year and “not 500 that pay the duties.” He noted that “the established price – for running the Wines” into America was twenty shillings per pipe and thus reduction of the duty would make it more profitable for the smugglers to pay the duty to avoid the risk of seizure by customs or naval patrols and it would even save the time spent lurking on the coast to run the goods. He also presented a plan to crush the Spanish fishery at the Canary Islands to limit its potential competition with Newfoundland and New

---

104 Weymouth to Consuls, December 6, 1768, SPFS 94/180.

105 Lyttleton to Weymouth, January 14, 1769, SPFP 89/67. It seems logical that pre-1764 much smuggling involved mainland wines run into America as island vintages. Riche “Letter Book, 1764-1771.” Other goods entering directly were illegal, as was Canary wine. Customs did not enforce the law rigorously. After September 1764 mainland wine could enter indirectly but otherwise the law was strictly enforced.

106 Weymouth to Consuls, December 6, 1768, SPFS 94/180.

107 Weymouth to Rochford, December 25, 1772, SPFS 94/192.

108 Ibid.

109 Weymouth to Rochford, July 6, 1773, SPFS 94/192.

110 Ibid.

111 Ibid.

112 Weymouth to Rochford, September 10, 1773, SPFS 94/194.



England. His correspondence marks him as a highly motivated, creditable observer.<sup>113</sup>

Careful consideration of the sparse data available suggests the following conclusions. Total consumption of wines from southern Europe in all of British America was probably 6,250 tons (12,500 pipes) annually by the early 1770s. The “Inspector General’s Report” indicates that direct and indirect wine imports to North America averaged about 1,460 tons of wine each year.<sup>114</sup> Legal West Indian consumption presumably remained at about 2,300 tons per year, as it had been in the 1730s. Consul Magra reported that perhaps 1,750 tons were illegally run into North America every year from Tenerife. These three sums make a total of 5,510 tons.

Soft data sources indicate that Madeira and the Azores sent as much as 4,000 tons of wine to America. The Canaries dispatched possibly 1,750 tons; Barcelona 200 tons; and Lisbon another 200 or 300 tons. If these figures are accurate then 6,250 tons appears a viable estimate. In that case, as much as three-eighths of the wine entering may have come in illegally in the years just before the Revolution. Newfoundland, New England, and the middle colonies appear to have been the most common areas for running Iberian wines, though smuggling was widespread. After 1763 customs officials, granted widespread authority, searched for and seized illegal goods. Their broader enforcement powers, plus assistance from naval units patrolling the coasts, saw smugglers hotly pursued under the new standards. The events of the late 1760s and the early 1770s testify to their considerable success. Some smugglers were apprehended, other escaped. Owners of vessels seized by government officials, like John Hancock, were lionized as patriotic leaders. Attempts to enforce the laws rigidly roused strong colonial opposition. Historian Edward Channing, commenting on the era 1764-1774, wrote: “the history of the next few years turned upon the repeated attempts of importers to bring in Madeira wines without paying the impost.”<sup>115</sup>

---

113 Ibid.

114 Direct imports from southern Europe equaled 846.4 tons; via England, 703.1 tons; via the West Indies, 32.2 tons. Total was 1,581.72 tons. See Table 11-4. CO 16/1.

115 Channing, *History of United States*, II: 92.



## CHAPTER XII

### SALT AND THE TRADE WITH SOUTHERN EUROPE

From ancient times “salt was one of the most sought after commodities in human history.”<sup>1</sup> It is a basic necessity for man and beast. Cattle require a minimum of twenty-six pounds of salt annually. Horses and mules need slightly less salt than cattle; pigs about half their annual requirement. Colonials mixed salt with animal foods, which was cheaper than salt blocks or licks. Farmers near the sea reduced salt dependence by pasturing animals on salt marshes.

Food has for centuries been preserved by dehydration, by applications of salt, or by immersion in heavy salt brine. Meat was pickled or hand rubbed with salt or a sugar/salt compound, often in a series of applications. As a general rule, colonials used seven to ten pounds per hundred pounds of meat. Ten hogsheads cured a hundred quintals of codfish for market. Animal hides required a quarter of a pound of salt per pound of hide to prevent spoilage. Bread recipes used two ounces of salt per loaf to aid fermentation; butter an ounce per pound. Salt was in constant demand.

Even before permanent settlement in North America, European fishermen brought salt to cure their fish. During the 1620s the Plymouth and Massachusetts Bay Companies sought sources of salt for their settlers. In both colonies salt making was a company monopoly but early attempts proved unsuccessful. John Winthrop, Jr., who may well have observed solar salt production in southern Europe, twice won patents for salt manufactories in New England; first in Beverly in 1638 and again ten years later in Connecticut. Both failed. He may have been influenced by Reverend Hugh Peters’s schemes for a shore-based fishery. Various colonial governments remained concerned with salt sources. Nonetheless, down to the Revolution in 1775, no salt deposits of any significance had been discovered in North America.<sup>2</sup>

Diplomatic officials in England strove to advance the American fisheries in 1654 by arranging most favored nation status with the Portuguese for export of salt from Setubal. George Downing pushed for an English monopoly of that traffic but accepted parity with Dutch exporters. Shortly, in 1661, Charles II’s marriage to a Braganza princess won England exclusive right to export salt from the Isle of May in the Cape Verde Islands. Two years later the English allowed direct exportation of salt from Portuguese territories to Newfoundland and New England, breaching the Navigation Laws in that regard.<sup>3</sup> Since experiments at developing local salt works proved unsuccessful, the colonies remained from the beginning dependent on supplies from overseas.

Salt was available in England. Cheshire was a center of production. English salt exports, mainly in the form of “fine” salt, usually went out through Liverpool, finding good demand in America.<sup>4</sup> Occasionally

---

1 Edwin C. Eckel, “Salt,” *Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*. Ed. Edwin R. Seligman, 15 vols. (New York, 1953), XIII: 523. A.R. Bridbury, *England and the Salt Trade in the Later Middle Ages* (Oxford, 1955), vii, xv, 40-56. P.H.A. Martin-Kaye, *Salt in the Leeward Islands* (Antigua, 1954), 12-14. Roscoe N. Snapp, *Beef Cattle* (New York, 1951), 55-57, 911, 950. Frank B. Morrison, *Feeds and Feeding* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1951), 683. P. Thomas Ziegler, *The Meat We Eat* (Danville, Ill., 1944), 163. *Historical Statistics*, 371-375.

2 Bradford, “*Of Plimouth Plantation*,” 234. Shurtleff, *Records of Massachusetts Bay*, I: 28, 331; III: 126, 275, 374, 400. Emory R. Johnson, et al., *The History of the Domestic and Foreign Commerce of the United States* (Pittsburgh, Pa., 1915), I: 27. Dunn, *Puritans and Yankees*, 61, 84. Phillips, *Salem in Seventeenth Century*, 94, 132, 143-144.

3 Innis, *Cod Fisheries*, 113. Andrews, *Colonial Period*, IV: 109. Ogg, *Reign of Charles II*, I: 246-247.

4 Ogg, *Reign of Charles II*, I: 46, 73-74. Davis, *Rise of English Shipping*, 38, 204. *PG*, July 19, 1753.

French salt from the Isle de Ré or the Biscay coast reached North American outlets.<sup>5</sup> However, the large majority of the salt cargoes arriving in English America came from Iberian sources or West Indian islands. All these areas produced solar salt by evaporation. A gallon of seawater contained nearly a quarter of a pound of salt. In enclosed seas such as the Mediterranean or the Caribbean the seawater was even more highly saturated.

Little advance in salt production methodology occurred from medieval times to the eighteenth century. Southern Europeans employed shallow basins two or three feet deep, lined with brick, clay, or wood. Seawater entered by tidal pressure, then the sluice gates were closed. As it evaporated, the brines concentrated and were drained into progressively shallower basins until the salt crystallized and precipitated. This process took four to six weeks, depending on the weather. The salt was then dug out and piled up to dry. In the final crystallizing pan, the salt crystals could be removed before full precipitation. The longer the process lasted the larger the crystals. Thus, southern European salt production could be somewhat controlled. When removed the salt was covered with straw or canvas to ensure purity. Salt was of special value to governments. Southern European countries monopolized its sale to provide government income. In Spain, the *salinas*, where the salt was produced, fell under the control of the *Hacienda Real*, the Royal Treasury.

Iberian salt found strong demand in North Sea and Baltic outlets. The Dutch actively engaged in its exportation. When Spain led Catholic Europe against the Northern Protestants, salt became an economic weapon. Since Spain controlled Portugal, 1580-1640, its regulations affected all of Iberia down to the mid-seventeenth century. In those years Spanish, French, and English competed to control the Newfoundland fishery. An Anglo-Spanish treaty in 1604 opened Iberia to English fishermen. As the English rose to a dominant position in Newfoundland, Spain sought, in 1631, to influence the struggle by imposing “a prohibitive export duty” on their salt, forcing the English to rely on French salt from the Biscay region temporarily.<sup>6</sup> The interrelationship of Iberian salt and North American codfish had thus been early recognized. Shortly, when Portugal regained its freedom, England established strong ties with the Lusitanians, assuring Portuguese markets for English fish and a salt supply for English fishermen.<sup>7</sup>

Salt works existed at numerous points in Iberia, in the western Mediterranean, and in the Cape Verde Islands. The major Portuguese export center at Setubal on the Sado River, southeast of Lisbon, shipped as much as 100,000 moys of salt yearly in the early eighteenth century.<sup>8</sup> Setubal (St. Ubes) produced an exceptionally fine, relatively clean salt, normally ready for export in September.<sup>9</sup> Its salt had “a special rough quality for use in curing Codfish.”<sup>10</sup> Lisbon exported 50,000 moys yearly. Salt could also be purchased at Figueira, Aveiro, and other Portuguese mainland ports.

Very important sources in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries existed at the Isle of May, Bonavista, and Sal in the Cape Verde Islands off the African coast. During the 1680s “whole Fleets of Newfoundland-Men and New Englanders” came “yearly to Lade” there.<sup>11</sup> In the late fall and winter

---

Letter to Lowndes, April 10, 1766, Lloyd “Letter Book.”

5 Davis, *Rise of English Shipping*, 204, notes that the French Biscay area was “economically part of Southern Europe.” *NEWJ*, October 30, 1732.

6 Innis, *Cod Fisheries*, 92. Frédérica Mauro, *Le Portugal et l’Atlantique au XVIIe Siècle, 1570-1670* (Paris, 1960), 270-274.

7 “Diary of Thomas Cox,” British Museum, Additional Mss. 23726, 16.

8 A moy of salt weighed 1,500 pounds.

9 Francis, *Methuens*, 19.

10 Collins, *Salt and Fishery*, 17.

11 *Ibid.*

predominant winds flooded shallow lagoons on the south side of the Isle of May. When the wind shifted in the spring, the water dried; the salt caked and was exploitable.<sup>12</sup> Through their diplomatic rapprochement with Portugal, the English arranged a monopoly there in the seventeenth century. In the year 1715-1716 ninety English vessels carried away Isle of May salt and another twenty took cargoes from Bonavista. The traders requested that a small warship be stationed there to protect against Barbary raiders.<sup>13</sup> English dominance was so complete that they controlled salt exports to Portuguese Africa. Salt was available in those islands very cheaply. Crews of vessels in this business actually landed “on the deserted beaches there” and “made salt to take across the Atlantic.”<sup>14</sup>

The Board of Trade estimated in 1767 that Portuguese salt exports to English and American outlets totaled 40,000 moys (26,680 tons), at twelve shillings sterling, £24,000 its price in England.<sup>15</sup> A Philadelphia merchant figured a “moy generously turns 17 to 19 Bushels our Measure,” at a cost of 1\$500 reis per Moy, at Lisbon.<sup>16</sup>

If Lisbon and Setubal together exported 150,000 moys of salt per year, then English vessels took a bit more than a fourth of mainland Portugal’s salt exports. Lisbon/Setubal prices apparently ranged about 7.5 pence per bushel.<sup>17</sup> Data on Cape Verdean productivity and exportations have not been found. During the 1770s annual salt exports from the mainland had a value of about £85,000.<sup>18</sup> A conservative estimate of Cape Verde’s trade would add 25,000 moys, making total Portuguese exports worth about £100,000. Weather could affect the productivity of the *salinas*. Portuguese salt prices in 1772 were much higher than normal. The English consul at Cadiz wrote: “the Crop of Salt is lost at St. Ubes and at Lisbon and has been very indifferent in France.”<sup>19</sup>

---

12 Board of Trade to Stanhope, March 2, 1716, *CSPC*, XXIX (1716-1717), 34.

13 Bourgoing, *Travels of Duke de Châtelet*, I: 235-237.

14 Davis, *Rise of English Shipping*, 269. Fairchild, *Pepperrells*, 134.

15 Board of Trade to Shelburne, March 10, 1767, CO 389/32, 138-139. At 12s. per moy, a bushel cost 8d.

16 Letter to Reade, January 17, 1759, Willing “Letter Book.” It sold for 5.6d. per bushel. Mayne, Burn & Mayne to Samuel Galloway, September 17, 1763, Galloway “Letters,” priced salt at Lisbon at 7.07d. per bushel. A milreis was worth about 67d. A price of 7.5d. per bushel has been used for Iberian salt unless otherwise noted.

17 “Diary of Cox,” 16.

18 See Appendix for Philadelphia salt values.

19 Dalrymple to Rochford, March 20, 1772, SPFS 94/189. Bezanson, Gray, and Hussey, *Prices in Colonial Pennsylvania*, 246.

**TABLE 12-1**  
**English Salt Exports from Mainland Portugal, 1772-1773**

City	1772				1773			
	Vessels	Moys	Tons	Value	Vessels	Moys	Tons	Value
Aveiro	4	295	196.5	£ 227.0	4	295	196.5	£ 227.0
Caminha		70	46.7	53.9		70	46.7	53.9
Faro					19			
Figueira	12	1,592	1,061.3	1,226.0	12	1,592	1,061.3	1,226.0
Lisbon		26,770	17,846.7	20,619.8	131	21,971	14,647.3	13,292.0
Oporto		1,978	1,318.9	1,524.0		2,902	1,934.9	1,524.0
Setubal	103	20,684	13,789.3	10,011.0	113	27,333	18,221.8	13,229.0
Vianna		<u>354</u>	<u>236.0</u>	<u>841.0</u>		<u>354</u>	<u>236.0</u>	<u>841.0</u>
		51,743	34,495.4	34,502.7		54,517	36,344.5	30,392.9

Sources: Consular reports to Walpole, 1774, SPFP 89/77. The report for Faro did not specify what was exported in 1773 but total exports were £13,820/4/4. In several cases for the smaller ports consuls just repeated earlier reports. Cape Verde exports were not reported. A moy is 18 bushels. Lisbon prices averaged 9.28d. per bushel and Setubal 6.45d. per bushel.

\* \* \*

Spanish salt export centers were located along the eastern and southern coasts. English carriers brought fish, grain, or finished products to Cadiz, Malaga, Alicante, or other points and took salt off to England or to North America. Others carried fish to Vizcaya, then freighted iron to Lisbon or Cadiz and picked up salt for Salem or St. Johns.

Salt pans at Cadiz were located on the Isle of Leon. Port St. Mary's across the bay, according to contemporaries, produced as much as a million bushels of salt each year. It was sold through the *Alfori*, special warehouses tightly managed by the Crown.<sup>20</sup> In Alicante province, two major *salinas* existed at Torrevieja and La Matta.<sup>21</sup> Ships bound to America also brought salt from smaller centers. In fact, cargoes could be purchased in almost any Spanish port, even Bilbao. Spanish salt consumption in the late eighteenth century ran at about 77,500 tons of salt internally and exports at its five principal *salinas* came to 105,606 tons. La Matta exported 53,101 tons; Cadiz 38,641 tons; and Ibiza 11,076 tons.<sup>22</sup> Balearic Island salt production centered at Ibiza.

Leizat in Sicily and Cagliari in Sardinia also sent an occasional salt vessel to America after fish or grain sales at Genoa, Leghorn, or Civita Vecchia. Some of these salt pans dated back to Phoenician times.<sup>23</sup> On occasion American-based vessels tramped the western Mediterranean carrying salt. One, the *Province Galley*, took salt cargoes from Ibiza to Monaco to Genoa; from Ibiza to Nice; and eventually from Arzeu in Algeria to Amsterdam.<sup>24</sup> In the late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries the Dutch actively engaged in

20 Townshend, *Journey through Spain*, II: 423; III: 224.

21 Ibid., III: 169.

22 Canga Arguelles, *Diccionario*, V: 117. Davis, *Rise of English Shipping*, 238. A fanega measured out to 109.5 pounds.

23 Ellen Churchill Semple, *The Geography of the Mediterranean Region* (New York, 1931), 665-666.

24 Moody, "Province Galley," 138.

carrying salt from Iberia. A Dutch trader even brought a load to Boston in 1642.<sup>25</sup> Passage of the Navigation Acts in midcentury closed them out of the salt trade to Britain and North America.

\* \* \*

Salt was in heavy demand in the fishing colonies. To cure the merchantable and Jamaica grades of fish taken at Newfoundland and New England required by the end of the period almost 65,000 hogsheads of salt per year.<sup>26</sup> A salt lading stabilized vessels going to America and was cheap, thus allowing a maximum specie return from any cargo sold in Iberia. It incidentally covered costs for the passage home. When American exports to Iberia peaked in the 1730s and after 1766, salt was in glut in America, so homeward bound shipping carried stone ballast, arriving in America empty. At Philadelphia fall months saw peak demand for salt, while in fishing centers spring and summer were times of heavy consumption.

Large doses of salt prepared codfish for market. A hogshead of salt preserved ten quintals of cod. On that basis the cod shipped to southern Europe in the eighteenth century required salt supplies as follows:

**TABLE 12-2**  
**Estimated Annual Salt Consumption**  
**of Fisheries, 1710-1774**

<b>Decade</b>	<b>Newfoundland</b>	<b>Salem</b>	<b>Boston</b>	<b>Totals</b>
1710-1719	10,042	6,012	853	16,907
1720-1729	12,749		1,513	14,262
1730-1739	32,471	4,739	1,765	38,975
1740-1749	44,046		1,037	45,083
1750-1759	40,214	9,434	2,029	51,677
1760-1769	52,669	8,933	1,160	62,762
1770-1774	53,170	10,642	774	64,586

Sources: In hogsheads. Estimates of annual consumption are based on Table 3-2.

Limited catches at Newfoundland in the early years are evident here. Wartimes curtailed the catch and put English fish carriers in harm's way.

Mercantilist policies allowed salt from southern Europe to enter only the fishing colonies to the mid-1720s. West Indian and English salt could go elsewhere in America directly but that from Iberia only via English ports or through the fishing areas. When permission to import salt directly was extended to New York and Pennsylvania, vessels taking produce to Iberia brought home so much salt that prices fell sharply in the mid-1730s. In 1736 John Reynell wrote of a salt cargo expected: "what I shall do with his Salt I Can't Tell for There has been such large Quantities Imported from the Streights, Isle of May & St. Christophers, That its Offered Pr the Quantity for 8d pr Bushells."<sup>27</sup> Excessive supplies were worked off coastally.

<sup>25</sup> *Winthrop's Journal*, II: 68. Davis, *Rise of English Shipping*, 224.

<sup>26</sup> In the 1770s exports to Europe averaged 648,235 quintals of fish. Eight bushels made one hogshead; one ton equaled 2.813 hogsheads.

<sup>27</sup> Letter to Flexney, September 10, 1736, Reynell "Letter Book."

In contrast, when war shortages disrupted the trade, the need for it to cure fish or hides or feed cattle occasionally pushed “coarse” prices above those for “fine” salt, normally selling at higher rates.<sup>28</sup>

\* \* \*

North America answered its salt needs from three sources. Fine salt came from English producers and often sold as “Liverpool” salt; southern European supplies arrived from Iberia, western Mediterranean, and Cape Verdean *salinas*. Caribbean islands sent large amounts of solar salt from Saltortuga, Turks Island, St. Kitts, Anguilla, the Caicos, and Cayman Islands, and other points. There, island lagoons flooded by water and wind action annually. Then, when seasons changed, the sun dried the trapped waters. In spring and summer months island settlers or ship’s crews dug the salt and loaded the carriers. West Indian salt often contained shells, dirt, and other detritus. All the European nations with Caribbean colonies claimed salt-producing islands. Very popular with New England mariners was Saltortugas, four hundred miles southwest of Barbados. Salt from there arrived in North America in time for the spring fishery.<sup>29</sup>

West Indian salt had reached Boston very early, brought by English and Dutch vessels. Less than a century later, 1718-1719, Barbados, Saltortugas, Antigua, St. Kitts, and St. Martins were all sending salt to Boston; eighteen vessels brought West Indian salt. Six came in from southern Europe. The latter were, however, three times the size of the Caribbean arrivals.<sup>30</sup> Vessels from the larger islands normally brought mixed cargoes, while those from smaller points carried solely salt. A number of them were desolate places, unsuitable for permanent settlement. Valued for their salt, they were jealously guarded and their ownership disputed. Saltortugas and Turks Island saw numerous confrontations. England claimed the right to gather salt there as early as the 1660s, and Spain contested its claims.<sup>31</sup> When forced to make concessions, they insisted that the English had no rights there, only liberties, which could be withdrawn in the event of illegal trading. Spanish *guarda costas* interfered with the salt gatherers, causing periodic diplomatic crises through much of the eighteenth century.

Salt aroused the cupidity of mercantilists, who sought to use it as a blue chip in economic power games. Salt shipments from both southern Europe and the West Indies found demand in English North America. The Spanish linked their right to fish on the Newfoundland Banks to English rights in the salt islands, and the English grudgingly conceded but interfered with Iberian vessels when they appeared to fish, seized some, and drove off others. The Spanish retaliated by taking English and colonial ships found at the salt islands, driving away workers there.

These problems presented thorny issues for treaty negotiators. In 1713 Jeremy Dummer, the agent for Massachusetts, insisted that England assure New England’s rights to collect salt at Saltortugas. Otherwise, he said, they would be forced to rely on the Dutch at Curaçao for supplies, placing the fishery in jeopardy.<sup>32</sup> The Treaty of Utrecht (1713) granted the “Liberty” to collect island salt but the Spanish in return demanded

---

28 Bezanson, Gray, and Hussey, *Prices in Colonial Pennsylvania*, 241. War in the 1750s disrupted trade with Lisbon. A Philadelphia firm reported a loss of “reasonable Rates” for salt, Letter to Palmer, December 23, 1757; letter to Clitherall, June 14, 1758, James & Drinker “Letter Book.” The right to import Iberian salt directly was extended to Canada in the 1760s.

29 Fairchild, *Pepperrells*, 107. McFarland, *New England Fisheries*, 95-96. This island was also known as the Tortudas, Tortugas, and Saltortudas.

30 MSR, September 29, 1687-March 25, 1688; July 1718-July 1719; southern Europe, 142 tons; West Indies, 43 tons.

31 Bubb to Stanhope, November 18, 1715, SPFS 94/84.

32 CSPC, XXVII (1712-1714), 239, 256.



security “against the abuse of that Liberty.”<sup>33</sup> English merchants firmly believed Spain would never acknowledge outright their claims to Caribbean salt and that it would be collected only if the Americans went there in convoy with “ships of force.”<sup>34</sup> English negotiator George Bubb said this clause caused more difficulty than “if he had been demanding a Spanish province.”<sup>35</sup> The government’s concern with the American salt supply emphasized its accommodating attitude toward American interests. The Treaty of Madrid (1750) again guaranteed the salt gatherers. On occasion English warships convoyed salt vessels to Saltortuga from Barbados.<sup>36</sup> Since direct importation from Iberia was confined to North of the Mason-Dixon Line, the southern colonies were more dependent on West Indian salt. The salt gathering guarantee was reconfirmed in the Treat of Paris (1763) but confrontations continued.<sup>37</sup>

\* \* \*

The quality of the salts produced from these varied sources differed. Iberian mainland exports generated under government auspices were of fairly high quality. Lisbon and Cadiz salt had a reputation for goodness. Yet, in 1735 a longtime American resident reported that “the French [were] masters of the best salt in the world for curing fish.”<sup>38</sup> Portuguese salt became available in the early fall, while that from the Tortugas reached America by April. Tortuga salt gained favor because the ship’s crews dug it out rather than paying the gatherers, as at Turks Island and elsewhere.<sup>39</sup> References suggest that West Indian salts were harsher than those from Iberia or the Bay of Biscay, causing salt burns. Massachusetts government leaders noted that the quality of fish was “much impaired by the use of Tortuga salt, which leaves spots upon the Fish by reason of shells and trash in it; they [forbade] such fish to be accounted merchantable.”<sup>40</sup> Isle of May salt could also leave fish “salt burnt.”<sup>41</sup> Newfoundland fish was deemed of better quality because cured with Lisbon, Cadiz, and Bay of Biscay salts.

Salt marketability depended then on its purity and on its eventual use. Obviously, “fine” or “English” salt was much purer. On the other hand, European solar salt was often washed to remove impurities, while natural salt from the West Indies or Cape Verdes was less pure and occasionally “exceedingly Dark Colour’d,” limiting its sale. Israel Pemberton reported one such shipment that he had to work off over time.<sup>42</sup>

Coarse salt, damper than the finer-grained English variety, was heavier. Cadiz salt was “more moist & damp” than that from Lisbon. Smugglers were concerned over the water content since barrels of wine or tea

---

33 Gosselin & Lordell to Board of Trade, January 25, 1715, SPFS 94/83.

34 Bubb to Stanhope, November 18, 1715, SPFS 94/84.

35 McLachlan, *Trade and Peace*, 69.

36 Ibid., 139. Clarke, *Letters Concerning Spanish Nation*, xxxv. AWM, April 27, 1727; May 25, 1727. PG, April 8, 1731. NEWJ, November 16, 1732; April 16, 1733. Weymouth to Harris, September 7, 1770, SPFS 94/185.

37 CSPC, XLI (1734-1735): 204-205; XLII (1735-1736): 144. Giesecke, *American Commercial Legislation*, 99. Richmond to Rochford, July 4, 1766, SPFS 94/174.

38 Coram to Board of Trade, May 11, 1735, CSPC, XLI (1734-1735): 413-414.

39 Richmond to Rochford, July 4, 1766, SPFS 94/174.

40 Joseph B. Felt, *The Annals of Salem from Its First Settlement* (Salem, Mass., 1827), 238. Innis, *Cod Fisheries*, 96n.

41 Douglass, *Summary Historical and Political*, I: 301. Innis, *Cod Fisheries*, 161.

42 Letter to Simons & Vashon, November 23, 1734, Pemberton “Letter Book, 1727-1735.” Letter to Jacks, February 8, 1729, Joshua Pierce, “Letter Book, 1725-1734,” Wendell “Papers,” BL.

hidden under damp salt risked “worse consequences” when run.<sup>43</sup>

\* \* \*

A salt cargo had to be carefully and properly stored aboard. Early in 1732 the ship *Brigtown Galley* came into Seville from New Hampshire with a cargo of timber, capstan bars, knees, and lumber. Her mate kept a log of the crew’s activities. Spanish officials were slow to purchase her cargo. A month passed before she unloaded. After a charter in the western Mediterranean, she returned to Cadiz to load salt for America.<sup>44</sup>

Between August 21 and September 7 the crew worked steadily unloading ballast, backbreaking labor in midsummer heat. The hold had to be cleaned and “dunniged.” Sixty-two salt mats were purchased and laid in the hold, to keep the salt out of the bilges so the pumps could be worked. Then the salt came aboard from seven small barks, a total of two hundred tons. The crew “trimmed ye Salt forward having Dunniged from the Pump well to the foremast” on one day and then on the next “did the same for the afterhold.”<sup>45</sup> With great relief, on September 8, the crew of the *Brigtown Galley* “wayed anchor & went to sea.”<sup>46</sup>

When a carrier arrived in America, the salt could be sold on board or landed and warehoused. Israel Pemberton wrote in the 1720s: salt must be “sold off the Vessel for Storage is Chargeable, and uncertain whether the price may advance to countervail the Charge.”<sup>47</sup> However, sale “off the Vessel” delayed the carrier in port. In 1771 the *Pennsylvania Gazette* carried a typical advertisement for the eighteenth century: “Choice St. Lucar Salt to be sold on board the Brig Sophie, Wm. Heasleton, Master, at Joseph Sim’s Wharf below the Drawbridge or at Mr. Heasleton’s house.”<sup>48</sup> The salt was priced at twenty pence per bushel. According to law, salt and other bulk commodities had to be measured. Government weighers boarded vessels to view the weighing at a charge of two shillings per hundred bushels. Buyers and sellers split the cost. The weighers recorded all goods they measured and provided copies of the record for six pence. Benjamin Morgan held the post of salt measurer at Philadelphia during the 1730s.<sup>49</sup>

The measurement of cargoes created problems for both merchants and sea captains. Accuracy was not really precise; merchants often used rules of thumb, with buyer and seller accepting qualifying terms, such as “more or less.” However, captains had to be alert to sharp practices in cargo measurements. Consuls in southern European ports reported complaints of short measures. James Banks at Corunna in 1767 reported a short salt cargo there and added: “the Fish Ships have a great deal more to fear.”<sup>50</sup> Thomas Riche reported losing 157 bushels of salt out of a total of 700 bushels and warned his minions to watch measurements strictly.<sup>51</sup> Ten years later Gerard G. Beekman wrote from New York, noting that “there is Always from 20 to

---

43 Bezanson, Gray, and Hussey, *Prices in Colonial Pennsylvania*, 237. Letter to Mayne, Burn & Mayne, August 18, 1755, Willing “Letter Book.” One captain was ordered to “Keep your Boards to put atop of the Salt, under the Wine.” Letter to Captain Parkinson, November 25, 1737, Robert Ellis “Letter Book, 1736-1748,” HSP.

44 “Log of John Sherburn,” of the *Brigtown Galley*, January 1732-September 1732,” PEM.

45 Dunnage: pieces of wood, mats, boughs, or loose materials laid in the hold to prevent injury by water, or stowed among cargo to prevent motion or chafing.

46 “Log of Sherburn.”

47 Letter to White, July 23, 1727, Pemberton “Letter Book, 1727-1735.”

48 *PG*, December 19, 1771; May 19, 1743.

49 *PG*, May 4, 1738.

50 Banks to Shelburne, March 18, 1767, SPFS 94/176.

51 Letter to Duncan, August 19, 1756, Riche “Letter Book, 1748-1764.”

25% Loss on the measure to this place.”<sup>52</sup>

Salt was generally cheap through southern Europe, though more costly at Bilbao or Corunna than at Lisbon, Cadiz, and Alicante. In the 1760s Richard Derby, Jr. of Salem shipped 1,092 farricks of Cadiz salt from Bilbao on the *Neptune*. The Gardoquis billed him for £55.39 for the salt; ten shillings for an export license; £8.78 to measure and load it; and £5.17 as a two-percent commission. Total costs at Bilbao reached almost £70.<sup>53</sup> To this had to be added shipping, insurance, and American sale costs. Salt importing was a way to help recover costs, not a means of earning large sums.

Though cheap, the amount of salt required by the colonials created competition for the North American market among salt-producing areas. Bermuda, for example, seeking a viable staple, strove to develop salt production at Turks Island.<sup>54</sup> In 1733 an advertiser in the *Pennsylvania Gazette* encouraged American merchants to seek salt cargoes at Bonaire and Curaçao, offering reasonable terms and moderate pricing incentives.<sup>55</sup> Numerous references in colonial newspapers demonstrate American concern over sources of this commodity so intrinsic to their existence and livelihood.

Naval Office Records for New York and Massachusetts allow a view of the southern European imports. New York’s data for 1715-1729 show that Isle of May salt arrived aboard eight vessels (755 tons), carrying 3,687.5 hogsheads. Only two vessels arrived before 1726.<sup>56</sup> Though the city’s records are scattered after 1742, in general, they show a gradual increase of salt imports from perhaps 2,500 hogsheads yearly in the 1730s to more than 5,000 yearly after 1768.

**TABLE 12-3**  
**New York’s Southern European Salt Imports, 1715-1722**

Years	Cape Verde			Lisbon			Cadiz			Other		
	Ves.	Tons	Hhd.	Ves.	Tons	Hhd.	Ves.	Tons	Hhd.	Ves.	Tons	Hhd.
1715-29a	7	790	14,038	1	80	--	--	--	--	1	90	--
1730-42b	24	1,185	7,802	41	3,087	11,278	13	860	2,219	23	1,645	2,882
1753-55c	9	530	2,098	8	375	2,213	4	225	1,406	1	40	250
1763-64d	1	70	213	9	803	4,304	9	675	3,438	3	310	1,050

Sources: NORNY 1222-1228. a. Lisbon and Gibraltar vessels carried no salt. b. Twenty vessels entered in ballast (18 vessels, 1,110 tons between 1736 and 1742). For five vessels salt amounts are illegible. c. Four vessels in in ballast (210 tons). d. One vessel (60 tons) in in ballast. From 1768-1772, 26,291 hogsheads entered. CO 16/1.

52 G.G. Beekman to Clifford, November 16, 1766, Clifford “Correspondence,” Box 14.

53 Gardoquis to Richard Derby, Jr., September 3, 1760; “Accounts concerning 1,092 Farricks of Cadiz Salt,” Derby “Papers,” Box IX, PEM. Holyrod, *Commerce of American States*, 33, describes salt as “profitable to ballast with.”

54 British Museum, Additional Mss. 38345, folio 210. *CSPC*, XXXVII (1730): xxliiii; XLII (1735-1736): 144, 321, 326, 389. *PG*, July 5, 1764; October 26, 1764.

55 *PG*, January 20, 1773.

56 NORNY, 1222-1224.

**TABLE 12-4**  
**Salt Imports to Boston and Salem, 1753-1756, 1762-1763**

<b>Totals</b>	<b>So. Eur.</b>	<b>West Indies</b>	<b>England</b>	<b>Holland</b>	<b>Coastal</b>	<b>Totals</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Boston	46,100	22,159	4,365	552	6,315	79,491	24.35
Salem	190,841	56,073	---	---	---	246,914	75.65
<b>Totals</b>	<b>236,941</b>	<b>78,232</b>	<b>4,365</b>	<b>552</b>	<b>6,315</b>	<b>326,405</b>	
<b>Percent</b>	<b>72.6</b>	<b>24.0</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>2.0</b>		

Source: *MSR*, 1753-1756, 1762-1763. In hogsheads.

Almost three times as much salt entered Massachusetts ports from southern Europe in the 1750s and 1760s as entered from all other salt sources. Salem took four times as much salt from there as did Boston. Average entrances of salt to Massachusetts reached 50,000 to 60,000 hogsheads per year.

**TABLE 12-5**  
**Total Salt Imports to North America, 1755-1771**

<b>Year</b>	<b>No. Cols.</b>	<b>New Eng.</b>	<b>Mid. Cols.</b>	<b>Up. South</b>	<b>Lower South</b>	<b>Fla., etc.</b>	<b>Totals</b>
1755	2,195	59,186	19,000	12,636	7,584	---	100,601
1756	---	82,709	19,809	12,523	1,218	---	116,259
1757	274	50,821	22,573	22,997	4,803		101,468
1758	938	49,689	24,767	29,674	11,035	---	116,103
1759	697	65,318	28,237	20,926	12,046	---	127,224
1760	961	50,442	27,086	16,047	6,013	---	100,549
1761	307	51,646	27,826	15,849	5,812	---	101,440
1762	548	58,204	31,184	11,098	10,224	---	111,258
1763	7,419	75,236	24,658	22,885	14,587	---	144,785
1764	12,399	55,884	37,267	15,632	9,644	76	130,902
1765	18,971	71,586	26,444	21,554	6,914	8	145,477
1766	26,764	48,278	24,069	16,669	11,201	18	126,999
1767	20,494	55,485	22,022	13,557	7,110	13	118,681
1768							
1769	15,095	89,061	38,294	26,586	16,635	---	185,671
1770	25,006	72,431	46,346	19,030	15,974	2,605	181,392
1771	39,156	99,585	33,781	25,688	9,736	3,119	211,065
<b>Totals</b>	<b>171,224</b>	<b>1,035,561</b>	<b>453,363</b>	<b>303,351</b>	<b>150,536</b>	<b>5,839</b>	<b>2,119,874</b>
<b>Avg.</b>	<b>10,702</b>	<b>64,723</b>	<b>28,335</b>	<b>18,959</b>	<b>9,409</b>	<b>365</b>	<b>132,492</b>

Source: For January 5, 1755-September 8, 1767, see Treasury 64/276a, #221, "An Account of the Quantity of Salt Imported into --- North America." For 1769-1771, see CO 16/1, in hogsheads of eight bushels.

No Pennsylvania Naval Records remain, preventing reconstruction of its salt imports. Permission to bring salt directly there was granted in the 1720s. Thus its salt import history should have shown an influx

of salt carriers in the early 1730s, followed by arrivals in ballast during the years 1736-1742. Customs reports for the colony's West Indian trade indicate that war crises shifted the areas of salt dependence. Philadelphia arrivals from Turks Island numbered one or two vessels in the early 1750s, but between 1758 and 1763 totaled sixty-four.<sup>57</sup> Entrances from Bermuda and St. Martins also rose sharply. With shipping to Lisbon and Cadiz endangered, American entrepreneurs evidently sent smaller, less valuable carriers to the Caribbean for salt.

Increased wheat and flour shipments to Iberia after 1765 left excess tonnage in those ports. Yet, many vessels bound back to the grain colonies carried no cargo. Pennsylvania's burgeoning population required large amounts of salt but significantly less than the codfish colonies.

In the average year between 1754 and 1772 the North Americans imported 132,492 hogsheads of salt, worth overseas possibly £32,000. The war years meant very low salt imports. Then imports in 1763-1764 reflected the opening of Quebec and Nova Scotia to southern European salt and an increased fishery. Table 12-5 presents a geographical view of imports but does not inform as to salt sources. Salt entering aboard fishing vessels to Newfoundland would not have cleared customs. However, the "Inspector General's Report" has data covering the years 1769 through 1771, which does allow a comparison. In these three years the colonies received 209,989 hogsheads from southern European points and 227,088 hogsheads from the West Indies. When indirect shipments via England (15,396 hogsheads) are included, the two sources are very nearly equal.<sup>58</sup>

The figures for per capita consumption vary widely by area since they are obviously skewed by fishing area requirements. The population of Canada and Newfoundland in this era was about 105,000 people.<sup>59</sup> If so, then its salt imports reached 2.01 bushels per capita, about 4.6 times the continental average.<sup>60</sup> The North Shore fishery also demanded relatively huge amounts of salt. Over the years 1768-1772 Salem entered seventy-three percent of the southern European salt reaching New England, 87,102 hogsheads, with another 57,088 hogsheads coming from the West Indies.<sup>61</sup>

Apparently no Iberian salt was shipped to the southern colonies indirectly through England and very little went there directly because of the mercantile regulations. However, 69,447 hogsheads did arrive there from English salt producers. Southern European salt predominated in the middle colonies, arriving on returning grain carriers. The availability of shipping in southern European ports made returns in salt very common and, of course, mercantilist controls over the trade distorted its natural flow. Unchecked trade would, for example, have seen rice carriers return salt to the Carolinas. Overall, Iberian salt would have had some preference because of its greater purity.

\* \* \*

---

57 PG, 1750-1763.

58 Shepherd and Walton, *Shipping, Maritime Trade*, Tables 7 and 8 (CO 16/1). Northern colonies' imports for 1772 should be corrected to 25,762 hogsheads or 206,096 bushels.

59 Ibid., 33. Average imports annually equaled 43.86 pounds per capita.

60 See Table 12-6.

61 CO 16/1. In the same period Boston took in 38,771 hogsheads from the south of Europe and 39,352 from the West Indies. The Boston figure for 1769 in this sources appears overstated by 100,000 bushels (12,500 hogsheads).

**TABLE 12-6**  
**North American Salt Imports by Geographic Area, 1769-1771**

<b>1769</b>	<b>No. Cols.</b>	<b>New Eng.</b>	<b>Mid. Cols.</b>	<b>Up. So.</b>	<b>Low So.</b>	<b>Fla.</b>	<b>Totals</b>
West Indies	1,203	44,870	3,313	5,743	8,240	2,605	65,974
So. Eur. (Dir.)	7,841	39,695	24,117	3,380	982	---	76,015
So. Eur. (Indir.)	3,851	45	17	---	---	---	3,913
England	2,200	4,449	10,847	17,519	7,413	---	42,428
<b>Totals</b>	<b>15,095</b>	<b>89,059</b>	<b>38,294</b>	<b>26,642</b>	<b>16,635</b>	<b>2,605</b>	<b>188,330</b>
<b>1770</b>							
West Indies	550	38,535	8,575	3,701	9,925	---	61,286
So. Eur. (Dir.)	12,993	25,155	26,256	750	---	---	65,154
So. Eur. (Indir.)	6,761	1,063	---	---	---	---	7,824
England	4,703	7,678	11,515	15,079	8,801	---	47,776
<b>Totals</b>	<b>25,007</b>	<b>72,431</b>	<b>46,346</b>	<b>19,530</b>	<b>18,726</b>	<b>---</b>	<b>182,040</b>
<b>1771</b>							
West Indies	225	74,827	10,450	4,522	6,685	3,119	99,828
So. Eur. (Dir.)	26,232	21,280	20,245	1,063	---	---	68,820
So. Eur. (Indir.)	2,508	583	568	---	---	---	3,659
England	10,191	2,895	2,518	17,585	3,050	---	36,239
<b>Totals</b>	<b>39,156</b>	<b>99,585</b>	<b>33,781</b>	<b>23,170</b>	<b>9,735</b>	<b>3,119</b>	<b>208,546</b>
Total 1769-71	79,258	261,075	118,421	69,342	45,096	5,724	578,916
Avg. Year	26,419	87,025	39,474	23,114	15,032	1,908	192,972

Sources: CO 16/1; in hogsheads of eight bushels; 22.5 bushels per ton.

The Inspector General also gathered figures on the coastal salt trade, thus making it possible to ascertain how much salt was consumed locally or worked off coastally. (Table 12-7.) Demand in Newfoundland and Nova Scotia drew salt supplies aboard coastal traders, while mercantilist strictures also encouraged its flow into the Upper and Lower South. Ample supplies in Boston saw a fairly large outflow to other New England areas, Halifax, and southward. The middle colonies were also large coastal salt exporters. While the origin of the salt they shipped is not ascertainable, it seems obvious from Table 12-6 that much of it was of southern European origin.

Salt prices varied over time and by area. When the southern European trade flourished, salt from there was sometimes in glut. An absolute necessity, salt was easily manipulated for mercantilist purposes. Through this whole period it was a blue chip in the southern European trade.

**TABLE 12-7**  
**Coastal Salt Imports and Exports, 1768-1772**

Regions	Imports						Exports					
	1768	1769	1770	1771	1772	Totals	1768	1769	1770	1771	1772	Totals
No. Colonies	1,209	2,681	1,810	5,314	1,486	12,500	318	10	233	87	--	647
New England	3,184	3,702	5,275	6,704	5,378	24,243	4,393	7,449	8,660	11,370	9,140	41,012
Mid. Colonies	711	778	704	3,453	3,692	9,338	8,270	11,995	8,934	11,822	9,526	50,547
Up. South	8,284	9,531	10,244	6,788	6,962	41,808	304	788	652	702	1,716	4,162
Lower South	4,299	3,827	4,689	4,054	3,164	20,033	491	751	530	400	420	2,592
Fla., Bahamas & Bermuda	134	84	73	66	125	482	1,220	2,790	2,691	2,309	2,809	11,819
<b>Cities</b>												
Salem	100	466	563	118	180	1,427	1,754	1,550	2,676	1,839	1,366	9,185
Boston	1,231	975	1,224	2,540	2,228	8,198	1,747	2,688	3,475	4,838	2,932	15,680
New York	318	460	629	2,035	2,954	6,396	2,219	3,056	2,253	2,142	1,239	10,909
Philadelphia	388	189	75	1,418	738	2,808	4,526	3,526	2,367	6,868	4,963	22,250

Source: CO 16/1. In hogsheads. The Florida region, including the Bahamas and Bermuda, can be viewed as part of the West Indies. Thus salt exports from there can be seen as imports into North America. North Carolina is included with the Lower South.





## CHAPTER XIII

### A SOURCE OF TREASURE, 1730-1772

Even before English settlements were established in North America, fish from those seas reached southern European consumers aboard English vessels. Profits from pandering to Iberian demand for dried codfish motivated English expansionists. After 1620 New England settlers competed with fishermen from Cornwall, Devon, and other Channel shires and sold wood products, beeswax, and other products of subsistence agriculture for salt to cure their fish, and wine to slake their thirsts. Through this Atlantic exchange they shared in the Spanish and later Portuguese treasure pouring from America into Seville, Cadiz, and Lisbon. By late seventeenth century English domination of the American fisheries was solidly established.

Western Europe's demographic expansion found traditional grain sources unable to answer Iberia's rising demand and opened the way for North American surpluses to compete in those marketplaces. Colonial wheat, flour, rice, and corn won consumers there by the 1730s, when periodic harvest shortfalls heightened Iberian needs. After 1765 southern Europe rivaled the West Indies as a market for North American fish and foodstuffs. Trade to Iberia and the Wine Islands offered fine opportunities for profit. England's permissive mercantilist system fostered its expansion. American exports there were encouraged and consumption of its imports discouraged. A lucrative traffic, it brought a steady inflow of bullion and bills of credit to cover America's adverse balances.

Rapid population growth in British North America in the eighteenth century saw a coincidentally large expansion of exportable surpluses available for various southern European markets. After midcentury English grain exports declined sharply. Limitations on American rice exports to Iberia had been removed earlier and salt importations selectively permitted. The commercial and financial infrastructure the English had built in southern Europe to facilitate transfer of specie earned by American codfish, English "corn," and Irish foodstuffs was now utilized to move excess funds resulting from sales of colonial wheat, flour, corn, rice, staves, and other goods home to England. By the 1770s this economic process was a large scale operation. Its importance was widely recognized in America and England. It absorbed almost a sixth of American grains and flour, and almost a quarter of their exports in rice, as well as its dried fish, employing a fleet of commercial vessels estimated by contemporaries at nearly 20,000 tons, navigated by 1,200 seamen.<sup>1</sup>

\* \* \*

Examining the three peacetime periods, 1730-1739, 1749-1756, and 1768-1774, discloses the extent of this trade's increase over time. Data gathered from a variety of sources, Naval Office Records, Colonial Office correspondence and reports, plus newspaper customs reports allow educated estimates for the first two periods. The "Inspector General's Report" allows analysis of the third area.

---

1 Dudley W., Knox, ed., *Naval Documents Relative to the United States Wars with the Barbary Powers*, 7 vols. (Washington, D.C., 1939-1945), I: 22.

**TABLE 13-1**  
**Annual Southern European Clearances for Selected Periods, 1730-1772**

	1730-1739			1749-1756			1768-1772		
	Ves.	Tons	Avg. Ves.	Ves.	Tons	Avg. Ves.	Ves.	Tons	Avg. Ves.
Nfld.	43	4,638	107.8	119	9,641	81.0	105	8,495	80.9
Canada	--	--		--	--		24	2,195	91.5
New Eng.	68	4,575	67.3	91	6,812	74.9	83	5,424	65.3
N.Y. & Pa.	32	2,081	65.0	43	3,284	76.4	162	11,968	73.9
Up. South	13	865	66.5	20	1,530	76.5	91	8,593	94.4
Low. South	20	1,633	81.7	27	2,559	94.8	54	5,403	100.1
<b>Totals</b>	<b>176</b>	<b>13,792</b>	<b>78.4</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>23,826</b>	<b>79.4</b>	<b>519</b>	<b>42,078</b>	<b>81.1</b>

Source: See chapters on individual trades.

Estimates of the sales of American goods to the area “south of Finisterre” for each period are not precise. During the 1730s a figure of nearly £310,000 for annual exports to there, at cost on arrival, appears warranted. Fish sales in that era made up almost three-quarters of the total value; Newfoundland sales £144,400 and New England £81,600.<sup>2</sup> Flour, wheat, and corn, mainly from the middle colonies, are estimated to have brought about £51,400 annually in the 1730s and rice exports had risen as England altered its mercantile controls to encourage the colonial economy.<sup>3</sup>

During the years before the Seven Years War began in 1756, Newfoundland with £410,000 in annual sales in Mediterranean Europe continued to enjoy the major fruits of the fish trade. Its returns probably came to more than sixty percent of sales there. New England’s share fell at about twenty-one percent. Goods from the Lower South, largely rice, reached about £50,000. The middle colonies sold goods there worth perhaps £51,600, while Maryland and Virginia exports were worth £24,000.<sup>4</sup> An acceptable total for all sales is about £688,000.

As the Revolution loomed, American goods sold in the south of Europe, at cost for £1,288,550 annually, up sharply, nearly ninety percent. Newfoundland and New England sales made up more than half the total of all exports to there. However, grains and flour from New York, Pennsylvania, Maryland, and Virginia were now worth almost £439,800 annually and rice sold at Lisbon, Oporto, and elsewhere brought nearly £90,000 yearly.<sup>5</sup> See Table 13-2. Traffic in codfish is broken down to reflect its geographical sectors. Fish was by far the most valuable product carried to southern Europe. During these years almost 700,000 quintals of cod, worth at least £720,447, were sent to this market annually.<sup>6</sup> Newfoundland dominated the market, shipping almost eighty percent of the fish. Three-fourths of it went overseas in English bottoms.

2 Newfoundland exports in the 1730s averaged 165,783 quintals, while New England’s are estimated at 63,602 quintals. For estimates of other commodities, see individual chapters.

3 The middle colonies probably shipped 80% of the grain, estimated at £27,000 annually. The rice figure was £25,600 and miscellaneous other goods at £4,500, based on the clearances in Table 13-1.

4 New England fish sales were about 139,800 quintals. Rice exports, 12,661 barrels were valued at £50,900. English-owned Newfoundland vessels usually made one voyage a year. New England fish carriers and middle colony grain vessels often made two or even three voyages yearly; rice carriers one a year.

