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Notes

Abbreviations Used in the Notes

BA Boston Athenaeum, Boston
BC Boston Chronicle
BEP Boston Evening Post
BG Boston Gazette
BL Baker Library, Harvard Business School
BNL Boston Newsletter
BPB Boston Postboy
BPL Boston Public Library
EG Essex Gazette
HL Houghton Library, Harvard University
MA Massachusetts Archives, Boston
MG Massachusetts Gazette, later Massachusetts Gazette and Boston Newsletter
MGBP Massachusetts Gazette and Boston Post-Boy
MHS Massachusetts Historical Society, Boston
NEHGS New England Historic Genealogical Society, Boston
NYPL New York Public Library, New York
PRO Great Britain Public Record Office (sources cited in these notes can be found at the U.S. Library of Congress)
Introduction


5. The general features of trade with the West Indies at this time are best described in: Richard Pares, *Yankees and Creoles: The Trade Between North America and the West Indies before the American Revolution* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1956); Richard Sheridan, *Sugar and Slavery: Economic History of the British West Indies, 1623–1775* (Bal-


8. Massachusetts Naval Office Records, PRO, Colonial Office 5/848-51, copies at MHS; and Ezekiel Price Insurance Records, BA. (A checklist of Boston newspapers appears in the bibliography of this book.)


11. Ezekiel Price Insurance Papers, BA.

12. Melatiah Bourn to Ebenezer Frost, March 15, 1763, Bourn Papers 1: 149, Houghton Library, and the accounting of the voyage of the schooner Sally, 1763, Bourn Papers, BL.

13. William Cooper to John Boylston, Boston, November 7, 1768, Boylston Papers, MHS.


16. Ironically, Loyalists proved much easier to document than patriots. See Lorenzo Sabine, *Biographical Sketches of Loyalists of the American Revolution* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1864); James H. Stark, *The Loyalists of Massachusetts: Their Memorials, Petitions and Claims* (London: Privately printed, 1930); "A list of Such Persons belonging to this Town, as have been Endeavouring . . . to counteract the united struggles of this & neighboring States," 1777, Boston Town Records xviii: 281–282, BPL; "A List of Names . . . of Persons who have left the State & are supposed to be Inimical," March 1778, Mss. L. 1, iii: 18, NEHGS.

Sources on patriots include: *Massachusetts Soldiers and Sailors of the Revolutionary War* (Boston: Wright and Potter, 1896–1908), 17 vols.; Gardner Weld Allen, "Massachusetts Privateers of the Revolution," *MHS Collections* lxxvii (1927); and the Thwing File, MHS.


18. 1771 Boston tax list (see note 3).


20. Drafts of the various petitions dispatched by the Boston Society for Encouraging Trade and Commerce between 1763 and 1767 can be found in the Ezekiel Price Papers, MHS.
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1. 1771 Boston tax list, MA CXXXII: 92–147.


3. See appendix for the names of Boston smugglers.

4. For war news: BEP, January 21, 1760. For seizures at Monte Cristi: BG, January 14, 1760, and BEP, same date. On the embarkation of Barons: BPB, January 21, 1760, and BNL, January 24, 1760.

tions of the controversy and attempt to provide any sort of month-by-
month account of the incident. Sharing as it does a number of sources
with both Smith and Thomas, this account inevitably overlaps with the
other two versions at times. Here, however, the focus is on merchants
and trade, and less on the political and constitutional issues involved.

On Barons’s early career, see Barrow, *Trade and Empire*, p. 123;
the memorial of Benjamin Barons to Lord Bute, March 23, 1763, pho-
tostatic copy in the collections of MHS. According to the *BG*, Barons
may have been Hardy’s brother-in-law. Smith, *Writs*, pp. 85–86.

6. Deposition of Charles Paxton, April 3, 1761, PRO Treasury
1/408, f. 102–104; deposition of Nathaniel Hatch, PRO Treasury
1/408, f. 153–154, transcripts of all the PRO documents cited here are
at the Library of Congress; Smith, *Writs*, p. 420n.

7. John Rowe to Alexander Collden, Boston, May 26, 1760, in
John Rowe Letterbook, 1759–1762, BL.

8. On the importance of the Monte Cristi trade: McCusker,
“Rum Trade,” pp. 303, 400, 422; George Louis Beer, *British Colonial Pol-
icy, 1754–1765* (New York: P. Smith, [1907], 1933), pp. 95–97; and
Emily Hickman, who notes especially the trade’s political implications

9. Ezekiel Price Insurance Records, BA; see also the memorial
on behalf of Benjamin Barons by the Boston Society for Encouraging
Trade and Commerce, August 14, 1761, PRO Treasury 1/408, f. 122.

