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Abstract

THE TRANSFORMATION OF ST PETER PORT, GUERNSEY, 1660-1831

Thesis submitted by Gregory Stevens Cox

The argument of this study is that during the eighteenth century the Guernsey merchants displayed considerable entrepreneurial energy and initiative. By improving the harbour facilities of St Peter Port and by establishing a network of factors throughout the Atlantic world, the merchants successfully developed St Peter Port as a major entrepot. Trade, not privateering, was the fundamental source of the town's prosperity. The entrepot attracted foreign merchants and migrants to St Peter Port. New port industries replaced the old putting-out system of stocking knitting. The influx of migrants, combined with natural increase, created significant population growth.

As the town became increasingly prosperous, the merchants rivalled one another in conspicuous consumption. By the second half of the 18th century the elite of St Peter Port were consciously imitating the metropolitan fashions of London. The town acquired many of the amenities characteristic of Dr Borsay's "English urban renaissance" - a promenade, theatre, assembly rooms, purpose-built markets and new civic buildings. However, the influx of English migrants created cultural pluralism. The traditional French system of status designation broke down; and the elite fashioned an alternative form of social segregation by moving to the outskirts of the town.

Throughout the 18th century the urban morphology was shaped and reshaped by the merchants as they organised the town to suit their requirements. By the early 19th century the town boasted a wide range of retailers catering to the wealthy. Paradoxically, despite the emergence of this new "middling" class, the pattern of income distribution remained constant.

This thesis is, in part, revisionist. Hitherto the history of St Peter Port in the 18th century has been described in terms of privateers and privateering success. The thesis also attempts (for the first time) to quantify the volume and value of the town's trade. Finally, the entrepot trade is seen as the engine of growth that led to the "Englishing" and modernising of this town.
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St Peter Port has not been well served by historians. Very little research has been conducted into the history of St Peter Port since 1935 when the late Professor Le Patourel analysed the mediaeval development of the town [1]. The topography and architecture of St Peter Port have received some attention. Edith Carey presented extracts from the notes of the Victorian antiquary F.C. Lukis which clarified aspects of the town lay-out in the early 19th century [2]. C.E.B. Brett's inventory of historic buildings catalogued the wealth of late Georgian and Regency architecture in St Peter Port [3]; and John McCormack's study threw light on vernacular building traditions in the island and town [4]. But the focus of these works was such that they had little to say about the economy, society and culture of the town and their relation to building forms. One reason for the lack of research into the history of St Peter Port has been the general understanding

that there is little relevant data, especially for the eighteenth century [5]. It is true that St Peter Port lacked many of the institutions regularly found in English towns (e.g. guilds) and the corresponding records have never existed. It is also true that the port records were destroyed in 1940 [6]. Nevertheless, there are good collections of parochial, ecclesiastical and insular archives which provide the foundations for an urban study.

The publication in 1986 of A People of the Sea offered a wealth of information about the maritime history of the Channel Islanders. However it contained strangely little about St Peter Port as a port town. In fact there is a subtle but profound difference between the maritime activities of the islanders and the history of the port. The trading of a Guernsey-owned vessel from port to port in the Pacific fell within the terms of reference of Dr Jamieson's work; the arrival of Baltic and Mediterranean vessels to trade in St Peter Port in the eighteenth century did not. A People of the Sea contains three chapters - nearly ninety pages - describing the privateering ventures of the islanders in the 18th century; but includes just one paragraph about St Peter Port as an entrepot [7]. Furthermore, Dr Jamieson's work did not consider the volume and value of trade transacted through the port, nor the significance of the entrepot trade in the mercantile policies of the


[6] Information from Mr Videlo.

There is scope, then, for a study which attempts to quantify the volume and value of the maritime trade of St Peter Port; and which relates these economic data to an examination of the town and its demographic, social and physical evolution. In writing about "Lisbon as a port town in the eighteenth century" Stephen Fisher has commented that while that city's commerce and shipping have attracted reasonable attention, "relatively little has been written on the general character, physical, social and so on, of this celebrated port town". He has observed that such studies of European ports during the era of the Commercial Revolution do exist "but are still unusual". He has also argued that a study of the structure and articulation of European ports is helpful in promoting an understanding of their differing success as trading centres [9].

It would be possible to study St Peter Port as a port town and to a considerable extent that is the agenda of the present work. However, this thesis attempts to be an urban rather than a port history.


A full understanding of St Peter Port demands an examination of its relationship - economic and cultural - with its insular hinterland just as much as its links with the proximate forelands of Normandy and Brittany and more distant horizons. St Peter Port was both a market town and administrative centre serving the nine rural parishes of Guernsey as well as being a port engaged in local and international trading. To be understood fully the town needs to be considered in its own insular setting and as a link in networks of French, English and international urban systems.

This thesis explores the identity of St Peter Port in the "long" eighteenth century, focusing on seven areas: demography; migration; overseas trade; internal economy; social structure and residential patterns; sociability and culture; and the physical transformation of the town. These represent the themes that currently concern the growing number of British urban historians [10]. At this juncture it may be useful to survey the theoretical and methodological ideas that underpin the current study of 18th century towns.

Much work on urban history earlier this century was predicated on theories that reified the town and presented it as a social reality, an explanans. Subsequently Philip Abrams and other urban historians repudiated the assumptions of this approach. Abrams, for example, argued that "the ramparts of the town identify an enterprise not an entity" [11].

He believes that the most effective attempts to understand towns are those which study the power relationships which towns embody. "On inspection many of the best case studies and many of the most convincing general commentaries in the field of urban history prove to be, often implicitly, studies of action and relationships within a complex of domination". This had been the approach of Max Weber in *Economy and society*; and was the understanding of Abrams' colleagues.

Scepticism about the validity of reifying the town has extended to theories about industrialisation and urbanisation. Martin Daunton, for example, has urged that the level of urbanisation should be seen as a reflection of other variables rather than as an independent factor. He concldes that towns acted "as a solvent of social norms and traditional consumption patterns" and that they had an independent role on the side of modernisation. However, he does not see 18th century towns as "useful analytical tools in explaining economic growth"; rather, he considers that it would be wiser to take the level of urban population as given and to concentrate on a different range of questions. The provisioning of cities, the building processes, the adjustment to the new urban environment and the control of society are the themes that he advocates for study. Daunton, like Abrams, denies the town a causal significance. During a period of economic growth it was not the town itself which was the independent factor, but rather the merchants whose

investments happened "to be in that particular location" [13].

Professor Daunton's view is easily harmonised with recent economic theories about entrepreneurial culture. In the past economists often concentrated on theories of rational choice in the market and neglected "the dimensions of personality". Now, however, Mark Casson and other economists are becoming increasingly aware of the significance of culture in determining commercial success. Great cities and ports are viewed as "the theatre for the various trading cultures...where merchants competed for trade" [14].

This approach can have its own problems. The comment of Peter Borsay is relevant in this context: "towns are treated as the accidental spaces in which interesting processes and incidents happen to occur; not as a special type of place which, by virtue of its generic qualities, moulded experiences and instigated events". The corrective to this error is, in part, he argues, the study of towns as part of a system rather than as "solitary entities" [15].

Scholars have suggested a variety of theoretical frameworks for systems analysis. Jan de Vries has maintained that during the early modern period an integrated network of towns linked by economic forces emerged in Europe [16]. The thesis postulates an era of general

---

urban stagnation during the 17th and early 18th centuries, with urban regeneration in the later 18th century. The schema of de Vries appears to fit the continental experience but sits uneasily with the English data. While De Vries' model is essentially economic, Immanuel Wallerstein has postulated a European "world economy" integrated by political and economic factors [17]. Cities played an important role in his model which has subsequently been adopted and elaborated by P.N. Hohenberg and L.H. Lees. Much of their analysis is based on central place and network systems, each system being characterised by structural, functional and evolutionary features. Hohenberg and Lees have argued that as an analytical tool their systems approach has a validity for more than one era [18].

The analysis of English towns has often been conceptualised in hierarchical terms. However Penelope Corfield has urged that by the 18th century English towns were talked of "in terms of their leading economic functions". Places became identified as "dockyard towns, manufacturing towns, spas, holidays resorts, university towns, as well as 'thoroughfare towns' on the main roads". These she has denominated "the mutable terms of a dynamic urban world" and her study of English towns between 1700 and 1800 is based on analyses of the dynamics of

urban growth [19].

The most obvious aspect of English urban growth in the 18th century was population increase. In 1700 sixty seven towns with a population of between 2500 and 100,000 inhabitants accounted for 7% of the nation's population; a century later there were 187 such towns and they housed 20% of the national population [20]. Altogether some 31% of the population lived in an urban centre by 1801. Eighteenth century towns and cities have traditionally been seen as graveyards, with mortality rates consistently running ahead of birth rates. Immigration has been understood to be "the principal locomotive of demographic urbanization" [21]. Caution is necessary, however. Studies of English provincial towns have demonstrated that some experienced natural population increase [22]. A.M. van der Woude has expressed reservations about the conventional theories of urban natural decrease. He has hypothesised that rural-urban migration rates varied and that they directly influenced the urban birth rate. Urban natural decrease was not inevitable, it was merely the result of variation in migration flows. But whereas van der Woude views rural-urban immigration as a positive factor, Allan Sharlin has postulated that temporary migrants in urban centres depressed the birth rate. Sharlin's model is internally

[22] Ibid., p 16 (Exeter, Nottingham and Leeds).
consistent but empirical evidence from Amsterdam and elsewhere does not seem to support it [23].

This is not to minimise the impact of migration. Even when there was natural increase in towns and cities, immigration provided a vital flow of new town dwellers. Earlier demographic studies tended to discuss net balances of migrants in a somewhat impersonal and statistical manner. Recently new methodologies have been developed to distinguish between the different cohorts of migrants and their motivation. The wealthy merchant moving a few miles to a better residence had little in common with the poor artisan travelling from a distant region in search of a living [24]. The analysis of church depositions and similar archives is progressively shedding light on migration processes. Simple "push" and "pull" interpretations are no longer sufficient. Scholars increasingly are examining the impact of migrants on the receiving community and the agencies that helped to


integrate them into their new urban environment [25].

Urban growth was particularly to be found in towns that were expanding as centres of commerce, industry, trade, defence (the dockyards and naval centres) and leisure pursuits. Many port towns flourished during the eighteenth century thanks to the expanding volume of overseas trade. Peter Borsay has characterised ports and market towns as the "engines of the commercial system, pumping goods to and fro along the arteries of trade" [25]. There has been a lively debate about the relationship between national economic growth and urbanization. As has been seen above, Martin Daunton has questioned whether urbanization can be regarded as an independent factor and views it more as a reflection of other variables [27].

What is abundantly clear is that many county gentry and "pseudo-gentry" took to living in town. This stimulated the growth of the service sector; and the professionals, retailers, artisans and domestics busy in the tertiary sector themselves became part of the new urban army of consumers. The growing number of doctors, lawyers and other professionals have been represented as part of the rising middle classes. They were more conscious of fashion than their country cousins and spent more lavishly. The wealthy, with an even greater surplus of


[27] Vide supra
cash, indulged in conspicuous consumption. In that sense the urban way of life was an important dynamic in the national economy. Moreover, the taste for civilized standards led directly to the improvement of the urban fabric [28].

There has been considerable debate about the extent to which urban society became more polarised during the course of the long eighteenth century. The traditional view maintained that there was an increasing divide between the cultural patterns of patricians and plebeians; and that this was reinforced by physical segregation as the wealthy moved from town centre to suburb. Jonathan Barry has challenged this thesis in his study of Bristol, arguing that the upper ranks, on the one hand, continued to enjoy traditional popular customs; and, on the other hand, that the new forms of urban culture were available to more people than just the urban elite. It is not clear whether the experience of Bristol was typical or exceptional [29].

Peter Borsay and others have redefined the debate by drawing attention to sub-cultures and minority cultures, and to the tensions occasioned by religion and politics. To concentrate on the divide between elite and plebeian is perhaps too simplistic. There is also a danger in paying too much attention to division, and too little to what united townspeople [30]. This latter is a theme that has attracted the


attention of Professor Peter Clark. He has contended that the mushrooming of clubs and societies in towns in the post-Restoration era helped to promote social integration and that the new forms of urban sociability generated "a renewed consciousness and pride in the urban community" [31].

The present study attempts to explore the history of St Peter Port against the background of these approaches and debates. It has been remarked earlier that the town should be studied in the context of its hinterland. Recent research suggests that this is too limited. Professor King has argued in *Urbanism, Colonialism, and the World Economy* that the colonial city should be viewed first in relation to its colonized territory; secondly in its links with the metropolitan power; thirdly in the context of its region; fourthly as part of an empire; fifthly in the world system; and finally as a colonial city per se. "Which of these levels we choose to examine...will depend on the problem to be investigated" [32]. Whether St Peter Port should be regarded as a colonial town is a question that will be addressed a little later. That apart, Professor King's multidimensional approach is eminently appropriate for placing St Peter Port in a series of perspectives. In the second part of this Introduction there is a rapid review of the experience of English, French and American port towns.


belonging to the local, regional and international networks within which the Guernsey merchants operated. The Introduction then considers whether St Peter Port should be viewed as a colonial town - fundamental for an understanding of the relationship between the islanders and the British government. After this synchronic approach - which is intended to set 13th century St Peter Port in its geographical, economic and constitutional context - there is a short diachronic survey which traces the historical development of St Peter Port from the Roman period to the late seventeenth century. Finally there is an outline of the workings of the insular and urban government to provide an institutional framework for the discussion of the demographic, economic and social development of the town.
Table 1: Urban growth in eighteenth century England

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1750/1700</th>
<th>1801/1750</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 historic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regional centres</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 established</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ports + Liverpool</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 'new'</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manufacturing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>towns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Significant among the rising towns and cities of England in the 18th century were the ports, their growth stimulated by the expansion of English trade overseas. Initially the growth of foreign trade was slow; during the period 1700 - 1745 the average growth rate was only 0.5% per annum. This picked up to 2.8% p.a. between 1745 and 1771 and fast growth of 4.9% came in the closing two decades of the century [33]. Not all

ports shared equally in this expansion of trade. Those that grew fastest were "coal" ports such as Newcastle and Sunderland and those involved in Atlantic trade - Bristol and Liverpool in particular. During the course of the eighteenth century foreign trade became increasingly concentrated in a smaller number of the larger provincial ports. By 1772 out of seventy-four listed ports only sixteen had more than five hundred registered tons active in foreign trade [34]. The medium and smaller sized ports tended to concentrate on coastal shipping, fishing and, in some cases, smuggling. An approximate index of the growth of shipping trade at the ports is afforded by a comparison of the shipping tonnages for the years 1709 and 1792 (Table 2).

The successful ports shared some, if not all, of the following characteristics. First, they were able to handle larger vessels either because of topographical advantages or thanks to dock improvement schemes [35]. Secondly, they were geographically well situated to engage in a major branch of overseas trade. Thus Hull on the east coast was well placed to trade with the Baltic, while Liverpool, Whitehaven and Bristol on the west coast found good markets in Ireland and America. Thirdly, they were able to achieve a reasonable balance in the volume of import and export trade. This led to the optimum use of shipping.


### Table 2: Merchant shipping owned in some English ports (000s tons)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1709 (Tons burden)</th>
<th>1792 (Measured tons)</th>
<th>Multiplier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>121.2</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hull</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King's Lynn</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Yarmouth</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ipswich</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colchester</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southampton</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristol</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liverpool</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All outports</td>
<td>179.8</td>
<td>812.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (London and outports)</td>
<td>319.8</td>
<td>1186.5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes and sources:** Ports arranged from north-east around to north-west.

Subsequent to 1786 tonnage was measured by a different method; consequently the 1792 figures are not strictly comparable with the 1709 figures. Nevertheless, the multiplier gives a crude index of the growth.

capacity. Merchants in ports that traded in bulky one-way commodities could experience difficulties [36]. Fourthly, successful ports served and were served by an extensive hinterland. Bristol became the “metropolis of the west”, while Liverpool served Lancashire and the industrialising Midlands [37]. Fifthly, the ports contained a merchant community with the entrepreneurial ability to create and develop trading opportunities [38]. The lack of one or more of these factors tended eventually to arrest port development.

Because of their rapid growth the port towns frequently displayed a high population density. Housing was packed around the dock areas with lodging houses, inns and brothels catering to the needs of the sailors and dock workers [39]. But the port towns also displayed a statelier aspect. The wealthy merchants of Bristol enjoyed “sumptuous mansions, luxurious living, liveried menials” [40] and Professor Minchinton has

---

guardedly portrayed the city as being "in some slight way, a centre of conspicuous consumption" [41].

Such luxury was not confined to Bristol. Southampton enjoyed some commercial prosperity and became popular as a spa. In the 1760s and 1770s residences were fitted up "in the neatest and genteelst manner"; the promenade was enhanced; and the paving, lighting and the watch were improved. The years 1773-1774 saw Southampton at its zenith as a spa. Among the amenities available to residents and visitors were dancing in the Long Rooms, plays at the theatre, companionship in the inns and coffee houses, the latest novels at the circulating library, and shops with representatives from London [42]. The nearby port of Weymouth enjoyed a similar urban transformation in the late 18th century, mainly thanks to the fashion for sea-bathing and the summer visits of George III and his court [43].

In this study we shall be examining how far such developments also affected St Peter Port. Certainly the improvements in English towns

such as Southampton did not pass unnoticed by the residents of St Peter Port. Members of the de Sausmarez family, for example, received catalogues and advertising sheets from Southampton and London traders (44). There were other cultural ties which bound Guernsey to the port towns in the south of England. Theatrical troupes regularly travelled from Plymouth and Southampton to St Peter Port to play for a season; there were links between the masonic lodges of Guernsey and those of English ports; and the children of St Peter Port merchants were frequently educated at academies in the port towns of Hampshire, Dorset and Devon (45).

French ports

Among French towns it was ports that experienced the greatest expansion in the eighteenth century. This was due to dynamic growth in overseas trade (46). In fact French trade expanded even more vigorously than that of England. Kriedte has observed that it grew three-fold between 1716-20 and 1784-88, as compared to a 2.4-fold growth of English

---

(44) See plate 27. The papers also include A Catalogue of Baker's Circulating Library, In the High Street, And in the Summer Season, Adjoining to Mr. Martin's Rooms, Southampton (Southampton, 1776).

(45) See Chapter Six.

foreign trade [47]. However, the average annual growth rates of French trade were higher in the early years of the eighteenth century and decreased later in the century - the reverse of the English pattern.

Of the port towns those situated on the Atlantic coast grew most vigorously [48]. Bordeaux specialised in the handling of colonial produce such as sugar, indigo, cocoa, coffee, silk and cotton, much of which was re-exported to Holland and the north. The port also exported wine from its hinterland. Between 1717 and 1789 the total value of the trade of Bordeaux increased twenty-fold and incomes in the city kept ahead of prices, a rare occurrence in France at that time [49]. Nantes experienced a similar boom, initially thanks to the wine trade and then by dealing in slaves, sugar and coffee. By 1780 the value of international trade to the port was in the region of 65 million livres tournois. In 1725 there were some 230 négociants in Nantes; by 1790 there were 400 [50]. In Nantes, as in Bordeaux, many handsome public and

Table 3: Vessels registered at, or departing from, French ports 1664-1787

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Bordeaux</th>
<th>La Rochelle</th>
<th>Lorient</th>
<th>Nantes</th>
<th>St Malo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1664</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1686</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>117</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1704</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1730</td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1787</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 4: Population of some Atlantic and Channel ports, 1650-1800

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Bordeaux</th>
<th>La Rochelle</th>
<th>Lorient</th>
<th>Nantes</th>
<th>St Malo</th>
<th>Dunkirk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1650</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1700</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1750</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

private buildings were erected in neo-classical styles.

There was prosperity in other towns. La Rochelle was involved in French colonial trade and its economy depended upon that sector to "a degree unmatched at other ports". The port of Lorient for many years enjoyed a monopoly of the French East India trade. Coffee, India cloths, Bengal silks, Chinese porcelain and spices from the Dutch East Indies were regularly offered at the auction sales of *La Compagnie Française des Indes* held at Lorient. Subsequent to the demise of the old company, a new Company of the Indies was founded there in 1785 [51].

St Malo participated in a range of Atlantic trades. From the sixteenth century she traded wheat and textiles to the Iberian peninsula from where her vessels returned with gold and silver. The Malouins integrated their commercial ventures by trading Newfoundland cod to the Mediterranean. The treaty of the Pyrenees (1659) consolidated the opportunities open to St Malo *négociants* and by 1682 some two million ecus of silver were being exported from Spain to St Malo. This helped to finance other enterprises. From c 1695 the Malouins engaged in an ambitious series of voyages to the South Seas. The voyages were discontinued c 1724 because St Malo lost government backing and the necessary investment capital. Nevertheless, the town maintained its links with Newfoundland, Spain, England and Holland and continued to

These major ports were involved in three complementary economic systems. First, there were local links with small French port towns, *le petit cabotage*. Secondly, there was traffic with Britain, Holland and Scandinavia, *le grand cabotage*. Thirdly, there was long distance oceanic trading conducted by *vaissseaux de long cours* ([53]). St Peter Port was geographically well situated to participate in some of the trade of all three systems.

The Guernsey merchants traded regularly with the French ports that we have just discussed. But the port that came nearest in function to St Peter Port in the eighteenth century was Dunkirk. It had interests in fishing (both in local waters and off Newfoundland) and in short-distance coastal trading. It was a frontier town situated close to the maritime powers of England and Holland; during wartime it served as a centre for French privateers. Dunkirk's status as a free-port made it a rendez-vous for smugglers and an entrepot for handling colonial produce. The port sustained two important industries: the processing of tobacco and the handling of spirits. Manufacturing attracted workers to the town, whose population grew rapidly from 15,044 in 1770 to 27,106 in 1789. There was little direct trade between Dunkirk and St Peter Port. Their activities were complementary rather than inter-dependent. For example, Dunkirk supplied cargoes to smugglers from the south-east of

---


of England, while St Peter Port served the south-west counties [54].

The Atlantic economy

Having examined the English and French ports, it is time to turn to more distant towns involved in the "Atlantic economy". In the 18th century St Peter Port was integrated into an international network of seaborne commerce which embraced the port towns of north-west Europe and North America. The merchants of Philadelphia, Boston, New York, Bordeaux, Nantes, London and Amsterdam were linked in shared commercial purposes. "Investment capital, goods, information, and people flowed between these centers" [55]. These flows were more important to merchants than the demands of patriotism. Mark Gregory, a London merchant with extensive interests in St Peter Port trade, explained to Lord Hawkesbury: "The first object of a merchant is his interest, all attempts of governments to lead him from that will be in vain" [56].

The growth of the North American ports was rapid. In 1690 Boston had a population of 6,000; New York and Philadelphia counted 14,000 and 12,000 respectively [57]. Buoyed up by an economic boom, and drawn further into international commercial networks, the three ports

---


[56] BL Add Ms 38228 f 4r, 5 Aug 1792 Gregory to Lord Hawkesbury.

had populations between thirteen and sixteen thousand by the mid-
eighteenth century [58]. The ports were tied to London by political and 
commercial links; and they also formed part of a colonial network of 
towns and cities that consistently reflected the culture and fashions of 
the metropolitan capital [59].

