

Working for the Crown. German Migrants and Britain's Commercial Success in the early eighteenth-century American Colonies

Abstract

Relaxation in the movement of foreigners into Britain and the origins of the Foreign Protestants Naturalisation Act of 1708 (7 Ann c 5) have been seen to lie in the arrival of religious refugees in England and the unsuitability of existing legislation to accommodate large numbers of foreigners. This paper proposes that trade and commercial interests in the American Colonies promoted the cause of Naturalisation by inciting German migration, causing Parliament to relax access to the domestic labour market, and crucially allow German labour to be trafficked to the Colonies. Reform was dictated by the needs of commerce and colonial enterprise, not just by politicians, courtiers and bureaucrats in London. The passing of the Naturalisation Act (1708) and subsequent General Naturalisation Act (1709) both took advantage of European warfare and economic disruption and was a direct response to colonial needs to source continental labour. The Act owed much to colonial Americans like Carolina Governor John Archdale who, like his co-religionist neighbour William Penn, acted in the interest of commerce and the colonial classes, broadening the base of non-Anglican access to the Colonies. Opportunities afforded German migrants in the American Colonies, in particular, grew from this signal legislative change.

Introduction

In the period 1688 to 1720, new agents of empire, speculators in the fortunes of colonial commerce and trade, emerged from the political, mercantile and commercial groups of the period and turned their attention towards the Atlantic Empire. John Archdale (1642-1717) sometime Governor of Carolina, was one such figure who came from the fringes of English subjecthood: as a Quaker he was barred from assuming his seat in Parliament, making his reputation instead in North America in Maine, Massachusetts and Carolina.¹ Pragmatic, speculative, opportunistic and sometimes desperate, Archdale epitomises the colonial adventurer who was so invested in the fortunes of England overseas that he assumed the responsibility of funding, administering and developing it himself. Yet Archdale and his ilk were restrained in their speculative ventures by one obstacle: a shortfall in labour.

Abroad as at home, in England's empire, industry and commerce and above all her people were held to be the richness of the state.² By the late seventeenth century, colonisation was seen as the most effective way to secure colonial territories, and for colonisers like Archdale, permanent English settlement was envisaged as the only way to safeguard American territory. England, however, could not afford to depopulate the mother country for the sake of populating the Empire. In the event, the solution would be purposed by adventurers, able to negotiate the economic, social and

¹ The description is that of a colleague of John Locke, commenting on Locke's *The Fundamental Constitution of Carolina* (1670): see *John Locke, A Letter concerning Toleration and Other Writings*, edited and with an Introduction by Mark Goldie (Indianapolis: Liberty Fund, 2010). 5/9/2016. <http://oll.libertyfund.org/titles/2375>, xxxv; see also James Farr, "Locke, 'Some Americans', and the Discourse on 'Carolina,'" *Locke Studies* 9 (2009): 19-96.

² Innumerable contemporary writers expressed this opinion; see, *inter alia*, Marquis de Mirabeau, *L'Ami des hommes ou traité de la population* (Avignon, 1756).

religious discourses of the day in order to direct migrants - regarded as undesirable for the metropole, but acceptable as colonists - towards territories in America.

This article examines the colonial, commercial and religious terrain that led to the passing of the Naturalisation Act (1708) through a range of primary sources in North America, England and Germany and through the actions of campaigners for general naturalisation on both sides of the Atlantic.³ It maps the commercial and religious terrain of the emerging British Empire at the turn into the eighteenth century through the lens of labour and legal debate.⁴ The first section considers Governor John Archdale of Carolina and the Foreign Protestants Naturalization Act of 1708 (*An Act for Naturalising Foreign Protestants*; 7 Ann c 5).⁵ In terms of Britain's long path to overseas and commercial Empire, the Naturalization Act neatly punctuates the period between Calvin's Case (1608) and the abolition of slavery (1808).⁶ Section Two places the story of John Archdale in context, discussing the desire of metropolitan

³ Literature on the early modern Atlantic world, on Britain and the American colonies and on German trans-Atlantic migration is understandably vast. This article does not seek to reiterate the history of German migration to North America in the pre-independence period. See, *inter alia*, Marianne S. Wokeck, *Trade in Strangers. The Beginnings of Mass Migration to North America* (University Park: Penn State University Press, 1999); Aaron Spencer Fogelman, *Hopeful Journeys. German Immigration, Settlement and Political Culture in Colonial America 1717-1775* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1996); Rosalind J. Beiler, *Immigrant and Entrepreneur: The Atlantic World of Caspar Wistar, 1650-1750* (University Park: Penn State University Press, 2008); Hartmut Lehmann, Hermann Wellenreuter, Renate Wilson (eds.), *In Search of Peace and Prosperity. New German Settlements in Eighteenth-Century Europe and America* (University Park: Penn State University Press, 2000); Steven Sarson, *British America, 1500-1800: Creating Colonies, Imagining and Empire* (London: Hodder Arnold, 2005).

⁴ Brent Sirota, *The Christian Monitors. The Church of England and the Age of Benevolence, 1680-1730* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2014), esp. ch. 6, 223-251.

⁵ This article uses primary manuscript material from the Library of Congress in Washington D.C.; the Massachusetts State Archives; the Sächsisches Hauptstaatsarchiv Dresden; Houghton Library, Harvard University; Library of the Society of Friends, London and the National Archives at Kew, London.

⁶ On Calvin's case and its impact beyond England, see Daniel J. Hulsebosch, "The Liberties of Englishmen beyond England: Calvin's Case," in, *Constituting Empire. New York and the Transformation of Constitutionalism in the Atlantic World, 1664-1830* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 2005), 20-28; see also John Mervyn Jones, "Evolution of British Nationality Law," in *British Nationality Law* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1956), 51-62; Lauren Benton, "Atlantic Law: Transformation of a Regional Legal Regime," in *OHAW*, ed Canny and Morgan, 401; Daniel Statt, *Foreigners and Englishmen* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1995), 32. On abolition see D.R. Peterson, ed., *Abolitionism and Imperialism in Britain, Africa and the Atlantic*. (Oxford: Ohio University Press, 2009).

English, and later British, interest groups to find streamlined, cost-effective mechanisms to populate, police and tax the expanding imperial domains. And Section Three looks more closely at mercantile interests, the commercial discourse within which they operated, their relationship to the sinews of power and how they used publicity to retail their ventures to officials and populace alike. It examines how colonial adventurers were able to exploit and negotiate their political and legal authority within Empire to increase their control over the governance of their investments. This article does not seek to review debates surrounding French settlement in Carolina and their naturalization in the colony; this has been expertly researched for the period here examined.⁷ Nor is this a study of the Carolinas *per se*; they, too, have their expert historians.⁸ It does seek to explore how Britain's commercial success in the eighteenth-century American colonies was aided by the procuring of German migrants who came to work for the British Crown.

I

John Archdale was an emblematic colonial entrepreneur.⁹ He was commissioned governor of Carolina in August 1694, an appointment which entitled him to a holding of 48,000 acres, but colonial enterprise was also part of his genealogy: marital ties connected him to the grandson of the Elizabethan adventurer Sir Ferdinando Gorges, also named Ferdinando, to whom title of the province had been granted in 1639, and

⁷ See the magisterial Bertrand Van Ruymbeke, "Naturalization and Representation. The Huguenots and Early Carolina Politics," in *From New Babylon to Eden. The Huguenots and Their Migration to Colonial South Carolina* (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press 2006), 161-190.

⁸ Louis H. Roper, *Conceiving Carolina. Proprietors, Planters, and Plots, 1662-1729* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004).

⁹ *Library of the Society of Friends*, London, "Appointment of John Archdale [as Governor of Carolina, America, and notes concerning his second visit there], Letter dated 1694, John Archdale papers," MSS 53/1/2a.

on whose behalf he travelled as a proprietary commissioner to Maine in 1664 in an effort to secure the family title there.¹⁰ Archdale travelled throughout the territory, “commanding the inhabitants to submit themselves to Ferdinando Gorges”, but he had little luck and the Massachusetts authorities refused to submit to the king’s Letter Patent.¹¹ Returning to England in 1665, Archdale became a Quaker, married, and raised a family in High Wycombe, but his desire to return to America only grew, particularly as America seemed a place where he and other co-religionists might settle and live a peaceable life. In 1678 he acquired John, Lord Berkeley’s share in the colony, holding title in his son Thomas’s name (Thomas was a baptised Anglican, and therefore a legal holder of title); he sought office, and was appointed Chief Justice of Carolina in 1680 and collector of quitrents there two years later.¹² In 1683, he moved to northern Carolina and quickly became the pointman for the Lords’ Proprietor in London; they relied almost entirely on his judgement and that of the Governor, Seth Southwell, whom Archdale replaced in late 1685.¹³ Archdale was no proselytiser: his contacts with Native Americans encouraged him to believe that living a peaceable life would be “a good preparation for yee Gospell which God in his good time without

¹⁰ See: *Massachusetts Archives*, Boston, Archives Collection (1629-1799), Series 2043, vol. 3, ‘Colonial’ (1629-1720), 263-5, Letters of 5 and 30 November 1664 concerning the Province of Maine, and signed by John Archdale; *Library of the Society of Friends*, London, “Establishment of the Colony of Carolina,” John Archdale papers, MSS 53/1/10; Peter H. Wood, “Archdale, John (1642–1717),” *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Oct 2007). <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/615> (accessed 12 May 2016) (hereafter: *ODNB*). The Massachusetts Bay Authority had laid claim to Maine during the Commonwealth, and Archdale attempted to regain control of the province for his brother-in-law.

¹¹ James Phinney Baster, ed., *Documentary History of Maine*, 19 vols. (Portland, Maine: Maine Historical Society, 1889), 4:186-90.

¹² W.L. Saunders, ed., *Colonial Records of North Carolina*, 10 vols. (Raleigh, NC: P.M. Hale and Josephus Daniels, State Printers, 1886-1890), 1:346-351.