10. A copy of the agreement of the owners of the five vessels
condemned at Jamaica, 1759, Bourn Papers i: 80, HL.

11. Nash, *Urban Crucible*, pp. 242, 244–247; William S. Sachs,
“The Business Outlook in the Northern Colonies, 1750–1775” (unpub-

12. *BPB*, *BG*, and *BEP*, March 24, 1760; *BEP*, August 11,
1760.


15. Proof of involvement in the Dutch trade can be found for
Thomas Hancock in: Henry Hope to Thomas Hancock, Amsterdam,
January 5, 1761, Box 7, Hancock Papers, NEHGS. For William Cooper:
[Melatiah Bourn and Co.] to John Hodshon, Boston, May 23, 1765,
Bourn Papers 11: 21, HL. For William Molineux, agreement of Bourn &
Davis with William Molineux, February 17, 1756, Bourn Papers 11: 60,
HL. For Thomas Boylston: receipt of Bourn & Davis, January 6, 1766,
Bourn Papers 11: 30, HL. For John Rowe: John Rowe to Philip Cuyler, Boston, April 15, 1760, Rowe Letterbook, BL.


17. The origins of the society are shadowy. A merchants’ club had been in existence since 1751, meeting informally in the front room of the British Coffee House on King Street. The question of when this group incorporated itself into the more formal society is much less certain, however. G. B. Warden has alleged that it was founded at this time with no other purpose than “to secure the continuance and increase of the profitable but threatened French [molasses] trade, untrammeled by customs duties.” (“The Caucus and Democracy in Colonial Boston,” *New England Quarterly* XLIII [1970]: 28.) Charles MacLean Andrews placed the date of incorporation for the society as late as April 1764. (“Boston Merchants,” pp. 160–171.) He was, however, almost certainly mistaken, since the *Boston Evening Post* for April 28, 1760, announced a meeting of the Boston Society for Encouraging Trade and Commerce and urged all members—or those inclined to become such—to attend. Andrews assigned the 1764 date on the strength of an undated charter agreement in the Ezekiel Price Papers at MHS. On the basis of internal evidence, Andrews determined that the document was written no later than 1764. I argue for an even earlier date, based on the fact that one of the signatories, James Mason, died in November 1761 (*BEP*, November 28, 1761). M. H. Smith, on the other hand, erred in fixing too early a date when he mistook mention of the 1756 agreement to inform on smugglers for evidence of some rudimentary form of the society (Smith, *Writs*, p. 155). Whatever its date of origin, the BS ETC soon played an important role in combating the increasingly restrictive pattern of customs enforcement at Boston.

18. John Rowe to Alexander Collden, Boston, May 12, 1760, Rowe Letterbook, BL; *BG*, May 19, 1760.

19. John A. Schutz, *Thomas Pownall, British Defender of American Liberty: A Study of Anglo-American Relations in the Eighteenth Century* (Glendale, Calif.: Arthur H. Clark, 1951); *BG*, May 19, 1760. Historians have attempted to subdivide the Boston merchant community in a number of ways. Stephen Patterson has suggested a division between “old merchant” and “new merchant” aristocracies, meaning families of seventeenth-century origin versus more recent arrivals. Patterson sees the “old merchant” aristocracy firmly in control of government war contracts and speculation in provincial currency. Frozen out of this largesse, the “new merchants,” according to Patterson, turned to illicit trade. Patterson chooses as paradigms of these two groups the Hutchinson—
Oliver oligarchy as representatives of the “old merchant” group and the Bowdoin–Pitts–Erving clan for the “new merchants” (Patterson, “Boston Merchants,” pp. 11–12, 22, 47). Unfortunately, there are too many exceptions to be completely satisfying. We need think only of Thomas Hancock, surely a “new merchant” if ever there was one, to be aware that certain men could combine both war contracting and illicit trade. Likewise, even the Hutchinson family had its black sheep. Shrimpton Hutchinson, the lieutenant governor’s cousin, was a frequent partner of John Erving, Jr., in smuggling ventures to and from Monte Cristi. (See insurance policies #150, 358, 960 in the Ezekiel Price Insurance Papers, B.A.)