The status of St Peter Port in the British Empire

At this juncture it is relevant to examine whether St Peter Port 
should be considered a colonial town. Superficially such a 
classification seems surprising; a colony is commonly understood to 
involve the imposition of imperial rule on a native people. In the 
eighteenth century some Englishmen viewed Guernsey as part of Hampshire, 
an understandable mistake as the island fell within the diocese of 
Winchester [60]. In fact Guernsey was not part of the realm of England 
but was a dominion, like the other Channel Islands, Ireland and the 
Isle of Man. These British islands, although dependencies of the 
Crown, enjoyed considerable political autonomy. Professor Fieldhouse 
has observed that these dominions "supplied a ready-made constitutional 
pattern into which the new American colonies were fitted without 
difficulty" [61]. Consequently there were many similarities between

[59] P. Clark, Sociability and Urbanity: Clubs and Societies in the 
     Eighteenth Century City (Leicester, 1988), p 12; A.D. King, 
     Urbanism, Colonialism and the World-Economy (London, 1991), pp 25-
     26.
[60] Some Sun Fire Insurance policies listed Guernsey thus.
the polity of Guernsey and those of the American colonies. They each had their own political institutions, assemblies and legal systems; and the Crown and Westminster exercised little control over their internal administration. It was only in the economic sphere that the British government sought to impose rigid controls (with the Navigation Acts). Edmund Burke summarised the system of the first British Empire as a "state of commercial servitude and civil liberty" (62). Although there is a distinction de jure between a dominion and a colony, in practice the constitutional and economic relationships between Guernsey and Britain in the eighteenth century were very similar to those of the northern American colonies with the mother country.

When in 1780 the British government started to construct a new fort near St Peter Port to defend the island against a French invasion, the Royal Court of Guernsey obstructed the work. The island leaders feared that the French would impose a harsher occupation if they had to overcome stiff opposition; they also suspected that with the return of peace the fort would be used by the British to suppress the smuggling trade (63). This and similar episodes betray the mentalité of a "colony". It seems probable that some aspects of the urban development of St Peter Port are better understood in a "colonial" context.

[63] PRO WO 34/106, f147r - f147v, 17 Aug 1780 Irving to Amherst.
The early development of St Peter Port

Recent archaeological excavations suggest that in the Roman period there was a trading post at the Plaiderie, near the centre of modern St Peter Port. This may have constituted the nucleus of the original settlement that was later to develop into the town of St Peter Port. In the 10th century Guernsey was assimilated into the Duchy of Normandy. The island was thoroughly integrated into the feudal polity of the duchy and Guernsey became Norman in its laws, customs, language and institutions. By virtue of military conquest Duke William of Normandy became King of England in 1066; this created the political link between the Channel Islands and England. In 1204 King John lost control of mainland Normandy to the French king but managed to retain the islands. Subsequent English monarchs have ruled the islands not in their capacity as English sovereigns but rather as descendants of the Norman dukes.

At some point in the thirteenth or fourteenth century St Peter Port developed into a town. There has been considerable debate about the definition of the term "town" as scholars have attempted to compile lists of criteria applicable universally to towns in different societies and at varying dates. Professor Hilton has recently suggested three criteria for defining mediaeval English and French towns [64]. They are, first, the existence of a permanent market; secondly, occupational

heterogeneity in "an economy which produced, bought and sold commodities other than those necessary for subsistence"; and, thirdly, an institutional dimension.

These were, essentially, the aspects considered by Professor Le Patourel in his essay on the early history of St Peter Port [65]. Professor Le Patourel demonstrated that by the fourteenth century the king's administration of Guernsey was centralised in St Peter Port, that being the location of the king's castle, the king's court and the king's grange. There was a market in St Peter Port serving the garrison and the island. The harbour of St Peter Port was a port of call for foreign shipping engaged in the exchange of the corn, cloth and salted fish of north-west Europe for the wine and spices of Bordeaux and the south. Moreover, Guernsey merchants were actively trading abroad, co-operating together as "socii mercatores". There was a concentration of population in St Peter Port, with the inhabitants enjoying a very considerable degree of personal and tenurial freedom. The town was referred to "quasi burgum" and there are traces of burgage tenure. By many standards 14th century St Peter Port was a town.

However Professor Le Patourel could find no trace of the municipal institutions characteristic of the fully developed medieval town - the court, the council, the self-administration, the community of burgesses, the gild-merchants. Even the existence of a town wall was doubtful. By the criteria of Professor Pirenne medieval St Peter Port was not a town. Professor Le Patourel concluded that there were two

possible theories. Either St Peter Port found its municipal institutions in the institutions of the island and therefore had no need to evolve separate institutions for itself; or St Peter Port should be examined in the context of neighbouring Normandy and Brittany, a region "where towns did not evolve important urban institutions, and seem to have got on very well without them" [66].

In the fifteenth century St Peter Port suffered some setbacks. The loss of Gascony to the French disrupted the Anglo-French wine trade; and Channel Island waters became infested with pirates. The situation improved when, in 1463, Pope Sixtus IV promulgated a bull conferring neutrality on the islands during wartime. This privilege lasted for just over two centuries and brought major benefits to St Peter Port. English and French merchants were able to trade in safety in St Peter Port during wartime. By the late 16th century William Camden observed that the town was well provided with fortifications "and the merchants abound as soon as there is war" [67].

In 1629 Heylyn found that the Guernseymen were "masters of good stout barks" in which they ventured "unto all these nearer ports of Christendom", selling abroad the works "of the poorer sort" such as waistcoats, stockings and other manufactures of wool [68]. The town


suffered somewhat, though, during the English Civil War. Castle Cornet was held until 1651 by Royalist forces, while the town and island declared for Parliament. The Royalists bombarded the town and some damage was done to the area around the town church. In a declaration to Oliver Cromwell the islanders complained that they had lost their ships, their traffic and their trading because their harbour and port had been "closed and shut up" by Sir Peter Osborne, the commander of Castle Cornet. The population of the island stood at eight thousand and many were in want and poverty (69). The declaration may contain some exaggerations but the general picture appears to be reasonably accurate. Though the town had grown considerably in the 16th and early 17th centuries its economic state at the Restoration was hardly strong - a situation not unlike that of many English provincial towns.

Insular and urban government

The economic and social history of St Peter Port is not intelligible without some understanding of the constitution of the island. What follows is a simple outline which explains the significance of certain technical terms used throughout the thesis. It is possible to analyse the workings of the constitution at three levels: the national, the insular and the parochial.

At the national level the government of Guernsey came under the crown which appointed a governor, lieutenant-governor, procureur, comptroller and the bailiff. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries the governors rarely, if ever, resided in the island. Instead, a lieutenant-governor took up the post in the island and regularly

reported to the governor and to various departments of state in England. The Home Office and Privy Council took a direct interest in the administration of the island. Orders-in-Council emanating from the Privy Council gave laws to the island. Occasionally Acts of Parliament relating to foreign affairs or trade applied to the island (e.g. the Navigation Acts).

At the insular level the government of Guernsey was guided by the bailiff. By tradition a Guernseyman, the bailiff presided as chief judge of the court and had custody of the seal of the island. The bailiff also presided at the meetings of the States of Guernsey, an assembly that had the power to legislate by passing acts. The States constituted a form of parliament but its powers were, in practice, relatively limited. Regulations were frequently introduced not through acts passed by the States but by ordonnances passed by the twelve jurats. The jurats, sitting with the bailiff, judged all causes criminal and civil (except cases of treason, coining and assault on the bailiff and jurats). The jurats, having the power both to create regulations and to exercise judicial control, ruled Guernsey as oligarchs. In the sixteenth century the schoolmaster Adrian Saravia observed that the jurats “lord it over them like dumb cattle” (70). The jurats were able to frustrate even the Crown. Any dispute affecting the Crown was heard before the Royal Court in St Peter Port where the jurats enjoyed a number of advantages. They could cite ancient privileges and baffle English officials who were unfamiliar with Norman

law (the juridical basis of Guernsey law) and island practice. The jurats were not trained lawyers and did not have "the restraint of a professional conscience" [71].

The ten ecclesiastical parishes of the island constituted the parochial divisions for administrative purposes. The parish of St Peter Port included the town but no distinction was made between town and parish except in the case of the administration of wills, when a different set of rules applied to property within the barracks of the town [72]. Business relating to the parish was considered and administered by the douzaine. In principle there were twelve douzeniers in each parish. The douzeniers were chosen from the wealthiest men of the parish. They assessed tax contributions; measured the king's fiefs; enquired after the names of tenants who owed chief rents; and decided differences over meets and bounds. Apart from the meetings of the douzaine there were occasionally larger parochial gatherings attended by the "heads of families". In St Peter Port the deliberations of the chefs de famille were held in the town church.

Each parish was sub-divided into vingtaines. Originally every twenty families made a vingtaine but with the passage of time and population growth the size of the vingtaines varied. One man from each vingtaine served for a year as a vingtainer. Apart from collecting taxes


[72] See chapter seven, infra.
the vingteniers summoned men to arms (for muster or to keep watch); organised the repair of the highways; and could destrain goods of any who defaulted. The vingteniers were responsible for most of the day-to-day administration of the parish and worked closely with the constable. He maintained the peace, set the watch at night, kept an eye on strangers, prevented begging, inspected taverns, tasted beer, cider and wine, and ensured that bakers gave correct weight. The constable received from vingteniers all taxes raised by order. As St Peter Port grew in size the office of constable became increasingly onerous. By the nineteenth century the town required two constables and a number of assistant constables. The office of constable was frequently held by wealthy men from merchant families and corresponded in some respects to the mayoralty of an English town (73). In parochial administration, as in insular government, the machinery of control lay in the hands of landowners and merchants, the local aristocracy (74).

Having surveyed the context in which St Peter Port developed it is time to study the town in detail. The first chapter deals with demography and attempts to establish the basic facts about the growth of population, the amount of immigration, the incidence of crisis mortality and the provisioning of the town.

Fig 1: Family links between the Guernsey elite. From U. Barry,
The History of the Island of Guernsey (London, 1815), p 204.
Guernsey was not included in the United Kingdom census until 1821 and there has been very little research into the population history of the island or its capital St Peter Port. This chapter tries to establish a more secure understanding of the demography of St Peter Port, fundamental for an examination of the economic and social history of the town.

It will be seen that enumerations and estimates suggest that the population of St Peter Port grew from about 3,000 in the second half of the seventeenth century to about 11,000 at the end of the eighteenth century. An aggregate analysis of the baptisms and burials recorded in the parish church registers reveals the underlying dynamics. Growth was achieved mainly through natural increase until the mid-eighteenth century; migration then became progressively more significant. St Peter Port did not suffer many mortality crises. The population density of Guernsey was high throughout the eighteenth century; but prompt action by the insular authorities effectively averted subsistence crises. St Peter Port enjoyed a healthier history than many other towns thanks to a variety of environmental, social and economic factors.

Contemporary population estimates

The earliest census figures available for Guernsey and St Peter Port date from 1800. The population of the island then amounted to 16,155 and the parish of St Peter Port numbered 8,450 inhabitants "exclusive of sailors in his majesty's service, privateers, and merchant vessels; also of strangers not permanently settled, who may amount to
2,000 or 3,000" [1]. These figures, based upon "an exact census", were supplied by the Royal Court, Guernsey, to Mr Stiles, a commissioner sent by the British government to enquire into the smuggling carried on from the island. The two or three thousand strangers "not permanently settled" were principally to be found in St Peter Port. It follows that the aggregate population (permanent population + temporary population) of St Peter Port in 1800 was approximately eleven thousand; and that of Guernsey eighteen and a half thousand (permanent population + 2,500).

Some rough enumerations were made by the parochial authorities in the eighteenth century. There were also government estimates and militia returns. Such estimates are liable to error but have some evidential value and are now examined.

On several occasions Guernsey experienced serious corn shortage. During times of dearth (disette) the authorities imported extra corn into the island. Early in 1727, during such an emergency, the inhabitants of the island were enumerated as being 10,246 of whom 4,350 lived in St Peter Port. Two quarters of wheat were required to sustain each inhabitant for one year; the island therefore needed 21,000 quarters [2]. During a later corn crisis in 1765 it was calculated


See Appendix 1 for full enumeration details.
that 3580 quarters of corn were needed to supply the St Peter Port population from May until September [3]. If the calculations were based on the same assumptions as those of 1727, the town population in 1765 was approximately 5,370.

From 1780 the strength of the British garrison on Guernsey was increased. This led to the import of larger quantities of corn into the island. Officials in Guernsey writing to the Home Office sometimes discussed this. For example, in 1789 H. Brown explained that the native population of the island was 18,000 but that allowance had also to be made for the garrison, their women and children, and "the vast concourse of strangers" [4]. In 1794 John Small estimated the island population at 20,000; and in 1807 General Doyle calculated the civilian population of the island as being twenty thousand, the garrison four thousand, and the garrison women and children "not overrated" at a thousand, giving a grand total of 25,000 altogether [5]. Most of the garrison soldiers were stationed at Fort George, in the parish of St Peter Port; army families regularly lodged in the town.

Guernsey militia returns provide some demographic insights. In 1656 the island could muster 1418 men, of whom St Peter Port


supplied 340. Using a multiplier of seven, and ignoring the fact that the male/female ratio probably varied between town and country, Tupper concluded that the population of the island was "fully 9,926 souls" and that the population of St Peter Port was probably about 3,000 [6]. In 1580 the island mustered 1,902 men, the town 521 men [7]. Tupper found this number "in a population of less than 10,000 souls" incredible. The militia returns are in fact comparable to the English muster rolls for which a multiplier of between 4 to 7 has been argued [8]. These multipliers suggest that in 1680 the island population was somewhere between 7,608 and 13,314 and the town population between 2,084 and 3,647. Tupper erred in assuming that the multiplier of seven is universally appropriate.

Ecclesiastical records contain some evidence. Details for Guernsey are not to be found in the Compton Census [9] but St Peter Port rectors occasionally estimated the size of their parish. In 1735 Elie de Fresne told the Bishop of Winchester "we are near 6000 souls in this parish" [10]. This was almost certainly an exaggeration, prompted

[7] Ibid., pp 466-467.
[10] Priaulx 29121/4080, 23 June 1735 de Fresne to Bishop of Winchester.
Fig 2: The population of Guernsey and St Peter Port, 1727-1831, based on contemporary estimates and enumerations. (Semi-logarithmic graph to illustrate the rate of population increase.)
by the fact that some English families had complained about de Fresne. The greater the size of his parish (and the greater the number of island-born parishioners), the smaller appeared the size of the "English" problem.

The Royal Court letter book contains estimates of the island population in 1756 (twelve thousand) and of the town population in 1781 (at least eight thousand) [11]. These figures may be considered well informed [12]. Despite their limitations these estimates provide a good picture of the demographic trends. Between 1656 and 1727 the total island population increased gradually. There was a faster rate of growth in St Peter Port, whose population rose from approximately 3000 to 4350 (a growth of 45%). Between 1727 and 1800 the island population increased from 10,246 to 15,655 (a growth of 82.1%), while the population of St Peter Port rose from 4,350 to approximately 11,000 (a growth of 152.9%).

St Peter Port grew at a faster rate than the other island parishes. St Sampson's developed rapidly at the end of the eighteenth century when the harbour took some of the shipping that could no longer be accommodated in St Peter Port harbour. The growth of the remaining parishes was considerably smaller. Catel would appear to be an exception, but a hospital for the poor of the nine country parishes was


[12] See Appendix 1
Fig 3: Town and country - the population of Guernsey in 1727, 1800 and 1831 (expressed in percentages). By the late 18th century more than half the population of the island lived in St Peter Port.
built here in the mid-eighteenth century; this "distorted" the population figures. The population of Torteval in the south-west actually declined [13]. Some parish registers which are currently being analysed demonstrate that there was considerable out-migration from the Guernsey countryside in the eighteenth century. The population increase in St Peter Port was achieved, in part, through a rural-urban shift. During the course of the eighteenth century St Peter Port moved into the position of housing over half the island population. This urban growth generated friction between St Peter Port and the nine rural parishes. The countryfolk argued that the town should contribute more to the States taxation; the town dwellers counter-claimed that they were under-represented in the States [14].

Having seen the general population trends, it is necessary to analyse the demographic factors in more detail.

Baptismal, marriage and burial records

The census figures and estimates supply isolated "snap-shots" of the population but fail to identify the underlying demographic patterns. A study of baptisms and burials reveals the extent of natural increase and immigration, the frequency of mortality crises and the relation between birth and death rates. Such a study is feasible because the parish church of St Peter Port possesses a continuous series of baptismal, marriage and burial registers dating from the sixteenth century. For the eighteenth century these registers satisfy the

Fig 4: Baptisms and burials, St Peter Port, 1651 - 1831.
preliminary requirements for a demographic study: there are over one hundred entries per year and there are only two small gaps. Evidence of under-registration is slight. A small volume listing baptisms and burials "administered in English" (1757-1761) contains a few records based upon pieces of paper found in the consistory in 1821. There may also have been under-recording in the late 18th century when nonconformity was introduced into the island.

Throughout the period of study there were British soldiers, sometimes accompanied by wives and children, garrisoned in the parish of St Peter Port. From the late seventeenth century until c.1780 the size of the garrison was small. Had the registers been kept consistently, with members of the garrison always identified, it would have been possible to isolate the military presence in the aggregate analysis. But this was not possible. During the years 1794 to 1810 a separate register of garrison baptisms and burials was kept (15). Some of these military entries were also recorded in the Town Church registers. Because of this double registration the garrison register has not been included in the aggregate analysis.

Marriages are not considered in this thesis because the records cannot yield sound statistical evidence. Inhabitants of the town regularly married outside the parish, St Andrews being a particularly popular location. Moreover English couples eloped to St Peter Port; it is impossible to distinguish between migrants and elopers (16).

---

(15) Housed in the Greffe.
(16) Winchester, Diocesan Records, A/4/A bundle 5 item A, 7 Apr 1809
Durand to the Bishop of Winchester.
The discussion of problems involved in this aggregate analysis should not obscure the fact that the registers compare well with many of their English counterparts; and they do provide a solid foundation for examining population trends. The aggregate baptismal and burial data have been checked by the Leicester version of computer programmes devised by the Cambridge Group for the History of Population and Social Structure. The analysis suggested that the baptismal and burial data were consistent.

The aggregate analysis shows that during the eighteenth century the baptismal (=birth) rate generally remained higher than the burial (=death) rate. The population growth of St Peter Port was consequently due in part to natural increase. But change in population size can also be influenced by migration. The aggregate analysis can be used in conjunction with population figures to determine the relative contributions of natural increase and migration to population change. This is done by using the well established demographic equation:

\[ P_{t2} = P_{t1} + (B-D) + \text{net balance of migration} \]

where \( P \) = population, \( t2 \) = second date, \( t1 \) = first date, \( B \) = number of baptisms (=births), \( D \) = number of burials (=deaths).

This equation acknowledges that changes of population size in a given community are brought about not just by births and deaths but also by migration inwards and outwards. When re-arranged the equation reveals the net balance of migration (net balance = \( P_{t2} - (P_{t1} + (B-D)) \)).
Table 5: The relative contribution of migration and natural increase to the population growth of St Peter Port, 1727-1831

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Balance of Migration</th>
<th>Migration</th>
<th>Natural Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1680-1727</td>
<td>3000?</td>
<td>+214?</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1727-1765</td>
<td>4500</td>
<td>+251</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>77.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1765-1800</td>
<td>5370</td>
<td>+4136</td>
<td>73.5%</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800-1821</td>
<td>11000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1821-1827</td>
<td>11173</td>
<td>+126</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>89.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1827-1831</td>
<td>12132</td>
<td>+1287</td>
<td>73.1%</td>
<td>26.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(\( + = \) immigration into St Peter Port)

These figures should not be allowed to assume a spurious precision. Their accuracy is determined by the census returns and the registration of baptisms and burials. Moreover, as Dr Corfield comments, such a study "cannot yield precise figures because the subsequent offspring (and indeed the eventual mortality) of the migrants themselves are counted as part of the urban vital statistics". [17] Nevertheless, the figures do show major trends. The population increase of St Peter Port in the first half of the eighteenth century was predominantly due to natural increase, the scale of migration being relatively limited. However migration was of cardinal importance between 1765-1800. During the years 1800-1821 there was significant natural increase (+2440); but its impact was cancelled by an almost equal flow of emigration between 1814-1821. The emigration flow was reversed in the 1820s and immigration contributed significantly to population growth.

in the years between 1827 and 1831. We shall examine these migration trends in greater detail in Chapter 2.

The church register evidence can be used alongside the independently attested population figures to calculate crude birth and death rates.

Table 6. Crude birth and death rates, St Peter Port, 1680-1831

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>year</th>
<th>population</th>
<th>crude birth rate</th>
<th>crude death rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1680</td>
<td>2800</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>36.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1700</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>33.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1720</td>
<td>3200</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1727</td>
<td>4350</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1765</td>
<td>5370</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>35.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1814</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1821</td>
<td>11173</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1827</td>
<td>12132</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1831</td>
<td>13893</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most of the crude birth rates are comfortably within the parameters anticipated by Wrigley and Schofield. They have observed that in most pre-industrial European populations the crude birth rate...
fell in the range 28-40 per 1,000 [18]. As the population for the year 1680 is not certain, the figures have been worked three times to show the possible range. High birth rates are not necessarily suspect; they do occur and "are often associated with populations with high proportions of young adults acquired through immigration" [19].

According to Wrigley and Schofield "death rates in pre-industrial England are unlikely to have been as extreme as 20 or 35 per 1,000 except fleetingly in unusual circumstances" [20]. The death rate in St Peter Port seems to have been rather low in several years. This is perhaps to be explained by the observations of Jan de Vries about the loss of sailors at sea. He notes that Wrigley and Schofield treat such loss "as a form of migration rather than a form of mortality" [21]. If St Peter Port sailors lost at sea are considered "missing deaths", the crude death rates given above require adjustment. The degree of error will be greatest for those periods when St Peter Port inhabitants were particularly involved in sea-faring.

There were twenty five years in the eighteenth century in which the number of deaths in St Peter Port appear to have exceeded the number

---

Fig 5: The baptism/burial ratio, St Peter Port, 1655-1829, five year centred moving average.
of births; but the deficit was usually slight and demographic recovery was swift. The birth/death ratios suggest that natural increase was reasonably secure for most of the eighteenth century.

Crisis mortality

St Peter Port experienced only a limited number of years of crisis mortality. This is remarkable as seaports are popularly considered to have been unhealthy. Writing in 1805 Doyle said that there had never been a plague or contagious disorder in the island but this was clearly an exaggeration (22). The years of crisis mortality can be detected by the analysis of the burial records. There have been numerous attempts to devise indices for measuring the intensity of crises, each methodology having idiosyncratic virtues and problems. The St Peter Port figures have been analysed using the computer programme of the University of Leicester (based on the programme of the Cambridge Group for the History of Population and Social Structure). This gives a month-by-month quinquennial analysis with a centred moving average.

The application of these statistical approaches to an analysis of the burial records of St Peter Port yields the following table:

[22] PRO HO 98/28, 3 Oct 1805 Doyle to Lord Hawkesbury.
Table 7: Crisis mortality in St Peter Port, 1654-1800

| Start year | Start month | End year | End month | Severity factor
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1654</td>
<td>Sept</td>
<td>1654</td>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1661</td>
<td>Sept</td>
<td>1662</td>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1667</td>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>1668</td>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1678</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>1678</td>
<td>Jun</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1703</td>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>1703</td>
<td>Apr</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1707</td>
<td>Dec</td>
<td>1708</td>
<td>Mar</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1710</td>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>1711</td>
<td>Mar</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1721</td>
<td>Jun</td>
<td>1721</td>
<td>Sep</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1731</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>1732</td>
<td>Mar</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1738</td>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>1739</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1742</td>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>1742</td>
<td>Apr</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1744</td>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>1745</td>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1755</td>
<td>Jul</td>
<td>1755</td>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1757</td>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>1758</td>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1775</td>
<td>Apr</td>
<td>1775</td>
<td>Jul</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1778</td>
<td>Dec</td>
<td>1780</td>
<td>Jun</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1780</td>
<td>Sep</td>
<td>1780</td>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1783</td>
<td>Aug</td>
<td>1783</td>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1787</td>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>1787</td>
<td>Mar</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1799</td>
<td>Dec</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>Mar</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The severity factor is the number of times by which the actual average monthly total is greater than the predicted total.
Table 7 lists only crisis mortality. In many years there were seasonal epidemics which sometimes affected particular sections of the community. In 1770, for example, a letter-writer recorded the death of several dignitaries "& many children of the small Pox" and in April 1778 Guille mentioned "spring and autumn fevers which reign greatly with the poor people of this island" [23]. Such epidemics inflicted numerous deaths without becoming crises.