¹³ *Library of the Society of Friends*, London, “Notes Concerning John Archdale’s first Visit to Carolina in 1682,” John Archdale papers, MSS 53/4a; Robert M. Weir, “Sothel, Seth (d. 1693/4),” *ODNB*, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/26039> (accessed 12 May 2016).

doubt will cause to dawn among them.”¹⁴ Through private and speculative investment as well as political office, the Archdale family’s fortunes were tied to America.¹⁵

The first group of investor merchants in the south of the colony of Carolina were largely shopkeepers with very limited resources and few slaves.¹⁶ Archdale’s appointment as governor came at the most opportune of times: there were eleven different administrations in the twenty-three years preceding his governorship and most of the proprietors were at best absentees from general meetings; William *Earl* Craven, principal proprietor at the time of Archdale’s appointment in 1694, was eighty-eight years old and neither able nor willing to pursue a vigorous colonial policy.¹⁷ During an earlier return to England in 1691-94, Archdale had regularly held court at Amy’s Carolina Coffee House in Birch Lane, promoting Carolina, encouraging emigrants and showing maps of the colony.¹⁸ Carolina had in these years grown to become the empire’s greatest rice colony during the 1690s, when the commodity became the main valuable staple for export.¹⁹ The colony proved her importance in debates over the English balance of trade, and by 1717 had become the leading colonial producer of naval stores.²⁰

¹⁴ *Library of the Society of Friends*, London, “Establishment of the Colony of Carolina,” John Archdale papers, MSS 53/1/10.

¹⁵ Henry G. Hood, *The Public Career of John Archdale (1642-1717)* (Greensboro, NC: North Carolina Friends Historical Society, 1976), 39; Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington D.C., *John Archdale Papers, 1694-1706*, hereafter L.C., Archdale MSS.

¹⁶ R. C. Nash, “The Organization of Trade and Finance in the Atlantic Economy: Britain and South Carolina, 1670-1775,” in *Money, Trade and power: the Evolution of Colonial South Carolina’s Plantation Society*, ed. J. P. Greene, R. Brana-Shute and R. J. Sparks (South Carolina: University of South Carolina Press, 2001), 95.

¹⁷ *Calendar of State Papers*, Colonial, 1693-1696. All entries concerning the Carolinas give lists of names of Proprietors attending meetings (one example is no.197, 10 September 1696). *Calendar of State Papers*, Colonial, 1693-1696, no. 1268, Letter of 31 August 1694; Hugh Lefler, *History of North Carolina*, 4 vols., (New York: Lewis Historical Publishing Co., 1956), 1:58.

¹⁸ Hood, *Career of John Archdale*, 4; Wood, “Archdale, John (1642–1717)”.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 237.

²⁰ Weir, “Shaftesbury’s Darling”, 388.

Of course, colonial land was of little use without labour to work it. Investors, governors, and colonists alike were faced with three potential options in order to optimise land use. The first, the Spanish *encomienda* system, involved granting parcels of colonial land to colonists together with any resident inhabitants.²¹ These natives then worked as slave labour on the land. But declining numbers of Native Americans meant that such a model was not suited to the needs of Archdale and his fellow colonists.²² The second option, of mixed native and settler plantation, had been experimented with in Ireland since the reign of Elizabeth, but carried the threat of dispossessed owners, now tenants to ‘foreign’ landlords, rising up in rebellion.²³ There were already concerns over an increased reliance on slave labour, particularly in the lower south of the colony; too high a ratio of slave to white labour carried security concerns.²⁴ The third option, more favourable from John Archdale’s perspective, was to bolster the white population of Carolina through settling migrants from Britain and continental Europe. It was quite apparent that labour could not be sourced directly from England: parliament and political commentators were already concerned with depopulation brought about by warfare and disease.²⁵ For this reason, labour would need to be sourced from the European continent.²⁶

²¹ T. J. Yeager, “Encomienda or Slavery? The Spanish Crown’s Choice of Labor Organization in Sixteenth-Century Spanish America,” *The Journal of Economic History* 55 (4) (1995): 843.

²² *Ibid.*, 845.

²³ For more on the settlement of Ireland see Nicholas Canny, *Making Ireland British* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001).

²⁴ C. Tomlins, *Freedom Bound: Law, Labour, and Civic Identity in Colonizing English America, 1580-1865* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 27. On slavery in colonial Carolina, see *inter alia*, S. Max Edelson, *Plantation enterprise in colonial South Carolina*, (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2006).

²⁵ Defoe wrote “Bills of Mortality,” reporting on deaths from disease. Daniel Defoe, *An Essay upon Projects* (London: R.R. for Thomas Cockerill, 1697), 140, 158; Statt, *Foreigners and Englishmen*, 74-5.

²⁶ Archdale did make reference to how a union between England and Scotland might encourage the settling of Scots in the American colonies. See John Archdale, *A new description of Carolina*.

At the same time that such concerns were occupying Archdale's efforts, Carolina's neighbouring colonies were becoming increasingly competitive in attracting settlers and developing export trades. John Archdale's fellow Quaker, William Penn, was in the process of organising a fast and effective colonization of Pennsylvania. In 1682, twenty-three ships from England carried 2,000 colonists armed with provisions, tools and livestock.²⁷ Penn eagerly sought fellow Quaker investors to finance and underwrite settlement in the new colony; over half of the investors actually went to settle in the colony with him.²⁸ As part of his programme of recruitment, Penn attracted persecuted Friends from Ireland and Wales, as well as Lutheran and sectarian groups from the continent.²⁹ Non-Quakers and non-Britons alike were promised equal rights and opportunities – the ultimate example of religious freedom serving as a means of attracting needed settlers to the colonies.³⁰

Archdale travelled from England, arriving at Pasca, Maine, working his way down the coast to Boston and Plymouth, and continuing overland to Carolina, and arriving in Albemarle on 25 June 1695. Along the journey he surveyed techniques and practices in the other colonies.³¹ The provisions offered by Maryland colonists to attract experienced people of whichever religious persuasion contributed significantly to its prosperity as a tobacco colony; a letter from John Boyd to Archdale, dated 2 September 1695, regarding privileges granted to French settlers, made reference to the fact that Penn (for Pennsylvania) and the Bishop of London (for Maryland) made

²⁷ N. C. Landsman, "The Middle Colonies: New Opportunities for Settlement, 1660-1700," in *The Oxford History of the British Empire: Volume I. The Origins of Empire*, ed. Nicholas Canny (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 360 (hereafter: *OHBE*).

²⁸ Alan Taylor, *American Colonies: The Settling of North America* (London: Penguin Books, 2001), 267.

²⁹ Landsman, "The Middle Colonies," 361.

³⁰ Taylor, *American Colonies*, 266.

³¹ *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic*, 1695, no.1897, 14 June 1695; Rufus Jones, *The Quakers in the American Colonies* (London: Macmillan and Co., 1911), 344.

“endeavours to ingage French to come [over]”, suggesting that similar provisions be made to cater for French interests in Carolina.³²

These trends and the increasing competition with neighbouring colonies would force Archdale’s hand: Carolina had to become more competitive in order for initial investments to bear dividends. Archdale certainly worked to improve the development and growth of the Carolinas, introducing a poor law; and comprehensive slave laws and provisions were made for the improvement of public roads as well as increased military fortifications in South Carolina.³³ More significantly, he sought to convince his fellow English colonists to extend full rights to Huguenots recently settled in Carolina.³⁴ Like Penn, Archdale also offered Quakers and conscientious objectors exemption from military service.³⁵ If competing colonies were attracting labour and migrants, then Carolina could and would do the same.³⁶

It was at this juncture that John Archdale turned to a fourth option for drawing colonists to the region: the direct sourcing of German Protestant refugees who were facing persecution during the campaigns of Louis XIV in the War of Spanish

³² Taylor, *American Colonies*, 137; Boyd was French and a Huguenot supporter. L.C., Archdale MSS., 56: *A letter from J. Boyd to John Archdale*. Dated: Sept. 2, 1695; Hood, *Career of John Archdale*, 23. See also Hermann Wellenreuter, ‘Contexts for Migration in the early modern World: Public Policy, European Migrating Experiences, Transatlantic Migration, and the Genesis of American Culture’, in *In Search of Peace and Prosperity*, 3-35.

³³ H. G. Hood (Jr), “John Archdale,” in *Dictionary of North Carolina Biography: A-C*, ed. W. S. Powell (United States: University of North Carolina Press, 1979), 39.

³⁴ *Calendar of State Papers*, Colonial, 1693-1696, no.2255. See, also: Marion E. Sirmans, *Colonial South Carolina: A Political History, 1663-1763* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1966), 62. On the Huguenots, see also Robin D. Gwynn, *The Huguenots in Later Stuart Britain. Volume I – Crisis, Renewal, and The Ministers’ Dilemma* (Brighton: Sussex Academic Press, 2015); Susanne Lachenicht, *Huguenotten in Europa und Nordamerika. Migration und Integration in der Frühen Neuzeit* (Frankfurt am Main: Campus Verlag, 2010).

³⁵ L.C., Archdale MSS., 48: “*Friends Expectation in the Military Act*”.

³⁶ In 1708, the white population of South Carolina was only 1,500 greater than it had been in 1682. See C. D. Clowse, *Economic Beginnings in Colonial South Carolina 1670-1730* (South Carolina: University of South Carolina Press, 1971), 105.

Succession (1701-13).³⁷ This group became known as the ‘poor Palatines’ in popular and political discourse, a name which did not pay full justice to their backgrounds. In reality, they were ‘German’ only in so far as they were German speakers from German-speaking territories in Europe; some, for example, came from the Swiss cantons.³⁸

To procure these ‘refugees’ and finance their passage, government in London would need to act. The legal inclusion of Germans into the empire was a logical step: the projected accession to the throne of Elector George of Hanover under the Act of Settlement meant that these ‘Germans’ would share a king with the British.³⁹

Incorporation of the refugees into the legal and commercial fabric of Britain and her emerging Empire would also complement Queen Anne’s public image as a ‘Protestant Protectress’. John Tribbeko, Lutheran chaplain to the Queen’s consort Prince George of Denmark and the German agent at court, was careful to cultivate an image of these migrants as ‘poor Protestant Palatines’, while the annals of parliamentary commentator Abel Boyer are replete with references to ‘distressed refugees; fleeing from persecution’.⁴⁰ Archdale himself warned parliament in his *Weighty*

³⁷ For specific campaigns see Statt, *Foreigners and Englishmen*, 122.

