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CHAPTER ONE: “THE METROPOLIS OF SOUTH CAROLINA”

1. Cape Finisterre is the westernmost point in Spain. See 3 Geo. II c. 28, in Great Britain, Statutes at Large, V, 553–55.

2. Historians have debated the Rice Act’s economic significance for South Carolina. For Eugene Sirmans, it “started a boom in the colony’s rice production,” and Kenneth Morgan noted that rice production and prices nearly doubled in its wake. John McCusker and Russell Menard, however, have suggested that its “effect was small.” See M. Eugene Sirmans, Colonial South Carolina: A Political History, 1663–1765 (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1966), 162; Morgan, “Colonial American Rice Trade,” 439; McCusker and Menard, Economy of
Providing statistical ballast to McCusker and Menard’s observation, Peter Coclanis demonstrated the exponential growth of South Carolina’s rice industry during the 1720s, when exports grew more than threefold, implicitly downplaying the significance of the legislation; see Coclanis, “Rice Prices in the 1720s and the Evolution of the South Carolina Economy,” *Journal of Southern History* 48.4 (1982): 531–44, esp. 532. For a discussion of the 1730 rice lobbying in the context of commercial lobbying in London, see Starr, *School for Politics*, esp. 24–43, which suggested how the tactics and style of London lobby politics influenced South Carolina’s political culture.
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15. The 1704 Naval Stores Act had introduced a bounty of six pounds per ton on colonial hemp, four pounds per ton on tar, four pounds per ton on pitch, three pounds per ton on rosin and turpentine, and one pound per ton on masts. See 3 & 4 Anne c. 10, in Great Britain, Statutes at Large, 176; Thomas Cooper and David J. McCord, eds., The Statutes at Large of South Carolina, 10 vols. (Columbia: A. S. Johnson, 1836–41), II, 600–602; Lonn, Colonial Agents, 66–67.
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20. Instances of unsuitable merchandise sent for sale in Charles Town by ill-informed British merchants abound in Pringle’s papers. One firm speculatively sent a cargo of buckram, a stiff cloth useful only for corset makers, of which there were none in Charles Town; a dozen fishing rods were part of another cargo, which was “Intirely unsaleable here & not at all proper for this Country” and which was eventually sent back to London. Woollens that arrived at the start of the summer and which the Charles Town storekeeper would have to keep in storage for several months were a regular bugbear. See RP to James Goodchild, 18 June 1739, 16 June 1740, and 31 March 1741; to Andrew Pringle, 29 March 1742; to Cookson & Wellfitt, 10 April and 2 September 1742, LRP, I, 99, 226–27, 306–7, 356–57, 361–62, 398–99.


22. Records of shipownership corroborate the link between petitioning activity and scale of participation in London’s Carolina trade. Samuel Barons and John Bell, both of whom signed more than five petitions, each had a stake in ten vessels that cleared Charles Town between 1717 and 1739. John Lloyd and Thomas Hyam, who signed five and four petitions respectively, had stakes in five vessels. See CO5/510, National Archives, London; Clowse, Measuring Charleston’s Overseas Commerce, 141, table C-61.


25. Olson, “Virginia Merchants of London,” 371, 378–80. Interaction with the Board of Trade fell correspondingly, with no Virginia merchants appearing before it between 1733 and 1751. Although Olson noted continuing interaction between London’s Virginia merchants and the treasury, she observed a net decline in the Virginia merchant community’s activity and impact. The capital’s Virginia traders had been by far the most active North American commercial lobby in London before 1725: they had submitted thirty-six petitions to the king, Parliament, and other branches of government. London’s New England merchants had petitioned sixteen times, and the capital’s New York merchants had petitioned on six occasions.


30. CO5/1265/11, National Archives, London. Along with colonial agent Kettleby, fourteen merchants trading to South Carolina signed the petition against Virginia’s arms trade with the Indians: Samuel Barons, Nathaniel Bradley, Michael Cole, Henry Daniels, James Deane, Stephen Godin, Richard Higgison, Robert Johnson, James Kinloch, John Lloyd, Andre Poon, William Rhett Jr., John Styleman, and William Wragg. In total there were twenty-nine signatories to the two petitions, of whom fifteen signed only the July petition, five signed only the September petition, and nine signed both.