The identity of some of the crisis epidemics in St Peter Port can be established. The last outbreak of the plague suffered in Guernsey occurred in the years 1629-1630 [24]. The epidemic of 1661-1662 was an outbreak of smallpox and other complaints [25]. The epidemic of 1731 (cause unidentified) was still dimly remembered almost a century later as having "nearly depopulated the island" [26]. The crisis in 1755 was a smallpox epidemic. In July of that year the "chefs de famille" decided to inoculate the children in the town hospital (poorhouse) provided that the parents did not object and that the children acquiesced with "bon coeur" [27].

[27] TC DdG4F, p 102, 22 July 1755.
The epidemic in 1775 was introduced by soldiers garrisoned at Fort George. Jeremie recorded that "a dissentry or bloody flux broke out at fort George in a regiment of highlanders quartered there. The corps was nearly destroyed, and the malady spreading in the neighbouring parishes, made considerable ravages" [28].

The epidemic of 1778-1779 was recorded in some detail by Nicholas de Garis. From the end of 1778, and throughout 1779, scarlatina was prevalent throughout the island. The illness was characterised by an unbearable pain in the throat. Almost everyone experienced an attack and those who survived took a long while to convalesce. The epidemic was exacerbated by other illnesses - measles, smallpox, purpura and military fever *inter alia* [29].

The epidemic in the early months of 1787 was smallpox. On 9 December 1786 the town authorities decided to raise 1500 livres tournois to inoculate the children of the poor and other poor people. On 15 January 1787 Thomas Dobree recorded that about 700 had been inoculated, three or four at most having died. He observed that those who had taken the disease in the natural way died very fast and he found it strange that people could be so weak and foolish as not to accept inoculation [30].

[29] J.P. Warren (ed.), *Extracts from the Diary of Elisha Dobree*, TSG vol x part 4, for 1929 (Guernsey, 1930), p 507, footnote. The notebook of Nicholas is in the Priaulx Library.
By 1805 Jennerian vaccination had reached the island. In July of that year Ann Grut wrote to her husband (who was in Ireland on business): "Our dear little Peter was carried to him (Dr Paul) last Tuesday, to be inoculated with the cowpox, for the natural smallpox infects the whole island and sweeps away many of the inhabitants" [31].

There was some opposition to the Jennerian method and a lively correspondence was published in the Guernsey press. In April 1808 S.N. Taylor "Member of the Royal Jennerian Society" advertised that he would vaccinate on Wednesday and Saturday mornings from 10 to 12 o'clock at No. 11 High Street; the poor would receive free treatment [32].

Vaccination won the day; at the session of Chief Pleas held on 3 October 1806 the Royal Court prohibited inoculation with smallpox unless specific permission had been granted by the Court [33].

The next significant outbreak of smallpox appears to have been in 1824 -1825. On 1 February 1825 the Royal Court enforced rigorous rules. The ordinance of 3 October 1808 was re-inforced; smallpox victims were forbidden to walk about in public before making a complete recovery; and buildings which housed a smallpox victim were to display a notice saying "La Petite Verole est dans cette Maison". The constables were to enforce the regulations and to encourage vaccination [34]. A contemporary writer commented that these ordinances "if zealously

[34] Ibid, vol 2, pp 315-316.
inforced" would tend to check the further progress of the disease which was understood to be strictly contagious. The writer regretted that there was still a bias in the country parishes in favour of inoculation and that numbers of children in the country had not been vaccinated. By April 1825 the progress of the disease had slowed: "a solitary case or two has appeared in some of the thickly-inhabited houses of the town, but as most of the individuals residing in them had been vaccinated, it has been confined to the persons originally affected". A month later smallpox was still "about the country" but "not prevalent" in town [35]. Vaccination seems to have proved successful in St Peter Port; but smallpox was only one of the diseases prevalent in 1824-1825 as the following table shows:

Table 8: Diseases and illnesses in Guernsey, July 1824 – June 1825.
(Source: The Monthly Selection (Guernsey, 1824-1825)).

1824
July Diarrhoea, dysenteric symptoms [p 62].
August Derangements in the hepatic and digestive functions; a few straggling cases of cholera morbus; measles [p 95].
September Bowel complaints; diarrhoea; measles [p 128].
October Croup [p 174].
November Croup [p 224].
December Low nervous fever; croup; smallpox [p 262].

1825

January Smallpox; colds; children affected by slight continued
fevers [pp 301-303].
February Erysipelas; eruptive disorders; colds; coughs [p 344].
March Pulmonic complaints; several phthisical patients dead
[p 383].
April Smallpox; diseases of the eye; an anomalous kind
of eruption among children, neither scarlet fever nor
measles [p 421].
May Smallpox [p 464].

The young were particularly at risk. The medical report mentions that
the town children were the first to suffer from the measles - "imported
by persons coming from Jersey" - in August 1824; and in the following
month diarrhoea was affecting "children principally" [36].

In October 1832 cholera entered St Peter Port from Jersey. In a
detailed analysis of this epidemic Dr Kellett-Smith has identified
369 (7371) cases with 103 (1057) deaths; which works out at a mortality
rate of 28%. This compares creditably with the rate in England, of the
order of 37%, and of Jersey which was around 40% [37]. The relatively
low mortality rate in Guernsey may perhaps be attributed to the wide
range of measures taken by the island authorities. Although the
epidemiology of cholera was imperfectly understood, some of the measures

[37] Dr S.K. Kellett-Smith, 'The Guernsey Cholera Epidemic of 1832' TSG
taken to combat the disease were fortuitously effective. The importation of bedding was forbidden; a strict quarantine was imposed; the roadways were washed; tar was burnt and vitriol and chloride of lime were sprinkled; Sunday schools were cancelled; the drinking of red currant juice to combat dehydration was recommended; blankets and clothes were distributed to the needy; and the town poor were moved from the hospital to the Vale. Dr Kellett-Smith argues that many of these measures were directly or indirectly valuable in helping to control the spread of the disease. Of the fatalities a large proportion seem to have been English migrants residing in the poorer parts of the town, close to contaminated water-supplies (38).

Jacques Dupâquier has argued that the chronology of crisis mortality differed between France and England in the 17th century; great crises in one country had no echo in the other. After 1705, on the other hand, the "two countries marched in step" - crises were experienced in common. He conjectures that seventeenth century crises were "national" and eighteenth century crises "international". But after testing this hypothesis he rejects it in favour of regional, rather than national or international, analysis (39).

It is not easy to fit St Peter Port into such an analysis. The temporal co-incidence of a crisis in Guernsey with a crisis in

---

[38] Dr S.X. Kellett-Smith, op. cit, pp 651, 655.
France does not *in itself* prove that there was a causal linkage. As a port town St Peter Port was exposed to infection from many quarters. Nevertheless, St Peter Port traded extensively with St Malo and other French ports and was vulnerable to French epidemics. It is possible that the St Peter Port crisis of 1661-1662 was related to "la crise de l'Avenement" of 1660-1662 [40]. The epidemics of 1710, 1738-1739 and 1742 may also form part of the history of French crisis mortality. The crisis of 1740-1742 particularly affected the Atlantic and northwestern coast of France, directly opposite Guernsey [41]. However, June 1741 to October 1742 was also a period of local crises in England [42]; as Dupaquier remarked, some of the epidemics of the eighteenth century can be termed "international" [43].

As an island Guernsey was, in one respect, insulated from epidemics. But the population needed to trade abroad and shipping frequently threatened to "import" disease. A quarantine was regularly established. In 1711 "when Bremen & other parts in the North were infected" the Royal Court of Guernsey made regulations "under severe penalties" which proved "effectual and sufficient" [44]. Nine years later, when the plague was raging at Marseilles, a quarantine boat was

---

[41] Ibid. pp 213 - 215, fig 76, p 215.
[43] Vide supra.
[44] PRO SP 47/4, 26 July 1733, Petition of bailiff and jurats.
arranged [45]. English quarantine regulations were regularly extended to the island by means of Orders-in-Council [46].

Food provision and subsistence crises

Historians have paid increasing attention to the links between demography and nutrition. It has been suggested that mortality crises were closely linked to subsistence crises. This idea was popularised by Pierre Goubert in his study on Beauvais and the Beauvaisis. However, Chaunu has objected that there were instances of mortality crises without high prices, and high prices without corresponding mortality crises [47].

To understand the story of food crisis in Guernsey and St Peter Port it is necessary to examine the whole picture of the island's food provision. In 1841 Jonathan Duncan calculated that the territorial surface of Guernsey was twenty four square miles i.e. 15,366 English acres (=approx. 62 square kilometres). He estimated that 10,240 English acres were fit for cultivation [48]. There may have been slightly more land available for agriculture in the eighteenth century, prior to the

[45] PRO SP 47/4, 25 July 1733 Petition of bailiff and jurats. See also J.N. David 'Some Notes on 18th Century Local Shipping' TSG vol xvi, part iii, for 1957 (Guernsey, 1958), p 275.
Fig 6: Corn imported from England to Guernsey, 1744-1763
(see Appendix 5)
suburban sprawling of St Peter Port.

The density of population on the island was high. Already by 1727 - when the island population was calculated as being 10,500 - there were approximately 170 inhabitants per square kilometre. Guernsey fell into the third and highest level of population density identified by A.P. Usher in which 40 to 44 inhabitants per square kilometre already corresponded to 'demographic tension'(49). By the early 19th century the population density of Guernsey had risen to approximately 395 people per square kilometre.

How large a population could be sustained by the produce of the island? In England Daniel Defoe estimated that three acres of good land or four acres of average land were required to support one man. If these figures are applied to Guernsey, it suggests that the island could support a population of between three and four thousand inhabitants. This calculation sits comfortably with another estimate that in the pre-modern period a town of three thousand inhabitants needed to be served by the lands of ten villages (or approximately 8.5 km²) in order to live (50). This model is strikingly similar to the reality of St Peter Port in the seventeenth century - the town parish of approximately 3,000 inhabitants being served by nine rural parishes in an island approx. 8 km². Guernsey, with a population of 10,500 in


increasing to 24,500 in 1836, experienced "demographic tension" throughout the eighteenth century. The Islanders coped with this by operating an intensive form of farming; by eating a lot of fresh fish, and less meat than the English; and by importing food [51].

When did Guernsey cease to be self-sustaining in corn production? Some clues are provided by examining Guernsey's sister island of Jersey. In the early 17th Century Jersey was able to feed its population by its own production and export surplus to barter at St Malo with the Spanish merchants [52]. However, by the late 17th Century Falle was observing that the island did not produce sufficient for the inhabitants, who were often supplied with corn from England, or (in time of peace) from France; and that the Islanders often went as far as Danzig because of the cheapness of the market there [53]. It seems reasonable to infer from this that Guernsey, a smaller island than Jersey and with a higher population density, was probably importing supplementary corn supplies by the end of the seventeenth century. This policy was encouraged by the falling grain prices in England in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. By the second half of the eighteenth century the island could not produce above two thirds of the provisions required by the inhabitants and was importing from the

west of England "but principally from the neighbouring provinces of Brittany and Normandy" [54].

Having established the general pattern of the food supply of Guernsey and St Peter Port, it remains to examine the correlation, if any, between subsistence crises and mortality crises. Table 9 indicates the years in which Guernsey experienced corn shortages and mortality crises.

References to food shortages are scattered throughout a variety of sources and the list in Appendix 3 is almost certainly not complete. However, there is an independent source of information about the island harvests for this period. Yearly, at Michaelmas, the medium annual price of a quarter of wheat was fixed by the Royal Court to provide a basis for the calculation of rents [55]. The valuations established by the court appear to reflect accurately the state of the harvest and of the wheat market on the island. A statistical test indicates those years in which the price fixed for wheat was more than one standard deviation higher than the mean price for the proceeding ten years (Table 9).

Table 9 shows that there were many years when Guernsey experienced subsistence crises. Yet few of these years coincided with years of crisis mortality; and in these cases of co-occurrence it is not clear whether there was a direct or indirect causal link between

[54] PRO WO 34/105, f 148r - 149v Memorial of Earl of Seaforth.
Table 9: Mortality crises and corn shortages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Mortality Crisis</th>
<th>Corn Shortages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1661</td>
<td>1662</td>
<td>1663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1664</td>
<td>1665</td>
<td>1666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1667</td>
<td></td>
<td>1668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1669</td>
<td>1670</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1671</td>
<td>1672</td>
<td>1673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1674</td>
<td></td>
<td>1675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1676</td>
<td></td>
<td>1677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1678</td>
<td></td>
<td>1679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1680</td>
<td>1681</td>
<td>1682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1683</td>
<td></td>
<td>1684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1685</td>
<td></td>
<td>1686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1687</td>
<td></td>
<td>1688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1689</td>
<td></td>
<td>1690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1691</td>
<td>1692</td>
<td>1693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1694</td>
<td></td>
<td>1695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1696</td>
<td></td>
<td>1697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1698</td>
<td></td>
<td>1699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1701</td>
<td>1702</td>
<td>1703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1704</td>
<td></td>
<td>1705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1706</td>
<td></td>
<td>1707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1708</td>
<td></td>
<td>1709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1710</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1711</td>
<td>1712</td>
<td>1713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1714</td>
<td></td>
<td>1715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1716</td>
<td></td>
<td>1717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1718</td>
<td></td>
<td>1719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1720</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1721</td>
<td>1722</td>
<td>1723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1724</td>
<td></td>
<td>1725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1726</td>
<td></td>
<td>1727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1728</td>
<td></td>
<td>1729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1730</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1731</td>
<td>1732</td>
<td>1733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1734</td>
<td></td>
<td>1735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1736</td>
<td></td>
<td>1737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1738</td>
<td></td>
<td>1739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1740</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1741</td>
<td>1742</td>
<td>1743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1744</td>
<td></td>
<td>1745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1746</td>
<td></td>
<td>1747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1748</td>
<td></td>
<td>1749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1750</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1751</td>
<td>1752</td>
<td>1753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1754</td>
<td></td>
<td>1755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1756</td>
<td>1757</td>
<td>1758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1759</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1760</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1761</td>
<td>1762</td>
<td>1763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1764</td>
<td></td>
<td>1765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1766</td>
<td>1767</td>
<td>1768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1769</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1770</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1771</td>
<td>1772</td>
<td>1773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1774</td>
<td></td>
<td>1775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1776</td>
<td></td>
<td>1777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1778</td>
<td></td>
<td>1779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1780</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: dates marked in red: mortality crisis (see Table 7);
with asterisk: documentary evidence of corn shortages (see Appendix 4);
underlined: rente value of a quarter of corn more than one standard deviation higher than the mean value for the preceding ten years.
the food shortage and the deaths, or, indeed, whether there was any link. Undernourishment may have led to more deaths; but Massimo Livi-Bacci has shown that it is a mistake to jump too readily to such conclusions [56].

When the Guernsey harvest failed, the island and parish authorities acted energetically. In the late winter and early spring they arranged the import of corn from overseas. Until c.1750 supplies were often available from England, a major grain exporter in the first half of the eighteenth century. After c.1750 the islanders sometimes had to look further abroad [57]. By corresponding with Guernseymen established as factors in foreign ports the Island authorities found it relatively easy to arrange shipments of cereals to St Peter Port, sometimes from markets as distant as Danzig and Quebec [58]. When the grain reached the island, care was taken to ensure that the poor could afford it. The States and constables regulated the sale and arranged subsidies [59]. An ad hoc tax made good any financial deficit [60]. There were bread riots in Jersey in the eighteenth century but there seem to have been none in Guernsey [61].

[58] See Appendix 4: 1773 - corn from Quebec, barley from Danzig.
[59] See Appendix 4: 1757, 1773.
[60] See Appendix 4: 1757.
Conclusion

It has been seen that throughout the eighteenth century the birth rate in St Peter Port was generally higher than the death rate. It has also been demonstrated that there were few years of crisis mortality. Some explanation of the relatively healthy nature of St Peter Port is necessary. There does not appear to be any single reason, but rather a complex mixture of environmental, social and economic factors. Some of these have been mentioned earlier but it will be convenient to bring them together.

First, Guernsey enjoys a climate which is - and was - relatively mild compared to the climate of central France and mainland Britain. The islanders were subjected rarely, if ever, to the full rigours of a bad winter. The climate of Guernsey was similar to that of Brittany, a province that escaped largely unaffected even in the great winter of 1709 thanks to its mild, wet climate (64).

Secondly, St Peter Port may have had a better quality water supply than many towns. Some of the inhabitants collected rain water in their own tanks. This conferred a double advantage. The water was unlikely to become contaminated by the seepage of drains; and the risks of mass infection associated with public pumps were avoided. The outbreak of cholera (a water-borne disease) in 1832 was principally located in the poor quarter of the town by the harbour; the inhabitants

here may have been more dependent on communal pumps [63].

Thirdly, throughout the eighteenth century a rigorous quarantine was imposed whenever there was the risk of a disease-ridden vessel entering the harbour. A similar system was operated in England but it is possible that it was easier to administer the quarantine effectively in a small island like Guernsey.

Fourthly, in the last third of the 18th century there were considerable efforts to inoculate the town population against smallpox, and then, in the 19th century, to vaccinate. Razzell conjectured that the control of smallpox was one of the decisive factors in bringing down mortality rates in the second half of the 18th century [64]. His thesis has been criticised but is not discredited. Furthermore, his conclusion may be correct in respect of some areas, even if not universally true.

Fifthly, throughout this period there seems to have been adequate provision for the poor. The church and the parish authorities organised poor relief [65]; and when the harvest failed sufficient corn was imported for the whole population.

Finally, it is possible that nutritional standards were better in St Peter Port than in some other eighteenth-century towns. The

[63] Ordonnances, vol 1 p 289; 7 Apr 1765, town inhabitants forbidden to keep free-flying pigeons (which fouled roofs "et par ce moyen corrompent l'eau des citernes").


[65] See Chapter 5.
poorhouse diet furnishes a clue to the diet of the urban poor in general. According to Thomas Dicey the inmates of the town hospital (= workhouse) were fed at dinner on fresh beef, salt pork, pease soup "and now and then fish and parsnips"; breakfast and supper consisted of bread and butter. They received about a pint of small beer at every meal, except the little children who drank out of a spring "remarkable for the soft milky quality of its water". Dicey's account is confirmed by the Hospital accounts. During the six months from July to December 1766 the 136 to 150 inmates were provisioned with beans, turnips, potatoes, carrots, cucumbers, herbs, fresh fish, "conger to refresh the poor", 1124 lbs of lard and 24114 lbs of bacon (= approximately twelve ounces of bacon per caput each week) [66].

It is instructive to compare the experiences of St Peter Port with those of St Malo and Dunkirk. St Malo suffered plague attacks in 1606-1622 and in 1663. It also experienced crisis mortality in 1693, in common with the rest of France. But in the great crisis of 1709 St Malo was unaffected. The Malouins benefited from the mild climate of Brittany and from their ability to ship corn from ports as distant as Bergen and Danzig. The demographic history of St Malo was essentially a happy one [67]. The story at Dunkirk was dramatically different. Between 1695 and 1789 the average annual number of deaths was 90 higher than the number of births, despite there being a high birth rate. Between a


third and a half of the mariners of Dunkirk perished at sea. Yet this was not the reason for Dunkirk's high death rate. Cahantous draws attention to the poor urban environment, portraying the marshy, fever-ridden land around the town as the cause of the high death rate. The population growth of Dunkirk (from 10,515 in 1685 to 27,106 in 1789) was achieved by large flows of migrants into the town [68].

It seems legitimate to conclude that it is rash to make generalisations about the unhealthiness of port towns. St Peter Port and Dunkirk both experienced corn shortages and epidemics, often in the same years. But local factors were decisive in shaping the favourable birth/death ratio in St Peter Port and in producing the dismal statistics at Dunkirk.

CHAPTER 2
MIGRATION

It has been demonstrated in the previous chapter that migration was a critical factor in the population growth of St Peter Port. Aggregate analysis, however, is purely quantitative and tends to produce "an impersonal, dehumanized approach" to migration studies [1]. Recent research has emphasised the need for studies which attempt to explore the migration process "as it affected the society in which migration occurred" and relating migration to "regional economic prosperity, variations in wage rates and employment opportunities, the availability and cost of transport and the topography over which a move took place, the availability of information through kin, friendship networks or propaganda, social and cultural barriers which may have inhibited movement, and political controls on movement and immigration" [2]. This is a challenging programme. Eighteenth century documentation for migration in England is limited and for Guernsey the situation is even more problematical. There are no archives such as ecclesiastical court deposition papers. Nevertheless, the dynamic factors influencing migration field and flow can be discerned, and the migration process can be illustrated with limited biographical data.

During the eighteenth century rural "push" and urban "pull"

---

brought many islanders into St Peter Port. Analysis reveals a diversity of motives and patterns. Migration from the country was not solely an escape from Malthusian pressures; and movement into St Peter Port was induced not only by the entrepot-oriented economy but also by the developing tertiary sector. As St Peter Port became larger and wealthier it attracted migrants from more distant horizons.

Endogenous factors determined the patterns of migration throughout the century and were of first importance. There were also, however, waves of immigration into St Peter Port occasioned by external pressures. War and privateering brought merchants and mariners to the town. In 1739 Carey asserted that during the Eleven Years' War the Guernsey privateers alone employed "not less than 1700 men, whereof about the one half belonged to the Island, & the remainder were English and Irish with some Dutch & other Foreigners"[33] These were essentially temporary migrants who made little immediate impact on the town except as consumers. Religious persecution in France (c.1681-c.1727) drove Huguenots to Guernsey; and towards the end of the century French royalists and catholics sought refuge on the island. An effort will be made to quantify the extent and nature of French settlement during these periods.

With the decline of the entrepot trade in the early nineteenth century the economy of St Peter Port changed. There was considerable emigration during the difficult years between 1815 and 1820. This was followed by a phase of quiet urban improvement which

[33] PRO SP 47/4, 9 Nov 1739 Carey to Duke of Newcastle.
attracted a considerable number of labourers and artisans from the south west of England and from Normandy. The rate of immigration into the town was accelerated by the improvement of transport links across the Channel. The census returns of 1821 and 1831, together with enumerations of 1827 and 1830, afford the opportunity for statistical analysis. It can be demonstrated that migration significantly affected the demographic profile and social geography of St Peter Port. By the second decade of the nineteenth century approximately one third of the town population was of English origin.

Rural "push" factors

There is a good case for arguing that the small land area of Guernsey and demographic pressure were necessarily bound to lead, via Malthusian forces, to rural out-migration. It might be argued that whatever the system of land tenure and agricultural production, the country parishes could sustain only a certain level of population density before migration became inevitable. However, it is necessary to examine the island customs of inheritance because these structured the forms of rural life and employment, which in turn shaped migration patterns.

The laws and customary practice of Guernsey were founded on those of the duchy of Normandy - of which the island formed a constituent part from the tenth to the thirteenth century. In matters of inheritance Guernsey essentially conformed with the system of Normandy and of the west of France - one of egalitarianism. It is true that the Guernsey tradition contained a contradictory element because the eldest son enjoyed the right to preciput. In this respect the Guernsey tradition resembled that of the Caux district in Normandy "where there
obtains, even among the commonalty, an English-style right of primogeniture that constitutes *ipsa facto* an enormous disadvantage for younger sons* [4]. But despite the advantage conferred by *preciput* in Guernsey on the eldest son, the fundamental principle of the insular system was partible inheritance. When the eldership had been taken, the real property was divided, two thirds among the sons, one-third among the daughters. Land could not be devised by will; and all the children had a right to a share in the inheritance [5].