³⁸ For example, Defoe’s *A brief history of the poor Palatine refugees, lately arriv’d in England...* (London: J. Baker, 1709). ‘Palatines’ was a nom de guerre. For German Protestant settlers in Georgia, in particular, see Alexander Pyrges, *Das Kolonialprojekt Ebenezer: Formen und Mechanismen protestantischer Expansion in der atlantischen Welt des 18. Jahrhunderts* (Stuttgart: Fritz Steiner, 2015); Ranate Wilson, ‘Land, Population, and Labor. Lutheran Immigrants in Colonial Georgia’, in *In Search of Peace and Prosperity*, 217-245.

³⁹ *An Act for the further Limitation of the Crown and better securing the Rights and Liberties of the Subject, 12 and 13 Will 3 c. 2; The Parliamentary History of England*, 6:931.

⁴⁰ Philip Otterness, *Becoming German: The 1709 Palatine Migration to New York* (New York: Cornell University Press, 2004), 40; TNA CO 388/76, 56: *Letter from John Tribbeko and George Andrew Ruperti*, dated: 9 May 1709; W. A. Speck, “George, prince of Denmark and duke of Cumberland (1653–1708),” *ODNB*, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/10543>, (accessed 12 May 2016); G. C. Gibbs, “Boyer, Abel (1667?–1729),” *ODNB*, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/3122> (accessed 14 April 2013); Abel Boyer, *The History of the Life and Reign of Queen Anne* (London: J. Roberts, 1722), 400.

Considerations that, ‘...the body of Europe is under ... all fermentation which hath and will persecute an uneasy body of Protestants.’⁴¹

The final step in the process of encouraging migrant labour to move to North America would be the initiation of a campaign to settle the refugees and labourers in Carolina through the grant of naturalization. Given that colonial governors could not ‘depeople’ Britain and Ireland to benefit colonial enterprise, this would be the perfect opportunity to force the issue of ‘foreign’ labour and naturalization onto the imperial agenda. In his *Weighty Considerations*, Archdale confirmed that such a programme could be done ‘...without weakening the strength of England’ and he and his company lobbied for labour in order to secure their colony defensively and economically.⁴² This drive to recruit more white settlers for the colony was not envisaged as a replacement for slave labour, however: a first comprehensive slave law, relying heavily on the Barbados Slave Code of 1688, was already passed for Carolina on 16 March 1696.⁴³

It is clear that John Archdale leveraged his European networks and connections in an effort to initiate his campaign: one-fifth of his extant correspondence relates directly to his efforts to recruit colonists for Carolina. As early as 1705, he had been in contact with the High German Company of Thuringia in an effort to arrange transport of

⁴¹ L.C., Archdale MSS., 64: “*Some Weighty Considerations humbly proposed to your Questions Parliament Considerations that shall be now assembled to consult your Welfare of this Nation,*” Undated.

⁴² L.C., Archdale MSS., 64: “*Some Weighty Considerations humbly proposed to your Questions Parliament Considerations that shall be now assembled to consult your Welfare of this Nation,*” Undated.

⁴³ Alexander S. Salley Jr., *Journal of the Commons House of Assembly of South Carolina* (Columbia, SC: Historical Commission of South Carolina, 1943), 47.

people to the colony.⁴⁴ He and other interested parties were working on both sides of the Atlantic to marry up the supply and demand for colonial labour.⁴⁵ Joshua de Kocherthal, a German Lutheran minister who from 1708 led groups of ‘poor Palatines’ from the Rhineland, travelled to London as early as 1704 to negotiate the transportation of the Palatines, and he continued to petition the Board of Trade as late as 1714.⁴⁶ The *Goldene Büchlein* (‘Golden Book’, almost certainly written by Kocherthal) was circulated at the time of the 1709 exodus, describing the province of Carolina and assuring readers that their passage to America would be funded.⁴⁷ What information Kocherthal had about the province was obtained when he met the Lords Proprietor in London in 1706 and from correspondence with them and others before that date.⁴⁸ Although he had been in Maine as early as 1664 and almost certainly encountered Archdale there, Kocherthal had no first hand experience of Carolina.⁴⁹ It was from John Archdale and the colonists in Carolina whose interests and needs were being served, that Kocherthal and others learned of opportunities in the Americas.⁵⁰ And as shall be seen, in some instances correspondence with Archdale was established, cultivated and maintained over a 40 year period in the service of Carolina’s interest.

⁴⁴ L.C., Archdale MSS., 23: *A letter of the German Thuringian Company to the Lords Proprietors*, Sept. 22, 1705; 24: *A letter from Polycarpus Michael Preckenbach to the Lords Proprietors*, Sept. 22, 1705; 51: *A letter from the German Company in Thuringia to the Lords Proprietors*, May 23, 1705; 61: *A letter from John Archdale to the German Company in Thuringia relative to their anticipated settlement in Carolina*.

⁴⁵ See letter from William Killigrew to Sir Hedges dated July 1706 reporting that he was in contact with Protestants from “foreign parts”; TNA CO 5/306, 3, 3i, *Letter from William Killigrew to Sir Hedges*, dated: July 1706.

⁴⁶ TNA CO 323/6, 55, 55i: *Mr Secretary Boyle to the Council of Trade and Plantations*, dated: 20 April 1708; TNA CO 324/9, pp.176-180: *Council of Trade and Plantations to Mr. Secretary Boyle*, dated: 28 April 1708; TNA CO 5/1085, 36: *Address of J. Falckner and J. Kocherthal, Lutheran Ministers at New York, etc. to the King*, dated: 1714.

⁴⁷ Otterness, *Becoming German*, 27.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*

⁴⁹ *Massachusetts Archives*, Boston, Archives Collection (1629-1799), Series 2043, Vol.3 ‘Colonial’ (1629-1720), pp.263-5, Letters of 5 and 30 November 1664 concerning the Province of Maine, and signed by John Archdale.

⁵⁰ This is emphasized by the fact that the ‘Golden Book’ had promised, purportedly on behalf of Queen Anne, to pay migrants’ travel fares to America.

The director of the High German Company of Thuringia, Polycarpus Michael Rechtenbach, met with Archdale in London and advised him how to recruit German labourers for Carolina. Rechtenbach wrote that it was crucial to make clear everyone could travel, irrespective of having the financial means to pay the cost of the Atlantic crossing.⁵¹

Next, Rechtenbach recommended that after the first ship of migrants had landed in America,

there should be published by us and in our names, a short plain description of the good scituation and Conveniences of the Country, with the advantageous Conditions granted to us by the proprietors, there should also circumstancially be sett forth the great eveready proffetts that might be Expected from there, and subjoynd thereunto Expecially this clause, that a Poor Man hath only need to provide himself to come to London and then to pay nothing for his transport thence to Carolina because upon his address to the Lords Proprietors they would maintain and transport him to Carolina whereby nothing which might recommend and make this country should be past by or ormitted.

The description, Rechtenbach suggested, should begin with an endorsement by the Lords Proprietors, as the imprimatur of government would carry great weight with the German migrants.⁵² Kocherthal's pamphlet, *Außführlich und umständlicher Bericht*, provided the detail required by Rechtenbach and in place of an endorsement from the

⁵¹ Rechtenbach, sometimes 'Prechenbach' [sic], wrote that he had read Richard Blome's *The English empire in America* and was moved to investigate the possibility of forging links with Carolina. Richard Blome, *The English empire in America: or A prospect of His Majesties dominions in the West-Indies. Namely, Newfoundland, New-England, New-York, Pensylvania, New-Jersey, Maryland, Virginia, Carolina...*, London, 1685. A German edition of Blome appeared in Leipzig in 1697; see Sarah L.C. Clapp, "The Subscription enterprises of John Ogilby and Richard Blome", *Modern Philology*, vol. 30, 4 (May, 1933): 365-379, 377, fn. 34.

⁵² L.C., *Archdale Manuscripts*, 1694-1706, 60, ff.

Lords Proprietors, Queen Anne was named as personal benefactor of the American venture.

The following year, John Archdale released a promotional tract entitled *A new description of that fertile and pleasant province of Carolina*.⁵³ The text was primarily concerned with encouraging agents of government in London to take an active role in encouraging migration to the colonies. Writing of “industrious Dissenters”, Archdale also explained how the granting of religious toleration in Carolina had been beneficial to the Crown.⁵⁴ Further incentives should be offered, he argued, including a grant of relief from debts accrued by any migrant willing to travel to the colony.⁵⁵ In a further effort to attract settlers, Archdale forgave some rents in arrears: others in the colony, including Jonathan Amery, speaker of the lower house, declared in a letter to Archdale that such a measure was of great advantage to Carolina, as it was “so highly necessary conducing to the Peopling, Settling and Safety thereof”.⁵⁶

Archdale’s actions were not without precedent and were, in some measure, clearly modelled on his better-known co-religionist William Penn. In Pennsylvania, Penn’s work to promote his fledgling commonwealth also drew on German labour, and especially from the Palatinate.⁵⁷ After granting of the royal charter in 1681, Penn set to writing a promotional tract for his territory, and the resulting *Account of the*

⁵³ John Archdale, *A new description of Carolina*, 1707.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, 28.

⁵⁵ A. H. Carpenter, “Naturalization in England and the American Colonies,” *The American Historical Review* 9 (2) (1904): 296.

⁵⁶ Alexander Samuel Salley, *Narratives of Early Carolina, 1650-1708* (New York: C. Scribner’s sons, 1911), vol. 12, 298-99.