The other way to subdivide the merchants is into “Shirleyan” and “Pownallite” factions. Following this typology, the Hutchinson–Oliver network is usually placed in the “Shirleyan” camp and their rivals, the Otises and others, among the Pownallites (Shufro, “Boston,” pp. 318–320). The problem here is finding a niche for the Ervings, who were among the most active illicit traders in Boston at this time. John Erving, Jr., was the son-in-law of William Shirley, though he remained a thorn in the side of the government party until the nonimportation controversy.

21. Admiralty Book of Accounts of Sales, 1743–1765, Archives of the Supreme Judicial Court, Suffolk County Court House; Thomas Hancock to Thomas Pownall, Boston, September 24, 1760, TH4, Hancock Papers, NEHGS.
22. BG, July 28, 1760; BNL, July 24, 1760.
25. [Napthali Hart & Co.] to Melatiah Bourn, Newport, September 20, 1760, Bourn Papers 1: 100, H.L. William Vernon, a merchant in Newport and Boston, repeated a similar story to Ezra Stiles, saying that “Cpt. Dorden told [him] that Adm. Holmes at Jamaica seized his Vessel for Coffee—& at [the] Same Time Dorden saw the Adm unlade from his own Ship Two Vessels’ Load of Coffee” and “that while Commodore Coates was on the Jamaica Station he was concerned with a Mercht. there in the Flag [of Truce] Trade which he himself convoyed to Cuba; & that the Balance due to Adm. Coates from s’d Merchant was above Fourtty Eight Thousand pounds Jamaica Money.” Franklin B. Dexter, ed., Extracts from the Itineraries and other Miscellanies of Ezra Stiles (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1916), p. 204. For further infor-

26. William Hodshon to [Isaac and Napthali Hart], London, July 12, 1760, Bourn Papers 1: 100, JL; \*BNL*, October 1, 1760.

27. *BG*, October 27, 1760; \*BNL*, October 30, 1760.

28. Deposition of Paxton, April 3, 1761, PRO Treasury 1/408, f. 112.

29. Deposition of William Story, March 24, 1761, PRO Treasury 1/408, f. 112.

30. Ibid.; deposition of George Craddock, February 24, 1761, PRO Treasury 1/408, f. 156–157; deposition of Francis Bernard, PRO Treasury 1/408, f. 115–118.

31. Deposition of Bernard as in n. 30; deposition of Paxton, February 18, 1761, PRO Treasury 1/408, f. 102–104.

32. Waters and Schutz, “Patterns of Politics,” pp. 558, 560n; William Tudor, *The Life of James Otis* (Boston: Wells & Lilly, 1823), pp. 384–386; deposition of Paxton, as in n. 31. M. H. Smith weaves an elaborate web of speculation around Bernard’s role in Otis’s resignation, postulating that the active enmity of the governor forced the advocate general from his position. The simple timing of the matter, however, supports the traditional explanation that Otis’s own resentment prompted his resignation. Smith, *Writs*, pp. 323–327.

33. Deposition of Story, as in n. 29; Oliver is quoted in Schlesinger, *Colonial Merchants*, p. 54n. Leslie Thomas comments at this point that “the personal attack of the Otises on the Hutchinson group and the attack of the Boston merchants on the Admiralty Court and customs officers to nullify the laws of trade becomes inseparable. It is virtually impossible to distinguish between personal animosities, constitutional principles, economic motives, and the naked struggle between the ‘ins’ and ‘outs’ for political offices and power.” Thomas, “Partisan Politics,” p. 118.

34. Deposition of Paxton, as in n. 6.

35. Deposition of Edmund Trowbridge, March 18, 1761, PRO Treasury 1/408, f. 105–106; deposition of Ebenezer Richardson, February 27, 1761, PRO Treasury 1/408, f. 155.