Under this system Guernsey landed property became extremely subdivided. In 1815 Thomas Quayle observed that the proprietor who occupied an estate from 45 to 60 vergees (= approx 18 to 25 acres) was deemed "a capital farmer" [6] and in 1844 Duncan calculated that on average each house in the country had approximately five English acres attached to it; many houses had only two or three acres attached to them [7]. In brief, the system of partible inheritance could lead to a form of rural pauperization, the land holdings being scarcely large enough to support a small nuclear family.

---


let alone a family with dependants and/or servants. In 1815 Berry commented that few persons were able to grow more than for their own existence and the payment of their rents [8]. The inheritance rules had the further consequence that daughters, although acknowledged, were disadvantaged, and that few labourers were employed [9].

It can be urged that this system of inheritance, land tenure and payment of rentes (often owed to seigneurs living in the town) encouraged more intensive agricultural practices. The landholdings were so small that the cultivators had the opportunity to work more like horticulturalists than farmers. But the law of diminishing returns meant that there could be no escape from Malthusian factors. Too many younger siblings and children could not be supported on the small farms; surplus population was driven away from the country to St Peter Port, and elsewhere, in search of work.

The case of Nicholas Blondel was probably quite typical. When his father married again, and a large second family was born, Nicholas saw no prospect in remaining at home: "wherefore, after staying until he was of age, conscientiously discharging his duty to his father, he left him and came to town with a very small sum in his pocket, and having some knowledge in spoon and buckle making he hired a small shop, where he cooked his victuals, &c., and from one mechanism to another lived"

pretty comfortable, and after a few years married" [10].

Others just left the land and sought alms in town. In 1759, for example, the inhabitants of St Peter Port complained that the streets of the town were "daily crowded by the poor of the country, who do not subsist but by the alms which they receive from charitable persons of the town" [11]. This was the most basic form of rural out-migration, one prompted by subsistence needs.

The town merchants relieved some of the pressure of rural unemployment by two strategies which harnessed surplus energy. The shipowners recruited islanders to serve as crew on vessels sent to the fisheries off Newfoundland. This was a form of seasonal migration. Secondly, the town merchants organised a stocking knitting industry which created rural by-employment. This allowed a larger number of people to subsist in the country parishes and slowed down the rate of rural out-migration [12].

So far the analysis has been concerned primarily with Malthusian forces as a "push" factor. There were other forces at work. Those living in the country parishes were born into a rural society that acknowledged at least three status ranks. In the parish of St Pierre du Bois, for example, although there were no gentlemen there were yeoman

E. Carey, 'The Beginnings of Quakerism in Guernsey' TSG vol viii, part ii, for 1918 (Guernsey, 1919), pp 115-117.
[12] See Chapter 4 for a fuller discussion of this putting-out industry.
farmers designated le Sieur; master craftsmen and tenant farmers designated Maître; and labourers and the poor known simply by their name. 'Legally a man was known as the son of his father "Nicolas So-and-so, fils Nicolas"... A woman was simply known by her men-folk "Elizabeth or Martha, wife, widow or daughter of Nicolas, fils Nicolas" [13]. A consequence of this social structure was that descent rather than market forces determined what work each individual did. One way of avoiding a predestined occupation was to migrate to town where employers were more interested in aptitude. Sometimes parents living in the country parishes arranged for their children to be apprenticed in St Peter Port, the classic route of "career" migration. Daniel Quartier from the parish of St Martin's was formally apprenticed to Peter Le Cocq, gunsmith and locksmith of St Peter Port, commencing 25 April 1737. Some four years later Daniel left that employment and was turned over to Stephen Mourant, mariner [14].

Daniel in effect engaged in a form of "step migration", from the Guernsey countryside to St Peter Port in stage one, and from St Peter Port to the sea in stage two. Such "step migration" may well have been relatively frequent in the early modern period, especially when the urban economy was in a phase of economic recession. In the seventeenth century a number of islanders served their apprenticeships in England; and there was a constant "leakage" of population from the island and


Work in progress on the church registers of the country parishes of Guernsey suggests that between 1727 and 1800 there was a steady outmigration from the countryside. The sex ratios at birth and death in St Peter Port differed; the "skew" suggests that the town was gaining females as immigrants. It is highly probable that there was a significant movement of girls and young women into St Peter Port where they found employment as domestics and widened their marriage horizons.

Urban "pull" factors

Hitherto the examination of migration has been centred on factors essentially endogenous to the island. Rural emigration has been seen as a response to Malthusian forces; as a means of escaping from "ascribed status"; as a quest for improvement through apprenticeship; as part of a sequence in step migration; as a form of employment and marriage opportunity for females. It has also been seen that in many cases, although not all, rural "push" factors brought countryfolk to St Peter Port. In this sense the town was a "passive" receiver of migrants who had been motivated by extra-urban factors. The town was often able to assimilate these newly arrived workers; but at other times the rural migrants proved a burden to the townsfolk and legislation was invoked to drive them back to their native parishes [16].

---


Fig 7: The contribution of migration to the population increase of St Peter Port in the 18th century.
The population increase of the town resulted in part from rural "push" factors; equally important was the growth induced by the entrepot sector of the St Peter Port economy. Professor Williamson has recently discussed the relationship between dynamic sectors of the urban economy and migration. He has drawn attention to the significance of the price elasticities of demand for urban output and has argued that city growth and migration rates are likely to be higher "the more open is the economy to foreign trade" (17).

Port-based enterprise constituted the dynamic modern sector of St Peter Port in the eighteenth century. The handling and processing of commodities in the international market created new types of employment and required a larger workforce. Job creation and wage differentials led to immigration and town growth. The entrepot and its allied industries in part required skilled labour. This constituted a problem in the early days and led to the employment of foreign migrants. The English ropemaker David Aldridge pointed out in 1727 that he had been encouraged to settle in the island to establish a corderie as there was none then existing in Guernsey. At the same time shipbuilders, cooper and sailmakers came from England to work in St Peter Port (18).

[18] COF A67 Taxes 1715-1740, pp 150-151, 6 July 1727 (Aldridge). Jacob Bart, shipbuilder, TC burial 22 May 1748 (wife, 31 Oct 1743); William Baker, cooper, TC burial (daughter) 3 Nov 1745; Willington, sailmaker, COF A67 Livre de Taxe (1724, Eglise); et alii in registers and family files (Priaulx Library).
When St Peter Port became increasingly important as a trading centre foreign merchants settled in the town. In 1738 Philip Durrell wrote to John De Saumarez explaining that Mr Trawton (Taunton) and his family planned to settle in Guernsey soon. "He is in the wine trade and intends to keep large quantities of wines in the island in order to send them over to England to his brother who is in partnership with him...if the widow Guerin could make room in her house for seven or eight people [J] believe it would be a good lodging for them" [19]. A number of British and foreign merchants settled in the town, frequently on a temporary basis, sometimes permanently [20].

It is instructive to study the migration history of one such merchant who settled in St Peter Port. William Bell was born in Leith in 1726. On his father's death in 1736 he went to Archibald Stewart's counting house in Edinburgh and occasionally attended the wine vaults in Leith. In 1742 he went to Boulogne where he worked in the vaults and counting house of Charles Smith until 1744. He returned to Scotland; then went to London and on to Zealand, later returning to England. In 1748 he travelled from London to Guernsey where he stayed for five weeks. He returned to London and then in September 1748 he toured France. He travelled via Paris-Ehimes-Béaune-Lyons-Avignon-Montpellier-Sète and Toulouse to Bordeaux. There he took ship for Guernsey, arriving in May 1749. He settled in St Peter Port and in 1755 married Mary Le Marchant, daughter of one of the most influential merchants in

Guernsey. Bell prospered as a wine merchant and left off business in 1792 in favour of his sons William and George [21]. Bell's long series of moves from childhood in Leith to his final settlement in St Peter Port represents "career" migration that brought him from humble obscurity at the age of ten to the centre of the Guernsey elite by the age of 29. He was one of the leading wine merchants for many years [22]. It may reasonably be inferred that through career migration Bell acquired a good understanding of the international wine trade and that this underpinned his commercial success.

The Guernsey merchants on occasion took legal action to curb the competition of foreign merchants engaged in industry in Guernsey [23]. But generally there seems to have been no prejudice against immigrant merchants such as Bell settling in St Peter Port. He brought a wealth of knowledge about the European wine trade in general and Scottish trade in particular. Archibald Stewart of Edinburgh had trading connections with Isaac Dobree and Jean Cornelius in St Peter Port [24]. Through Stewart and his other commercial acquaintances Bell would have had access to an extensive network of mercantile contacts. This was

---


[22] PRO WD 34/105, f 3r, 15 Dec 1778 Irving to Amherst: Bell one of the most considerable merchants in the wine trade in St Peter Port.

[23] Greffe, Amirauté vol 7, f 65r, 30 Mar 1717 (le Sr Louis de Solignac, French, forbidden to manufacture tobacco in the island).

essential for success in trading as it secured credit and reduced risks. Bell's arrival in St Peter Port conferred an advantage on the entrepot just as he in return derived a benefit from being able to operate from St Peter Port.

The entrepot trade generated capital accumulation in the merchant class. This in turn led to the growth of the tertiary sector which also drew in immigrants. Although the evidence is fragmentary, it seems possible to distinguish two phases in this development. In the first phase the immigrants belonged, in the main, to long established crafts and trades associated with food distribution, clothing and building. We find English butchers and bakers; tailors and shoemakers; a seamstress and a staymaker; joiners and a glazier. [25]. These migrants were joining a workforce which was serving a larger

[25] e.g.:

Nathaniel Scammel  butcher (TCR baptism, godfather, 31 March 1740);
James Downer  butcher, from Whitechapel, London
            (EC Wills 1754-1762, pp 57-60; 17 June 1757);
John Lawrence  baker, (TCR burial, 23 March 1755);
Joseph Fulford  tailor, (TCR burial, 6 March 1755);
John Toms  tailor, (EC Wills 1754-1762, pp 134-139, 28 June 1759);
Richard Matherell  shoemaker, (TCR baptism of dau., 20 Dec 1742);
Elizabeth Savry  seamstress, (TCR burial, 27 Mar 1744);
Robert Fyle  joiner (Newport, I.of W.; EC Wills 1704-1727, pp 364-365; 17 Dec 1737);
John Hoybeen  glazier, (TCR burial, 21 Feb 1740).
and wealthier urban population. More butchers imply more meat consumption. As the inhabitants of St Peter Port grew wealthier their appetites and diets altered. Similarly, the presence of an immigrant staymaker can be construed as denoting the existence in St Peter Port of ladies wishing to dress fashionably (26). In the second phase - from c.1760 onwards - the merchant class grew even wealthier, and their tastes correspondingly more sophisticated. This sustained the development of a tertiary sector that became increasingly specialised as it catered for the leisure interests and luxury tastes of an affluent bourgeoisie. Thus we find the arrival of confectioners, cabinet-makers, musicians, dancing-masters, actors and printers. The taste of the bourgeoisie for fine new houses and more urban amenities (such as a new market, assembly rooms, chapels, a theatre and a court house) stimulated the building industry which employed immigrant builders, masons, sawyers, carpenters, joiners and labourers (27).


[27] See below and Chapter 7.
Urban attitudes to immigration

Migrants were a mixed blessing to the town. Newcomers with relevant skills were welcome, especially when the economy was expanding; but vagrants and vagabonds represented a burden — actual or potential — on the resources of the urban taxpayers. The English Poor Law regulations and the Settlement Act were not operative in Guernsey but the island authorities exercised a similar system. A long series of ordonnances controlled and regulated the migrant flow. An ordonnance of 1685 concerning strangers and vagabonds in St Peter Port and Guernsey required islanders to return to their native parishes and specified that, unless permission had been granted, marriages involving foreigners were thenceforth prohibited [28]. An ordonnance issued in 1726 developed the legislation by setting out the conditions and qualifications for being received as an "habitant" and the procedure for changing parish. This legislation required lodging-house keepers to inform the Crown officials about strangers [29]. Throughout the century cabaretiens were often required to keep check list of strangers. From this it may be inferred that on their arrival in St Peter Port immigrants regularly put up at the cabarets (wine shops/taverns) which seem to have played a role similar to that of the English alehouse. By the 1780s there were just over a hundred cabarets in St Peter Port, many

by the harbourside [30].

Much legislation controlling migrants dates from the second half of the eighteenth century, when the expanding entrepot economy was drawing many artisans and retailers into St Peter Port. These ordonnances strengthened earlier legislation. By 1786 the urban and island authorities had developed a system which gathered intelligence about newcomers; kept surveillance on immigrants' behaviour; maintained control over their activities; and exercised sanctions and expulsions.

Ships' masters were required to give details of arriving foreigners to the town authorities [31] and passenger lists had to be submitted within 24 hours of arrival in the island [32]. Cabaretiers and lodging-house keepers were instructed to submit lists of migrants and their professions to the parish constables [33]. Certain occupations were subject to restrictions; migrants practising medicine and surgery, and actors and charlatans needed permission to pursue their vocations [34]. Immigrants were required to produce papers about their native legal settlement [35]. Parish constables were empowered to produce before the courts any immigrants suspected of being liable to become a charge on the parish [36]. The regulations about settlement in the

[33] Ibid. pp 330-331, 4 Apr 1785.
[34] Ibid. p 302, 6 Oct 1777.
[36] Ibid. p 295, 4 Oct 1773.
island were re-iterated and strengthened [37]. The court had the power to caution strangers and, if necessary, to expel them from the island.

The ordonnances were issued when there were high levels of immigration. The insular authorities had several fears. Street disorder was blamed on the migrants; and some foreigners constituted a threat during wartime. But the deepest anxiety was that immigrants might become a charge on the community, particularly if they acquired the status of habitants.

External pressures causing migration to St Peter Port

Guernsey, being close to the coast of France, offered a convenient asylum to migrants during troubled times. St Peter Port witnessed two such waves of migration during the period 1680-1830: Huguenots fleeing from the persecution of Louis XIV’s regime; and catholics and royalists fleeing from the French Revolution.

The Revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685 is popularly seen as the beginning of the persecution of the Huguenots in France. In fact harassment and flight had started well before that date. In 1681, le Sieur Papin, “ci-devant lecteur au preche”, fled with his family from their home in the parish of St Saviour at La Rochelle and found exile in Guernsey [38]. But what started as a trickle was soon to become a flood. Valuable evidence of this is contained in the abjurations and reconnaissances entered in the Ecclesiastical Court.

[37] Ordonnances vol 1 pp 335-336, 23 May 1786. See COf A58 and COf B5 for “Cautions pour les etrangers”.

registers. These records suggest that there were three main "waves" of refugees. The first "wave" fell immediately after the Revocation (1685) and lasted until 1690; the second fell during the years of peace of 1699-1700; the third was less concentrated and lasted some ten years, from 1717 to 1727. Many of the refugees in the first and second "waves" came from Saintonge and Aunis; the third "wave" included exiles from the South of France.

St Peter Port proved a welcome residence for some of the refugees. The town already housed some families of French origin (e.g. the Dobrees and Fautrarts) who had sought refuge during the wars of religion in the sixteenth century. And the islanders were decidedly anti-Catholic. Writing in 1715 on the foiling of a Jacobite threat, Guille, a Guernsey landowner and merchant, referred to "les Papistes nos Ennemis Jures", a sentiment with which more than one Huguenot could have concurred.

It is not easy to determine how many Huguenots settled in St Peter Port. The abjurations and reconnaissances do not in themselves prove more than temporary domicile in the island. Many refugees stayed in Guernsey for a matter of just days or weeks until they could find an opportunity to travel further. Typical of these was David Garrick, a wine merchant from Bordeaux, who left everything, even his wife and a four months old son, and travelled via St Malo to Guernsey where he remained for the space of a month. Garrick arrived in London on 5 October 1685 where he was shortly joined by his wife and son who

\[39\] Ecclesiastical Court registers, Actes vols 1 and 2. See Fig 6.
\[40\] Frisaulx 31468, Jean Guille journal, p 51.
Fig 8: Abjurations and reconnaissances of Huguenots recorded in the Ecclesiastical Court Register, St Peter Port.
travelled by boat from Bordeaux [41]. St Peter Port, with its protestant, French-speaking merchants and its trade routes leading to England and the New World, proved an excellent temporary asylum for the refugees.

The baptisms, marriages and burials recorded in the Town Church registers cast some light on the number who settled permanently. During the years 1703-1724 two or more baptisms were recorded for some thirty Huguenot families. Of these families it can with some assurance be asserted that they were permanently settled in St Peter Port. There were at least a further eight families credited with one baptism apiece. During the period 1701-1724 some sixty-two burials of Huguenots are recorded; forty-five of these surnames are additional to the family names of the baptismal list. Some of the burials may have been of celibates; but a high proportion of the Huguenots fleeing from France consisted of families. The evidence suggests that eighty to a hundred Huguenot families had settled in St Peter Port by the early eighteenth century, and that they represented somewhere between 4% - 7% of the urban population. This is consistent with estimates of the size of the Huguenot settlements in some of the Devon ports [42].

Huguenots settling in St Peter Port included surgeons, an


At least three Huguenot refugees commanded Island privateers in the wars against the French; but it is not easy to determine how many Huguenots served as ordinary sailors; there were those who employed noms de guerre (44).

Some of the settlers were families of standing and substance. There were four such households in the Grande Rue - those of le Sieur Pierre Tyrand, Mr Simon Rivoire, Mr Lauga and Mr Condamine (45). There were poor Huguenots as well. Wills registered in the Ecclesiastical Court record bequests made to the "pauvres francois refugiez de cette isle" but it is difficult to calculate the precise...

---

[43] Town church registers:

Maitre Pierre de' Bôinây, sur腈gon, from Quintin, m. Demille


[45] COF A67 Livre de Taxes 1715-1740 for domicile. Huguenot origins can be demonstrated by family files (Prinulx Library). Ecclesiastical Court registers and wills.
A considerable number of royalist and catholic refugees found political asylum in Guernsey from 1789. Some settled. Antoine Rosetti, a musician and composer, fled from Normandy and found employment for many years running the Assembly Rooms in St Peter Port [47]. However, most of the emigres remained in the island for only a short while. In 1796 the Catholic priests were moved from the island to England [48]. Some emigres eked out a precarious existence by giving lessons in dancing, fencing and drawing; others copied music, carved ivory, worked hair as ornaments, or kept a billiard table. There were families of distinction "some of whom had come over with small remnants of their property, but many comparatively resourceless" [49].

British military analyses of 1805 identified three groupings of emigres in Guernsey. First, there were the foreigners, principally Frenchmen, who had been many years in the Island, "several of them being

[46] EC Vills 1704-1737: p 71 William Chaillou (26 Feb 1713); p 139 Francois Germe (10 Sept 1720); p 335 Louis Dollon (24 June 1735).
[48] Thirty four of the priests were from Normandy, ninety four from Brittany: PRO HO 98/25, ff 36-39.
married & settled and in some degree identified with the inhabitants". Some of these had settled in the island long before the French Revolution broke out. Secondly, there were the Frenchmen formed into "La Compagnie des Français a Guernesey" under the surveillance of the Baron de la Garde. The officers were all emigrants of long standing who appeared "to have given up all idea of returning to France". The privates were mostly "mechanics or peasants". The "mechanics" included cooperers, labourers, servants, shoemakers, smiths, a baker, joiner, knife-grinder and gun-smith. There were 46 in the Compagnie, of whom about half lived in town. Thirdly, there were the Royalists who had served under General George in La Vendée, 51 in number, under the charge of Mr De Vossey. These were "accustomed to an irregular warfare", "tired of an inactive life" and "impatient of control". They were "exceedingly troublesome" and potentially dangerous, both militarily and politically [50]. The evidence suggests that although at moments there were large numbers of émigrés in St Peter Port and Guernsey, the number of refugees who settled in St Peter Port was relatively very small and had only a marginal impact on town life [51].

[50] PRO HO 98/28, 7 Sept 1805 Doyle to King, with accompanying lists.
[51] C.E. Brett conjectured that the émigrés "no doubt brought with them metropolitan tastes which put both the island vieux-riches and nouveaux-riches on their mettle" Buildings in the town and parish of Saint Peter Port (Guernsey, 1975), p 10; but he cited no evidence. There is, on the other hand, evidence of the British military garrison influencing urban fashionability from the 1780s onwards; see Chapter 6.
Immigration in the 19th century

The patterns of migration in the 19th century differed from those of the 18th century in various ways. The urban economy was depressed by the collapse of the entrepot trade (1805-1814) and by a reduction in the size of the garrison (c 1815). This, combined with bad harvests and high food prices, prompted many islanders to emigrate to America and Canada [52]. The emigrants were predominantly from the poorer classes. The wealthy were not adversely affected by the economic difficulties because many of their foreign investments were flourishing [53].

After 1821 the urban economy improved. There was a change in the flow of migration, with an increasing volume of immigration into St Peter Port. There were several reasons for this. A number of English gentlemen settled in the town, attracted either by the relatively low levels of taxation or by the salubrious climate [54]. In Guernsey they could maintain a certain standard of living on a modest income. These settlers, and the prosperous natives of the town, continued to require domestics. The retail trade and other branches of the tertiary sector prospered, drawing into St Peter Port a host of skilled and semi-skilled artisans, some with a knowledge of new technologies (e.g. gas-

the salty air was "of benefit to consumptive patients....an insular watering place offers great advantage".
A large number of craftsmen were needed to build fashionable new houses on the outskirts of St Peter Port. In the centre of the town the demolition of the mediaeval rue Tanquiel and the construction of a commercial arcade (c.1830) was carried out by French labourers "at a wage of only one franc each day - living being then very cheap in Guernsey" [56].

Immigration into St Peter Port became considerably easier from the mid 1820s thanks to the development of steam shipping links between Guernsey and Plymouth, Southampton and Cherbourg [57]. Between 1 Jan 1826 and 1 Nov 1826 there were 1,896 ship arrivals in Guernsey, with 30,350 persons landing [58]. Some of these were visitors, others were islanders returning home, but many were seasonal migrants. They came principally from Normandy and Wessex. These were regions experiencing demographic and economic pressures [59].

[56] Priaulx, newsclipping of obituary of Le Boutillier [n.d.].
[58] BL Add Mem 33599 f 211r (newsclipping). COf B31 lists the large numbers of passengers who landed in Guernsey, 1826-1832.
[59] See Fig 9; G. Duby et al (ed) Histoire de la France rurale (Paris 1975-6), vol 3 pp 65,81,82 (for demographic pressures in Normandy). Vide infra for English conditions.
Fig 9: The origin of 1040 male migrants resident in St Peter Port, December 1830 [Source: COF B44].
In December 1830 the Guernsey authorities became anxious about the unrest in the south of England (the "Swing" riots) and feared that the hundreds of unknown strangers in their midst constituted a threat. Spurred by this worry, they compiled a survey of male migrants in St Peter Port. The records are detailed but require careful handling as it can be demonstrated that many English residents were omitted (presumably on the grounds that they were well known and "safe"). The clearest understanding of the migration patterns is achieved by an analysis of the cohort of migrants who arrived during 1830. This shows that the typical male migrant was English, in his twenties, and single. It is hazardous to judge social and economic status by occupation, but the majority of these immigrants appear to have been of the lower middle or working class (60).