⁵⁷ Samuel M. Janney, *The Life of William Penn* (Philadelphia, 1852), 117, treats of Penn’s 1677 visit and his friendship with Princess Elizabeth of the Palatinate. Hermann Wellenreuter, ‘Tradition and Expectation. The German Immigrants in English Colonial Society in Pennsylvania 1700-1765’, in Frank Trommler and Joseph McVeigh (eds.), *America and the Germans. An Assessment of Three-Hundred-Year History, vol. I, Immigration, Language, Ethnicity* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1986), 85-105.

province of Pennsylvania in America proved extremely popular, appearing in translation in Amsterdam in 1682 and making its way into the German lands almost immediately thereafter.⁵⁸ In 1684, Penn's letter addressed to the people of Germany was published in Hamburg, spreading news of the province and of opportunities to settle and farm there.⁵⁹ He was aided in his venture by his co-religionist, translator and promoter, Benjamin Furly, who sold nearly 50,000 acres of the commonwealth for Penn.⁶⁰ Whereas Kocherthal's was the only publication to promote Carolina in the German lands, there were a variety of pamphlets and books in circulation in German and Dutch, from as early as 1681, which popularised Pennsylvania.⁶¹ Of particular importance were Franz Daniel Pastorius's *Umständige geographische Beschreibung* of 1700 and Daniel Falckner's influential *Curieuse Nachricht von Pennsylvania* of 1699 (in manuscript) and 1702 (in print), both of which appeared in a single edition in 1704, published by the Frankfort Company for whom Benjamin Furly then worked.⁶² The Frankfort Company, as with all other land proprietors at the time, was anxious to settle colonists as quickly as possible and encouraged colonial agents to spread ideas of a better life in Pennsylvania. These speculators rode the coattails of the Quakers, whose reputation as honest and upright people encouraged audiences to trust their

⁵⁸ William Penn, *Some account of the Province of Pennsylvania in America, lately granted under the great seal of England to William Penn, &c. Together with privileges and powers necessary to the well-governing thereof. Made publick for the information of such as are or may be disposed to transport themselves or servants into those parts* (London, 1681).

⁵⁹ William Penn, *Ein Brief von William Penn, Eigentumsherrn und Befehlshaber in Pennsylvania in Amerika*, (Hamburg: Heusch, 1684).

⁶⁰ Richard L. Greaves, 'Furly, Benjamin (1636–1714)', *ODNB*, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/10248> (accessed 12 May 2016); Julius F. Sachse, "Benjamin Furley," *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 19 (3) (1895): 276-306.

⁶¹ Julius F. Sachse, "The Fatherland 1450-1700," *Proceedings of the Pennsylvania German Society* 7 (1897): 201-256, reprints a list of over fifty titles in circulation before 1709.

⁶² Franz Daniel Pastorius, *Umständige geographische Beschreibung der zu allerletzt erfundenen Provinz Pennsylvania in denen Endgrenzen Americae in der neuen West-Welt gelegen, durch Franz Daniel Pastorius,...* (Frankfurt and Leipzig: Andreas Otto, 1704 [2nd ed.]); Daniel Falckner, *Curieuse Nachricht von Pennsylvania in Norden-Amerika Welche Auf Begehren guter Freunde,...* (Frankfurt and Leipzig: Andreas Otto, 1702); Julius F. Sachse, *Curieuse Nachricht von Pennsylvania (of 1702)* (Philadelphia, 1905), 8.

tales of America, and this reputation would play a part in Archdale's later success.⁶³ Penn's work, and the work of agents serving his commonwealth, was successful, as the poor Palatines asked to be sent on to Pennsylvania shortly after they had arrived in London in 1709.⁶⁴

Since the time of the Glorious Revolution, the monarchy in England had encouraged European Protestants to take refuge in Britain.⁶⁵ Queen Anne built on the practices of William and Mary, supporting persecuted European Protestants with words, deeds and money.⁶⁶ And continental Protestants saw in Anne a champion of their cause.⁶⁷ Anne and her ministers were inspired, too, by mercantilist policies declaring that economic strength would be found in a large population. Population was the *mot juste* of 1709: a preamble to a new law of that year noted that 'the increase of people is a means of advancing the wealth and strength of a nation'.⁶⁸ Josiah Child encouraged emigration as a means of developing trade, and others looked to the Dutch Republic as a model, where recent legislation encouraged foreign Protestants to come and reside in the Provinces.⁶⁹

It was opportune, then, that colonial proprietary interests merged with European, and principally German, commercial companies, to wage a canvassing campaign of legislative reform in London. A German Protestant residing in Pennsylvania, John

⁶³ John M. Brown, *Brief sketch of the first settlement of the county of Schoharie by the Germans* (Schoharie, 1823), 5; Albert B. Faust, *The German element in the United States* (New York, 1927) 1:61; Friedrich Kapp, *Die Deutschen in Staate New York* (New York, 1884), 1:20.

⁶⁴ Narcissus Luttrell, *Brief relation of state affairs* (Oxford, 1857), 6:434-440; Luttrell reports that on 28 April and 12 May, Palatines arriving in London said they were bound for Pennsylvania.

⁶⁵ J.S. Burn, *History of the French, Walloon, Dutch and other foreign refugees settled in England from the reign of Henry VIII to the revocation of the edict of Nantes* (London, 1746), 18.

⁶⁶ Luttrell, *Brief relation*, 6:452.

⁶⁷ TNA, Townshend MSS, *Historical Manuscripts Commission 11th Report*, Appendix, 4:52.

⁶⁸ 7 Anne, C. 5, *Statutes of the Realm*, 9:63.

⁶⁹ Josiah Child, *A new discourse on Trade* (London, 1693), 154; *Monthly Mercury*, (London, July, 1709), XX:275.

Henry Sprögel, wrote to Parliament petitioning for a naturalisation act for Germans wishing to emigrate to the colonies.⁷⁰ Sprögel reminded Archdale that German settlement in neighbouring Pennsylvania had proved highly successful and that industrious German colonists were of real benefit to the Commonwealth. In ‘Some weighty considerations for Parliament’, Archdale argued that: the “uneasy body of [European] Protestants... opprest with taxes, drained of their wealth and lying in the jealous sight of popery, are grown so uneasy, as to be willing to transplant themselves under the English Government.”⁷¹ William Penn was entirely behind a naturalisation act for the colonies, seeing it as advantageous to the further development of his Commonwealth. It was in “the interest of England to improve and thicken her colonies with people not her own”, he wrote, and he was frustrated that the bill before Parliament “moves but slowly”.⁷² The City of London stood in opposition to a new bill, fearing it would swell the city with poor and destitute migrants; but those in favour “argued, that very great benefits would thereby accrue to Britain; that the king of Prussia, by inviting the French refugees to settle in his dominions, had fertilized a barren and ill-peopled country, improved its trade and manufactures, and increased his own revenues.”⁷³ The bill finally received royal assent on 23 March 1709 and was the first general naturalisation law in England, requiring candidates to take an oath of allegiance and to “have received the sacrament of the Lord’s supper in some protestant or reformed congregation within this kingdom of Great Britain within

⁷⁰ L.C., *Archdale MSS*, 1694-1706, 70.

⁷¹ L.C., *Archdale MSS*, 1694-1706, 151; the letter is titled ‘Some weighty considerations for Parliament’.

⁷² Huntington Library, *H.M. MSS* 22285; “Correspondence between William Penn and James Logan”, Edward Armstrong ed., *Memoirs of Historical Society of Pennsylvania*, X, II (Philadelphia: Historical Society of Pennsylvania, 1872): 323.

⁷³ Luttrell, *Brief relation*, 6:404-408, 415-417; David Macpherson, *Annals of commerce, manufactures, fisheries, and navigation, with brief notices of the arts and sciences connected with them* (London, 1805), 3:5.

three months before taking the said oaths.”⁷⁴ Children born of naturalised parents were to be considered naturalised themselves, and all could engage in trade and commerce.⁷⁵

While there is no direct mention in the statutes of a connection between this change to English law and the recruitment of German colonists for the colonies in 1709, it was certainly believed at the time that the law was “made with a particular view to the Protestant Palatines brought this year into England.”⁷⁶ Promoters of commerce, manufacturing and trade all watched as Holland and Prussia boomed – largely, it was believed, thanks to the skills and crafts introduced by Huguenot refugees from France. It is no accident that the Act was passed at a time when Germans were amassing in Rhine river stations, preparing for their journey to Rotterdam and then to London; news of their gathering was known in England. Archdale and Penn and their agents had whipped up an advertising frenzy, a German audience had listened attentively, and parliament in London had prepared the ground by passing legislation that encouraged German Protestants to believe that the government eagerly awaited their arrival.⁷⁷

Britain, however, needed to be careful not to appear a poacher of friendly-states’ citizens; after all, London would not allow other countries to lure away her

⁷⁴ Macpherson, *Annals of Commerce*, 3:5.

⁷⁵ 7 Anne, C. 5, *Statutes of the realm* 9:63; L.C., *Archdale MSS*, 1694-1706, 70.

⁷⁶ Macpherson, *Annals of Commerce*, 3:6.