31. JHC, XVIII, 262.


34. 3 & 4 Anne c. 5, in *Great Britain, Statutes at Large*, IV, 170.


39. The bill appears to have had support from both the government and regional trading interests. The three MPs who introduced it to Parliament are indicative: Martin Bladen, MP for Stockbridge in Hampshire, was a member of the Board of Trade, was an expert on trade
and colonial affairs, and owned a plantation in the West Indies; Sir Abraham Elton was a commercial magnate in and MP for Bristol; and Archibald Hutcheson, MP for Hastings in Sussex, was a well-connected former member of the Board of Trade. The most likely reason for the bill’s failure is that it ran out of parliamentary time. Wragg’s costs are revealed in a retrospective claim for a total of £500 he submitted to South Carolina’s Assembly in 1742 for his efforts. However, the assembly found no evidence that he had spent more than the £183 it agreed to reimburse him. See Commons Journals, XX, 463–65; Journal of the Commons House of Assembly, 1742–1744, 225–26; Sedgwick, House of Commons, 1715–1754.


41. Earl John Perceval, Manuscripts of the Earl of Egmont: Diary of Viscount Percival, afterwards First Earl of Egmont, 3 vols. (London: H.M.S.O, 1920–23), 26 March 1735, II, 154. For their part, the Georgia Trustees recognized the reciprocal advantages of good relations with Fury and his employers. Agreeing to the South Carolinian authorities’ request that Fury’s salary be temporarily paid through a bill drawn on the trustees in London, Egmont recorded that the trustees considered that “it was a neighbourly action, and would engage Mr. Fury to be affectionate to our colony” (Perceval, Manuscripts, 16 January 1735, II, 221). Fury had been appointed as South Carolina’s metropolitan agent in 1733.

42. 8 Geo. II c. 19, in Great Britain, Statutes at Large, V, 674–75; Commons Journals, XXII, 453, 464–65, 469, 473–75, 493. Some seventeen of the thirty-seven MPs named to the committee that considered the bill and proposed the law’s extension to Georgia were members or trustees of the Georgia Society. On the Georgia interest in Parliament, see also Richard Dunn, “The Trustees of Georgia and the House of Commons, 1732–1752,” WMQ 11.4 (1954): 551–65; Betty Wood, Slavery in Colonial Georgia, 1730–1775 (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1984), 2–11, 34–48.

43. Quoted in Kamen, Empire and Interest, 68.

44. Of nineteen merchant “associates” studied by David Hancock whose pre-London travels are known, for example, three had spent time in North America; see Hancock, Citizens of the World: London Merchants and the Integration of the British Atlantic Community, 1735–1785 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 41n. See also William I. Roberts III, “Samuel Storke: An Eighteenth-Century London Merchant Trading to the American Colonies,” Business History Review 39.2 (1965): 149.


46. The earliest record of Crokatt in South Carolina is from 1728, when he was executor of the will of David Durham, a Berkeley County planter (SCG, 26 February 1732; Edgar and Bailey, Biographical Directory, II, 213).


52. Public Register, South Carolina, Conveyance books [Charleston Deeds], vols. A, 220; B, 153: E, 313; F, 153; South Carolina Court of Common Pleas, Judgement Rolls: 19A, 36A, SCDAH.


54. *SCG*, 16 February 1734, 5 April and 31 May 1735, 31 January 1736 (quote), 6 November 1740; Charles Town Naval Office list, 1736–37, CO5/510, National Archives, London.
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58. Robert Raper to John Beswicke, 11 January 1762, LRR.
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63. James Ogilvie to Alexander Ogilvie, 17 March 1743, OFP; Calhoun et al., “Geographic Spread,” 200.


65. *RP* to Thomas Pringle, 21 October 1746, Pringle-Garden Papers, SCHS.