Many of the newcomers arrived through chain migration. For example, the following migrated from Modbury in Devon to St Peter Port: John Wyatt, a schoolmaster, and his family in 1825; George Prout, founder, in 1827; John Pike, a cordwainer, and his brother, a carpenter, in 1828; Richard Pike, a mason, and his wife in 1828 (three months after John and Josh Pike); George Avery, a labourer, in 1830 (61). Chain migration was probably instrumental in the formation in St Peter Port of the clusters of specialists all from one particular area in England (e.g. stone cutters and stone dressers from Swanage in Dorset) (62). At

[60] CoB 844, Census of migrants 1830; see Appendix 9 and fig 9.
[61] CoB 844, Census of migrants 1830: entries 541 (Wyatt); 523, 524, 525 (Pikes); 684 (Avery); 806 (Prout).
the same time regional and local affinities may have helped the migrants to find their feet. Thus in 1830 at Saundry’s (on the south beach) there were to be found six miners, all from Cornwall [63].

The social and economic impact of migration in the early 19th century

Migration had a profound impact on St Peter Port society in the early nineteenth century. First, it skewed the sex ratio. There were 75.0 males per 100 females in 1821; 79.5 in 1827; and 75.3 in 1831 [64]. The impact was particularly exaggerated in the cohorts of those aged between twenty and thirty. A note appended to the 1821 census explained the phenomenon as due to "the absence of the seamen abroad in registered vessels, of the men at Gaspee, &c, in the Cod Fishery, of the young men settled elsewhere; and to the many English servant-maids employed in town" [65]. The emigration of males combined with the immigration of females produced the very low sex ratio of 45.7 in the cohort of those in their twenties.

Secondly, migrants were not spread evenly throughout the town; patterns of segregation developed in the residential distribution of migrant sub-groups. These patterns are revealed by the analysis of a census conducted in 1827. Statistical tests establish the indices of segregation and dissimilarity and the location quotients of the town streets (Appendices 6, 7, 8).

[63] COF B44, entries 478, 481, 482, 484, 487, 488.
[64] Appendix I.
[65] Gazette de Guernesey, 4 August 1821. See fig 10.
ST PETER PORT, 1821 (census)

Age pyramid and sex ratio.
(The sex ratio is skewed because many males were away at sea and many young women came into the town to work as servants).

MALES: 4788
(no. of males per 100 females)

FEMALES: 6385
St Peter Port, 1827, composition of population

Fig 11: Location of immigrants, 1827 (see Appendix 8)
The degree of segregation must not be exaggerated but most streets possessed their own idiosyncratic character. The following generalisations underline the most significant trends. Recently arrived migrants were particularly over-represented in areas 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 29 – Berthelot Street, Church Street, Market Street, Fountain Street, Bordage Street, Cornet Street, Beauregard, and Glategny (see Fig 11 and Appendix 8). These streets lay in the old quarter of the town, near the harbour, and offered cheap lodging houses, taverns and slum accommodation for labourers and poorer artisans. These streets also housed a certain number of migrants, male and female, of longer standing. Clusters of settled migrants, male and female, were to be found in some of the more salubrious suburbs, areas 24, 25 and 26 in particular – L’Hyvreuse, Doyle Road and New Town. Many of these migrants were English settlers of the “middle class”. The settled migrant females displayed the greatest degree of residential dissimilarity and segregation (see Appendixes 6 and 7). The reason for this is that there were concentrations of English women and migrant servants in wealthier areas (and an absence of such females in poorer localities).

Conclusion

"The great Multitudes of People requisite for Manufacturies, Sea-Ports, etc. proves the Necessity of In-Comers," observed Dr Short in 1760 [66]. "In-Comers" were no less necessary to St Peter Port than to the English ports. Throughout the "long" 18th century migrants swelled

the town population. The settlement of Huguenot refugees in the late 17th and early 18th centuries re-inforced the French culture of the town. But thereafter the main flows of migration were from England. The English migrants changed the demographic, economic and cultural character of St Peter Port. By the second decade of the 19th century it was calculated that approximately one third of the town population was English (67). In some areas of St Peter Port native residents constituted less than half the population. Migration flows skewed age/sex ratios to such an extent that in 1821 among the young adults there were approximately two females for every one male. English immigrants brought occupational skills which expanded and enriched the urban economy. But the volume of immigration amounted to informal colonisation; this revolutionised the societal patterns and culture of St Peter Port. These themes are explored in the following chapters (Chapters 5 and 6 in particular).

(67) Ecclesiastical Court, Register 1799-1863, pp 64-65. In 1827 settled migrants and 'recently arrived' migrants constituted 30.8% of the town population of 12132. The composition was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>sex ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resident</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>males:</td>
<td>3495</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>females:</td>
<td>4906</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>71.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>settlement migrants</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>males:</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>71.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>females:</td>
<td>1193</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>74.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>recently arrived migrants</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>males:</td>
<td>992</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>females:</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>150.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 3
FOREIGN TRADE

During the course of the eighteenth century the population of St Peter Port grew over threefold and its taxable wealth increased sixfold. This growth was largely sustained by foreign trade without which, according to an eighteenth century bailiff of Guernsey, two thirds of the islanders would have been compelled to emigrate [1]. This chapter opens with a simple model of Guernsey's economy and traces the development of St Peter Port, the only port serving the island. (The harbour of St Sampson began to be developed in the late eighteenth century but the foreign trade of Guernsey was controlled by St Peter Port).

Thanks to a conjuncture of geographical, political, mercantilist and entrepreneurial factors St Peter Port developed as a major entrepot in the years between 1660 and 1750. Initially the trade was predominantly Anglo-French, St Peter Port acting as a mart for the trading of high tariff goods; but by the second half of the eighteenth century the entrepot was handling a wide variety of goods (mostly destined for England) from a dozen or more countries. The entrepot was part of an international trading complex, playing the role of "node in a network of linked cities" [2].


successfully established agents and factors in major ports throughout the world of the "Atlantic economy".

The port books of St Peter Port were destroyed by enemy action in 1940 and so the quantification of the town's trade is difficult. The problem is compounded by the fact that the St Peter Port merchants often engaged in clandestine trade. Two strategies have been employed to try to illuminate the volume and value of St Peter Port's trade. First, fragmentary evidence from a wide number of sources is presented to illustrate the quantity of specific commodities traded by the St Peter Port merchants. Secondly, the customs records of the import and export trade between Guernsey and England, Scotland and Ireland are analysed. These complementary approaches establish a number of parameters which demonstrate the importance of the town as a trading port.

The chapter continues with a short examination of the re-organisation of foreign trade that took place in the nineteenth century. When the British government suppressed the smuggling trade in 1805-1810, the St Peter Port merchants looked for new markets. They succeeded in developing a considerable trade with South America.

Apart from its ordinary commerce, St Peter Port was also the base for privateering during wartime. It was long considered that profits from privateering were responsible for rapid capital accumulation in St Peter Port in the eighteenth century. Recently that view has been challenged but the debate has been inconclusive. New evidence is presented below which suggests that although privateering was often profitable, especially for the agents, trade was the real engine of economic growth.
The Guernsey economy

Guernsey was not well endowed with land or capital and there was a constant threat that agricultural output would fail. Fishing increased the supply of food and left a surplus for export. During the mediaeval period Salerie, just to the north of St Peter Port, was developed as an eperquerie for the drying and curing of conger [3]. Guernsey conger, mackerel and herring were regularly sold in France. In the mid-fourteenth century Parisian fishmongers were shouting out "leur hareng de Garnissi, de Saffaire, d'Escone ou de Fraonlais" (= herring from Guernsey, Suffolk, Scanie, or Pas-de-Calais) [4]. Fishing was further developed in the sixteenth century when the merchants of St Peter Port participated in a triangular trade. They sent vessels to fish off Newfoundland; the catches of cod were shipped to Portugal, Spain and France; and the Guernsey vessels returned home with cargoes such as wool and iron. The Newfoundland fish paid for the imports. The balance of trade of the island further improved when the St Peter Port merchants developed a stocking export industry [5].

Had its fortune been dictated solely by the factors of production, the economic history of Guernsey might well have been

limited to small-scale trading exchanges. However, the island profited from a favourable geographical location and from political decisions made by foreign powers. Guernsey, situated close to the coast of France, was well placed to engage in Anglo-French trade. Such opportunities were enhanced when a papal bull of 1483 confirmed an Anglo-French agreement that Guernsey would be regarded as neutral in any future conflict. This was advantageous to the islanders and to English and French merchants. The Queen of Hungary complained in 1544 that the English made use of the pretended neutrality of Guernsey for bartering freely with the French as often as they liked without hindrance or restriction of any sort. In 1544 the import of French goods into England was prohibited, but as the interdiction did not apply to the Channel Islands French wine could be shipped to Guernsey and re-exported to England (6).

The development of St Peter Port as an entrepot

The trade of Guernsey with foreign ports was seriously disrupted by the English Civil War (7). From c. 1660, however, the merchants of St Peter Port were able to benefit from a number of factors which, in combination, led to the rapid growth of St Peter Port as a major international entrepot. These factors were: the development of the

---


(7) F.B. Tupper, *The History of Guernsey* (Guernsey, 1854) p 312, citing petition to Cromwell: "The inhabitants...have lost their ships, their traffic, and their trading".
Atlantic economy; the location of Guernsey; the trading privileges enjoyed by the islanders; and the high tariffs associated with mercantilism.

In the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries British and French trade increased considerably thanks in part to a growing demand for American and Asian colonial products. This was accompanied by a demand in Europe for British re-exports of colonial produce. Britain also found an expanding market in her American colonies for British manufactures and re-exports of Asian and European goods. In this developing Atlantic economy major British ports, led by Bristol and Liverpool, as well as port cities of northern and western France, found opportunities for trading on a greatly increased scale [8].

St Peter Port was excellently situated in relation to the principal shipping lanes of this Atlantic economy. First, the town was well located on the north-south axis to serve as an entrepot in Anglo-French trade. Secondly, being at the western end of the Channel, St Peter Port was ideally positioned to engage in the Atlantic trade. In contrast to London the western outports were one or two weeks "closer" to the West Indies and during wartime these outports benefited even more [9].

Traditionally Guernsey had enjoyed considerable privileges in its trade with England. Relying on ancient practice the islanders saw themselves as "free and discharged from all Customs, Tolls, and Subsidies, as well in the Island, as elsewhere, in Her Majesty's

Apart from "some trifle for keeping their piers and harbours in repair" [11] goods could enter Guernsey as into a free-port. This was of considerable significance during the age of mercantilism, when national economies were protected by high tariff barriers.

The Guernsey merchants were well placed to ignore the provisions of the Navigation Acts. Under this legislation the Channel Islanders' shipping was regarded as English built, but no exception was made in regard to their commerce. Although the islanders could trade directly with any of the ports of Spain or Portugal or with those of the Azores, Madeira or the Canaries, they were not allowed to deal directly with the English colonies, or to bring colonial raw materials into English ports [12]. In practice the St Peter Port merchants ignored the Navigation Acts and invoked customary privileges. The customs authorities at the English ports were often confused. In 1744 the Treasury cleared up some of the misunderstandings by ruling that "no one should bring from the Channel Islands into any port of the kingdom..."

[10] The Case of the Inhabitants of the Island of Guernsey, in Relation to several Orders of Council obtained by the Commissioners of the Customs, for setting Custom-House-Officers in the Island, and subjecting the Inhabitants to the Laws relating to the Customs in Great Britain. [n.d., c 1708/1709].


products from the English colonies, because not first taken on at the
place of their origin" [13]. The implementation of this ruling led to an
increase in the amount of colonial produce smuggled from Guernsey to
England.

Throughout the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries the
English authorities found it practically impossible to enforce the
Navigation Acts in Guernsey. The regulations relating to the nationality
of carrying vessels were regularly ignored. In 1777 John Guille of St
Peter Port commented: "We have had part of our brandy in French bottoms
from Spain to avoid the high insurance & the Americans; tho' it is
against the Act of Navigation no one has taken any notice of it. The
bills of lading were made for Dunkirk" [14].

The rise of the port of St Peter Port as an entrepot in the second
half of the seventeenth century was linked to the flourishing commerce
of the nearby French port of St Malo. Writing from Guernsey in 1667
Colonel J. Atkins commented: "It is a rare thing now to hear from
England, and it is as hard a matter to send thither, for St. Malo is the
place they all send to" [15]. This observation is confirmed by a 1678
listing of sailings from St Peter Port [16]. Of the 149 sailings
recorded (23 August 1678 - 11 December 1678) 95 were to

[14] Priaulx 18459 p 18, 7 June 1777, Guille to Knowsley (of Hull).
to Andros.
[16] Northampton Record Office, Finch Hatton papers, 278. See Fig 12.
Fig 12: Destination of vessels sailing from St Peter Port,
28 Aug 1678 - 11 Dec 1678 [Source: Northampton Record Office,
Finch Hatton papers, 278].
France and of these at least 21 were specifically identified as being to St Malo (no other port, French or English, had a higher ranking).

St Malo was enjoying its golden age. To the south the Malouins made fortunes in Cadiz, trafficking in silver [17]. There was also an extensive trade between St Malo and England. Textiles, lace, oil, soap, pork, hemp, cordage and honey were exported from St Malo to England; in return the Malouins imported draperies, tin, lead, coal, slate, hides, beef, herring, sardine and other fish, and tallow. Most of this Anglo-French trade was conducted by strangers as the Malouins distrusted the English "qu'ils disent estre infidels" [18]. Analyses of the port movements of St Malo demonstrate that many vessels arrived in ballast in St Malo and left with merchandise, especially for the Channel Islands [19]. The shipping patterns of St Peter Port and St Malo in the second half of the seventeenth century suggest that the Guernsey merchants were established as trusted middlemen in the St Malo - England trade.

Malouins visited St Peter Port where they spent gold and silver on contraband goods, tobacco in particular [20]. Trading

---

links were maintained with the French even during wartime and despite British acts specifically forbidding such trade [21]. On 29 September 1712 Mr John Sherwood reported to the English customs: "the French merchants are here in great numbers...bring in wine, brandy, lines, cloth, salt and wares of diverse sorts...They carry from us coal, soap, rosin, wool, tobacco, East India goods and what not" [22].

Trade with the Malouins flourished with the restoration of peace. In 1713 we find that le sieur Thomas le Nasurier of Guernsey made accord with Jean Heilly to command J'Aigle of St Malo, a vessel of 220 tons. Thirty five men were engaged in Guernsey to serve as crew. The projected journey was a triangular voyage to Guinea - Jamaica - Guernsey [23]. It is not clear whether the expedition took place but there is good evidence of a joint venture soon afterwards. In 1716 a Guernsey ship at St Pierre, Newfoundland, had Malouins as its principal officers and crew fishing from its sixteen boats [24].

The Malouins were active in developing trade with South America

[21] C.M. Andrews, _op. cit._, Vol 4, p 68: "This traffic was carried on in defiance partly of the acts of trade and navigation and partly of the acts passed in 1678, 1689, 1693, and 1704 prohibiting trade with France".

[22] PRO SP 47/3, copy of extract of letter 29 Sept 1712 from Mr John Sherwood.

[23] Greffe, Depositions, 23 June 1713.

from where some cargoes reached St Peter Port. Circa 1716 a Frenchman from St Malo "lately arrived from the South-Sea" came to Guernsey "to traffic", bringing with him "three small branches of a tree which he said was the tree that bore the Balsam of Peru" [25]. When St Malo declined as a great port in the 1720s, the St Peter Port merchants continued to trade there but they increasingly developed their links with Nantes and other ports involved in international commerce [26]. For their part French merchants were attracted to St Peter Port where they could buy British colonial produce, principally tobacco and East India goods [27]. Between c 1720 and c 1750 the Guernsey merchants developed St Peter Port as an entrepot. In the next section we shall examine the ways in which they improved the facilities of the port.

The improvement of port facilities, 1700 - 1750

As there were no bonded warehouses in England in the early 18th century for the storage of wine, English merchants found it convenient to have cargoes shipped to Guernsey in bulk and then sent across to England in smaller consignments. In this way they avoided having to pay down one large sum in English duty [28]. Thus in 1719 we find Abraham Eyre and his partners in Southampton explaining that they did

[25] BL Sloane Ms 4053 f 239 r, 1 July 1734, Carey to Sloane ["...about 18 years ago..."]. A. Lespagnol, op. cit., pp 541-546

for trade of St Malo with the South Seas.

[26] Vide infra.

[27] Vide infra.

not have the cash to pay the duty down for the whole cargo of Bordeaux
wine shipped to Guernsey and so they let part of the cargo remain in the
island until they were "more in cash" [29].

Eyre complained that "by the hotness of the weather and the
badness of their cellars which are above ground" his wines in St Peter
Port had turned and were hardly fit for distilling. Between 1719 and
1747 new - and, apparently, better - warehouses were built. Several
young men of the island sold their small estates "and turned the money
into building of warehouses for wine and brandy". They regarded those
who had in their power but did not follow this method of trade as
"slothful and stupid" [30]. By c 1747 the merchants and "the monied
men" of the island had built some twenty or thirty "magazines" (i.e.
warehouses) which could be reckoned "among the most magnificent and
spacious in England" [31]. In 1751 Dicey eulogised St Peter Port as
having "the best vaults in Europe". He claimed "that all wines
(eespecially Lisbon or white wines) kept at Guernsey but a very few
months, do actually imbibe, or receive a peculiar flavour, and are
mended in quality, to what the same species of wines have, when
immediately imported here from Portugal or any part of Spain" [32]. The
new warehouses represented a significant improvement in the entrepot
facilities. Thy St Peter Port merchants could handle large consignments
of wine for English merchants and trade extensively on their own behalf.

[29] PRO CUST 62/59, 10 Sept 1719, Eyre to Southampton Customs board.
[31] BL Lansdowne Ms 657 f 17r, 25 Sept 1750, Strahan to Governor.
The status of St Peter Port as an entrepot was enhanced by harbour improvements. In the late 17th century the harbour consisted of a single pier which could shelter "about 20 or 30 sail of small vessels" [33]. In 1684 the States decided to enclose the harbour by building a north pier. The work was started but there were interruptions and financial difficulties. In 1724/5 the leading merchants of St Peter Port and other inhabitants raised six to seven thousand livres tournois by a voluntary subscription. There were further grants in 1728 and by 1730 the pier was almost complete [34]. Altogether the townsfolk subscribed about twelve thousand livres tournois to the project. It was money well invested. St Peter Port harbour was rendered "more easy of access"; its shipping was sheltered from storms; and trade considerably increased. Prior to the improvements the farm of the pier had been let at six to seven hundred livres tournois per annum; by the 1750s it was being let for three thousand livres tournois [35]. The pride that Guernsey merchants took in their harbour improvement was soundly based. By the 1750s more and larger ships were visiting St Peter Port from European and American

[33] Royal Court, Leggs survey.
[34] Actes, vol 1 pp 145, 165.
Fig 13: The farm of the chausée - eleven year centred moving average
(Source: Greffe, Commonplace book)
The waters around Guernsey posed navigational hazards, especially to foreigners. This problem was solved in part when in 1746 Nicholas Dobree (senior), a St Peter Port merchant, published charts of Guernsey and the other Channel Islands based on his own survey. The charts were considered "very accurately done" and were issued with an accompanying booklet of sailing directions printed in French and English (37). The maps were republished in 1779 and 1786.


[37] T. Dicey, An Historical Account of Guernsey (London, 1781), pp 195-196. There are copies of the sailing directions in the Prinloux Library, Guernsey, and the British Library. The significance of Dobree's charts is underlined by Dicey's comment that all the others "in any of the Books of Charts" were "extremely erroneous and not to be depended on" (Dicey, op. cit. pp 195-196). See Map 4.

Nicholas Dobree (senior) was one of the leading merchants in St Peter Port in the first half of the 18th century. A monument in the Town Church records that he devoted himself to the security of navigation, the improvement of the harbour and the establishment of the town hospital; text in W. Berry, The History of the Island of Guernsey (London, 1815), p 148. For further details of his life see P. Hocart, "A Guernsey Merchant and his Family in the Reign of George II" TSU vol XXI part iii, for 1983 (Guernsey, 1984) pp 360-378.
The St Peter Port entrepot at its zenith, c 1750-1805

From the mid-18th century, and especially after the suppression of smuggling from the Isle of Man (1765), St Peter Port was one of the principal commercial entrepots in the Atlantic economy. The merchants enjoyed a good reputation among the French who saw them as "riches marchands qui font un grand commerce". They were like the merchants in Jersey, but traded on a greater scale and were "plus honnetes" (38). St Peter Port, with its improved harbour and purpose-built warehouses, was an entrepot in the fullest sense of the word (39). Cargoes, generally of goods that attracted high tariffs in the normal course of international trade, were brought to St Peter Port, which served as a storage centre, distribution point and mart.

The supplies came to St Peter Port directly from colonies; via major ports engaged in le grand commerce; and from the sales of East

[38] L.M. Cullen, Anglo-Irish Trade 1650-1800 (New York, 1968), p 148: the importance of Guernsey as a smuggling entrepot was "greatly enhanced" in 1765. G. Dupont, Histoire du Cotentin et de ses Iles (Caen, 1885), vol 4 pp 447, 471-473 (citing memorandum by the Marquis de Craney, 1748, referring to the Channel Islands).

[39] "Entrepot: 1. Temporary deposit of goods, provisions, etc; chiefly condr. a storehouse or assemblage of storehouses for temporary deposit. 2. A commercial centre; a place to which goods are brought for distribution to various parts of the world. 3. A mart or place where goods are received and deposited, free of duty, for exportation to another port or country". L. Dudley Stamp (ed.), A Glossary of Geographical Terms (London, 1963), p 177.
India goods in England, France, Holland, Denmark and Sweden. The Guernsey merchants sometimes acted for overseas clients and handled goods on a commission basis; but much of the cargo landed in St Peter Port had been bought by the St Peter Port merchants and was intended for re-sale either in bulk, wholesale, to another merchant (négociant) or in smaller lots to retailers (marchands). Some cargoes (e.g. wines) were held in St Peter Port for a considerable length of time before being forwarded; and wine and tobacco were often "processed" in St Peter Port [40].

Many cargoes were sold in St Peter Port. Spirits and tobacco were bought by smugglers who sailed across to the town. A wide variety of goods was sold to vessels sailing for Newfoundland: tea, silks, muslins, calicoes, India goods of all kinds, French brandy, molasses, French and Dutch linens and woollens, French nets and lines for fishing, Dutch cordage, utensils, provisions and all sorts of wines. [41]. Some English vessels bound for New England and Quebec, after clearing in Great Britain, took on "great quantities" of goods in St Peter Port contrary to the Navigation Acts [42]. British naval vessels departing on voyages similarly stocked up in St Peter Port [43].

[40] Vide infra, Chapter 4, for these port related industries.
[41] BL Add Mss 38463 f 199v - f 200r, 13 Aug 1764, Poole Customs report
[42] Ibid. f 200r.
[43] Information from Dr N.A.M. Rodger. See also PRO T1 381/9, 4 Oct 1758, Cleveland to West: requesting permission for 46250 gallons of wine to be shipped from Guernsey to Navy at Spithead (wartime)
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Fig 14: The working of the entrepot
During wartime "considerable purchases" of British manufactures were frequently made by neutrals who touched at the island [44].

Some of the entrepot goods were shipped openly and legally to their next destination. This was generally the case with bulky cargoes such as wine and fruit. Some cargoes were shipped openly to the British Isles but were furnished with false bills of lading. For example, French wine was described as of Spanish origin to evade the high duties on goods of French origin [45]. "Considerable quantities" of tea, brandy, gin, wine and tobacco were shipped from Guernsey to Alderney. That island, being a little closer to England, was more convenient for English smugglers [46]. Sometimes Guernsey mariners ran contraband cargoes across to the English coast; but it was more commonly the case that the cross-channel smuggling was conducted by the English.