⁷⁷ On the role of British emissaries based in the Low Countries and their role in German migration, see Rosalind J. Beiler, ‘Information Brokers and Mediators: The Role of Diplomats in the Migrations of German-speaking People, 1709-1711’ in Jan Stievermann and Oliver Scheidling (eds.), *A Peculiar Mixture: German-Language Cultures and Identities in Eighteenth-Century North America* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2013), 43-57; eadem., ‘Information networks and the dynamics of migration. Swiss Anabaptist exiles and their host communities’, in Susanne Lachenicht (ed.), *Religious Refugees in Europe, Asia and North America, 6th to 21st century* (Hamburg: Lit Verlag, 2007), 81-91.

industrious labourers. As such, advantage was taken of political and religious turmoil on the continent to attract colonists – this was true in 1709 and would be true at other similar junctures throughout the eighteenth century. Sometimes, a government could offer a group of people to another, just as the canton of Bern did in 1710, when it offered its unwanted Anabaptist residents to England for settlement in the American colonies.⁷⁸ Some rulers even thought that by improving local conditions, emigrants might even choose to return to their birth home, upon receipt of the good news that domestic conditions had improved.⁷⁹

This was the most opportune moment for Archdale and other colonial agents to petition the Board of Trade to fund the passage of German migrants to the American colonies. The British government was unable to handle the 13,000 migrants from the Rhine valley arrived in the city since March 1709, and the cost of supporting the Palatines rose to £318 per day; parliament struggled to act charitably in the face of growing public approbrium.⁸⁰

To offload the migrants the government agreed, at the end of 1709, to fund the passage to New York and the north-eastern colonies of some migrants.⁸¹ This followed on an earlier decision in 1708 to transport 3,000 German refugees to New York to develop naval stores in North America. The successful migration of 1708 lay the foundations for the migration of 1709, and the direct link between commercial

⁷⁸ *Maggs Brothers Catalogue, Autograph Letters and Historical Documents*, Catalogue no. 522, New York, 1929; letter from the British Envoy Abraham Stanyan to Lord Townshend, dated 5 April 1710.

⁷⁹ Charlotte-Elizabeth, duchess d'Orléans, *The letters of Madame: the correspondence of Elisabeth-Charlotte of Bavaria, Princess Palatine, Duchess of Orleans, called "Madame" at the court of Louis XIV* (London: Arrowsmith, 1924), 25.

⁸⁰ Statt, *Foreigners and Englishmen*, 20, 134.

⁸¹ TNA CO 5/1049, 155, 155.i: *J. de Kocherthal to the Council of Trade and Plantations*, dated: 27 December 1709.

need and state action serves as a notable example of commercial interests exerting an influence on the peopling of the English world in the early eighteenth century.⁸²

II

Management of an emerging British Empire was concerned with maintaining jurisdiction over people and territory in the most secure way at the least possible cost.⁸³ This involved making delegated authorities (such as private companies or individual families) part of Empire in a legal and economic capacity, and maintaining a balance of power in which colonial authorities had an interest in being part of Empire. The Spanish Empire found sources of wealth abroad (such as gold mines and other natural resources) relatively quickly, yet the British Empire could not yet fund itself without the aid of private finance.⁸⁴ By the close of the seventeenth century, the emerging British state's reliance on such groups forced it to make concessions in order to ensure that 'membership' of Empire remained an attractive option while at the same time achieving a delicate balance in ensuring the economic and commercial contribution of the colonies to the prosperity of the metropole.

At the turn of the Glorious Revolution, the operation of British colonial law was in a process of slow change from law by license to law by contract. The variation in legal status of the colonies as well as the limited legal control exercised from London is demonstrated by the fact that, well into the eighteenth century, some of the American

⁸² Justin Williams, "English Mercantilism and Carolina Naval Stores", *The Journal of Southern History* 1:2 (May, 1935): 169-185, 174; H. T. Dickinson, "The Poor Palatines and the Parties," *English Historical Review* 82 (324) (July, 1967): 464-485, 480; Statt, *Foreigners and Englishmen*, 155. See also TNA CO 324/9: 176-80, *Council of Trade and Plantations to Mr. Secretary Boyle*, dated: 28 April 1708.

⁸³ Jack P. Greene, *Negotiated Authorities: essays in colonial, political and constitutional history* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1994): 13.

⁸⁴ Jorge Cañizares-Esquerro, *Puritan Conquistadors: Iberianizing the Atlantic, 1550-1700* (California: Stanford University Press, 2006), *passim*.

colonies (notably Pennsylvania and Maryland) were still in the administration of those families that had established them.⁸⁵ Belatedly in 1663, the New England colonies were granted indulgent royal charters and enjoyed near autonomy from the Crown's authority: decision-making was often delegated to small towns within the colonies.⁸⁶ Similarly in Carolina, John Locke's 'Constitutions of Carolina' (1669/70), drafted for the Carolina proprietor the Earl of Shaftesbury by his secretary, offered an early example of liberal toleration, in the context of the time.⁸⁷ The *Constitutions* allowed for the public exercise of any religion on which "seven or more persons" could agree. And while the *Constitutions* were never approved, the spirit of their intent resonated throughout the colony until the Church of England was finally established there in 1706.⁸⁸ In this way, it was the responsibility of individual governors like John Archdale of Carolina, rather than the Crown, to secure a suitable population for their own territories. And while Archdale served the Crown, his labourers worked for it. It was clear that new settlers would come from the range of faiths and beliefs: "Jews, heathens, and other dissenters from the purity of the Christian religion"; not just Anglicans, or from England alone.⁸⁹

⁸⁵ P.J. Marshall, "Introduction," in *OHBE Vol. II: The Eighteenth Century*, ed. P.J. Marshall (Oxford, 1998), 10.

⁸⁶ Aside from paying customs duties and contributing small numbers of men to wars, both Rhode Island and Connecticut enjoyed near-autonomy at the turn of the century. Taylor, *American Colonies*, 284, 247.

⁸⁷ "The Constitutions of Carolina," in *John Locke: A Letter Concerning Toleration*, ed. Goldie, 146-8.

⁸⁸ *Fundamental Constitutions of Carolina*; see also "Fundamental Constitutions of Carolina, March 1, 1669/70," in *North Carolina Charters and Constitutions*, ed. Mattie Erma Edwards Parker (Raleigh, 1963), 181-3; Roper, *Conceiving Carolina*, 128-31; Charles H. Lippy, "Chastized by Scorpions: Christianity and Culture in Colonial South Carolina, 1669-1740," *Church History* LXXIX:2 (June, 2010): 253-270, 269; Robert M. Weir, "'Shaftesbury's Darling': British Settlement in the Carolinas at the Close of the Seventeenth Century," in *OHBE: Vol. I*, ed. N. Canny (Oxford, 1998), 375-97; Evan Haefeli, "Toleration and Empire: The origins of American Religious Pluralism," in *British North America in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries*, ed. Stephen Foster (Oxford: Oxford University Press), 123-4.

⁸⁹ As quoted in: Conrad Henry Moehlman, *The American Constitutions and Religion: Religious References in the Charters of the Thirteen Colonies and the Constitution of the Forty-Eight States* (Berne, IN, 1938), 29. See also: Vicki Hsueh, "Giving Orders: Theory and Practice in the Fundamental Constitutions of Carolina," *Journal of the History of Ideas* LXIII:3 (2002): 425-46; David Armitage, "John Locke, Carolina, and the Two Treatises of Government," *Political Theory* XXXII:5 (2004): 602-

By the early eighteenth century, an emerging body of economic commentary had given rise to the idea of a 'Balance of Trade' as core to the survival and prosperity of Britain and its empire. Pioneered by Thomas Mun, the theory of the Balance of Trade upheld the importance of the potential surplus value of a country's exports over its imports.⁹⁰ This surplus value of exports would lead to an overall increase in the nation's wealth, particularly if exports were raw materials produced wholly within the country's borders, as the political economist Charles Davenant argued they should be.⁹¹ Given that the amount of land and resources in the country were fixed, the only way of increasing both the quantity and quality of exports was to apply more labour to existing materials.⁹² William Petty's theory of labour postulated that the value of all commodities could, in principle, be reduced to the value of the land and labour required to produce such goods.⁹³ More labour could be applied to existing amounts of land in order to achieve a surplus of exports and therefore a favourable balance of trade. This led Petty to declare in *Britannia Languens* (1680) that "...people are

27. On Anglicanism in colonial Carolina, see: S. Charles Bolton, *Southern Anglicanism. The Church of England in Colonial South Carolina* (Westport, CT, 1982).

⁹⁰ Thomas Mun, *England's treasure by forraign trade. or, the ballance of our forraign trade is the rule of our treasure* (London: J.G. for Thomas Clark, 1664), 23; Statt, *Foreigners and Englishmen*, 45; Edgar Furniss, *The Position of the Labourer in a System of Nationalism: A Study in the Labor English Mercantilists* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1920), 14.

⁹¹ Julian Hoppit, "Davenant, Charles (1656–1714)," *ODNB*, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/7195> (accessed 12 May 2016); Furniss, *The Position of the Labourer*, 14.

⁹² Contemporary Thomas Mun provided the example of applying labour to the spinning of wool into woven cloth, whose bulk value would significantly outweigh that of its raw material. Mun, *England's treasure by forraign trade*, 23. See also Furniss, *The Position of the Labourer*, 11.

⁹³ Toby Barnard, "Petty, Sir William (1623–1687)," *ODNB*, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/22069> (accessed 12 May 2016); William Petty, "Treatise of Taxes" (1662) in *Economic Writings of Sir William Petty, Vol. I*, ed. C. H. Hull (initial publication, 1899; London: Routledge, 1997), 43.

therefore in truth the chiefest, most fundamental and precious commodity...”.⁹⁴

“Fewness of people”, Petty wrote, “is real poverty.”⁹⁵

Whereas the declining doctrine of ‘Bullionism’ had associated wealth with the supply of precious metals, the idea therefore developed from the 1660s onwards that wealth was most associated with the ‘peopling’ of a territory.⁹⁶ A very specific type of ‘peopling’ was envisioned: following the perceived stagnation of the population due to the plague of 1665 and the Great Fire of London, contemporaries sought to source new labour and populations rather than resting their hopes on the existing English population.⁹⁷ Moreover, significant fluctuations in the price of gold and silver made such materials increasingly unreliable measures of value. This prompted Petty and others to calculate value in terms of units of labour; population could be seen as the key to unlocking wealth.⁹⁸

Petty’s views illuminate two important features of the role of labour in the emerging British empire. First, vested interests in colonial rule directly informed the economic discourse of the time: many of those who wrote economic tracts and commentaries were not economic theorists by profession, but merchants and colonists, or were patronised by such. One example of this convergence was the merchant Josiah Child,

⁹⁴ William Petty, *Britannia Languens, or a discourse of trade: shewing the grounds and reasons of the increase and decay of landrents, national wealth and strength...* (London, 1680), 238.