36. Deposition of Richardson as in n. 35.


39. Ibid; deposition of Trowbridge, as in n. 35.

40. Deposition of Paxton, as in n. 6. The merchants’ petition is found in MA XLIV: 446.
41. MA XLIV: 448, 452; Quincy, Reports, p. 542n; John J. Waters, Jr., The Otis Family in Provincial and Revolutionary Massachusetts (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1968), pp. 120–121.
43. Francis Bernard to [John Pownall], Boston, January 19, 1761, Bernard Papers i: 296, HL.
44. BEP and BNL, February 2, 1761; BEP, December 6, 1756.
45. BG, February 16, 1761.
46. BG, March 2 and 9, 1761.
47. Thomas Lechmere to Board of Customs [Boston], July 8, 1761, PRO Treasury 1/408, f. 146–149; deposition of Paxton, as in n. 6.
49. Francis Bernard to John Pownall, Boston, April 28, 1761, Bernard Papers i: 316, HL.
50. William Pitt to Francis Bernard, Whitehall, August 23, 1760, Bernard Papers i: 316; HL; Bernard to Pitt, Boston, November 8, 1760, i: 284; Bernard to Pitt [Boston], May 5, 1761, i: 309–311, HL.
51. Francis Bernard to John Pownall, Boston, June 15, 1761, Bernard Papers i: 318–320, HL; Thomas Lechmere to Board of Customs, as in n. 47.
52. Lechmere, as in n. 47; deposition of Gideon Thayer, PRO Treasury 1/408 f. 128–131; Francis Bernard to [John Pownall], Boston, June 28, 1761, Bernard Papers, 321–322, HL.
53. Thomas Lechmere to Benjamin Barons, n.p., June 20, 1761, Samuel Phillips Savage Papers, MHS; Francis Bernard to John Pownall, June 28, 1761, as in n. 52; Thomas Lechmere to the Board of Customs, as in n. 47; Quincy, Reports, p. 425n.
54. Francis Bernard to [Thomas Pownall], Boston, August 28, 1761, Bernard Papers ii: 9–11, HL.
55. Francis Bernard to Lords of Trade, Boston, August 27, 1761, Bernard Papers ii: 52, HL.
56. Francis Bernard to Lords of Trade, Boston, August 6, 1761, Bernard Papers ii: 45, HL.
57. Ibid.; Bernard to [Thomas Pownall], as in n. 55.
58. Thomas Lechmere to Board of Customs, as in n. 47; Fran-


60. John Rowe to Dr. William Catherwood, Boston, July 6, 1761, Rowe Letterbook, BL; Memorial of the Boston Merchants, August 14, 1761, PRO Treasury 1/408, f. 122.

61. Boston merchants to Sir Charles Hardy, n.p., August 20, 1761, Samuel Phillips Savage Papers, MHS.


63. John Rowe to Thomas Saul, Boston, October 20, 1761, Rowe Letterbook, BL.

64. Lord Barrington to Francis Bernard, Cavendish Sq., December 12, 1761, and Bernard to Lord Barrington, Boston, January 14, 1762, in Edward Channing and Archibald C. Coolidge, eds., The Barrington-Bernard Correspondence (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1912), pp. 37 and 39, respectively.

65. Smith, Writs, p. 433; Barrow, Trade and Empire, p. 172; Francis Bernard to Lord Barrington, Boston, January 12, 1762, Bernard Papers ii: 24–25, HL; John Temple to Commissioners of Customs [Boston], January 1, 1762, Bowdoin-Temple Papers, MHS.

66. Quincy, Reports, p. 508.


68. BG, December 7, 1761.

69. BG, December 21, 1761.

70. Benjamin Barons to Melatiah Bourn [Boston], December 29, 1761, Bourn Papers 1: 116, HL.


72. BG, January 4, 1762.
73. Francis Bernard to Lord Barrington, as in n. 65; *Journal of the Massachusetts House of Representatives*, February 2, 1762; *BEP*, June 11, 1770.

74. Memorial of the Boston Merchants, February 18, 1762, PRO Treasury 1/415, f. 157–162.

75. Ibid. M. H. Smith observes that it would be only natural for Barons, as collector of the king’s revenues at Boston, to make the disbursements necessary to meet the legal fees incurred by the customs service in the case. Smith, *Writs*, p. 198.


77. John Rowe to Lane & Booth [Boston], February 24, 1762, Rowe Letterbook, BL.


81. Francis Bernard to Lords of Trade, Boston, April 13, 1762, Bernard Papers ii: 58, HL: Quincy, *Reports*, pp. 495–499; Thomas Hutchinson to William Bollan, Boston, March 6, 1762, MA xxvi: 8–9. M. H. Smith, in his account, misses the significance of the provincial writs of assistance by failing to note the implication of an amendment to the bill that would have forced customs officers to identify their informants, thereby exposing them to the full fury of popular resentment. Smith, *Writ*, pp. 425, 429.