5 See Table 13-2. Note that these are values in southern Europe.

6 See Table 5-2.

American flour sales ranked second, bringing in at minimum £243,146 yearly. Wheat made up about twelve percent of sales worth £152,484 per year. Rice followed with about eight percent of sales. The 25,272 barrels sold for £90,787. Corn at £44,080, staves at £17,676, and boards selling for £3,761 annually followed. Miscellaneous exports brought £13,309.<sup>7</sup>

**TABLE 13-2**  
**North American Trade to Southern Europe, 1768-1772**

Exports	American Price	Prime Cost	Freight	In-surance	Han-dling	Duties	Losses	Commis-sions	Tran-sfers	Sales at Cost
Fish										
Nfld. 2730266 K.	13.33s	1819722	491448	45493	36394	218367	36394	132391	42895	2823104
Canada 140620 K.	13.33s	93723	25312	2343	1874	11247	1874	6819	2209	145401
U.S. Terr. 612892 K.	13.33s	408493	110320	10212	8170	49019	8170	29719	9629	633732
Flour 876079 bll.	19.64s	860310	219020	21508	17206	--	17206	60787	19695	1215732
Wheat 2668757 bu.	3.93s	524411	153454	13110	10488	--	10488	38120	12351	762422
Rice 124929 bll.	40.8s	254911	145605	6373	5098	--	5098	20854	6758	444697
Corn 1291665 bu.	1.95s	125937	71687	3148	2519	--	2519	11020	3570	220400
Staves 10291 M.	*	49500	46310	1238	990	5940	990	5249	1701	111918
Boards 2756 M.	31.60s	4354	12402	109	87	522	87	940	305	18806
Misc.	--	46173	7417	1154	924	5541	924	3327	1078	66538
<b>Totals</b>		<b>4187534</b>	<b>1282975</b>	<b>104688</b>	<b>83750</b>	<b>290636</b>	<b>83750</b>	<b>309226</b>	<b>100191</b>	<b>6442750</b>

Sources: Figures in pounds sterling, or as indicated. K=quintal; M=1,000. Commodity volumes from CO 16/1. Cf. Shepherd and Walton, *Shipping, Maritime Trade*, 220-222. Newfoundland figures from CO 194/27-32; CO 16/1 gives data for shore fishery only. See Table 2-2. According to Massachusetts Naval Office Records, annual averages for these years are 122,578 K yearly. Merchantable fish prices are from Cole, *Wholesale Commodity Prices*, II. Other American prices are from Shepherd and Walton. Flour is converted at 11.48 barrels per ton; rice at 4.67 hundredweights per barrel. Rice volume for 1771 is 17,144 barrels. European sale prices are at cost, all inclusive, and should be viewed as a minimum. Boards are pine. Lisbon stave imports were 55% pipe, 35% barrel, and 10% hogshead. Prices for miscellaneous goods are from Shepherd and Walton. Freight rates in shillings are: fish 3.6; flour 5; wheat 1.15; corn 1.11; rice 23.31; boards and staves 90. Miscellaneous freights 69.4s. per ton. Insurance is reckoned at 2.5% of prime cost; handling and losses at 2%. Duties, where applicable, were 12% of prime cost. Iberian commissions are at 5%; transfer charges at 1.62%, both of sale price. Sales at cost include commissions and transfers. Figures do not balance due to rounding. \*American stave prices=pipe £6/M; hogshead £4.6/M; barrel £3/M; European prices £12.38/M; £10.61/M; and £8.59/M, respectively.

The importance of the American fisheries is amply evident. Their fish sold in this market for at least £3,602,237, about fifty-six percent of colonial sales there. English economic thinkers during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries praised this trade for its financial returns; its role as a nursery for seamen and as an

<sup>7</sup> CO 16/1. Shepherd and Walton, *Shipping, Maritime Trade*, 220-222. Miscellaneous exports, priced in America, equaled £46,173. Whale oil was worth £14,524; rum valued at £11,316; beeswax, £10,144; and candles at £4,601 made up about 88% of the total.

employer of shipping. About 34,600 tons of shipping capacity was needed to move the annual catch from American to Iberia and the Mediterranean.

Historically, the Newfoundland branch of the fishery had been an enterprise carried on by fishermen based in England. English shippers controlled about three-quarters of the fish marketed south of Cape Finisterre. The capital earned by their sales went into English rather than colonial pockets. The Newfoundland catch dispatched to Europe equaled 2,730,266 quintals over these five years. Its sale at cost brought £2,823,104. One-fourth of that might be credited to Newfoundland merchants handling shore-based exports, £141,155 yearly. English-owned vessels marketed fish worth about £423,465.

The limited earnings won by Canadian fish exporters were divided on a four-to-one basis between local entrepreneurs and those who came to purchase cargoes of fish. Thus, by estimate, eighty percent of Canadian fish sales would have accrued to those buyers. Canadians shipped only four percent of the fish shipped.

New Englanders, in contrast, handled one-sixth of the fish going to the eastward annually, worth £126,746 at market. Ninety-five percent, or more of it, went aboard New England-owned ships.

Rice shipments to Iberian buyers went mainly from South Carolina; only small amounts from Georgia. Rice ships were mostly English and Scottish owned; only twenty-five percent of it went on American vessels. The other commodities involved were carried mainly on American ships, eighty percent being colonial owned.

\* \* \*

Employing CO 16/1 data for goods carried to southern Europe, 1768-1772, allows estimation of annual tonnages of the commodities exported and thus the tonnage of the whole. See Table 13-3. Fish made up almost forty percent of exports. Flour and wheat together required an equal amount of shipping annually. By the 1770s colonials dominated all carrying trades to southern Europe except for Newfoundland fish exports and rice shipments to Iberia. Data in CO 16/1 indicate that southern European clearances in this period reached 210,354 tons or about 42,071 tons yearly. Actual tonnage was then about double that listed officially.

**TABLE 13-3**  
**Commodity Tonnage Shipped to Southern Europe, 1768-1772**

	Totals 1768-1772			Average Annually			% Total Tonnage
	Tons Carried	American Owned	Other	Tons Carried	American Owned	Other	
<b>Fish</b>							
Nfld.	121345	30336	91009	24269	6067	18202	30.2
Canada	6250	5000	1250	1250	1000	250	1.6
U.S. Terr.	27240	25878	1362	5448	5176	272	6.8
<b>Flour</b>	83373	66698	16675	16675	13340	3335	20.8
<b>Wheat</b>	83139	66511	16628	16628	13302	3326	20.7
<b>Rice</b>	28548	7137	21411	5709	1427	4282	7.1
<b>Corn</b>	36181	28945	7236	7236	5789	1447	9.0
<b>Staves</b>	10291	8233	2058	2058	1646	412	2.6
<b>Boards</b>	2756	2205	551	551	441	110	0.7
<b>Misc.</b>	2148	1718	430	430	344	86	0.5
<b>Totals</b>	<b>401271</b>	<b>242661</b>	<b>158610</b>	<b>80254</b>	<b>48532</b>	<b>31722</b>	

Sources: CO 16/1. All figures in tons. Commodities converted to tons (2,250 pounds) as follows: fish 22.5 quintals; flour 11.48 barrels; wheat 32.1 bushels; rice 4.29 barrels; boards and staves, 1,000 per ton. Miscellaneous exports were expressed as follows: whale oil in tons; beef and pork, 14 barrels; beeswax and candles in pounds; rum, 252 gallons. Figures differ slightly due to rounding.

As a collateral source of income, freight earnings were very important. Total returns from freights in this trade over this period amounted to more than a million pounds sterling (£1,282,975). Almost half this sum, £627,080, came from the carriage of salt cod to Catholic buyers. Significant added income was paid carriers of wheat and flour (£372,474). Wood products brought less than five percent of freight income.

Freight charges per ton were highest for rice cargoes at £5. Boards and staves, awkward cargoes, paid £4.5 per ton. Fish followed at £3.6 per ton; flour at £2.87; corn paid £1.98; and then wheat at £1.85 per ton. Cargo ownership has been equated with vessel ownership for our purposes, thus freight earnings have been divided on that basis. American-owned vessels thus earned £692,967, while English and other owners shared a total of £591,675. Freight rates and insurance charges obviously fluctuated. However, the five-year time span, a peaceful period, allows acceptance of these rates for the whole period.

Insurance premiums also served as a subsidiary source of income. A peacetime rate of 2.5 percent for insurance would be acceptable. Total insurance expenditures of £104,688 protected the cargoes shipped. Insurance underwriting in the 1770s was still centralized in London. Probably only ten percent of American-owned cargoes would have been locally insured; the remainder by English underwriters.

Earnings in this trade can be divided between colonials and “others.” Though overwhelmingly English, non-colonial exporters also included Scottish, Irish, and West Indians in small numbers. Certainly ninety percent or more of the goods they exported would have been listed in English ledgers.

If vessel ownership and cargo ownership were the same, it is possible to divide the sums amassed in southern Europe between colonial and “other” shippers. Sales at cost there would have covered all expenditures but include no profit and thus represent a minimum return. Three-quarters of the Newfoundland fish shipped; twenty percent of that from Canada, and only five percent of that from New England went out on “other” vessels. With the exception of the rice trade, all other exports were approximately eighty percent in American hands. Only about a fourth of South Carolina rice went on colonial vessels.

Non-colonials purchasing American goods for export shouldered the costs of those purchases (£552,490), plus commissions (3%) and handling expenses (1%) in America (£22,100), as a charge against their southern European sales, totaling £564,590.<sup>8</sup> However, since ninety percent of the insurance fees were earned by English firms, the “other” side of the ledger should be credited £46,288. These changes require a shift of £518,302 from the “other” to the colonial column.

---

<sup>8</sup> Lisbon data, *CPR*, and newspaper customs reports all indicate that in 1774 and early 1775 the trade reached levels comparable to 1769 and 1770.

**TABLE 13-4**  
**Estimated Division of Earnings, 1768-1772**

Cargo	Colonial		Other	
	%	Value S.E	%	Value S.E.
Fish				
Nfd.	25	£ 705776	75	£ 2117328
Can.	80	116321	20	29080
N.E.	95	602045	5	31687
Flour	80	972586	20	243146
Wheat	80	609938	20	152484
Rice	25	111174	75	333523
Corn	80	176320	20	44080
Stav.	80	89534	20	22384
Bds.	80	15045	20	3761
Misc.	80	53230	20	13308
Totals		3451969		2996781
		+ 518302		- 518302
		<u>3970271</u> 5 yrs.		<u>2472479</u> 5 yrs.
		794054 1 yr.		494496 1 yr.

Sources: See Table 13-2. Newfoundland fish carried by English fishermen were caught not purchased. Only five percent of New England fish were purchased by others.

Earnings assigned to both colonials and “others” would have together contributed to “Imperial Earnings,” a yearly average of £1,288,550, including the five percent commissions pocketed by British merchants in Iberian and Mediterranean ports from the sale of American produce. Funds for transferring the surpluses resulting from those sales would also have been earned by the same merchants and by the mail packets and naval vessels carrying those funds. See Table 13-2. Again all of these estimates are based upon sales in southern Europe *at cost*. An additional ten percent profit would have increased annual income to more than £1,400,000.

Demand for these colonial exports fluctuated from year to year dependent upon availability of alternative grain and fish supplies in the European markets, as well as on North American harvests. Iberian food shortages in 1769 and 1770 increased demand, with American imports peaking in 1770 and falling off in the next two years. The Falkland Islands crisis in 1771 and 1772 and a depressed English economy contributed to that decline. Exports rose sharply again in 1773 and 1774.<sup>9</sup>

Some income could be garnered from other sources. Colonial vessels might be sold in Iberia. The Portuguese journal *Com Privilegio Real* advertised several English vessels for sale in these years but few seem to have been colonial owned.<sup>10</sup> Carrying goods from port to port in this region brought small returns. Port charges ate up profits.

The major charge against earnings from sales in southern Europe resulted from exports of wine and salt to America, either directly or indirectly. Both must be debited against sales.

\* \* \*

<sup>9</sup> Shepherd and Walton, *Shipping, Maritime Trade*, 133-134.

<sup>10</sup> *CPR*, February 10, 1771-December 28, 1776.

The wines purchased in this trade varied in price depending on quality and point of origin. Average wine prices at Madeira and in the Azores apparently ranged at about twenty pounds per pipe at this time. Island wines usually came directly to America rather than through England; this route directed by geography and Atlantic winds and currents. Wine arriving via English ports was normally of Spanish origin or so-called "Lisbon wine." Considerably cheaper than that from the peninsula, its price has been set at £15.2 per pipe, probably a higher figure than actually the case.<sup>11</sup> Wines coming in directly paid heavier duties than those coming indirectly. Most of the wine was purchased as a charge against goods sent from North America to Spanish and Portuguese outlets. Salt imports have been priced at 7.5 pence per bushel of one hundred pounds.

Sales at cost of North American produce in southern Europe over the years 1768-1772 brought a total of £6,442,750. Wine imports over these years totaled 15,495 pipes. Some 8,464 pipes came directly (estimated price £20 per pipe) and 7,031 pipes indirectly (£15.2 per pipe). American wine imports from this area then had a value of £276,151, plus commissions at three percent of £8,285. Salt prices in southern Europe cost at prime five shillings per hogshead.<sup>12</sup> Indirect salt arrivals had a value of £7,390, that coming directly £99,398. Commissions paid for its purchase reached £3,204. Exports to southern Europe less the cost of imports then left a surplus of £6,051,526, a yearly average of £1,210,305.

\* \* \*

Modern historians studying the growth of the colonial economy in the eighteenth century generally agree that English mercantilists did not impose the crushing burden on their North American subjects that earlier Whiggish writers had postulated. This study of the southern European trade, 1600-1800, strongly endorses that interpretation. In fact, the royal government fostered a paternalistic and permissive economic system down to 1764, one which indulgently encouraged colonial trade with southern Europe.

Through this whole era the merchants of northern Europe avidly sought Iberian treasure. Within the Atlantic community Iberia was widely recognized as the font from which "returns" in specie or credits could be drawn. England's American subjects, a part of that community, required credits to relieve their stringent negative trade balance with the mother country. One study of the colonial economy stresses that overseas trade made life in the colonies not only comfortable but "possible"; trade to the lands "south of Finisterre" earned "substantial credits" there.<sup>13</sup> Citing the work of Shepherd and Walton, it endorses their estimation of "visible" current account data for this traffic. Colonial exports to there are fixed at £426,000 and imports to America debited at £68,000 annually, resulting in a surplus of £358,000 per year during the 1770s.<sup>14</sup> However, this view of the trade is based upon the value of these exports in North America, where colonial produce was cheap and Iberian goods dear. Since Bilbao, Lisbon, Barcelona, Cadiz, and other ports were where this exchange took place, where the surplus was realized and from there transferred, it is more logical to determine the results of this exchange there rather than in America. There the annual surplus becomes £1,210,305.

The question of smuggling during this exchange has also to be addressed, as examined above.<sup>15</sup> Considerably more wine smuggling apparently occurred after 1763. If the extent of duty avoidance

---

11 No commodity price indices for wines except Madeira have been found.

12 Prime cost of a hogshead of 8 bushels, at 100 pounds per bushel, priced at 7.5d. per bushel.

13 McCusker and Menard, *Economy of British America*, 82.

14 Ibid., 81. Shepherd and Walton, *Shipping, Maritime Trade*, chapters 7 and 8.

15 See Chapter XI. Shepherd and Walton, *Shipping, Maritime Trade*, 205-206.

suggested by Consul Magra's estimates is accurate, the debit against sales of American goods would have been increased by £66,000 per year.<sup>16</sup> Even then, available surplus funds still totaled more than £1,144,000 annually. About ninety percent of that surplus, after allowances for exports, was transferred to England aboard packet boats or royal naval vessels.

Income from trafficking colonial products in southern Europe can be viewed on two levels. First, it served mercantilist aims of the empire by draining gold and silver from Iberia to England. Second, it assisted colonial economic development by offsetting the adverse colonial trade balance.

"Imperial Earnings" resulting from the positive balance of this trade amounted to well over a million pounds sterling per year. British customs duties collected on these wines would be counted also. English merchants in the Iberian ports handled most of the sales and purchases, their commissions would be included on the imperial side of the ledger as well. Mercantilist thinkers would have been impressed by the employment of some 80,000 tons of shipping and the training of the seamen required, a military resource for wartime, additional imperial advantages.

The annual surplus £1,144,000 included freight income of £256,595 and insurance sales of £20,938, as well as commission and transferal charges £81,899. Freight charges on wine and salt to North America would have brought £5,769 a year and duties on the wine returned £4,649 annually.

The importance of this trade to the North American economy has been noted in a number of studies centering on the data in CO 16/1. Shepherd and Walton commented: "The trade with southern Europe was the only one in which a large surplus was earned from commodity trade alone; and all the regions except Florida, the Bahamas, and Bermuda shared in it."<sup>17</sup>

Current thinking sets the colonial negative balance with the mother country at £1,100,000 each year.<sup>18</sup> Annual colonial earnings alone (Table 13-4) of £794,000 would have paid nearly three-quarters of that negative balance. The advantages of those markets, provided by Britain's permissive mercantile system, bulk very, very large.

Over the years 1730-1775 southern European trade showed a very healthy overall growth. Individual sectors of the trade did not share this expansion equally. The grain colonies enjoyed the greatest growth, with annual exports rising from £51,400 to £439,711, more than 750 percent. Newfoundland grew exports by £420,221, almost 300 percent, and Carolina rice growers increased their sales in the south of Europe to £90,787, a rise of 229 percent. On the other hand, New England's fish sales rose by only some £45,145, slightly more than fifty percent. Philadelphia, leader in flour and wheat exporting, enjoyed a lion's share of this expansion, while Channel port investors profited most from the rise in Newfoundland's Iberian sales.

The availability of Iberian markets was enormously important for the elasticity of the colonial economy. When the trade flourished, as in the late 1730s and in 1768-1770 and 1773-1774, significant expansion was possible. But, when the trade was depressed, especially during wartime, lack of returns from Iberia undoubtedly limited economic growth and may have encouraged inflationary paper money issues in the colonies. Perhaps ten percent of the returns came directly home to the colonies in specie. Apparently as much as half of the coinage circulating in America was in Spanish "dollars," pieces of eight.<sup>19</sup>

The English opened extraordinary opportunities in southern European markets to their American children. Those advantages would disappear with the coming of the Revolution in 1775.

---

16 Magra to Rochford, December 25, 1772; July 6, 1773, SPFS 94/192; September 10, 1773, SPFS 94/194. This last letter claimed 3,500 pipes of Canary wine were smuggled into America yearly.

17 Shepherd and Walton, *Shipping, Maritime Trade*, 165.

18 McCusker and Menard, *Economy of British America*, 80-82.

19 McCusker, *Money and Exchange*, 7.



## CHAPTER XIV

### “UNDER COLOURS OF A NEW DEVISE”

English leaders formally established new economic policies in the 1660s. These “important mercantilist laws were adopted in response to a development that had occurred. They undertook to encourage, or to regulate, or to suppress some industry, practice or trade that had been initiated...and proved to be profitable.”<sup>1</sup> They “had at inception a certain symmetry and logicity and were never designed merely as an instrument of colonial exploitation.”<sup>2</sup> “They were by no means one-sided and did not appear to be so to the men of the day.”<sup>3</sup>

Mercantilists altered the natural channels of exchange to direct trade to the economic advantage of their nations. High tariff levels encouraged venturesome risk takers to run goods despite the regulations. Smuggling was endemic in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Direct trade from the British Isles and from North America to southern Europe was encouraged by English leaders but direct imports into America from there were limited to salt and Portuguese island wines. All other goods were to come through English ports. Ships returning to America from Iberia tempted merchants and mariners to ignore the mercantilist codes. However, the need for a colonial source of returns outweighed the negative effects of smuggling in the eyes of English policymakers.

Through the mid-seventeenth century New Englanders traded quite openly with the Dutch, French, and Iberian ports. European goods brought to Boston and elsewhere were bought with fish, timber, and tobacco cargoes to the detriment of English traders. Even after the 1660s enforcement remained a problem, as Americans showed little respect for the Navigation Acts. In 1676 Edward Randolph, sent to observe conditions in Massachusetts Bay, reported widespread illegal trading. Local authorities responded to his protests “that the colony was not bound by the laws of England.”<sup>4</sup>

Sir George Downing, earlier sympathetic to New England interests, now called for harsh measures to halt illegal trade from southern Europe, even suggesting the seizure of all New England vessels so engaged.<sup>5</sup> On his return to England Randolph pressed for tight customs enforcement. In 1679 he was sent back to New England as Customs Commissioner and shortly initiated actions against at least sixteen illegal traders, with very limited success. Local officials allowed some to flee the court’s jurisdiction. He was denied writs to search for illegal merchandise. Various methods were used to run these cargoes. In one case the ship *Johanna* landed goods on the Penobscot River, including Malaga wines, olive oil, brandy, and fruit, then she entered customs in ballast.<sup>6</sup> Importation of Canary wines especially aroused Randolph. He described how a Canary cargo might be carried to a Portuguese island; a small amount of that wine purchased and put in the hatchway coming home. New England officials would be given a taste of the Madeira or Fayal as proof of the cargo’s legality. Smugglers even attacked his customs officials.<sup>7</sup> In thirty-six of Randolph’s suits, 1676-

---

1 Nettels, “British Mercantilism,” 108.

2 Anderson, *Europe in Eighteenth Century*, 266.

3 Beer, *Colonial System*, I: 108.

4 Edward Randolph, *Edward Randolph, Including His Letters and Official Papers*. Eds. Robert N. Toppan and A.T.S. Goodrick, 7 vols. (Boston, 1898-1909), I: 254.

5 Michael G. Hall, *Edward Randolph and the American Colonies, 1676-1703* (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1960), 23, 67. Ogg, *Reign of Charles II*, I: 246-247. Ogg views Downing as a successful political climber in Restoration politics.

6 *Randolph Letters and Papers*, IV: 96.

7 *CSPC*, X (1681-1685): 1165. Beer, *Colonial System*, II: 78-80. Smugglers employed this ruse

1689, all the culprits escaped justice.

The legality of importing Canary wine was moot. By tradition it had been treated as falling under special permission as Portuguese island wine. George Chalmers in *Opinions of Eminent Lawyers* reports on a decision by Francis Fane in February 1737, arguing in favor of the colonial stance, which noted that European maps did not include those islands. This, plus long usage, convinced him of the legality of their position.<sup>8</sup>

When the Dominion of New England was overthrown in 1689, Randolph was temporarily imprisoned at Boston and New Englanders were tempted to return to their old habits. But, the bright light that he had shone on their activities made them trade with more circumspection.

From 1670 through 1700 the government had made a determined effort to force conformity to the laws controlling imperial trade.<sup>9</sup> Randolph continued in a watchdog role even after 1689 and helped to enforce the mercantilist program. Colonial legislators, customs and court officials were all forcefully encouraged to obey the Navigation Laws. The Act of 1696, regulating the plantation trade, ended flagrant abuses. European goods were no longer openly imported. Most exports to southern Europe now created credits for transfer to pay for finished English products. Major breaches of the laws occurred very rarely. Some goods did enter from Iberia as ship's stores or concealed among the legal cargo. As Charles M. Andrews recognized: "The results, even under the pressure of the new orders and instructions, were again far from satisfactory."<sup>10</sup>

Following the 1690s reforms, there is little evidence of a major concern with smuggling in America.<sup>11</sup> Occasionally vessels imported Iberian goods. Spanish iron or Barcelona handkerchiefs or other goods were condemned and vendued. A shipment of iron entered "in a clandestine and illegal Manner" was seized and condemned.<sup>12</sup> Customs officials offered a fifty-pound reward in sterling, plus ten percent of any apprehended goods to informers. On occasion officials seized Canary wine as entered improperly.<sup>13</sup>

Customs officers faced the daunting task of enforcing trade laws over hundreds of miles of coastline containing innumerable points where goods could be run ashore. A case of smuggling at London in October of 1738 perhaps places their problems in perspective. A gang of smugglers rode out across London Bridge at five A.M. "well mounted, richly loaded and strongly armed" within sight of officers who dared not interfere with them. The reporter then commented: "Duties are so high, that tis to be feared there never will be wanting Men daring enough to venture their Lives and Fortunes for such extraordinary Gain."<sup>14</sup>

Estimations on the extent of American smuggling, 1700-1763, range broadly. Familiarity with the mercantile correspondence of those in southern European trade leaves the strong impression that it was not uncommon. Thomas Amory, an American merchant, wrote: "If you have a Captain you confide in you will

---

through the whole era.

8 George Chalmers, *Opinions of Eminent Lawyers on Interesting Subjects* (London, 1784), 572-573. Hall, *Randolph and American Colonies*, 57.

9 Hall, *Randolph and American Colonies*, 111, comments that shutting off this illegal trade "worsened an already depressed economy in America."

10 Andrews, *Colonial Period*, IV: 149.

11 Ibid., 164n. A Salem customs officer dedicated to strict enforcement was found guilty of "great disorder and unwarrantable procedures" by a Vice Admiralty judge.

12 *BNL*, June 2, 1735; June 7, 1750; September 19, 1754. *NEWJ*, February 18, 1738. Bilbao iron was often run.

13 *BNL*, June 7, 1750. V. Barnes, *Dominion of New England*, 159-160. Andrews, *Colonial Period*, IV: 112n, 160.

14 This report, dated London, October 14, 1738, is in *PG*, March 8, 1739.

find it easy to import all sorts of goods from the Streights, France and Spain, Although prohibited.”<sup>15</sup> Some merchants were active smugglers; others in a cursory fashion. To Curtis P. Nettels, English failure to close this breach in the mercantilist system seemed “fairly conclusive evidence that its proceeds were returning to the colonies chiefly in the form of English goods.”<sup>16</sup>

Commonly, illegal imports included mainland wines, olive oil, olives, capers, almonds, figs, raisins, and citrus fruits. In 1735 the naval commander at Newfoundland reported: “Wines and brandy in great quantities are every year imported by vessels into all parts of Newfoundland, who are chiefly loaded with salt from France, Spain or Portugal.”<sup>17</sup> Most of the goods run were relatively harmless in that they did not compete with English products. However, Joshua Gee noted, early in the eighteenth century, French and Indian silks, stuffs, druggets, and calicoes, as well as German and Dutch linens were often brought from Iberia and the Straits, reducing sales of English goods.<sup>18</sup> References to such imports in merchant records are uncommon.

Commercial letters and instructions offer candid glimpses into mercantile life. Peter Faneuil’s “Letter Book, 1737-1739” is replete with references to illegal trade with southern Europe. Importation of Canary wines, as well as L[emons] and O[ranges] and H[andkerchiefs], “moracker Lether Chairs,” boxes of Genoese velvet, mainland wines, jars of O[y]l and O[lives] and A[nchovies], all are mentioned in his letters.<sup>19</sup> In September 1738 he noted: “have had imported here within this Six weeks near 100 Tunn of Spanish Iron.” Again he wrote of two casks of brandy “w’h you’ll use the necessary caution in getting safe Landed on Shore so as not to be of any Prejudice to my Vessell.” He cautioned Barcelona correspondents that five hundred dozen handkerchiefs were to be “out of the way till the vessel is clear.”<sup>20</sup>

The merchant community treated customs regulations casually. Questionable attitudes were not confined to a specific colony or a specific time period. John Reynell of Philadelphia wrote of thirty dozen handkerchiefs and five hundredweights of cocoa that “it would have answered better if the duty on ‘em had been saved, which the Captain saith, might have been done easy enough.”<sup>21</sup> The Willings of Philadelphia complained to Mayne, Burn & Mayne of Lisbon that two chests of tea from them had been stored amidst a salt cargo and through dampness spoiled. The following year they ordered an additional ten to fifteen chests.<sup>22</sup>

Joshua Gee’s *Trade and Navigation of Great Britain Considered*, published in 1722, while sympathetic to the expansion of the timber trade from America to southern Europe and to the important fish traffic, felt it “absolutely necessary” that all vessels trading to Europe clear through a British port before returning, to prevent smuggling. Nevertheless, this gap in the mercantile regulations remained open.<sup>23</sup> Thomas Wharton wrote in 1759:

---

15 Weeden, *Economic and Social History*, II: 556. David S. Lovejoy, *The Glorious Revolution in America* (New York, 1972), 240-246.

16 Nettels, *Money Supply*, 79-80.

17 Lee to Pople, September 29, 1735, *CSPC*, XLII (1735-1736): 65.

18 Joshue Gee, as quoted in Ashley, *Surveys Historic and Economic*, 342.

19 Letter to Lynch & Blake, October 7, 1737; letter to Lloyd, December 13, 1737; letter to Macky & Smith, January 3, 1738; letters to Michael and Richard Harris, June 12, 1738; August 8, 1738, Faneuil “Letter Book.”

20 Letter to Captain Brown, September 11, 1738; letter to Pringle, March 10, 1738; letter to Harris’s, March 14, 1739, Faneuil “Letter Book.”

21 Letter to Leybourne, January 25, 1743, Reynell “Letter Book, 1741-1744.”

22 Letters to Mayne, Burn & Mayne, August 15, 1755; June 19, 1756, Willing “Letter Book.”

23 Gee, *Trade and Navigation*, 50-51.

For salt from Lisbon we have a free trade by act of Parliament and, although the wine and fruit is not free yet, there never has been any seizure made of those articles in this Port [Philadelphia] but are daily brought in and no notice taken thereof.<sup>24</sup>

Down to 1763 entries of mainland wines, fruit, and some ship's stores were not viewed as threatening to the mercantilist structure. Shortly, however, increasing tensions between the government and the colonials created confrontations reminiscent of the earlier era.

Recognition of the need for tighter regulation of American trade originated in the war years, 1744-1763. English officials had been shocked and angered by American refusal to sacrifice for the imperial good in wartime. Colonials traded with Spanish and French islands using such ruses as flag of truce vessels and the so-called Monte Christi trade, or by direct collusion supplied the Crown's enemies.<sup>25</sup> When the second war ended in 1763, government officials moved to overhaul trade regulations. In addition, heavily taxed Englishmen sought to share imperial burdens more equitably with their American cousins. New legislation tightened mercantilist bonds and increased imperial income, taxing the colonials for their upkeep. These innovations brought confrontation, colonial resistance, and eventually revolution.

Charles M. Andrews believed that despite its systemic weaknesses – distance from England; extended coastline; colonial opposition to regulation and taxation; the limited efficiency of the customs and insufficient naval enforcement – despite all those difficulties, mercantilism worked fairly well and “did not at any time before 1764 seriously interfere with the growth or prosperity of the colonies.”<sup>26</sup> Thus comes the term for the years 1699-1763, the “Era of Salutary Neglect.” Under the cumbersome system of controls erected before 1700 the colonies had flourished.

To increase customs efficiency England tightened trade controls in the early 1760s; ended absenteeism in the colonial customs establishment; and expanded the powers of the Vice-Admiralty Courts to enforce customs laws. Income and efficiency were diligently pursued. Better quality appointments and less nepotism raised a customs establishment noted for its indulgent attitudes to a higher level. The laws were now strictly enforced, often to the letter. A Board of Customs Commissioners at Boston, distinct from that of England was made directly responsible to the Treasury Board in 1767. Vice Admiralty Courts broadly extended search warrants (writs of assistance).

In October of 1763 a Philadelphia journal noted: “We hear that His Majesty's Ships are so stationed as to keep up a Chain of Communications from one End to the other of the British Dominions in America and to keep continually cruising, so as to effectually crush the Contraband Trade.”<sup>27</sup> Twenty-seven naval vessels reportedly took up station on the coast to pursue smugglers.<sup>28</sup> A new schedule for dividing rewards from captures encouraged active enforcement by the navy.<sup>29</sup> All illegal trading concerned the royal authorities but the southern European trade attracted special attention from reformers.

From earliest times direct importation of Portuguese island wines and Iberian salts had created inordinate temptations. That permissiveness came under review in the 1760s. As West Indian traders were sorely tested by the area's cheap foreign sugars and molasses, those coming from southern Europe succumbed to the

---

24 Wharton to Perriot, Dawson & Co., February 28, 1759, cited in Bezanson, Gray, and Hussey, *Prices in Colonial Pennsylvania*, 245.

25 Pares, *War and Trade*, 403. *BNL*, October 30, 1760, has an interesting proclamation concerning smuggling.

26 Andrews, *Colonial Period*, IV: 179.

27 *PG*, October 27, 1763.

28 *PG*, September 29, 1763.

29 *PG*, October 6, 1763.

running of wines, fruits, oil, capers, olives, handkerchiefs, tea, and other goods.

Passage of the American Revenue Act in April 1764 aimed at halting those illegal entries. It required all vessels carrying mainland cargoes, except salt, to pay duties at an English port. Also included was a section allowing the trial of offenses against these mercantile laws in Vice Admiralty courts, markedly altering prosecution of these cases. Customs collections under these new laws were expected to return £45,000 in income to the Royal Treasury. Salutary neglect ended in 1764. Canary vintages had now to come through England. New duties on Madeira and Azores wines discriminated against direct importation. Direct wine now paid £7 per ton, that arriving indirectly only £3/10/2.5 per ton. In fact, the law reduced duties on indirect entries by about two-thirds. Spanish and Portuguese mainland wines imported via England now paid only ten shillings per ton. By one estimation this act increased British revenue by £20,000, at American expense. It also ended drawbacks on foreign goods; fostered sale of English products in America; and changed the wine duties to divert that trade from the Atlantic islands through Great Britain.<sup>30</sup>

Wood products, mainly lumber and staves, could now be marketed only in the Wine Islands, or in an English port. Such exports now required a bond and a cocket signed to cancel the bond. By fall 1764 American rumors had the Parliament prepared to require all American exports to go to Europe via England; a proposal said to be supported by some of the “most eminent merchants in the kingdom.”<sup>31</sup>

American protests against the new regulations began before the law went into effect. Governor Francis Bernard of Massachusetts commented: “An indulgence timeout of mind allowed in a trifling but necessary article,...permitting Lisbon Lemons and wine in small quantities to pass as Ships Stores. I have always understood that this was well known in England – allowed, as being no object of trade or if it was, no way injurious to that of Great Britain.”<sup>32</sup>

Initial complaints stressed the illogicality of these changes. A pamphlet entitled *Observations on the Acts of Trade* argued that Parliament should have granted the colonials

Liberty to import Fruit, Wine & Oyl direct from Spain and Portugall subject to the same Dutys that are now paid on those Goods imported from Great Britain & laid the same Dutys on Wines from Medeara & the Western Islands as on those from Spain & Portugall; this would have prevented all Clandestine Trade in N. England, saved the Expenche of Men of Warr & Cutters & a great Number of customs House Officers; our Trade Navigation and Fishery greatly promoted, the Consumption of British Manufactures greatly encreased & a much greater Revenue would have been raised than can possibly be expected from the present Act.<sup>33</sup>

It also stressed the negative effect of controls over exports of wood products and insisted that Spanish and Portuguese wines, burdened with two freights and the duties, would be so costly in America that “none will be imported.”<sup>34</sup>

In fact, colonial agents sympathetic to American interests had insisted that more indulgence was preferable to more controls. An anonymous essayist wrote that illegal imports were limited except for the arrival of “Raisins, Lemons and other perishable fruits directly” and they could not enter any other

---

30 Beer, *British Colonial Policy*, 280-283.

31 PG, October 4, 1764.

32 Schlesinger, *Colonial Merchants*, 42.

33 Edward Payne, “Observations on the Acts of Trade (1763),” MHS, Ezekial Price Collection.

34 Ibid.

way. Yet, “as considerable profit is made by them, from a very small stock, this greatly encourages and consequently increases the whole fish trade, which is a business of the utmost importance to all parts of the nation.” The new legislation forced wines to enter “by a roundabout and expensive route” and discouraged the lumber and iron trade.<sup>35</sup>

Other voices in and out of Parliament called for an alternative approach. The Mediterranean trade should be open to the colonists, some said, “upon condition that everything imported thence should be subject to duties on arrival in America.”<sup>36</sup> Freedom of trade for the colonials ran aground on two shoals. It would have deprived English merchants of the middleman’s profit and made the revenues raised appear as a direct government subsidy from colonial pockets. Americans recognized the actualities of the new system and smarted under the new regulations. As a number of historians have seen it: “The history of the next few years turned upon the repeated attempts of importers to bring in Madeira wine without paying the impost.” Wine became “an essential ingredient of American independence.”<sup>37</sup>

Opponents of the American Act emphasized the importance of the fishery as a “nursery of Sea-Men” and of southern Europe as a source for returns to England. They stressed the interrelationship between the West Indian and Iberian fish sales.<sup>38</sup> Boston merchants petitioned Parliament to consider “the great expence, port charges and delay occasioned by carrying fruit and Oyl from southern Europe to England to pay the Duties [which] vastly exceeded the amount of the duties.” As citrus fruits had “become almost necessary for the Health & Comfort of the Inhabitants of North America,” they requested that their direct importation be allowed, along with oil and Iberian wines. In fact, they pointed out, American population had grown so large that island wine prices had risen until few could afford them.<sup>39</sup>

English merchants in Iberia also opposed the new controls. A consular report commented on the Portuguese trade of Philadelphia and New York in flour, wheat, corn, and staves, taking back large quantities of salt, lemons, some oranges, oil, figs, and almonds. Previously those colonies had sent 500,000 staves to Portugal each year, encouraged by escalating Baltic stave prices. The American Act ended those stave exports because prices in Portugal would not serve if sent via England. Staves sold in the Wine Islands were now being shipped on to the mainland in island vessels, something not foreseen when the act was passed. Also, the new system in effect prohibited exports of fruit and other goods because even “with the most fortunate Voyage, it is a very precarious Business” because of its perishability. Not one chest of fruit in ten arrived sound. The Lisbon factory saw the act as advantageous to the Portuguese Wine Islands; prejudicial to the fisheries; and advantageous to the French. Several changes were suggested. Staves should be sold directly in Iberia, their arrival certified by the consuls. Portuguese wines, fruits, oil, and nuts should be freely imported in the colonies, subject to the same duties as if through England. Duties might be collected in Portugal or in America. Mainland wines would reduce the exorbitant price of Madeira, as the colonials shifted to Lisbon wine at ten pounds per pipe, a third as much as Madeira. Lower wine costs would bring imperial savings of perhaps £200,000.<sup>40</sup>

Despite strong support for direct importation of Iberian goods, the Grafton-Chatham coalition in Parliament squelched all attempts at that reform. Collection of duties in North America would have

---

35 [Stephen Hopkins], *An Essay on the Trade of the Northern Colonies of Great Britain in North America* (Philadelphia, 1764), 9-10.

36 Channing, *History of United States*, III: 84.

37 Ibid., 92. Schlesinger, *Colonial Merchants*, 98.

38 Payne, “Observations on Acts of Trade.”

39 “Petition of the Merchants of Boston to the Parliament,” January 1767, MHS, Ezekial Price Collection. This change would have let Canary wines enter.

40 Lisbon Factory to Rochford, n.d., Consular Reports, CO 388/95, folios 11-15.

deprived London and outport merchants of middleman profits.<sup>41</sup> Officials at home also claimed direct trade would divert revenue from the exchequer, though proponents of it insisted that crown revenues would not be diminished. Though income opportunities for customs officials from various fees might have been reduced.<sup>42</sup>

American protests, supported by sympathetic English merchants, did gain a hearing in London. Lord Townshend urged direct importation in 1766 and 1767, but in the end opponents convinced Parliament it would be “a hazardous relaxation of the acts of trade.”<sup>43</sup> Though popular with both colonials and factory members in Iberia, it was rejected. Also rejected were draconian measures requiring all colonial exports to pass via England to south of Cape Finisterre.<sup>44</sup>

American merchants’ letter books disclose real anger at the government over the new wine taxes and stricter enforcement measures. The new imposts weighed more heavily on Azores wines imported directly, which were significantly cheaper than Madeira, raising the duty to almost forty percent. Merchants hid the destinations of their vessels, so that on their return they would not be suspected of carrying wine. In some cases, voyages could be “saving ones” only if the wine duties were avoided.<sup>45</sup> Thomas Riche of Philadelphia, an unrepentant devotee of “saving the duty,” wrote Parr & Bulkeley at Lisbon in November 1763, opposing the new laws. He then proposed loading two hundred quarter casks of Lisbon wine, stowed fore and aft. Then at Fayal his captain would fill the space near the hatch with Fayal. The cargo would then pass “without the least discovery.”<sup>46</sup> News from ‘England in 1764 made him “a little alarmed at the Duty Lay’d on wines from Portugal.”<sup>47</sup> Reckoning that vessels clearing Fayal after mid-August would miss the new law’s deadline, September 29, 1764, he ordered his captain to unload his salt and Lisbon wine at Fayal and then reload the same wine “again as fyall wine which will blind your Sailors,” stowing it “foar and aft where I think it will be safe.”<sup>48</sup> If too late to reach Philadelphia before September 29, he was to enter at Lewes to avoid the new tax. So much wine was rushed to Philadelphia to avoid the duty that Riche wrote of a glut there. He warned one of his captains that “the men of war are very Strick in searching your Papers” and if he had “any People on board you Cannot Trust. Let them know they will be press’d and put them a Shoar Least they will inform.”<sup>49</sup> While Riche concerned himself with running wine, New Yorker Gerard G. Beekman abandoned that trade because of the new onerous duties.<sup>50</sup>

The American Act made colonial smugglers patriotic figures.<sup>51</sup> Enforcement of the customs laws led directly to confrontations with royal officials at Salem, Boston, Newport, New York, Philadelphia, and

---

41 For comments on the Grafton/Chatham coalition, see Michael Kammen, “Colonial Agents, English Politics and the American Revolution,” *WMQ*, XXII (1965): 256.

42 Channing, *History of United States*, III: 84.

43 Schlesinger, *Colonial Merchants*, 88n.

44 *PG*, October 4, 1764. These measures were said to be favored by “the most eminent merchants” in England.

45 Letters to Knight, June 3, 1766; July 21, 1766; letter to Bryan, November 24, 1766, Lloyd “Letter Book.” See references to Captain Crowninshield in “Salem Customs House Book,” 219, 225.

46 Letter to Parr & Bulkeley, November 16, 1763, Riche “Letter Book, 1748-1764.”

47 Letter to Parr & Bulkeley, May 22, 1764, *ibid.*

48 Letter to Street, June 22, 1764; letter to Captain Davidson, June 22, 1764, *ibid.*

49 Letter to Captain Ross, July 18, 1764, *ibid.*

50 White, *Beekmans*, 220-221.

51 Gary B. Nash, *The Urban Crucible: The Northern Seaports and the Origins of the American Revolution* (Cambridge, Mass., 1986), 225, comments, perhaps facetiously, on patriots who “rescued goods seized by customs.”

Charleston. In 1766 Captain Daniel Malcolm stood off Boston customs officers, who tried to seize Madeira landed illegally.<sup>52</sup> John Hancock's *Liberty* illegally ran a hundred pipes of Madeira in 1768, avoiding duties of at least five hundred pounds. A riot ensued; property was destroyed.<sup>53</sup> Months later Philadelphia officials seized fifty pipes of smuggled island wine and a mob spirited it away. The merchants involved calmed matters by returning the wine, though they replaced it with a cheaper Fayal vintage.<sup>54</sup>

Naval and customs enforcement measures included a liberal extension of the right to search under writs of assistance. This, plus cavalier treatment of colonial rights, grated on American sensibilities. The requirement that the wine duties be paid in specie was a further bone of contention.

A Salem Customs House ledger still extant holds correspondence with the Boston Board of Customs Commissioners, 1763-1772. Salem officials were constantly admonished to be alert to illegal wines and warned to search cargoes diligently for prohibited goods. The Commissioners believed "great Quantities of wine & other dutyable Goods [were] being frequently run on shore by Vessels arriving from Madeira & the Azores & other Foreign Islands."<sup>55</sup> Eleven Salem arrivals from southern Europe were either caught smuggling or strongly suspected of it over these years. A Salem mob tarred and feathered a customs officer in 1768, for informing on a smuggler.<sup>56</sup>

The editor of the *Salem Gazette*, a Whig sympathizer, in late 1772 published a series of resolutions adopted by Salem citizens indicting the government for its duties on "Wine, Oyl, Feathers, Raisins, and other produce of Spain and Portugal" and condemning the need to carry them to Britain. These laws, he argued, prolonged voyages; increased costs; and caused cargo losses, all of which could have been avoided by direct shipments to America.<sup>57</sup> His attack on the government aroused Salem loyalists, who branded it the work of a malcontent. In answer, twenty-nine prominent North Shore citizens, many sea captains and merchants, active Iberian traders, strongly endorsed his resolutions.<sup>58</sup>

Strict enforcement and infringements on constitutional and political rights of Americans aroused extreme anger but the initial motivation came very largely from frustration with colonial trade controls, especially those affecting the wine trade. Late in 1768 at Halifax, Captain Amos Grundy, bound home from Lisbon, had his salt cargo searched and himself insulted.<sup>59</sup> While smugglers became colonial heroes, honest traders often faced harassment by arrogant naval and customs officers. In spring 1769 the *Pitt Packet*, bound home from Lisbon to Marblehead, was brought in by HMS *Rose* and then "rummaged" by Boston's port officers. Small amounts of oil, part of a barrel of lemons, and small amounts of liquor, classifiable as ship's stores, were found. Released, she proceeded to Salem to unload her salt. Boston officials warned those at Salem to watch her unloading carefully "least she should have any Prohibited Goods under the Salt."<sup>60</sup>

New York too had its share of smugglers. The naval officer there reported that, over a year's time, sixteen vessels with 1,200-ton capacity had brought in only 190 tons of wine, while the colony had exported 100 tons and local consumption stood at 540 tons. Apparently, he was skeptical of a local marriage feast of Canaan. In 1767 Cadwallader Colden reported an increase in smuggling: "shiploads of Wine has been Run

---

52 Channing, *History of United States*, III: 92-93.

53 Ibid. Schlesinger, *Colonial Merchants*, 103. D.H. Watson, "Joseph Harrison and the *Liberty* Incident." *WMQ* XX (1963): 585-595.

54 Schlesinger, *Colonial Merchants*, 101. *EG*, December 31, 1771.

55 "Salem Customs House Book," 276-277, 280-281.

56 *EG*, September 13, 1768.

57 *EG*, December 15, 1772.

58 *EG*, December 22, 1772.

59 *EG*, November 15, 1768.

60 Boston to Salem officials, April 27, 1769, "Salem Customs House Book."



besides what is usual in the way of smuggling.”<sup>61</sup>

Officious and overbearing government employees often raised colonial hackles. Early in 1774 a shallop taking goods from Newcastle, Delaware to Philadelphia was arrested for carrying enumerated goods without clearing customs. Franklin’s newspaper printed an impassioned essay, arguing that this seizure, if upheld, would halt commerce between the Lower Counties and Philadelphia.<sup>62</sup> Half of the city’s lumber and grain exports came up the river in shallops. The same issue affected rice shipments into Charleston, South Carolina.<sup>63</sup> Whether slavish devotion to regulations or the actions of customs racketeers, the result was anger at the government.

The American Act and enforcement of regulations changed the patterns of southern European trade. Given its volume, only a small percentage of American-owned vessels going there returned indirectly. English-owned Newfoundland fishing vessels did so and Scottish- and English-owned shipping on other routes did also. Colonial vessels in large majority returned direct. (See Table 9-1.) The extent of smuggling aboard those vessels is impossible to estimate precisely. However, Lisbon periodical *Com Privilegio Real* reported in general terms on cargoes exported from there, allowing a view of the goods shipped to America before and after passage of the Act in 1764. The data covering April 1757 through December 1763 disclose that 302 vessels cleared Lisbon for North America. Twenty-six left in ballast, mainly to the Carolinas. Seventy-eight vessels took cargoes conforming to English mercantile regulations. The remainder, about two-thirds, carried goods forbidden by English trade laws. For the years 1771-1776 the data indicate 434 ships cleared for America; 126 sailed empty; 282 went with legal cargoes; and only 26 with illegal goods aboard. In sharp contrast with the earlier years, now ninety-four percent traded legally.<sup>64</sup>

Strictures on the southern European trade caused colonial complaints down to 1775. Commenting on changes made by the Townshend Acts, a Virginia resident wrote his London agent in late 1769: “That alone wont satisfy America, Medeira Wine and other things are unconstitutionably taxed. These must be taken off or we shall hardly thank them for the other.”<sup>65</sup>

Whigs and Tories battled in a warfare of pamphlets on the American crisis, the provisions of the American Act continually a major point of issue. In the colonial view they demonstrated that their interests were being sacrificed for the advantage of influential British merchants.

\* \* \*

As early as 1764 some English mercantile leaders supported American positions on the Iberian trade. A letter from Bristol indicated that its merchants endorsed “with all their interest the independent free trade of the North American colonies, the late unnatural restraint upon which, has already occasioned some alarms that if not timely removed, may be attended with very melancholy consequences, with regard to the credit of North America.”<sup>66</sup> Colonial newspapers noted the concern of English merchants for their American colleagues, who often owed them large sums. Successive non-importation movements greatly concerned

---

61 Harrington, *New York Merchants*, 269. Schlesinger, *Colonial Merchants*, 98n.

62 *PG*, January 12, 1774; January 19, 1774; February 9, 1774.

63 McCusker and Menard, *Economy of British America*, 365n.

64 *CPR*, April 10, 1757-November 22, 1759; December 26, 1762-December 29, 1763; and February 16, 1771-December 28, 1776,

65 Letter from Nelson, November 18, 1769, John Norton & Sons, *John Norton & Sons, Merchants of London and Virginia, being the papers from their counting house for the years 1750 to 1795*. Ed. Frances Norton Mason (Richmond, Va., 1937), 113.

66 *PG*, October 18, 1764.

them. Through correspondents they kept a finger on the American pulse. London agents communicated the attitudes of metropolitan policymakers to American legislatures.