⁹⁵ William Petty, *A treatise of taxes and contributions. Shewing the nature and measures of crown lands, assessments, customs, poll-moneys...* The third [i.e. fourth] edition (London, 1685), 16.

⁹⁶ Statt, *Foreigners and Englishmen*, 44.

⁹⁷ William Petty recorded and reported on cases of plague in his “Bills of Mortality”; Samuel Fortrey among others advocated this idea in “England’s Interest and Improvement” (1663). See Statt, *Foreigners and Englishmen*, 57.

⁹⁸ ‘6 millions of people be worth 417 millions of pounds sterling.’ William Petty, *The political anatomy of Ireland. With the establishment for that Kingdom when the late Duke of Ormond was Lord Lieutenant. Taken from the records...* (London: D. Brown and W. Rogers, 1691), 8.

who forcefully proclaimed that people constituted the basis for national wealth.⁹⁹ Similarly, William Petty's 'Political Arithmetick' was hardly a neutral piece of economic analysis. His acquisition of 30,000 acres in the controversial Irish Cromwellian land settlement gave him a vested interest in the success of the colonial settling of Ireland, and his position as administrator of the Restoration Irish land settlement and co-ordinator of the unpopular Down Survey exposed him to fierce attacks from the powerful Irish Catholic lobby in Court, perhaps forcing a defence of such policies based on empirical measures.¹⁰⁰

Second, this economic discourse informed assumptions about how best to secure empire and trade. In the sphere of high politics, colonial security was seen as synonymous with the adequate 'peopling' of a territory to form religiously-acceptable bulwarks against other populations. As early as the Ulster Plantation of 1609, the Stuarts held the plantation of English Crown subjects in colonial domains to be the safest way of guaranteeing the security and subordination of the territory. Similarly, some of the 1709 Germans were put to use in order to bolster the Protestant interest in Ireland: Queen Anne herself commented, '...we have to strengthen the Protestant interest of that Our Kingdom.'¹⁰¹ German Protestants could form part of the

⁹⁹ Josiah Child, *A discourse about trade, wherein the reduction of interest of money to 4 l. per centum, is recommended* (London: A. Sowle, 1690), Preface, fourth point.

¹⁰⁰ Sabine Reungoat, *William Petty: observateur des îles britanniques* (Paris: INED, 2004); Aaron James Henry, "William Petty, the Down Survey, Population and Territory in the Seventeenth Century", *Territory, Politics, Governance*, 2 (2) (Routledge, 2014): 218-237; Tony Aspromourgos, "The Life of William Petty in relation to his economics: a tercentenary interpretation," *History of Political Economy* 20:3 (1988): 337-356, 341.

¹⁰¹ "To the Earl of Wharton, Governor-General of Ireland," in *The Letters of Queen Anne*, ed. Curtis Brown (London: Cassell, 1935), 283. Some authors have argued that it was this obsession with securing the Protestant cause which motivated the naturalization debate; Caroline Robbins, "A Note on General Naturalization under the Later Stuarts and a Speech in the House of Commons on the Subject in 1664," *The Journal of Modern History* 34:2 (June 1962): 168-77.

‘Protestant International’ that Herbert Lüthy originally spoke of in reference to a ‘cosmopolitan diaspora’ of Protestants.¹⁰²

A diasporic Protestant workforce, trade and commerce and naval security converged in the ‘Tar Crisis’ of 1702-3. Until the first decade of the eighteenth century, England had been dependent on the Baltic for naval stores supplies, making the construction of maritime equipment reliant on a foreign power and highly vulnerable to price and supply fluctuations in times of war or uncertainty. In 1689 the Stockholm Tar Company was granted a monopoly over Sweden’s resinous products, which served to drive up prices exponentially. The ‘Tar Crisis’ and the Northern War (1700-21) threatened a dearth in supply of naval stores, further highlighting the precarious nature of the country’s reliance on the Baltic.¹⁰³

The Naval Stores Act (1705) and its promise of royal bounties to settlers travelling to New York to manufacture these products within the Crown’s territories was one articulation of the theories of the balance of trade and role of labour in empire.¹⁰⁴ Carolina, New York and the New England coast were rich in the natural materials needed to produce naval stores, yet the perennial problem of a small population and underdeveloped labour force posed an obstacle to the processing of these materials. After initial attempts at production through the settlement of German colonists in upstate New York, South Carolina emerged as the greatest producer of naval stores,

¹⁰² Robin Gwyn, “The Huguenots in Britain, the ‘Protestant International’ and the defeat of Louis XIV,” in *From Strangers to Citizens: the Integration of Immigrant Communities in Britain, Ireland and Colonial America, 1550-1750*, ed. Randolph Vigne and Charles Littleton (Brighton: Sussex Academic Press, 2001), 412.

¹⁰³ Williams, “English Mercantilism and Carolina Naval Stores,” 173.

¹⁰⁴ Otterness, *Becoming German*, *passim*.

and England was able to correct the unfavourable balance of trade with Sweden.¹⁰⁵

This perfectly demonstrated the arguments of contemporaries like Daniel Defoe who advocated the centrality of traders and workers to the health and survival of the nation, and also served to show how trade and colonial expansion, so central to the fabric of national survival, could form part of the moral economy.¹⁰⁶

In 1709, during parliamentary debates concerning the War of the Spanish Succession, it was declared that the war ‘had already consumed such a vast number of men, that it was highly necessary to supply that loss by inviting foreigners to come over.’¹⁰⁷

Consequently, the question arose of how to source more migrants, not just through natural increase, but also through a process of settlement. It was this discourse that informed debates over a general naturalization act, and contemporary commercial writers saw provisions for naturalization of select migrants as crucial to the attraction of foreigners to kingdom and colony. As the anonymous author of *The Grand Concern of England* (1673) declared: ‘...an Act for a general naturalization is absolutely necessary, if we will be supplied with people from foreign parts...’¹⁰⁸

However, practical economic concerns created hostility towards migrants in many sections of society.¹⁰⁹ Resentment based on perceived threats to an economic community stemmed from the perception that foreigners brought threatening ideas

¹⁰⁵ Williams, “English Mercantilism and Carolina Naval Stores,” 170.

¹⁰⁶ Statt, *Foreigners and Englishmen*, 49.

¹⁰⁷ *The Parliamentary History of England* 6: 783.

¹⁰⁸ Joan Thirsk and J. R. Cooper, ed., *Seventeenth Century Economic Documents* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972), 743.

¹⁰⁹ Catherine Swindlehurst, “An Unruly and presumptuous rabble: the reaction of the Spitalfields weaving community to the settlement of the Huguenots, 1660-90,” in *From Strangers to Citizens*, ed. Vigne and Littleton, 366.

and innovations with them.¹¹⁰ Religious consideration also informed Tory concerns about welcoming foreigners permanently to England.¹¹¹ Determined to protect the Anglican High Church from poisonous dissenting interests, many Tories feared that refugees and migrants would be damaging to the religious interest of the established Church of the country. Parliament had considered bills promoting naturalization in 1679, 1680, and 1690 and again between 1693 and 1698; they were vigorously challenged and nothing came of these bills.¹¹² As late as 1709 opponents of a general Naturalization Bill argued that it would be a threat to the established Church and to England.¹¹³ On 28 July 1681, Charles II had issued a proclamation which allowed “distressed Protestants abroad” to settle in England, although it guaranteed no special concessions concerning taxes or jurisdiction; the king’s promise of letters of denization for the immigrants, and indeed of proposing a naturalization bill to Parliament, came to nothing.¹¹⁴ Under James II, only those Huguenots and other foreigners who conformed to Anglicanism could obtain any charitable support from

¹¹⁰ J. P. Ward, “‘Employment for all hands that will worke’: Immigrants, Guilds and the Labour Market in Early Seventeenth Century London,” in *Immigrants in Tudor and Early Stuart England*, ed. Nigel Goose and Lien Luu (England: Sussex Academic Press, 2005), 82; Malcolm R. Thorp, “The Anti-Huguenot Undercurrent in late Seventeenth-Century England,” *Proceedings of the Huguenot Society of London* 22 (1970-1976): 571.

¹¹¹ At this point, there were tens of thousands of Irish Catholics in London prompting questions over the relationship between religion and foreignness.

¹¹² Clive Parry, *British Nationality Law and the History of Naturalization* (Milan: Università di Milano, 1954), 91; David Resnick, “John Locke and the Problem of Naturalization,” *The Review of Politics* 49 (3) (1987): 368-388.

¹¹³ The barrister Robert Raymond speaking before the House of Lords in 1709, on behalf of the City of London; David Lemmings, ‘Raymond, Robert, first Baron Raymond (1673–1733)’, *ODNB*, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/23207>, (accessed 12 May 2016). Parliamentary diarist John Milward, for example, argued against the introduction of a general Naturalization Bill in 1667 on the grounds that it would be a threat to the established Church. Paul Seaward, ‘Milward, John (1599–1670)’, *ODNB*, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/38330> (accessed 12 May 2016); Statt, *Foreigners and Englishmen*, 70.

¹¹⁴ Proclamation of King Charles II, 28 July 1681, promising “privileges and immunitys for the liberty and free exercise of their trades and handicrafts as are consistent with the Laws.” William A. Shaw, ed., *Letters of Denization and Acts of Naturalization for Aliens in England and Ireland, 1603-1700* (London: Huguenot Society of London, 1911), 124-5; Ulrich Niggemann, “Craft Guilds and Immigration: Huguenots in German and English cities,” in Bert De Munck and Anne Winter, ed., *Gated Communities? Regulating Migration in Early Modern Cities* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2012), 49-50.

the Church.¹¹⁵ There had already been an overwhelming growth in outward dissent since the Act of Toleration (1689).¹¹⁶ This growth was unlikely to favourably dispose contemporaries towards any further immigrants.