By the second half of the eighteenth century many commodities were handled in the St Peter Port entrepot (Fig 15). The major items were spirits, wine, tobacco, East India goods, tea and fruit. The volume of cargoes handled by the St Peter Port merchants is discussed below.

---

[44] PRO HO 98/30, 5 Feb 1807 Doyle to Treasury.

[45] PRO T1 445 f 215v, 24 Nov 1766, Lutwidge: proposal to prevent "the fraud which arises from entering French wines under the denomination of Portugal or Spanish Vines in order to evade the payment of the French duty". See also F. Wilkins, Strathclyde's Smuggling Story (Kidderminster, 1992), p 39: claret to be shipped from Guernsey "under the denomination of Spanish Galicia".

Fig 15: Commodities sent to the entrepot and the location of Guernsey agents in Europe (see Appendix 16)
A network of agents and factors

Underpinning the development of St Peter Port as an international entrepot was the establishment of a network of connections at strategic commercial points throughout the world of the Atlantic economy. As the nineteenth century historian Lukis observed: "Parents, whose sons were intended for commercial pursuits, would send them to Spain, France, Holland and other countries, and there they established themselves as agents for their Guernsey relations" [47].

An example of one such son is Pierre Frédéric Dobree. Sent to France in 1775, he settled in Nantes where his father was known to many of the négociants. In 1779 he married Rose-Marie Schweighauser, the daughter of a protestant merchant of Swiss origin. The marriage alliance was cemented by a formal business partnership between Pierre Frédéric and his father-in-law. Soon afterwards Pierre Frédéric wrote to his Guernsey cousins, the merchants Le Masurier and Jean Carey junior, offering to supply French brandy, taffia, rice, tobacco, sugar, coffee, indigo, cocoa and other items. Pierre Frédéric corresponded regularly with his father in St Peter Port, exchanging mercantile news and arranging business [48].

The Guernsey merchants also enjoyed good business relations with...
number of foreign negociants. The excellent links with the merchant houses of St Malo have already been mentioned [49]. Other important contacts included the Swedish, Danish, Dutch and French merchants who acted as agents at the various European sales of East India goods each year. Examples of such agents were Arfwidson & sons at Gothenburg who bought for their Guernsey clients at the Swedish India sales; Fabritius & Vever of Copenhagen, who attended the Danish India sales; and Chenard, Giraudais & LePage who attended the sales of La Compagnie Française des Indes at Lorient [50].

For much of the 18th century there were several merchant bankers of Guernsey origin working in London - Bonamy & Samuel Dobree, Dobree & Aubin, Perchard & Brock and Paul Le Mesurier. These merchant bankers handled many financial transactions for their fellow islanders, dealing with bills of exchange, arranging introductions, investing money in the British funds, acting as shipping and insurance agents, securing letters of marque during war-time, and collecting rents from land held in England [51]. The Guernsey connection gave these merchant-bankers an

[49] Vide supra.

[50] Priaulx 18459 contains copies of several letters from Guille to such foreign agents. "Fabritius & Vever earned considerable commission ... by lending name and nationality to illicit British trade direct from England or via Copenhagen and Ostend" O. Feldbaek, India trade under the Danish Flag 1772-1808, (Denmark, 1963), p 141.

unrivalled understanding of the entrepot trade, privateering and French trade. Paul Le Mesurier set up a commercial house in Normandy in 1785 in partnership with his brother Havilland (based in Guernsey) with a view to developing trade with Tobago (52). Paul was elected Lord Mayor of London in 1793, the first Guernseyman to achieve this distinction. He was also an M.P. and was active in arguing in defence of the Channel Islands' interests (53). Another English M.P., Mark Gregory, although not an islander by birth, was a friend of the St Peter Port merchant family of Guille and was part of the Guernsey "connection" in London (54). Gregory was a merchant and belonged to the governing body of Lloyds (55). He had interests in Turkey and Spain (56); and set up a trading house in Barcelona in partnership with Guille. Much of the brandy shipped from Catalonia to Guernsey in the second half of the 18th century was handled by the partnership of Gregory & Guille.

(52) Priaulx, Le Mesurier papers (SR), articles of agreement.
(54) Priaulx 18459 contains copies of letters from Guille to Gregory;
Gazette de l'Ile de Jersey, 3 mars 1787, p 127, Gregory's defence of Channel Islands' interests.
(55) Guildhall Library, Lloyds' lists, 1780s.
The shipping of the cargoes

Despite the growing importance of British shipping and the regulations of the Navigation Acts, many imports to St Peter Port continued to be carried in foreign shipping throughout the second half of the eighteenth century. Much of the gin, coffee, tea, silk, handkerchiefs, callicoes and chintz from Holland and Sweden arrived in ships belonging to the Danes, Swedes and Dutch (57). This is independently confirmed by cases heard in the Cour d'Amirauté at St Peter Port and by depositions recorded in the Dobree protest book (58). Baltic shipping brought goods from the north on the outward voyage and sometimes carried southern produce to St Peter Port on return voyages from the Mediterranean. The true destination — St Peter Port — was frequently concealed, a policy dictated through a desire to thwart the Navigation Acts; to deceive insurers; or to protect the cargo during wartime. For example, in the winter of 1757-1758 a Swedish vessel bound, according to the bills of lading, from Bordeaux with brandy and prunes for Rotterdam put in at Guernsey "under pretence of being leaky" to undergo repairs; there she landed her whole cargo (59). In 1778 the St Peter Port merchant John Guille ordered a cargo of tea from John George Ekman of Gothenburg and gave instructions that the captain and

[57] BL Add Mss 38463 f 208v, 17 Aug 1764 Southampton Customs board report; f 201r, 13 Aug 1764 Exeter Customs board report; f 215 r., 13 Sept 1764, Portsmouth Customs board report.


[59] PRO CUST 62/68, p 185, 10 Jan 1758 London Customs House to Southampton board.
crew were not to know "they are to unload here". If the vessel was
seized, Ekman was to claim from the insurers, representing the cargo as
his property [60].

The fact that foreign vessels regularly delivered cargoes to St
Peter Port had important implications for the Guernsey merchants. They
were able to handle a greater volume of commodities than could have
been carried by the island's shipping. The merchants employed their
own vessels in a variety of profitable trades that served the entrepot.
Guernsey shipping carried wine, brandy, cottons and linen from France;
rum from the West Indies; tobacco from Maryland and Virginia; and traded
to Newfoundland and Africa [61]. A clear pattern emerges. The Guernsey
vessels concentrated on the Channel and transatlantic trades which were
sheltered from foreign competition by the Navigation Acts [62]. The
northern trade with the Baltic - which demanded shipping with excellent
manning ratios because of Dutch competition - was essentially left to
foreigners. Guernsey vessels also participated in "bulk-breaking", a
characteristic activity at entrepots. The cargoes brought in large
foreign ships to St Peter Port were reshipped in the smaller island
vessels to London and the English outports [63].

[60] Priaulx 18459 p 110, 14 Aug 1778 Guille to Ekman. Gothenburg
Landsarkivet, Ekman & Co papers contain some references to the
Guernsey trade (e.g. Bl:10 letter book 1782-1784, pp 35, 129-130).
[61] BL Add Ms. 38463 f 208v, 17 Aug 1764 Southampton Customs report.
[63] Vide infra, Table 12.
Trade with Newfoundland, Africa and the West Indies

From the late sixteenth century Guernsey fishermen went to Newfoundland to fish for cod. This developed into a triangular trade, the fish being taken from Newfoundland and sold in Spanish and Portuguese ports; cargoes such as wine were loaded there and transported back to Guernsey. In the late seventeenth century some four to six Guernsey vessels were engaged in the trade [64]. Although several of the St Peter Port merchants maintained interests in Newfoundland during the eighteenth century, the level of activity was relatively low. It is possible that the competition of the Vest Country and Jersey "Newfoundlanders" had some influence. Also, other mercantile ventures probably proved more profitable to the Guernsey merchants.

In the mid-18th century some St Peter Port merchants were involved in the notorious "triangular trade", taking slaves from West Africa to the West Indies and returning to Europe with Caribbean cargoes. It is difficult to assess the extent to which the Guernsey merchants were involved in the trade. Nineteenth century Guernsey historians denied that the islanders had ever participated in slaving voyages [65]. However, a number of cases heard in the Cour d'Amiraute in St Peter Port provide evidence of several such voyages. In November 1740, for example, James Seaborn, sometime master of the Charles, was actioned by the ship's owners for final returns on the


voyage that he had made to the coast of Africa; in a counter-action Seaborn claimed ten casks of rum from Mr Charles Mauger [66]. Seaborn was again involved in litigation in August 1742, this time over the commission "sur le produit de 6200 lbs pes d'yvoire à 5 p cent" [67].

The year 1742 also witnessed a long series of court cases involving le Sieur Thomas Ebsworthy (Elsworthy), master of the Anne Galley, a vessel owned by Mr Pierre Dobree. Ebsworthy bought 241 negroes in Africa, some of whom died, apparently on the middle passage. In Barbados Ebsworthy misappropriated the money from the sale of eight of the slaves. During the course of the litigation Dobree demanded delivery of 25 elephants' tusks and a piece of camwood and Ebsworthy counter-claimed for a butt of rum [68].

There is little evidence of Guernsey merchants participating in the slave trade after c.1750, possibly because of the competition from Liverpool and London merchants. Most voyages of Guernsey ships to the West Indies in the second half of the 18th century appear to have been either direct or via Madeira (where wine cargoes were delivered), the raison d'être of the voyages being the return cargo of rum from

Barbados, Jamaica or Santa Cruz. On the West Indies run the Guernsey merchants used their own vessels [69] which tended to be lightly manned. Slaving voyages required greater capital investment [70].

The principal commodities handled in the entrepot

It is time to turn away from the discussion of the general patterns of trade to consider the volume and value of the principal commodities handled in the St Peter Port entrepot.

Spirits

The late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries witnessed a rapid acceleration in the production of distilled drinks in the western world. This was partly production led, thanks to the improvement of distilling techniques and the increasing availability of raw materials, and partly consumer led, as urban society acquired a taste for new tipples. Guernsey merchants in France took an active part in developing the Cognac brandy trade. Professor Cullen observes that in the second decade of the 18th century these Guernseymen were the main impetus behind shipments destined for London, the largest and most discriminating spirits market in England [71].


[71] L.M. Cullen, 'The Early Brandy Trade (1600-1760)' in E. Aerts et al. (eds), _Production, Marketing and Consumption of Alcoholic Beverages since the Late Middle Ages_ (Leuven, 1990), p 25.
St Peter Port merchants supplied brandy to the English market throughout the eighteenth century. They imported principally from Nantes, La Rochelle, Bordeaux and Sete in France; and, later, from Barcelona in Spain. Small quantities of the brandy were shipped openly to England but most of the sales were to smugglers.

The St Peter Port merchants appear to have become interested in the rum trade c.1730 [72]. In 1738 the quantity of rum shipped from Guernsey to Southampton was 1724 gallons; in 1740 it amounted to 5062 gallons. When the British government gained greater control over the Isle of Man in the 1760s, Manx traders shipped rum from the Danish West Indies to Guernsey [73]. Dutch gin seems to have become a commodity attractive to the St Peter Port merchants in the second half of the eighteenth century.

The scale of the spirit trade at the end of the eighteenth century can be quantified with some precision. In the eight months from January to August 1796 some 6975 pipes of French brandy, 2354 pipes of Spanish brandy, 1507 pipes of gin and 88 pipes of rum were brought into Guernsey. This amounted to 10,024 pipes and was all for British accounts. It was not possible for a precise figure to be given of the imports for the accounts of island merchants but it was estimated that they had received about 15,000 pipes [74].

[74] Priaulx 20763, 21 Sept 1796 Guille to Yates.
Fig 16: Spirits traded through the St Peter Port entrepot:

(a) imported into Guernsey between Jan - Aug 1796

(b) imported into Guernsey and Alderney in one year, c 1802/1803

(c) shipped from St Peter Port, Nov 1806 - Feb 1807.
An estimate made c.1802/3 suggested that annually 60 vessels from Holland imported 2,268,000 gallons of gin to Guernsey and Alderney. The quantity of brandy imported was reckoned at 28,000 pipes (3,360,000 gallons) and the rum imported was estimated at 5,000 puncheons (500,000 gallons). According to the calculations the alcohol was increased at least one sixth in volume by water added in Guernsey. The British allowed one million gallons for what was consumed on the island, or shipped elsewhere, or lost. This left an estimated 6,150,000 gallons which entered Britain from Guernsey, mostly illegally [75].

In the four months from November 1806 to February 1807 the vessels observed clearing Guernsey carried cargoes which totalled 400,560 gallons of brandy, 49,570 gallons of rum and 109,395 gallons of gin. Had all of this been smuggled into England the lost excise duties would have amounted to £411,366/18/14, the lost customs duties £3,0145/18/4 [76].

Wine

It has been mentioned earlier that St Peter Port merchants were involved in the shipping of French wine to England from the mediaeval period onwards. During the eighteenth century the island merchants

[75] BL Add Ms 38759, f 105v - f 106r.

[76] An Account presented to the House of Commons, of the number and names of vessels Cleared out from the Port of Guernsey, in the Months of November and December 1806, and January and February 1807: with the Amount of the excise and custom duties thereon. 21st July, 1807, p 10, in Parliamentary Papers, House of Commons, session 27 June-14 August 1807, iv <57>, pp 85-95. See Appendix 16.
continued to trade in French wines (from the Bordeaux area in particular) but they increasingly dealt in Portuguese and Spanish wines, especially port. This reflected the swing in English fashion away from French wines towards Iberian produce. British legislation and tariffs were directed against French goods on the one hand and trade links with Portugal were strengthened on the other (77). In 1762 the Consul and Committee of the British Oporto Factory complained to the Earl of Egremont that the Portuguese were shipping "several thousand pipes" of wine to Guernsey, Plymouth and Portsmouth in their own vessels: "large quantities of their wines are deposited in the Island of Guernsey which are afterwards fraudulently introduced into England as British property" (78).

In 1763, in the exceptional conditions of wartime, the Guernsey merchants shipped 1869 tuns 2 hogsheads 15 gallons of Portuguese wine to the English outports and 718 tuns 2 hogsheads 29 gallons to London (79). The following year Warren Lisle reported to the London Customs Board that many of the merchants had laid out great sums of money in making vaults and magazines "for receiving of port wines which is now at an end and greatly lessens the business here" (80). In fact the Guernsey merchants continued to handle considerable quantities of Portuguese wine. Thanks to a British concession Guernsey merchants

(78) PRO SP 69/65, f 255r, 6 Apr 1762 Consul and Committee to Egremont.
(79) PRO CUST 3/63.
(80) BL Add Ms 38463, f 211v, 20 Aug 1764 Warren Lisle report to London Customs Board.
were allowed 12% "leakage" on foreign wines that they handled for English accounts. A certificate was required and the shipper in the island had to declare *inter alia*, that the wines had received no mixture since their landing in the island, that the wines had been imported in British bottoms only, and that the wine was the property of British subjects only [81]. During the following two decades quantities of between three to six hundred tuns of Iberian wine were shipped annually from Guernsey to England [82]. Considerable quantities of French wines were traded by the St Peter Port merchants, particularly during the years of the French revolutionary wars [83].

**Tobacco**

Tobacco was an important commodity to the St Peter Port entrepot from the late 17th century onwards. Some was smuggled back into England [84] but the main customers were the French. The establishment of the tobacco monopoly in 1674 in France made smuggling an attractive proposition. Professor Jacob Price has remarked that from the Channel Islands "every variety of tobacco, even that of St. Domingue, could be

---


[84] BL Add Mss 38463, f 61r, 23 Mar 1693/1694 Council report.
Fig 17: The quantity of tobacco imported into the entrepot from England, 1701-1776; and of tobacco imported from all sources, 1791, 1802/3.
(Source: PRO CUST 3, for years 1701-1776; see text for 1791, 1802-3).
smuggled into France" [85]. Price's calculations suggest that perhaps 25,000 lb of tobacco were required per annum for the needs of the Islanders of Guernsey and for legitimate sales to visiting ships. The quantity of tobacco exported from England to Guernsey frequently ran far above this level and, by inference, was sold mainly to French smugglers.

During the War of the Spanish Succession the annual average export from England to Guernsey was 76,539 lbs [86]. The volume rose considerably in the decade 1713-1722 to an annual average of 357,768 lbs [87]. Tobacco continued to be exported from England to Guernsey in quantities larger than necessary for island consumption. On the eve of the American Revolution (from 1769 to 1776) the annual average re-export from England to Guernsey was 291,438 lbs [88]. The quantity shipped from England fell after the American War of Independence [89]. However, in the post bellum era the Guernsey merchants imported not only from England but also intermittently from Scotland [90] and directly from the U.S.A. [91].

After the defection of the American colonies the relevance of

---

[86] J.M. Price, op.cit., vol 1, p 131 (based on Table 1).
[87] Ibid Fig 17.
[88] Ibid.
[89] PRO CUST 3.
[90] Vide infra, trade with Scotland.
the Navigation Acts to trade between America and Guernsey was not clear. The island merchants profited from this uncertainty and imported much greater quantities. A total of 5198 hogsheads were brought into the island in 1789 and 3144 hogsheads in 1790. The Bailiff calculated in 1791 that the island was handling five thousand hogsheads of tobacco annually, and that this earned above one hundred thousand pounds sterling "on a moderate computation". The French came in small craft to buy the tobacco, taking 15 to 30 hogsheads per vessel [92]. Circa 1802 it was estimated that the amount of tobacco imported into Guernsey was five thousand hogsheads (the hogshead measuring 1200 lbs); this gives a total of 6 million lbs of tobacco [93]. During the four winter months of 1806-1807 it was assessed that 350,300 lbs of tobacco had been shipped out of Guernsey [94].

India goods

East India goods were traded by the St Peter Port merchants in some quantity after the Treaty of Utrecht. In the years 1713-1716 forty-five different types of East India fabrics were exported from England to Guernsey, the principal varieties being chintz, chelloes, cuttanees, romals, scosneys and "Staffs Guiney" [95]. In the 1720s and 1730s tea consumption in Europe increased following the development of direct

[93] BL Add Mss 32759 f 105v.
[94] See Appendix 16.
[95] PRO CO 390/8, f 238r - f 239 r.
trade between Europe and China [96]. In 1732 Henry Mauger reported that several merchants had imported into Guernsey large quantities of tea from France: a quantity weighing 150 lbs had been found hidden in a barn [97]. In 1734 Mauger complained that the St Peter Port merchants daily imported all sorts of India goods both from Holland and France: "within these few days several of them are gone to Nantes to be at a sale, so that in all likelihood many cargoes of Tea & other foreign commodities will soon be imported here to the great detriment of the trade of Great Britain..." [98]

Tea and East India goods were frequently despatched from London to Guernsey via Southampton [99]. A "very great quantity" of the tea (and some coffee) exported to the Channel Islands was run back to England [100]. The year 1744 saw an exceptionally large volume of tea exported officially from England to Guernsey (90724 lbs from London, 73482 lbs

[97] PRO SF 47/3, 22 July 1732 Mauger and de Sausmares to Duke of Newcastle.
[98] PRO SF 47/4, 16 Sept 1734 Henry Mauger report. Compare Cambridge U L Cholmondeley (Houghton) Papers, 41/30 (c 17337) 80 "tonneaux de thee" (= 320 "barriques") imported in one year from Nantes.
[100] PRO CUST 62/63, 12 May 1737 London Custom House to Southampton.
from the outports) [101].

Customs reports in 1764 refer to East India goods "of all sorts" imported into Guernsey from England, France and Holland [102]. The merchants in Guernsey "have India goods from Fort L'Orient and Holland and have agents that attend the sales at these places" [103] Tea was bought from England, France, Denmark and Holland [104] and shipped in Dutch, Danish and Swedish vessels "from which countries they used to buy them during the war" [105]. As late as 1790 tea smuggling from Guernsey was considered "an enormous evil" [106].

Fruit

The Guernsey merchants frequently dealt in fruit from France and the Mediterranean. There were particularly good opportunities during the War of the Austrian Succession (see Table 10 below) and the Seven Years' War for profitable trade in this sector. The year 1763 was exceptionally

[101] PRO CUST 3/44.
[103] BL Add Mss 38463, f 199v, 13 Aug 1764 Poole board to London Customs House.
[105] BL Add Mss 38463, f 218r, 13 Sept 1764 Portsmouth board to London Customs House.
Table 10: The quantities of fruit and wine imported into England from Guernsey, 1733 - 1745.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PRUNES</th>
<th>RAISINS</th>
<th>LEMONS &amp; ORANGES</th>
<th>WINE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>cwt/qts/lbs</td>
<td>cwt/qts/lbs</td>
<td>number</td>
<td>Tuns/hogsheads/gallons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1733</td>
<td>40.0.0</td>
<td>62.0.10</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>228.2.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1734</td>
<td>142.0.0</td>
<td>397.1.12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>224.0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1735</td>
<td>514.0.5</td>
<td>10.0.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>338.3.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1736</td>
<td>568.0.10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>384.1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1737</td>
<td>290.0.19</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>377.1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1738</td>
<td>60.3.26</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>420.3.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1739</td>
<td>203.1.19</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>576.1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1740</td>
<td>128.3.4</td>
<td>3565.0.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1913.0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1741</td>
<td>360.0.7</td>
<td>0.0.27</td>
<td>24250</td>
<td>605.3.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1742</td>
<td>561.1.16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7250</td>
<td>374.1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1743</td>
<td>203.2.19</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10250</td>
<td>787.0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1744</td>
<td>62.3.11</td>
<td>297.3.25</td>
<td>16500</td>
<td>247.1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1745</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>378.2.17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>925.0.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: PRO T 64/274, documents 128, 129.
good for the St Peter Port merchants (see Table 11 below), with over two and a half thousand tons of fruit being imported into London and the English outports from Guernsey. The fruit was shipped in bulk to Guernsey and then carried in smaller vessels to England. Entries in the Bristol port books illustrate the Guernsey - England stage of the trade (see Table 12).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>to London</th>
<th>to the English outports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>quantity</td>
<td>quantity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cwts/qu/lbs</td>
<td>cwts/qu/lbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>currants</td>
<td>6973-3-14</td>
<td>1644-2-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prunes</td>
<td>1518-3-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>raisins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>denial</td>
<td>30229-2-11</td>
<td>3775-2-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lyord</td>
<td>1297-3-5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isiaga</td>
<td>8-0-20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solis</td>
<td>4603-2-23</td>
<td>2398-3-6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: PRO CUST 3/63
Table 12: Shipping from Guernsey to Bristol, June 1763.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>June</th>
<th>Vessel</th>
<th>tons</th>
<th>master</th>
<th>crew</th>
<th>cargo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>John Little</td>
<td>m + 2</td>
<td>wine, raisins, cork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thomas Hammon</td>
<td>m + 3</td>
<td>raisins, oil, cork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Andrew Morell</td>
<td>m + 2</td>
<td>raisins, wine, oil, cork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Jenny &amp; Mary</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>John Snow</td>
<td>m + 2</td>
<td>wine, cork &amp;c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Nicholas Enuf</td>
<td>m + 3</td>
<td>raisins, cork</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Long lists of quantities of cargoes are not easy to visualise. How much trade was St. Peter Port handling in relation to other ports? It must be stressed that as an entrepot St Peter Port had a specific and narrow function. The total of cargo traded through the port was smaller in volume and value than that handled in many of the great international ports such as Bordeaux and Liverpool. However, in certain commodity sectors the St Peter Port entrepot trade rivalled that of many of the leading British ports. For example, during the years 1771-1781 on average 1,320 tuns of wine were imported annually into Bristol. This was lower than the average for the preceding two centuries but affords a yardstick for comparison (107). As we have seen, in 1763 just over two and a half thousand tuns of wine from Portugal alone were shipped from the island to England. This was, admittedly, a good year but the figure

Illustrates the fact that the Guernsey merchants were playing a significant role in England's foreign trade. The scale of trading in wine in St Peter Port was even greater by the end of the century. In 1795, a single Guernsey merchant received 2,491 hogsheads and 17 cases (≈ approx 623 tuns) of Claret and Hermitage from Bordeaux for the account of just one London firm. The volume of spirits handled in St Peter Port was even more impressive. In 1802 some 7172 tuns of brandy were imported legally into Great Britain—the equivalent of just half the quantity of brandy shipped through St Peter Port in that year.