83. Francis Bernard to Lord Halifax, Castle William, August 31, 1765, Bernard Papers iv: 149–150, HL.

84. Ibid.
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6. Lords of Trade to Francis Bernard, Whitehall, October 11, 1763, Bernard Papers, x: 131, HL; Thomas Cushing to Jasper Mauduit, Boston, October 28, 1763, MHS *Collections* lxxiv: 131. On the general acceptability of the duty, see also: Thomas Hutchinson to Richard Jackson, Boston, August 3, 1763, MA xxvi: 65–66; Francis Bernard to Richard Jackson, Boston, November 26, 1763, Bernard Papers iii: 106–107, HL; as well as Bernard to John Pownall, Castle William, October 30, 1763, Bernard Papers iii: 105, HL.

7. The “State of Trade” is reprinted in Colonial Society of Massachusetts *Publications* xix: 379–390. For the circumstances of its com-
position, see Charles M. Andrews, "Boston Merchants," p. 166. For Gray, see Sabine, Biographical Sketches, 1: 491. For Payne, see Anne Rowe Cunningham, The Letters and Diary of John Rowe (Boston: W. B. Clarke, 1903), p. 22.


12. The figures for relative imports and exports are taken from Shepherd and Walton, Shipping, pp. 96–97, 105. Although Shepherd and Walton's work is problematic, their figures here tally with Richard Sheridan's in Sugar and Slavery, p. 470. The information on the relative tonnage of the three port cities is from Sachs, "Business Outlook" p. 182.


14. BG, March 28, 1768; BEP, January 2, 1764.

15. Francis Bernard to Richard Jackson, Boston, November 26, 1763, Bernard Papers 111: 106–107, H.L.

16. BG, October 17, October 31, and November 14, 1763; John Temple to all Customs Officers of the Northern District, n.p., December 26, 1763, Bowdoin-Temple Papers, MHS; BG and BEP, January 2, 1764; Providence Gazette, January 21, 1764; Francis Bernard to Richard Jackson, January 7, 1764, Bernard Papers iv: 120–122, H.L.


18. William Bollan to the Committee of Merchants at Boston, n.p., April 12, 1764, Price Papers, MHS; Andrews, "Boston Merchants," p. 167; Johnson, "Sugar Act," p. 513; Knollenberg, Origin, p. 145. Although Knollenberg contends that no agent received instructions to oppose the act on principle, Thomas Cushing had written Jasper Mauduit to inform him that discussion in one of the committees of the General Court had tended in the direction of refusing to admit that any duty on
molasses would be acceptable because it would be tacit acknowledgment of Parliament’s right to tax the colonies without their consent. But Cushing’s letter did not arrive in time. See Thomas Cushing to Jasper Mauduit, Boston, January, 1764, MHS Collections LXXIV: 145–146.


23. Ibid., p. 90.

24. Ibid., pp. 92, 66.

25. Henry McCulloh placed the figure at £500,000, while the *Regulations Lately Made* represented it as £700,000. See Bullion, “Honor, Trade and Empire,” pp. 112, 115, 177; and [Whately] *Regulations Lately Made*, p. 60. Both Bullion and Barrow believe Grenville’s figures are exaggerated. See “Honor, Trade and Empire,” p. 179, and *Trade and Empire*, pp. 149–151. Benjamin Labaree, however, has estimated that between 1760 and 1766 the colonies imported smuggled tea worth about £200,000 annually. If this was indeed the case for tea alone, then perhaps Grenville and his colleagues were not so far wrong. See Bullion, “Honor, Trade and Empire,” pp. 179, 574; and Labaree, *The Boston Tea Party* (London: Oxford University Press, [1966], 1970), p. 7.

26. [Whately], *Regulations Lately Made*, pp. 91–92.

27. Ibid., pp. 87–88.


whale fins and potash would be particularly annoying to the New England colonies, and Boston in particular, since commerce in those two items was among the fastest-rising trades in the decade following the Seven Years' War. Sachs, "Business Outlook," pp. 189–190.


39. B.E.P., January 2, 1764; Francis Bernard, "Answers to Queries," September 5, 1763, Bernard Papers XLIII: 18, HL; B.E.P., April 9, 1764; Thomas Cushing to Jasper Mauduit, Boston, April 9, 1764, MHS Collections LXXIV: 158–159; B.G., May 4, 1764, and B.E.P., May 7 supplement, 1764.