The high political changes of the Williamite revolution and planned Hanoverian succession played a significant role in British attitudes towards foreignness. Some criticized the foreigner who had “rapaciously seized” the crown and who sought to introduce “atheism, thralldom, and poverty” to the kingdom, yet not all sections of society were so resolutely hostile: most favoured the German king, and if an Englishman might share the crown with a foreigner, the idea of ‘foreignness’ or a foreign subject was not so distant.¹¹⁷ Some even sought to defend the presence of foreigners in society. The most prominent advocate of naturalization, Daniel Defoe, rebuked attacks on William III for giving English titles to Dutch interests in *The True Born Englishman* in 1701: society, he argued, should take little concern over a person’s name or identity, and value rather their character and moral standing.¹¹⁸ Daniel Defoe’s work, in particular, articulated the link between economic prosperity based on the importance of labour, the balance of trade, and the growth of empire. Concerned with the underemployment of the English population, Defoe’s solution was to settle immigrant families in the colonies where they might produce

¹¹⁵ Robin D. Gwynn, “James II in the Light of his Treatment of Huguenot Refugees in England, 1685-1686,” *English Historical Review* 92 (1977), 820-33.

¹¹⁶ Jeremy Gregory, “‘Establishment’ and ‘Dissent’ in British North America. Organising Religion in the New World”, in *British North America*, ed. S. Foster (Oxford, 2013), 142-3; Jonathan Israel, “William III and Toleration” in Ole Grell *et al.* eds. *From Persecution to Toleration* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1980): 129-171, 154.

¹¹⁷ Robert Ferguson, *A brief account of some of the late incroachments and depredations of the Dutch upon the English...*, (London, 1695): 2, 8, 27; Melinda Zook, ‘Ferguson, Robert (d. 1714)’, *ODNB*, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/9325>, (accessed 12 May 2016).

¹¹⁸ John Mullan, “Introduction,” in Daniel Defoe, *Moll Flanders (1714)*, (London: Random Century Group Ltd, 1991); Paula R. Backscheider, “Defoe, Daniel (1660?–1731),” *ODNB*, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/7421> (accessed 12 May 2016); Mullan, “Introduction”, xii.

commodities to be sold for export, thereby contributing to a positive balance of trade.¹¹⁹

Until the end of the eighteenth century, there was no single policy dictating how best, if at all, to attract and accommodate foreign interests into the country, even though English travel around the world and the simultaneous expansion of empire called for a new strategy to deal with non-nationals.¹²⁰ The first articulation of this problem can be seen with Calvin's Case (1608), the point at which it was declared that the King's authority, but not the writ of common law, could be extended beyond England into the Crown's global territories.¹²¹

Before 1700, there were two means by which an alien might change his legal status: an act of naturalization, which bestowed rights of citizenship on the person in question, and an act of denization, which, though similar, did not confer all rights of citizenship. A general act of naturalization would provide a way of easing this process. First, a general act rather than a private grant would take initiative away from the will of the monarch, and provide blanket provision for naturalization.¹²² Crucially, attaining citizenship through a General Naturalization Act would also confer citizenship rights beyond the border of the kingdom into the kingdom's jurisdiction,

¹¹⁹ Peter Earle, "The Economics of Stability: the Views of Daniel Defoe," in *Trade, Government and Economy in Pre-Industrial England: Essays Presented to F.J. Fisher*, ed. D. C. Coleman and A. H. John (London: Littlehampton Book Services Ltd, 1976), 282. A prime example of the potential fruits of this endeavour was the 53,000 deerskins (worth about £30,000) exported from South Carolina across the period 1699-1715. See Taylor, *American Colonies*, 230.

¹²⁰ William O'Reilly, "Law and International Relations in 1608," in *Law and Society: Which is to be Master?*, ed. R. Aikens and K. Richardson (London: Wildy, Simmons & Hill Publishing, 2011), 121.

¹²¹ Calvin's Case 7 Coke Report 1a, 77 ER 377; Carol Miller Swain, *Debating Immigration* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007) 41. "Nearly all scholarship on the origins of American citizenship acknowledges the singular importance of *Calvin's Case* in shaping the legal and philosophical principles upon which American citizenship was founded." Statt, *Foreigners and Englishmen*, 32.

¹²² Moreover, a private bill would make the process more costly. A private bill cost fifty to sixty pounds whereas a general naturalization act set the cost of the process at no more than a few shillings. See Robbins, "A Note on General Naturalization," 170.

and grant certain privileges and rights which were seen as important to economic and political integration.¹²³

Discussion of such an act generated opposition. The association of foreignness with religious dissent made a possible naturalization act highly unpalatable to opponents like Sir John Knight and Roger North, and provided a legal obstacle to the extension of citizenship to certain groups. In the 1699 ‘Humble Address to the Honourable House of Commons on behalf of the Trades of England against Naturalizing Aliens’, reference was made to concerns that foreign kings (in particular Louis XIV) would hire naturalized foreigners as spies.¹²⁴ Merchants and others who sought to attract labour through a general naturalization act were prompted to consider carefully how they would promote such an idea to the Board of Trade, to those in Parliament, and to the public more broadly.

A naturalization act would also give advantage to foreign Protestants when compared with native non-Protestants. At the very moment non-conformists were being excluded, parliament would welcome foreign, ‘conforming’ groups to populate kingdom and colony; in the Colonies, resident English colonists were prepared to be far more pragmatic in terms of admitting potential dissenters.¹²⁵ In England, the 1707 provisions to bar Presbyterians and Catholics from holding public office were a way of branding these groups as ‘lesser Englishmen’. Certain concerning features of a General Naturalization Act – such as bringing in dissenting religious interests – could

¹²³ Carpenter, “Naturalization”, 291. These rights might include property inheritance for example. See Taylor, *American Colonies*, 293.

¹²⁴ Robbins, “A Note on General Naturalization,” 171; Thirsk and Cooper, ed., *Economic Documents*, 747.

¹²⁵ Lord Baltimore encouraged the settlement of Catholics and Protestants alike to bolster the colony of Maryland; Taylor, *American Colonies*, 137.

be minimised if such influences were confined to the colonies rather than London and the English shires. In the eyes of some colonists, notably Quakers William Penn and John Archdale, migrants to the colonies need not be ‘conforming Protestants’.¹²⁶ The delegated authority enjoyed by many of the colonies ensured they had more freedom to effect change than did many in England.

The efficacy of a general naturalization act to attract significant numbers of aliens into Britain was minimal: it has been noted, for example, that many of the Palatines in 1709 had left their homes before news of the Naturalization Act had even reached them. They made the journey from their homeland expecting an ambiguous position within the legal system and without a guarantee of citizenship. It is noteworthy that the Palatines claimed protection not on legal but on religious grounds, patronised by Queen Anne, the ‘Protectress of Protestantism’.¹²⁷ The Naturalization Act (1709) was most important because it formed a blanket provision for a movement of Protestant people to and within the Empire, not dependent on the will of the monarch.¹²⁸ The passing of a general act put the transfer of people into the hands of mercantile and colonial agents working, broadly, for the Crown, rather than courtiers and the Crown proper.

¹²⁶ Early Quakers were encouraged to think of America as a refuge, knowing of George Gardiner, *A description of the new world.: or, America islands and continent: and by what people those regions are now inhabited. And what places are there desolate and without inhabitants...* (London: Robert Leybourn, to be sold by Thomas Pirrepoint, at the Sun in S. Pauls Churchyard, 1651); See: Frederick B. Tolles, *The Atlantic Community of the Early Quakers* (London: Friends’ Historical Society, 1952), 16.

¹²⁷ The total number of people naturalized between 1715 and 1800 was rather low, standing at only 446 male Germans. M. S. Beerbühl, “Naturalization and economic integration: the German merchant community in 18th century London,” *From Strangers to Citizens*, ed. Vigne and Littleton, 512.

¹²⁸ The inclusion of an oath of allegiance to be taken by the naturalized naturally ruled out some dissenting groups and Catholics.

Contemporary concern over the security of the crown's domains, emerging discourses on labour, and the doctrine of the Balance of Trade all gave free reign to certain interests groups who could claim to be operating according to the rules of these theories and in the wider interests of the Crown and Parliament. Commentators and commercial interests like Petty, Child, and Davenant constructed a special status for themselves in the emerging empire, and belonged to a growing imagined economic and commercial community. They and other mercantile groups would have little trouble finding both economic and moral justification for their privileges and behaviour based on contemporary religious and economic thought. In the same moment, commercial and political developments would provide a practical window of opportunity to pursue those economic interests.

III

The period 1688-1717 saw the profound fracturing of the mercantile community in London and across the British Atlantic. When the Williamite Parliament replaced royal license and provision for trade with parliamentary sanction, it profoundly influenced the structure and operation of mercantile groups. The expiration of licenses and monopolies opened up participation in trading activity beyond the traditional, and regulated company structure.¹²⁹ William and his successors were granted more steady revenue through new taxes and customs, which reduced the need to indulge wealthy commercial groups willing to make loans to the Crown.¹³⁰ And with the rise of formal

¹²⁹ For more on licenses, charters etc. see M. J. Braddick, "The English Government, War, Trade, and Settlement, 1625-1688," in *OHBE: Vol. I*, ed. N. Canny (Oxford, 2001).