In June 1767 royal officials requested reports from Iberian diplomats concerning southern European trade from the colonies, its extent, profitability, and their views on the amount of illegal trading.<sup>67</sup> Later in 1768 Viscount Weymouth, Secretary of State for the Southern Department, again ordered all consuls to report with care on the arrival of all vessels from the colonies in southern European ports and all vessels clearing thence for North America; along with an account of the cargoes entering and clearing. Among his concerns were the smuggling of island wines; illegal exportation of European goods; and American sale of enumerated goods to the Iberian ports.<sup>68</sup> Many of his subordinates there regularly reported to the Treasury through Weymouth's office on the American goods sold there. Some of those reports provide an excellent picture of this traffic. Others submitted intelligence but were less forthcoming. Consul General Brusby at Madrid wrote of his concern at the lack of a consul at Bilbao, "the principal Rendezvous of American Vessels, that are inclined to carry on an illicit Trade," adding: "they can purchase all kinds of European goods at a very low price, [and] Carry them away without being Subject to pay Duties or the inspection of anybody."<sup>69</sup>

"Separate and Secret" instructions issued to Lord Grantham in 1771 included Article 11 of special interest: "it is of considerable Importance to have the Amount of Trade, permitted by several Acts of Parliament, to be carried on directly from America to the different Ports of Spain fully ascertained." Grantham was to add "whatever Remarks may occur to you. In what Instances such Acts are beneficial, or hurtful to the Mother Country and how far they may be extended without giving a Facility to a Contraband Trade in Foreign Manufactures being carried on in their Returns to America."<sup>70</sup> About six months later Consul John Magra at Tenerife wrote Lord Rochford, claiming that American vessels cleared for Tenerife or Fayal but really went to France and loaded "Teas and Brandy which are put up in Wine-pipes." They then proceeded to Tenerife, added a few pipes of wine and entered the whole as Tenerife wines. To his "certain knowledge the Americans are supply'd with the greatest quantity of Tea they make use of thro this channel." He believed at least one hundred pipes of tea had gone through Tenerife to New York, Rhode Island, and Boston under this disguise. Of all wine sent to America, he added, not "above one fifth part pay any duty." Rochford praised Magra and requested information on all American-bound vessels clearing from there.<sup>71</sup>

Magra now submitted a well developed proposal to reduce smuggling. First, captains should be required to obtain clearance certificates from the consuls in southern Europe, including a cargo manifest endorsed by the consul, which would be presented to American customs officers on arrival. Rochford had suggested Magra forward messages to customs men in America on vessels bound to there. The consul replied that there was "little probability...of my having it in my power to transmit such Letters, as your Lordship was pleased to order me." Since such warning letters would have to go aboard the smuggling vessel, "it is all odds but it would be thrown overboard." In contrast, his certificate system would reduce contraband trading by preventing the running of cargoes ashore and then entering in ballast, "as most of them do." It would also prevent them using double commanders to avoid taking "the Oath...being very common and attended with

---

67 Instructions to Lyttleton, June 25, 1767, Consular Reports, CO 388/95.

68 Weymouth to Consuls and Consul Generals, December 6, 1768, SPFS 94/180.

69 Brusby to Weymouth, February 13, 1769, SPFS 94/181.

70 Separate and Secret Instructions to Lord Grantham, May 23, 1771, SPFS 94/187.

71 Magra to Rochford, December 25, 1772; Rochford to Magra, May 11, 1773, SPFS 94/192.

no difficulty.”<sup>72</sup>

In a long letter in September 1773 Magra advised reducing the wine duties collected in America to £1/10/0 per pipe, which he believed would triple income on that item. “Twenty shillings is the established price which the Merchants pay for running the Wines and for the securing of which the Vessels are obliged to cruise some time on the Coast.”<sup>73</sup> Lowering the rate would thus make it cheaper to pay the duty than smuggle it in. He believed that only 500 pipes currently paid the tariff, producing £1,750. If all 4,000 pipes of wine that cleared to America paid a duty of thirty shillings, income would reach £6,000.

As the crisis in America deepened, Consul Josiah Hardy at Cadiz had another tale of illicit trade. Late in 1773 a ship in from Virginia brought a wheat cargo. Her captain told Hardy he was bound to Nantes to take brandy back to America, “entirely ignorant of the illegality” of it. Realizing that he could not now go on to France, “much pains was taken to persuade” Hardy to connive at the business. He had given bond cancelable by a consul or by two well known merchants. Hardy noted that apparently: “The certificates are signed by any two of the Irish [merchants] who will put their names to anything without scruple and the vessel goes on to any forbidden port with impunity.”<sup>74</sup> Hardy strongly urged limiting such cancellations to consular control.

Agitation in America had reached fever level by late summer of 1774. The *Pennsylvania Gazette* informed its readers that American debts to British creditors stood at £4,000,000 sterling and cited a London Whig, who urged Americans “to put a total stop to all commerce with England, both exports and imports” and called for a halt to trade to the West Indies as well.<sup>75</sup> Shortly, the Continental Congress adopted the Continental Association, suspending imports from England and Ireland, adding a proviso that if no redress from the Intolerable Acts was forthcoming, all West Indian exports would be halted.<sup>76</sup> Economic coercion was the policy of the day.

Mediterranean trade restrictions alone did not cause the American Revolution but this breach in mercantilism caused serious problems between colonies and crown. The era of reform after 1763 saw Americans and government policymakers in confrontation over this issue. Trade with southern Europe had become a very major source of colonial returns to the mother county; its central importance is obvious. The substitution of American wheat for English “corn” in Iberian markets may well have influenced mercantile factions at home to seek a share of the income from America’s Iberian trade, via taxation.

Toward the close of 1774 the *Pennsylvania Gazette* published a long, anonymous essay by an American author, taken from the *London Chronicle*:

Thus they get all our money from us by trade, and every profit we can anywhere make by our fishery, our produce, and our commerce, center finally with them! But this does not satisfy. It is time then to take care of ourselves by the best means in our power...how lightly the interests of all America had been esteemed here, when the interests of a few inhabitants of Great Britain happened to have the smallest competition with it. That then the whole American people were forbidden the advantage of a direct importation of wine, oil and fruit from Portugal but must take them loaded with all the expences of a voyage of one thousand leagues round about, being to be landed first in England to be reshipped for America;

---

72 Magra to Rochford, July 6, 1773, SPFS 94/194.

73 Magra to Rochford, September 10, 1773, *ibid.*

74 Hardy to Porten, February 12, 1775, SPFS 94/195.

75 *PG*, September 21, 1774.

76 *PG*, November 9, 1774.

expences amounting in wartime, at least to thirty percent more than otherwise they would have been charged with, and all this merely that a few Portugal Merchants in London might gain a commission on those goods passing through their hands.<sup>77</sup>

Fractious complainants returned again and again to the issues created by the American Act, convinced that the colonial compact had been betrayed.

Official inability to resolve this conflict poisoned the thinking of all involved. Colonial boycotts disrupted trading patterns and reduced shipping earnings. The depressed economy of 1773 reflected in part concern that the Americans might be unable to remit sufficient funds to pay their debts. Some English merchants hesitated to ship goods to the colonies for fear of losses “due to the general resistance there.”<sup>78</sup> Americans increasingly demonstrated their unity. Salem’s editor emphasized this growing cohesiveness, stressing the value of American trade to the mother country and its contributions to English self-sufficiency. The heavy indebtedness of the colonials, if left unpaid, he felt, might cause “a general bankruptcy” in England.<sup>79</sup> The *Pennsylvania Gazette*, as 1775 began, believed that the Continental Association had reduced English income by £200,000 per year. London merchants trading with North America set their losses from the stoppage at £1,000 a day.<sup>80</sup>

Rumors of yet more repressive legislation became current. New Englanders, it was claimed, would soon be confined to trading solely with the British Isles or the British West Indies. No wines, salt, or other goods would be allowed to enter America, except for horses, foodstuffs, and Irish linens. No New England vessel without a pass would be allowed to fish “upon any part of North America.”<sup>81</sup> Such draconian steps would have ended New England’s fish exports to the Mediterranean and West Indies, as well as the whaling fishery. Some felt such threats were exaggerated, but by the summer 1775 the depressed Massachusetts economy saw Andrew Cabot inform his Lisbon agent that he had “removed his stock in trade, self and family to Philadelphia.”<sup>82</sup>

Gradually Americans concluded that the government no longer served imperial interests but rather provided opportunities for one interest group to the injury of others. Time and again commentators emphasized that the American Act, in discriminating against direct importation of wines, oil, and fruits, corrupted imperial principles. By fall 1775 the Revolution had occurred, though its declaration was not official. In December the Parliament passed the Prohibitory Act, withdrawing the King’s protection from his American children and forbidding all trade with the colonies. In effect, the government recognized that what had begun with a series of protests against the new mercantilism had become a full-fledged rebellion in all the American colonies.

\* \* \*

English merchants in Iberian and Wine Island ports, led by their consuls, had divided sympathies as the conflict escalated. As Englishmen, their right to do business at Barcelona, Malaga, Cadiz, or Lisbon depended on the treaty structure supported by England’s military and diplomatic power. Yet, from the

---

77 *PG*, November 23, 1774.

78 *EG*, May 3, 1774; September 3, 1770; February 23, 1773; July 6, 1773.

79 *EG*, May 3, 1774; July 12, 1774; October 11, 1774; October 18, 1774; November 1, 1774.

80 *PG*, March 9, 1775; March 15, 1775.

81 *PG*, April 5, 1775; April 12, 1775; April 26, 1775; June 14, 1775. Dickerson, *Navigation Acts and Revolution*, 109, 112.

82 A. Cabot to Duff & Welch, August 21, 1775, in Ford, “Colonial Commerce,” 222.

mid-1760s onward North American products had so grown in importance that commissions from them represented a large part of their overall business. They treasured their close relationships with leading American merchants. Even English consuls were, for the most part, merchants engaged in trade there. Consular reports on this trade expose its volume and value and the constant struggle to maintain English treaty rights in face of Iberian attempts at economic reforms. There are numerous references to smuggling by Banks at Corunna, by Hort and Walpole at Lisbon, by Magra at Tenerife, and by others. The merchants and merchant/consuls occupied an ambivalent position between the government and their American clients.

Consular and factory comments emphasized the restrictiveness of the American Act and the perishability of fruit shipments. They decry controls on the lumber and stave trades and view the new wine tax structure as disadvantageous to the empire. They firmly believed exports to America could best be taxed in Europe or on arrival and that those changes would result in increased trade; lower priced island wines; a halt to smuggling; and a diminution of colonial complaints.<sup>83</sup>

Robert Walpole, minister to Portugal, wrote Lord Rochford, head of the Southern Department in early 1775, that two schools of thought existed among the Lisbon factory on the smuggling question. Some believed that “a scandalous contraband trade” went on; others felt that “it [was] not of any great consideration.” He accepted that some smuggling went on, “now and again a cargo of wines and other articles,” but, since there were seizures in America, some of them failed of success. He had sought information on it from Lisbon merchant leaders and all denied involvement “and yet say such a trade is carried on.”<sup>84</sup> Only at Bilbao did local merchants act as agents for American-bound exports. Elsewhere Englishmen controlled the trade protected by the commercial treaties. That was the dilemma. The crisis in America threatened their profitable trade. Walpole cited one case in which a Lisbon firm had a standing American order for three pipes of Lisbon wine annually. When Congress closed trade to America via England, the contract had been cancelled, costing a commission loss of nearly one hundred pounds sterling. American ships now returned home with “only Salt or in Ballast.”<sup>85</sup>

Now London officials grew concerned that “a very illicit Trade [was] Carrying on to His Majestys Colonies in America as well by British as Foreign Ships.” They warned their Spanish ambassador to check on prohibited goods and “warlike stores,” bound for the colonies. Grimaldi, the Spanish prime minister, assured Lord Grantham that any vessel carrying such goods would be seized.<sup>86</sup>

Consul John Hort at Lisbon admitted that the “care and secrecy used in it [the illicit trade] was an overmatch for all the vigilance [he] was master of.” Large amounts of tea and wines went out clandestinely and “very recently some gunpowder, but as far as I have yet learned, not a great deal.”<sup>87</sup> Pombal promised to prevent such exports. Some American captains, Hort claimed, had attempted to buy gunpowder but the English merchants denied supplying them. He had detected no munitions smuggling though he had “employed several persons to watch over it.”<sup>88</sup> Smuggling of warlike materiel became a major concern. Rumors of powder, cannon, and other supplies being brought to Iberia by Dutch, French, and Danish ships

---

83 Lisbon Factory to Rochford, n.d., Consular Reports, CO 388/95, folios 11-15. Separate and Secret Instructions to Lord Grantham, May 23, 1771, SPFS 94/187. Magra to Rochford, July 6, 1773; September 10, 1773, SPFS 94/194; Hardy to Porten, January 21, 1774, SPFS 94/195; Instructions to Lyttleton, June 25, 1767, SPFP 89/63.

84 Walpole to Rochford, March 29, 1775; April 5, 1775, SPFP 89/79.

85 Walpole to Rochford, March 29, 1775, SPFP 89/79.

86 Rochford to Grantham, January 31, 1775; Grantham to Rochford, March 2, 1775, SPFS 94/197.

87 Hort to Rochford, February 12, 1775; Walpole to Rochford, March 29, 1775; April 5, 1775, SPFP 89/79.

88 Hort to Rochford, April 6, 1775, *ibid.*

circulated in England and in Lisbon. Parr & Bulkeley, to avoid suspicion, deposited a shipment of powder in the Portuguese arsenal with the proviso that it could be released only with Walpole's permission.<sup>89</sup>

Lisbon and Bilbao were natural outlets for such shipments. The arrival of "Ships from North America" at Bilbao and Saint Sebastian concerned London by fall 1775. A year earlier an Order in Council had forbidden exports of powder or arms from any part of Britain as the "Rebellious Colonies" sought "all over Europe to purchase Warlike Stores, and particularly Gunpowder."<sup>90</sup> Absence of consular oversight at Bilbao was serious. Congressional agents actively sought military hardware. Danish arms merchants were rumored bound for Cadiz with saddlery, arms, and cartridge boxes.<sup>91</sup> Though Minister Grimaldi continued to assure that Spain would not permit Americans to export such supplies, the English remained skeptical. American vessels sought such cargoes in Spain more commonly because Anglo-Portuguese diplomatic ties made Pombal more willing to bow to English wishes.

\* \* \*

Consular officials in Iberia faced another major problem: how to handle the questionable status of American vessels that still claimed the protection of the English flag. Were their Barbary Passes viable? Even before this crisis, many illegal passes circulated in those seas. Some were licensed vessels sold out from under English control.<sup>92</sup> Many passes were badly out of date. They were to be endorsed by English consuls on any arrival at a Mediterranean port, but no specific law dictated conformity. Consuls could cancel outdated or fraudulent passes, so ship captains often did not seek endorsements. In early 1775 Rochford requested the Attorney General's ruling on a consul's authority to withhold clearances until a captain submitted his papers.<sup>93</sup> Hort at Lisbon questioned if vessels from ports closed by government order could utilize Barbary Passes. This status was clarified by May 1775. Some passes were surrendered to consuls and forwarded to the Admiralty.<sup>94</sup>

What was the exact status of American vessels? Two schooners arrived at Cadiz in late September, with no papers covering their lumber cargoes. They "had eluded the Vigilance of the Ships of War by getting away in the night."<sup>95</sup> The consul at Malaga noted that many American ships were seeking Spanish buyers, adding "I think it highly necessary...that the cut of the Mediterranean Passes should be immediately alter'd" to block American trading.<sup>96</sup> In late fall an American ship reached Alicante flying no British colors except "a blue and red pendant from the main topmast," claiming her ensign was blown away. Consul Robert Wilkie wrote, asking if he should have seized her pass. Other passes had been altered without any endorsement; how was he to proceed?<sup>97</sup>

---

89 Hort to Rochford, April 13, 1775; May 5, 1775; May 13, 1775; June 23, 1775, *ibid.* Yet in December 1775 a Newburyport firm ordered Parr & Bulkeley to return the bulk of a cargo sent them in gunpowder. Porter, *Jacksons and Lees*, I: 315.

90 Rochford to Grantham, October 6, 1775; October 10, 1775, SPFS 94/199. *PG*, December 14, 1774. Porter, *Jacksons and Lees*, I: 325.

91 Katenkamp to Rochford, September 27, 1775; Rochford to Grantham, October 31, 1775; Hardy to Rochford, November 28, 1775, SPFS 94/199.

92 Hort to Rochford, February 12, 1775, SPFP 89/79.

93 Rochford to Attorney or Solicitor General, March 18, 1775, *ibid.*

94 Hort to Rochford, March 23, 1775; April 6, 1775, *ibid.*

95 Hardy to Rochford, September 29, 1775, SPFS 94/199.

96 Marsh to Rochford, October 6, 1775, *ibid.*

97 Wilkie to Rochford, October 28, 1775; Wilkie to Admiralty, October 28, 1775, *ibid.*

The consul at Corunna reported early in 1776 the detention of a Dutch ship that had been standing on and off the coast, awaiting the *Lyon* of Philadelphia, a Willing & Morris vessel, to transfer a cargo of two thousand barrels of powder. Another American had entered under Spanish colors. An American ship sought powder at Malaga; three more waited to load at Bilbao.<sup>98</sup> Hort at Lisbon in April described: “the recent arrival from Philadelphia of a ship laden with flour; that has had the folly to enter the Tagus under colours of a new devise, and with mottos allusive to the supposed independence of the united American colonies.”<sup>99</sup> She was the *Hancock and Adams*, Samuel Smith, master, with a cargo consigned to the Pasley Brothers.

\* \* \*

For a year before Independence was declared, American shipping existed in a state of limbo. No longer English, they were threatened by Congress and Crown. Some tramped from port to port in Europe. Others were sold off. In May 1775 Captain Burchmore of the *Union* wrote the Cabots from Falmouth, England: “it is the Opinion of most hear that a sivell war will Commence in America as thire is Grait preparations making hear for it.” His owners instructed him: “By no means whatever break one single Act or Resolution of the Continental or any other Congress, Committee, etc. Nor any Acts of Trade.”<sup>100</sup>

Lacking customs clearances, without paper bonds and cockets, these ships lay open to seizure wherever boarded by naval personnel. At Lisbon in spring 1776 several Philadelphia flour carriers arrived, all insured in London. The consuls were in a quandary as to how to treat such vessels without proper credentials. Hort at Lisbon refused to endorse the sale of the American ship *Ranger* because of “the endless mixture of property between American and other subjects of Great Britain.” Sixteen American carriers had escaped “the vigilance of his majesty’s cruizers: and all [were] locked up through fear of them.”<sup>101</sup>

The disruption of Lisbon’s American trade created wheat and flour shortages in spring and summer 1776 but the Anglo-Portuguese alliance remained firm. On news that the Congress had erected its own government, Pombal closed all seaports to American shipping; vessels in port were required to sail within eight days. Those discovered with munitions aboard faced confiscation.<sup>102</sup>

\* \* \*

Colonial merchants were angered initially by attempts to control and restructure imperial regulations, beginning in 1763. Those imperial reforms were instituted in the face of rising colonial particularism. Americans reacted to the new controls and duties apparently by increasingly turning to smuggling, which led to confrontations. The permissive mercantilist system of earlier days had allowed wide latitude to American traders who engaged in smuggling when oversight had been casual. Strict enforcement under the new laws roused the anger of those used to earlier lax practices.

The profitable trade with southern Europe was, by the early 1770s, bringing almost £800,000 annually into the colonial economy, covering a large part of the negative balance with the mother country. The new laws materially affected that trade and roused colonial anger, which was further escalated by proposals to

---

98 Katenkamp to Weymouth, January 24, 1776; Marsh to Weymouth, January 16, 1776; Katenkamp to Weymouth, February 5, 1776; Hardy to Weymouth, April 2, 1776, SPFS 94/200.

99 Hort to Weymouth, April 4, 1776, SPFP 89/81. *CPR*, March 24, 1776.

100 Burchmore to Cabot, May 6, 1775; Cabot to Burchmore, August 21, 1775, in Ford, “Colonial Commerce,” 219-220, 223-224.

101 Hort to Weymouth, April 28, 1776; June 13, 1776, SPFP 89/82.

102 Walpole to Weymouth, March 23, 1776, SPFP 89/81; Walpole to Weymouth, July 6, 1776, SPFP 89/82. Pombal’s order was dated July 4, 1776.

require all European trade to enter and clear through the mother country.

The Parliamentary coalition controlling policy, at first willing to make concessions, over time rejected intransigent American demands. On the other hand, an increasingly mature economic society in America refused to kowtow before aggressive English reformers. An extraordinary population growth, a burgeoning productivity, and expanding overseas markets – especially in southern Europe – opened the way to rapid generation of capital which fostered self-confidence among the colonials.

The Mediterranean had for more than 150 years attracted exports from North America; at first, mainly fish, but over time, in increasing volumes, wheat, flour, rice, and wood products. As the eighteenth century progressed, coastal North America became fully integrated into the Atlantic economy, answering Iberian demands for foodstuffs, pipe staves, and lumber and carrying off from there salt and wine. North Shore Massachusetts, New York, the Delaware and Chesapeake regions, and South Carolina producers all enjoyed significant expansion from that trade. The Revolution ended that, at least temporarily.

By spring 1775 restraints on colonial trade had been extended from New England to the rest of North America. Well before they took effect, the die had been cast. Soon blood flowed copiously at Lexington, Concord, and Bunker Hill. Americans organized a navy and commissioned privateers. George Washington forced the British out of Boston. The Royal Navy blockaded Philadelphia and other ports and seized an estimated five hundred American ships.<sup>103</sup>

Pombal's edict closed Lisbon, the largest market for American wheat and flour and a valuable outlet for fish and other goods. Disappearing, as well, were those advantages the mother country had provided in southern Europe; the protection of Barbary Passes; the treaty privileges for English traders; the financial structure allowing easy transfer of funds. From a protection and a support the Royal Navy became a dire threat; American shipping lay open to attack in the whole Atlantic world.

---

103 Hort to Weymouth, July 6, 1776, SPFP 89/82.



## CHAPTER XV

### EPILOGUE, 1783-1800

The economic viability of the newly independent United States depended on the sale of surplus agricultural produce overseas. The Revolutionary War saw the near total destruction of its merchant shipping capabilities and the volume of goods available for export had also declined sharply. The Royal Navy maintained a close blockade of America's coastline through the period 1776-1782. Boston, Newport, New York, Philadelphia, Charleston, and Savannah suffered British occupation, in some cases for long periods. The trade of these port cities was disrupted. Merchants decamped to the interior. Economic structures disintegrated.

By late 1782 New England's whale and cod fisheries had been almost completely suspended. Marblehead's tonnage alone declined nearly ninety percent.<sup>1</sup> New England vessels not destroyed or captured had to be refurbished and new bottoms for fishing and trade constructed. Shipping resources in New York, along the Delaware, and in the Chesapeake had to be reorganized and rebuilt. Agricultural productivity and transportation infrastructure had also suffered. The seizure and transportation of slave labor forces reduced plantation production in Virginia and South Carolina.

In the Revolution's aftermath, British mercantilist policymakers took steps to halt trades previously open and advantageous to the ex-colonials. British West Indian markets remained shut. New Englanders had previously profited by exporting foodstuffs to Newfoundland and purchasing fish there. Postwar, that market was closed and special encouragements extended advantages to Irish and other British islanders there. Bounties, formerly fostering production of goods desired by the mother country ended, of course, with the war. Americans not only lost the support of England's mercantilist system but now found themselves specifically discriminated against.

The negative balance with the British metropolis had, before 1775, been overcome in several ways: through trade with southern Europe; by exports to the British Isles; by freight earnings; by selling American-built vessels into British registration.<sup>2</sup> Postwar exports to Britain declined or were forbidden by the Navigation Laws. As trades closed, sale of shipping services was limited and sales of vessels to British owners forbidden. Potentially a major source of returns still remained for the ex-colonials. The Mediterranean trade had covered nearly three-quarters of their negative balance annually. Given America's financial crisis in 1783 and the changed commercial conditions, rapid resuscitation of that trade was of paramount importance. In 1784 John Adams wrote John Jay, in charge of foreign affairs for the Confederation government, denigrating those who had "not calculated the value of our Mediterranean trade, in which every one of our States is deeply interested."<sup>3</sup> New nations establish their international probity by negotiating treaties of commerce and amity. The new democracy confronted considerable skepticism. France, America's wartime ally, supported her recognition by the international community. Spain, of indirect aid during the war, had not recognized American independence and Portugal, long-term British ally, had closed its ports to Americans. Recognition by the Iberian countries was a prime commercial goal. Another issue also demanded resolution. Independence had removed the protective umbrella supplied by

---

1 Johnson, *History of Commerce*, 158. Marblehead's tonnage dropped from 12,000 tons to 1,509 tons. McFarland, *New England Fisheries*, 121. Doerflinger, *Vigorous Spirit*, 341.

2 Shepherd and Walton, *Shipping, Maritime Trade*, chapter 9.

3 Adams to Jay, December 15, 1784, as cited by Norman A. Graebner, *Ideas and Diplomacy* (New York, 1964), 41.

England's treaties with North Africa's Barbary powers. American representatives in London and Paris, John Adams and Thomas Jefferson, were well aware of the need to resolve these issues.

Congressional instructions governing the new state's diplomatic relationships had established the principle that commercial agreements were to be based on the "most favored nation" approach. By 1783 Treaties of Amity and Commerce had been negotiated with France, the Netherlands, and Sweden. The Adams-Jefferson correspondence through the 1780s and into the next decade demonstrated their continuing concern with diplomatic openings to Spain, Portugal, and the Barbary States.

During the Revolution Spain secretly assisted the North Americans to weaken British power. Though at war with Britain after 1779, Spanish leaders questioned the efficacy of recognizing a nation born out of wedlock via a rebellion. They feared the democratic infection might spread to their own colonies. Hoping to regain Gibraltar and Florida and reduce British strength, they negotiated, unofficially, with American emissary John Jay in Spain but still refused American recognition. Secret assistance came through Spanish merchant houses, notably Casa de Gardoqui, which actively served as a conduit for arms, munitions, and military accoutrements. American vessels were welcomed in Spanish ports and permitted to trade temporarily at Havana and New Orleans. But, when peace came in 1783, those ports were abruptly closed.<sup>4</sup>

Through the years until the signing of the Treaty of San Lorenzo (1795), American vessels entered Spanish Iberian ports under "the sufferance of Spanish municipal decrees, without legal certainty, but apparently without particular discrimination."<sup>5</sup> Spain's vessels traded in America on the same basis. Spanish-American commercial relations approximated the "most favored nation" status.

Don José Monino y Redondo, Count of Floridablanca, held the post of foreign minister in Spain throughout this era. Before the war ended, semiofficial negotiators had laid down the functions and prerogatives of consuls representing the interests of the two nations.<sup>6</sup>

A major concern of those wishing to trade in Spain was extension of the Anglo-Spanish treaty privileges, which had protected individuals involved in illegally exporting specie from Spain. In September 1781 John Jay, unrecognized American representative in Spain, proposed a treaty granting mutual "most favored nation" rights to the signatories. The Spanish adamantly rejected extension of those commercial advantages forced from them by the English – more extensive rights than those enjoyed by Spanish nationals.<sup>7</sup> Despite the lack of official agreements between the two countries, trade went forward, though the transference of surplus funds from Spain and other matters complicated the relationship because of a lack of specificity. One problem involved disposition of prizes brought to Spain by American privateers during the war.<sup>8</sup>

As peace reigned, William Carmichael, American chargé in Spain, wrote to Minister Floridablanca: "The Season approaches when there can be expected to arrive many American ships in the Spanish ports filled with different products of their country or of the fishery that they have taken on the Newfoundland banks." Commenting on inconveniences that could "result from the fact that there [were] still no rules established by treaty in order to facilitate the trade of one party or the other," he raised an issue involving a Boston vessel's imbroglio with Cadiz customs officials. The vessel had sailed to Spain, he noted: "in the confidence that the citizens of the United States trading with Spain would be treated at least as favorably as they had been

---

4 Channing, *History of United States*, III: 283. Samuel Flagg Bemis, *Pinckney's Treaty: America's Advantage from Europe's Distress, 1738-1800* (New Haven, Conn., 1960), Appendix II.

5 Bemis, *Pinckney's Treaty*, 58-59.

6 Miguel Gomez del Campillo, *Relaciones Diplomáticas entre España y los Estados Unidos*, 2 vols. (Madrid, 1944), I: xxiii.

7 Bemis, *Pinckney's Treaty*, 27n.

8 AHN-M, Legajo 3884 bis, expedientes 12, 17; Legajo 3885, ex. 3.

previously as subjects of Great Britain.”<sup>9</sup> Other cases involved salvage claims and Americans’ religious rights. In the latter case, Carmichael wrote: “This Conduct of the Holy Office, if not rectified may be attended with bad Consequences to the Commerce and Friendly Correspondence that ought to be cultivated between the two Nations.”<sup>10</sup>

Don Diego de Gardoqui, scion of the Bilbayan merchant firm, served as liaison between Floridablanca and John Jay during the latter’s Spanish mission and, in 1784, went to America to negotiate a treaty with Jay, now responsible for foreign affairs under the Confederation. Gardoqui’s reputation and American connections were expected to be of special advantage. Spanish interest in regularizing relations centered on protecting Florida and the Mississippi Valley from the expansionistic tendencies of the Americans, whom Gardoqui characterized as “vecinos mui terribles.”<sup>11</sup>

Spain hoped to exchange Iberian trade concessions for American surrender of navigation rights on the Mississippi River, either permanently or temporarily. This ran counter to Jay’s instructions to insist on those rights in any agreement. Spain expected to promise “most favored nation” status to the Americans in Spain, in theory making them equal to British in trade there. They believed Jay would sacrifice claims in the west and south because of America’s need to market its fish, grain, and other exports. The Americans faced a dilemma because this trade “paid plenteously in hard cash.”<sup>12</sup>

As negotiations proceeded, a Philadelphia newspaper praised the proposed treaty, which opened trade to Spain as a most favored nation and allowed Americans to export “specie free from impost or duty.”<sup>13</sup> Samuel Flagg Bemis’s study of these negotiations stresses the interstate conflict in America, centering on north-south political issues. The commercial areas feared, he felt, a future drain of labor to the west and a resultant shift of political power arising from a southern and western alliance. However, the need to reestablish firmly the pre-war Iberian outlets, which had provided a most important source of specie appears to have been underappreciated by him.<sup>14</sup>

When Gardoqui arrived in America in 1785, the new nation faced a major depression, with its traditional trading systems disrupted by the war and the British-controlled markets largely closed to them. The commercial sectors desperately needed to reestablish the Iberian specie source. Gardoqui’s negotiations continued into the summer of 1786, with the Spaniard threatening that, should they fail, the Americans would lose the Iberian trade and also that to the Canary Islands. Pushing their Mississippi claims would result, he wrote Jay, in the loss of this unmatched trade whose balance was in their favor.

These facts are well known in all of these states, everyone understands them, that all of your products find easy consumption in the Markets of Spain, and that for them one pays in gold and silver when all the other Nations pay you with Manufactured products (for the most part luxury goods) which causes your country to waste away. Everyone understands the great advantages that the United States derive from its trade with Spain, from whence each year they carry off Millions, arising from its exports and also for the shipping which promotes so

---

9 Carmichael to Floridablanca, September 22, 1783, AHN-M, Legajo 3885, ex. 15.

10 Carmichael to Floridablanca, November 9, 1784, AHN-M, Legajo 3885 bis, ex. 3.

11 Ibid., Gardoqui to Galvez, August 23, 1785.

12 Bemis, *Pinckney’s Treaty*, 63.

13 *PG*, August 30, 1786.

14 Bemis, *Pinckney’s Treaty*, 85. Spanish-American trade concessions were also dangled by Gardoqui. John Jay, *Correspondence and Papers of John Jay*. Ed. Henry P. Johnston. 4 vols. (New York, 1890-1893), III: 150.

much the breeding and the maintenance of your body of seamen.<sup>15</sup>

Gardoqui had the advantage of long-term business connections in America. The new President of Congress John Hancock was sympathetic to his goals and “an old friend with whom I have corresponded for many years.”<sup>16</sup> To Jay, he stressed Spanish willingness to aid negotiations with the Barbary States and to push Britain out of the Northwest posts but was loathe to concede the same commercial privileges enjoyed by the British in Spain. He offered Jay instead a mutual exchange of rights based on the privileges enjoyed by the nationals of each signatory. Special rights to trade in the Canaries were discussed, as well as a clause providing for an annual purchase of lumber by Spain to be paid for in specie.<sup>17</sup>

The final treaty proposed saw the United States relinquish its claim to Mississippi navigation and compromise on southwest border claims. The Spanish committed to intercede with the Barbary powers and agreed not to demand payment of war debts. To encourage American concessions, Gardoqui warned that, since American products were available elsewhere and Spain sold very little to America, the King might withdraw his friendly offices and exclude American fish, flour, corn, and other goods.<sup>18</sup>

For negotiations to be brought to conclusion, the Congress had to abandon Mississippi navigation for as long as twenty-five or thirty years. Jay now requested a change in his instructions regarding Mississippi rights. That caused a direct confrontation between the northern and southern states in May 1786. Seven northern states favored the change. Five in the south were unalterably opposed. Delaware was absent and not voting. The division was extremely bitter, with some northerners threatening secession. Gardoqui met with the pro-treaty faction. Then, by judicious “loans” and clever diplomacy tried to swing the votes of Virginia and North Carolina behind the treaty but with little success.<sup>19</sup> George Washington and Richard Henry Lee both favored the treaty. Lee was willing to surrender the navigation right because of the importance of a “liberal system of trade with Spain.”<sup>20</sup>

The treaty issue became so divisive that the debate took place behind closed doors. Eventually commercial leaders, fearing the collapse of the Confederacy if they insisted on majority rule, relented. The treaty conflict colored events through the whole period 1784-1787 and had a distinct impact on the Constitutional Convention, where southern states feared commercial/financial interests might destroy the particularistic protections of the Confederation. The Jay-Gardoqui Treaty crisis led directly to the protection of minority interests in the Constitution’s two-thirds requirement for Senate approval of treaties.<sup>21</sup> Relations with Spain were left to future negotiation.

Washington’s administration under the new Constitution advanced American interests by utilizing European conflicts to its advantage. Improving economic conditions, fiscal stability, and development of trade outlets reduced pressure for concessions to Spain in the west. Eventually Spanish fear of a rapprochement between the United States and Britain, threatening its American colonies, brought them to sign the San Lorenzo Treaty, October 1795. By it, Spain recognized American rights to navigate the Mississippi and the right of deposit at New Orleans. It also set the northern boundary of Florida. Trade

---

15 Gardoqui to Jay, May 25, 1786, AHN-M, Legajo 3889, ex. 1.

16 Gardoqui to Floridablanca, November 21, 1785; June 19, 1786, AHN-M, Legajo 3893, ex. 2.

17 Bemis, *Pinckney’s Treaty*, 78.

18 *Ibid.*, 83.

19 *Ibid.*, 94-95.

20 As cited in Edmund C. Burnett, *The Continental Congress* (New York, 1964), 655.

21 R. Earl McClendon, “The Origin of the Two-Thirds Rule in Senate Action on Treaties,” *AHR* XXXVI (1931): 768-772.

between the nations was regularized on the basis of equality between their inhabitants.<sup>22</sup>

\* \* \*

Relations between the United States and Portugal were also complicated. The long-term Anglo-Portuguese alliance meant that the natural antipathy of that monarchy for a newly independent democratic nation was strongly seconded by British diplomats, who pressured Lisbon to deny recognition to the Americans and, in consequence, a market for their goods.

The refusal to allow American merchantmen to trade in Portugal in 1776 was a severe loss. The following year, Benjamin Franklin and Silas Deane proposed to the French a tripartite alliance, including Spain, which would guarantee to continue the fight until Spain reconquered Portugal, directly reflecting American anger at the cut-off of their Portuguese trade outlets.<sup>23</sup> Through the war captured American vessels were carried into Lisbon and other ports for condemnation. With peace, in 1783, merchant leaders in both countries moved to resuscitate trade but the nations, for a time, remained estranged. Thomas Jefferson, on his arrival in Paris in 1785, made courtesy visits to other diplomats; all were returned, except by the Portuguese ambassador.<sup>24</sup>

Jefferson and Adams both recognized that: “The most critical diplomatic question confronting [them] was that of trade relations.”<sup>25</sup> Jefferson’s differences with Chevalier de Sousa Coutinho, the Portuguese representative at Paris, remained a problem. He described him as a “torpid uniformed machine,” in contrast to the Chevalier de Pinto at London, whom he viewed as “well informed and sensible.”<sup>26</sup>

Western Europe, beginning in 1784, faced a severe drought, the first of several years of shortages there. John Adams commented at length on the desperate conditions faced by the people of northern France.<sup>27</sup> Ties with Britain had discouraged Portugal from taking the first step toward recognition of the United States by assigning a representative to negotiate there.<sup>28</sup> Now the need for food made them willing to reestablish commercial relations.

Jefferson considered “the treaty with Portugal as among the most important to the U.S.”<sup>29</sup> Adams, however, believed that the Americans should insist on keeping the trade in their own hands, unless they received “a rich equivalent for it.”<sup>30</sup> Negotiations took place in London, where Count de Pinto assured that his country “was sincerely desirous of entering into a Treaty of Commerce with the United States of America, a Power with which it was more convenient for Portugal to Trade than any other.”<sup>31</sup> The principals examined the goods available for exchange and commented on their “Mutual Wants.” The Portuguese wanted grain but not flour, since they had “Mills in Portugal which they wished to employ,” echoing the issue that had divided Britain and Portugal during the 1760s and 1770s, when flour had replaced grain

---

22 Bemis, *Pinckney’s Treaty*, 258, Appendix V, 343n.

23 Samuel Flagg Bemis, *The Diplomacy of the American Revolution* (Bloomington, Ind., 1957), 53.

24 Jefferson to Adams, June 2, 1785, *A-JL*, 27.

25 Thomas Jefferson, *Papers of Thomas Jefferson*. Ed. Julian P. Boyd et al. 33 vols. to date (Princeton, N.J., 1950-), VII: 72.

26 Jefferson to Adams, November 27, 1785, *A-JL*, 100.

27 Vicens Vives, *Historia social y economica*, IV: 160. Adams to Jefferson, May 22, 1785; May 23, 1785, *A-JL*, 21-22.

28 *A-JL*, 74.

29 Jefferson to Adams, October 11, 1785, *A-JL*, 81.

30 Adams to Jefferson, November 4, 1785, *AJ-L*, 89.

31 Adams to Jefferson, November 5, 1785, *AJ-L*, 90.

shipments because the Lisbon government controlled grain sales. Adams responded that America too had mills, which needed employment. Wheat cargoes, he noted, suffered spoilage from damp and pests, losses which would be solely borne by the Americans if flour were excluded. For the time the issue remained unresolved. Large quantities of pipe staves and other lumber were needed and “above all salt Fish. The Consumption...was immense and...American salt Fish was preferred to any other on account of its Quality.”<sup>32</sup>

The Portuguese wished to encourage exports to the United States, de Pinto stated, “otherwise the Ballance in your favour may be ruinous to us.”<sup>33</sup> Adams reassured him, adding, however, “Nothing would contribute so much to promote the Trade as their receiving our Flour without Duties or Discouragements.”<sup>34</sup> He added that Portugal “might allways Ballance Accounts with us to our intire satisfaction [with]...Gold and Silver, than which no kind of Merchandise was in greater demand or had higher reputation.” The Portuguese answered that: “they would rather pay...in anything else.”<sup>35</sup> Adams reported to Jefferson in detail since they were to act jointly.

In reply to Adams, Jefferson commented on the wheat/flour problem. He believed wine sales to be of prime importance to the Portuguese and, of course, salt.<sup>36</sup> He felt that there was “no country with which we are likely to cultivate a more useful commerce.”<sup>37</sup> Early in 1786 he traveled to London in hopes of concluding the negotiations. Relations with Portugal warmed, when Queen Maria I ordered Portuguese naval units to protect American shipping against Algerine attacks.<sup>38</sup>

The Portuguese court, however, moved at a snail’s pace. In January 1786 Adams complained of the long delay and ascribed it to British influence in Lisbon. “As to the Reasons why the Treaty is not signed, they know it at New York as well as you and I know, or even as De Pinto knows them.”<sup>39</sup>

Despite their most earnest arguments, “No relaxation of the regulations prohibiting the importation of flour into Portugal could be obtained.”<sup>40</sup> And, in spite of their great efforts, the Portuguese never ratified this treaty.

\* \* \*

Withdrawal of British protection against the Barbary pirates coincided with American independence, though many American vessels still possessed their Barbary Passes, which they used when brought to, even though new British passes were current after 1776. American vessels masqueraded under the British flag or carried double papers.<sup>41</sup> By the mid-1780s the Barbary leaders had been made aware of the change in North American status. English consuls in Barbary made it a point to inform officials of it.<sup>42</sup> Spain signed a long-term truce with the Dey of Algiers in 1784, opening the Straits to his raiders. By summer 1785 three

---

32 *A-JL*, 91.

33 *Ibid.*

34 *AJ-L*, 92.

35 *AJ-L*, 93.

36 Jefferson to Adams, November 27, 1785, *A-JL*, 100-103.

37 Jefferson to Adams, February 7, 1786, *A-JL*, 119.

38 Jefferson to Adams, June 29, 1786, *A-JL*, 138.

39 Adams to Jefferson, January 25, 1787, *A-JL*, 161.

40 *PG*, August 2, 1786. Vernon G. Setser, *The Commercial Reciprocity of the United States, 1774-1829* (New York, 1969), 76-77, 133-134.

41 *PG*, July 20, 1785; November 9, 1785.

42 H.G. Barnby, *The Prisoners of Algiers, 1785-1797* (London, 1966), 4.

American ships had been seized, their crews enslaved. Benjamin Franklin had earlier suspected the English would secretly encourage such attacks: “to prevent our interference in the carrying trade; for I have in London heard it is a maxim among the merchants that if there were no Algiers it would be worth England’s while to build one.”<sup>43</sup> In late fall a Sallateen rover had also taken the brig *Betsey* into Tangier, to encourage the Americans to purchase peace.<sup>44</sup>

English insurance agents now refused to issue policies on American bottoms.<sup>45</sup> Anger at Britain is amply evident in the American press. In June the *Pennsylvania Gazette* charged the British court with encouraging corsair attacks “to distress our European trade as much as possible, that we may be induced to import from Europe in English bottoms; but it is hoped Congress will speedily fall upon some plan to counteract this insidious piece of policy.”<sup>46</sup> Reports continued of raider attacks and the vulnerability of American shipping. Three Algerine cruisers were reported as cruising east of Barbados.<sup>47</sup>

Repeated accounts of corsair activity encouraged one editor “to think the far greater part of the intelligence is fabricated by our old well-wishers in England and elsewhere for purposes sufficiently obvious.” This propaganda was intended to impress “the credulous and uninformed...who think nothing safe, except in British bottoms.”<sup>48</sup> In the same issue, news arrived that a Portuguese fleet had closed the Straits to the Algerines. Shortly, American insurance rates, double those charged English vessels, fell abruptly.<sup>49</sup> Improved relations with Portugal meant American shipping was protected, as if Portuguese, because of dependence on American food supplies.<sup>50</sup> Portuguese naval units barred the Gates of Hercules down to 1793, when, rumor had it, Britain encouraged their peace with the Dey to damage America’s Iberian trading. Attacks followed and soon 119 American prisoners were enslaved in Algiers.

From 1785 until the mid-1790s American shippers protected their vessels bound in harm’s way by purchasing forged British Barbary Passes. His Majesty’s consuls in New York and Philadelphia complained bitterly to John Jay of their open sale in American ports, to little avail.<sup>51</sup>

American diplomats differed as to the best method of dealing with North Africa’s piratic states. Some favored paying annual tribute for peace. Others, embarrassed by that policy, wished to destroy the Barbary strongholds once and for all. European policymakers were equally divided. Major commercial nations favored payments since their powerful navies checked the North Africans and helped them monopolize Mediterranean trade. Weaker traders faced almost constant harassment. Potential profits outweighed for the strong an embarrassment at their inhumanity.

Barbary negotiations were handled through Adams and Jefferson. The latter sought the council of French leaders, notably the Comte de Vergennes, who offered helpful advice. The Americans were philosophically divided. Adams, though believing war would settle this problem, felt America was too weak to fight, so favored tribute. Jefferson preferred war and formation of an international alliance of smaller European states to crush the pirates. In a letter to Jefferson in July 1786, Adams cogently laid out the economic issues that

---

43 Franklin to Robert Livingston, as cited by Graebner, *Ideas and Diplomacy*, 41.

44 *PG*, February 9, 1785; May 11, 1785.

45 *PG*, April 13, 1785.

46 *PG*, June 1, 1785.

47 *PG*, May 3, 1786.

48 *PG*, May 17, 1786.

49 *PG*, July 26, 1786. Council Minutes, April 1, 1786, Board of Trade Papers, 6/226.

50 *PG*, May 7, 1787.

51 Merrill Jensen, *The New Nation, 1781-1789* (New York, 1950), 212-213. Phineas Bond, “Letters of Phineas Bond, British Consul at Philadelphia, to the Foreign Office of Great Britain, 1787-1789.” Ed. John Franklin Jameson. *AHA Annual Report*, I (1896): 523. Channing, *History of United States*, III: 420.

dictated the need for peace. Though the Northwest posts in British hands were important, he said:

The war with the Turks is more so...At present we are sacrificing a million annually to save one gift of £200,000. This is not good economy. We might at this hour, have two hundred ships in the Mediterranean, whose freights alone would be worth £200,000 besides the influence upon the price of our produce. Our farmers and planters will find the price of their articles sink very low indeed, if this peace is not made...The policy of Christendom has made cowards of all of their sailors before the standard of Mahomet.<sup>52</sup>

Jefferson and Adams, realists, accepted that weakness forced them to pay tribute. Yet, Congress had authorized only \$80,000 to buy peace with all the Barbary States. Even that sum was to be borrowed from the Dutch. John Jay noted: “those Nations to whom our war with the Barbary States is not disagreeable will be little inclined to lend us money to put an end to it.”<sup>53</sup>

Initial negotiations took place with Morocco (Sallee), though Algiers was the most powerful of the “Pyritical states.” Jefferson urged a liberal peace with the Salletens, “on account of the neighborhood to our Atlantic trade.”<sup>54</sup> Thomas Barclay handled negotiations, assisted by the good offices of the Spanish.

Treaty discussions with Algiers, led by John Lamb, failed. British consuls at Barcelona and Algiers spread misinformation about his mission and the Algerines would not make peace cheaply. The captives remained in slavery at Algiers for another eleven years. Exorbitant Algerian ransom demands caused Jefferson to try another road to their freedom, through the Catholic Order of the Trinity.<sup>55</sup>

Diplomacy to reopen southern European trading enjoyed successes and suffered failures. The Adams-Jefferson correspondence shows their clear awareness of the importance of this trade to the new nation. Drought and the resultant food shortages worked in their favor. Spain and Portugal opened their markets to American vessels. However, both refused to extend the exceptional privileges enjoyed by the English, which “most favored nation” status would have granted. Americans who accumulated surplus funds in Iberia and wished to export specie had either to pay the fees for export licenses or employ English firms to handle transfers. After its war with Britain in 1793, Spain abrogated those British trade privileges.

\* \* \*

Despite the lack of formal relations with Spain and Portugal immediately after the Revolution, trade went on informally. Demand for American goods existed there from the early 1780s on. Need for hard money to redress negative balances still motivated American shipments. Mechanisms for safely transferring specie still existed. Trade statistics for the new nation are limited for this period. The *Pennsylvania Gazette* did not publish customs data regularly through the 1780s, though scattered reports are available. Research has turned up information on two major trade outlets, Bilbao and Lisbon.<sup>56</sup>

The war ended officially on January 20, 1783. Almost at once British houses poured goods into America

---

52 Adams to Jefferson, July 3, 1786, *A-JL*, 138.

53 *Correspondence of Jay*, III: 197.

54 Jefferson to Adams, September 4, 1785, *A-JL*, 58.

55 James G. Lydon, “Thomas Jefferson and the Mathurins,” *The Catholic Historical Review* XLIX (1963): 192-202.

56 Bilbao data are from the “Averia Accounts,” 1783-1794; for Lisbon, see the “Livros,” 1783-1788, 74-80.



to answer pent-up demand. Generous credit was extended to American merchants and through them to retail distributors. In short order the limited specie available had been drawn to England to pay for those goods. By early summer of 1784 an English commentator criticized his country's shortsighted commercial policy toward America, warning that the trade would decrease sharply because of "the difficulties and embarrassments of remittances" caused by British blockage of traditional trading patterns.<sup>57</sup>

Portuguese-American trade enjoyed a slow advance in 1784, after a limited initial year. One reporter believed total exports of wheat and flour "did not amount to more than one-third of what they were in the year before the war."<sup>58</sup> The *Pennsylvania Gazette* listed overall wheat shipments in 1784 as off 86.6%, flour down 24.3%, bread 40.2%, and corn off 58.9% from 1773.<sup>59</sup> Late that year news of Iberian grain shortages circulated in Philadelphia. The next year, 1785, tonnage from America to Lisbon jumped, almost doubling from 7,353 tons to 14,262 tons. Demand in Portugal was so great that vineyards were converted to wheat "to prevent the vast sums of money that every year are spent on grain and have greatly diminished the circulating media."<sup>60</sup> Still, American cargoes went off to the Tagus and found "ready sale."<sup>61</sup>

A Lisbon correspondent, to encourage traders, wrote that an edict of the Queen had suspended duties on American produce, adding: "no American ships shall be searched by any of her officers, when they get ready to sail."<sup>62</sup> Thus, smuggling of specie was to be countenanced. Shortly, it was bruited about that an American factory would be established at Lisbon.<sup>63</sup> When, in late 1785, news of Algerine captures reached American ports, trade to Lisbon fell about fifty percent; it showed little improvement until 1788, when Portuguese naval units blocked Algerine vessels from the Atlantic.<sup>64</sup>

These pirate attacks and John Lamb's inability to arrange a reasonable treaty seriously reduced American exports. As the new year began, John Temple, British consul at New York, reported that "a dread of the Barbary rovers hath of late struck a palsy into what remained of their trade to Spain, Portugal and the Mediterranean."<sup>65</sup> From the summer of 1785 on the trade suffered, even though a peace was reached with Morocco. Some exports did go out of Lisbon, Cadiz, and other points outside the Straits, and occasionally shippers risked trading inside Gibraltar.<sup>66</sup> In 1789 Stephen Girard sent his *Polly* there with wheat and superfine flour, paying an extra insurance charge to protect her "against Capture and Seizure By Algerines, Moors or any of the Piratical States."<sup>67</sup> American ships remained under threat. Down to the late 1780s much of the cargo clearing went in foreign-owned vessels. From 1768-1775 about eighty percent of the shipping entering Lisbon from the mainland colonies had been American registered. Lisbon entered 241 vessels (41,609 tons) from the United States, 1784-1788, only sixty-five percent of which was American owned.<sup>68</sup>

\* \* \*

---

57 *PG*, July 21, 1784, quoting a letter from the *London Evening Post*.