41. Francis Bernard to the Board of Trade, Boston, June 29, 1764, Bernard Papers III: 157, HL.

42. Thomas Hancock to Barnard & Harrison, Boston, June 23, 1764, JH6, Hancock Papers, NEHGS; B.G., June 11, 1764; and Franklin, cited in Ubbelohde, Vice Admiralty, p. 66.

43. Andrews, "Boston Merchants," p. 172. The "Proposals" were never printed; a draft version of the document (with the 1767 additions) still exists in the Ezekiel Price Papers, f. 20, MHS.

45. "Proposals," Ezekiel Price Papers, f. 26, MHS.
46. Ibid.
47. Schlesinger, Colonial Merchants, p. 62.
48. Thomas Hutchinson to [Richard Jackson], Boston, November 6, 1764, MA xxvi: 11–12. The much-revised draft version of the petition is in MA vi: 290.
49. John Huske to the Committee of Merchants at Boston [London], August 17, 1764, printed in BG, October 29, 1764.
52. Arthur Savage, Jr., to Samuel Phillips Savage, [London], February 8, 1765, Savage Papers, MHS; Jasper Mauduit to the Committee of the General Court, March 8, 1765, MHS Collections LXXIV: 171–172n; Arthur Savage, Jr., to Samuel Phillips Savage [London], March 1, 1765, Savage Papers.
53. BEP, January 7, 1765.
54. BEP, June 17, 1765.
55. Schlesinger, Colonial Merchants, pp. 78–79; BG and BEP, December 9 and December 15, 1765.
56. BG, December 9, 1765. Harbottle Dorr identifies the style of the letters as Otis's. See Dorr Collection, MHS.
57. BG, December 16 and December 23, 1765.
59. H. S. Conway to Francis Bernard, St. James's, March 31, 1766, Bernard Papers xi: 3–4, HL.
60. See 5 George III, c. 45; Thomas Whately, Considerations
on the Trade and Finances of This Kingdom (London: J. Wilkie, 1766), p. 70; New York Gazette, February 20, 1766; Schlesinger, Colonial Merchants, p. 58.

61. The best account of the meeting is printed in BG, May 26, 1766; another version is contained in Sosen, Agents, pp. 81–82.

62. Sosen, Agents, p. 84; see also 6 George III, c. 52; William Bollan, The Mutual Interest of Great Britain and the American Colonies Considered (London: W. Nicholl, 1765), p. 8; Schlesinger, Colonial Merchants, p. 84.


67. Printed in BG, September 8, 1766. On the respectability of colonial smuggling, authors differ. Some maintain that smuggling in the West Indies was readily condoned, while illicit trade in European and East India goods was not. (Knollenberg, Origin, p. 134; Harrington, New York Merchants, p. 275.) Others think that colonial merchants had few scruples about the issue, regarding themselves “simply as businessmen who were willing to take extra risks in order to . . . make extra profits.” (Jensen, Maritime Commerce, pp. 130–131.) Nearly all agree that smuggling had no ideological overtones, at least early on in the prerevolutionary period, and that it assumed them only as the enforcement of the Navigation Acts became a political issue on both sides of the Atlantic. Christie and Labaree, Empire or Independence, p. 92; Labaree, Boston Tea Party, p. 56; and Pauline Maier, From Resistance to Revolution: Colonial Radicals and the Development of American Opposition to Britain (New York: Random House, [1972], 1974), p. 9n.

68. BG, October 6, 1766.


70. The list of historians who have assumed that the one-penny duty made smuggling no longer profitable is an impressive one: Schlesinger, Colonial Merchants, p. 98; Dickerson, Navigation Acts, pp. 173, 187; McCusker, “Rum Trade,” p. 421; Jensen, Maritime Commerce, pp. 131–132; and James B. Hedges, The Browns of Providence Plantations
(Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1952), i: 45. Figures for receipts under the Revenue Act of 1766 are in Christie and Labaree, *Empire of Independence*, p. 120n.

71. John Powell to Christopher Champlin, London, June 24, 1766, Letters of the Boston Merchants, BL; Jonathan Barnard to John Hancock, London, May 18, 1766, BPL; John Hancock to Harrison & Barnard, Boston, June 30, 1766, JH6, Hancock Papers, NEHGS.