66. Alexander Cumine to Alexander Ogilvie, 1 and 22 April (quote) 1763 and 17 March 1770, OFP. Cumine’s strategy failed to pay off. The barriers to entering trade in Charles Town were greater than he had expected, and after seven years of trying to enter business he instead took a job as a Latin teacher.


70. Charles Ogilvie to Alexander Ogilvie, 9 February 1751, OFP.
71. Charles Ogilvie to Alexander Ogilvie, 17 July 1752, OFP.
72. The mortality rate among slaves on board British ships in the Atlantic slave trade between 1701 and 1750 has been calculated at 15.6 percent per voyage. This does not include the deaths of slaves before leaving the coast of Africa or, once they had arrived in the Americas, before they had disembarked or been sold, which could be nearly as high. See Herbert S. Klein, Stanley L. Engerman, Robin Haines, and Ralph Shlomowitz, “Transoceanic Mortality: The Slave Trade in Comparative Perspective,” WMQ 58.1 (2001): 105–6, tables II, V, XI. Stephen D. Behrendt has estimated that “each year in the slave trade about one in five crew members died” (Behrendt, “Markets, Transactions Cycles, and Profits: Merchant Decision Making in the British Slave Trade,” WMQ 58.1 [2001]: 180).
73. Charles Ogilvie to Alexander Ogilvie, 17 July 1752, OFP.
74. Charles Ogilvie to Alexander Ogilvie, 20 August 1752 (postscript to 17 July letter), OFP.
75. For an overview of the organization and structure of Charles Town’s colonial-era trade, see Nash, “Organization of Trade and Finance” (2001), 77–85; Morgan, “Colonial American Rice Trade,” 441–47.
76. Rogers, Charleston in the Age of the Pinckneys, 56. Six of the other wharves were named after local merchant-planters: Rhett’s Bridge, Elliott’s Bridge, Motte’s Bridge, Pinckney’s Bridge, Lloyd’s Bridge, and Brewton’s Bridge; the largest, containing the city market, was simply Middle Bridge (Calhoun et al., “Geographic Spread,” 188).
77. Miscellaneous Records, 1749–51, 292–301, SCDAH; SCG, 19 October – 9 November 1738.
78. South Carolina Court of Common Pleas, Judgement Rolls: 23A/58A, 24A/1A, 2A, 26A; 24B/2A, 19A, SCDAH.
79. SCG, 17 April 1736, 30 April 1741.
80. SCG, 15 May 1736, 7 September 1734.
81. South Carolina Court of Common Pleas, Judgement Rolls: 27B, 19A; 33A/108A, SCDAH.
85. RP to Andrew Pringle, 17 April 1742, LRP, I, 371; Easterby and Olberg, Journal of the Commons House of Assembly, 16 and 18 February 1742, 379, 395. On the Shubricks’ naval connections, see also SCG, 20 December 1742, 21 February 1743, 21 September 1748; Stumpf, “Implications of King George’s War,” 165.
87. Littlefield, “Slave Trade to Colonial South Carolina,” 69–70; Richardson, “British Slave Trade,” 127–29. Richardson estimated that about eighty thousand slaves came directly from Africa, with about thirteen thousand imported into South Carolina from other British colonies, and that 87 percent of the slaves brought directly from Africa were carried on vessels owned in Britain.
90. SCG, 19 April 1739.
91. SCG, 14 June 1735. The story was newsworthy enough to be reprinted in a Philadelphia newspaper the following month: American Weekly Mercury, 31 July 1735. Peter H. Wood cited this case as an example of “semi-organized crime” by black slaves (Wood, Black Majority, 215–16). No court records of criminal cases in Charles Town before 1769 have survived.


94. SCG, 22 November 1742; RP to Andrew Pringle, 11 June 1744, LRP, II, 708; Edgar and Bailey, Biographical Directory, II, 326.


96. SCG, 2 December 1732, 13 November 1736; Hennig Cohen, The South Carolina Gazette, 1732–1775 (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1953), 17–18. For other examples of Crokatt’s links to Scottish causes, see SCG, 29 September 1738, 19 April 1739; Scots Hospital of King Charles II, A Short Account of the Institution, Progress, and Present State of the Scottish Corporation in London (London, 1777), 39.