58 *PG*, January 12, 1785.

59 *PG*, February 4, 1785.

60 *PG*, February 16, 1785.

61 *PG*, May 9, 1787.

62 *PG*, July 28, 1784; April 27, 1785.

63 *PG*, August 10, 1785.

64 *PG*, May 9, 1787. Occasionally Portuguese ships convoyed Americans.

65 Temple to Lord Carmathen, January 5, 1786, microfilm: "British Trade, 1662-1798," Papers and Collection of Peter Force, 1170-1961: George Chalmers Collection, 1640-1825, British Museum.

66 Morison, *Maritime History*, 82-84.

67 David S. Miller, "The *Polly*: A Perspective on Merchant Stephen Girard." *PMHB* CXII (1988): 196.

68 "Livros," 1784-1788. See Tables 15-1 and 15-2.

In an era when mercantilist policies were all but universally accepted, the new nation's leaders naturally espoused those principles. At first, driven by particularistic attitudes, each state established its own mercantilist program. An anarchy of commerce resulted, which encouraged adoption of the Constitution.<sup>69</sup> By the late spring of 1785 American anger at British policies brought demands for state boycotts against British imports and for limits on the rights of British merchants here.<sup>70</sup> Discriminatory state duties and legislation favoring American-owned vessels apparently reduced the proportion of American goods carried to Lisbon aboard foreign bottoms. Previously, Portuguese-registered vessels had sailed in this trade but by 1788, none were engaged in it.<sup>71</sup>

Through the whole period the Portuguese government refused admittance to American flour. In retaliation Pennsylvania laid heavy duties on Portuguese wines and fruits. The proposed commercial treaty with Portugal, signed at London in April 1786, retained the ban on American flour but ended American discrimination against Portuguese products.<sup>72</sup> See Tables 15-1 and 15-2.

Sales of American foodstuffs, staves, and lumber continued through the 1780s but at a significantly reduced level compared to the early 1770s. Keppelle & Steinmetz of Philadelphia and other American firms quickly resumed connections with Parr & Bulkeley at Lisbon, or with the Gardoquis at Bilbao and Scott & Pringle in Madeira. By the mid-decade the Confederation government had begun to appoint consular officials in Iberian and island ports, following the British policy of employing local merchants.<sup>73</sup> They reestablished the trade on nearly the same basis as in the 1770s. Surplus credits were exported in specie or transferred to English centers. the same goods were returned to America, wine and salt.

Commercial agents in southern Europe were anxious to reconnect with American merchants. John Marsden Pintard, later American consul at Madeira, was a member of John Searle & Company. An "old Established House here," he wrote John Hancock in April 1784, stressing theirs was the only American house there, "whose manifest attachment to our Glorious Cause during the war entitles them to the attention of the Patriotick Merchants."<sup>74</sup>

---

69 William Appleman Williams, "The Age of Mercantilism," *WMQ* XV (1958): 419-425.

70 *PG*, May 4, 1785; May 11, 1785; June 1, 1785; June 8, 1785; August 8, 1785; November 14, 1787; February 20, 1788.

71 "Livros," 1784-1788. See Table 15-2.

72 Giesecke, *American Commercial Legislation*, 130-131. Tomkins to Steinmetz, March 12, 1783, Keppelle & Steinmetz "Correspondence," Box L. The Portuguese apparently prohibited rice imports as well.

73 Adams to Jefferson, September 11, 1785; December 13, 1785, *A-JL*, 63, 106-107.

74 Pintard to Hancock, April 5, 1784, John Hancock "Papers," 27, BL.

**TABLE 15-1**  
**Lisbon/United States Trade, 1783-1788**

From	Lisbon Entrances														
	1783		1784		1785		1786		1787		1788		Totals		
	US	For	US	For	US	For	US	For	US	For	US	For	US	For	
Maine	1-260	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	1-260	---
Salem <sup>a</sup>	1-112	---	---	---	2-219	---	---	---	3-330	---	4-364	---	10-1025	---	---
Boston	3-551	---	4-960	4-476	4-651	4-755	3-360	3-346	6-789	1-96	8-853	---	28-4164	12-1673	---
R.I.	---	---	---	---	3-248	---	---	---	---	---	1-170	---	4-418	---	---
Conn.	---	---	---	---	---	3-253	---	---	---	1-100	---	---	---	---	4-353
N.Y.	---	4-245	---	2-219	---	1-286	2-371	4-622	3-615	2-354	17-3123	6-1397	22-4109	19-3123	---
Del. R.	1-130	---	4-923	11-1545	6-1406	5-624	4-719	4-748	2-487	7-1458	11-1920	2-194	28-5585	29-4569	---
Md.	2-237	---	2-284	---	5-1177	6-1088	2-504	3-634	5-1395	1-245	10-2251	5-952	26-5848	15-2919	---
Va.	---	---	2-241	---	16-3403	4-542	1-268	2-438	---	2-244	3-623	---	22-4535	8-1224	---
Car.	---	---	---	1-180	5-748	3-381	1-171	---	---	---	2-180	---	8-1099	4-561	---
Amer.	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	1-144	---	1-144	---
Totals	8-1290	4-245	12-2408	18-2420	41-7852	26-3929	13-2393	16-2788	19-3616	14-2497	56-9484	14-2687	149-27043	92-14566	---
Yearly Total	12-1535		30-4828		67-11781		29-5181		33-6113		70-12171		241-41609		

  

From	Lisbon Clearances														
	1783		1784		1785		1786		1787		1788		Totals		
	US	For	US	For	US	For	US	For	US	For	US	For	US	For	
N. Eng.	---	1-230	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	1-230
Salem <sup>a</sup>	4-565	---	1-100	---	1-100	---	---	---	2-255	---	4-364	---	12-1384	---	---
Boston	3-465	---	10-1626	6-1101	16-2537	6-1050	4-633	1-144	6-557	---	9-893	---	48-6711	13-2295	---
R.I.	---	---	---	---	4-338	1-225	---	---	---	---	1-170	---	5-508	1-225	---
N.Y.	---	4-245	1-50	1-94	6-1165	2-477	2-371	2-406	3-615	1-218	17-3054	3-842	29-5255	13-2282	---
Del. R.	4-633	6-788	4-1000	11-1570	10-1912	6-1020	3-644	6-1328	3-831	3-545	10-1740	3-415	34-6760	35-5666	---
Md.	4-705	1-90	3-420	2-450	7-1688	2-321	3-729	2-444	6-1080	---	10-2251	6-1052	33-6873	13-2357	---
Va.	---	---	1-183	2-210	5-1127	2-416	1-135	2-432	---	2-246	3-623	---	10-2068	8-1304	---
Car.	---	---	1-140	2-270	4-643	3-545	1-171	1-134	---	---	1-75	---	7-1029	6-949	---
Amer.	---	---	---	1-139	---	4-481	---	1-300	---	---	---	---	---	6-920	---
?	---	---	---	---	1-217	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	1-217	---
Totals	15-2368	12-1353	21-3519	25-3834	54-9727	26-4535	14-2683	15-3188	20-3338	6-1009	55-9170	12-2309	179-30805	96-16228	---
Yearly Total	27-3721		46-7353		80-14262		29-5871		26-4347		67-11479		275-47033		

Source: Data are from the "Livros" for these years. Figures are numbers of vessels and their tonnages.  
<sup>a</sup>Salem data include other North Shore towns. Vessels are divided by registry, American and foreign.

**TABLE 15-2**  
**Lisbon/United States Trade, 1783-1788**

<b>Registry of Entering Vessels</b>										
	<b>US</b>		<b>Eng.</b>		<b>Port.</b>		<b>Other</b>		<b>Total</b>	
	Ves.	Tons	Ves.	Tons	Ves.	Tons	Ves.	Tons	Ves.	Tons
1783	8	1,290	4	245	---	---	---	---	12	1,535
1784	12	2,408	2	219	11	1,480	5	721	30	4,828
1785	41	7,852	14	2,004	5	540	7	1,385	67	11,781
1786	13	2,393	10	2,023	4	529	2	236	29	5,181
1787	19	3,616	5	656	4	955	5	886	33	6,113
1788	56	9,484	6	1,085	---	---	8	1,602	70	12,171
<b>Totals</b>	<b>149</b>	<b>27,043</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>6,232</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>3,504</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>4,830</b>	<b>241</b>	<b>41,609</b>

  

<b>Registry of Clearing Vessels</b>										
1783	15	2,368	4	245	5	608	3	500	27	3,721
1784	21	3,519	6	656	13	1,892	6	1,286	46	7,353
1785	54	9,727	13	2,521	5	834	8	1,180	80	14,262
1786	14	2,683	9	1,954	2	540	4	694	29	5,871
1787	20	3,338	4	531	---	---	2	478	26	4,347
1788	55	9,170	5	944	---	---	7	1,365	67	11,479
<b>Totals</b>	<b>179</b>	<b>30,805</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>6,856</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>3,874</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>5,503</b>	<b>275</b>	<b>47,033</b>

Source: Data are from the "Livros." Others included mainly Dutch, German, Swedish, and Danish vessels.

\* \* \*

Data is also available on the trade to Bilbao. The North American fisheries recovered fairly rapidly in the post-Revolutionary era; Newfoundland fishermen reorganized quickly, New Englanders more slowly. By 1787 the latter sent more than 110,000 quintals of cod to Bilbao and Lisbon. Through this decade, with rare exceptions, shipments to Bilbao from the United States exceeded those entering direct from Newfoundland and Canada. If indirect fish shipments via English ports are added, total fish imports to Bilbao average 126,837 quintals.<sup>75</sup> Now Bilbao was also importing large amounts of fish from Norway and Iceland.

After 1785 Algerian attacks on American shipping and threats by Tunisian and Tripolitan pirates seriously reduced this trade. Ships, Mediterranean bound, were at greater risk; those to ports outside the Straits faced a lesser threat. Bilbao, north in the Bay of Biscay, was much less affected. Newfoundland carriers had always dominated markets in the Mediterranean ports and in Portugal. That continued to be the case. American shippers concentrated on Bilbao.

Relations between North American merchant houses and those in Bilbao were also quickly renewed. Five firms all but engrossed American fish arrivals during this twelve-year period. As the volume of New England fish shipments rose, so did the fortunes of the Casa de Gardoqui, still the premier importing firm, taking thirty-five percent of the fish entering. See Table 15-4.

<sup>75</sup> See Table 15-3. The American fish came 47.8% from New England; 45% from Canada and Newfoundland, and 7.1% via England. Between 1790 and 1794 Bergen sent 121 shiploads of fish to Bilbao. "Averia Accounts," 1770-1774, 1784-1794.

Their long-term connections with New England fish purveyors extended back at least sixty years. They handled on consignment 198 of approximately 280 New England cargoes at Bilbao, 1783 through 1794. Don Diego de Gardoqui's appointment to negotiate Spain's treaty with the United States doubtless contributed to the company's dominance.

Employing data from the Bilbao Averia records and presuming a fixed sale price of cod, allows a comparison of the fish shipments from New England and other sources. New England fish held a very slight margin on that from St. John's and other Newfoundland points. Lack of Lisbon data for imports in the 1790s complicates comparisons. The two ports took together about a hundred fish cargoes annually. At Bilbao in the 1770s New England fish dominated the market and shipments to there in the next decade approximated the same volume as in the early 1770s, 74,000 quintals. Newfoundland fish outsold that from New England by three to one at Lisbon in the 1780s. Southern European consumption of New England fish probably now ran to about 125,000 quintals per year.<sup>76</sup>

**TABLE 15-3**  
**Bilbao and Lisbon Fish Entrances, 1770-1774, 1783-1794**

Year	Nfldld.		BILBAO		New Eng.		Old Eng.		Totals		LISBON		New Eng.	
	Ves.	Qtls.	Ves.	Qtls.	Ves.	Qtls.	Ves.	Qtls.	Ves.	Qtls.	Ves.	Qtls.	Ves.	Qtls.
1770	14	31,068	1	1,966	35	82,401	2	2,250	52	117,685	---	---	---	---
1771	16	22,601	2	2,844	41	92,783	4	5,523	63	123,751	33	54,252	12	23,136
1772	23	35,787	4	5,821	38	69,036	2	2,577	67	113,221	25	41,100	8	15,424
1773	16	24,948	1	1,817	23	43,510	7	8,198	47	78,473	31	50,964	7	13,496
1774	26	32,614	4	4,522	52	80,121	12	13,609	94	130,866	28	46,032	11	21,208
Avg.		29,404		3,394		73,570		6,431		112,799		48,087		18,316
1784	19	81,362	6	17,597	1	1,751	1	5,310	27	106,020	26	70,980	10	29,510
1785	29(8)	84,054	8	13,174	8(2)	37,627	2	3,391	47(10)	138,246	52	141,960	16	47,216
1786	9	38,329	3(1)	5,762	16(11)	52,789	1	3,318	29(12)	100,198	36	98,280	6	17,706
1787	20	46,916	7	16,594	22(2)	77,981	12(2)	28,613	61(4)	170,104	36	98,280	11	32,461
1788	28(2)	49,614	3	3,674	36(4)	101,363	10	26,401	77(6)	181,052				
1789	32(8)	59,345	1(2)	4,249	36(4)	75,960	6(1)	9,048	75(15)	148,602				
1790	20(4)	39,896	2	4,449	33(5)	79,340	4	6,467	59(9)	130,152				
1791	18(4)	48,602	2	4,712	18(8)	51,773	4	10,393	42(19)	115,480				
1792	8	23,379	4	11,918	23(2)	64,882	5	9,907	40(2)	110,086				
1793	15	28,663	7	23,839	39(4)	114,516	3(2)	5,678	64(6)	172,696				
1794	9(1)	27,422	2	3,650	30(1)	75,223	2(1)	5,718	43(3)	112,013				
Avg		47,962		9,965		66,655		10,386		134,968		102,375		31,723

Sources: Bilbao data is from the Averia records. Lisbon figures are from the Livres dos Navios. During the 1770s the average Newfoundland vessel carried 1,644 quintals of cod to Bilbao; those from New England, 1,928 quintals. During the 1780s, the New Englanders took 2,951 quintals to there and Newfoundland fish carriers' 2,730 quintals. Figures in parenthesis are partial cargoes. These figures are utilized to estimate the amounts of fish brought to Lisbon in these two decades, at a price of 22 shillings per quintal.

76 See Table 15-3.

**TABLE 15-4**  
**Bilbao Entrances from North America, 1783-1794**

Year	Gardoqui & Sons <sup>a</sup>		Gomez & Barrera <sup>b</sup>		Villeneva <sup>c</sup>		Dovatt, Labatt <sup>d</sup>		Lynch <sup>e</sup>		Totals	
	Ves.	£	Ves.	£	Ves.	£	Ves.	£	Ves.	£	Ves.	£
1784	2	8,912	19	83,381	2	5,695	1	3,164	3	6,484	27	116,824
1785	9(1) <sup>f</sup>	33,592	23(2)	63,780	11(2)	30,536	3(2)	11,439	---	---	47(10)	152,095
1786	13(5)	47,184	8(3)	43,801	2	6,397	2	4,518	1(1)	3,056	29(12)	110,218
1787	16(1)	68,390	22(1)	55,391	8	17,249	14	34,951	---	---	61(4)	187,113
1788	31(2)	102,150	19(2)	51,007	9	15,552	15	24,012	2(1)	3,244	77(6)	199,160
1789	28(3)	74,952	17(3)	32,623	12(3)	25,498	16(4)	25,828	---	---	75(15)	163,464
1790	26(2)	75,192	9	17,115	8(1)	19,057	10(3)	21,360	5(2)	7,007	59(9)	143,166
1791	15(3)	49,242	9(1)	21,267	4(6)	19,906	6(4)	17,997	4(3)	5,550	42(19)	127,029
1792	11(1)	47,421	10	26,663	5	16,104	2	6,644	8	15,379	40(2)	121,095
1793	23(2)	80,760	10	28,347	7	16,987	2	4,921	11(2)	26,518	64(6)	190,009
1794	21(1)	62,192	7	29,571	4(1)	8,262	---	---	6(1)	16,294	43(3)	123,213
Totals		649,987		452,946		181,243		154,834		83,632		1,633,186
Avg./Yr.		£59,090		£41,177		£16,477		£14,076		£7,603		£148,371

Sources: Data is from Averia Accounts of the Consulado de Bilbao: a. Joseph Gardoqui and Sons' Casa de Gardoqui; b. Ventura Francisco Gomez de la Torre and Pedro Barrera; c. Juan Angel de Villeneva; d. Dovatt, Labatt and Plante; e. Lynch, Lynch, Kelly and Moroney; J. Moroney. Figures in parenthesis indicate partial cargoes. Price of fish is 22 shillings per quintal.

In 1788 the Lisbon grain trade under American registry showed signs of recovery but lack of data prevents generalization. According to Merrill Jensen, by the early 1790s flour, bread, and corn exports there exceeded the levels attained in the 1770s.<sup>77</sup> The series of European wars, 1790-1816, and the demand they created for agricultural produce saw America engage very profitably with Iberia.<sup>78</sup> A report covering October 1797 through September 1798 indicated that the United States exported to Spanish and Portuguese points as follows:<sup>79</sup>

Spain	\$2,274,223	Portugal	\$286,787
Tenerife	<u>94,054</u>	Port. Islands	<u>442,308</u>
	\$2,368,277		\$729,095

These are American export values, which would have doubled upon sale in those markets. Portuguese-American trade remained very significantly depressed compared to the 1770s, while commercial relations with Spain had grown materially. The treaty of peace signed in Algeria in 1795 released the prisoners there and removed the threat. Unfortunately, depredations by Tripolitan raiders soon placed the trade again under threat. Jefferson, who had earlier favored war with the pirates rather than tribute, shortly became president. He went to war with Tripoli, 1801-1805, initiating an aggressive policy against the Barbary States, which remained in effect to the 1820s.

\* \* \*

77 M. Jensen, *New Nation*, 236-237.

78 A.C. Clauder, *American Commerce as Effected by the Wars of the French Revolution and Napoleon, 1792-1812* (Philadelphia, 1932), 21-22.

79 "United States Exports, October 1, 1797-September 30, 1798," AHN-M, Legajo 3892, ex. 1.

Southern European markets in the post-Revolutionary era, then, offered outlets for American goods and, in return, provided cargoes of salt and wine wanted by Americans and continued to provide surplus credits or cash for transfer elsewhere. In the years before 1775 Britain's American colonists may have consumed 6,250 pipes of Iberian and island wines, legally and illegally imported. That trade from the Wine Islands declined quite significantly after 1783. One source places United States' wine imports in 1790 at about 1,275 pipes of Madeira and ten years later at 2,224 pipes.<sup>80</sup> Island wines, so popular earlier, apparently gave way to French and German vintages, partially because after May of 1789 Madeira paid a significantly higher duty than other wine imports.<sup>81</sup>

A dependable source of salt continued to be a problem for the new nation. In August of 1785 Stephen Higginson of Massachusetts wrote to John Adams, concerning the state of trade with southern Europe:

Malaga, Alicant, Barcelona, Leghorn, etc. are Considerable Markets for Fish and other American produce and proper Salt for our Fishery is obtained cheaper in Lamat, Ivica and other places in Europe – we used to send Cargo's of Fish, Wheat, Flour...to those markets, and returned Salt, and this was as profitable to us as any part of our European Trade.<sup>82</sup>

He then complained that the Barbary threat had closed off that trade and thus the new nation faced "the mortification of seeing foreign ships profitably employed in bringing Salt and taking away our Fish for these Markets, while our own vessels lay idle and we dare not send [them] scarcely to Cadiz."<sup>83</sup>

During the Revolution salt prices rose precipitously and, post-war, it was sought at traditional West Indian sources. But, at those English or Spanish islands Americans were not welcomed. Both strove to control their Caribbean salt supplies for mercantilist purposes. In 1784 American vessels loaded salt at Turks Island but in the following year were barred from there.<sup>84</sup> Salt sources at Lisbon, Setubal, Cadiz, and other points in southern Europe remained of major importance. When the government under the Constitution established its trade policies, salt for use in making fish or provisions for export was exempted from import duties.<sup>85</sup>

Once the states endorsed the Constitution, the complicated mare's nest of state navigation laws was replaced by a centralized national system. The first Congress enacted a Navigation Act and a Tariff Act in July 1789. Now American ships enjoyed a ten percent tariff discount. Regulations changed from time to time, but discrimination in favor of American vessels was early established. The new charter of government had the solid support of the mercantile leaders in all the seaport towns, with the "Essex Junto," centered in North Shore Massachusetts, a prime example.

\* \* \*

For more than 150 years, down to 1775, markets in the south of Europe drew North American exports. At first American producers sold their surpluses to English merchant entrepreneurs. In time colonials took control largely into their own hands. By the 1770s trade to Iberia, the Wine Islands, and up the Straits had

---

80 Harper, *Navigation Laws*, 265n. Shillington and Chapman, *Commercial Relations*, 276.

81 Channing, *History of United States*, III: 415. *PG*, May 3, 1789.

82 Higginson to Adams, August 8, 1785, "Letters of Stephen Higginson, 1783-1804," ed. John Franklin

Jameson. *AHA Annual Report I* (1896): 723-724.

83 *Ibid.*

84 *PG*, November 24, 1784; May 2, 1787.

85 *PG*, May 13, 1789.

become of major importance to the economic expansion of the colonies because the funds remitted from them were intrinsic to balancing colonial payments, a fact widely recognized in England and America.

During the post-Revolutionary era of adjustment, reopening trade with Spain and Portugal and its protection against the Barbary corsairs became major concerns for John Adams, John Jay, and Thomas Jefferson down into the 1790s and beyond. Their diplomatic maneuverings did not bring immediate and total success but Iberia's need for foodstuffs and lumber products worked to America's advantage. The strong central government under the Constitution had its impact and the European wars after 1790 saw this valuable trade firmly and profitably regenerated.



## Footnotes

### chapter 1

- Thomas Mun, *England's Treasure by Forraign Trade* (London, 1933), 9-12. Pick a date – 1661 in biblio!
- Earl J. Hamilton, *War and Prices in Spain, 1651-1800* (Cambridge, Mass., 1947).
- Eli F. Hecksher, *Mercantilism*, ed. E.F. Soderbund (London, 1955). Lawrence A. Harper, *The English Navigation Laws: A Seventeenth Century Experiment in Social Engineering* (New York, 1939). Charles M. Andrews, *The Colonial Period of American History*, 4 vols. (New Haven, Conn., 1964), IV. George L. Beer, *The Old Colonial System, 1660-1754*, 2 vols. (Gloucester, Mass., 1959). John J. McCusker and Russell R. Menard. *The Economy of British America, 1607-1789* (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1985), Part I.
- Jean O. McLachlan, *Trade and Peace with Old Spain, 1667-1750* (Cambridge, England, 1940), 4-5. J.H. Parry, *Trade and Dominion: The European Overseas Empires in the Eighteenth Century* (New York, 1971), 66-67.
- McLachlan, *Trade and Peace*, 6, citing an anonymous author, 1701. Richard Herr, *The Eighteenth Century Revolution in Spain* (Princeton, N.J., 1958), 145.
- Viola F. Barnes, *The Dominion of New England* (New York, 1960), 136-137.
- Andrews, *Colonial Period*, IV, 43-48, 134-142.
- Gee to Board of Trade, *CSPS*, XXIX (1716-1717): 271. Cf. William Vaughan, *The Golden Fleece* (London, 1623). Henry Robinson, *England's Safety in Trade's Encrease* (London, 1641) [not in biblio] on the Newfoundland fishery as a source of specie. George L. Beer, *The Origins of the British Colonial System, 1578-1660* (Gloucester, Mass., 1959), 294. Fayrer Hall, *The Importance of the British Plantations in America to This Kingdom* (London, 1731), 95-98, 102-103. Thomas Pownall, *The Administration of the British Colonies*, 2 vols. (London, 1774), I: 256-257.
- Clarence S. Brigham, ed., *British Royal Proclamations, 1603-1783*, Transactions and Collections of the American Antiquarian Society, XII (Worcester, Mass., 1911), 87-88. Beer, *Colonial System*, II: 256. Harold A. Innis, *The Cod Fisheries: A History of an International Economy* (New Haven, Conn., 1940) 34-35, 73, 99. Ralph Greenlee Lounsbury, *The British Fishery at Newfoundland, 1634-1763* (New Haven, Conn., 1934), 38. Carew Reynell, *The True English Interest* (London, 1674), 91, noted that the northern colonies competed with English merchants, taking “the bread out of our mouths.” John Collins, *A Plea for the Bringing in of Irish Cattle and the Keeping Out of Fish Caught by Foreigners* (London, 1680). John White, *The Planter's Plea* (London, 1630). John Collins, *Salt and Fishery* (London, 1682), 95. Collins believed the Newfoundland fishery increased the “Stock of the Nation at least five hundred thousand pounds per Annum.”
- Brigham, *British Proclamations*, 87-88. Lounsbury, *British Fishery*, 38-39. Innis, *Cod Fisheries*, 73. Beer, *Origins*, 274. Gillian T. Cell, “The Newfoundland Company: A Study of Subscribers to a Colonizing Venture,” *WMQ* XXII (1965): 616-617, 624. Italics mine.
- Andrews, *Colonial Period*, IV: 60, 87. Beer, *Colonial System*, II: 9. Lounsbury, *British Fishery*, 96. David Ogg, *England in the Reign of Charles II*, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1963), I: 246-247. Michael G. Hall, *Edward Randolph and the American Colonies, 1676-1703* (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1960), 23, 67. Samuel E. Morison, *The Maritime History of Massachusetts, 1783-1860* (Cambridge, Mass., 1921), 14. Bernard Bailyn, *The New England Merchants in the Seventeenth Century* (New York, 1964), 126-127, 219n2. Charles B. Judah, *The North American Fisheries and British Policy to 1713* (Urbana, Ill., 1933), 148-149.
- Andrews, *Colonial Period*, IV: 109-111.
- Ibid. George L. Beer, *The Commercial Policy of England toward the American Colonies* (New York, 1948), 37-38.
- Harper, *Navigation Laws*, 401. William R. Riddell, “Suggested Governmental Assistance to Farmers Two Centuries Ago in Pennsylvania,” *PMHB* LIII (1929): 137-140.
- Lounsbury, *British Fishery*, 38. Innis, *Cod Fisheries*, 50-52. Bailyn, *New England Merchants*, 78-79. Richard S. Dunn, *Puritans and Yankees* (Princeton, N.J., 1962), 39-42.
- Judah, *North American Fisheries*, 149.
- V.M. Shillington, and A.B.W. Chapman, *The Commercial Relations of England and Portugal, 1487-1807* (London, 1907), 237n.
- John Cary, *An Essay on Trade* (Bristol, England, 1695), 118-119. Bolton, William, *The Bolton Letters: The Letters of an English Merchant in Madeira, 1695-1714*, ed. André L. Simon, 2 vols. (London, 1928), 18, 24, 112.
- Donald G. Barnes, *A History of the English Corn Laws from 1660 to 1846* (New York, 1961), chapters 3-4.
- Board of Trade to Methuen, March 28, 1717, *CSPC*, XXIX (1716-1717): 275.
- Francis Rawle, *Ways and Means of the Inhabitants of Delaware to Become Rich* (Philadelphia, 1725). Frederick B. Tolles, *Meeting House and Counting House: The Quaker Merchants of Colonial Philadelphia, 1682-1763* (New York, 1963), 106-108.
- NORNY. Customs Office Reports in *PG*, 1735-1740. Between 1738 and 1741, 197 vessels (12,958 tons) carrying largely grain went to southern Europe. Virginia records show six or seven ships clearing yearly, with up to about 20,000 bushels of grain. See James F. Shepherd and Gary M. Walton, *Shipping, Maritime Trade and the Economic Development of Colonial North America* (Cambridge, England, 1972), 168-169. Virginia petitioned the Crown to permit direct salt importations in 1739. Andrews, *Colonial Period*, IV: 109.
- English grain exports fell from 3,495,000 bushels in 1738-1739 to 347,196 bushels in 1740-1741. See D. Barnes, *Corn Laws*, 15, Appendices B and C, 297-300.
- Mabel P. Wolff, *The Colonial Agency of Pennsylvania, 1712-1757* (Philadelphia, 1933), 90-92. Leslie Stephen, *The History of*

*English Thought in the Eighteenth Century*, 2 vols. (New York, 1962), I: 151, notes that Bolingbroke, champion of the landed interests, was opposed to Robert Walpole, who did not act to halt American grain competition. Richard Pares, *War and Trade in the West Indies, 1739-1763* (Oxford, 1936), 438n. Embargoes of American grain exports and other goods, passed as a war measure, served temporarily to prevent colonial competition.

Samuel Powell, Jr. to Thomas Hyam, May 2, 1741, in his "Letter Book," HSP, as cited in Anne Bezanson, Robert D. Gray, and Miriam Hussey, *Prices in Colonial Pennsylvania* (Philadelphia, 1935), 29.

Joshua Gee, *The Trade and Navigation of Great Britain Considered* (London, 1722), 21-22, reported that Captain Michael Cole, disappointed of a rice cargo at Charleston, had a bill introduced to Parliament for the enumeration of rice. See Andrews, *Colonial Period*, IV: 95-97. Harper, *Navigation Laws*, 398. Albert A. Giesecke, *American Commercial Legislation before 1789* (New York, 1910), 6. Richard Champion, *Considerations on the Present Situation of Great Britain and the United States of North America* (London, 1784), 105-106.

CSPC, XXXVIII (1730): 56. Andrews, *Colonial Period*, IV: 95-97. Shillington and Chapman, *Commercial Relations*, 243-244.

William J. Ashley, *Surveys Historic and Economic* (London, 1900), 316.

Gee, *Trade and Navigation*, 22.

Harper, *Navigation Laws*, 95-97. Andrews, *Colonial Period*, IV: 95-96.

McCusker and Menard, *Economy of British America*, 175-181.

Harper, *Navigation Laws*, 399n. Oliver M. Dickerson, *The Navigation Acts and the American Revolution* (Philadelphia, 1951), 40, notes that a third of the rice for southern Europe cleared through English ports. Cf. "A List of Licenses and Bonds taken out from the London Customs House," September 29, 1730-February 29, 1731 (N.S.), Treasury Papers, 64/276a, PRO.

Pares, *War and Trade*, 61-62.

Ralph Davis, *The Rise of the English Shipping Industry in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries* (London, 1962), 268. Pares, *War and Trade*, 80, 506.

Andrews, *Colonial Period*, IV: 87n. McCusker and Menard, *Economy of British America*, 71-88. Davis, *Rise of English Shipping*, 230. Francis Brewer, *New Essays on Trade* (London, 1702) [not in biblio] in his preface commented "for the gain of Fishing is solid, brings in Bullion." Margaret E. Martin, *Merchants and the Trade of the Connecticut River Valley, 1750-1820* (Northampton, Mass., 1939), 32, cites a letter from Richard Jackson, Connecticut agent at London to Jonathan Trumbull, October 19, 1767, as follows: "But could the colony acquire a share of the Cod Fishery the Sale of this Commodity in Italy, Spain and Portugal would be exactly the same as Money in England & would serve as effectually to pay for a Cargo of British Manufactures."

CSPC, XXVIII (1717): 222-223, quoting Thomas Banister, *An Essay on the Trade of North America*.

Anonymous, *A Letter to the Honourable A[rthur] M[oores]* (London, 1714), 12.

John Rutherford, *The Importance of the Colonies to Great Britain* (London, 1761), 16.

John Reynell to P. and J. Williams, May 21, 1731, "Letter Book, 1729-1734," HSP. Parenthesis mine.

Davis, *Rise of English Shipping*, 230, states of Cadiz: "Every ship that called there, whether outward or homeward bound, could expect to take aboard some silver bullion..."

"Resolutions of the Town of Marblehead, December 8, 1772," as printed in *EG*, December 15, 1772. Edward Channing, *A History of the United States*, 6 vols. (New York, 1905-1925), III, 84. Dickerson, *Navigation Acts and Revolution*, 109, 112.

Lawrence A. Harper, "The Effect of the Navigation Acts on the Thirteen Colonies," in *The Era of the American Revolution*, ed. Richard B. Morris, 3-39 (Gloucester, Mass., 1971). Curtis P. Nettels, "British Mercantilism and the Economic Development of the Thirteen Colonies." *JEH* XII (1952): 105-114. Beer, *Colonial System*, I, 108.

McCusker and Menard, *Economy of British America*, 353-377. Marc Egnal and Joseph A. Ernst. "An Economic Interpretation of the American Revolution," *WMQ* XXIX (1972): 3-32. Gary M. Walton and James F. Shepherd. *The Economic Rise of Early America* (Cambridge, England, 1979), chapter 8.

Walton and Shepherd, *Economic Rise*, 158-159.

Tyrawley to Newcastle, June 25, 1752, SPFP 89/48.

Shillington and Chapman, *Commercial Relations*, 177n, 192-195, 199-203, 208-211.

*Ibid.*, 223, 225. The Portuguese called it "feitoria inglese."

*Ibid.*, 177, 204.

*Ibid.*, 246, 230.

*Ibid.*, 234-238. Worsley to Stanhope, January 1, 1715; January 21, 1715; March 8, 1715; SPFP 89/23. A milreis fluctuated in value but generally ranged at 66 pence, making 12 milreis about £3.3 per vessel. Early in the eighteenth century the Lisbon consulship was worth about £1,200 per year and the vice-consulship about £400.

Jaime Vicens Vives, *Manual de historia economica de España* (Barcelona, 1965), 509, 516-517. McLachlan, *Trade and Peace*, 20-21, 51-52, 68-69, 139.

Munroe to Rochford, June 7, 1773, SPFS 94/193, commented on the lack of a consul at Bilbao/Santander. See also Conway to Lords of Trade, September 26, 1765, Original Correspondence of the Board of Trade, CO 388/53, which suggests that merchant Lorenzo Barrow held the post, 1749-1755. He probably served unofficially.

Vicens Vives, *Manual*, 517, comments that though the price of English products had doubled, they were still paying the same customs duties as in 1667. McLachlan, *Trade and Peace*, 20-21.

McLachlan, *Trade and Peace*, 22, 56-57, 69. She notes that the Judge Conservator post was established in the 1667 treaty; its

powers were reduced in the 1713 treaty but reinstated in 1715.

Ibid., 65n, 74.

Consul William Cayley at Cadiz commented on specie smuggling from Spain, stating that if the Spanish tried to halt it, “they may as well prohibit all further trade from abroad, and order every foreign merchant out of their country, since without that exportation either permitted or connived at, no trade can be carried on with them.” [same quote in chap 2, fn 71] Cayley to Newcastle, September 30, 1738, SPFS 94/222.

Grantham to Rochford, March 11, 1773, SPFS 94/192; Magra to Rockford, February 15, 1774, SPFS 94/195. Vicens Vives, *Manual*, 475.

Magra to Rockford, September 10, 1773; February 15, 1774, SPFS 94/194.

Rochford to Magra, December 3, 1773; July 15, 1774 SPFS 94/194.

Walpole to Rochford, April 3, 1773, SPFP 89/74.

Lyttleton to Weymouth, October 11, 1769, SPFP 89/69.

McLachlan *Trade and Peace*, 74-77, 97-98, 140-141. Shillington and Chapman, *Commercial Relations*, 177-178, 192-194, 235-236, 243. A.B. Walford, *The British Factory in Lisbon and Its Closing Stages* (Lisbon, 1940), 16-44. H.E.S. Fisher, “Anglo-Portuguese Trade, 1700-1770” (PhD diss., University of London, 1961). Magra to Rochford, November 1, 1773, SPFS 94/194.

Dalrymple to Rochford, July 16, 1773; August 20, 1773, SPFS 94/193.

David, Macpherson, *Annals of Commerce, Manufactures, Fisheries and Navigation*, 4 vols. (London, 1805), II: 600, 612. Andrews, *Colonial Period*, IV: 64n.

Matthew S. Anderson, *Europe in the Eighteenth Century, 1713-1783* (New York, 1961), 218.

Pares, *War and Trade*, 53-55, 144-145. *PG*, October 26, 1738. *CPR* indicates that from 1757 through 1763 at least one British naval vessel patrolled almost constantly on the Portuguese coast.

Consul William Cayley, Cadiz, wrote a series of reports from Faro, Portugal between 1741 and 1747. See Cayley to Newcastle, July 11, 1741, SPFS 94/226.

*PG*, January 17, 1771.

*PG*, April 28, 1757; January 8, 1761; January 21, 1762.

*PG*, September 23, 1762.

Macpherson, *Annals*, II: 282, reports five vessels protecting the Newfoundland fishery as early as 1622. In 1718 the Lisbon consul sent a British naval vessel to cruise off Cape St. Vincent to warn the Newfoundland fishery fleet away from Cadiz. Poyntz to Cragg, October 15, 1718, SPFP 89/26. Cf. CO 194/27, Board of Trade Instructions, May 14, 1765, to Captain Hugh Palliser, Lord High Admiral of the naval escort at Newfoundland.

*CPR*. By the early 1770s their number had increased to five.

Original Correspondence of the Board of Trade, January 27, 1762, CO 188/55. [388?] Jordan to Parker, March 18, 1750, SPFP 94/137, reported a packet’s arrival at Corunna from Falmouth in sixty-two hours.

Shillington and Chapman, *Commercial Relations*, 249. Alan D. Francis, *The Methuens and Portugal, 1691-1702* (Cambridge, England, 1966), 24, citing Thomas Cox in 1700, reports that the post left London every Tuesday for Spain or Portugal and that an answer was expected in about six weeks. The voyage outward could be made in three or four days but the inward leg took much longer. SPFP 89/62 contains a number of references indicating the Falmouth packet’s Lisbon voyage ranged from five to nine days in the 1760s. On average Falmouth cleared more vessels annually to Lisbon than any English port except London. Davis, *Rise of English Shipping*, 243.

Fn. 71 *PG*, October 18, 1770. Fn. 72 *CSPC*, XXIX (1716-1717): 271, Joshua Gee to the Board of Trade. No text for these footnotes!

## chapter 2

Earl J. Hamilton, “Spanish Mercantilism before 1700.” In *Facts and Factors in Economic History*, 214-239 (Cambridge, Mass., 1932).

Ibid.

José Canga Arguelles, *Diccionario de Hacienda para el uso de los Encargados*, 5 vols. (Madrid, 1833-1834), V: 44-45. this is biblio entry; your fn is diff.

Jaime Vicens Vives, *Historia social y economica de España y America*, 5 vols. (Barcelona, 1957-1959). III, 318-320, 348-350.

Canga Arguelles, *Diccionario*, IV: 154. Francisco Morales Padron, *El Comercio Canario-Americano* (Seville, 1955), 199.

McLachlan, *Trade and Peace*, 22.

Ibid.

Edward Clarke, *Letters Concerning the Spanish Nation: Written at Madrid during the Years 1760 and 1761* (London, 1763), 253. Vicens Vives, *Manual*, 509-517.

William Coxe, *Memoirs of the Kings of Spain of the House of Bourbon*, 3 vols. (London, 1813), II: 129-130.

*PG*, October 9, 1729. *BNL*, October 23, 1729.

*BNL*, July 5, 1733.

*NEWJ*, September 11, 1739. *PG*, December 21, 1733. should this be 9; we’re talking about 1739.

Vicens Vives, *Manual*, 399.

Ibid., 462, 516-517. Herr, *Revolution in Spain*, 48-49, 113n, 145n. Jaime Carrera Pujal, *Historia de la Economía Española*, 5

vols. (Barcelona, 1943-1947), III: 310n.  
 Clarke, *Letters Concerning Spanish Nation*, xxxvi.  
 Vicens Vives, *Manual*, 462, 475, 501, 517. Carrera Pujal, *Economía Española*, III: 151, 157, 310-317, 369, 377.  
 PG, December 10, 1761. changed to match Library of Congress catalog  
 PG, April 15, 1762. While some English vessels were seized in Spain when war began, the goods of the British consul and merchants at Alicante were sealed and apparently returned with the peace. *BNL*, April 8, 1762.  
 PG, February 4, 1762. you had *ibid*, not PG; what does *ibid* refer to PG or *BNL*?  
*Ibid.* here you had PG and Feb. 4, 1762. shouldn't it be *ibid*?  
 Herr, *Revolution in Spain*, 149.  
 Data on Bilbao arrivals, 1770-1773, are from the Averia Account Books in the Records of the Consulado de Bilbao in the Archivo Municipal de Bilbao.  
 Barcelona data, 1770-1773, are from consular dispatches in SPFS 94/193-194. Newfoundland sent 75 vessels (8,830 tons; 154,530 qtls.) out of 107 arrivals (12,340 tons); Quebec provided more than 50 percent of the wheat.  
*BNL*, May 8, 1760.  
 "A General State of the Vessels entered and cleared from Cadiz Bay for the Year 1775," SPFS 94/200. Total entering was 1,215 vessels. American entries made up a tenth of all entries.  
 Shillington and Chapman, *Commercial Relations*, 199-200.  
*Ibid.*, 211-220.  
*Ibid.*, 234-236.  
*Ibid.*, 218, 223, 243-245, 254-256. Macpherson, *Annals*, III: 425.  
 Macpherson, *Annals*, III: 426. John Smith Athelstone, Conde da Carnota, *Memoirs of the Marquis of Pombal*, 2 vols. (London, 1843).  
 Shillington and Chapman, *Commercial Relations*, 266n.  
 Committee of the Lisbon Factory to Newcastle, February 7, 1752, SPFP 89/48. PG, May 7, 1752.  
 Tyrawley to Newcastle, June 25, 1752; Lisbon Factory to Holderness, February 7, 1752, SPFP 89/48.  
 William C. Atkinson, *British Contributions to Portuguese and Brazilian Studies* (Edinburgh, 1945), 24. Anderson, *Europe in Eighteenth Century*, 56.  
 Castries to Holderness, September 6, 1753; Castries to Anzard, September 22, 1753, October 6, 1753, November 26, 1753; Castries to Robinson, June 1, 1754, SPFP 89/48.  
 Castries to Anzard, October 6, 1753; Castries to Holderness, January 22, 1754, SPFP 89/48.  
 Castries to Holderness, February 4, 1754; Lisbon Factory to Holderness, n.d., SPFP 89/48.  
 Castries to Robinson, November 6, 1755, SPFP 89/50. C.R. Boxer, *Some Contemporary Reactions to the Lisbon Earthquake of 1755* (Lisbon, 1956). Carnota, *Memoirs of Pombal*, I: 87, 103. Hay to Fox, December 28, 1755, SPFP 89/50. Seventy-eight English died but only nine were listed as merchants.  
 Hay to Robinson, November 15, 1755, SPFP 89/50.  
 Hay to Robinson, November 19, 1755, SPFP 89/50.  
*Ibid.*  
 Castries to Fox, February 4, 1756, SPFP 89/50. Walford, *British Factory*, 59-60.  
 Shillington and Chapman, *Commercial Relations*, 266n, 281-282. Carnota, *Memoirs of Pombal*, II: 40, 56. Charles Francis Dumouriez, *An Account of Portugal* (Lausanne, 1766), 200-205. PG, March 16, 1758; May 8, 1758; May 28, 1761; June 18, 1761; July 19, 1764; December 6, 1764 (dateline London, October 6, 1764), refers to a factory report listing twenty-one oppressive Portuguese practices.  
 Lyttleton to Shelburne, October 13, 1768, SPFP 89/66.  
 Castries to Robinson, June 2, 1755, SPFP 89/50.  
 PG, September 20, 1764, a letter from a Lisbon merchant, dated June 8.  
 PG, December 12, 1770; October 10, 1772; January 20, 1773.  
 PG, February 17, 1773.  
 PG, March 3, 1773; April 28, 1773.  
 Dumouriez, *Account of Portugal*, 200. Richard Twiss, *Travels through Portugal and Spain in 1772 and 1773* (London, 1775), 1.  
 PG, May 7, 1752; May 14, 1752. Allan Christelow, "Great Britain and the Trades from Cadiz and Lisbon to Spanish America and Brazil, 1759-1783," *HAHR* XXVII (1948): 6-7.  
 Banks to Conway, October 19, 1765, SPFS 94/172.  
 AWM, April 12, 1722; May 17, 1722.  
 Tyrawley to Newcastle, June 25, 1752; Lisbon Factory to Holderness, February 7, 1752, SPFP 89/48. Whitehall to Keene, February 20, 1752, SPFS 94/141.  
 Whitehall to Keene, February 20, 1752, SPFS 94/141.  
*BNL*, May 14, 1752.  
 PG, May 14, 1752; June 28, 1753.  
 Tyrawley to Newcastle, June 25, 1752, SPFP 89/48.  
 Crowle to Cleveland, May 29, 1753, Letters from British Consuls, ADM 1/3833.

Keene to Whitehall, March 20, 1752, SPFS 94/141.  
*PG*, April 4, 1754.

Hay to Holderness, January 15, 1754; March 5, 1754, SPFS 94/228. Castries to Robinson, June 2, 1755; July 15, 1755, SPFP 89/50.

McLachlan, *Trade and Peace*, 25.

Keene to Newcastle, February 8, 1751, SPFS 94/139.

Rochford to Halifax, January 13, 1764, SPFS 94/166.  
*PG*, June 28, 1753; April 4, 1754 (dateline London, December 22, 1753).

Rochford to Conway, February 18, 1766, SPFS 94/173.

Hay to Holderness, January 15, 1754; March 5, 1754, SPFS 94/228.

Geronimo Uztariz, *The Theory and Practice of Commerce and Maritime Affairs*, trans. J. Kippas, 2 vols. (London, 1751), I: 137.  
*The Mercator* (London), No. 74 (1713), 2; No. 75, 2.

Cayley to Newcastle, September 30, 1738, SPFS 94/225.

Davis, *Rise of English Shipping*, 230.  
*PG*, May 7, 1761.

Marsh to Shelburne, April 27, 1770, SPFS 94/183.

Christelow, "Trades from Cadiz and Lisbon," 7.  
*AWM*, November 21, 1723.

Tyrawley to Secretary of State, May 30, 1728, SPFP 89/35.  
*NEWJ*, November 7, 1738.

Tyrawley to Newcastle, September 29, 1734, SPFP 89/37.  
*PG*, January 10, 1749.  
*PG*, September 14, 1749. *BNL*, January 11, 1750. John J. McCusker, *Money and Exchange in Europe and America, 1600-1775* (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1978), 10, values a dollar at £0.23 sterling.

Gray to Shelburne, August 25, 1768, SPFS 94/180.

Harris to Weymouth, October 6, 1769, SPFS 94/182; Weymouth to Admiralty, September 7, 1770, SPFS 94/184.  
*EG*, October 23, 1770.  
*EG*, August 27, 1771. Collier to Admiralty, June 16, 1771, SPFS 94/187.

Hardy to Moutray, March 19, 1771; Moutray to Stephens, April 15, 1771; Rochford to Hardy, April 26, 1771, SPFS 94/186.

Prince de Masseras to Weymouth, July 26, 1769, SPFS 94/182.  
*EG*, September 10, 1771.

Dalrymple to Rochford, November 8, 1771, SPFS 94/188. *PG*, May 14, 1772; June 9, 1773.  
*CPR*, April 19, 1757-June 24, 1759; February 10, 1771-June 24, 1776.  
*EG*, January 29, 1771.

Worsley to Stanhope, February 24, 1716; Petition to Worsley, February 18, 1716, SPFP 89/24. Burnett to Cragg, January 15, 1720, SPFP 89/28. Keene to Bedford, January 9, 1750, SPFS 94/137.

Tyrawley to Secretary of State, May 30, 1728, SPFP 89/35.  
*PG*, September 25, 1740, almost £25,000 sterling.

Letter of Robert Wood, May 3, 1759, British Museum, Additional Mss. 36807. *CPR*, June 13, 1759.

Castries to Robinson, June 2, 1755; July 15, 1755, SPFP 89/50.

Hay to Pitt, April 2, 1759, SPFP 89/51.

Christelow, "Trades from Cadiz and Lisbon," 26-27.  
*Ibid.*, 8.

William B. Weeden, *The Economic and Social History of New England, 1620-1789*, 2 vols. (Boston, 1890), I: 384.  
 "Schooner Jolly Robin's Book of Acco'ts for Voyages as Settled by Daniel Staniford," BL, Heard Collection, AQ1.

McLachlan, *Trade and Peace*, 21.  
*Ibid.*, 14. Corruption had been rife at Cadiz even in the seventeenth century. Cf. Albert Girard, *La Rivalité Commerciale et Maritime entre Séville et Cadiz jusque la Fin du XVIII<sup>e</sup> Siècle* (Paris, 1932).

Jean Baptiste Labat, *Voyage du P. Labat en Espagne et en Italie, 1705-1706*, 2 vols. (Amsterdam, 1731), I: 151-152. this part of title not in biblio

Grey to Weymouth, January 2, 1769, SPFS 94/181.

Labat, *Voyage du Labat*, I: 195n.

Castries to Robinson, June 2, 1755, SPFP 89/50.

Board of Trade to Shelburne, March 10, 1767, SPFP 89/64; Hay to Pitt, April 2, 1759, SPFP 89/51; Castries to Robinson, July 15, 1755, SPFP 89/50.

Worsley to Stanhope, November 16, 1715, SPFP 89/23.

Grimaldi to Rochford, November 4, 1765, SPFS 94/172.