¹³⁰ Take the example of the Hearth tax and Excise taxes. Note that the granting of charters and licenses did not disappear altogether. For example, in 1698, the government raised a loan from the New East India Company after granting it a charter over its rival. See Daniel Carey, "An Empire of Credit: English, Scottish, Irish, and American Contexts," in *The Empire of Credit. The Financial Revolution in Britain, Ireland and America, 1688-1815*, ed. Daniel Carey and Christopher J. Finlay (Dublin: Irish Academic Press, 2011), 5.

taxation and customary payments, City corporations and companies could no longer rely on loans and gifts to obtain political influence. This made it harder for City fathers to block petitions to the government and easier for unregulated entrepreneurial groups to lobby Parliament.¹³¹ Petitions no longer needed to be mediated through legally recognized institutions, or through the City government, but could be made directly to the Board of Trade.¹³² The resulting increase in petitioning and growth of informal networks of mercantile activity can be traced across the Atlantic to the American colonies and the rise of trans-Atlantic petitioning and lobbying.¹³³

Merchants took little interest in everyday matters of state-building and the construction of state policy, as shown by the relatively small number who pursued parliamentary office and the length of time for which each served.¹³⁴ In terms of time and organisation, it was far more effective for colonists and merchants to lobby or bribe in the name of specific interests than it was to assume a seat in Parliament. In 1695 rumours circulated of the attempts of the East India Company to bribe MPs to renew their charter – just one example of how political office was by no means a prerequisite for political influence in this period.¹³⁵ Direct petitioning to the Board of Trade, lobbying for specific interests, became much easier and more commonplace

¹³¹ In a sample of 279 London petitions between 1660 and 1720, seventy-five per cent were submitted after 1688. See Perry Gauci, *The Politics of Trade: the overseas merchant in state and society, 1660-1720* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 130. New York merchant groups in particular organized themselves to petition Parliament three times between 1689 and 1702 and guaranteed the attendance of prominent New York figures before the Board of Trade in 1703 as part of a further petition. See Alison Gilbert Olson, *Making the Empire Work: London and American interest groups 1690-1790* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1992): 55.

¹³² Olson, *Making the Empire Work*, 16.

¹³³ In a sample of 279 London petitions between 1660 and 1720, seventy-five per cent were submitted after 1688. See Gauci, *The Politics of Trade*, 130. New York merchant groups in particular organized themselves to petition Parliament three times between 1689 and 1702 and guaranteed the attendance of prominent New York figures before the Board of Trade in 1703 as part of a further petition. See Olson, *Making the Empire Work*, 55.

¹³⁴ Gauci, *The Politics of Trade*, *passim*, shows that merchant politicians would usually serve only one term in office.

¹³⁵ Perry Gauci, *Emporium of the World: The Merchants of London, 1660-1800* (London: Hambledon Continuum, 2007), 179.

and colonial mercantile figures began to press their interests; the Board remained a more politicized institution than many have purported.¹³⁶ Iron users, for example, allied with Virginian merchants between 1718 and 1720 to persuade Parliament to remove import duties on iron, thus encouraging an increase in iron production in the colony.¹³⁷ Similar efforts can be seen on the part of sugar and tobacco traders, with the aim of reducing new duties on their commodities.¹³⁸ The post-Restoration merchant had a greater variety of ways than his predecessors to force an issue onto the imperial agenda, be it through Parliament or more likely through the Board of Trade. Petitioning increased and lobbying, both formal and legal and informal and illegal, became an even-greater activity for merchants and colonial proprietors promoting their own economic interests. Whether through lobbying or personal connections, mercantile interests were represented in parliament and the work of these merchant interests did more to advance colonial development than the action of government ever did.¹³⁹

Merchants also provided valuable systems of credit and underwriting: London-based financiers underwrote many of the state loans in this period.¹⁴⁰ In terms of colonial migration, where trans-Atlantic passage was to be paid in advance, the role of merchants as providers of credit was crucial.¹⁴¹ It is important to remember that in colonies like South Carolina, the shift to exchanging goods on an open market only occurred after 1720; before then, trade was centralized in certain towns (for example

¹³⁶ Previously, under the Stuarts, the 'Lords of Trade'.

¹³⁷ J. M. Price, "The Imperial Economy, 1700-1776," in *OHBE Vol. II*, ed. P. J. Marshall (Oxford, 1998), 83.

¹³⁸ Steele, *The English Atlantic 1675-1740*, 244.

¹³⁹ Olson, *Making the Empire Work*, 34; Gauci, *The Politics of Trade*, 3.

¹⁴⁰ H. V. Bowen, *Elites, Enterprise and the Making of the British Overseas Empire, 1688-1775* (London: MacMillan Press Ltd, 1996), 84.

¹⁴¹ Marianne Wokeck, "German Immigration to Colonial America: Prototype of a Transatlantic Mass Migration," in *America and the Germans, An Assessment of a Three-Hundred-Year History*, ed. Joseph McVeigh and Frank Trommler (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1985), 7.

Charles Town in the case of South Carolina) and managed by local merchants who acted as agents for British colleagues.¹⁴² In this way, sellers in both the colonies and London relied heavily on merchants to broker their goods, to take on any risk, and to deliver fair prices and profits.

The confluence of successful trans-Atlantic collaboration, contemporary labour theory, and the religious parameters of Empire is well illustrated, then, through the prism of John Archdale's interests and activities. The governor of Carolina drew together the discourses and economic demands of the nascent Empire, working at the forefront of foreign Protestant recruitment and its inclusion in the major Acts and events of the early eighteenth-century British Atlantic World.

CONCLUSION

By the time Britain secured the Asiento Contract at the Treaty of Utrecht (1713), two labour systems had emerged: slave labour and colonial white labour. The transformation of colonists into recruiters of white migrant labour was dictated by the needs of commerce and colonial enterprise, not by politicians, courtiers and bureaucrats in London. The sourcing of labour for the emerging British Empire in America owed most to characters like John Archdale who acted independently, but in the interests of, British commerce and the emerging entrepreneurial colonial classes.

There were inherent contradictions in the eighteenth-century British state's attitudes towards migration. At the same time as the government displaced Catholics from

¹⁴² Nash, "The Organization of Trade", 78-9.

Ireland, urged the removal of Quakers and Presbyterians, and excluded dissenting interests from political office and participation, it was also trying to avoid ‘depeopling’ itself.¹⁴³ England was in the process of ridding itself of people it did not want (convicts, vagrants, Catholics, Presbyterians, and Quakers among others) whilst also seeking to attract to its colonies those that it needed. All this was conducted within the discourse of moral economy and Protestant interest at a time when a non-English-speaking German was seated on the throne.¹⁴⁴ What we see in Archdale’s campaigning, and in the campaigning of a number of his peer colonialists and mercantile colleagues, is a challenge to the ascendancy of the established church: the Anglican Church, or any church, they argued, should be no different from any association, including the “merchants for commerce”.¹⁴⁵ It is in the Carolinas, where from the time of the *Constitutions of Carolina* (1669) onwards any group could register as a church, that one first sees the emerging Lockean state: labour trumped narrow religious concerns in the interest of increasing trade and manufacturing. “’Tis hardly to be doubted but that most of even our ancestors were foreigners”, Locke argued, in favour of general naturalisation. “The more [people] we have the better it is for us”.¹⁴⁶

¹⁴³ The clearest example of this is the Cromwellian transplantation to Barbados under the settlement of Ireland in the 1650s. For more on Quakers in Bristol see David Harris Sacks, *The Widening Gate, Bristol and the Atlantic Economy, 1450-1700* (London: University of California Press, 1991).

¹⁴⁴ Colley, *Britons: Forging the Nation, 1707-1837*.

¹⁴⁵ Goldie, ed., *John Locke: A Letter Concerning Toleration*.

¹⁴⁶ Harvard University, Houghton MS Eng. 818, John Locke, “For a General Naturalisation,” (1693), 1-5, here: 2. Transcription of the manuscript is included in Resnick, “John Locke and the Problem of Naturalization,” 368-388 and Mark Goldie, ed., *Locke. Political Essays* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 322-26. Compare this manuscript, which Resnick describes as “an occasional piece that was intended to contribute to contemporary political debates about naturalization” (374) with ‘Anonymous to Locke, [London?], [c.23 February 1697], in which the author promotes the cause of a general naturalization to Locke, hoping that Locke’s “penn will fully and speedily enlarge on this subject to perfect soe glorious a designe”. Mark Goldie, ed., *John Locke. Selected Correspondence* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 238-41, here: 241, 3, 5.

The Foreign Protestants Naturalization Act (1708) and the General Naturalization Act (1709) spelled an end to *Ancien Regime* denization and signalled instead the growing importance of commercial and financial interests exerting influence on Parliament. Parliamentary bills, not royal license, would shift the form and quantity of foreign presence on English domestic and overseas soil from noble and individual to common and collective. No longer the denization of individual Huguenot nobles, but instead the arrival of masses of German migrants.¹⁴⁷ The Act embodied a moment in which there was a convergence of changes in the law, parliamentary authority, commercial discourse and a growing 'Protestant culture' in Empire.¹⁴⁸ And the forces that lobbied for this provision operated between Parliament and the City, often in the Colonies, in the context of the rising forces of commerce, war on the continent and the growing need for colonial labour.

It is also at this crucial moment that we begin to see the increasing obsession of European rulers with the maintenance of their own populations. Between 1680 and 1780 nearly every European leader took measures to curb the exodus of people from their territories.¹⁴⁹ The emergence of a more streamlined indentured and redemptionist system from the late 1720s prompted such concerns, and was a more developed form of the system pioneered and experimented with by John Archdale and his peers.¹⁵⁰ It would be in the American Colonies that a new basis of political obligation would be worked out, and that the question of allegiance would be confronted from the point of

¹⁴⁷ For a comparison of the Huguenot migration and 'Palatine migration' of 1709 see Alison Olson, "The English Reception of the Huguenots, Palatines and Salzburgers, 1680-1734: A Comparative Analysis," in *From Strangers to Citizens*, ed. Vigne and Littleton, 481-491.

¹⁴⁸ Colley, *Britons: Forging the Nation, 1707-1837*.

¹⁴⁹ K. J. Bade, P. C. Emmer, L. Lucassen and J. Oltmer, *The Encyclopedia of Migration and Minorities in Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011); *passim*.

¹⁵⁰ For more on the redemptionist system see Marianne Wockeek, *Trade in Strangers* (The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1999).

view of naturalization.¹⁵¹ The actions of English colonial commercial interests of the late seventeenth and early-eighteenth centuries foreshadowed a developing trend in how British and European states would source, recruit and administer labour in Empire, and beyond.

END

¹⁵¹ Kettner, *The Development of American Citizenship*, 60; Resnick, “John Locke and the Problem of Naturalization,” 381.