97. SCG, 27 December 1735, 31 January 1736, 22 December 1737.

98. SCG, 9 April 1737, 23 August 1738 (quote).


100. SCG, 4 May 1738, 21 June 1742 (on Beswicke); 22 April 1745, 7 April 1746 (on Shubrick).

101. Nash, “Trade and Business,” 13. Notable Charles Town merchants in the first category were Gabriel Manigault, John Guerard, and Henry Laurens. George Austin, Laurens’s business partner and a native of Shropshire, England, was a notable member of the second group.


104. George Udny to William Middleton, 13 January 1753, Middleton Family Papers, HA93: 722/124, microfilm, SCDAH.


106. Charles Ogilvie to Alexander Ogilvie, 20 March 1760, OFP.

107. SCG, 25 February 1764.


109. Charles Ogilvie to Alexander Ogilvie, 22 February 1761, OFP. Ogilvie had been in partnership with John Ward during the 1750s, which terminated in March 1759. He then went into partnership with John Forbes, with whom he continued after relocating to London. See SCG, 31 March 1759; Calhoun et al., “Geographic Spread,” 203, 209.

110. Charles Ogilvie to Alexander Ogilvie, 22 February 1761, OFP.

111. SCG, 23 March 1747.

112. SCG, 1 February, 19 April, 2 June 1739.

113. SCG, 16 November 1738–16 June 1739. Crokatt’s gift for advertising apparently rubbed off on his young partner, Benjamin Smith. Smith’s three-column spread in the largest type to announce the formation of his new firm, Benjamin Smith & Co., in 1752 has been called “the boldest advertisement that had yet appeared in the Gazette” (Rogers, Evolution of a Federalist, 14).

114. SCG, 5–25 April and 22 November 1735, 5 March 1737.
115. SCG, 15 and 22 May; 5 June 1736. For further examples of his assertiveness in reclaiming debts, see SCG, 9 February and 15 April 1738.

116. SCG, 15 January 1737. See also Judgement Rolls: 23A/58A; 24A/1A, 2A; 26A/78A, SCDAH; SCG, 12 May 1733, 26 May 1746, 21 January 1751.

117. SCG, 29 December 1739. Crokatt’s relationship with his agent, Robert Raper, continued for nearly thirty years. When they settled their account in 1767, Raper expressed his hope that “we may finish our Concerns as amicably as we began which I think was in the year 1739” (Robert Raper to James Crokatt, 14 February 1767, LRR).

118. Miscellaneous Records, 1749–51, 292–301, SCDAH; SCG, 19 October–9 November 1738. Smith had been at Crokatt’s trading house as early as June 1735, when he was identified in a newspaper advertisement (SCG, 21 June 1735).

CHAPTER TWO: “FRIENDS TO ASSIST AT HOME”

1. RP to Andrew Pringle, 30 May (quote) and 20 July 1744, LRP, II, 699–701, 728–30.

2. Scottish-born Robert Pringle still conceived of Britain as “Home” in the 1740s, an affective and linguistic trait shared by many Carolinians whether born in Britain or in the colony.


4. HL to Francis Bremar, 27 March 1749, PHL, I, 232. Laurens’s omission of John Beswicke from this list, despite the scale of Beswicke’s involvement in London’s Carolina trade, probably reflected the small amount of trade the two did with one another.


6. The concentration of London’s Carolina trade in the early 1760s is further confirmed by ships’ manifests detailing indigo exports from South Carolina in 1764 (Charles Town Naval Office, ships’ manifests, January–April 1764, CO5/511/2–63, National Archives, London).