Keene to Bedford, January 9, 1750 and enclosure, SPFS 94/137.  
*Ibid.*

Banks to Shelburne, January 27, 1768, SPFS 94/179.

Hay to Shelburne, March 25, 1767, SPFP 89/63.  
 Poyntz to Stanhope, March 10, 1716 SPFP 89/24; Russell to Aldworth, September 28, 1759, SPFP 89/47.  
 Board of Trade to Shelburne, March 10, 1767, CO 389/92.  
 PG, October 18, 1770.  
 Crowle to Cleveland, May 29, 1753, Letters from British Consuls, ADM 1/3833.  
 Fisher, "Anglo-Portuguese Trade" (PhD diss.), 230n. Christelow, "Trades from Cadiz and Lisbon," 19, 28.  
 Shepherd and Walton, *Shipping, Maritime Trade*, Table 4, Table 7.  
 PG, October 18, 1770.  
 Vives, *Historia social y economica*, IV: 42. THERE WAS NO FN. 122 IN THE TEXT. I JUST STUCK A NUMBER IN THE TEXT RANDOMLY.  
 Hamilton, "Spanish Mercantilism," 239.  
 Ibid.  
 Dalrymple to Rockford, November 8, 1771, SPFS 94/188.  
 Bezanson, Gray, and Hussey, *Prices in Colonial Pennsylvania*, 29.  
 "Inspector General's Report on American Trade, 1768-1772," CO 16/1.  
 George Rogers Taylor, "American Economic Growth before 1800: An Explanatory Essay." *JEH* XXIV (1964): 436.  
 Bezanson, Gray, and Hussey, *Prices in Colonial Pennsylvania*, 316n.

### chapter 3

Fisher, "Anglo-Portuguese Trade" (PhD diss.), 175. Fisher indicates that silver could be exported under license, but not gold. Yet the *Indulto* of 1755 seems to have included both gold and silver. PG, April 4, 1754. Cf. H.E.S. Fisher, "Anglo-Portuguese Trade, 1700-1770." *EHR* XVI (1963-4): 219-233.  
 Letter to Parr & Bulkeley, April 30, 1764, Thomas Riche "Letter Book, 1764-1768," HSP. says 1771 in biblio  
 Stocker and Wharton to Champlin, June 18, 1773, *Commerce of Rhode Island*, Collections of MHS, LXIX, LXX. (Boston, 1914-1915), LXIX: 441.  
 Letter to Downell, October 26, 1753, John Reynell, "Letter Book, 1752-1754," HSP.  
 Bezanson, Gray, and Hussey, *Prices in Colonial Pennsylvania*, 431-432. CPR, 1757-1766. In 1766 salt sold at Philadelphia forty percent lower than at New York. Tables A-4.  
 Hardy to Porten, March 12, 1771, "Instructions to be Observed by the Masters of all British Ships and Vessels in the Merch't Service arriving in the Bay of Cadiz," SPFS 94/186.  
 Rochford to Halifax, May 28, 1764, SPFS 94/167.  
 Hardy to Porten, March 12, 1771, "Instructions to be Observed by the Masters of all British Ships and Vessels in the Merch't Service arriving in the Bay of Cadiz," SPFS 94/186.  
 Stuart Bruchey, "Success and Failure in Foreign Trade," *Business History Review* XXXII: 280.  
 Worsley to Stanhope, November 16, 1715, SPFP 89/23.  
 Lyttleton to Shelburne, July 21, 1768, SPFP 89/65.  
 Coxon to Porten, July 13, 1765, SPFS 94/171.  
 Byron Fairchild, *Messrs. William Pepperrell* (Ithaca, N.Y. 1954), 190-191.  
 Parr & Bulkeley to Thomas Clifford, December 8, 1761, Clifford "Correspondence," III, HSP.  
 Parr & Bulkeley to Thomas Clifford, February 6, 1764, Clifford "Correspondence," IV.  
 C.R. Boxer, *The Golden Age of Brazil, 1695-1750* (Berkeley, Calif., 1962), 316n.  
 Letter to Parr & Bulkeley, April 29, 1766, Riche "Letter Book, 1764-1768." Cf. Mayne, Burn & Mayne to Samuel Galloway, July 5, 1764, Galloway "Letters, 1760-1768," Galloway, Maxey, Markoe Family Papers, 1654-1768, Library of Congress.  
 McLachlan, *Trade and Peace*, 25. Delves and Duff to Dalrymple, August 13, 1772, SPFS 94/191.  
 Mayne, Burn & Mayne to Samuel Galloway, September 17, 1763, Galloway, "Letters." doesn't match text  
 Parr & Bulkeley to Thomas Clifford, November 10, 1765, Clifford "Correspondence," IV.  
 Williams and Co. to Champlin, November 1, 1773, *Commerce of Rhode Island*, LXIX: 458.  
 Parr & Bulkeley to Thomas Clifford, May 10, 1764, Clifford "Correspondence," IV.  
 Parr & Bulkeley to Thomas Clifford, February 6, 1764, *ibid.*  
 Fisher, "Anglo-Portuguese Trade" (PhD diss.), 129.  
 EG, January 10, 1769. Letter to Captain John Davidson, May 6, 1764, Riche "Letter Book, 1764-1768," II?, ordered him to follow the same practice at Fayal.  
 Rochford to Halifax, January 1, 1764, SPFS 94/166. An enclosure identified English allegiance. Cf. Rochford to Halifax, September 17, 1764, SPFS 94/168.  
 "A Representation from the Portugal Merchants," November 23, 1709, SPFP 89/89.  
 Shillington and Chapman, *Commercial Relations*, 243.  
 Castries to Holderness, September 6, 1753, SPFP 89/48.  
 Castries to Anzard, September 22, 1753, *ibid.*

Castries to Anzard, October 6, 1753; November 26, 1753, *ibid.*  
 Hay to Pitt, January 30, 1758, SPFP 89/51. *PG*, June 28, 1764, quoting a London report of April 12, 1764. Ibbetson's "Memorial on Lisbon Trade," 1765, Correspondence of the Board of Trade, CO 388/95.  
 Hort to Lyttleton, October 8, 1768, SPFP 89/66.  
 Hay to Conway, June 28, 1766, SPFP 89/62.  
 Hort to Lyttleton, October 8, 1768, SPFP 89/66.  
*Ibid.*  
 Letter to Simpson, May 16, 1728, in Samuel Powell "Letter Book, 1727-1739," HSP. This isn't in biblio! see chap 1, fn23.  
 Weeden, *Economic and Social History*, II: 759.  
 Lyttleton to Shelburne, October 3, 1768; Hort to Shelburne, October 8, 1768, SPFP 89/66.  
*Ibid.* The four cargoes, 17,526.5 bushels, sold for approximately £4,879, at 5.57s. per bushell. They were consigned to Moylan and Forrest, Parr & Bulkeley, and Thomas Horne  
 Lyttleton to Weymouth, October 11, 1769, SPFP 89/69.  
 Lyttleton to Weymouth, May 6, 1769, SPFP 89/68.  
*PG*, December 12, 1770.  
 Walpole to Rochford, May 18, 1772, SPFP 89/72.  
*Ibid.*  
 Thomas Jefferson to John Adams, November 27, 1785, *A-JL*, 100-101.  
*Ibid.*  
 Grantham to Rochford, August 27, 1772, with enclosures, SPFS 94/191.  
 Delves and Duff to Dalrymple, August 13, 1772, *ibid.*  
 Grantham to Rochford, December 16, 1772, *ibid.*

Lyttleton to Weymouth, January 4, 1767, SPFP 89/67.  
 Parr & Bulkeley to Thomas Clifford, February 6, 1764, Clifford "Correspondence," IV.  
 Letter to Leybourne, July 21, 1740, Reynell "Letter Book, 1738-1741."  
 Walpole to Rochford, July 4, 1774, SPFP 89/77. The Portuguese allowed agents two to six months to pay duties owed. Agents signed "Customs House Notes," which were punctually paid.  
 Fisher, "Anglo-Portuguese Trade" (PhD diss.), 147-148.  
*Ibid.*, 130. Stocker and Wharton to Champlin, September 13, 1773; Parr & Bulkeley to Champlin, January 25, 1774, *Commerce of Rhode Island*, LXIX: 478-479, 453.  
 Letter to Parr & Bulkeley, May 20, 1764 and April 30, 1764, Riche "Letter Book, 1764-1768."  
 Worsley to Stanhope, February 24, 1716, SPFP 89/24.  
 Davis, *Rise of English Shipping*, 176n. French charges for bullion export were set at the same level, one percent. Freight charges to and from Cadiz ran at one percent each way and merchant commissions were at three percent. See Leon Vignols, *El Assiento Frances, 1701-1713* (Madrid, 1929), 38. not in biblio  
 Fisher, "Anglo-Portuguese Trade" (PhD diss.), 184.  
*Ibid.*, 148. "Gardoqui's Account of Cash supply'd Captain Lovit in the Tryal"; Gardoqui to the Cabots, September 20, 1771, Cabot "Papers," I, PEI. [Institute no longer in name; Philips Library at PEM see biblio] They charged one half of one percent.  
 Gardoqui to the Cabots, December 12, 1769.  
 Lane and Son and Fraser to Joseph Cabot, August 12, 1772, Cabot "Papers," I.  
*PG*, July 4, 1754, citing a letter from Amsterdam.  
 Fisher, "Anglo-Portuguese Trade," *EHR*, XVI: 233

## chapter4

David D. Hebb, *Piracy and the English Government, 1616-1642* (Aldershot, England, 1994). Ray W. Irwin, *The Diplomatic Relations of the United States with the Barbary Powers, 1776-1816* (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1931). Salé in Morocco was known to the English as Sallee and its corsairs as Salleteens, pirates from Algiers as Algerines or Argerines.  
*CSPC*, XLIII (1737): 97.  
 George N. Clark, "The Barbary Corsairs in the Seventeenth Century," *War and Society in the Seventeenth Century*. Wiles Lectures, 1956 (Westport, Conn., 1985), 113. *PG*, August 23, 1750, with reference to the Dey's share of the *Prince Frederick* packet.  
 Adam Anderson, *An Historical and Chronological Deduction of the Origin of Commerce from the Earliest Accounts*, 2 vols. (London, 1764), II: 269. Clark, "Barbary Corsairs," 114, 116-117.  
 Macpherson, *Annals*, II: 284, 308-309. Jasper Danckaerts and Peter Sluyter, *Journal of a Voyage to New York and a Tour in Several of the American Colonies in 1679-1680*, Memoirs of the Long Island Historical Society I (Brooklyn, N.Y., 1867), 49.  
 Beer, *Origins*, 199. Harper, *Navigation Laws*, 325.  
 Macpherson, *Annals*, II: 321, 336, 340, 410.  
 Clark, "Barbary Corsairs," 108, 113. Macpherson, *Annals*, II: 371.  
 Clark, "Barbary Corsairs," 107-108.

Vaughan, *Golden Fleece*, II: 103. Macpherson, *Annals*, II: 338. Innis, *Cod Fisheries*, 62. Judah, *North American Fisheries*, 71. Lounsbury, *British Fishery*, 63.

William Bradford, *Bradford's History "Of Plimouth Plantation"* (Boston, 1898), 245. Bailyn, *New England Merchants*, 12. Beer, *Origins*, 319. John Winthrop, *Winthrop's Journal, "A History of New England," 1630-1649*. Ed. James K. Hosmer, 2 vols. (New York, 1908), II: 20, 35, 126. Danckaerts and Sluyter, *Journal of Voyage to New York*, 102.

J.D. Phillips, *Salem in the Seventeenth Century* (Boston, 1933), 166.

*Winthrop's Journal*, II: 126. Weeden, *Economic and Social History*, I: 154. Nathaniel B. Shurtleff, ed., *Records of the Governor and Company of Massachusetts Bay in New England*, 5 vols. (Boston, 1853-1854), II: 350.

Macpherson, *Annals*, II; 366, 508. Beer, *Origins*, 124.

Harper, *Navigation Laws*, 326. Judah, *North American Fisheries*, 71.

Ogg, *Reign of Charles II*, I: 232. Macpherson, *Annals*, II: 507, 518. Violet Barbour, "Dutch and English Merchant Shipping in the Seventeenth Century," I: 228n. and "Marine Risks and Insurance in the Seventeenth Century," I: 567n, both in E.M. Carus-Wilson, ed., *Essays in Economic History*, 3 vols. (London, 1954-1962). Davis, *Rise of English Shipping*, 59. The penalty amounted to one percent of the cargo's value. Davis says that all ships in this trade listed crews of thirty-two men, even if lightly manned, well into the 1700s.

Clark, "Barbary Corsairs," 121-123.

Judah, *North American Fisheries*, 129. *CSPC*, VII (1669-1674): 342, 351. Macpherson, *Annals*, II: 579. The fishing fleet carried more than 2,000 guns and 9,100 men in 1676. Godolphin to Williamson, November 18, 1677, SPFP "Newsletters" 101/92. E.M.G. Routh, *Tangier, England's Lost Atlantic Outpost, 1661-1684* (London, 1912), 145. Godolphin to Jenkins, May 5, 1677, SPFP "Newsletters" 101/92. *CSPC*, IX (1677-1680): 329. Davis, *Rise of English Shipping*, 353-355. Beer, *Origins*, 124-125.

Macpherson, *Annals*, II: 502-503, 600, 612. Clark, "Barbary Corsairs," 120-128. Davis, *Rise of English Shipping*, 96n.

Julian S. Corbett, *England in the Mediterranean, 1603-1713*, 2 vols. (Westport, Conn., 1987), introduction.

John Hull, *The Diaries of John Hull, mint-master and treasurer of Massachusetts Bay*, Transactions and Collections of the American Antiquarian Society, III (Worcester, Mass., 1857), 154.

*Ibid.*, 231, 245.

*CSPC*, IX (1677-1680): 529.

John Josselyn, "Chronological Observations of America, 1661," *An Account of Two Voyages to New England Made during the Years 1638, 1663* (Boston, 1865), 204. *CSPC*, VII (1669-1674): 60.

Danckaerts and Sluyter, *Journal of Voyage to New York*, 35, 41, 381.

*CSPC*, IX (1677-1680): 544.

Hall, *Randolph and American Colonies*, 123. Anderson, *Origin of Commerce*, II: 743.

Anderson, *Europe in Eighteenth Century*, 221. *BNL*, November 13, 1704.

Wescombe to Stanhope, August 4, 1715, SPFS 94/212. Davis, *Rise of English Shipping*, 250.

*AWM*, October 27, 1720; December 27, 1720; June 1, 1721; June 15, 1721; June 22, 1721; September 27, 1721; October 22, 1721.

*AWM*, January 16, 1722; April 26, 1722; November 8, 1722.

Anderson, *Origin of Commerce*, 140. Newcastle to Tyrawley, July 30, 1728, SPFP 89/36. Anderson, *Europe in Eighteenth Century*, 221. Colonial newspapers constantly sought and printed news on relations with the Barbary States.

*PG*, August 29, 1734. *NEWJ*, August 12, 1734; August 29, 1734; September 2, 1734; September 23, 1734.

*PG*, June 27, 1734; October 3, 1734. *NEWJ*, September 23, 1734; November 11, 1734; September 30, 1734.

*PG*, November 28, 1734. *NEWJ*, November 18, 1734.

*PG*, November 13, 1735.

*NEWJ*, March 24, 1735.

*PG*, April 28, 1737. *NEWJ*, April 12, 1737.

*PG*, August 17, 1749; March 6, 1750; March 14, 1750; June 7, 1750; August 23, 1750; January 12, 1751.

*PG*, March 27, 1753; September 13, 1753; October 24, 1754.

*PG*, October 10, 1763; January 5, 1764; October 18, 1764; June 5, 1765; August 8, 1765. *EG*, November 1, 1768.

Shillington and Chapman, *Commercial Relations*, 212.

*PG*, August 3, 1749.

*PG*, July 20, 1749; September 7, 1749; January 23, 1750; June 7, 1750.

*PG*, January 23, 1750; March 27, 1750; April 19, 1750.

*PG*, June 7, 1750; November 15, 1750; April 9, 1752; May 31, 1753; January 29, 1754; March 5, 1754.

Andrews, *Colonial Period*, IV: 276. *CSPC*, IX (1677-1680): 15.

Brigham, *British Proclamations*, 129-130. Phillips, *Salem in Seventeenth Century*, 287-288. Beer, *Origins*, 125.

*CSPC*, X (1681-1685): 368; XVI (1699): 196. Leonard W. Labaree, *Royal Government in America* (New York, 1958), 72. *CSPC*, XVII (1700): 528, 528i. *BNL*, September 18, 1704. Robert L. Playfair, *The Scourge of Christendom* (London, 1884), 168-170.

August 10-September 28, 1700, SPFS 94/212.

*CSPC*, XXVIII (1716-1717): 9, 26. "Admiralty Registers of Mediterranean Passes," ADM 7/75-103 and ADM 1/3832-3833.

Letter to Coventry, November 19, 1675, "Letter Book of Francis Parry, 1668-1680," Southwell Papers, British Museum,



Additional Mss. 35101. Clark, "Barbary Corsairs," 124.  
 Andrews, *Colonial Period*, IV: 208.  
 Letters to Francis Annessly, June 5, 1732; March 16, 1733, Israel Pemberton, "Letter Book, 1727-1735," G.W. Blount Library, Mystic Seaport (Mystic, Conn.).  
 Entry for September 21, 1732, Peter Faneuil, "Day Book, 1731-1732," BL? not in biblio! *PG*, August 6, 1730. Giesecke, *American Commercial Legislation*, 102n.  
 Letter to Newcastle, March 5, 1731; letter from Newcastle, April 27, 1731, "Correspondence of Lord Tyrawley," British Museum, Additional Mss. 23627. Aiskill to Whitehall, July 29, 1755, "Consular Reports," SPFS 94/228.  
*PG*, May 28, 1730.  
*NEWJ*, November 29, 1731.  
 Aspinwall to Cleveland, March 9, 1755, ADM 1/3833. *NEWJ*, May 1, 1735. *PG*, May 1, 1735; May 28, 1734.

Castries to Cleveland, May 22, 1749, ADM 1/3833. *PG*, May 11, 1749.  
 Jordan to Colebrooke, November 10, 1749, SPFS 94/227. *BNL*, March 29, 1750. Stanyford to Corbett, March 31, 1749; Castries to Cleveland, August 7, 1749, ADM 1/3832. *PG*, August 23, 1750; January 8, 1751; March 3, 1752.  
*PG*, May 3, 1750, citing a letter from Whitehall, dated February 8, 1750; August 23, 1750, citing a dispatch from Keppel, May 22, 1750.  
*PG*, May 31, 1750; August 23, 1750.  
*PG*, July 12, 1753.  
*PG*, November 2, 1764; December 13, 1764.  
*PG*, December 13, 1764; December 20, 1764.  
*PG*, February 21, 1765. Order in Council, December 19, 1764, SPFS 94/169.  
 Burnaby to Stevens, April 10, 1767, ADM 1/3837. Marsh to Rochdale, June 9, 1775, SPFS 94/198.  
 Andrews, *Colonial Period*, IV: 276. Letter to Murray, December 2, 1765, Henry Lloyd, "Letter Book, 1765-1767," BL.  
 Letter to Walter and Samuel Franklin, March 6, 1766, Lloyd, "Letter Book."  
 Letter to Jacob R. Rivera, June 2, 1766, *ibid*.  
 Letter to Barclay, May 1, 1733, Pemberton, "Letter Book, 1727-1735."  
 Letter to Lory & Michel, December 14, 1738, Peter Faneuil, "Letter Book, 1737-1739," BL. prob 1741 see fn 45 in chap 6. Letter to Captain Close, October 25, 1753, Reynell, "Letter Book, 1752-1754."  
 Jackson to Cleveland, January 8, 1756, ADM 1/3833.  
 Arthur L. Jensen, *The Maritime Commerce of Colonial Philadelphia* (Madison, Wisc., 1963), 59. *PG*, October 21, 1731.  
 Robert E. Moody, "The Last Voyage of the *Province Galley*," *Transactions of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts XXXII* (1933-1937): 137.  
 William Petyt, *Britannia Languens, or a Discourse of Trade* (London, 1680), 258.  
 Weeden, *Economic and Social History*, II, 817.  
 Anderson, *Origin of Commerce*, I: lx. Macpherson, *Annals*, II: 309.  
 Macpherson, *Annals*, II: 472.  
 Anderson, *Origin of Commerce*, II: 577. Daniel Defoe, *A Plan of the English Commerce* (London, 1728), 321-322.  
*PG*, July 12, 1750.  
*PG*, June 7, 1750; November 29, 1764; December 13, 1764.  
*PG*, February 28, 1765; December 26, 1765.  
 Lacey Baldwin Smith, *The Elizabethan World* (Boston, 1972), 152-153.  
 Playfair, *Scourge*, 34, 52, 55. Clark, "Barbary Corsairs," 107-108.  
*CSPC*, XLII (1737): 75  
 Playfair, *Scourge*, 34, 63-65. The 1646 ransom was £9,196.  
*Ibid.*, 126. Beer, *Colonial System*, I: 123.  
 Hist. Mss. XXVII, 179, 188. James G. Lydon, "Barbary Pirates and Colonial New Yorkers," *NYHSQ* XLV (1961): 282-284.  
 Hist. Mss., XXVII: 188.  
 E.B. O'Callaghan and B. Fernow, eds., *Documents Relative to the Colonial History of the State of New York*, 15 vols. (Albany, N.Y., 1853-1887), III: 717; II: 318-319.  
 Beer, *Origins*, 122n, 198-199. Harper, *Navigation Laws*, 216. *CSPS*, IX (1677-1680): 326, Playfair, *Scourge*, 131. William R. Riddell, "From Slave to Governor," *Dalhousie Review* IX (1930): 475-480.  
 Richard S. Dunn, *Puritans and Yankees* (Princeton, N.J., 1962), 220-221. *CSPS*, IX (1677-1680): 589, 612; X (1681-1686): 65-66. Connecticut collected the ransom from his estate, £459.  
 Sidney Perley, *The History of Salem*, 3 vols. (Salem, Mass., 1924), III: 298. J.D. Phillips, *Salem in the Eighteenth Century* (Boston, 1937), 91.  
 Cotton Mather, *Diary of Cotton Mather*, ed. Worthington C. Ford, 2 vols. (New York, 1957), I: 177n..  
*Ibid.*, I: 181.  
*Ibid.*, I: 197.  
*Ibid.*, I: 260.

Ibid., I: 320-321.

Ibid., I: 321.

ERNY, II, 1061-1063. Hist. Mss. XXXIX, 44. *Calendar of Council Minutes, 1668-1783* (Albany, N.Y. 1902), 83. DHNY, III, 416. Lydon, "Barbary Pirates," 284-289.

ERNY, II: 1063-1065. Hist. Mss. XL: 182.

CSPC, XIII (1693-1696): 450. I.N.P. Stokes, *The Iconography of Manhattan Island, 1498-1909*, 6 vols. (New York, 1922), IV: 396. Hist. Mss. XL: 182. DHNY, III: 415-416, 420.

???

Lewis Roberts, *The Merchant's Mappe of Commerce* (London, 1641/1700), 65.

PG, August 7, 1732; May 3, 1733.

PG, August 14, 1735. *NEWJ*, May 3, 1735.

Ibid., [which one PG or *NEWJ*?] September 14, 1774. Here the Royal Council in England is referred to as the "DIVAN," a slighting comparison to the Dey's council in Algiers.

AWM, April 26, 1722.

PG, February 18, 1735; May 2, 1734. *NEWJ*, February 24, 1735; March 10, 1735; March 24, 1735.

PG, May 11, 1749; August 8, 1751. Eighty-six had reached shore.

PG, July 7, 1763; October 13, 1763.

PG, August 3, 1749; June 7, 1750; September 12, 1751.

PG, April 19, 1750; January 22, 1751.

PG, September 23, 1731.

Andrews, *Colonial Period*, IV: 322. PG, April 4, 1765; June 1, 1738.

AWM, May 3, 1722.

J.N. Larned, *History for Ready Reference*, 5 vols. (Springfield, Mass., 1894-1895), I: 263.

Macpherson, *Annals*, III: 593.

## chapter 5

Max Savelle and Darold D. Wax, *The History of Colonial America* (Hinsdale, Ill., 1973), 374. Curtis P. Nettels, *The Roots of the American Civilization* (New York, 1963), 262. Innis, *Cod Fisheries*, 161, 167. This chapter appeared in *NEQ*, LIV: 539-558 and is reprinted by permission.

Edward Payne, "Observations on the Acts of Trade (1763)," MHS, Ezekial Price Collection.

Innis, *Cod Fisheries*, 118. Raymond McFarland, *The History of the New England Fisheries* (New York, 1911), 69, 95. Curtis P. Nettels, *The Money Supply of the American Colonies before 1720* (Madison, Wisc., 1934), 78. A significant price differential existed between fish sent to southern Europe and that shipped to the West Indies. In December 1763 prices were listed as 17s. per quintal for merchantable and 12s.8d. per quintal for Jamaica fish. See Edward Payne, "Account of Costs and Returns from the Marblehead Fishery," MHS, Ezekial Price Collection.

Reconstruction of eighteenth-century trade statistics is a difficult task. Those contained here are, therefore, not precise but are exact enough to warrant conclusions. Newfoundland data came from *CSPC*, 1701-1738 and CO 194/-?25, 27-32. The Naval Office Records for Massachusetts in the PRO, were excerpted and photostated in the 1930s under the title *Massachusetts Shipping Records (MSR)* and are listed under that title at MHS, PEI, The Library of Congress, and Wisconsin State Historical Society, Madison, and elsewhere. Salem material may be found in *MSR*, 1714-1717 and 1751-1765; in Salem Light Money Accounts, 1751-1771, at PEI; and also in *EG*. Boston statistics are from *MSR*, 1718-1719, 1752-1765, and customs reports in *BNL*, 1714-1773; also in *NEWJ*, 1730-1739. The "Inspector General's Reports" (CO 16/1) have been utilized for 1768-1772.

Bernardo de Ulloa, *Rétablissement des manufactures et du commerce d'Espagne* (Amsterdam, 1753), 45-55. McLachlan, *Trade and Peace*, 14.

Anderson, *Europe in Eighteenth Century*, 48. Herr, *Revolution in Spain*, 86-87. Vicens Vives, *Historia social y economica*, 809; *Manual*, 440-444. Joseph Townshend, *A Journey through Spain in the Years 1786 and 1787*, 3 vols. (London, 1792), I: 118; II: 369, 418; III: 11, 122, 169, 236. Pedro Voltes Bou, "Aspectos economicas del siglo XVIIIe," *Cuadernos de Arqueologia e Historia de la Ciudad* (Barcelona), III (1962): 143.

See Table 5-2. Codfish is estimated at 100 pounds per quintal (qtl.); 22.4 qtls. per ton. This figure for 1770-1773 is from CO 16/1. The actual average for these years is 646,920 qtls. These figures may well overstate exports.

Ulloa, *Rétablissement*, 46-48. Cf. Innis, *Cod Fisheries*, 195n and Table 5-2. Southern European exports rose sharply in the late 1760s, which may account for the discrepancy between figures.

See chapter VI.

Minor port consumption included Vianna (17,000 qtls./yr.), Figuera (13,600 qtls.), Aveiro (2,400), Caminha (2,700), Madeira (4,000). SPFP 89/77 and Board of Trade Papers, 6/62, for consulate correspondence on 1770s imports. Cf. Fisher, "Anglo-Portuguese Trade" (PhD diss.), 79, 146. Jean-François Bourgoing, ed., *Travels of the Duke de Châtelet in 1777 and 1778 in Portugal*, 2 vols. (London, 1809), I: 264-265. Some sources suggest a decline in Lisbon's imports in the 1770s from earlier in the century. In 1729 a figure of 80,000 quintals was reported. Possibly the earthquake of 1755 caused the decline. See Compton to Newcastle, August 6, 1729, SPFP 89/35. Ibbotson to Board of Trade, August 3, 1765, Consular Reports on Trade 388/95.

Twiss, *Travels through Portugal*, 26. Francis, *Methuens*, 13.

Innis, *Cod Fisheries*, 180. Dick to Board of Trade, July 11, 1765; Consular Reports on Trade 388/95. Dick to Board of Trade, Consular Reports on Trade 388/53.

Angeles Alvarino and Olegario Rodriguez, *La Merluza et el bacalao y especies afines* (Madrid, 1955), 47, 52, 58, 68. Innis, *Cod Fisheries*, 149, 171. *PG*, April 16, 1752. *BNL*, April 26, 1752.

“Report on the State of the Fish Trade to Portugal,” September 17, 1718, SPFP 89/26.

Hamilton, *War and Prices*, 264-267.

Innis, *Cod Fisheries*, 180.

See Table 5-4. For fish transported to Spain in Portuguese vessels, see “Averia Accounts,” 1756-1763, which indicate a relatively large number of small vessels carrying fish entering from Corunna and Lisbon.

Poyntz to Cragg, October 15, 1718; Rowe to Hubbert, April 19, 1762, SPFP 89/26. Fairchild, *Pepperrells*, 102-103. England and Spain warred 1702-1713, 1719-1720, 1739-1748, 1762-1763. redundant

Henri Sée, “Documents sur le Commerce de Cadix (1691-1752),” *Revue de l’Histoire des Colonies Françaises* XV (1926-1927): 61. William Shirley, *Memoirs of the Principal Transactions of the Last War* (London, 1757), 7-10. Innis, *Cod Fisheries*, 173-175.

“Averia Accounts,” 1749.

Hamilton, *War and Prices*, 264-267. Base years for this index of fish prices were 1726-1750.

Cabot “Papers,” I. Beginning in May 1771 the Gardoquis warned of a glut of fish at Bilbao and continued to do so as late as May 1773.

It is impossible to reconcile the various figures for fish exports in the early 1770s. CO 16/1 provides a figure of 538,613 quintals for total North American exports to southern Europe in 1771, while British Museum, Addition Mss., usually mss #, folios 136-137 sets the total at 736,877 quintals. My data show that Newfoundland and Salem shipped 689,183 qtls. that year. According to CO 194/25-32, the CO 16/1 data seriously understate Newfoundland exports; CO 16/1, therefore, exaggerates the Massachusetts share of that market. My statistics for Salem (Table 5-2) show exports of 128,979 quintals in 1771, as opposed to CO 16/1 figures of 119,028 quintals. In the absence of any firmer data, Boston export figures have been taken from CO 16/1 for 1768-1772.

Innis, *Cod Fisheries*, 174, 183-185. The French supplied their own market but rarely competed in Iberia after 1700.

Morison, *Maritime History*, 9. Innis, *Cod Fisheries*, 72.

“The Names of such Ships and Masters that have come in and gone out of our Harbours & Given Bond for His Majesty’s Customs, August 16, 1661 to February 25, 1662,” MHS.

*MSR*, March 25, 1688 to September 29, 1688. Twenty vessels (1,100 tons) carried 16,080 quintals of fish to Iberia and the Wine Islands. See also Nettels, *Money Supply*, 79.

*BNL*, 1714-1774; *NEWJ*, 1730-1739; and *EG*, 1768-1774, provide customs data. Newspaper runs are quite complete but for 1749 and 1751, where a number of issues are missing. Occasionally editors omitted data when short of space but often the next issue had returns for two weeks. Winter omissions reflected weather closure of ports. Checked against *MSR*, newspaper data ran about twelve percent below official statistics.

See chapter VI and Table 5-1.

Boston trade to the Wine Islands declined significantly over time. Between 1711 and 1735, on average, over 60% of Boston’s clearances in the fish trade went to the island ports. Between 1735 and 1750 that percentage fell to about 35%, and after 1750 declined to about 18%. Salem percentages were 7.1% (1714-1717), 10.3% (1729-1735), and 5.2% (1751-1774).

The circumlocution may have been used to mask market strategies and during wartime to conceal information from the enemy. For the same reason, Boston newspapers did not list clearances between 1744 and summer 1747 and again from early 1757 through 1759.

“Averia Accounts,” 1732-1738, 1749-1754, 1758, 1763-1774. Identifiable ships from Newfoundland numbered 642 and from New England 661. After 1763 Massachusetts dominated the market.

Average tonnages have been derived from *MSR*, 1752-1765 and from Salem Light Money Accounts, 1751-1768.

Average tonnages of vessels sailing Boston to southern Europe were: 1718-1719, 30 vessels, 1,971 tons, average 65.7 tons; October 1752 to October 1756, 114 vessels, 8,007 tons, average 70.2 tons; 1762 and 1764, 29 vessels, 648 tons, average 65 tons. Data from CO 16/1 were, 1768-1772, 80 vessels, 4,895 tons, 61.1 tons.

*MSR* and CO 16/1 provide utilization ratios for Boston vessels taking fish to southern Europe, as follows: 1752-1756, 65%; 1762-1764, 56.4%; 1768-1772, only 47.3%.

Official data are lacking to provide a comparison with CO 16/1 statistics, but Salem Light Money Accounts allow comparisons for number of vessels and tonnage. A small discrepancy exists for vessels (4.3%), with CO 16/1 having fewer clearances. The difference in tonnage cleared is, however, not acceptable (17.3%) over the years 1768-1771: Light Money Accounts, 235 vessels, 20,244 tons; CO 16/1, 225 vessels, 16,748 tons. As a spot check, tonnages of individual vessels identifiable in both Light Money data and in *MSR* were compared. This analysis confirmed the accuracy of the Light Money figures for tonnages. Serious questions are thus raised concerning the accuracy of CO 16/1. The weakness of the tonnage statistics affects average tonnage for vessels in this source and also utilization factors for fish carried. In the latter case, utilization factors from CO 16/1 would be significantly overstated.

James G. Lydon, “North Shore Trade in the Early Eighteenth Century,” *The American Neptune*, XXVIII (1968): 261-274.

*Ibid.*, 273-274.

*Boston Records*, XXXII (Aspinwall Notarial Records, 1644-1651) (Boston, 1903).

MSR, Boston clearances: May-September 1686; March-September 1687; March-September 1688. Total cleared were 51, 2,453 tons: Boston-registered vessels, 23; English 25; Salem 2, 120 tons total; West Indies 1, 18 tons. tonnage #s don't make sense. For example, Robert Hooper's vessel, the *Hooper*, was built at Portsmouth, N.H., registered there but sailed from Salem through the period. Vessel registries were not changed unless a change in ownership occurred or the vessel itself was structurally altered. Colonial owners used small vessels to spread their risk. Although their vessels increased in size over the century, they did not approach the larger vessels that were forced out of the traffic. By 1768-1771 vessels were carrying about the same amount of cargo as in 1714.

Report of Edward Payne, December 1763, MHS, Ezekial Price Collection. For fishery development, see *BNL*, June 14, 1753, February 21, 1754, August 29, 1754.

CO 16/1. West Indies fish exports (dried fish in quintals; pickled fish in barrels), 1768-1772, were: Salem 439,521 qtls. and 15,090 blls.; Boston 290,955 qtls. and 38,880 blls.; and Rhode Island 85,940 qtls. and 63,216 blls.

Innis, *Cod Fisheries*, 118. Weeden, *Economic and Social History*, II: 750.

Shepherd and Walton, *Shipping, Maritime Trade*.

MSR. Tonnage to Iberian ports: 1714-1717 was 9,433 tons, with 180,350 quintals in 126 vessels; October 1752-September 1756, 17,407 tons, 405,228 quintals in 228 vessels; 1759 and 1762, 5,508 tons, 115,383 quintals in 72 ships; 1763-September 1765, 11,466 tons, 257,761 quintals, 149 ships. Fish utilization estimates are based on 22.4 qtls./ton carrying capacity. Note that carrying capacity was understated in the eighteenth century to avoid port charges based on tonnage.

MSR, June 25, 1718-June 24, 1719.

MSR, October 1752-September 1756; 1762-1764 (one quarter in 1763 is missing). CO 16/1.

Harper, *Navigation Laws*, 398-399.

Shepherd and Walton, *Shipping, Maritime Trade*, 239-240.

Arthur H. Cole, *Wholesale Commodity Prices in the United States, 1700-1861*, 2 vols. (Cambridge, Mass., 1938), II: 2 and Statistical Supplement. "Averia Accounts" and Cabot "Papers" both indicate that fish sold at Bilbao for approximately twice its New England value.

Costs are figured as follows: prime cost (PC) of merchantable fish in Massachusetts, 1752-1772, equaled on the average 11.65s. sterling/qlt. Sale price (SP) in Europe was double the American price. Freight charges (F) cost about 3.6s./qlt. Insurance in peacetime was 2.5% of PC or 1.25% of SP. War insurance rates were much higher. Customs duties (H) in Europe added some 12% to PC. Transferal costs (T) to send funds to England were apparently 2%; providing cash to captains, 0.5%. Estimating three-fourths of the funds were transferred, T equals 1.62% of SP. Loss (L) on goods through damage (broken or damaged fish was commonly donated to charities) or losses uncovered by insurance equaled 2% of PC. Shipping/handling costs (SH) amounted to 29% in peacetime (6.75s.) or 33.3% in wartime (7.68s.). I have rounded peacetime costs to 30%. PC plus SH when subtracted from SP gives the surplus figure (S).

*EG*, January 26, 1773.

Bernhard Knollenberg, *Origin of the American Revolution, 1759-1766* (New York, 1961), 164, 262. A very small percentage of vessels returned via the West Indies.

Salem Light Money Accounts, 1764-1771 and *EG*, 1768-1773. Apparently 40 vessels entered indirectly and 479 directly to Salem. Boston data from *BNL* indicate 205 direct and 83 indirect entrances in these years.

"Resolutions of the Town of Marblehead, December 8, 1772," in *EG*, December 15, 1772. Payne, "Observations on Acts of Trade."

Harper, *Navigation Laws*, 401. *CSPC*, XLII (1735-1736): 109.

Innis, *Cod Fisheries*, 161. See Lloyd, "Letter Book" for salt prices. Salt was normally packed in hogsheads (hhds.), holding eight bushels. Prices varied but usually southern European salt was more expensive than that from the West Indies.

Madeira and wine from the Azores (Western Islands) could enter directly. Colonials also imported Canary wines under the law of 1664, though they were often challenged by customs officials. See Harper, *Navigation Laws*, 248, 401, 265n.

Newspaper advertisements and merchant letter books contain many references to both personal importations and smuggled goods.

See Table 5-7. Indirect entrances numbered Boston 73, Salem 40. Salt entering Boston indirectly was worth £10,821 sterling and to Salem £700.

CO 16/1. Massachusetts imported 95.5% of the total salt, 954,476 bushels, entering New England, and Salem took 696,814 bushels, or 73%, of this. The figure for salt entering Boston, 1769 has been corrected to 52,000 bushels.

Bourgoing, *Travels of Duke de Châtelet*, I: 235-237.

Vicens Vives, *Manual*, 517. The Spanish paid twenty-two reales for a fanega of salt that foreigners bought for five reales.

Cole, *Wholesale Commodity Prices*, II. Boston prices are converted to sterling as one-third in advance of sterling. For Portuguese prices see June 26, 1729, SPFP 89/25; "Estimate of Trade between England and Portugal, 1768," SPFP 89/64. This source estimates salt prices at 12s. per moyo, which is very high. Cf. SPFP 89/77, which contains trade data for various Portuguese ports, 1772-1773, and has salt prices for Lisbon and Setubal, which average 130 pence sterling per moyo of 1,500 pounds. A moyo equaled 15 bushels. Kenneth Wiggins Porter, ed., *The Jacksons and the Lees: Two Generations of Massachusetts Merchants, 1765-1844*, 2 vols. (Cambridge, Mass., 1937), I: 406. Townshend, *Journey through Spain*, III: 169, prices salt at Alicante at 12s. per ton, which compares favorably with the Portuguese prices. The large majority of Massachusetts vessels came either from Cadiz or Lisbon/Setubal, with the former preferred in peacetime.

For Lisbon/Setubal prices see note 66 above. For Boston costs, see Cole, *Wholesale Commodity Prices*, II, reduced to sterling. Salem imports were 355,233 hhds. direct and 1,470 indirect, total 356,703 hhds. Boston imports were 133,964 direct and 23,735 indirect, total 157,699. Boston profits were £11,354 sterling.

MSR, 1761-1763, for Salem indicates that 92 salt cargoes entered from southern Europe, a total of 30,000 hhds., an average of 333.26 hhds. per ship. Each cargo valued at approximately £83, prime cost.

Bradford, "*Of Plymouth Plantation*," 191n.

George Louis Beer, *British Colonial Policy, 1754-1765* (Gloucester, Mass., 1958), 280n. Wine coming in direct faced a differential penalty of £3 sterling/ton.

MSR, October 1752-September 1756. CO 16/1. Between 1752 and 1773 twenty percent of the vessels entering Boston from southern Europe came from the Wine Islands.

MSR for Salem and CO 16/1 have full data for eleven years of Salem entrances. In those years, wine never filled more than seven percent of the tonnage arriving.

CO 16/1. Boston entered 910.66 tons of the total (1,086.21) and Salem 175.55 tons. Additional wine came from West Indies and coastal ports.

Letters dated May 20, 1765, September 30, 1765, November 11, 1765, November 23, 1765, March 3, 1766, Lloyd "Letter Book." Dickerson, *Navigation Acts and Revolution, 176-179*. Bezanson, Gray, and Hussey, *Prices in Colonial Pennsylvania, 230-235*.

Jensen, *Maritime Commerce*, 61.

"British Exports to and Imports from Portugal in 1773," January 13, 1774, SPFP 89/77. "Report on the Consul and Factory of British Merchants on the Trade of Madeira," Thomas Cheap, Consul, to Halifax, July 1, 1765, Consular Reports on Trade, Board of Trade Papers 388/95. Wine prices varied widely, based on the quality of the vintage. Azores and Canary wines were more reasonably priced than Madeira, as were mainland vintages.

Shepherd and Walton, *Shipping, Maritime Trade*, 124, Table 7.4, "Average Freight Rates per Registered Ton by Route, 1768-1772." Prime cost of a ton (tun) of Madeira was £40 sterling; freight £3/ton; commission and brokerage at 3% equals £1.2; insurance peacetime was 3% or £1.4; handling and losses equal 4% (32s.); Portuguese duties were 10% on export from Madeira or £4; English duties were £7 on wines directly imported; and handling and local duties brought the cost of a ton of wine, after 1764, to about £60 on arrival in New England. Cf. Bezanson, Gray, and Hussey, *Prices in Colonial Pennsylvania, 235*.

Shepherd and Walton, *Shipping, Maritime Trade*, 233. Arthur Meier Schlesinger, *The Colonial Merchants and the American Revolution, 1763-1776* (New York, 1968), 88, 98, 101, 103.

Wine imported directly was worth £?160,254, indirectly £52,122.

Data are from the weekly *CPR*, April 1757-November 1759, an official journal of Lisbon shipping activity, located in the Junta de Comercio records in Arquivo da Torre de Tombo, Lisbon. Additional issues are in PEI, covering February 1771-December 1776. Large amounts of mainland wine illegally run into Massachusetts may well have driven down the price of wine entered legally. The English consul at Tenerife estimated in 1773 that only one-eighth of the wine shipped thence to America passed American customs. Magra to Rochford, September 10, 1773, SPFS 94/194.

Entries for April 10, 1769; April 17, 1769, "Book of Records of the Salem Customs House, September 28, 1763-July 17, 1772," PEI. Quotations by permission. [fn says Sept. 17]

Gardoqui to Cabot, May 15, 1773, Cabot "Papers," I. In 1771 the schooner *Premium* imported 720 dozen silk handkerchiefs and the schooner *Tryal* 501 dozen.

MSR, 1756, Boston exports.

Shepherd and Walton, *Shipping, Maritime Trade*, 220, Table 4; actual total listed is £42,070.

Using the ratio between Boston and Salem that applied between 1762 and 1765, £42,000 of the exports would be assigned to Salem and £108,000 to Boston shippers.

Salem credits totaled £1,856,775; deducting salt PC £89,193 and wine PC £49,036 leaves £1,718,546. Salem's twenty-two-year average was £78,116. Boston credits totaled £389,620, deducting salt and wine PCs, £39,521 and £92,548, leaves £257,551, a yearly average of £11,707.

"Schooner Jolly Robin's Book of Acco'ts for Voyages." See also Cabot "Papers."

Shepherd and Walton, *Shipping, Maritime Trade*, 128. Fish shipped from Boston (304,823 hhds.) and Salem (2,080,753 hhds.) from 1752-1773 suggests freight earnings of £54,868 and £374,536, respectively. Problems with registration accuracy of ownership indicate that an even larger percentage of these earnings went to the North Shore nabobs.

Shepherd and Walton, *Shipping, Maritime Trade*, 47, 101.

These figures represented funds left after sale of fish in Europe, less charges. My figures are somewhat higher, a total of £552,549 and an annual average of £104,509. [what are you dividing by?]

Evarts B. Greene and Virginia D. Harrington, *American Population before the Federal Census of 1790* (New York, 1932), 31-32. The Massachusetts census for 1776 provides population figures for Essex County seaport towns as follows: Salem 5,337; Ipswich 4,508; Lynn and Lynnfield 2,755; Marblehead 4,386; Beverly 2,754; Gloucester 4,512; Manchester 949. The total of these figures is 25,201; thus a figure of 25,000 for the earlier period is probably high.

Shepherd and Walton, *Shipping, Maritime Trade*, 128.

*Ibid.*, 30-31.

Phillips, *Salem in Eighteenth Century*, chapters 30 and

## chapter 6

EG, August 27, 1771.

EG, November 22, 1768, July 11, 1769, May 1, 1770, November 27, 1770, August 27, 1771. Harriet S. Tapley, ed., *Early Coastwise and Foreign Shipping of Salem; a record of the entrances and clearances of the port of Salem, 1750-1769* (Salem, Mass., 1934), 28, 73, 109, 127, 142-143. Tapley's data on Salem trade is from the Salem Light Money Accounts, 1751-1771. Tapley, *Early Coastwise*, 72-73.

EG, June 16, 1772.

EG, July 14, 1772.

Tapley, *Early Coastwise*, 7, 19, 92, 115, 129. EG, September 13, 1768; September 19, 1769; June 26, 1770.

The real significance of the southern European fish trade was the opportunity it offered North Shore merchants to accumulate capital rapidly.

By mid-eighteenth century the North Shore towns had virtually engrossed the southern European trade and were rapidly expanding West Indian fish sales as well. See CO 16/1.

John J. Babson, *The History of the Town of Gloucester* (Gloucester, Mass., 1860), 28. Innis, *Cod Fisheries*, 72.

[Robert] Trelawney, *The Trelawney Papers*, ed. James P. Baxter. Maine Historical Society Collections, 2nd ser., III (Portland, 1884), lxxxiv, 198-199, 273, 288.

Beer, *Colonial System*, I: 9.

Bailyn, *New England Merchants*, 76n. "The Names of Such Ships and Masters that have come in and gone out of our Harbours," August 1661-February 1662, *Boston Records*.

Nettels, *Money Supply*, 79.

Phillips, *Salem in Seventeenth Century*, 209.

MSR, Part I. Nettels, *Money Supply*, 79n.

Phillips, *Salem in Seventeenth Century*, 288. Barnard Bailyn and Lotte Bailyn, *Massachusetts Shipping, 1696-1714* (Cambridge, Mass., 1959), 37.

"Averia Accounts." Data for the eighteenth century are more easily utilized and contain important information on cargoes entering, consignees, tonnages, as well as valuations of arriving cargoes.

Nettels, *Money Supply*, 79. Phillips, *Salem in Seventeenth Century*, 287.

McLachlan, *Trade and Peace*, 74-75. Uztariz, *Theory and Practice of Commerce*, II: 126-127. He estimated Spanish codfish consumption at 487,500 quintals and the Portuguese areas at 150,000 in the 1770s. See Tables 5-1 and 5-2.

William H. Bowden, "The Commerce of Marblehead, 1667-1775." *Essex Institute Historical Collections*, LXVIII: 121-123.

William Douglass, *Summary Historical and Political of the British Settlements in North America*, 2 vols. (London, 1755), I: 291. *CSPC*, XXVII (1712-1714): 243; XXVIII (1714-1715): 143, 295; XXIX (1716-1717): 207.

Bailyn, *New England Merchants*, 81. Lydon, "North Shore Trade," 273-274.

Nettels, *Money Supply*, 79. Carl Bridenbaugh, *Cities in the Wilderness* (New York, 1966), 330.

MSR, Part II. They include data on entrances and clearances, cargo destination, owners, size of crew, registry, and other material. Salem Light Money Accounts, 1751-1771, provide names of captains, vessels, and tonnage figures. They supplement CO 16/1 and EG customs data for the 1760s and 1770s.

Since shipowners purposely understated the tonnages of their vessels to cut port taxes, actual capacity of colonial vessels significantly exceeded the carrying capacity listed in customs records. Analysis of Naval Office Records indicates that Salem vessels carried, on average, fish weighing about sixteen percent more than the listed tonnage. Thus, for those years where actual volume of fish exports is not available, estimates of exports have been based on the ratio of 116.4 to 100. A quintal is presumed to be 100 pounds or 22.4 quintals per ton. redundant

Vera Lee Brown, "Spanish Claims to a Share in the Newfoundland Fisheries in the Eighteenth Century," *Canadian Historical Association Report* (1925): 64n. Innis, *Cod Fisheries*, 23.

Federico de Zabala y Allende, *El Consulado y las ordenanzas de comercio de Bilbao* (Bilbao, 1907), 13.

Innis, *Cod Fisheries*, 97n, 161. Vicens Vives, *Manual*, 332-333. Gardoqui to the Cabots, June 1, 1772, Cabot "Papers."

"Averia Accounts."

Robert S. Smith, *The Spanish Guild Merchant: A History of the Consulado, 1250-1700* (Durham, N.C., 1940), 77n. Zabala y Allende, *Consulado de Bilbao*, 114n. Teofilio Guiard de Larrauri, *El Historia de la Noble Villa de Bilbao*, 3 vols. (Bilbao, 1908), II: 94n.

Smith, *Spanish Guild Merchant*, 83. J. de Lazurtegui and V. de Larrea, *Merchants and Shipmaster's Practical Guide to the Port of Bilbao* (Bilbao, 1882), 68.