Most accounts of Otis’s career have focused on his alleged retreat from the advanced ideological position of *The Rights of the British Colonies* (1764) to the more moderate ideas outlined in *A Vindication of the British Colonies against the Aspersions of the Halifax Gentleman and Brief Remarks on the Defence of the Halifax Libel* (both printed in 1765). (See especially Ferguson, “Reason in Madness,” pp. 203–210.) Although there is evidence to suggest that this retreat was a temporary expedient necessitated by the fear that he would actually be charged with treason (see Ellen Brennan, “James Otis, Recreant or Patriot?” *New England Quarterly* xii (1939): 701; and Samuel Allyne Otis to Col. James Otis, n.p., n.d., BPL), it should be noted that Otis never retreated from his advanced views on colonial trade. In his *Considerations on Behalf of the Colonists in a Letter to a Noble Lord* (London: J. Almon, 1765), pp. 22–23, which appeared after the two previously mentioned pamphlets, Otis asked, “Can any one tell me why trade, commerce, arts, sciences, and manufactures should not be as free for an American as for a European?” In the same pamphlet, he went on to attack mercantilist restrictions on colonial manufactures. “In plain English,” according to Otis, the net effect of the Navigation Acts is that “we shall do nothing that they can do for us. This is kind!—And what they cannot do for us, we are permitted to do for ourselves. Generous!” The significance of Otis’s early advocacy of unrestricted trade was carefully noted by John Adams and William Tudor, Otis’s first biographer, although it has eluded most subsequent historians. John Adams to William Tudor, August 21, 1818, printed in Adams, *Works*, x: 349; Tudor, *Life of James Otis*, p. 74.

73. *BEP*, June 23 and November 24, 1766; Cunningham, *Rowe Diary*, p. 115; John Cruger et al. to James Otis et al., New York, November 24, 1766, Ezekiel Price Papers, MHS.

74. Since the various states of the 1767 petition of the Boston
merchants have been misidentified in Andrews, "Boston Merchants," p. 172n, it is worth setting the record straight here. Folio 39 of the Ezekiel Price Papers, MHS, is the earliest state of the petition, f. 54 is a second draft, and f. 27 is the final draft, incorporating parts of the two earlier versions. Folios 38, 52, 53, 55, 56, and 74 are notes considered in the composition of the final draft, although not all parts of every note are incorporated in the final text. The signers of the petition are listed in f. 77.

75. "Petition of the Merchants of the Town of Boston," January, 1767, Ezekiel Price Papers, f. 27, MHS.
76. Ibid.
77. Ibid.
78. Ibid., ff. 52, 54, 55, 56, 74.
79. The text of the New York merchants' petition is printed in BEP, May 11, 1767. For the similarities, see Schlesinger, Colonial Merchants, pp. 87–88. On the profits of smuggling foreign sugar, see McCusker, "Rum Trade," p. 403. McCusker estimates the loss to the Treasury from smuggled sugar at nearly £114,000 annually versus an estimated annual loss of £11,000 in revenue on illegally entered molasses. On the inflammatory nature of the New York petition, see Dennys DeBerdt to the Boston Merchants, London, March 9, 1767, Ezekiel Price Papers, MHS.

Chapter 3

1. The notion that nonimportation was in part a plan by some merchants to clear away large stocks of old goods circulated among contemporaries and was included by Schlesinger in Colonial Merchants, pp. 210–211. It has recently received a more elaborate restatement in Dirk Hoerder, Crowd Action in Revolutionary Massachusetts 1765–1780 (New York: Academic Press, 1977), pp. 161–162.
2. As in Chapter 1, estimates of the number of merchants “active” in Boston at any given time are based on Naval Office Records (PRO Colonial Office 5/848–851); the Ezekiel Price Insurance Records, BA; an abstract of advertising from contemporary Boston newspapers; and, in this case, the subscription lists of the nonimportation agreement [March 1768], Samuel Phillips Savage Papers, MHS.
3. Concerning bankruptcy in Boston, see John Hancock's oft-quoted letter to Barnard & Harrison, Boston, January 21, 1765, JH6, Hancock Papers, NEHGS and Francis Bernard to Board of Trade, Bos-
ton, April 8, 1765, Bernard Papers III: 203–204, HL. For other bankruptcies, see MG, 1765–1766 passim, and Price Insurance Papers, BA.

4. John Hancock to William Reeve, Boston, September 3, 1767, JH6, Hancock Papers, NEHGS.
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