7. Thomas Mortimer, The Universal Director . . . [Mortimer’s Directory] (London, 1763). As the only London directory published before 1788 that was classified by field, Mortimer’s is an invaluable source for the study of the city’s merchants in the 1760s. The largest group is general merchants, without a defined field of trade. However, the directory has some limitations as a source. Containing around 2,900 names and addresses, including 1,252 individuals and firms listed as merchants, it was less comprehensive than contemporary directories such as the rival but unclassified Complete Guide. The Complete Guide contained around 4,200 entries in its 1760 edition and around 6,000 in 1765. After Mortimer’s was published in 1763 no further classified London directories were published before 1788, making it hard to track participation in each trade over time. See Peter J. Atkins, The Directories of London, 1677–1977 (London: Mansell, 1990), 22. Sketchley’s Bristol Directory was the first classified directory in Bristol, in 1775. Among the 168 merchants listed, it categorized just one specialist Carolina trader, Samuel Brailsford. Formerly a prominent merchant in Charles Town, he had relocated to Britain in the late 1760s. See James Sketchley, Sketchley’s Bristol Directory; including Clifton, Bedminster, and the out-parishes of St. James and St. Philip (Bristol, 1775).

8. His children’s “disobedience” included his eldest daughter’s elopement with an unsuitable husband, which had resulted in John Nickleson “raging like a Madman” and his wife “drowned in Tears”; and the conduct of his “Brutal Son” Jack, of whom Peter Manigault, visiting from Charles Town, remarked that “for sure a greater Mixture of Fool & Villain never met together in one Man.” See Peter Manigault to Gabriel Manigault, 26 February 1754, Peter Manigault Papers, SCHS.

9. For example, the linen drapers Pomeroys & Streetfield and the woollen drapers Rogers & Dyson, who traded to South Carolina between the 1740s and the 1770s, and the textile wholesaler Nathaniel Newberry (PHL, I, 151, 232; VIII, 261; Kellock, “London Merchants and the Pre-1776 American Debts”; City of London Land Tax Assessments, MS.11316/132–34, Guildhall Library, London; London Directories).


14. No data on the destination of Charles Town rice exports survive for the 1740s, but London’s average annual share of the port’s rice exports to Britain between 1734 and 1738 was 42 percent and between 1758 and 1760, 30 percent; see Clowse, *Measuring Charleston’s Overseas Commerce*, 63, table B-26. A lawsuit brought by Richard Shubrick against a Capt. Salmond, whom Shubrick had chartered to collect a cargo of rice in Winyaw (Georgetown) in 1762–63, is an illuminating account of how the transatlantic rice trade was organized and the principal role of London merchants in it. Salmond was contracted to take a cargo to Madeira and then sail to Winyaw, where he would stay for forty days, unless loaded and dispatched earlier. In Winyaw, he was to “load his ship with such rice and other goods as the plaintiff’s agents & c. should tender to be laden.” If the ship failed to arrive in Winyaw by 1 March 1763, Shubrick’s “factors or assigns” could choose either to load the ship as specified or refuse it altogether. Shubrick brought the case since Salmond never sailed from Madeira to Winyaw, and it was decided in Shubrick’s favor. See Thomas Parker, *The laws of shipping and insurance, with a digest of adjudged cases; containing the acts of parliament relative to shipping, insurance and navigation . . . from Trinity term 1693, to Michaelmas term 1774* (London, 1775).

15. As with rice, there are no data on the destinations of Carolinian deerskins or naval stores between 1738 and 1758. However, between 1734 and 1738 London received an annual average of 50 percent of the colony’s deerskin exports, 57 percent of its tar, and 53 percent of its pitch; and between 1758 and 1760 an annual average of 60 percent of its deerskins, 18 percent of its tar (second to Poole), and 31 percent of its pitch. See Clowse, *Measuring Charleston’s Overseas Commerce*, 54–55, 67, tables B-11, B-32; Nash, “Organization of Trade and Finance” (2001), 88–89.


19. On London’s share of the Atlantic slave trade to South Carolina, see Richardson, “British Slave Trade,” 139. For evidence that the principal London Carolina merchants of the 1740s and 1750s had had limited direct participation in the slave trade when they had been based in Charles Town, see Higgins, “Charles Town Merchants,” 205–17.