Frankland to Stanhope, July 3, 1716, SPFS 94/213. Bubb to Stanhope, August 12, 1715, SPFS 94/84.

Reynolds and Harvey to Stanhope, March 13, 1716, SPFS 94/213.

Guiard de Larrauri, *Noble Villa de Bilbao*, III : 319n.

Keene to Bedford, March 11, 1749, SPFS 94/137. Original Correspondence to the Board of Trade, September 26, 1765, CO 388/53.

Porten to Halifax, March 22, 1764, SPFS 94/166.

Brusby to Weymouth, February 13, 1769, SPFS 94/181.

The consulage duty, paid by all British vessels, supported consuls in foreign ports. In 1768 it was 200 reales in Spanish ports,

payable to the consul on arrival. Gray to Shelburne, September 12, 1768, SPFS 94/180.

Innis, *Cod Fisheries*, 118. McFarland, *New England Fisheries*, 69. Nettels, *Money Supply*, 78.

McFarland, *New England Fisheries*, 69.

Judah, *North American Fisheries*, 69.

“Court Records” in the Library of the Provincial Disputacion, Bilbao, Spain, Legajo 218, No. 15. Bailyn and Bailyn, *Massachusetts Shipping*, 37. Guiard de Larrauri, *Noble Villa de Bilbao*, III: 319n.

Reynolds and Harvey to Stanhope, March 13, 1716, SPFS 94/213.

“Averia Accounts.” During the years 1732-1737 a total of 344 fish cargoes entered Bilbao. Parminter and Barrow acted as consignees for 116 full and partial cargoes. Of 123 New England fish cargoes, they handled 68 full and 4 part cargoes. From 1732-1735 John Archer took 11 full and 2 part cargoes, while Arthur Lynch received 27 full and 4 partial shipments.

Keene to Bedford, March 11, 1749, SPFS 94/137. Letter, dated March 17, 1741, Faneuil “Letter Book.”

McLachlan, *Trade and Peace*, 140-141. Colebrooke to Bedford, July 14, 1750; August 11, 1750, SPFS 94/227. Guiard de Larrauri, *Noble Villa de Bilbao*, III: 319n.

“Averia Accounts,” 1749-1756. Over these years 506 fish cargoes entered Bilbao. The three major fish houses were Joseph Gardoqui (215 full and 34 part cargoes), Lynch, Lynch, Kelly & Moroney (44 full and 8 part cargoes), and Pedro Beckwelt (91 full and 11 part). From 1770-1774 some 189 vessels reached Bilbao from New England. The Casa de Gardoqui acted as consignees for 148 full and 13 partial shipments. Of the New England arrivals 184 came from Salem and Marblehead.

The Cabot “Papers” contain considerable material dealing with the Casa de Gardoqui.

Pickman to Captain Cabot, May 30, 1767; October 8, 1766, Cabot “Papers.”

“Averia Accounts” list the arrival of the brigantine *Tartar*, Benjamin Warren, on three separate voyages in 1768.

Freight bill for the voyages of the *Tartar* to Bilbao, 1766-1767, Cabot “Papers.”

MSR, Part II, Salem Port Records, 1752-1756. Hooper owned the *Bilbao*, *Haley*, *Hooper*, *Joseph*, *Prince William*, and *Swallow*. The Lees (Jeremiah, John, Richard, Samuel, and Seaward) owned *Eunice*, *Storke*, *Gardoqui*, *Lucretia*, *Susanna*, *Hannah*, *Dolphin*, *Lynn*, *Two Brothers*, *Boston*, and *Champion*. Smith owned *Gloucester*, *Industry*, *Mermaid*, *Nancy*, and *Molly*.

Letter to Lory & Michael of Bilbao, December 14, 1738, Faneuil, “Letter Book.” They had sent Faneuil chocolate, champagne, and other gifts and he answered: “Am exceedingly mortified that I know of nothing from these parts that will be of any Pleasure to you.”

Tapley, *Early Coastwise*, 19-20, 72-73.

See Table 6-1. For codfish prices in this era, see Cole, *Wholesale Commodity Prices*, II. Fish prices in Bilbao were about double Salem’s.

The Gardoquis charged a three-percent commission for handling fish cargoes and added commissions to transfer funds, arrange freights, advance cash, and other services. “Account of Sales of the Cargo of the Schooner *Salley*,” George Cabot, January 29, 1770, Cabot “Papers.”

Francisco de Ygartua y Landecho, *Diego de Gardoqui, primer embajador de Espana en los Estados Unidos de Norte America* (Bilbao, 1964), 7-8.

## chapter 7

Innis, *Cod Fisheries*, 30.

Ibid. Beer, *Origins*. Judah, *North American Fisheries*. Lounsbury, *British Fishery*. All provide solid studies of the fisheries. For Dutch competition, see Innis, *Cod Fisheries*, 68-69, as well as Judah, 113-114. Barbour, “Dutch and English Merchant Shipping,” 230.

Lounsbury, *British Fishery*, 36. Innis, *Cod Fisheries*, 49-50.

On the London/western England conflict, see Innis, *Cod Fisheries*, 49-52; Lounsbury, *British Fishery*, 35-40, 53; Judah, *North American Fisheries*, 86-90; Beer, *Origins*, 56-63, 115, 185 and *Colonial System*, II: 201, 205, 207, 210-213, 220-231. Cf. Cell, “Newfoundland Company,” 617.

Innis, *Cod Fisheries*, 51-52.

Beer, *Origins*, 199, 213.

Ibid., 292-293. Lounsbury, *British Fishery*, 210. Nettels, *Money Supply*, 145.

CSPC, VIII (1675-1676): 316. Captain John Berry, HMS *Bristol* reported arriving at Livorno (Leghorn), Italy in December 1765, having convoyed forty sail from Newfoundland.

Beer, *Colonial System*, II: 227-228, and *Origins*, 292-293. McFarland, *New England Fisheries*, 69. CSPC, VIII (1675-1676): 179. Francis Brewster, *Essays on Trade and Navigation* (London, 1695), 75.

Lounsbury, *British Fishery*, 210-211. McFarland, *New England Fisheries*, 69-70. See Newfoundland Fishery Statistics, 1675-1731, CO 390/6.

Beer, *Colonial System*, 294 and *Origins*, II: 212. Colonial System has 2 vols, not Origins. fn 9 & 11 – all Beer works have similar names; I’m confused which ones you’re referring to. Colonial Policy?

One official described “the scheme of the fishery” as “more a matter of speculation than certainty.” See Byron to Weymouth, November 25, 1769, Correspondence of the Secretary of State (Newfoundland), CO 194/28. Cf. Newfoundland Fishery Statistics, 1675-1731, CO 390/6. These annual reports in condensed form are found in CSPC down to 1739. The “sack ships” commonly brought wine to answer the demands of the fishermen. “Sack” was strong white wine from southern Europe, including sherry.

New Englanders also fished at Newfoundland but contributed few exports from that fishery.

See Table 4-1. For Newfoundland population, see McCusker and Menard, *Economy of British America*, 112.

As cited in Beer, *Colonial System*, II: 210-213.

Ibid., 220-221. "Notebook of Sir Joseph Williamson," *CSPC*, VIII (1675-1676): 159.

"Report on the State of the Fish Trade," September 17, 1718, SPFP 89/26. *CSPC*, XLI (1734-1735): 276; XLII (1735-1736): 5, 108-109, 280, 396-397.

Lounsbury, *British Fishery*, 317-318.

Nettels, *Money Supply*, 78.

Henri Louis Duhamel de Monceau, *Traité Général des Pesches et Histoire des Poissons*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1772), II: 49.

Lists of Lisbon arrivals in *CPR* indicate length of time at sea and thus give clearance data for them.

*CPR*, PG, February 3, 1763, seamen's wages had fallen to thirty shillings per month. Differential for a crew of eight would have amounted to two pounds in wages.

As cited in Innis, *Cod Fisheries*, 97n.

Cf. Rochford to Halifax, January 1, 1764, SPFS 94/166. Rochford to Halifax, September 17, 1764, SPFS 94/168.

"Averia Accounts," 1763-1775.

Twenty-two of the twenty-seven vessels from Iberian ports with fish came from Lisbon and seem to have been mainly Newfoundlanders. Between 1763 and 1775 the origins of only five shipments are not identified.

"Account of Goods Exported from Great Britain to Portugal, 1761-1786," Board of Trade Papers, 6/62. Annual imports never exceeded £3,500.

"Averia Accounts," 1763-1775.

Crosse to Holderness, July 12, 1753, SPFS 94/228.

"Averia Accounts," 1763-1775. In large percentages fish carriers chose to sail from Bilbao without cargoes. Those from Newfoundland did so 77.8% of the time, from Canada 64.7%, from New England only 45%, from Iberia 69.25%, from Old England 61.6%; overall 58.3%

Ibid.

The average vessel took 14.3 tons of iron. Exports divided into 7.3% wool and 92.7% iron. Three-quarters of the wool went to London. Poole took wool worth only £141.

Bilbayan records list iron in quintals, which, converted at twenty per ton, gives a figure of 14,342 tons over these years. Voyages from America to Iberia took a minimum of seventy days, including port time in both areas. Freight rates varied between £1.85/ton for wheat and £3.5/ton for codfish. A Cadiz passage from Bilbao probably averaged about ten days plus port time, probably at least fourteen days more. Total time would have been about one-third of that from America. At a minimum freight rate of ten shillings/ton, these ships would have earned an additional £7,171.

*CPR*, 1771-1774. Freight charges were 3.6s./qtl. A one-fifth reduction would be 8.64pense/qtl. See Table 4-6.

Ibid. Almost 90% arrived after August first.

"Account of Goods Exported from Great Britain to Portugal, 1761-1786," Board of Trade Papers, 6/62.

*CPR*, 1757-1775.

"Livros."

Forrester to Halifax, February 16, 1765, SPFS 94/169. This report was also signed by Greene, Ford, and Hall and by Irish Brothers and Company. Forrester was a partner in the firm of Miller and Forrester. James Miller was consul.

SPFS 94/193-194; 94/196. These contain reports by Consul James Miller on British trade at Barcelona.

Miller to Rochford, March 31, 1773, SPFS 94/193; October 2, 1773, SPFS 94/194; October 7, 1774, SPFS 94/196. Codfish here is priced at 22s., the Bilbao price. In March 1773 the English government was concerned over widespread smuggling of foreign goods from Guernsey and Jersey in the Channel Islands into England. See *PG*, May 5, 1773.

The price of codfish here is 20.77s./qtl., which is the minimum required for sale at cost, including all expenses for freight, insurance, handling, losses, duties, and commissions in Iberia. See Table 15-2.

## chapter 8

Anderson, *Europe in Eighteenth Century*, 48n. A. Lloyd Moote, *The Seventeenth Century: Europe in Ferment* (Lexington, Mass., 1970), 6. Herr, *Revolution in Spain*, 132.

Vicens Vives, *Historia social y economica*, III: 162-163; IV: 8-9; and *Manual*, 440-444. Albert Girard, *Le Commerce Français à Séville et Cadix au temps des Habsbourg* (Paris, 1932), 386-387. not in biblio! Hardy to Shelburne, December 31, 1767, SPFS 94/178, reported many vessels expected from the Morea with wheat. *PG*, August 11, 1737, included news from London that Islamic conservatives in North Africa threatened a "Scourge from Heaven," if grain sales to European Christians continued. Cf. *PG*, February 24, 1730, scarcity in Sicily and June 22, 1738, drought in Barbary. Cf. Dumouriez, *Portugal*, 202.

Discussion with Professor Fritz Redlick at Harvard Business School, July 15, 1965. Percy W. Bidwell and John I. Falconer, *The History of Agriculture in the Northern United States, 1620-1860* (Washington, D.C., 1925), 134.

C. R. Boxer, *The Dutch Seabourne Empire, 1600-1800* (London, 1966), 5-6, 85-86, 282-283. Jared Eliot, *Essays upon Field Husbandry in New England and Other Papers, 1748-1762*, ed. Harry J. Carman (New York, 1934), 81. A. H. John, "Agricultural Productivity and Economic Growth in England, 1700-1760," *JEH* XXV (1965): 25. Penfield E. Roberts, *The Quest for Security*,



1715-1740 (New York, 1947), 25. *PG*, September 12, 1734; February 23, 1737, for Polish grain shortage. Moote, *Europe in Ferment*, 6.

Davis, *Rise of English Shipping*, 48n. Harper, *Navigation Laws*, 288-292. Ogg, *Reign of Charles II*, I: 37-42.

D. Barnes, *Corn Laws*, 10-11. Thomas S. Ashton, *Economic Fluctuations in England, 1700-1800* (Oxford, 1959), 58-61. M. W. Flinn, "Agricultural Productivity and Economic Growth in England, 1700-1760: A Comment." *JEH* XXVI (1966): 93-98. Ogg, *Reign of Charles II*, I: 37-42, 46-50, 65-67. Harper, *Navigation Laws*, 277-278, 405, 411. A quarter of grain equaled eight bushels (560 lbs.).

McLachlan, *Trade and Peace*, 20-21, 52-57, 139. Shillington and Chapman, *Commercial Relations*, 192, 199-204, 223. Fisher, "Anglo-Portuguese Trade," *EHR*, 219-233.

D. Barnes, *Corn Laws*, 12-15, 30-32. Annual exports rose from 21,662 to 134,400 tons.

*BNL*, October 4, 1733, cited a London report dated July 19, 1733. Much the same figures appear in the December 6, 1733 issue. *PG*, May 16, 1734; May 23, 1734; August 8, 1734; September 19, 1734. *NEWJ*, November 4, 1735, reported from London, August 19, "The Monopolizers of Corn have met with the greatest Disappointment." Prices fell by one-third. Pares, *War and Trade*, 61-62.

*PG*, February 18, 1735, citing a London correspondent, November 5, 1734.

*NEWJ*, January 11, 1737; June 7, 1737. *PG*, February 17, 1737; March 31, 1737; July 28, 1737.

*PG*, July 28, 1737; August 11, 1737; August 25, 1737; April 20, 1738; July 27, 1738.

Pares, *War and Trade*, 124. D. Barnes, *Corn Laws*, 298-299. Flinn, "Agricultural Productivity," Table 2, 96. *PG*, September 30, 1740; October 2, 1740; September 17, 1741. Jensen, *Maritime Commerce*, 91.

See Table 8-1. Valentin de Foronda, *Cartas Sobre Los Asuntos Mas Exquisitos de la Economia*, 2 vols. (Madrid, 1789-1794), II: 87. *PG*, July 5, 1750, drought hit Spain as early as February 1750. *BNL*, February 20, 1752. *PG*, March 3, 1752; August 9, 1753; September 6, 1753; October 25, 1753; December 13, 1753. John, "Agricultural Productivity," 32-33.

*BNL*, February 3, 1757; February 10, 1757; April 14, 1757.

*BNL*, April 28, 1757. Demand was so great that vessels were diverted from the Spanish market to Bristol. *BNL*, May 19, 1757.

Rains and flooding reduced the harvest and threatened to halt grain exports from England in 1764; see *PG*, May 3 1764; June 28, 1764. Gilbert C. Fite and James E. Reese, *An Economic History of the United States* (Cambridge, Mass., 1959), 64. Jensen, *Maritime Commerce*, 91. Mary Alice Hanna, *The Trade of the Delaware District before the Revolution* (Northampton, Mass., 1917), 320. *EG*, August 30, 1768, reported riots in London to halt exportations. Dickerson, *Navigation Acts and Revolution*, 15.

*PG*, October 24, 1773. For twenty of the years between 1765 and 1800 England imported more grain than it exported.

In 1750 English wheat prices reached 42 pence per bushel. The bounty for export was at 5 shillings per quarter. Freight costs to Iberia are estimated at 7.5 pence per bushel. D. Barnes, *Corn Laws*, 11, 26n.

Spain in the twentieth century had ten million acres in wheat, which yielded only a third as much as France raised on the same acreage. *The World Book Encyclopedia*, 18 vols. (Chicago, 1957), XV: 7613-7614. Clarke, *Letters Concerning Spanish Nation*, 284, described primitive threshing methods, which this author observed in use in the summer of 1967. The government in the 1700s insisted that local grain be sold at low prices, while imports were not so limited. Hamilton, *War and Prices*, 187-194. Herr, *Revolution in Spain*, 132.

Vicens Vives, *Manual*, 376-377, 440-442; *Historia social y economica*, III: 8n; IV: 8-9. Herr, *Revolution in Spain*, 29, 86.

Herr, *Revolution in Spain*, 132. Canga Arguelles, *Diccionario*, III: 296, estimates annual consumption at 7 fanegas (about 11 bushels). Another reference (V: 217) sets consumption (1797) at 50.6 million bushels. If population was at 13.5 million that meant 3.75 bushels per capita. Cf. Vicens Vives, *Historia social y economica*, IV: 161-163. In 1797 Spain produced about 50 million bushels. Foronda, *Cartas Sobre*, II: 98. David Klingaman, "Food Surpluses and Deficits in the American Colonies, 1768-1772," *JEH* XXXI (1971): 559, uses 4.9 bushels per capita and cites Marvin W. Towne and Wayne D. Rasmussen, *Trends in the American Economy in the Nineteenth Century* (Princeton, N.J., 1960), 294, which accepts 4.3 bushels.

Vicens Vives, *Historia social y economica*, IV: 8-9, 14, 161n. One fanega is 1.56 bushels; *Manual*, 442-444, 461. Clarke, *Letters Concerning Spanish Nation*, 284.

Vicens Vives, *Historia social y economica*, III: chapter I. His data are for the early seventeenth century; population later shifted toward coastal sections.

"Averia Accounts," 1770-1775, list twenty-four grain carriers from North America arriving. Grain paid no tax so values cannot be estimated. Other nations doubtless also sent grain. James Banks, consul for Galicia/Asturia, reported English vessels there, 1768-1772. See Banks to Board of Trade, January 27, 1768, Original Correspondence of the Board of Trade, CO 388/55; Banks to Rochford, July 25, 1772, SPFS 94/190; Banks to Weymouth, September 20, 1769, December 27, 1769; August 31, 1770, SPFS 94/182. No data have been found for Santander or St. Sebastian. One barrel of flour equals 4.5 bushels of wheat.

One source indicates that such exports totaled 780,000 bushels in 1755, an exaggerated figure. *BNL*, August 23, 1750. Carrera Pujal, *Economia Española*, IV: 38. Delves and Duff to Dalrymple, August 13, 1772, SPFS 94/191, data on Cadiz reports, 1771-1773.

Townshend, *Journey through Spain*, II: 421-422. Consul's reports from Cadiz cover the full year 1771 and six months of 1773. The Falklands crisis of 1771 limited shipments but 1773 saw heavy demand, and it is presumed that the two years together reflect an annual average. Beawes to Richmond, July 8, 1766 SPFS 94/174, noted that Moroccans opposed exports to there. San Lucar and Seville were satellites of Cadiz. Christelow, "Trades from Cadiz and Lisbon," 17, notes that Lisbon was "the more treasured and profitable traffic."

Townshend, *Journey through Spain*, III: 11n, 122n. Bannester to Halifax, SPFS 94/167, notes that only thirty-six English vessels reached Valencia from February 1763 to June 2, 1764. Marsh to Rochdale, February 11, 1774, SPFS 94/195, does not indicate grain or flour traded there. Townshend makes no reference to the volume of grain entries at Alicante and Valencia, III: 169, 179, 265-270.

Miller to Rochdale, October 1, 1769; April 3, 1773; September 30, 1773; September 30, 1774; October 7, 1774, SPFS 94/193-194, 196. In 1773-1774 some forty-three vessels arrived there with grain and flour from other than American ports, though several appear to have been Americans arriving indirectly. Townshend, *Journey through Spain*, I: 118.

Collins to Bradshaw, June 29, 1769, SPFS 1/474. Some supplies reached there via Barcelona. See Miller to Halifax, May 1, 1764, SPFS 94/167. Morales Padron, *Comercio Canario-Americano*, 201.

Vicens Vives, *Manual*, 463. Carrera Pujal, *Economía Española*, III: 369. Herr, *Revolution in Spain*, 20-21. *NYM*, September 17, 1753. *PG*, September 13, 1753. Anderson, *Europe in Eighteenth Century*, 56. Rochford to Conway, March 24, 1766, SPFS 94/173.

CO 16/1. Average exports of wheat and flour to southern Europe reached 1,340,216 bushels per year.

For Lisbon imports, see Fisher, "Anglo-Portuguese Trade" (PhD diss.). Ibbetson to Board of Trade, August 3, 1765, CO 388/95. Oeyrus to Lyttleton, July 21, 1768, SPFP 89/65. Portugal imported 150,000 quarters (1,200,000 bushels) annually, worth £300,000 sterling; Hort to Shelburne, October 8, 1768, SPFP 89/66; Portugal produced one-third of its grain needs. Hort to Walpole, May 6, 1774, "An Account of all Goods, etc. Imported into or Exported from Portugal in 1772," SPFP 89/77. *PG*, July 20, 1738, in 1736 Lisbon entered 669 vessels with grain and flour, mostly English. Hort's "Report on Lisbon Trade, 1772-1773," SPFP 89/77. Average entrances 228,247 bushels of wheat; 1,085,505 bushels of Indian corn; 66,298.5 barrels of flour. None came from England or Ireland. For small Portuguese ports, see SPFP 89/77; few specifics except for fish.

Pombal to Lyttleton, July 21, 1768, SPFP 89/65, says imports of 150,000 quarters went yearly. Cf. Carnota, *Memoirs of Pombal*, II.

Hort to Lyttleton, October 8, 1768, SPFP 89/65, estimated that Portugal grew one-third of its wheat. Ibbetson to Board of Trade, August 3, 1765, CO 388/95, noted that Portugal produced enough for six months consumption. The remainder came from England, the American colonies, the Mediterranean, and, when grain was cheap there, France. In that year one hundred grain carriers arrived at Lisbon.

If Portugal's population was 2.4 million by 1770, with consumption at 3 bushels per capita, the nation needed 7.2 million bushels in a normal year, and local production would have been about 6 million bushels.

Thomas Cheap's "Report on the Trade of Madeira," July 1, 1765, SPFP 89/77. Madeira raised one-fourth of its needs, so consumption was at about 1.66 bushels per capital. The Azores occasionally exported surplus grain, English traders sold goods there, and took wheat on to Madeira. Cary, *Essay on Trade*, 118.

SPFP 89/77.

Dumouriez, *Portugal*, 202-205. Carnota, *Memoirs of Pombal*, I: 87; II: 33-40. Bourgoing, *Travels of Duke de Châtelet*, I: 284.

Vicens Vives, *Historia social y economica*, IV: 161; *Manual*, 462, 517. Foronda, *Cartas Sobre*, II: 72, 90.

See Table 8-1. Vicens Vives, *Manual*, 516-517.

*CSPC*, XLI (1734-1735): 322-323.

Richard Pares, "The Economic Factor in the History of the Empire," I: 419-422, in Carus-Wilson, *Essays in Economic History*. McLachlan, *Trade and Peace*, 4. V. Barnes, *Dominion of New England*, 140-141. Barnes sees the English pushed from West Indies provision markets by 1675. Bidwell and Falconer, *Agriculture in Northern United States*, 134. Jensen, *Maritime Commerce*, 63.

Pares, "Economic Factor," 419-422. For voyage length from England, see *CPR*, November 17, 1759, January 1, 1763, January 15, 1763, January 23, 1763, and March 19, 1763.

Darret B. Rutman, "Governor Winthrop's Garden Crop: The Significance of Agriculture in the Early Commerce of Massachusetts Bay." *WMQ* XX (1963): 396, 402, 405. Marion H. Gottfried, "The First Depression in Massachusetts." *NEQ* IX (1936): 672. *Boston Records*, 395, reports on September 14, 1645 on Edmond and John of London taking 3,000 bushels of corn, wheat, and "pease" to Bilbao. *Winthrop's Journal*, II: 154, 245, 341.

John Franklin Jameson, ed., *Johnson's Wonder Working Providence, 1628-1651* (New York, 1910), 247. Black stem rust ended the exportability of New England's wheat.

Beer, *Colonial System*, I: 265.

Lyman Carrier, *The Beginnings of Agriculture in America* (New York, 1923), 185. Rutman, "Winthrop's Garden Crop," 44. Giesecke, *American Commercial Legislation*, 22. Virginia D. Harrington, *The New York Merchants on the Eve of the Revolution* (New York, 1935), 276. *Bolton Letters*, I: 8, 16-17. He noted so much grain sent from America that "Wheate cannot be shipped from England." I: 156. Lawrence A. Leder, *Robert Livingston and the Politics of Colonial New York* (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1961), 17.

Tolles, *Meeting House*, 87.

Harper, *Navigation Laws*, 401. Pennsylvania's permission was granted June 24, 1727; New York's June 1, 1730. Andrews, *Colonial Period*, IV: 109. Lounsbury, *British Fishery*, 96, on the role of George Downing. *CSPC*, XLI (1734-1735): 255, 269, on Maryland's request to import salt. Wolff, *Colonial Agency of Pennsylvania*, 31.

The extant NORNY cover the period June 1717 through March 1742 fairly thoroughly, though a number of quarter reports are missing in CO 5/1222-1227. Folio 1228 contains about ten quarters in the early 1750s and eight quarters, January 1, 1763-January

5, 1765. Sections of the records are badly stained and in part illegible.

NORNY, 1225-1227 (March 1731-March 1742).

NORNY, 1222-1224 (March 1717-September 1730).

NORNY, 1222-1225.

NORNY, 1225-1228.

NORNY, 1223-1227.

NORNY, 1223-1228. CO 16/1

CO 16/1.

Stuart Bruchey, *The Colonial Merchant* (New York, 1966), Table 2, 12. CO 16/1.

Madeira prices are from mercantile correspondence.

No price runs have been found for other wine. First cost has been set at £6 per pipe to 1740; at £10.4 per pipe to 1764; and £15.2 per pipe, 1765-1774.

Beer, *British Colonial Policy*, 280-281. Island wine entering directly now paid £3.5 per pipe. If my price is accurate, the tax represented a levy of more than 25% of first costs.

Andrews, *Colonial Period*, IV: 109. T. Bentley Duncan, *Atlantic Islands; Madeira, the Azores, and the Cape Verdes in Seventeenth-Century Commerce and Navigation* (Chicago, [1972]), for comments on English privileges at the Isle of May.

Vicens Vives, *Manual*, 517, prices Spanish salt at 5 reales per fanega (109.5 lbs.) to foreigners, equal to 9 shillings per bushel, which is very, very high. Board of Trade Papers 6/266, gives a Setubal price of 3.75 pence per bushel, including export taxes, which is quite low. An acceptable figure for all salt sources would be 7.5 pence per bushel or 14.06s. per ton, on board.

Wheat-to-salt ratios varied over time from a low of about 8.4 bushels of salt (1720s) to 15.3 bushels (1760s) to one bushel of wheat. Wine ratios ranged from 2.12 tons of wheat to more than 5 tons (1770s) per ton of Madeira.

NORNY. CO 16/1.

Ibid. Lyttleton to Shelburne, October 3, 1768; Hort to Shelburne, October 8, 1768, SPFP 89/66.

Mayne, Burn & Mayne to Galloway, July 5, 1764, Galloway Papers.

NORNY, 1222-1228.

Note 62.6% of entrances and 68.9% of clearances took place before 1740. New York-registered vessels often had non-New York owners.

Reference is to the PSR, 1729-1737, 1750-1755, and 1770-1775. For a description of this source, see Thomas M. Doerflinger, *A Vigorous Spirit of Enterprise: Merchants and Economic Development in Revolutionary Philadelphia* (Chapel Hill, N.C. 1986), 386-387.

Data on the voyages come from PC. British and Irish owners held about twenty percent of locally registered vessels. PSR, July 1729-October 1731; January 1736-December 1739.

PC, 1750-1755. PRS, 1750-1755. Non-Pennsylvania ownership was at 56.2%.

PC, 1770-1774. PSR, 1770-1775.

The tonnage duty, six pence per measured ton, supported a lighthouse at the Delaware entrance. Duties were paid on entrance to the port. TDB list vessel names, rigs, masters, arrival dates, points of origin (for about two-thirds of entries), and names of owners or consignees. New vessels were treated as if entering. These are the most accurate figures for tonnages. Combined with PC data, they provide clearance statistics for this period.

Philadelphia newspapers were weeklies, so customs data are accurate to within seven days. PC, 1720-1774. *PG*, January 26, 1764.

PC, 1764-1774. Local vessels cleared in 27.5 days; others in 37.5 days. PC, 1729-1737, 106 vessels cleared on average in 45.5 days; PC, 1750-1755, 114 vessels on average 48 days; PC, 1770-1775, 225 vessels, 28.2 days.

Bartholemew Putnam to Andrew Cabot, March 9, 1772, Cabot "Papers."

The weekly commercial newspaper at Lisbon *CPR* reported 29 entries from Philadelphia over the years 1757-1759. The average voyage lasted 36.8 days. The longest took 60 days, the shortest 14.

PC. During the first time period vessels (60) took on average 139.1 days and in the third period, vessels (300) only 125.4 days. Even by the 1750s voyage lengths had dropped to 129.4 days. Apparently, familiarity with the trading pattern increased productivity. Of 71 voyages to the Wine Islands in the 1750s and 1770s, average length was 116.1 days. Some 194 voyages to Lisbon in those years averaged 119.1 days.

Davis, *Rise of English Shipping*, 72-73.

PSR, August 7, 1751. The snow *Betsey* was registered at sixty tons but probably measured out at more than one hundred tons. *PG*, December 17, 1751-December 13, 1753.

Jensen, *Maritime Commerce*, 72, 77, says Philadelphia took up to 100,000 bushels of wheat in coastwise, mainly from the Delaware counties. As only one example, *BNL*, January 31, 1754, refers to two Philadelphia vessels bound from Chesapeake Bay for Lisbon. William Bell Clark, ed., *Naval Documents of the American Revolution*, 15 vols. (Washington, D.C., 1964-2005), I: 1361-1394, provides some Naval Office data for Virginia and Maryland.

SPFS 94/176 and 94/196, Barcelona Consular reports from James Miller for the late 1760s and early 1770s.

Jensen, *Maritime Commerce*, 75, 92.

"Livros," 1770-1775.

Miller to Shelburne, January 3, 1767, SPFS 94/176, reported American wheat imports in 1766 as 149,188 bushels: from

Maryland 51,750 bushels; from Philadelphia 36,993 bushels; from Quebec 38,980 bushels. doesn't add Miller to Rochford, October 2 1773, SPFS 94/194, on wheat qualities. Cf. CO 16/1 and Shepherd and Walton, *Shipping, Maritime Trade*, Appendix, 168-169.

Ibid. John Baker Holyrod (Lord Sheffield) in *Observations on the Commerce of the American States* (London, 1784), 45, indicates that in 1774 a hundred ships carried Canadian wheat to southern Europe.

CO 16/1. Shepherd and Walton, *Shipping, Maritime Trade*, 211-226. Tons of flour are converted on the basis of 11.48 barrels per ton.

CO 16/1. Joseph A. Ernst, "The Political Economy of the Chesapeake Colonies, 1760-1775," in Ronald Hoffman et al., eds. *The Economy of Early America: The Revolutionary Period, 1763-1790* (Charlottesville, Va., 1988), 215-218. As early as 1765 Baltimore shipped 120,000 bushels of wheat to those markets.

Clark, *Naval Documents*, I: 1361-1394. Freight charges were at 5s. per bushel for wheat and 1.11s. per bushel for corn. Pennsylvanians probably earned about £12,000 annually for carrying goods from other colonies to Iberia.

PC and TDB data allow creation of ship histories. For the manning of vessels, see Davis, *Rise of English Shipping*, 71-73. Larger vessels managed with fewer hands. NORNY provides ratios for vessel classes, as follows: ships 8.02 tons/man; brigs 6.41 tons/man; snows 7.68 tons/man; sloops 4.55 tons/man; schooners 5.64 tons/man. Over the yearly average was 76 vessels, 8,907 tons, 1,246 men, and 7.15 tons/man. New York tonnage was understated by at least one-third, increasing the ratio to 10.72 tons/man.

PC, 1730-1739, southern European ports took 287 vessels, 19,670 tons, out of a total clearing of 1,469 vessels and 87,510 tons. From 1766-1770 the colony cleared 429 vessels, 28,450 tons to those points out of a total going overseas of 1,867 vessels and 111, 580 tons.

See Table 8-6. CO 16/1. Pennsylvania carried about 57.2% of the total tonnage going there and owned 55.3% of the vessels clearing to there.

Wolff, *Colonial Agency of Pennsylvania*, 31. Henry C. Hunter, *How England Got Its Merchant Marine* (New York, 1935), 254-255. Tolles, *Meeting House*, 106-108. Andrews, *Colonial Period*, IV: 109.

D. Barnes, *Corn Laws*, 11, 26.

## chapter 9

PG, May 1, 1755.

Twiss, *Travels through Portugal*, 26.

Fisher, "Anglo-Portuguese Trade" (PhD diss.), 97.

Gaff-rigged, single-masted vessels, carrying perhaps twenty tons of salt, were unloading cargoes at the Caix do Sodre along the Tagus as late as 1967. Brawny stevedores shoveled the salt into burlap bags, carried it ashore, dumped it into warehouses, and took the bags back to be refilled.

CPR, 1771-1776.

Tyrawley to Newcastle, June 6, 1732, SPFP 89/37.

Boxer, *Reactions to Earthquake*, 6.

Francis, *Methuens*, 114.

Dumouriez, *Portugal*, 203.

PG, June 28, 1753; May 1, 1755. Hort to Rochford, August 4, 1771, SPFP 89/71; Walpole to Rochford, March 21, 1772, SPFP 89/72; Walpole to Rochford, August 19, 1772, SPFP 89/73.

CPR records entrances and clearances, general cargo descriptions, names of consignees, and lists of vessels in port.

PG, July 20, 1738. Bourgoing *Travels of Duke de Châtelet*, 271. Fisher, "Anglo-Portuguese Trade" (PhD diss.), 79n, 105.

Christelow, "Trades from Cadiz and Lisbon," 17.

Fisher, "Anglo-Portuguese Trade (diss.)," 105. British Museum, Additional Mss. 23726, in 1699 more than 200 entered; in 1700, 207 entries. CPR.

Tolles, *Meeting House*, 87.

Bezanson, Gray, and Hussey, *Prices in Colonial Pennsylvania*, 9, cites Norris to Pike, June 1711. By the 1720s approximately forty American vessels entered yearly, the majority with Newfoundland fish.

Bezanson, Gray, and Hussey, *Prices in Colonial Pennsylvania*, 93-94, suggests that Hall understated Pennsylvania prices, though he may have presumed a small profit on the original outlay of £500. The Lisbon price of 4s. per bushel appears quite accurate.

Letter to M.L. Dicker, June 5, 1736, Reynell, "Letter Book, 1734-1737."

Letter to Williams, September 11, 1740, Till "Papers, 1735-1744," as cited by Jensen, *Maritime Commerce*, 59. Such exports now required a bond of £1,000, assuring delivery at an English port.

Letter to Flexney, April 12, 1741, Reynell, "Letter Book, 1738-1741."

Letter to Thomas Willing, July 1, 1757, Charles and Thomas Willing. "Letter Book, 1754-1761," HSP.

Letter to Perks, April 27, 1758; letter to Scott, Pringle & Cheap, September 21, 1757, *ibid*.

CPR, April 10, 1757-December 31, 1759. In these years fifty-six fish vessels entered from New England and seventy from Newfoundland.

Ibid., in 1758 Admiral Osborn cruised with his fleet on the Spanish coast to protect the fish carriers from America. Walter L. Dorn, *Competition for Empire, 1740-1763* (New York, 1940), 104.

Frankland to Cleveland, May 20, 1761, Consular Letters to the Admiralty, ADM 1/3836. PG, January 8, 1761; February 12,

1762.

"Livros," 1769-1775. North American vessels entering reached 1,064. An added 173 arrived but went to other ports. See Table 9-1. Sixty fish carriers were franked.

Hort to Rochford, March 23, 1775, SPFP 89/79.

"Livros," 1769-1774. Philadelphia in the years 1770 and 1771 sent 162 vessels (32,321 tons) to Lisbon; Sweden 41 vessels (13,287 tons); Sicily 48 (11,917 tons); Bahia 28 (11, 140 tons); Amsterdam 47 (10,641 tons); Carolina 37 (8,734 tons); Newfoundland 60 (8,329 tons); Maryland 34 (6,123 tons); Virginia 26 (4,529 tons); New York 11 (1,896 tons).

Enclosure in Walpole to Rochford, "List of the Merchant Ships entered and cleared at the Port of Lisbon for the Years 1772 and 1773," June 6, 1774, SPFP 89/77. Some 734 English ships entered and 752 cleared; 257 entered from North America. "The Maritime Commerce of Lisbon in 1765, 1766, 1767 and 1768," March 13, 1769, SPFP 89/67. In those years North American entries were 119, 115, 84, and 151, respectively

"Livros," 1772-1773. CPR, 1772-1773. Hort to Walpole, May 6, 1774, SPFP 89/77.

TDB, Philadelphia cleared 102 vessels (13,453 tons) to Lisbon in 1772-1773 and had 87 entries from there (10,795); comparison of number of vessels is acceptable, figures for tonnage are not. The Marcos data is probably more accurate.

Hort and Factory to Walpole, May 6, 1774, contained Walpole to Rochford, May 6, 1774, SPFP 89/77.

Ibid. Emphasis mine.

Newfoundland was an exception to this rule. That branch of the fishery was based mainly in England, but fish sold in Lisbon still resulted in remittances to England.

Letter to Williams, October 5, 1734, Pemberton, "Letter Book, 1727-1735."

AWM, 1729-1737. PG, 1729-1737. PSR, 1728-1740.

Ibid.

PSR, May 22, 1730.

PSR, 1748-1755. PG, 1750-1755. Fifteen resided in English ports; thirteen in Ireland; seven in southern Europe; five in the West Indies; three in other colonies, and two at unknown locations.

PSR, *Snow Rachel*, November 24, 1750. PG, October 17, 1751-November 13, 1755. Brig *Marlborough*, PSR, March 28, 1750; PG, October 4, 1750-April 4, 1754. Ship *Halifax*, PSR, November 2, 1749; PG, April 19, 1750-October 24, 1751.

PSR, 1748-1755; PG, 1750-1755.

PSR, 1748-1755.

PSR, *Dursley Galley*, December 8, 1750; Ship *Swanzy*, March 24, 1755; Ship *Union*, November 29, 1753; Ship *Industry*, March 1, 1749; Ship *Boyne*, April 30, 1750; Ship *Eurydale*, June 27, 1755.

John J. McCusker, "Sources of Investment Capital in the Colonial Philadelphia Shipping Industry," *JEH* XXII (1972): 147-148, estimates vessels in service at £5 sterling/ton. Registered tonnage at Philadelphia discounted measured tonnage by about forty percent.

PSR, April 2, 1752; April 16, 1752.

PSR, November 29, 1753. PG, November 6, 1753. CPR, January 15, 1758; February 27, 1758; August 8, 1758; September 16, 1758.

CPR, 1769-1775. "Livros," 1769-1775.

See Table 9-1.

Lisbon/Philadelphia trade data are not precisely comparable. PG and TDB should and do coincide quite well on entrances from Lisbon. They do not match figures from CPR and the "Livros" Lisbon arrivals because of the elapsed time between Philadelphia clearances and Tagus River arrivals. The same was true of trade Lisbon to America. Missing issues also cause minor difficulties. Recorders of tonnage duties failed to enter point of origin for a considerable number of arrivals. PC reports answer those discrepancies. Vessels clearing had already paid tonnage fees.

PSR, 1769-1774. PC, 1769-1775. TDB, 1769-1774.

Ships carried 57.25% of the tonnage; brigs and snows, 42.0%. The rest went on fore and aft sloops and schooners.

TDB, 1769-1774. PC, 1769-1774. English, Spanish, and Portuguese records of these years reveal that a considerable number of the 283 vessels identified in the trade also made voyages from other North American points to those centers. In all 72 carriers held Pennsylvania registries; 18 were of unknown origin.

See Table 9-4.

A-JL, 100-101. Invoice for goods loaded on the *Agnes and Betty*, John Brome, master, July 3, 1739, Reynell "Letter Book, 1738-1741." Charges included branding and nailing barrels, 20 1/2d. each; measuring wheat 9d. per 100 bushel; portering, measuring, and loading wheat 5/6 per bushel; culling and piling pipe staves, 2/6 per 1,000.

Arthur H. Cole, "The Tempo of Mercantile Life in Colonial America." *Business History Review* XXXIII: 277-299.

Instructions to Captain David Stewart, brig *Nancy*, May 6, 1757, Willing "Letter Book."

Letter to Flexney, June 8, 1734, Reynell "Letter Book, 1741-1744."

CPR, 1757-1776, refers to 276 voyages from Philadelphia to Lisbon. The average crossing took 37.4 days.

PSR, July 9, 1771. Miller's report on shipping to Barcelona, October 1, 1770-March 31, 1771, SPFS 94/193. CPR, August 11, 1772, entrance; September 2, 1772, clearance. Board of Trade to Shelburne, Report on Anglo-Portuguese Trade Problems, March 10, 1767, SPFP 89/64. Three customs guards cost £2.5 sterling per day. "Livros," August 1772. Clarke, *Letters Concerning Spanish Nation*, 354.

PG, October 28, 1772. CPR, August 19, 1772, entered; cleared in ballast, September 2, 1772.  
 PG, November 11, 1772. CPR, December 5, 1772; December 21, 1772.  
 CO 16/1, Philadelphia's exports to southern Europe converted into tons, in relation to the tonnage of this vessel.  
 See footnote for Table 9-6. Letter to Bacon, April 12, 1757, Willing "Letter Book," referred to Morris becoming a partner on May 1, 1757.  
 Presumably consignees disposed of arriving cargoes and arranged for those clearing to southern Europe.  
 CPR, 1766-1775. Consular Report on English Shipping to Barcelona, SPFS 94/193.  
 Six vessels entered from Madeira and five cleared to there. The remainder traded to Tenerife.  
 PG and CPR, 1766-1776. Davis, *Rise of English Shipping*, 128.  
 CPR, 171-1776. Doerflinger, *Vigorous Spirit*, 109.  
 Francis, *Methuens*, 60. British Museum, Additional Mss. 23726, folio 25. Fairchild, *Pepperrells*, 42. "Representations from the Portugal Merchants," November 23, 1709, SPFP 89/89. Tolles, *Meeting House*, 87.  
 Fairchild, *Pepperrells*, 103-105. Gerald Cobb, *Oporto Older and Newer* (London, 1965), 72-81. London in biblio; Chichester, Eng.? in fn  
 Letters to Barclay, February 14, 1732; June 1, 1733, Pemberton "Letter Book, 1727-1735."  
 Letters to Flexney, May 23, 1740; May 31, 1740; June 13, 1740; July 14, 1740; October 10, 1740, Reynell "Letter Book, 1738-1741."  
 Letters to Leybourne & Co., August 13, 1742; August 21, 1742, Reynell "Letter Book, 1741-1744."  
 Letter to Leybourne & Stubbs, June 17, 1746, Israel Pemberton "Letter Book, 1744-1747," American Philosophical Library, Philadelphia. Letters to Stubbs & Taylor, October 26, 1753, Reynell "Letter Book, 1752-1754."  
 Horne to Hancock, May 27, 1754, Thomas Hancock "Papers," VII, BL.  
 Letter to Carter & Wentworth, August 12, 1765, Lloyd "Letter Book."  
 Report of the Historical Association (Lisbon Branch), I (1937-1945): 162-166. PSR, April 2, 1752.  
 Walford, *British Factory*, 43-45. PSR, November 29, 1753; April 2, 1752; April 9, 1752.  
 Walford, *British Factory*, 16.  
 Ibid., 59-60.  
 Lyttleton to Shelburne, October 3, 1768; Hort to Shelburne, October 8, 1768, SPFP 89/66. Depositions, November 29, 1764; November 30, 1764, Correspondence of the Board of Trade, CO 388/53.  
 CPR, 1757-1776. Seven cargoes were delivered to unknown firms and one disposed of by its captain. Two rice cargoes also came to unknown consignees. Lumber products, mainly staves, entered as incidental added imports with other goods.  
 CPR, 1757-1776. Letter to Mayne, Burn & Mayne, August 5, 1755, Willing "Letter Book," expressed condolences at news of his [?] death. Matters are further complicated by various spellings of Burn (Burne, Burns) or Murrough (Murray, Morrough, Morrow). See Table 9-7.  
 Newfoundland sent about 44,200 quintals of cod to Lisbon; New England 19,500. Hort to Walpole, May 6, 1774; June 6, 1774 and enclosures, SPFP 89/77.  
 CPR, 1771-1776. In these years Parr & Bulkeley handled 225.5 cargoes; Maynes 245 cargoes; Pasleys, 134; Garnaults, 89.5; Hake 81; Burn 75. Those from North America were Parr & Bulkeley 76.5%; Hake 66.7%; Pasleys 58.2%; Burn 42.6%, Maynes 36%; and Garnaults 22.9%.  
 Ibid. National identification is complicated. The editors translated English names into Portuguese, so Paul George became Paulo Jorge. Spelling was far from systematic, thus assigning nationalities far from scientific.  
 Parr & Bulkeley to Thomas Clifford, February 6, 1764; May 10, 1764; August 26, 1765; September 26, 1765; November 10, 1765; December 13, 1765, Clifford "Correspondence," IV.  
 Letter to Parr & Bulkeley, April 8, 1765, Riche "Letter Book, 1765/4-1771." 1764 in biblio!  
 PSR, Parr, November 1, 1769; Morris, November 14, 1768; Nesbitt, November 9, 1769; King of Portugal, January 26, 1769; Queen of Portugal, March 19, 1773; Ceres, October 27, 1769.  
 Crowle to Cleveland, May 29, 1753, Letters from British Consuls, ADM 1/3833.

## chapter 10

Beer, *Commercial Policy*, 54. France required an import license.  
 United States, Bureau of the Census, *Historical Statistics of the United States, Colonial Times to 1970*, 2 parts (Washington, D.C., 1975), Series Z, 486-492, 1193. card catalog says 2 vols. no mention of series see fn 32, 35, 39  
 Townshend, *Journey through Spain*, III: 236. Canga Arguelles, *Diccionario*, I: 234-235. Angel Ruiz y Pablo, *Historia de la Real Junta Particular de Comercia de Barcelona, 1758-1847* (Barcelona, 1919), 127-128. In the eighteenth century rice cultivation was halted in Aragon as deleterious to the rice growers.  
 Robert Horne, "A brief description of the province of Carolina," in Alexander S., Salley, ed., *Narratives of Early Carolina, 1650-1708* (New York, 1911), 69. Macpherson, *Annals*, II: 723-724. Peter A. Coclanis, "Distant Thunder: The Creation of a World Market in Rice and the Transformation It Wrought," *AHR* 98 (1993): 1056. Peter H. Wood, *Black Majority: Negroes in Colonial South Carolina* (New York, 1974), 35-36.  
 Nettels, *Money Supply*, 113-114. Duncan C. Heyward, *Seed from Madagascar* (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1937), 7.  
 John Oldmixon, "From the history of the British empire in America," in Salley, *Narratives of Carolina*, 369. [not a citation,

actually one of the narratives] R.C. Nash, "South Carolina and the Atlantic Economy in the Late Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries," *EHR* XLV (1992): 677-702.

Leila Sellers, *Charleston Business on the Eve of the American Revolution* (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1934), 151. Heyward, *Seed from Madagascar*, 4. Macpherson, *Annals*, II: 723-724.

*PG*, November 4, 1762.

Gee, *Trade and Navigation*, 21-22.

Champion, *Considerations on Situation of Great Britain*, 105-106. C. Robert Haywood, "Mercantilism and South Carolina Agriculture, 1700-1763," *South Carolina Historical Magazine* LX (1959): 15-27.

Gee, *Trade and Navigation*, 22.

*Ibid.* Kenneth Morgan, "The Organization of the Colonial Rice Trade," *WMQ* LII (1995): 438-440. Changes to regulations in 1764-1765 allowed reexportation without unloading and reloading the rice, cutting costs and speeding the process. For Italian rice production and competition, see Nash, "South Carolina and Atlantic Economy," 682-686. Gee, *Trade and Navigation*, 22.

Ashley, *Surveys Historic and Economic*, 316.

Oliver M. Dickerson, *American Colonial Government, 1696-1765: A Study of the Board of Trade* (Cleveland, Ohio, 1912), 296n. Andrews, *Colonial Period*, IV: 95-96. Harper, *Navigation Laws*, 262. Robert Quarry, "Report on New England Commerce, 1708," *Proceedings of MHS*, 2nd ser., IV (1888): 154. Quarry was a Vice Admiralty judge at Philadelphia and then surveyor of the customs.

Letter to Parr & Bulkeley, April 8, 1765, Riche "Letter Book, 1764-1771."

Woodford to Grafton, February 13, 1766, Correspondence of the Board of Trade, CO 388/53. Dickerson, *American Colonial Government*, 67, 296n, argues that this was rarely the case.

"A Humble Representation of the Lisbon Factory," August 30, 1711, SPFP 89/89.

Lisbon Factory to Board of Trade, July 31, 1715, SPFP 89/23. Six thousand tons of rice equaled 25,714 barrels at 525 pounds per barrel.

*Ibid.*

Andrews, *Colonial Period*, IV: 94-97. Channing, *History of United States*, II: 495. *PG*, August 6, 1730. *CSPC*, XXV (1730): 56. Harper, *Navigation Laws*, 262, 398-399. Direct exportation to southern Europe was extended to the Carolinas (1730), Georgia (1733), and West Florida (1770).

Morgan, "Colonial Rice Trade," 439.

*Ibid.*, 439-440. Nash, "South Carolina and Atlantic Economy," Table 3, 684.

*PG*, August 6, 1730.

Letter to Flexney, January 20, 1743, Reynell "Letter Book, 1741-1744."

Letter to C. Mayne, September 14, 1764, Willing "Letter Book."

Letters from James & Wilson, February 15, 1775; May 10, 1775, Henry Keppelle & Joseph Steinmetz "Correspondence," HSP, Jasper, Yeates, Brinton Collection. biblio differs from your fn.