By national standards the quantity of tobacco traded by the St Peter Port merchants was relatively modest for much of the century. On the eve of the American War of Independence the Scottish merchants imported nearly 46 million lbs of tobacco, while the Guernsey import was not much greater than a quarter of a million lbs. However, the position altered significantly after the war. By 1795 the total Scottish import of tobacco amounted to 2,731,091 lbs and in 1800 to 4,074,919 lbs, whereas the Guernsey merchants were handling some five to six million lbs of tobacco annually by this time.


(110) E.B. Schumpeter, *op. cit.*, Table XVII, p 59; and *vide supra* for Guernsey figures.

Trade between the island and British ports was clearly of great importance in all aspects of St Peter Port's economy and this is considered in more detail now.

Trade with England and Wales

In the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries Guernsey’s trade with England and Wales was based on London, the ports of the South West, and the coal ports of Newcastle, Sunderland, Swansea and Llanelli. Southampton handled a great deal of Guernsey’s trade. During the war years 1710-1712 nearly half of the vessels clearing from English ports for Guernsey sailed from Southampton. With the return of peace (1713-1717) the total volume of traffic between England and Guernsey increased and Southampton’s share dropped to just below 30%, although the number of sailings from Southampton actually rose during those years ([112]). Southampton continued to serve as a “staple port” to Guernsey throughout the eighteenth century. High priced goods from London were frequently despatched to the island via Southampton, especially during wartime, when the London – Guernsey voyage was endangered by enemy privateers. By 1807 Southampton was forwarding goods from London, Manchester, Birmingham and Sheffield to the island ([113]).

The port books record a large number of vessels sailing from Newcastle and Swansea to the island. These statistics in part represent

[112] See Appendix 17 and Fig 18.


PRO HO 98/30, 5 Feb 1807 Doyle report.
Fig 18: Annual average of vessels clearing from English and Welsh ports for Guernsey, 1710-1717 [see Appendix 17].
the fact that the Guernsey merchants were involved in the export of coal to France. English and Welsh coal transported by sea to the west coast of France was "cheaper there than French coal, which had to be carried great distances overland" [114].

From 1697 onwards official figures exist for Guernsey's trade with England [115]. These have to be interpreted with care as commodities were valued at fixed prices selected at the beginning of the eighteenth century. The statistics therefore suggest the physical volume of foreign trade rather than the value [116]. Moreover the figures make no allowance for smuggled goods. Nevertheless, if analysed with caution the statistics do reveal the growth and changing patterns of Guernsey's trade.

English imports from Guernsey consisted principally of:
(a) island produce: cider, cattle, salt, lobsters, stone and knitwear;
(b) entrepot goods: wine, fruit, salt (French), textiles, iron and a variety of other goods.

During the early eighteenth century the major constituent in the value of imports into England from Guernsey consisted of the woollen garments knitted on the island. The stockings alone sometimes accounted for almost half of the total value of all imports. By the second half of the century this had changed. A much larger volume of entrepot goods was

[115] PRO CUST 3
being imported into England, while the volume of island produce rose only slightly. Although less Guernsey knitwear was imported into England, there was a big increase in the quantity of granite shipped from the island to London.

The exports from England to Guernsey can be classified as follows:

(a) goods for the Guernsey domestic market (principally food, textiles, building materials);

(b) goods destined for the international entrepot trade (including colonial re-exports such as tobacco);

(c) materials required to operate the entrepot trade (glass, timber, iron).

During the course of the century the quantity of commodities required by the Guernsey domestic market rose. This was due, first, to the increase in population which needed more food, clothing and heating (more flour, textiles and coal). Secondly, the growth in prosperity stimulated a demand for more fashionable luxuries (more expensive textiles). Thirdly, a building boom in the last quarter of the century led to the shipping of more limestones, bricks, pantiles, slabs, steps, quoins and slates. Larger quantities of goods were also sent from England for the entrepot market. Moreover the merchants and cooperers needed more glass, bottles, wooden staves and hoops to package their alcohol and tobacco. The busier the harbour became, the greater was the demand for sailcloth, cordage and the ironmongery of the chandler's trade.

Having broadly characterised the nature of England's trade with Guernsey, it remains to examine the trade statistics, always bearing in mind that we are dealing with volume rather than value, and that the
Fig 19: Guernsey - England trade, 1697-1801
(exports from England to Guernsey, imports from Guernsey to England)
Fig 20 (above): Guernsey-England trade, five year centred moving averages of exports (England-Guernsey); imports (Guernsey-England); and aggregate volume of exports and imports moving through St Peter Port; together with the "line of best fit".

Fig 21 (below): Guernsey-England, balance of trade, (positive figures indicate a balance in Guernsey's favour).
The terms of trade improved for Guernsey in these years because the volume of her exports to England increased. It is immediately apparent that these were almost all war years. The merchants of St Peter Port benefited because, with the disruption of international trading patterns, they were able to take over some lucrative business. The exports from Guernsey to England during wartime also include some prize cargoes. During the course of the eighteenth century the aggregate volume of legal trade between England and Guernsey (i.e. imports + exports) increased tenfold (see Fig 20).

Guernsey's trade with Scotland

During the eighteenth century the Scots greatly enjoyed drinking French claret; for some it was a rejection of port - the English drink - and hence an affirmation of Scottish independence. French wines, however, were subject to heavy duties and so the Scots looked to entrepots such as St Peter Port for their supplies. French wine could be shipped from Guernsey to Scotland as Spanish or Portuguese wine, Iberian produce attracting a smaller duty than French at the Scottish port of entry. In 1751-2 and 1760-1 almost all of the French wine landed at Leith was from Guernsey. Other produce imported from Guernsey included French prunes and, occasionally, walnuts, chestnuts and salt. There are some rare references to Scottish exports to Guernsey. Between 1741 and 1744 James Watson, merchant of Greenock, shipped roll and leaf tobacco.
in trusses on board the *Endeavour* of Wexford and the *Mary* of Waterford to the island. However, the total quantity of tobacco shipped to Guernsey seems to have been relatively small.

In general it is very difficult to quantify the scale of trade between Guernsey and Scotland in the first half of the 18th century. There is better evidence for the volume of trade in the second half of the century as customs returns exist for the years 1755 to 1801. They show that generally the volume of imports to Scotland from Guernsey was greater than the volume of exports from Scotland to Guernsey. The imports to Scotland included small quantities of a considerable number of goods, some of Guernsey origin, the rest foreign. In 1775 the list of imports included anchovies, apples, capers, cork, nuts, oil of cloves, olives, pickles, rosin, brandy, vinegar and wine [118]. During the French revolutionary wars large quantities of wine were imported from Guernsey (e.g. 412 tuns 1 hogshead 23 gallons of Spanish wine and 41 tuns 2 hogsheads 45 gallons of French wine in 1799 [119]. There was a regular export from Scotland to Guernsey of small quantities of coal, bottles and green glass. In some years large quantities of tobacco were exported to Guernsey and this altered the terms of trade in Scotland's favour (e.g. 1766: 490,400 lbs of tobacco)


[118] PRO CUST 14/2, f 6r - f 6v (microfilm numbers).

[119] PRO CUST 14/13B, 3 f 12r (microfilm numbers).
Fig 22: Guernsey-Scotland trade, 1755-1801 (exports from Scotland to Guernsey, imports from Guernsey to Scotland).
to Guernsey; 1789: 238,477 lbs.]

Guernsey's trade with Ireland

There was considerable trade between Guernsey and Ireland in the eighteenth century but it is not easy to quantify before 1782/3. In 1765 the parliament of Bordeaux forbade the mixing of Spanish wine with local claret, a mixture esteemed in Ireland and previously exported there in great volume. About 8000 tuns of claret were shipped yearly from Bordeaux to Ireland, according to William Le Marchant. In consequence of the ban on the mixing of wines, the claret and Spanish wines were shipped separately to Guernsey, mixed in the island and forwarded to Ireland. The St Peter Port merchants made a profit of above £3000 on this transaction; and in 1766 the Bordeaux parliament reversed its ban on mixing.

Trade between Guernsey and Ireland seems to have been stimulated during the American War of Independence. In February 1782 Henry Budd complained to the Lieutenant Governor about the considerable quantities

[119] PRO CUST 14/13B, 3 f 12r (microfilm numbering)
[120] PRO CUST 14/1B, f 282v (microfilm numbering); CUST 14/8 f 96v (microfilm numbering). For Scottish trading links with Guernsey in the late 18th and early 19th centuries see also: Scottish Record Office OD.1/306 (Alexander Oliphant Letter Book), correspondence with Mr Thomas Barry of Guernsey about wine, 1767-1768); CS. 96/3231, Sederunt book 1803-1804, p 33: Hugh Mathie bankrupt, stock of wine in Guernsey.

Fig 23: Guernsey–Ireland trade, 1783–1800 (exports from Ireland to Guernsey, imports from Guernsey to Ireland)
salted beef and pork brought from Ireland to Guernsey by Captain Cullen, master of a brigantine from Waterford. These shipments were for Mr Khae, an Irish merchant who had been resident in the island for some months. Some of the provisions were destined for the "iniquitous traffick of conveying from hence salt provisions for the equipment of the enemy's fleet" [122].

It was possibly this episode that led to the recording of Irish - Guernsey trade separately (rather than aggregated with Jersey) [123]. In the last two decades of the eighteenth century Irish exports to Guernsey consisted principally of meat and dairy products (beef, pork, ham, bacon, butter) together with items manufactured from animal fats (candles, soap, tallow). Irish exports were usually shipped from the ports of south-east Ireland (from Dublin round to Cork), but there were occasional shipments of linen from Belfast [124].

Guernsey exports to Ireland consisted of a variety of goods but the main value resided in wines. The volume of trade increased during the French wars, with 966 tuns 1 hogshead 33 gallons of French wine being exported from Guernsey to Ireland in the year ending 25 March 1796; just over 90% of this was for the Dublin market [125]. Exports from Ireland to Guernsey also ran at a higher level during the war years 1793-1800.

[122] PRO HO 98/23, 14 Feb 1782 Budd to Irving; 15 Feb 1782 Irving to Hillsborough. See L. Vignols, 'L'Importation en France au XVIIIe siècle du bœuf salé d'Irlande' in Revue Historique part 150 pp 79-95 (1928) for the context of this trade.
[123] PRO CUST 15/86 onwards lists Guernsey trade separately.
[125] PRO CUST 15/99.
The South American trade in the 19th century

During the Napoleonic Wars the British government could no longer afford to forego the excise and customs dues evaded by smugglers. Acts were introduced in 1805 and 1807 to suppress smuggling and the Guernsey merchants soon found themselves in difficulties [125]. The function of St Peter Port as an entrepot was greatly reduced and there was considerable unemployment. The merchants looked for new markets and turned towards South America, to Brazil and St Domingo "where most of the low articles of India goods" found "a ready sale" [126]. In fact the Guernsey merchants discovered that in South America they could sell a diversity of cargoes from Northern Europe and the Mediterranean. Their trade centred on Rio de Janeiro. In the 18 months from January 1825 to June 1826 there were 43 arrivals in Rio of 26 Guernsey vessels. The usual return cargoes from Brazil consisted of coffee, hides and sugar. On return to Europe the vessels touched at Gibraltar where they received instructions about their port of unloading [127].

This trade represented a significant shift from the eighteenth-century pattern. Although some of the voyages originated from, or ended in, St Peter Port, many of the voyage "legs" were between foreign ports. The South American trade involved the St Peter Port merchants in a

[126] PRO CUST 105/102, 27 Jan 1810 Guernsey Customs to Commissioners.
[127] Star 6 Feb 1827 p 2 c-e; Star, 18 Oct 1826, p 3b.
See Appendixes 18 and 19.
carrying trade rather than in a home-based entrepot business. Although organised from St Peter Port, the commercial centre of the new trade was Rio de Janeiro. There were profits for the shipowners but the harbour and town of St Peter Port slowly lost out.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Cargo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ancona</td>
<td>wheat; paper;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antwerp</td>
<td>wheat;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arichat</td>
<td>cod fish;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahia</td>
<td>red wine; olive oil; wheat;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buenos Ayres</td>
<td>hides;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genoa</td>
<td>olive oil; wheat; tallow candles; paper; steel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibraltar</td>
<td>brandy; red wine; ale and porter; olive oil; biscuit; paper; steel; huts;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guernsey</td>
<td>brandy; geneva; wheat; cheese; red wine; white wine; cider; vinegar; ale and porter; cordage; hams; olive oil; potatoes; soap; linseed oil; glass; iron bars; brooms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isle Mayo</td>
<td>salt; brandy; geneva;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oporto</td>
<td>port wine; onions; ale and porter;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sete</td>
<td>brandy; red wine; wheat; onions; paper; steel;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sisily</td>
<td>brandy; red wine; olive oil; wheat; steel;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarragona</td>
<td>brandy; red wine; olive oil; paper; steel; tallow candles; macaroni; currants;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trieste</td>
<td>olive oil; wheat;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Having reviewed the development of Guernsey's trade, it is appropriate to take a short look at the evolution of the island's fleet. It will be seen that the shipping reflected the changing patterns of foreign trade handled by the St Peter Port merchants.

In 1680 there were eighteen vessels based in St Peter Port. The commonest type of vessel was the bark, of which there were eight. The pink was the second favourite type of vessel. Whereas the barks were mainly French built, all five of the pinks were of English construction. These were larger than the barks, ranging in size from 50 to 120 tons. Vessels described as pinks were very often of the fly-boat type with hull forms of the Dutch fashion. This achieved "a high carrying capacity in relation to the ship's main measurements" (129). The barks and pinks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Tons</th>
<th>Avg. tonnage</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pinks</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>all English built</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ketches</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barks</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>2 English, 6 French built</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shallop</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>English built</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small hoy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ship</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>French built</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Royal Court, Legge Survey.

were particularly well suited to the carrying of cargoes between St Malo and England.

Between 1680 and 1701 the number of Guernsey's ships nearly doubled. This can be attributed to successes in trading and in privateering. In 1701 Guernsey owned 32 vessels, of 1260 tons; the crew strength was 180 men. This represents an average tonnage for Guernsey vessels of 39.4 tons, somewhat lower than the average for the shipping of all outports (62.0 tons). In comparison with the shipping owned by English ports the fleet of St Peter Port was relatively modest. London boasted 140 thousand tons, Liverpool nine thousand and Whitehaven seven thousand. Southampton's fleet, however, with 1.6 thousand tons was not much larger (130).

Aggregate details for the mid-eighteenth century are lacking. In 1788 Guernsey is listed as possessing 69 vessels of 5074 tons (131). The 1788 record may be incomplete as the island was credited with 77 vessels of 5861 tons in 1789 (132). These figures suggest that the size of the island fleet was approximately 4.7 greater in 1789 than it had been in 1701. This is in line with the average growth of the fleets

---

(130) PRO ADM 1/3863, 187627 (dated 1702; refers to 1701). See also the Introduction; and P Corfield, The Impact of English Towns 1700-1800 (Oxford, 1982), pp 36 – 37, for 1709 data.

(131) BL Add Mem 38376 f 85r – f 88r.

belonging to the English outports. In 1788 London possessed 315 thousand tons of shipping, Liverpool 76 thousand tons, Whitehaven 52 thousand tons, Southampton 9 thousand tons \[\text{[133]}\].

Much of the Guernsey fleet consisted of relatively small vessels suitable for bulk-breaking. In 1788 six vessels (8.7%) were under twenty tons; twenty four vessels (34.8%) were between 20 – 40 tons; and twelve (17.4%) were between 40 – 60 tons. Thus, over half of the shipping was made up of vessels of 60 tons and below. Only seventeen ships (24.6%) were over 100 tons (see Fig 26).

There was some shipbuilding in Guernsey during the eighteenth century but most vessels were English or plantation built \[\text{[134]}\]. Vessels suitable for privateering were bought on the outbreak of war \[\text{[135]}\]. After a period of successful privateering there were captured enemy ships for sale in St Peter Port; these could sometimes be bought cheaply \[\text{[136]}\]. In 1788 nine out of Guernsey’s sixty nine vessels were prize ships \[\text{[137]}\].

The number of Guernsey vessels increased from 77 to 88 between 1789 and 1801; and then from 86 to 112 between the years 1801-1803 (see Figs


\[\text{[134]}\] See Chapter 4 below for Guernsey shipbuilding.

\[\text{[135]}\] Priaulx 18459 p 103, 25 July 1778 Guille to Tonkin (offering a share in a Bermudan built vessel. mounting sixteen guns, purchased at Bristol).

\[\text{[136]}\] Priaulx 18459 p 122, 11 Oct 1778 Guille to Perkins.

\[\text{[137]}\] BL Add Mss 38276 f 88r - f88r.
Fig 24 (above): The size of the Guernsey fleet, 18th century
(Source: see text)

Fig 25 (below): The size of the Guernsey fleet, 19th century
(Source: J. Marshall, *A Digest of all the Accounts* (London, 1833)
Part 2, pp 226, 234)
With the decline of the entrepot trade (1805-1810), the island fleet grew smaller. The decline was arrested, however, by the development of the trade with South America. From 1812 onwards there was considerable shipbuilding in and near St Peter Port. Many of the vessels were designed specifically for the requirements of local merchants - the brigs for voyages to South America, the cutters for Channel trading. In 1827 the Guernsey fleet numbered 78 vessels (7723 aggregate tons) \[138\].

Table 15: Ships belonging to St Peter Port, 1827

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Built in</th>
<th>Guernsey</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Built in</td>
<td>elsewhere</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ships</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigs</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schooners</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sloops and cutters</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasure vessel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Fig 26: The composition of the Guernsey fleet, 1680, 1788, 1827. (Vertical axis - number of ships; horizontal axis - tonnage)
So far this chapter has been concerned with the trade of the Guernsey merchants and in particular with their development of St Peter Port as an entrepot. It has been argued that from the mid-18th century St Peter Port was one of the principal commercial entrepots in the Atlantic economy and that this generated considerable profits. By the beginning of the nineteenth century the British government was losing so much excise and customs duty on goods smuggled from St Peter Port into England that it introduced legislation which crippled the entrepot trade. However, the Guernsey merchants soon found a profitable new venture by trading with the newly opened markets in South America. It remains to re-assess one of the more notable aspects of the port economy — privateering. This has often been represented as the source of St Peter Port’s wealth. C.E. Brett argued that there was only very moderate prosperity until the American, Revolutionary and Napoleonic wars. "Vast fortunes were made, still pretty much legally, by privateering; one merchant, John Le Mesurier, brought in £212,000 with eight ships in the course of 1779 alone" (139). The value of privateering and the relative importance of trade are central issues which need to be resolved.

Privateering

In 1689 King William allowed the neutrality of the Channel Islands to lapse. This meant, inter alia, that it became legitimate in wartime for Guernseymen to operate as privateers both in local waters and further away. Furnished with letters of marque issued by the High Court of Admiralty in London the Guernsey privateers were able to cruise

in armed traders or private men-of-war and capture enemy merchant vessels. As Great Britain was frequently at war with the Bourbon powers during the "long" eighteenth century, there were frequent opportunities for the islanders to engage in privateering. Professor Bromley has observed that at first "the Islands were extremely slow to commission privateers" (140). This reluctance is probably to be attributed to a desire to continue trading with the French. However, from c.1696 the islanders committed themselves more energetically to attacking the enemy. Professor Bromley estimated that the Guernsey captors received at least £200,000 gross in the Spanish Succession War alone. Later wars were also, apparently, profitable. The value of the prizes taken during the American War of Independence (£981,300) has commonly been regarded as the source of the wealth that led to the urban improvement of St Peter Port (141).

Peter Wickins has urged that the profits from privateering were widely dispersed "enough to thwart rather than promote capital accumulation" (142). He does allow that "the dispersion was less than

would appear at first sight from the number of beneficiaries entitled to participate in the rewards" [143]; and in the third stage of his essay he does present material that can be used to qualify his initial thesis.

Assessing two earlier wars Professor Bromley established the impressive extent of Guernsey privateering in the period 1689-1697 and 1702-1712 but concluded by agreeing with the seventeenth century Jersey historian who commented that "Privateering, which, tho' gainful to some particular Persons, could not make us amends for the loss of peaceable open Trade, the Benefit whereof is more general and diffusive" [144]. Dr Jamieson, examining the period 1739-1783, opined that trade "whether in peace or war, was the main source of capital in the islands and brought prosperity to the widest section of the population. Privateering... brought wealth to only a handful of investors" [145].

This revisionism has served a valuable purpose. Many of the figures bandied about by earlier historians related to the initial gross value of the captured prizes and for a variety of legal reasons the net profits were frequently considerably less. Nevertheless, the revisionists' case cannot be accepted uncritically. Much of the recent debate has centred on the account book of Vardon and Duniere, St Peter Port merchants who were part-owners, and acted as the agents of

have argued that the costs of administering the prize "took nearly 30% of gross takings" or "no less than 30%" [146]. However, their analysis seems to discount the fact that part of the administrative expenses consisted of agents' commissions and expenses. As the agents were part owners they were paying themselves. Such payments should not be aggregated as part of some "lost" administrative fee, as though parallel to disbursements to the British Admiralty Court. There are in fact several ways in which the existing accounts could be re-arranged to present a more favourable picture of the profitability of privateering - at least for the owner-agents, if not for other investors. Interpretations of the accounts books of 18th century merchants should, perhaps, be conducted with at least some of the scepticism of a twentieth century accountant. Agents such as Vardon and Duniere had a direct interest in maximising their personal gain and in limiting the amount that had to be paid out to investors and third parties. It follows that their accounts almost certainly present a somewhat biased perspective of the profitability of privateering.

Further, there is a methodological problem. An intensive study of the accounts of one firm cannot constitute a good foundation for making judgments about the profitability of privateering in general. Even if accurate conclusions could be reached about the profitability of Vardon and Duniere's activities, it would still not be clear whether the particular case study was typical. Moreover, a significant answer

would not be achieved until a counter-factual hypothesis had been formulated and evaluated (e.g. what would the profitability of Vardon and Duniere's partnership have been had they engaged solely in trade rather than in trade and privateering?). So far the debate has been too preoccupied with a micro-economic approach to the problem, concentrating on details of shares and the arcana of privateering law.

The concern of this study is with the impact of privateering on the economy of St Peter Port. In the immediate context of the urban economy privateering appears to have been beneficial. First, it should be noted that much of the money invested in fitting out and maintaining privateering voyages came from outside the town and, indeed, from outside the island [147]. The *négociants* in St Peter Port who acted as agents and armateurs were cushioned against failure. Even if a privateer made no captures, the agent could set expenses against the shares of the investors (as has been argued above in discussing the account book of Vardon and Duniere). It was the *marginal* investor who stood to lose; those operating the system had a good chance of covering their expenses, at the least.

Secondly, privateering had a wider impact on the urban economy than is implied by a study that concentrates exclusively on the analysis of prize values. The total equation should take into account the stimulus to the St Peter Port economy resulting from the arrival in the town of adventurers and seamen. The prospect of prizes attracted mariners from far and wide. Peter Carey estimated that in the Eleven

Years War some 1,700 men were employed in privateering, half from
Guernsey, the remainder being English, Irish, Dutch and others [148].
These men ate, drank, lodged and fornicated in St Peter Port both while
looking for employment and in the intervals between voyages. Moreover
while crews were ashore the ships laid in copious supplies of victuals
from the St Peter Port market in preparation for the next cruise; at
times this led to scarcities and high prices [149].