21. Among the other merchants who specialized in London's goods export trade to South Carolina between 1749 and the American Revolution, during which time sixty-three ships departed on slaving voyages from London and completed their journeys in South Carolina, only Benjamin Stead was active in the slave trade. He was a prominent slave trader in Charles Town before relocating to London in 1759, and his participation in the slave trade in London was concentrated in three years, when he had a stake in five slaving voyages between 1764 and 1766. See Transatlantic Slave Trade Database: http://slavevoyages.org/voyages/oxw15R6C (accessed 31 October 2016). See also Richardson, “British Slave Trade,” 125–72; Higgins, “Charles Town Merchants,” 208, 210–11; SCG, 17 July 1755.

22. In this, the Carolina merchants appear to have more closely matched the commercial strategies of London’s largest colonial merchants in the late seventeenth century, among whom Zahedieh observed “very high levels of regional specialization,” than the merchants profiled by David Hancock, who participated in several different branches of trade. See Zahedieh, *Capital and the Colonies*, 103 (quote), 286; Hancock, *Citizens of the World*.


30. The turnover in personnel in these partnerships indicates the fluidity of Town’s commercial scene, in contrast to the relative stasis of London’s Carolina trade. Beswick’s partnerships were with, successively, John Crokatt and Alexander Livie (1752–53), then with Livie and John McQueen (1753–54), with McQueen alone (1754–58), and with McQueen and Maurice Harvey (1758–62). See South Carolina Court of Common Pleas, Judgement Rolls: 33A/87A: 37A/12A; 45B/20A, SCDAH.


33. Judgement Rolls: 32A/65A; 43A/50A, 139A/171A, SCDAH.
34. Robert Raper to Charles Crokatt, 13 January 1764; to Greenwood & Higginson, 6 March 1765, LRR.
35. HL to Rawlinson & Davison, 24 September 1755, PHL, I, 344.
36. HL to John Hopton, 4 September 1771, PHL, VII, 559.
42. RP to Andrew Pringle, 9 March 1744, LRP, II, 662.
44. RP to James Hunter & Co., 2 April 1737, LRP, I, 11.
45. RP to John Erving, 17 May 1740, LRP, I, 207. Crew members of another merchant vessel, the *Caesar*, were less fortunate in their attempts to avoid impressment by a gang from the *Tartar*, with one killed while resisting (SCG, 17 and 24 May 1740).
46. RP to Andrew Pringle, 27 January and 5 February 1743, and to Richard Partridge, 29 January 1743, LRP, II, 491–92, 497. On shortages of manpower caused by naval impressments, see also RP to Andrew Pringle, 31 December 1742, LRP, II, 471. The Royal Navy’s impact on shipping was probably the reason that Charles Town’s merchants, as Robert Pringle reported, were not too concerned about the lack of naval protection against Spanish vessels off the Carolina coast during the war: “we have had no King’s ships on a Cruize for these Ten Months past, so badly is this coast taken care of & yet the Merchants here won’t be Unanimous to Complain of Same.”
47. The failure of London’s Carolina lobby to press for the 1708 law to be enforced or for impressment in Charles Town to be otherwise curbed contrasted with the activity of the capital’s West Indies lobby on the matter. The agents for the Caribbean sugar colonies, planters on the islands, and merchants trading to the islands petitioned the king and Parliament to complain about the effects of impressment on the West Indies. Thanks to their efforts, an act “for the better Encouragement of the Trade of his Majesty’s Sugar Colonies in America” was passed in 1746 to prohibit impressment in the West Indies, making a distinction between the Caribbean and the North American mainland colonies. See Clark, “Impressment of Seamen,” 212–15.
48. RP to Pringle & Scott, 15 May 1742, LRP, I, 374.
49. *JHC*, XXIII, 284. Permission was granted for direct exports of sugar to European points south of Cape Finisterre but not for the other commodities (12 Geo. II c. 30, in Great Britain, *Statutes at Large*, VI, 115–20). However, the act had little effect since unlike rice, sugar exports to southern Europe remained very small (O’Shaughnessy, *Empire Divided*, 61–62).
50. RP to Andrew Pringle, 5 July 1743, LRP, II, 577–78; Easterby, *Journal of the Commons House of Assembly*, vol. 1746–47, 251, 336, 380–81; *Parker’s Penny Post*, 7 May 1725; *Whitehall Evening Post or London Intelligence*, 20 October 1759.
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