Sellers, *Charleston Business*, 158-159. On occasion that rate rose as high as 6.33 shillings sterling per barrel.

*Ibid.*, 157.

*PG*, April 8, 1731. *CSPC*, XXXVIII (1734-1735): 367.

*CSPC*, XXXVIII (1734-1735): 372.

Macpherson, *Annals*, III: 156.

Russell R. Menard, "Slavery, Economic Growth and Revolutionary Ideology in the South Carolina Low Country," in Hoffman et al., *Economy of Early America*, 249-255. Nash, "South Carolina and Atlantic Economy," 680-681; Table I, 680; Table 4, 684, both converted to 525-pound barrels. *Historical Statistics*, Series 481-485, 1192. Nash compares Italian and American production. see fn 2

*NEWJ*, May 17, 1731. *PG*, June 3, 1731. Arrival in Iberia before Lent, the fasting time, was most important.

Converse D. Clowse, *Measuring Charleston's Overseas Commerce, 1717-1767* (Washington, D.C., 1981), 57-60.

*Historical Statistics*, 1164. Naval Office Records cover much of the 1730s, then only five years to 1767, though CO 16/1 is valuable for 1768-1772. Reconciling data in pounds, hundredweights, and changeable barrels is a problem. Barrels varied from 450 pounds in the 1730s to 525 pounds post-1754. Hundredweights also varied from Charleston, 100 to 112.5 pounds, elsewhere and in Portugal to 128 pounds. Where practicable data are standardized, barrels 525 pounds; hundredweights 112.5 pounds.

References to an annual crop of rice sometimes mean crop years, November to November. McCusker and Menard, *Economy of British America*, 177n. *NEWJ*, May 17, 1731. *PG*, June 3, 1731. American rice prices are from Cole, *Wholesale Commodity Prices*, II: 154.

*Historical Statistics*, Series 481-485, 1192; Series 493-499, 1193.

Cole, *Wholesale Commodity Prices*, II: 15-68. McCusker and Menard, *Economy of British America*, 177.

CO 16/1. In a normal year perhaps 3,000 barrels of rice came out to Spain and Portugal, usually from Cowes or London.

Charles Whitworth, *The State of the Trade of Great Britain in its Imports and Exports Progressively from the Year 1697 to 1773* (London, 1776), 53-54. Francis B.C. Bradlee, "Colonial Trade and Commerce, 1733-1774," *Essex Institute Historical Collections*, LXIII: 12.

Nash, "South Carolina and Atlantic Economy," Table 5, 680, 686. *Historical Statistics*, Series Z, 493-499, 1193.

Report to James Gray, July 1767, "Observations on the Exports and Imports to and from Spain and England, Christmas 1750 to

Christmas 1765,” SPFS 94/177. Annual reports, 1763-1765, were £984, £2,565, £8,588.

For 1771-1772, see CO 16/1. *CPR*. “Livros.” Clowse, *Charleston’s Overseas Commerce*, 57-64. Barcelona in 1773 took three cargoes from Cowes, 1,570 barrels. Miller to Rochdale, October 10, 1773, SPFS 94/194. Dickerson, *Navigation Acts and Revolution*, 40, reports indirect shipments that year of 24,684 hundredweights.

Clowse, *Charleston’s Overseas Commerce*, 60. Barrels adjusted to 525 pounds. CO 16/1. “Livros,” 1769-1772. *CPR*, 1769-1772. Rice is estimated at 5.39 barrels per ton, calculated from CO 16/1. Hort to Walpole, May 6, 1774, “Report on the State of the Trade between the British Dominions and the Port of Lisbon, 1772-1773,” SPFP 89/77.

For Oporto, see Hort to Walpole, May 6, 1774, SPFP 89/77. For Madeira, see Cheap and Madeira Factory to Board of Trade, July 1, 1765, SPFP 89/77. Ibbetson to Board of Trade, August 3, 1765, CO 388/95.

Earl J. Hamilton, “The Decline of Spain,” I: 219, in Carus-Wilson, *Essays in Economic History*.

“A Report on the Trade of Cadiz for 1771,” SPFS 94/193, indicates that of ten vessels from the Carolinas and Georgia, only three carried rice. Another “Report of the Trade of Cadiz, January 1, 1733-September 30, 1773,” notes one rice vessel and three with staves entering. A printed circular in SPFS 94/200 titled *Estado General de las Embarcaciones...en Bahia de Cadiz, 1775*, dated December 31, 1775, reports eleven arrivals from Carolina but not cargoes carried.

Consul Miller’s reports on English vessels reaching Barcelona, 1769-1774, to Rochdale, SPFS 94/193 and 196. Two other vessels went on to Cette in southern France.

Burchmore to Joseph Lee, March 14, 1775, Porter, *Jacksons and Lees*, I: 402.

Garidoqui to Joseph Cabot, May 15, 1773, Cabot “Papers.” Earlier shipments are noted in letters dated December 12, 1769; April 6, 1771; and September 30, 1771.

Cabot “Papers.” Cf. Worthington C. Ford, “Colonial Commerce, 1774-1776,” *Proceedings of MHS LIX* (1926): 210n. Porter, *Jacksons and Lees*, I: 397n.

Burchmore to Joseph Lee, January 19, 1775, Porter, *Jacksons and Lees*, I: 402. (you had this letter in Cabot Papers? see fn 47)

Note these barrels averaged 534 pounds each.

Ford, “Colonial Commerce,” 210n. Porter, *Jacksons and Lees*, I: 402-404.

Clowse, *Charleston’s Overseas Commerce*, Table C-61, 141-142; Table C-62, 143-144.

Morgan, “Colonial Rice Trade,” 442-443, refers to the accounts of Holderness, Olive & Newman at Oporto, 1755-1771.

Charleston merchants owned 46.1%, Londoners 18.6%, Bristol 6.9%, Captains 5.7%, and Portuguese firms 2.5%.

Clowse, *Charleston’s Overseas Commerce*, Table C-51, 128-129. Thomas Amory, “Account Book, 1720-1728,” MHS. He traded with the Wine Islands and South Carolina.

CO 16/1.

Doerflinger, *Vigorous Spirit*, 59, 92.

*PG*, 1748-1774. In the late fall and early winter 1763-1764 ten vessels followed this pattern but after that few ships cleared for the Carolinas.

Letter from John Hopton, December 12, 1771, Keppelle & Steinmetz. “Correspondence.” Agreements for chartered vessels set a vessel’s destination and agents to be employed and laid down allowed time for loading and unloading. Morgan, “Colonial Rice Trade,” 448.

Powell & Hopton to Keppelle, March 30, 1772, Keppelle & Steinmetz. “Correspondence.”

James & Wilson to Steinmetz, April 2, 1772, *ibid*.

John James to Keppelle & Steinmetz, September 23, 1772, *ibid*.

John James to Keppelle & Steinmetz, October 16, 1773, *ibid*.

James & Wilson to Keppelle & Steinmetz, February 8, 1774, *ibid*. McCusker and Menard, *Economy of British America*, 177.

*CPR*, 1757-1759, 1763, 1771-1775. Some 120 voyages averaged 42.05 days.

*Ibid*.

Lyttleton to Weymouth, January 14, 1769, SPFP 89/67. The Portuguese sought Carolina advice on the best methods for preparing Brazilian rice for market. *CPR*, 1772-1774. Ibbetson to Board of Trade, August 3, 1765, CO 388/95.

*CPR*, see Table 10-7. Data for Mayne, Burn & Mayne and for Mayne & Co. have been combined.

Hort and Factory to Walpole, May 6, 1774, SPFP 89/77. *CPR*. Prices are from Table 10-9, averaged for 1771 and 1772, amounting to £3.96 per barrel. Total rice sales at minimum £40,721; commissions (5%) £2,036. Added income arose from delivery and transfer of excess funds.

“Livros,” 1769-1775. Carolina entrances totaled 120 vessels, 23,920 tons. See Table 10-3. *CPR*, 1771-1775. CO 16/1 noted such small shipments, 1768-1772.

Shepherd and Walton, *Shipping, Maritime Trade*, Table 7, 228. See Table 10-9. £228,981.

Hort to Walpole, May 6, 1774, with reports on Lisbon and Oporto trade submitted by Hort and Whitehead for 1772 and 1773, SPFP 89/77.

*Ibid*. For rice exports see *Historical Statistics*, Series Z 481-485, 1192; an economic contraction occurred in Europe, 1772-1775.

Thomas S. Ashton, *Economic Fluctuations in England, 1700-1800* (Oxford, 1959), as cited by McCusker and Menard, *Economy of British America*, 62-63.

Cabot “Papers.” These references come from Garidoqui letters to the Lees and Cabots, 1769-1775, and from Parr & Bulkeley letters to the Cliffords and to Keppelle & Steinmetz.

Clowse, *Charleston’s Overseas Commerce*, Table C-61, 141-142; Table C-62, 143-144. Morgan, “Colonial Rice Trade,” 443. see



fn 52; you had C-1

Morgan, "Colonial Rice Trade," 452, citing Arthur Young's *Annals of Agriculture and Other Useful Arts* (London, 1784), I: 13-14. His is a very high estimate. With the exception of two years, 1771 and 1772, southern Europe evidently took about twenty percent of the rice exported.

## chapter 11

*Trelawney Papers*, III: 191-192, 202. Anderson, *Origin of Commerce*, II: 261.  
Dean Albertson, "Puritan Liquor in the Planting of New England," *NEQ* XXIII: 482. *Winthrop's Journal*, II: 269.  
Weeden, *Economic and Social History*, I: 148. A butt and a pipe were equal.  
Bradford, "Of Plimouth Plantation," 191.  
*Boston Records*, 254, 397, 400-401, 418-419.  
Weeden, *Economic and Social History*, I: 183.  
Morales Padron, *Commercio Canario-Americano*, 194-195.  
Giasecke, *American Commercial Legislation*, 5.  
Randolph to Coventry, June 17, 1676, *CSPC*, VIII (1675-1676): 408.  
*CSPC*, IX, (1677-1680): 156-157.  
Holden to Commissioners of Customs, June 10, 1769, *CSPC*, IX, (1677-1680): 372-373.  
George F. Cheever, "Some Remarks on the Commerce of Salem, 1626 to 1740." *Essex Institute Historical Collections* I (1859-1860): 81.  
Entries for October 31, 1685; November 9, 1685; December 4, 1685; December 29, 1685, John Hull, "Journal, 1685-1689," BL.  
V. Barnes, *Dominion of New England*, 158.  
Cranfield to Lords of Trade, May 14, 1684, *CSPC*, X (1681-1685): 1683?.  
Weeden, *Economic and Social History*, I: 239, 354.  
Bailyn and Bailyn, *Massachusetts Shipping*, 149.  
Beer, *Origins*, 416-419.  
Ralph Davis, "English Foreign Trade, 1660-1700," II: 264, in Carus-Wilson, *Essays in Economic History*.  
In biblio this article in *Economic History Review*. Apparently, it is in both places but choose one!  
*Bolton Letters*, I: 16-19. Vidonia wine (Canary) was "of a pale colo'r tasts harsh and is inclined to look thick," William G. Saltonstall, *Ports of Piscataqua* (Cambridge, Mass., 1941), 30, citing Birkett.  
*Ibid.*  
*CSPC*, IX, (1677-1680): 372-373. Giasecke, *American Commercial Legislation*, 14-26.  
NORNY, 1222-1228.  
*Ibid.* Wine island vessels, arriving in ballast, were viewed skeptically by customs officials.  
NORNY, 1228.  
CO 16/1. In these five years Virginia took 128.6 tons of wine on average.  
Whitehead to Rochford, April 30, 1774; SPFP 89/76; Hort to Walpole, May 6, 1774, SPFP 89/77. "An Account of Madeira's Trade," Board of Trade 6/62.  
See Table 11-1.  
*PG*, August 30, 1764.  
Letter to Scott, Pringle & Cheap, December 16, 1765, Lloyd "Letter Book."  
Philip L. White, *The Beekmans of New York, 1647-1877* (New York, 1956), 220-221.  
Letters to Deeble, April 19, 1731; September 30, 1732; letter to Dicker, December 4, 1733, Reynell "Letter Book, 1729-1732."  
Letter to Pope & Company, March 1, 1738, Faneuil "Letter Book."  
Letter to Pope & Company, December 15, 1738, *ibid.* I added, based on your *ibid.*  
Letter to Peter Lynch, September 10, 1738, *ibid.*  
Letter to Baynton, Wharton & Morgan, September 30, 1765, Lloyd "Letter Book."  
Letter? from Reed & Pettit, August 11, 1763, Thomas Fayerweather "Papers." Where? Not in biblio!  
Letter to Willing & Morris, October 17, 1765, Lloyd "Letter Book." James & Wilson of Charleston wrote them, July 29, 1774, that they had not sold their wine "owing to its being in Pipes was it in Qr. casks could vend some." Keppelle & Steinmetz "Correspondence."  
*NEWJ*, March 8, 1737. John Reynell sold wine in flasks, *PG*, November 2, 1738.  
*PG*, August 4, 1763.  
Letter to Shirley & Martin, August 1, 1764, Riche "Letter Book, 1764-1771."  
White, *Beekmans*, 326.  
Jensen, *Maritime Commerce*, 61-62.  
*CSPC*, XXVIII (August 1714-December 1715), xxvi, 15.  
Letter from Parr & Bulkeley, September 2, 1773, Keppelle & Steinmetz "Correspondence." *Charming Peggy* also carried one hundred boxes of lemons, ten barrels of sweet oil, and thirty casks of corks. Total cargo cost at Lisbon 11,115\$554 reis at 66.75d. per milreis was £3,310.17 sterling.  
*PG*, December 8, 1773.

Harrington, *New York Merchants*, 201-202, citing William Gordon to William Allen, March 9, 1754.  
 Letter? from Cawthorne at Madeira, February 24, 1763, Fayerweather "Papers." Not in biblio!  
 Bezanson, Gray, and Hussey, *Prices in Colonial Pennsylvania*, 231-235.  
 Ibid. White, *Beekmans*, 473, notes James Beekman making fine returns on two Madeira cargoes, though apparently after the Revolution began.  
 Report of Consul Cheap and Madeira Merchants, July 1, 1765, SPFP 89/77. *CSPC*, XLIII (1737): 183. Weeden, *Economic and Social History*, II: 643-644.  
*Bolton Letters*, I: 20.  
 Letter to Captain Davidson, May 6, 1764, Riche "Letter Book, 1764-1767."  
*EG*, January 10, 1769; September 15, 1772.  
 Letter? from Boswell, January 12, 1765, Fayerweather "Papers." Not in biblio! *PG*, March 3, 1775.  
 Letter to Lawrence, May 21, 1731, Reynell "Letter Book, 1729-1734."  
 Weeden, *Economic and Social History*, I: 150. *Bolton Letters*.  
 Report of Consul Cheap and Madeira Merchants, July 1, 1765, SPFP 89/77.  
 Letter to Dicker, October 7, 1728; letter to Corsley & Rogers, June 4, 1728, Pemberton "Letter Book, 1727-1735."  
 Entry for December 23, 1684, Hull "Journal."  
 Letter to Champion, December 10, 1756, James & Drinker "Letter Book, 1756-1762," in HSP.  
 Letter to Corsley & Rogers, April 6, 1728, Pemberton "Letter Book, 1727-1735."  
 Letter to Baynton, Wharton & Morgan, September 30, 1765, Lloyd "Letter Book."  
 Letter to Parr & Bulkeley, July 31, 1765, Riche "Letter Book, 1764-1767."  
 Letter to Connell & Moroney, August 5, 1755, Willing "Letter Book."  
 Jensen, *Maritime Commerce*, 61.  
 NORNY, 1228. Cargoes of four vessels from Madeira were not listed in both measures.  
 Cole, *Wholesale Commodity Prices*.  
*NEWJ*, July 25, 1738. *PG*, April 16, 1771; September 29, 1770.  
 Shepherd and Walton, *Shipping, Maritime Trade*, 103n. Andrews, *Colonial Period*, IV: 111-112. Weeden, *Economic and Social History*, I: 238.  
 Morales Padron, *Commercio Canario-Americano*, 201, 218.  
*AWM*, June 1, 1721. *PG*, August 25, 1763.  
 Report of Consul Trowbridge and Factory, July 9, 1714, SPFS 94/82. *PG*, October 9, 1729; October 23, 1729; July 5, 1733.  
*PG*, June 27, 1754. Letter to Jesson, February 8, 1765, SPFS 94/169; Halifax to Rochford, March 22, 1765, 94/170; Pasley to Conway, September 7, 1765, 94/171. Hort to Porton, January 16, 1772, SPFP 89/72.  
 Magra to Rochdale, SPFS 94/192.  
 Letter to Parr & Bulkeley, November 16, 1763, Riche "Letter Book, 1750-1763."  
*PG*, May 10, 1764; May 17, 1764; June 7, 1764.  
 Letter to Parr & Bulkeley, April 30, 1764; letters to Searle, May 20, 1764; May 22, 1764; June 11, 1764; June 16, 1764; letter to Sweat, June 22, 1764, Riche "Letter Book, 1764-1771."  
 Letter to Captain Davidson, June 22, 1764, *ibid*.  
 Letter to Searle, September 23, 1764, *ibid*. Bezanson, Gray, and Hussey, *Prices in Colonial Pennsylvania*, 232-235.  
 Harrington, *New York Merchants*, 201.  
 Beer, *British Colonial Policy*, 283. Duties on wine entering England at this time were four pounds per ton (French wines eight pounds per ton). Dickerson, *Navigation Acts and Revolution*, 176-177.  
 Dickerson, *Navigation Acts and Revolution*, 177. Wine Island entries, 1760-1764, were 153; 1765-1769, reached 74.  
 Wine arriving from the West Indies, 1768-1772, totaled 161.11 tons, about 2% of the total. Charleston exported 81.14 tons to there and entered 103.93 tons. CO 16/1.  
*PG*, June 14, 1764. Beer, *British Colonial Policy*, 280-281. Dickerson, *Navigation Acts and Revolution*, 175-179.  
 Schlesinger, *Colonial Merchants*, 98.  
 Dickerson, *Navigation Acts and Revolution*, 176. CO 16/1.  
 Letter from Banfield, December 5, 1772, Keppelle & Steinmetz "Correspondence."  
 See customs reports in *BNL*, 1750-1773 and in *PG*, 1750-1774.  
 "Livros," 1769-1775.  
*CPR*, 1771-1775.  
 Miller to Rochdale, January 1, 1773; March 23, 1773; October 2, 1773; October 10, 1773; September 10, 1774, Barcelona Consular Reports, SPFS 94/193-196.  
 Salem sent out 88.27 tons coastal. CO 16/1. Letter to Rochford, October 2, 1773, SPFS 94/194. The consul at Barcelona noted annual shipments of 2,000 pipes (at £5) to Quebec, but CO 16/1 indicates that entrances for the whole period to the northern area only reached an average of 714.17 pipes per year.  
 Letter? from Cawthorne, February 24, 1763, Fayerweather "Papers." Not in biblio!  
 Morales Padron, *Commercio Canario-Americano*, 218. Report of Consul Cheap and Madeira Merchants, July 1, 1765, SPFP 89/77. Letter to Shelburne, March 10, 1767, Board of Trade Papers, CO 389/32. England and her possessions took 5,800 pipes of

Lisbon wine yearly (1772-1773); Hort to Walpole, June 6, 1774, SPFP 89/77.  
 Andrews, *Colonial Period*, IV: 112n.  
 Max Savelle, *A History of Colonial America*. Rev. by Robert Middlekauff (New York, 1964), 337. This is what you have in biblio, which also exists: Savelle, Max and Darold D. Wax. *A History of Colonial America*. Hinsdale, Ill., 1973. which one where? Colonial population grew from 250,000 in 1700 to about 2,500,000 in 1770.  
 Beer, *Origins*, 416-419. *Bolton Letters*, I: 34-35, 91.  
 Letter to Dicker, April 18, 1730, Pemberton "Letter Book, 1727-1735."  
 Letter to Hill, April 9, 1745, Pemberton "Letter Book, 1744-1747." didn't understand your *ibid.* do you mean the letter to Dicker and one to Hill? or just one letter, to Hill  
 Letter to Fernandez, May 28, 1745, Pemberton "Letter Book, 1744-1747." same problem as above, 3 letters? Letter to Lawrence, June 9, 1732; letter to Dicker, July 18, 1732, Reynell "Letter Book, 1729-1734."  
 For Antigua in 1733, see *CSPC*, XLI (1734-1735): 208; for St. Kitts, see *CSPC*, XLIII (1737): 262, covering nineteen months; over a nine-year period, 1723-1732, imports for Barbados are in *CSPC*, XLI: 288.  
 Since the white population of Barbados declined in this century and that of Jamaica rose, sales of Madeira in the West Indies may have remained static.  
*CPR*, 1757-1759, 1763, and 1771-1775.  
 Weymouth to Consuls, December 6, 1768, SPFS 94/180.  
 Lyttleton to Weymouth, January 14, 1769, SPFP 89/67. It seems logical that pre-1764 much smuggling involved mainland wines run into America as island vintages. Riche "Letter Book, 1764-1771." Other goods entering directly were illegal, as was Canary wine. Customs did not enforce the law rigorously. After September 1764 mainland wine could enter indirectly but otherwise the law was strictly enforced.  
 Weymouth to Consuls, December 6, 1768, SPFS 94/180.  
 Weymouth? to Rochford, December 25, 1772, SPFS 94/192.  
*Ibid.*  
 Weymouth? to Rochford, July 6, 1773, SPFS 94/192.  
*Ibid.*  
*Ibid.*  
 Weymouth? to Rochford, September 10, 1773, SPFS 94/194.  
*Ibid.*  
 Direct imports from southern Europe equaled 846.4 tons; via England, 703.1 tons; via the West Indies, 32.2 tons. Total was 1,581.72 tons. See Table 11-4. CO 16/1.  
 Channing, *History of United States*, II: 92.

## chapter 12

Edwin C. Eckel, "Salt," *Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*. Ed. Edwin R. Seligman, 15 vols. (New York, 1953), XIII: 523.  
 A.R. Bridbury, *England and the Salt Trade in the Later Middle Ages* (Oxford, 1955), vii, xv, 40-56. (not in biblio) P.H.A. Martin-Kaye, *Salt in the Leeward Islands* (Antigua, 1954), 12-14. Roscoe N. Snapp, *Beef Cattle* (New York, 1951), 55-57, 911, 950.  
 Frank B. Morrison, *Feeds and Feeding* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1951), 683. P. Thomas Ziegler, *The Meat We Eat* (Danville, Ill., 1944), 163.  
*Historical Statistics*, Series Z, 371-375.  
 Bradford, "Of Plimouth Plantation," 234. Shurtleff, *Records of Massachusetts Bay*, I: 28, 331; III: 126, 275, 374, 400. Emory R. Johnson, et al., *The History of the Domestic and Foreign Commerce of the United States* (Pittsburgh, Pa., 1915), I: 27. Dunn, *Puritans and Yankees*, 61, 84. Phillips, *Salem in Seventeenth Century*, 94, 132, 143-144.  
 Innis, *Cod Fisheries*, 113. Andrews, *Colonial Period*, IV: 109. Ogg, *Reign of Charles II*, I: 246-247.  
 Ogg, *Reign of Charles II*, I: 46, 73-74. Davis, *Rise of English Shipping*, 38, 204. *PG*, July 19, 1753. Letter to Lowndes, April 10, 1766, Lloyd "Letter Book."  
 Davis, *Rise of English Shipping*, 204, notes that the French Biscay area was "economically part of Southern Europe." *NEWJ*, October 30, 1732.  
 Innis, *Cod Fisheries*, 92. Frédérica Mauro, *Le Portugal et l'Atlantique au XVIIIe Siècle, 1570-1670* (Paris, 1960), 270-274.  
 "Diary of Thomas Cox," British Museum, Additional Mss. 23726, folio? 16.  
 A moy of salt weighed 1,500 pounds.  
 Francis, *Methuens*, 19.  
 John Collins, *A Discourse of Salt and Fishery* (London, 1682), 17.  
*Ibid.*  
 Board of Trade to Stanhope, March 2, 1716, *CSPC*, XXIX (1716-1717), 34.  
 Bourgoing, *Travels of Duke de Châtelet*, I: 235-237.  
 Davis, *Rise of English Shipping*, 269. Fairchild, *Pepperrells*, 134.  
 Board of Trade to Shelburne, March 10, 1767, CO 389/32, folios 138-139 compare to chap 11, n94. At 12s. per moy, a bushel cost 8d.  
 Letter to Reade, January 17, 1759, Willing "Letter Book." It sold for 5.6d. per bushel. Mayne, Burn & Mayne to Samuel Galloway, September 17, 1763, Galloway "Letters," priced salt at Lisbon at 7.07d. per bushel. A milreis was worth about 67d. A

price of 7.5d. per bushel has been used for Iberian salt unless otherwise noted.

“Diary of Cox.”

See Appendix for Philadelphia salt values.

Dalrymple to Rochdale, March 20, 1772, SPFS 94/189. Bezanson, Gray, and Hussey, *Prices in Colonial Pennsylvania*, 246.

Townshend, *Journey through Spain*, II: 423; III: 224.

Ibid., III: 169.

Canga Arguelles, *Diccionario*, V: 117. Davis, *Rise of English Shipping*, 238. A fanega measured out to 109.5 pounds.

Ellen Churchill Semple, *The Geography of the Mediterranean Region* (New York, 1931), 665-666.

Moody, “*Province Galley*,” 138.

*Winthrop’s Journal*, II: 68. Davis, *Rise of English Shipping*, 224.

In the 1770s exports to Europe averaged 648,235 quintals of fish; 10 hogsheads of salt cured 100 quintals. Eight bushels made one hogshead; one ton equaled 2.813 hogsheads. basically repeated on next page

Letter to Flexney, September 19, 1736, Reynell “Letter Book.”

Bezanson, Gray, and Hussey, *Prices in Colonial Pennsylvania*, 241. War in the 1750s disrupted trade with Lisbon. A Philadelphia firm reported a loss of “reasonable Rates” for salt, Letter to Palmer, December 23, 1751; letter to Clitherall, June 14, 1758, James & Drinker “Letter Book.” The right to import Iberian salt directly was extended to Canada in the 1760s.

Fairchild, *Pepperrells*, 107. McFarland, *New England Fisheries*, 95-96. This island was also known as the Tortudas, Tortugas, and Saltortudas.

*MSR*, September 29, 1687-March 25, 1688; July 1718-July 1719; southern Europe, 142 tons; West Indies, 43 tons.

Bubb to Stanhope, November 18, 1715, SPFS 94/84.

*CSPC*, XXVII (1712-1714), 239, 256.

Gosselin & Lordell to Board of Trade, January 25, 1715, SPFS 94/83.

Bubb to Stanhope, November 18, 1715, SPFS 94/84.

McLachlan, *Trade and Peace*, 69.

Ibid., 139. Clarke, *Letters Concerning Spanish Nation*, xxxv. *AWM*, April 27, 1727; May 25, 1727. *PG*, April 8, 1731. *NEWJ*, November 16, 1732; April 16, 1733. Weymouth to Harris, September 7, 1770, SPFS 94/185.

*CSPC*, XLI (1734-1735): 204-205; XLII (1735-1736): 144. Giesecke, *American Commercial Legislation*, 99. Richmond to Rochdale, July 4, 1766, SPFS 94/174.

Coram to Board of Trade, May 11, 1735, *CSPC*, XLI (1734-1735): 413-414.

Richmond to Rochdale, July 4, 1766, SPFS 94/174.

Joseph B. Felt, *The Annals of Salem from Its First Settlement* (Salem, Mass., 1827), 238. Innis, *Cod Fisheries*, 96n.

Douglass, *Summary Historical and Political*, I: 301. Innis, *Cod Fisheries*, 161.

Letter to Simons & Vashon, November 23, 1734, Pemberton “Letter Book, 1727-1734/5.” Letter to Jacks, February 8, 1729, Joshua Pierce, “Letter Book, 1725-1734,” Wendell “Papers,” BL.

Bezanson, Gray, and Hussey, *Prices in Colonial Pennsylvania*, 237. Letter to Mayne, Burn & Mayne, August 18, 1755, Willing “Letter Book.” One captain was ordered to “Keep your Boards to put atop of the Salt, under the Wine.” Letter to Captain Parkinson, November 25, 1737, R. Ellis “Letter Book, 1736-1748.” where? not in biblio

“Log of John Sherburn,” of the *Brigtown Galley*, January 1732-September 1732,” PEI.

Dunnage: pieces of wood, mats, boughs, or loose materials laid in the hold to prevent injury by water, or stowed among cargo to prevent motion or chafing.

“Log of Sherburn.”

Letter to White, July 23, 1727, Pemberton “Letter Book, 1727-1735.”

*PG*, December 19, 1771; May 19, 1743.

*PG*, May 4, 1738.

Banks to Shelburne, March 18, 1767, SPFS 94/176.

Letter to Duncan, August 19, 1756, Riche “Letter Book, 1750-1763.”

G.G. Beekman to Clifford, November 16, 1766, Clifford “Correspondence,” Box 14.

Gardoquis to Richard Derby, Jr., September 3, 1760; “Accounts concerning 1,092 Farricks of Cadiz Salt,” Derby “Papers,” Box IX, PEI. Holyrod, *Commerce of American States*, 33, describes salt as “profitable to ballast with.”

British Museum, Additional Mss. 38345, folio 210. *CSPC*, XXXVII (1730): xxliii; XLII (1735-1736): 144, 321, 326, 389. *PG*, July 5, 1764; October 26, 1764.

*PG*, January 20, 1773.

NORNY, 1222-1224.

*PG*, 1750-1763.

Shepherd and Walton, *Shipping, Maritime Trade*, Tables 7 and 8 (CO 16/1). Northern colonies’ imports for 1772 should be corrected to 25,762 hogsheads or 206,096 bushels.

Ibid., 33. Average imports annually equaled 43.86 pounds per capita.

See Table 12-6.

CO 16/1. In the same period Boston took in 38,771 hogsheads from the south of Europe and 39,352 from the West Indies. The Boston figure for 1769 in this sources appears overstated by 100,000 bushels (12,500 hogsheads).

## chapter 13

Dudley W., Knox, ed., *Naval Documents Relative to the United States Wars with the Barbary Powers*, 7 vols. (Washington, D.C., 1939-1945), I: 22.

Newfoundland exports in the 1730s averaged 165,783 quintals, while New England's are estimated at 63,602 quintals. For estimates of other commodities, see individual chapters.

The middle colonies probably shipped 80% of the grain, estimated at £27,000 annually. The rice figure was £25,600 and miscellaneous other goods at £4,500, based on the clearances in Table 13-1.

New England fish sales were about 139,800 quintals. Rice exports, 12,661 barrels were valued at £50,900. English-owned Newfoundland vessels usually made one voyage a year. New England fish carriers and middle colony grain vessels often made two or even three voyages yearly; rice carriers one a year.

See Table 13-2. Note that these are values in southern Europe.

See Table 5-2.

CO 16/1. Shepherd and Walton, *Shipping, Maritime Trade*, 220-222. Miscellaneous exports, priced in America, equaled £46,173. Whale oil was worth £14,524; rum valued at £11,316; beeswax, £10,144; and candles at £4,601 made up about 88% of the total. Lisbon data, *CPR*, and newspaper customs reports all indicate that in 1774 and early 1775 the trade reached levels comparable to 1769 and 1770.

Shepherd and Walton, *Shipping, Maritime Trade*, 133-134.

*CPR*, February 10, 1771-December 28, 1776.

No commodity price indices for wines except Madeira have been found.

Prime cost of a hogshead of 8 bushels, at 100 pounds per bushel, priced at 7.5d. per bushel.

McCusker and Menard, *Economy of British America*, 82.

*Ibid.*, 81. Shepherd and Walton, *Shipping, Maritime Trade*, chapters 7 and 8.

See Chapter XI. Shepherd and Walton, *Shipping, Maritime Trade*, 205-206.

Magra to Rochford, December 25, 1772; July 6, 1773, SPFS 94/192; September 10, 1773, SPFS 94/193. This last letter claimed 3,500 pipes of Canary wine were smuggled into America yearly.

Shepherd and Walton, *Shipping, Maritime Trade*, 165.

McCusker and Menard, *Economy of British America*, 80-82.

McCusker, *Money and Exchange*, 7.

## chapter 14

Nettels, "British Mercantilism," 108.

Anderson, *Europe in Eighteenth Century*, 266.

Beer, *Colonial System*, I: 108.

Edward Randolph, *Edward Randolph, Including His Letters and Official Papers*. Eds. Robert N. Toppan and A.T.S. Goodrick, 7 vols. (Boston, 1898-1909), I: 254.

Michael G. Hall, *Edward Randolph and the American Colonies, 1676-1703* (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1960), 23, 67. Ogg, *Reign of Charles II*, I: 246-247. Ogg views Downing as a successful political climber in Restoration politics.

*Randolph Letters and Papers*, IV: 96.

*CSPC*, X (1681-1685): 1165. Beer, *Colonial System*, II: 78-80. Smugglers employed this ruse through the whole era.

George Chalmers, *Opinions of Eminent Lawyers on Interesting Subjects* (London, 1784), 572-573. Hall, *Randolph and American Colonies*, 57.

Hall, *Randolph and American Colonies*, 111, comments that shutting off this illegal trade "worsened an already depressed economy in America."

Andrews, *Colonial Period*, IV: 149.

*Ibid.*, 164n. A Salem customs officer dedicated to strict enforcement was found guilty of "great disorder and unwarrantable procedures" by a Vice Admiralty judge.

*BNL*, June 2, 1735; June 7, 1750; September 19, 1754. *NEWJ*, February 18, 1738. Bilbao iron was often run.

*BNL*, June 7, 1750. V. Barnes, *Dominion of New England*, 159-160. Andrews, *Colonial Period*, IV: 112n, 160n.

This report, dated London, October 14, 1738, is in *PG*, March 8, 1739.

Weeden, *Economic and Social History*, II: 556. David S. Lovejoy, *The Glorious Revolution in America* (New York, 1972), 240-246.

Nettels, *Money Supply*, 79-80.

Lee to Poppel, September 29, 1735, *CSPC*, XLII (1735-1736): 65.

Joshue Gee, as quoted in Ashley, *Surveys Historic and Economic*, 342.

Letter to Lynch & Blake, October 7, 1737; letter to Lloyd, December 13, 1737; letter to Macky & Smith, January 3, 1738; letters to Michael and Richard Harris, June 12, 1738; August 8, 1738, Faneuil "Letter Book."

Letter to Captain Brown, September 11, 1738; letter to Pringle, March 10, 1738; letter to Harris's, March 14, 1739, Faneuil "Letter Book."

Letter to Leybourne, January 25, 1743, Reynell "Letter Book, 1741-1744."

Letters to Mayne, Burn & Mayne, August 15, 1755; June 19, 1756, Willing "Letter Book."  
 Gee, *Trade and Navigation*, 50-51.  
 Wharton to Perriot, Dawson & Co., February 28, 1759, cited in Bezanson, Gray, and Hussey, *Prices in Colonial Pennsylvania*, 245.  
 Pares, *War and Trade*, 403n. *BNL*, October 30, 1760, has an interesting proclamation concerning smuggling.  
 Andrews, *Colonial Period*, IV: 179.  
*PG*, October 27, 1763.  
*PG*, September 29, 1763.  
*PG*, October 6, 1763.  
 Beer, *British Colonial Policy*, 280-283.  
*PG*, October 4, 1764.  
 Schlesinger, *Colonial Merchants*, 42.  
 Edward Payne, "Observations on the Acts of Trade (1763)," MHS, Ezekial Price Collection. (biblio says this; your fn says Houghton Lib. Harvard)  
 Ibid.  
 [Stephen Hopkins], *An Essay on the Trade of the Northern Colonies of Great Britain in North America* (Philadelphia, 1764), 9-10.  
 Channing, *History of United States*, III: 84.  
 Ibid., 92. Schlesinger, *Colonial Merchants*, 98.  
 Payne, "Observations on Acts of Trade."  
 "Petition of the Merchants of Boston to the Parliament," January 1767, MHS, Ezekial Price Collection (where?). Not in biblio  
 This change would have let Canary wines enter.  
 Lisbon Factory to Rochford, n.d., Consular Reports, CO 388/95, folios 11-15.  
 For comments on the Grafton/Chatham coalition, see Michael Kammen, "Colonial Agents, English Politics and the American Revolution," *WMQ*, XXII (1965): 256. not in biblio  
 Channing, *History of United States*, III: 84.  
 Schlesinger, *Colonial Merchants*, 88n.  
*PG*, October 4, 1764. These measures were said to be favored by "the most eminent merchants" in England.  
 Letters to Knight, June 3, 1766; July 21, 1766; letter to Bryan, November 26, 1766, Lloyd "Letter Book." See references to Captain Crowninshield in "Salem Customs House Book," 219n, 225.  
 Letter to Parr & Bulkeley, November 16, 1763, Riche "Letter Book, 1748-1764."  
 Letter to Parr & Bulkeley, May 22, 1764, *ibid*.  
 Letter to Street, June 22, 1764; letter to Captain Davidson, June 22, 1764, *ibid*.  
 Letter to Captain Ross, July 18, 1764, *ibid*.  
 White, *Beekmans*, 220-221.  
 Gary B. Nash, *The Urban Crucible: The Northern Seaports and the Origins of the American Revolution* (Cambridge, Mass., 1986), 225, comments, perhaps facetiously, on patriots who "rescued goods seized by customs."  
 Channing, *History of United States*, III: 92-93.  
 Ibid. Schlesinger, *Colonial Merchants*, 103. D.H. Watson, "Joseph Harrison and the *Liberty Incident*." *WMQ* XX (1963): 585n.  
 Schlesinger, *Colonial Merchants*, 101. *EG*, December 31, 1771.  
 "Salem Customs House Book," 276-277, 280-281.  
*EG*, September 13, 1768.  
*EG*, December 15, 1772.  
*EG*, December 22, 1772.  
*EG*, November 15, 1768.  
 Boston to Salem officials, April 27, 1769, "Salem Customs House Book."  
 Harrington, *New York Merchants*, 269. Schlesinger, *Colonial Merchants*, 98n.  
*PG*, January 12, 1774; January 19, 1774; February 9, 1774.  
 McCusker and Menard, *Economy of British America*, 365n.  
*CPR*, April 10, 1757-November 22, 1759; December 26, 1762-December 29, 1763; and February 16, 1771-December 28, 1776,  
 Letter from Nelson, November 18, 1769, John Norton & Sons, *John Norton & Sons, Merchants of London and Virginia, being the papers from their counting house for the years 1750 to 1795*. Ed. Frances Norton Mason (Richmond, Va., 1937), 113.  
*PG*, October 18, 1764.  
 Instructions to Lyttleton, June 25, 1767, Consular Reports, CO 388/95.  
 Weymouth to Consuls and Consul Generals, December 6, 1768, SPFS 94/180.  
 Brusby to Weymouth, February 13, 1769, SPFS 94/181.  
 Separate and Secret Instructions to Lord Grantham, May 23, 1771, SPFS 94/187.  
 Magra to Rochford, December 25, 1772; Rochford to Magra, May 11, 1773, SPFS 94/192.  
 Magra to Rochford, July 6, 1773, SPFS 94/194.  
 Magra to Rochford, September 10, 1773, *ibid*.

Hardy to Porten, February 12, 1775, SPFS 94/195.  
 PG, September 21, 1774.  
 PG, November 9, 1774.  
 PG, November 23, 1774.  
 EG, May 3, 1774; September 3, 1770; February 23, 1773; July 6, 1773.  
 EG, May 3, 1774; July 12, 1774; October 11, 1774; October 18, 1774; November 1, 1774.  
 PG, March 9, 1775; March 15, 1775.  
 PG, April 5, 1775; April 12, 1775; April 26, 1775; June 14, 1775. Dickerson, *Navigation Acts and Revolution*, 109, 112.  
 A. Cabot to Duff & Welch, August 21, 1775, in Ford, "Colonial Commerce," 222.  
 Lisbon Factory to Rochford, n.d., Consular Reports, CO 388/95, folios 11-15. Separate and Secret Instructions to Lord Grantham, May 23, 1771, SPFS 94/187. Magra to Rochford, July 6, 1773; September 10, 1773, SPFS 94/194; Hardy to Porten, January 21, 1774, SPFS 94/195; Instructions to Lyttleton, June 25, 1767, SPFP 89/63. (compare Lyttleton instructions with fn 67, same date, Consular Reports, CO 388/95).  
 Walpole to Rochford, March 29, 1775; April 5, 1775, SPFP 89/79.  
 Walpole to Rochford, March 29, 1775, SPFP 89/79.  
 Rochford to Grantham, January 31, 1775; Grantham to Rochford, March 2, 1775, SPFS 94/197.  
 Hort to Rochford, February 12, 1775; Walpole to Rochford, March 29, 1775; April 5, 1775, SPFP 89/79.  
 Hort to Rochford, April 6, 1775, *ibid.*  
 Hort to Rochford, April 13, 1775; May 5, 1775; May 13, 1775; June 23, 1775, *ibid.* Yet in December 1775 a Newburyport firm ordered Parr & Bulkeley to return the bulk of a cargo sent them in gunpowder. Porter, *Jacksons and Lees*, I: 315.  
 Rochford to Grantham, October 6, 1775; October 10, 1775, SPFS 94/199. PG, December 14, 1774. Porter, *Jacksons and Lees*, I: 325.  
*Ibid.* (do you really mean everything in fn 90 above or do you mean SPFS 94/199?) Katenkamp to Rochford, September 27, 1775; Rochford to Grantham, October 31, 1775; Hardy to Rochford, November 28, 1775, SPFS 94/199.  
 Hort to Rochford, February 12, 1775, SPFP 89/79.  
 Rochford to Attorney or Solicitor General, March 18, 1775, *ibid.*  
 Hort to Rochford, March 23, 1775; April 6, 1775, *ibid.*  
 Hardy to Rochford, September 29, 1775, SPFS 94/199.  
 Marsh to Rochford, October 6, 1775, *idid.*  
 Wilkie to Rochford, October 28, 1775; Wilkie to Admiralty, October 28, 1775, *ibid.*  
 Katenkamp to Weymouth, January 24, 1776; Marsh to Weymouth, January 16, 1776; Katenkamp to Weymouth, February 5, 1776; Hardy to Weymouth, April 2, 1776, SPFS 94/200.  
 Hort to Weymouth, April 4, 1776, SPFP 89/81. CPR, March 24, 1776.  
 Burchmore to Cabot, May 6, 1775; Cabot to Burchmore, August 21, 1775, in Ford, "Colonial Commerce," 219-220, 223-224.  
 Hort to Weymouth, April 28, 1776; June 13, 1776, SPFP 89/82.  
 Walpole to Weymouth, March 23, 1776, SPFP 89/81; Walpole to Weymouth, July 6, 1776, SPFP 89/82. Pombal's order was dated July 4, 1776.  
 Hort to Weymouth, July 6, 1776, SPFP 89/82.

## chapter 15

Johnson, *History of Commerce*, 158. Marblehead's tonnage dropped from 12,000 tons to 1,509 tons. McFarland, *New England Fisheries*, 121. Doerflinger, *Vigorous Spirit*, 341.  
 Shepherd and Walton, *Shipping, Maritime Trade*, chapter 9.  
 Adams to Jay, December 15, 1784, as cited by Norman A. Graebner, *Ideas and Diplomacy* (New York, 1964), 41.  
 Channing, *History of United States*, III: 283. Samuel Flagg Bemis, *Pinckney's Treaty: America's Advantage from Europe's Distress, 1738-1800* (New Haven, Conn., 1960), Appendix II.  
 Bemis, *Pinckney's Treaty*, 58-59.  
 Miguel Gomez del Campillo, *Relacionés Diplomaticas entre España y los Estados Unidos*, 2 vols. (Madrid, 1944), I: xxiii.  
 Bemis, *Pinckney's Treaty*, 27n.  
 AHN-M, Legajo 3884 bis, expedientes 12, 17; Legajo 3885, ex. 3.  
 AHN-M, Legajo 3885, ex. 15, Carmichael to Floridablanca, September 22, 1783. Is this a letter? I usually list this at beginning of fn.  
 AHN-M, Legajo 3885 bis, ex. 3, Carmichael to Floridablanca, November 9, 1784. Is this a letter? I usually list this at beginning of fn.  
*Ibid.*, Gardoqui to Galvez, August 23, 1785.  
 Bemis, *Pinckney's Treaty*, 63.  
 PG, August 30, 1786.  
 Bemis, *Pinckney's Treaty*, 85. Spanish-American trade concessions were also dangled by Gardoqui. John Jay, *Correspondence and Papers of John Jay*. Ed. Henry P. Johnston. 4 vols. (New York, 1890-1893), III: 150.  
 AHN-M, Legajo 3889, ex. 1, Gardoqui to Jay, May 25, 1786.

AHN-M, Legajo 3893, ex. 2, Gardoqui to Floridablanca, November 21, 1785; June 19, 1786.  
 Bemis, *Pinckney's Treaty*, 78.  
 Ibid., 83.  
 Ibid., 94-95.  
 As cited in Edmund C. Burnett, *The Continental Congress* (New York, 1964), 655.  
 R. Earl McClendon, "The Origin of the Two-Thirds Rule in Senate Action on Treaties," *AHR* XXXVI (1931): 768-772.  
 Bemis, *Pinckney's Treaty*, 258, Appendix V, 343n.  
 Samuel Flagg Bemis, *The Diplomacy of the American Revolution* (Bloomington, Ind., 1957), 53.  
 Jefferson to Adams, June 2, 1785, *A-JL*, 27.  
 Thomas Jefferson, *Papers of Thomas Jefferson*. Ed. Julian P. Boyd et al. 33 vols. to date (Princeton, N.J., 1950-), VII: 72.  
 Jefferson to Adams, November 27, 1785, *A-JL*, 100.  
 Vicens Vives, *Historia social y economica*, IV: 160. Adams to Jefferson, May 22, 1785; May 23, 1785, *A-JL*, 21-22.  
*A-JL*, 74.  
 Jefferson to Adams, October 11, 1785, *A-JL*, 81.  
 Adams to Jefferson, November 4, 1785, *AJ-L*, 89.  
 Adams to Jefferson, November 5, 1785, *AJ-L*, 90.  
*A-JL*, 91.  
 Ibid.  
*AJ-L*, 92.  
*AJ-L*, 93.  
 Jefferson to Adams, November 27, 1785, *A-JL*, 100-103.  
 Jefferson to Adams, February 7, 1786, *A-JL*, 119.  
 Jefferson to Adams, June 29, 1786, *A-JL*, 138.  
 Adams to Jefferson, January 25, 1787, *A-JL*, 161.  
 PG, August 2, 1786. Vernon G. Setser, *The Commercial Reciprocity of the United States, 1774-1829* (New York, 1969), 76-77, 133-134.  
 PG, July 20, 1785; November 9, 1785.  
 H.G. Barnby, *The Prisoners of Algiers, 1785-1797* (London, 1966), 4.  
 Franklin to Robert Livingston, as cited by Graebner, *Ideas and Diplomacy*, 41.  
 PG, February 9, 1785; May 11, 1785.  
 PG, April 13, 1785.  
 PG, June 1, 1785.  
 PG, May 3, 1786.  
 PG, May 17, 1786.  
 PG, July 26, 1786. Council Minutes, April 1, 1786, Board of Trade Papers, 6/226.  
 PG, May 7, 1787.  
 Merrill Jensen, *The New Nation, 1781-1789* (New York, 1950), 212-213. Phineas Bond, "Letters of Phineas Bond, British Consul at Philadelphia, to the Foreign Office of Great Britain, 1787-1789." Ed. John Franklin Jameson. *AHA Annual Report*, I (1896): 523. Channing, *History of United States*, III: 420.  
 Adams to Jefferson, July 3, 1786, *A-JL*, 138.  
*Correspondence of Jay*, III: 197.  
 Jefferson to Adams, September 4, 1785, *A-JL*, 58.  
 James G. Lydon, "Thomas Jefferson and the Mathurins," *The Catholic Historical Review* XLIX (1963): 192-202.  
 Bilbao data are from the "Averia Accounts," 1783-1794; for Lisbon, see the "Livros," 1783-1788, 74-80.  
 PG, July 21, 1784, quoting a letter from the *London Evening Post*.  
 PG, January 12, 1785.  
 PG, February 4, 1785.  
 PG, February 16, 1785.  
 PG, May 9, 1787.  
 PG, July 28, 1784; April 27, 1785.  
 PG, August 10, 1785.



## Prices of Exports from Philadelphia to Southern Europe, 1720-1774

Year	Wheat Bushels	Prov. Ton	Flour Barrels	Corn Bushels	Staves Ton	Misc. Ton	Exch. %	Year	Wheat Bushels	Prov. Ton	Flour Barrels	Corn Bushels	Staves Ton	Misc. Ton	Exch. %
1720	2,31s	£16.0	12,83s	1,30s	£1.69	£11.0	133.33	1750	2,63s	£21.5	14,15s	1,50s	£3.50	£11.0	171.60
1721	2,29	16.0	12,24	1,32	1.69	11.0	133.33	1751	2,50	21.5	13,37	1.64	2.73	11.0	170.63
1722	2,23	16.0	12,37	1,30	1.69	11.0	133.33	1752	2,62	21.5	14,55	1.54	2.56	11.0	166.66
1723	1,79	16.0	10,73	1,23	1.48	11.0	151.67	1753	2,66	21.5	14,09	1.73	3.02	11.0	167.96
1724	2,52	16.0	15,18	1,59	1.53	11.0	133.33	1754	2,65	21.5	15,52	1.39	2.93	11.0	168.15
1725	2,90	16.0	16,81	1,50	1.53	11.0	133.33	1755	2,65	21.5	15,05	1.28	2.71	11.0	168.88
1726	2,54	16.0	15,42	1,50	1.53	11.0	150.00	1756	2,51	21.5	13,67	1.45	2.05	11.0	172.52
1727	2,18	16.0	14,13	1,35	1.53	11.0	150.00	1757	2,28	21.5	12,59	1.04	2.37	11.0	165.95
1728	2,26	16.0	12,35	1,51	1.53	11.0	150.00	1758	2,44	21.5	14,24	1.22	3.52	11.0	159.21
1729	2,46	16.0	13,13	1,43	1.53	11.0	150.00	1759	3,20	21.5	17,44	1.93	3.18	11.0	154.71
1730	2,42	17.0	14,09	1,27	1.53	11.0	151.69	1760	3,18	26.0	17,26	1.85	3.34	11.0	160.30
1731	1,61	17.0	9,67	1,08	1.53	11.0	153.13	1761	2,88	26.0	15,74	1.39	4.90	11.0	174.12
1732	1,67	17.0	9,37	1,12	1.53	11.0	161.10	1762	3,21	26.0	17,68	1.98	5.06	11.0	175.84
1733	1,85	17.0	9,89	1,27	1.53	11.0	165.00	1763	3,50	26.0	18,09	2.17	3.94	11.0	173.13
1734	2,18	17.0	11,95	1,24	1.53	11.0	162.50	1764	2,66	26.0	13,74	1.59	3.13	11.0	172.38
1735	2,36	17.0	13,04	0,97	1.58	11.0	162.50	1765	2,73	26.0	14,54	1.75	3.99	11.0	171.58
1736	1,96	17.0	10,74	1,14	1.41	11.0	165.13	1766	3,46	26.0	16,55	1.99	3.97	11.0	165.35
1737	2,31	17.0	12,93	1,24	1.90	11.0	167.50	1767	3,76	26.0	19,09	1.76	4.25	11.0	166.20
1738	2,07	17.0	12,32	1,25	2.04	11.0	167.50	1768	3,79	26.0	18,77	1.54	3.24	11.0	166.36
1739	1,65	17.0	8,73	0,83	1.89	11.0	170.00	1769	3,46	26.0	17,57	1.77	3.17	11.0	158.31
1740	1,98	18.5	9,82	0,91	2.04	11.0	164.06	1770	3,84	27.0	18,87	2.34	4.01	11.0	153.99
1741	3,07	18.5	17,39	1,89	3.10	11.0	145.18	1771	4,09	27.0	19,53	2.11	4.09	11.0	165.57
1742	2,24	18.5	12,70	1,68	2.30	11.0	159.69	1772	4,80	27.0	23,23	2.29	4.17	11.0	161.21
1743	1,77	18.5	10,02	1,33	2.06	11.0	160.31	1773	4,47	27.0	21,10	1.90	3.60	11.0	165.80
1744	1,48	18.5	8,47	0,91	1.77	11.0	167.35	1774	4,08	27.0	19,73	1.67	4.04	11.0	169.74
1745	1,47	18.5	8,41	0,96	1.67	11.0	175.70								
1746	1,60	18.5	9,34	1,02	2.28	11.0	179.25								
1747	1,78	18.5	10,02	1,04	2.86	11.0	184.56								
1748	2,89	18.5	16,33	1,31	2.98	11.0	174.33								
1749	3,28	18.5	17,79	1,53	3.05	11.0	172.36								

**Sources:** All prices are in sterling pounds. Export prices for wheat, flour, corn and staves are from *Berzanson's Prices in Colonial Pennsylvania*. Price for staves is for hoghead staves since not all staves shipped were pipestaves, and hoghead staves are priced in the middle between pipe and barrel staves. Stave prices are lacking for 1724-1734, so a median price between 1723 and 1735 was used. The term provisions used in NORNY is an amorphous one. To arrive at a specific figure for this item, the prices per ton of beef, pork, ship's bread, rice and fish at Philadelphia were averaged per decade. The Miscellaneous column includes all exports other than those listed above. With the exception of the war years when prize goods increased this item significantly, these exports were usually less than 3 percent of the total.



APPENDIX B

Prices of Goods from Southern Europe  
on Purchase and on Sale in Philadelphia, 1720-1774

Year	Madeira		Other		Salt/Bu.		Madeira		Other		Salt/Bu.		
	S.E.	Phila.	S.E.	Phila.	S.E.	Phila.	S.E.	Phila.	S.E.	Phila.	S.E.	Phila.	
1720	£7.5	£13.5	£---	£---	7.5d	---	17560	£14.5	£17.4	£10.4	£15.0	7.5d	9.8d
1721	7.5	14.3	---	---	7.5	13.2d	1751	14.5	17.5	10.4	15.0	7.5	8.2
1722	7.5	15.4	---	---	7.5	---	1752	14.5	18.1	10.4	15.0	7.5	9.1
1723	7.5	---	---	---	7.5	---	1753	14.5	18.3	10.4	15.0	7.5	10.2
1724	7.5	14.5	---	---	7.5	---	1754	14.5	17.2	10.4	15.0	7.5	10.4
1725	7.5	16.5	---	---	7.5	---	1755	14.5	17.5	10.4	15.0	7.5	10.6
1726	7.5	15.5	---	---	7.5	---	1756	14.5	19.0	10.4	15.0	7.5	15.0
1727	7.5	14.7	---	---	7.5	---	1757	14.5	23.8	10.4	15.0	7.5	20.5
1728	7.5	14.7	---	---	7.5	21.2	1758	14.5	26.2	10.4	15.0	7.5	17.8
1729	7.5	14.7	---	---	7.5	21.2	1759	14.5	29.3	10.4	15.0	7.5	15.8
1730	9.0	14.5	6.0	10.0	7.5	---	1760	20.0	31.4	10.4	19.0	7.5	15.6
1731	9.0	14.4	6.0	10.0	7.5	14.8	1761	20.0	28.0	10.4	19.0	7.5	13.2
1732	9.0	13.7	6.0	10.0	7.5	---	1762	20.0	28.9	10.4	19.0	7.5	19.2
1733	9.0	13.3	6.0	10.0	7.5	---	1763	20.0	28.5	10.0	19.0	7.5	15.6
1734	9.0	13.5	6.0	10.0	7.5	14.2	1764	20.0	29.3	10.4	19.0	7.5	13.2
1735	9.0	13.2	6.0	10.0	7.5	11.5	1765	20.0	27.6	15.2	15.2	7.5	11.9
1736	9.0	13.1	6.0	10.0	7.5	9.8	1766	20.0	29.6	15.2	15.2	7.5	12.4
1737	9.0	12.5	6.0	10.0	7.5	8.8	1767	20.0	30.7	15.2	15.2	7.5	11.9
1738	9.0	13.1	6.0	10.0	7.5	9.7	1768	20.0	28.7	15.2	15.2	7.5	11.6
1739	9.0	12.7	6.0	10.0	7.5	8.8	1769	20.0	30.3	15.2	15.2	7.5	10.8
1740	10.0	---	10.4	12.0	7.5	20.4	1770	22.0	32.2	15.2	15.2	7.5	12.7
1741	10.0	15.0	10.4	12.0	7.5	20.4	1771	22.0	30.2	15.2	15.2	7.5	12.0
1742	10.0	15.3	10.4	12.0	7.5	21.6	1772	22.0	33.5	15.2	15.2	7.5	13.8
1743	10.0	17.1	10.4	12.0	7.5	14.4	1773	22.0	34.5	15.2	15.2	7.5	12.2
1744	10.0	16.6	10.4	12.0	7.5	14.4	1774	22.0	32.5	15.2	15.2	7.5	9.7
1745	10.0	15.7	10.4	12.0	7.5	18.0							
1746	10.0	12.8	10.4	12.0	7.5	25.2							
1747	10.0	13.2	10.4	12.0	7.5	22.8							
1748	10.0	14.7	10.4	12.0	7.5	21.6							
1749	10.0	16.7	10.4	12.0	7.5	15.6							

widely; data are scarce. Estimates based on scattered references, have been placed at higher levels than probably was the case in the 18th century. The American Revenue Act (1764) sharply reduced direct imports of wines other than Madeira and presumably lowered their prices. Southern European salt prices remained static. Philadelphia prices from Bezanon are converted to sterling. Salt cost on board in Europe 5.6s/hhd. Minus duty (10%), commissions (3%) and Handling (2%), its prime cost was about 7.5d/bu. of 100 lbs.



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### Primary Sources (Archival):

#### GREAT BRITAIN:

National Archives:

Admiralty Papers, 1/3833.

Colonial Office, 388/53; 55; 95.

Board of Trade Correspondence, 6/226.

Naval Office Records, New York, CO 5/1222-1228.

Ledger of Imports and Exports to America, 1768-1772; CO 16/1.

State Papers Foreign, Newsletters, 101/92.

State Papers Foreign (Portugal), 89/23-24; 26; 47-51; 62-74; 77; 79; 81-82; 89; 91.

State Papers Foreign (Spain), 94/84; 104; 137; 139; 141; 166-169; 171-184; 186-197; 200; 213; 222; 225-228. 1/474.

Treasury Papers, 64/276a.

British Museum:

Additional Manuscripts, 23726; 35101; 36807; 38345.

Peter Force Collection; George Chalmers Papers (microfilm).

#### PORTUGAL:

Arquivo Historico Municipal at the Camara Municipal (Lisbon):

Livros das entradas da Marco das Navios, 1770-1775; 1783-1788.

#### SPAIN:

Archivo Historico Nacional (Madrid):

Seccion de Estado, Legajos 3884bis; 3885; 3885bis; 3889; 3892-3893.

Archivo del Consulado de Bilbao (Archivo Municipal de Bilbao):

Manuals des Ambos Averias, 1732-1737; 1749-1756; 1770-1774; 1783-1794.

#### UNITED STATES:

Massachusetts Historical Society (Boston)

Abstracts of English Shipping Records Relating to Massachusetts Ports; 2 parts.

Abstracts of Customs Records for Massachusetts, 1661-1662.

Peabody Essex Museum (Salem, Mass.):

Book of Records of the Salem Customs House, 1762-1772.

Salem Tonnage and Light Money Account Books, 1751-1769.

New York State Archives (Albany, N.Y.):

Historical Manuscripts in the Office of the Secretary of State, Albany: "English Manuscripts," vols. XXVII, XXXIX, XL.

Historical Society of Pennsylvania (Philadelphia):

Pennsylvania Ship Registers, 1729-1737, 1750-1755, 1770-1775

Records of Tonnage Duties on Incoming Vessels, 1765-1775, 3 vols.; in the Cadwallader Collection; Thomas Cadwallader Section.

### Primary Sources (Unpublished Correspondence):

- Amory, Thomas. "Account Book, 1720-1728" in Massachusetts Historical Society (MHS).
- Cabot "Papers," I, in the Peabody Essex Museum (PEM).
- Clifford "Correspondence," Box 3, in the Historical Society of Pennsylvania (HSP).
- Derby "Papers," Box IX in PEM.
- Drinker, Henry. "Letter Book, 1762-1768" in HSP.
- Ellis, Robert. "Letter Book, 1736-1748" in HSP.
- Faneuil, Peter. "Day Book, 1731-1732"; "Letter Book, 1737-1741"; "Ledger, 1725-1732"; "Invoice Book, 1725-1737"; in Baker Library, Harvard (BL).
- Fayweather, Thomas. "Papers, 1760-1763" in the New England Historical and Genealogical Society (Boston) (NEHGS).
- Fitch, Timothy. "Letter Book, 1714-1717" in NEHGS.
- Galloway, Samuel. "Letters, 1760-1768" in the Library of Congress, Galloway, Maxey, Markoe Family Papers, 1654-1768.
- Hancock, John. "Papers," Vol. 27 in BL.
- Hancock, Thomas. "Papers," Vol. VII in BL.
- Hull, John. "Journal, 1685-1689" in BL.
- "Schooner Jolly Robin's Book of Acco'ts for Voyages as Settled by Daniel Staniford" in BL, Heard Collection.
- James & Drinker. "Letter Book, 1756-1762" in HSP.
- Keppelle, Henry & Joseph Steinmetz. "Correspondence" in HSP, Jasper, Yeates, Brinton Collection.
- Lloyd, Henry. "Letter Book, 1765-1767" in BL.
- Payne, Edward. "Account of Costs and Returns from the Marblehead Fishery" in MHS.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Observations on the Acts of Trade (1763)" in MHS, Ezekial Price Collection.
- Pemberton, Israel. "Letter Book, 1727-1735," in the G.W. Blount Library at Mystic Seaport (Mystic, Conn.).
- Pemberton, Israel. "Letter Book, 1744-1747," in the American Philosophical Society Library, Philadelphia.
- "Petition of the Merchants of Boston to the Parliament," January 1767, in MHS, Ezekial Price Collection.
- Pierce, Joshua. "Letter Book, 1725-1734" in BL, Wendell "Papers."
- Powell, Samuel. "Letter Books, II (1727-1739)," in HSP.
- Reynell, John. "Letter Books, 1729-1734; 1734-1737; 1738-1741; 1741-1744; 1752-1754" in HSP.
- Riche, Thomas. "Letter Books, 1748-1764; 1764-1771" in HSP.
- Rowe, John. "Letter Book, 1759-1762" in MHS.
- Sherburn, John. "Log of John Sherburn, January 1732-September 1732" in PEM.
- Willing, Charles and Thomas. "Letter Book, 1754-1761" in HSP.

### Primary Sources (Published):

- Adams, John. *The Adams-Jefferson Letters*. Ed. Lester J. Cappon. Chapel Hill, N.C. 1959.
- Balch, Thomas, ed. *Letters and Papers Relating Chiefly to the Provincial History of Pennsylvania*. Philadelphia, 1855.
- Bond, Phineas. "Letters of Phineas Bond, British Consul at Philadelphia, to the Foreign Office of Great Britain, 1787-1789." Ed. John Franklin Jameson. *AHA Annual Report*, I (1896).
- Bolton, William, *The Bolton Letters: The Letters of an English Merchant in Madeira, 1695-1714*. Ed. André L. Simon. 2 vols. London, 1928.

- Boston Records*, XXXII (Aspinwall Notarial Records, 1644-1651). Boston, 1903.
- Bradford, William. *Bradford's History "Of Plimouth Plantation."* Boston, 1898.
- Brigham, Clarence S., ed. *British Royal Proclamations Relating to America, 1603-1783.* Transactions and Collections of the American Antiquarian Society, XII (Worcester, Mass., 1911).
- Carnota, John Smith Athelstone, Conde da. *Memoirs of the Marquis of Pombal.* 2 vols. London, 1843.
- Champion, Richard. *The American Correspondence of a Bristol Merchant, 1766-1776: Letters of Richard Champion.* Ed. George H. Guttridge. Berkeley, Calif., 1934.
- Clark, William Bell, ed. *Naval Documents of the American Revolution.* 15 vols. Washington, D.C., 1964-2005.
- Commerce of Rhode Island, 1726-1800.* Collections of MHS, LXIX, LXX. Boston, 1914-1915.
- Corwin, E.Y. and H. Hastings, eds. *Ecclesiastical Records of New York.* 7 vols. Albany, N.Y., 1901.
- Danckaerts, Jasper and Peter Sluyter. *Journal of a Voyage to New York and a Tour in Several of the American Colonies in 1679-1680.* Memoirs of the Long Island Historical Society, I. Brooklyn, N.Y., 1867.
- Eliot, Jared. *Essays upon Field Husbandry in New England and Other Papers, 1748-1762.* Ed. Harry J. Carman. New York, 1934.
- Fortescue, John William et al., eds. *Calendar of State Papers, Colonial Series.* 45 vols. London, 1880-1964.
- Higginson, Stephen. "Letters of Stephen Higginson, 1783-1804." Ed. John Franklin Jameson. AHA *Annual Report*, I (1896).
- Hull, John. *The Diaries of John Hull, Mint-master and Treasurer of Massachusetts Bay.* Transactions and Collections of the American Antiquarian Society, III (Worcester, Mass., 1857), 109-316.
- Jay, John. *Correspondence and Papers of John Jay.* Ed. Henry P. Johnston. 4 vols. New York, 1890-1893.
- Jefferson, Thomas. *The Adams-Jefferson Letters.* Ed. Lester J. Cappon. Chapel Hill, N.C. 1959.
- Jefferson, Thomas. *Papers of Thomas Jefferson.* Ed. Julian P. Boyd et al. 33 vols. to date. Princeton, N.J., 1950-.
- John Norton & Sons. *John Norton & Sons, Merchants of London and Virginia, being the papers from their counting house for the years 1750 to 1795.* Ed. Frances Norton Mason. Richmond, Va., 1937.
- Johnson, Edward. *Johnson's Wonder Working Providence, 1628-1651.* Ed. John Franklin Jameson. New York, 1910.
- Knox, Dudley W., ed. *Naval Documents Relative to the United States Wars with the Barbary Powers.* 7 vols. Washington, D.C., 1939-1945.
- Mather, Cotton, *Diary of Cotton Mather.* Ed. Worthington C. Ford. 2 vols. New York, 1957. New York (Colony). Council. *Calendar of Council Minutes, 1668-1783.* Albany, 1902.
- O'Callaghan, E.B., ed. *The Documentary History of New York State.* 4 vols. Albany, N.Y., 1850-1851.
- O'Callaghan, E.B. and B. Fernow, eds. *Documents Relative to the Colonial History of the State of New York.* 15 vols. Albany, N.Y., 1853-1887.
- Pickering, Danby, ed. *The Statutes at Large from Magna Carta to 1761.* 24 vols. Cambridge, England, 1762-1807.
- Pinkerton, John, ed. "Peter Kalm's *Travels into North America, 1748-1749,*" in *A General Collection of the Best and Most Interesting Voyages and Travels in All Parts of the World.* London, 1812.
- Porter, Kenneth Wiggins, ed. *The Jacksons and the Lees: Two Generations of Massachusetts*

- Merchants, 1765-1844*. 2 vols. Cambridge, Mass., 1937.
- Quary, Robert. "Report on New England Commerce, 1708." *Proceedings of MHS*, 2nd ser., IV (1888).
- Randolph, Edward. *Edward Randolph, Including His Letters and Official Papers*. Eds. Robert N. Toppan and A.T.S. Goodrick. 7 vols. Boston, 1898-1909.
- Report of The Historical Association (Lisbon Branch)*, I (1937-1945).
- Salley, Alexander S., *Narratives of Early Carolina, 1650-1708*. New York, 1911.
- Sée, Henri, ed. "Documents sur le Commerce de Cadix (1691-1752)," *Revue de l'Histoire des Colonies Françaises* XV (1926-1927).
- Shurtleff, Nathaniel B., ed. *Records of the Governor and Company of Massachusetts Bay in New England*. 5 vols. Boston, 1853-1854.
- Trelawney, [Robert]. *The Trelawney Papers*. Ed. James P. Baxter. Maine Historical Society Collections, 2nd ser., III (Portland, 1884).
- United States, Bureau of the Census. *Historical Statistics of the United States, Colonial Times to 1970*. 2 parts. Washington, D.C., 1975.
- Winthrop, John. *Winthrop's Journal, "A History of New England," 1630-1649*. Ed. James K. Hosmer. 2 vols. New York, 1908.

### **Primary Sources (Contemporary Publications):**

- The Advantages and Disadvantages which will attend the Prohibition of the Merchandizes of Spain, impartially examined*. London, 1740.
- Anderson, Adam. *An Historical and Chronological Deduction of the Origin of Commerce from the Earliest Accounts*. 2 vols. London, 1764.
- Antunez y Acevedo, Rafael. *Memorias Historicos Sobre Legislacion y Gobierno del Comercio de Los Españoles*. Madrid, 1797.
- Bourgoing, Jean Francis, ed. *Travels of the Duke de Châtelet in 1777 and 1778 in Portugal*. 2 vols. London, 1809.
- Brewster, Francis. *New Essays on Trade and Navigation*. London, 1702.
- Canga Arguelles, José. *Diccionario de Hacienda para el uso de los Encargados*. 5 vols. Madrid, 1833-1834.
- Cary, John. *An Essay on Trade*. Bristol, England, 1695.
- Chalmers, George. *Opinions of Eminent Lawyers on Interesting Subjects*. London, 1784.
- Champion, Richard. *Considerations on the Present Situation of Great Britain and the United States of North America*. London, 1784.
- Child, Josiah. *A Discourse of Trade*. London, 1690.
- Clarke, Edward. *Letters Concerning the Spanish Nation: Written at Madrid during the Years 1760 and 1761*. London, 1763.
- Cluny, Alexander. *The American Traveller*. London, 1769.
- Collins, John. *A Plea for the Bringing in of Irish Cattle and the Keeping Out of Fish Caught by Foreigners*. London, 1680.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Salt and Fishery*. London, 1682.
- Coxe, William. *Memoirs of the Kings of Spain of the House of Bourbon*. 3 vols. London, 1813.
- Defoe, Daniel. *A General History of Trade*. London, 1713.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *A Plan of the English Commerce*. London, 1728.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Some Considerations on the Reasonableness and Necessity of Encreasing and Encouraging the Seamen*. London, 1728.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Trade with France, Italy, Spain and Portugal*. London, 1713.
- Duhamel de Monceau, Henri Louis. *Traité Général des Pêches et Histoire des Poissons*. 2 vols. Paris, 1772.



Douglass, William. *Summary Historical and Political of the British Settlements in North America*. 2 vols. London, 1755.

Dumouriez, Charles Francis. *An Account of Portugal*. Lausanne, 1766.

Foronda, Valentin de. *Cartas Sobre Los Asuntos Mas Exquisitos de la Economia*. 2 vols. Madrid, 1789-1794.

*A Full and Impartial History of the Expedition into Spain; in the year 1702*. London, 1704.

Gee, Joshua. *The Trade and Navigation of Great Britain Considered*. London, 1722.

Hall, Fayrer. *The Importance of the British Plantations in America to This Kingdom*. London, 1731.

Holyrod, John Baker [Lord Sheffield]. *Observations on the Commerce of the American States*. London, 1784.

[Hopkins, Stephen]. *An Essay on the Trade of the Northern Colonies of Great Britain in North America*. Philadelphia, 1764.

*The Importance of the Island of Minorca and Harbour of Port Mahon*. London, 1756.

Josselyn, John. *An Account of Two Voyages to New England Made during the Years 1638, 1663*. Boston, 1865.

Labat, Jean Baptiste. *Voyages du P. Labat en Espagne et en Italie, 1705-1706*. 2 vols. Amsterdam, 1731.

*A Letter to the Honourable A[rthu]r M[oo]re, Com[missio]ner of Trade and Plantation*. London, 1714.

[Little, Otis]. *The State of Trade in the Northern Colonies Considered*. London, 1748.

Macpherson, David. *Annals of Commerce, Manufactures, Fisheries and Navigation*. 4 vols. London, 1805.

Melchor de Jovellanos, Gaspar. *Informe de la Sociedad Economica de esta Corte*. Madrid, 1795.

Mun, Thomas. *England's Treasure by Forraign Trade*. London, 1933.

Oldmixon, John. *The British Empire in America*. 2 vols. London, 1741.

Petyt, William. *Britannia Languens, or a Discourse of Trade*. London, 1680.

Postlethwayt, M[alachi]. *A Universal Dictionary of Trade and Commerce*. 2 vols. London, 1751-1755.

Pownall, Thomas. *The Administration of the British Colonies*. 2 vols. London, 1774.

*A Proposal for Humbling Spain. Written in 1711*. London, [1739].

Rawles, Francis. *Ways and Means of the Inhabitants of Delaware to Become Rich*. Philadelphia, 1725.

Reynell, Carew. *The True English Interest*. London, 1674.

Roberts, Lewis. *The Merchant's Mappe of Commerce*. London, 1700.

Robinson, Henry. *England's Safety in Trade's Encrease*. London, 1641.

Rutherford, John. *The Importance of the Colonies to Great Britain*. London, 1761.

Shirley, William. *Memoirs of the Principal Transactions of the Last War*. London, 1757.

Townshend, Joseph. *A Journey through Spain in the Years 1786 and 1787*. 3 vols. London, 1792.

Twiss, Richard. *Travels through Portugal and Spain in 1772 and 1773*. London, 1775.

Ulloa, Bernardo de. *Rétablissement des manufactures et du commerce d'Espagne*. Amsterdam, 1753.

Uztariz, Geronimo. *The Theory and Practice of Commerce and Maritime Affairs*. Trans. J. Kippas. 2 vols. London, 1751.

Vaughan, Sir William. *The Golden Fleece*. London, 1623.

Ward, Bernardo. *Proyecto economico*. Madrid, 1779.

White, John. *The Planter's Plea*. London, 1630.

Whitworth, Charles. *The State of the Trade of Great Britain in its Imports and Exports Progressively from the Year 1697 to 1773*. London, 1776.

## Primary Sources (Newspapers):

*American Weekly Mercury*, 1720-1728.  
*Boston Newsletter*, 1714-1774.  
*Com Privilegio Real* (Lisbon), 1757-1759; 1762-1763; 1771-1775.  
*Essex Gazette* (Salem), 1768-1774.  
*New England Weekly Journal*, 1730-1739.  
*New York Mercury*, 1750-1759.  
*Pennsylvania Gazette*, 1720-1775; 1783-1789.  
*The Mercator* (London), 1713-1714.

## Secondary Sources:

Albertson, Dean. "Puritan Liquor in the Planting of New England," *NEQ* XXIII: 477-490.  
Alvarino, Angeles and Olegario Rodriguez. *La Merluza et el bacalao y especies afines*. Madrid, 1955.  
Anderson, Matthew S. *Europe in the Eighteenth Century, 1713-1783*. New York, 1961.  
Andrews, Charles M. *The Colonial Period of American History*. 4 vols. New Haven, Conn., 1964.  
Ashley, William J. *Surveys Historic and Economic*. London, 1900.  
Ashton, Thomas S. *Economic Fluctuations in England, 1700-1800*. Oxford, 1959.  
\_\_\_\_\_. *An Economic History of England: The Eighteenth Century*. New York, 1956.  
Atkinson, William C. *British Contributions to Portuguese and Brazilian Studies*. Edinburgh, 1945.  
Babson, John J. *The History of the Town of Gloucester*. Gloucester, Mass., 1860.  
\_\_\_\_\_. *Notes and Additions to the History of Gloucester*. Salem, Mass., 1891.  
Bailyn, Bernard. *The New England Merchants in the Seventeenth Century*. New York, 1964.  
Bailyn, Bernard and Lotte Bailyn. *Massachusetts Shipping, 1697-1714*. Cambridge, Mass., 1959.  
Ballesteros y Beretta, A. *Historia de España su influencia en la historia universal*. vols. V and VI. Barcelona, 1918-1941.  
Barbour, Violet. "Dutch and English Merchant Shipping in the Seventeenth Century." In Carus-Wilson, *Essays in Economic History*, I.  
\_\_\_\_\_. "Marine Risks and Insurance in the Seventeenth Century." In Carus-Wilson, *Essays in Economic History*, I.  
Barnby, H.G. *The Prisoners of Algiers, 1785-1797*. London, 1966.  
Barnes, Donald G. *A History of the English Corn Laws from 1660 to 1846*. New York, 1961.  
Barnes, Viola F. *The Dominion of New England*. New York, 1960.  
Beer, George Louis. *British Colonial Policy, 1754-1765*. Gloucester, Mass., 1958.  
\_\_\_\_\_. *The Commercial Policy of England toward the American Colonies*. New York, 1948.  
\_\_\_\_\_. *The Old Colonial System, 1660-1754*. 2 vols. Gloucester, Mass., 1959.  
\_\_\_\_\_. *The Origins of the British Colonial System, 1578-1660*. Gloucester, Mass., 1959.  
Bemis, Samuel Flagg. *The Diplomacy of the American Revolution*. Bloomington, Ind., 1957.  
\_\_\_\_\_. *Pinckney's Treaty: America's Advantage from Europe's Distress, 1738-1800*. New Haven, Conn., 1960.  
Bezanson, Anne, Robert D. Gray, and Miriam Hussey. *Prices in Colonial Pennsylvania*. Philadelphia, 1935.  
Bidwell, Percy W. and John I. Falconer. *The History of Agriculture in the Northern United States, 1620-1860*. Washington, D.C., 1925.

- Boissonade, Prosper. *Les études relatives à l'histoire économique de l'Espagne et leurs résultats*. Paris, 1913.
- Bowden, William H. *The Commerce of Marblehead, 1667-1775*. Essex Institute Historical Collections, LXVIII (Salem, Mass., 1932), 117-146.
- Boxer, C.R. *The Dutch Seabourne Empire, 1600-1800*. London, 1966.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Golden Age of Brazil, 1695-1750*. Berkeley, Calif., 1962.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Some Contemporary Reactions to the Lisbon Earthquake of 1755*. Lisbon, 1956.
- Bradlee, Francis B.C. *Colonial Trade and Commerce, 1733-1774*. Essex Institute Historical Collections LXIII (Salem, Mass., 1927), 1-29.
- Bridbury, A.R. *England and the Salt Trade in the Later Middle Ages*. Oxford, 1955.
- Bridenbaugh, Carl. *Cities in the Wilderness*. New York, 1966.
- Brown, Vera Lee. "Contraband Trade, a Factor in the Decline of Spain's Empire in America." *HAHR* VIII (1928): 179-189.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Spanish Claims to a Share in the Newfoundland Fisheries in the Eighteenth Century." *Canadian Historical Association Report* (1925).
- Bruchey, Stuart. *The Colonial Merchant*. New York, 1966.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Success and Failure in Foreign Trade." *Business History Review* XXXII: 272-292.
- Buel, Richard J. *In Irons: Britain's Naval Supremacy and the American Revolutionary Economy*. New Haven, Conn., 1998.
- Burnett, Edmund C. *The Continental Congress*. New York, 1964.
- Carosso, Vincent P. and Lawrence H. Leder. "Robert Livingston, 1654-1728." *Business History Review* XXX, 18-45.
- Carrera Pujal, Jaime. *Historia de la Economía Española*. 5 vols. Barcelona, 1943-1947.
- Carrier, Lyman. *The Beginnings of Agriculture in America*. New York, 1923.
- Carus-Wilson, Eleanora M., ed. *Essays in Economic History*. 3 vols. London, 1954-1962.
- Cell, Gillian T. "The Newfoundland Company: A Study of Subscribers to a Colonizing Venture." *WMQ* XXII (1965): 611-623.
- Channing, Edward. *A History of the United States*. 6 vols. New York, 1905-1925.
- Chapman, A.B.W. *The Commercial Relations of England and Portugal, 1640-1790*. London, 1907.
- Cheever, George F. *Some Remarks on the Commerce of Salem, 1626 to 1740*. Essex Institute Historical Collections I (Salem, Mass., 1859-1860), 67-81, 117-148, 157-181.
- Chitwood, Oliver P. *A History of Colonial America*. New York, 1961.
- Christelow, Allan. "Great Britain and the Trades from Cadiz and Lisbon to Spanish America and Brazil, 1759-1783." *HAHR* XXVII (1948): 2-29.
- Clark, George N. "The Barbary Corsairs in the Seventeenth Century," *War and Society in the Seventeenth Century*. Wiles Lectures, 1956. Westport, Conn., 1985.
- Clauder, A.C. *American Commerce as Effected by the Wars of the French Revolution and Napoleon, 1792-1812*. Philadelphia, 1932.
- Clowse, Converse D. *Measuring Charleston's Overseas Commerce, 1717-1767*. Washington, D.C., 1981.
- Cobb, Gerald. *Oporto Older and Newer*. Chichester, England, 1965.
- Coclanis, Peter. "Bitter Harvest: The South Carolina Low Country in Historical Perspective." *JEH* 45 (1985): 251-259.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Distant Thunder: The Creation of a World Market in Rice and the Transformation It Wrought." *AHR* 98 (1993): 1050-1078.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Rice Prices in the 1720s and the Evolution of the South Carolina Economy." *Journal of Southern History* XLVIII (1982): 531-544.
- Cole, Arthur H. "The Tempo of Mercantile Life in Colonial America." *Business History Review* XXXIII, 277-299.

- \_\_\_\_\_. *Wholesale Commodity Prices in the United States, 1700-1861*. 2 vols. Cambridge, Mass., 1938.
- Corbett, Julian S. *England in the Mediterranean, 1603-1713*. 2 vols. Westport, Conn., 1987.
- Davies, Kenneth G. *The North Atlantic World in the Seventeenth Century*. Minneapolis, Minn., 1974.
- Davis, Ralph. "English Foreign Trade, 1660-1700." *EHR* VII (1954-5): 150-166.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Rise of the Atlantic Economies*. Ithaca, N.Y., 1973.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Rise of the English Shipping Industry in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries*. London, 1962.
- Dickerson, Oliver M. *American Colonial Government, 1696-1765: A Study of the Board of Trade*. Cleveland, Ohio, 1912.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Navigation Acts and the American Revolution*. Philadelphia, 1951.
- Doerflinger, Thomas M. *A Vigorous Spirit of Enterprise: Merchants and Economic Development in Revolutionary Philadelphia*. Chapel Hill, N.C. 1986.
- Dorn, Walter. *Competition for Empire, 1740-1763*. New York, 1940.
- Duncan, T. Bentley. *Atlantic Islands; Madeira, the Azores, and the Cape Verdes in Seventeenth-Century Commerce and Navigation*. Chicago, [1972].
- Dunn, Richard S. *Puritans and Yankees*. Princeton, N.J., 1962.
- Egnal, Marc and Joseph A. Ernst. "An Economic Interpretation of the American Revolution." *WMQ* XXIX (1972): 3-32.
- Elliott, J.H. *The Revolt of the Catalans, A Study in the Decline of Spain, 1598-1640*. Cambridge, Mass., 1963.
- Ernst, Joseph A. "The Political Economy of the Chesapeake Colonies, 1760-1775." In Hoffman et al., *Economy of Early America*.
- Fairchild, Byron. *Messrs. William Pepperrell*. Ithaca, N.Y. 1954.
- Felt, Joseph B. *The Annals of Salem from Its First Settlement*. Salem, Mass., 1827.
- Fisher, H.E.S. "Anglo-Portuguese Trade, 1700-1770." PhD dissertation, University of London, 1961.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Anglo-Portuguese Trade, 1700-1770." *EHR* XVI (1963-4): 219-233.
- Fite, Gilbert C. and James E. Reese. *An Economic History of the United States*. Cambridge, Mass., 1959.
- Flinn, M.W. "Agricultural Productivity and Economic Growth in England, 1700-1760: A Comment." *JEH* XXVI (1966): 93-98.
- Ford, Worthington C. "Colonial Commerce, 1774-1776." *Proceedings of MHS* LIX (1926): 210-235.
- Francis, Alan D. *The Methuens and Portugal, 1691-1702*. Cambridge, England, 1966.
- Giesecke, Albert A. *American Commercial Legislation before 1789*. New York, 1910.
- Gillingham, Harold E. *Marine Insurance in Philadelphia, 1721-1800*. Philadelphia, 1933.
- Girard, Albert. *Le Commerce Français à Séville et Cadix au temps des Habsbourg*. Paris, 1932.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *La Rivalité Commerciale et Maritime entre Séville et Cadix jusque la Fin du XVIII<sup>e</sup> Siècle*. Paris, 1932.
- Gomez del Campillo, Miguel. *Relaciones Diplomáticas entre España y los Estados Unidos*. 2 vols. Madrid, 1944.
- Gottfried, Marion H. "The First Depression in Massachusetts." *NEQ* IX (1936): 655-678.
- Graebner, Norman A. *Ideas and Diplomacy*. New York, 1964.
- Gray, Lewis Cecil. *The History of Agriculture in the Northern United States to 1860*. New York, 1941.
- Greene, Evarts B. and Virginia D. Harrington. *American Population before the Federal Census of 1790*. New York, 1932.
- Guiard de Larrauri, Teofilio. *El Historia de la Noble Villa de Bilbao*. 3 vols. Bilbao, 1908.
- Hall, Michael G. *Edward Randolph and the American Colonies, 1676-1703*. Chapel Hill, N.C., 1960.

- Hamilton, Earl J. "The Decline of Spain." In Carus-Wilson, *Essays in Economic History*, I. \_\_\_\_\_ . "The Mercantilism of Geronimo Uztariz: A Re-examination," 111-129. In Norman E. Himes, ed. *Economics, Sociology and the Modern World*. Cambridge, England, 1935.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Spanish Mercantilism before 1700." In *Facts and Factors in Economic History*. Cambridge, Mass., 1932.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *War and Prices in Spain, 1651-1800*. Cambridge, Mass., 1947.
- Hanna, Mary Alice. *The Trade of the Delaware District before the Revolution*. Northampton, Mass., 1917.
- Harper, Lawrence A. "The Effect of the Navigation Acts on the Thirteen Colonies." In Richard B. Morris, ed., *The Era of the American Revolution*. Gloucester, Mass., 1971.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The English Navigation Laws: A Seventeenth Century Experiment in Social Engineering*. New York, 1939.
- Harrington, Virginia D. *The New York Merchants on the Eve of the Revolution*. New York, 1935.
- Haywood, C. Robert. "Mercantilism and South Carolina Agriculture, 1700-1763." *South Carolina Historical Magazine* LX (1959): 15-27.
- Hebb, David D. *Piracy and the English Government, 1616-1642*. Aldershot, England, 1994.
- Heckscher, Eli F. *Mercantilism*. London, 1955.
- Herr, Richard. *The Eighteenth-Century Revolution in Spain*. Princeton, N.J., 1958.
- Heyward, Duncan C. *Seed from Madagascar*. Chapel Hill, N.C., 1937.
- Hoffman, Ronald, John J. McCusker, Russell R. Menard, and Peter J. Albert. *The Economy of Early America: The Revolutionary Period, 1763-1790*. Charlottesville, Va., 1988.
- Hooker, Roland Mather. *The Colonial Trade of Connecticut*. Tercentenary Commission of the State of Connecticut. New Haven, Conn., 1936.
- Hunter, Henry C. *How England Got Its Merchant Marine*. New York, 1935.
- Hussey, Roland H. "Antecedents of the Spanish Monopolistic Overseas Trading Companies, 1624-1728." *HAHR* IX (1929): 1-39.
- Innis, Harold A. *The Cod Fisheries: A History of an International Economy*. New Haven, Conn., 1940.
- Irwin, Ray W. *The Diplomatic Relations of the United States with the Barbary Powers, 1776-1816*. Chapel Hill, N.C., 1931.
- Jensen, Arthur L. *The Maritime Commerce of Colonial Philadelphia*. Madison, Wisc., 1963.
- Jensen, Merrill. *The New Nation, 1781-1789*. New York, 1950.
- John, A.H. "Agricultural Productivity and Economic Growth in England, 1700-1760." *JEH* XXV (1965): 19-34.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Aspects of English Economic Growth in the First Half of the Eighteenth Century." In Carus-Wilson, *Essays in Economic History*, II.
- Johnson, Emory R. et al. *The History of the Domestic and Foreign Commerce of the United States*. Pittsburgh, Pa., 1915.
- Judah, Charles B. *The North American Fisheries and British Policy to 1713*. Urbana, Ill., 1933.
- Kammen, Michael. "Colonial Agents, English Politics, and the American Revolution." *WMQ* XXII (1965): 244-263.
- Klingaman, David. "Food Surpluses and Deficits in the American Colonies, 1768-1772." *JEH* XXXI (1971): 553-569.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Significance of Grain in the Development of the Tobacco Colonies." *JEH* XXIX (1969): 268-278.
- Knollenberg, Bernhard. *Origin of the American Revolution, 1759-1766*. New York, 1961.
- Kurlansky, Mark. *Salt, A World History*. New York, 2002.
- Labaree, Leonard W. *Royal Government in America*. New York, 1958.
- Lawson, Murray G. "The Routes of Boston's Trade, 1752-1765." *Transactions of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts* 38 (1947-51): 81-120.

- Lazurtegui, J. de and V. de Larrea. *Merchants and Shipmaster's Practical Guide to the Port of Bilbao*. Bilbao, 1882.
- Leder, Lawrence H. *Robert Livingston and the Politics of Colonial New York*. Chapel Hill, N.C., 1961.
- Lipson, E. *The Age of Mercantilism*. London, 1956.
- Lounsbury, Ralph Greenlee. *The British Fishery at Newfoundland, 1634-1763*. New Haven, Conn., 1934.
- Lovejoy, David S. *The Glorious Revolution in America*. New York, 1972.
- Lydon, James G. "Barbary Pirates and Colonial New Yorkers." *NYHSQ* XLV (1961): 281-289.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Fish and Flour for Gold: Southern Europe and the Colonial Balance of Payments." *Business History Review* 39 (1965): 171-183.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Massachusetts Fish Trade with Iberia, 1700-1773." *NEQ* LIV (1981): 539-582.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "North Shore Trade in the Early Eighteenth Century." *The American Neptune* XXVIII (1968): 261-274.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Thomas Jefferson and the Mathurins." *The Catholic Historical Review* XLIX (1963): 192-202.
- Maier, Pauline. *From Resistance to Revolution*. New York, 1974.
- Martin, Margaret E. *Merchants and the Trade of the Connecticut River Valley, 1750-1820*. Northampton, Mass., 1939.
- Martin-Kaye, P.H.A. *Salt in the Leeward Islands*. Antigua, 1954.
- Mauro, Frédéric. *Le Portugal et l'Atlantique au XVII<sup>e</sup> Siècle, 1570-1670*. Paris, 1960.
- McClendon, R. Earl. "The Origin of the Two-Thirds Rule in Senate Action on Treaties." *AHR* XXXVI (1931): 768-772.
- McCusker, John J. *Money and Exchange in Europe and America, 1600-1775*. Chapel Hill, N.C., 1978.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Sources of Investment Capital in the Colonial Philadelphia Shipping Industry." *JEH* XXII (1972): 146-157.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Tonnage of Ships Engaged in British Colonial Trade during the Eighteenth Century." *Research in Economic History* VI (1981): 73-105.
- McCusker, John J. and Russell R. Menard. *The Economy of British America, 1607-1789*. Chapel Hill, N.C., 1985.
- McFarland, Raymond. *The History of the New England Fisheries*. New York, 1911.
- McLachlan, Jean O. *Trade and Peace with Old Spain, 1667-1750*. Cambridge, England, 1940.
- Menard, Russell R. "Slavery, Economic Growth and Revolutionary Ideology in the South Carolina Low Country." In Hoffman et al., *Economy of Early America*.
- Miller, David S. "The Polly: A Perspective on Merchant Stephen Girard." *PMHB* CXII (1988): 189-208.
- Mingay, G. "The Agricultural Depression, 1730-1750." *EHR* VIII (1955): 323-338.
- Moody, Robert E. "The Last Voyage of the *Province Galley*." *Transactions of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts* 32 (1933-7): 131-155.
- Moote, A. Lloyd. *The Seventeenth Century: Europe in Ferment*. Lexington, Mass., 1970.
- Morales Padron, Francisco. *El Comercio Canario-Americano*. Sevilla, 1955.
- Moran, Charles. *The Sea of Memories*. New York, 1942.
- Morgan, Kenneth. "The Organization of the Colonial Rice Trade." *WMQ* LII (1995): 433-452.
- Morison, Samuel E. "The Commerce of Boston on the Eve of the Revolution." *Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society* 32 (1922): 24-51.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Maritime History of Massachusetts, 1783-1860*. Cambridge, Mass., 1921.
- Morrison, Frank B. *Feeds and Feeding*. Ithaca, N.Y., 1951.
- Nash, Gary B. *The Urban Crucible: The Northern Seaports and the Origins of the American Revolution*. Cambridge, Mass., 1986.

- Nash, R.C. "South Carolina and the Atlantic Economy in the Late Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries." *EHR* XLV (1992): 677-702.
- Nettels, Curtis P. "British Mercantilism and the Economic Development of the Thirteen Colonies." *JEH* XII (1952): 105-114.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Emergence of a National Economy, 1775-1815*. New York, 1962.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Money Supply of the American Colonies before 1720*. Madison, Wisc., 1934.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Roots of American Civilization*. New York, 1963.
- Ogg, David. *England in the Reign of Charles II*. 2 vols. Oxford, 1963.
- Pares, Richard. "The Economic Factor in the History of the Empire." In Carus-Wilson, *Essays in Economic History*, I.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *War and Trade in the West Indies, 1739-1763*. Oxford, 1936.
- Parry, J.H. *Trade and Dominion: The European Overseas Empires in the Eighteenth Century*. New York, 1971.
- Peabody, Robert E. *Merchant Ventures of Old Salem*. Boston, 1912.
- Perley, Sidney. *The History of Salem*. 3 vols. Salem, Mass., 1924.
- Phillips, James Duncan. *Salem in the Eighteenth Century*. Boston, 1937.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Salem in the Seventeenth Century*. Boston, 1933.
- Playfair, Robert L. *The Scourge of Christendom*. London, 1884.
- Prestage, Edgar. *The Diplomatic Relations of Portugal with France, England, and Holland, 1640-1668*. London, 1925.
- Riddell, William R. "From Slave to Governor." *Dalhousie Review* IX (1930): 475-480.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Suggested Governmental Assistance to Farmers Two Centuries Ago in Pennsylvania." *PMHB* LIII (1929): 137-140.
- Roberts, Penfield E. *The Quest for Security, 1715-1740*. New York, 1947.
- Routh, E.M.G. *Tangier, England's Lost Atlantic Outpost, 1661-1684*. London, 1912.
- Ruiz y Pablo, Angel. *Historia de la Real Junta Particular de Comercia de Barcelona, 1758-1847*. Barcelona, 1919.
- Rutman, Darret B. "Governor Winthrop's Garden Crop: The Significance of Agriculture in the Early Commerce of Massachusetts Bay." *WMQ* XX (1963): 396-415.
- Sacks, William and Ari Hoogenboom. *The Enterprising Colonials*. Chicago, 1965.
- Saltonstall, William G. *Ports of Piscataqua*. Cambridge, Mass., 1941.
- Savelle, Max. *A History of Colonial America*. Rev. by Robert Middlekauff. New York, 1964.
- Schlesinger, Arthur Meier. *The Colonial Merchants and the American Revolution, 1763-1776*. New York, 1968.
- Sellers, Leila. *Charleston Business on the Eve of the American Revolution*. Chapel Hill, N.C., 1934.
- Semple, Ellen Churchill. *The Geography of the Mediterranean Region*. New York, 1931.
- Setser, Vernon G. *The Commercial Reciprocity of the United States, 1774-1829*. New York, 1969.
- Shafer, Robert Jones. *The Economic Societies in the Spanish World, 1763-1821*. Syracuse, N.Y., 1958.
- Shepherd, James F. and Gary M. Walton. *Shipping, Maritime Trade and the Economic Development of Colonial North America*. Cambridge, England, 1972.
- Shillington, V.M. and A.B.W. Chapman. *The Commercial Relations of England and Portugal, 1487-1807*. London, 1907.
- Smith, Lacey Baldwin. *The Elizabethan World*. Boston, 1972.
- Smith, Robert S. *The Spanish Guild Merchant: A History of the Consulado, 1250-1700*. Durham, N.C., 1940.
- Snapp, Roscoe N. *Beef Cattle*. New York, 1951.
- Stephen, Leslie. *The History of English Thought in the Eighteenth Century*. 2 vols. New

- York, 1962.
- Stokes, I.N.P. *The Iconography of Manhattan Island, 1498-1909*. 6 vols. New York, 1922.
- Tapley, Harriet S., ed. *Early Coastwise and Foreign Shipping of Salem; a Record of the Entrances and Clearances of the Port of Salem, 1750-1769*. Salem, Mass., 1934.
- Taylor, George Rogers. "American Economic Growth before 1800: An Explanatory Essay." *JEH* XXIV (1964): 427-444.
- Tolles, Frederick B. *Meeting House and Counting House: The Quaker Merchants of Colonial Philadelphia, 1682-1763*. New York, 1963.
- Towne, Marvin W. and Wayne D. Rasmussen. *Trends in the American Economy in the Nineteenth Century*. Princeton, N.J., 1960.
- Usher, Abbot Payson. "Spanish Ships and Shipping in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries." In *Facts and Factors in Economic History*. Cambridge, Mass., 1932.
- Vicens Vives, Jaime. *Historia social y economica de España y America*. 5 vols. Barcelona, 1957-1959.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Manual de historia economica de España*. Barcelona, 1965.
- Vickers, Daniel Frederick. *Farmers and Fishermen: Two Centuries of Work in Essex County, Massachusetts, 1630-1850*. Chapel Hill, N.C., 1994.
- Vignols, Leon. *El Asiento Frances, 1701-1713*. Madrid, 1929.
- Voltes Bou, Pedro. "Aspectos economicas del siglo XVIII." *Cuadernos de Arqueologia e Historia de la Ciudad* (Barcelona), III (1962): 139-152.
- Walford, A.B. *The British Factory in Lisbon and Its Closing Stages*. Lisbon, 1940.
- Walton, Gary M. "Sources of Productivity Change in American Colonial Shipping, 1675-1775." *EHR* XX (1967): 67-78.
- Walton, Gary M. and James F. Shepherd. *The Economic Rise of Early America*. Cambridge, England, 1979.
- Warren, George F., Frank A. Pearson, and Herman M. Stoker. *Wholesale Prices at New York, 1720-1932*. 2 vols. Ithaca, N.Y., 1932.
- Watson, D.H. "Joseph Harrison and the *Liberty* Incident." *WMQ* XX (1963): 585-595.
- Weeden, William B. *The Economic and Social History of New England, 1620-1789*. 2 vols. Boston, 1890.
- White, Philip L. *The Beekmans of New York, 1647-1877*. New York, 1956.
- Whiteley, William H. "Governor Hugh Palliser and the Newfoundland and Labrador Fishery, 1764-1768." *The Canadian Historical Review* I (1969): 141-163.
- Williams, William Appleman. "The Age of Mercantilism." *WMQ* XV (1958): 419-425.
- Wolff, Mabel P. *The Colonial Agency of Pennsylvania, 1712-1757*. Philadelphia, 1933.
- Wood, Peter H. *Black Majority: Negroes in Colonial South Carolina*. New York, 1974.
- Ygartua y Landecho, Francisco de. *Diego de Gardoqui, primer embajador de Espana en los Estados Unidos de Norte America*. Bilbao, 1964.
- Zabala y Allende, Federico de. *El Consulado y las ordenanzas de comercio de Bilbao*. Bilbao, 1907.
- Ziegler, P. Thomas. *The Meat We Eat*. Danville, Ill., 1944.