Thirdly, the auctions of prize cargoes attracted foreign
merchants to St Peter Port. During the period 1777-1782 there were at
least 164 such sales in Guernsey, some of which were advertised in
Lloyd's Evening Post. The issue for 31 March - 2 April 1779 carried
six advertisements for forthcoming Guernsey sales [150]. Apart from the
prize cargoes there were captured vessels for sale. In the autumn of
1778 there were vessels of all sizes available in Guernsey "from 80
tons to 300, mostly French built new and old, selling cheaply" and the
Dutch came over to buy them [151]. These contacts may well have borne
other commercial fruit; in that sense the value of privateering is
unquantifiable.

[148] PRO SP 47/4, 9 Nov 1739 Carey to Duke of Newcastle.
[149] The Case of the Town Parish versus the Nine Country
Parishes...1759 (Guernsey, 1843), p 27.
[150] Greffe, de Saumarez papers (D.I.15.21), list of prizes.
Lloyd's Evening Post, 31 Mar - 2 Apr 1779, vol xliv, no 3397, p
316. (Illustrated in Plates section).
This analysis suggests that there should be a measured appreciation of the role of privateering in the generation of wealth in St Peter Port. It is mistaken to see privateering in the late 18th century as the sudden source of urban wealth (pace C.E. Brett); but it would be equally misleading to discount the significance of privateering to the urban economy (pace P.L. Wickins). There is, happily, some completely independent evidence which illuminates the rate at which St Peter Port grew wealthier during the 18th century. This is now discussed.

In nearly every year from the 1720s onwards the inhabitants of St Peter Port were assessed for tax purposes. Throughout the 18th century income served as the basis for these assessments. Those engaged in privateering had their assessments revised upwards relatively quickly after any success (152). Consequently the aggregate tax assessments reflect the economic fortunes of the town and provide independent evidence about the impact of privateering (see Fig 27).

The graph reveals that St Peter Port became increasingly wealthy during the 18th century and analysis suggests that trade, not privateering, was the crucial factor in generating this urban prosperity. The rapid rise in the aggregate assessments in the early 1720s corresponds with the prosperous years of the St Malo trade. There was no growth during the 1730s but the economy picked up again in the mid-1740s, precisely at the time when the merchants were building

[152] The Case of the Town Parish versus the Nine Country Parishes. 1759 p 60. The tax assessments are considered in more detail later (Chapter 5 below).
Fig 27: The taxable wealth of St Peter Port, 1722-1834, in quarters of wheat (semi-logarithmic graph).

their spacious warehouses and developing the entrepot trade. From then onwards the town grew wealthier at a relatively constant rate. The fortunes of privateering and the influx of wealth during the American War are discernible but hardly exceptional. The economy "peaked" in the early years of the Napoleonic War but then suffered a setback when the British government suppressed the smuggling trade. This affected the poor much more seriously than the rich who, by this time, were protected by their extensive savings in the British funds. In the post 1814 era many taxpayers prospered by switching to the French funds and the merchants reaped profits from the trade with South America (153).

The tax assessments indicate that during the 18th century the rate of growth of urban wealth was marginally greater during some war years. Privateering did make its contribution; but it was as an entrepot that St Peter Port annually grew richer. Even during war years commercial success was due as much to trade as to privateering. The island merchants happily traded with the enemy. During the American War the French sent orders to Guernsey by way of Amsterdam; and the St Peter Port merchants used neutral shipping to deliver cargoes (154).

Finally, privateering was not always what it seemed to be. Although Guernsey privateers captured French vessels, the enemy did not:

(154) Fraulex 18459 p 123, 12 Oct 1778 Guille to Menais Robert frères: 'il ne nous est point défendu de faire commerce avec la France par le moyen des neutres, il faut faire des expéditions simulés, soit pour Hollande, Espagne ou Portugal ou se servir d'un négociant d'Hollande'.

C1543 Priaulx 18459 p 123, 12 Oct 1778 Guille to Menais Robert frères: 'il ne nous est point défendu de faire commerce avec la France par le moyen des neutres, il faut faire des expéditions simulés, soit pour Hollande, Espagne ou Portugal ou se servir d'un négociant d'Hollande'.

Finally, privateering was not always what it seemed to be. Although Guernsey privateers captured French vessels, the enemy did not:
lose: Malgré que les corsaires & fregates prennent les Françaïs ils n'y perdent rien parce qu'ils sont assurés à Londres (155). The island merchants and the French waged war at the expense of the English: "en pareil cas c'est faire la guerre aux depens des Anglais" commented Guille (156). The islanders ostentatiously paraded their success at privateering. However, their exploits demand closer scrutiny. During the years 1780-1783 fifty letters-of-marque were issued to commanders of Alderney and Guernsey vessels to proceed against Dutch shipping. This resulted in the condemnation of just four Dutch prizes. Meanwhile the commanders of vessels based at Penzance were granted fifteen similar letters-of-marque and secured seven Dutch prizes (157). Either the islanders were not very successful at privateering against the Dutch; or they used their letters-of-marque in an unusual fashion.

Conclusion

In the late seventeenth century the St Peter Port merchants profited from the prosperity of St Malo. As the Malouins did not trust the English the islanders were able to play a major role in the carrying trade between St Malo and England. In the first half of the eighteenth century the merchants transformed the port facilities of

[155] Priaux 18459 p 119, 18 Sept 1778, Guille to Brilliantais Marion (St Malo).

[156] Ibid.

St Peter Port. They improved the harbour and built some twenty or thirty commodious warehouses. These entrepreneurial initiatives, coupled with the traditional trading privileges claimed by the islanders, underpinned the growth of St Peter Port as an entrepot. The merchants educated their sons for trade (1581); and sent them out to European and American ports to serve as agents. This created a network through which orders, credit and commercial intelligence flowed easily. The merchants of St Peter Port grew progressively wealthier thanks to the entrepot trade. The British government did not recognise St Peter Port as a free port de jure; but de facto the port functioned as such.

By the second half of the eighteenth century St Peter Port was a major commercial centre in the world of the Atlantic economy. Trade was the central concern of the négociants. In wartime privateering offered a partial substitute for lost trade. Privateering brought profits to some individuals, particularly to the amateurs who organised the speculative enterprises. However, war also offered opportunities for profitable trade. The négociants were not unanimously in favour of privateering; their métier was international trade. The principal value of privateering was constitutional. The Guernsey merchants regularly defended their privileges (and the entrepot) by extolling their value as privateers; Guernsey was a nursery of seamen, a front-line against

(158) Henry De Saumarez was educated in Holland "to learn commerce": De Saumarez, An Account of the Proceedings of Henry De Saumarez, of the Island of Guernesey, Gent., (London, 1717), p 3. Many merchants' sons were sent to England in the 18th century for the same purpose.
the French (159). The British government tolerated these arguments until the era of the Napoleonic Wars. Then, impatient with the scale of smuggling from the island to England (and the lost excise revenue), it compelled the Guernsey merchants to abandon supplying smugglers (160). The négociants weathered the crisis and re-adjusted their trading patterns. They found a new way to exploit the commercial potential of their international network of agents and developed a carrying trade between Europe and Rio de Janeiro. This was a profitable new venture for the Guernsey négociants involved but one in which the town of St Peter Port played a much reduced role; its days as a major international entrepot were at an end.

(160) See Appendix 15 for estimates of lost revenue.
CHAPTER 4
THE INTERNAL ECONOMY OF THE TOWN

St Peter Port was both a port and a market town. These functions fashioned the structure of its internal economy. As a market town it was a central place offering services and marketing to the island; as a port it linked the island economy to a wider trading network (1). The first section of this chapter studies the role of St Peter Port as a market centre. This leads onto an analysis of the internal structure of the town's economy in the 17th and early 18th centuries. Merchants dominated the urban hierarchy and regulated the work of the town. Below the merchants there were a few professionals and a large number of labourers. The merchants operated a putting-out industry which tied the rural parishes tightly to the urban economy.

The second section of the chapter examines the impact of the entrepot on the urban economy in the 18th century. The merchants invested in the infrastructure, developed harbour-related industries and fostered crafts. The success of the entrepot created wealth that was available, in part, for conspicuous consumption. This encouraged the growth of services and the opening of specialist retail shops. The trend was accelerated in the 1780s when a larger British garrison was stationed at Fort George (in the town parish).

The final section of the chapter analyses the economic readjustment that occurred in the early 19th century when the entrepot trade declined and the garrison was reduced in size. The shipbuilding

industry was expanded and St Peter Port enjoyed quiet prosperity as a market town and minor resort.

The market centre for the island

During the mediaeval period St Peter Port emerged as the market centre for the island. The town became the location of a fish market in the 13th century "for the sustenance and convenience of the lord king's castles and garrison and of all the people of the island", the market days being established as Tuesdays, Thursdays and Saturdays. Next, in 1309, the general market of the island was moved from the Catel parish to St Peter Port. Three reasons were given for the transfer. First, St Peter Port was a sort of borough ("quasi-burgum") whereas the other parishes were country vills with houses dispersed in the fields. Secondly, there was "a far greater concourse" of people, both countrymen and strangers, at St Peter Port than in any other parish. Thirdly, in practice there already was buying and selling in St Peter Port on Sundays when, during service, they held a market "to the great scandal of Christianity". It was decided before the king's justices in 1309 that thenceforth the market should be held exclusively in the vlll of St Peter Port every Thursday [2]. In some respects St Peter Port was not as convenient a location for the island market as the

(2) J.H. Le Patourel,'The Early History of St Peter Port' TSG vol xii part ii, for 1934 (Guernsey, 1935), p 187. By the 18th century produce was sold in St Peter Port streets every day of the week, Sundays excepted, The Case of The Town Parish versus the Nine Country Parishes...1759 (Guernsey, 1843), p 9.
more central Catel parish; but with its inhabitants, soldiers and strangers the town was the natural destination for islanders with agricultural surplus to sell. The decision of 1309 confirmed an economic reality.

The fact that marketing in St Peter Port was conducted next to the church was not unusual in the medieval world. In England buying and selling took place wherever there were regular assemblies; churches provided good opportunities "for they attracted people every Sunday and especially on festivals" [3]. From the fourteenth to the nineteenth century the Guernsey markets continued to be held near the town church. In the early modern period the principal markets were located in the High Street. Fish was displayed for sale on mats near the juncture of the Grande Rue and the Carrefour; lower down the street countrywomen displayed vegetables; and butchers hung, carved and sold their meat at the junction of Grande Rue and Cow Lane [4].

The market brought countryfolk into St Peter Port throughout the year. The town was also the location of a great fair held annually just before Christmas [5]. On this occasion countryfolk brought to the merchants of St Peter Port garments that they had knitted during the

---


Having sold their handicraft, the countryfolk bought from traders. In 1758 William Le Marchant, jurat and
the annual profits made by the country in supplying each, one with the other. £2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fish, at 15s. each</td>
<td>£1875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eggs, at 10s. per hhd.</td>
<td>£1250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wool, at 8d. per lb.</td>
<td>£5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt, at 10s. each</td>
<td>£1600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuts, and eggs</td>
<td>£600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>物 ships and heating the ovens</td>
<td>£225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>光 fish</td>
<td>£400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>光 and greens, &amp;c</td>
<td>£800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total sterling</td>
<td>£22,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Estimated that the country spent £4000 on "such things in the town" and concluded that there remained a balance of the country inhabitants profit upon those of the town in war. But Le Marchant wanted to rebut the idea that the country should pay a larger proportion of the island for the effects in trade of merchants in town should be for purposes. Consequently his audit was selective and

Town Parish versus the Nine Country Parishes...1759, pp 23-24.
biased. He ignored the knitting industry; and dismissed the rentes paid by country inhabitants to down dwellers with the sophistry that the former grew every year more wheat upon their grounds than was necessary to pay the rentes. But despite the bias Le Marchant's calculation throws a valuable light on the volume of trade between the country parishes and St Peter Port.

Having examined the marketing relationship between town and country, it is time to analyse the internal structure of the St Peter Port economy in more detail.

The internal economy of the town

In the early modern period the shape of the urban hierarchy of St Peter Port seems, as in many English towns, to have resembled a pyramid with a narrow elite of merchants at the apex and large numbers of poor people at the base. The elite controlled both the urban and insular economies. As merchants operating in the port they managed foreign trade. Those serving as jurats were able to implement pro-trade policies in their ordonnances and court judgments. Although the merchants were not great landowners in the fashion of their English contemporaries, many owned small farms in the country parishes.

The English term merchant in fact translates two French words — négociant and marchand. The négociant operated on a grander scale, he was like a wholesaler, trading with other merchants and selling his commodities "in bales, cases or full lots" (71). The marchand on the

---

71 R. L. Stein, The French Slave Trade in the Eighteenth Century
(Wisconsin, 1979), p 152.
other hand operated in the retail market, selling commodities to consumers. In the early eighteenth century approximately sixty leading 'marchants et negocians' working in St Peter Port contributed to the harbour developments [8]. Apart from trading, this mercantile elite financed shipping and privateering and organised the putting-out of a knitting industry [9].

Below the elite came a small number of professionals such as the rector, doctors, and advocates. As late as 1775 there were only three medical practitioners serving the whole island [10]. It is not possible to calculate the number of people working in other sectors of the St Peter Port economy because scarcely any relevant source material has survived. However, church registers, wills, actes and ordonnances sometimes refer to occupations and this makes it possible to sketch in outline the rest of the structure of the urban economy.

A certain number of the inhabitants of the parish of St Peter Port were occupied in agriculture and fishing, the town providing an immediate market for their produce. The provision of food and drink involved millers, bakers, fishmongers, butchers and brewers. Innkeepers, sometimes styled "taverniers" but usually known as

"cabaretiers", supplied drink and, by an ordonnance of 1611, were required to keep two beds ready to accommodate travellers. In 1683 there were 24 licensed cabaretiers in St Peter Port and they probably gave employment to a number of servants [11].

The building and clothing trades were other important sectors of the urban economy. In metalworking St Peter Port could boast blacksmiths, pewterers and a few silversmiths [12]. The port sector required ships' carpenters, sailmakers, block makers, porters, carriers and boatmen; and suppliers of cordage, pitch, tar and other equipment. Part of the urban population was made up of seamen and captains; in 1701 the thirty two vessels of Guernsey were crewed by 180 men, many if not all of whom lodged in St Peter Port [13].

An ordonnance of 1605 regulating the wages of artisans and manual labourers ("travailleurs de bras") provides some insights into the structure of the economy [14]. The passing of this ordonnance may possibly have been caused by a shortage of skilled manual labour.

[12] R.H. Kayne, Old Channel Islands Silver (Jersey, 1969); C. Woolmer and C. Arkwright, Pewter of the Channel Islands (Edinburgh, 1973);
G.J.C. Bois, An Introduction to Channel Islands Pewter (Jersey, 1993).
[13] PRO ADM 1/3863 'An abstract of the number of vessels..' 
Table 16: The wages of artisans, Guernsey, 1605

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>To Master (dras. ster.)</th>
<th>To Artisan (dras. ster.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ships' carpenters</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common carpenters</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone dressers and master masons</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common masons</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slaters</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thatchers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woolcombers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvesters</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodcutters</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardeners</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common labourers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The regulations reveal a labour hierarchy, ships' carpenters being permitted to earn three times the amount fixed for common labourers. Of the eleven occupations regulated, five were immediately connected with the construction sector. Some evidence suggests that building craftsmen were in short supply in Guernsey in the early modern period. For example, when building work was undertaken by James de Haviland in the mid-17th century craftsmen were brought across from England [15].

Retailing was poorly developed in the town in the seventeenth century and there are frequent references to Frenchmen visiting the island to sell commodities. In 1658, for example, a Norman doctor arrived with three assistants. They erected a theatre in front of Jean Bord's house, played some tricks and sold medicines for all sorts of diseases. After six weeks they returned to France "having made much money... for the time they were here" [16]. Complaints were made from time to time about strangers retailing their goods "en chambres" and in the street [17].

There was little specialisation in the retail shops that did exist in St Peter Port. Nathaniel Carey's account book, kept between 1737 and 1747, shows that he dealt in a wide range of goods including wine, spirits, groceries, shoes and textiles [18]. In the mid-18th century the Misses Rivoueres stocked drugs, spices, chintz and china at their shop in Fountain Street. Shops were of the simplest "look up" variety, a lowered shutter at a window offering an outside counter (see Illustration 5). Window decoration was unusual, although not unknown. In 1763, to celebrate the end of the Seven Years' War, the shops of St Peter Port "assumed a gayer appearance than usual". Esther Naho's shop displayed "an astonishing variety" of nuts, almonds, penny whistles and purple-dyed eggs "at uncommonly low prices" [19].

Women constituted an essential part of the urban economy as they supplied a large reserve of cheap or "free" labour. Female work was used as a substitute for male work, allowing men to be released for other occupations. While some merchants travelled abroad their wives looked after their commercial interests in St Peter Port. Some wives continued in business when widowed. Most of the women working in the town seem, like their English counterparts, to have been predominantly of the middling and lower ranks and employed either in occupations connected with textiles, petty retailing and the provision of food and drink or in domestic service [20]. Details of these women and their work are usually lacking but documents occasionally provide what may be glimpses of typical situations. For example, in 1707 Jean Gruchy and his wife Marthe sold their partnership interest in a shop in St Peter Port to the third partner, their mother, Marie Bonamy, because they found that they were called to be "more in the fields than in town". Not having the time to help in the shop as they would have wished, they

sold their share of the stock to their mother for 400 l.t. [21].

At the “base” of the economic pyramid there was a large pool of poor people. These constituted a cheap urban workforce and provided the common labourers needed in the port and construction trades. But much of that work was seasonal and it is probable that underemployment was a frequent problem. It was in these circumstances that the merchants were able to operate a putting-out industry.

The knitting industry

Until c.1750 the knitting industry was of major economic significance to St Peter Port and Guernsey. It produced a valuable export for English and foreign markets; and in the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries it provided employment for nearly half the total population of the island. The industry was organised on a “putting-out” basis. This employed many rural workers who combined the by-employment of knitting with their farm work. But putting-out was also an important part of the economy of St Peter Port. The town merchants organised the industry; and many urban workers found employment either in preparing the wool or in knitting [22].

The industry may have arisen in a Ricardian manner as a response to population pressure and land scarcity. This produced a supply of


[22] The Case of the Town Parish versus the Nine Country Parishes...1759 (Guernsey, 1843), p 9 (“hundreds of the common people in town, who have no other way of getting their livelihood but by knitting hose or stockings”). Cp. L.A. Clarkson, Proto-Industrialization: The First Phase of Industrialization? (Hasingstoke, 1991), p 54.
labour surplus to the requirements of agriculture. Moreover, even amongst those engaged in agriculture there was seasonal underemployment which made by-employment a useful extra source of income. Finally, the system of paribale inheritance practised in Guernsey meant that small land holdings were the rule rather than the exception. As a consequence farms were frequently too small to provide a family with more than a subsistence living. Combined, these factors produced the classic conditions for the establishment of a putting-out system. The pool of underemployed rural workers was available to the owners of circulating capital looking for cheap labour. Merchants were in an ideal position to benefit from putting-out as they controlled both the original purchase and distribution of the wool and organised the export of the finished goods.

There were several ways in which production could be organised. Two German words neatly categorise the two main branches: Kaufsystem and Verlagsystem. The Kaufsystem was a form of production characterised by familial production units which were subjected to the dominance of merchant capital; while the Verlagsystem was characterised by large scale production units, with significant division of labour, dominated by the 'marchand-fabricant' [23]. Both the Kaufsystem and the Verlagsystem appear to have been practised in Guernsey. In 1677 Charles Trumbull described St Peter Port as being inhabited by "stocking merchants as they will call themselves, those that buy all the stockings"

that are made in the island and barter or sell them away by wholesale in France" [24]. This implies a Kaufsystem. In 1716 petitioners from Jersey and Guernsey explained that merchants delivered the raw wool in small parcels to the wool combers, each parcel containing one or two tods. The owners later parcelled out the combed wool in small quantities (not exceeding one or two pounds in weight) to great numbers of women, girls and other poor people [25]. The knitters were required to bring the finished stockings before a further quantity of wool was given out to any of them. The letter book of the merchant John Guille suggests that he was, perhaps, operating something closer to a Verlagsystem in the 1770s [26]. The evidence is not clear-cut. It is possible that the Kaufsystem developed through time into a Verlagsystem or, the Verlagsystem may have been the characteristic form of production in the town.

Whether Kaufsystem or Verlagsystem, the merchants in St Peter Port controlled the whole operation for it was they who imported the wool under licence from England. The licences were crucial. In January 1685 Mary Major, widow, and Peter Major, her son, sent a petition to Lord Hatton pointing out that formerly she had received 60 tods of wool "which was but a small quantity, and not able to suffice us who keep both the combing and the stocking trade"; as they had an allowance now

[26] Priaulx 18459, Guille letters to Crew and Tatham.
of only thirty tods they had "been constrained to buy licences at a very dear rate to our very great prejudice and of the poor people which we employ" (27). By the second half of the eighteenth century the island knitting industry was dominated by just a few merchants. This situation seems to have come about through the practice of buying licences. The shift towards oligopoly may represent the transition from Kaufsystem to Verlagsystem.

The quantity of wool exported from England was regulated by an Act of Parliament passed in Charles II's reign which permitted the export of 1000 tods annually to Guernsey (28). However, the knitting industry on the island increased to such an extent that during the reign of James II the allowance was raised to 2000 tods (29). The supply of wool from England was supplemented occasionally by cargoes imported from other countries. In October 1687 le Sieur Samuel Dobree was actioned by Pierre Vallet, part owner of the ship le Content for 12 livres tournois for the freight on four "pouchees de laine" brought from Bilbao to Guernsey (30). On the other hand, not all of the wool exported from England to Guernsey reached its destination as some

[27] BL Add Hist 29461 f 37r, 25 Jan 1684/5 Major to Hatton.
[28] *Statutes of the Realm* 12 Car II cap. 32.
cargoes were illegally "owed" to France [31]. It follows that we should understand that approximately two thousand tods of wool were imported annually into Guernsey.

Most of the wool was used to make stockings, but smaller quantities of other garments were also knitted. The exports from Guernsey to London in 1699 included 19 dozen pairs of breeches; 3 dozen pairs of gloves; 31 petticoats; 14 dozen pairs of sleeves (for women); 1751.3 dozen pairs of stockings; and 51.3 dozen waistcoats. The exports to the English outports included blankets, coarse, 5 parcels; breeches 104 pairs; gloves knit 7 dozen 1 pair; petticoats 3; stockings 1273.3 dozen pairs; ditto, women's 6 dozen; worst caps 5 3 4 dozen; worst drawers 12 pairs; worst waistcoats 213 dozen; and a small quantity of serge and worsted stuff [32].

Some tentative calculations can be made about the volume and value of the industry. A knitter could produce one or two pairs of stockings per week. In England the aulnage collectors in 1595 reckoned that one knitter made two pairs of stockings per week [33]. However, a more relevant indicator may be that in 1687 six thousand knitters in Jersey reputedly made 6,000 pairs of stockings weekly, using 100 tods of uncombed wool [34]. If the Guernsey knitters worked at the same rate as


[34] S. Carey Curtis, op. cit. p 363.
their Jersey counterparts, it would have taken approximately 2300 people to transform the whole of the 2000 tods into 120 thousand pairs of stockings. But this leaves out of the reckoning the people needed to clean, comb and spin the wool preparatory to the knitting. It is not easy to find reliable figures for these processes but clearly the whole operation - from tods of raw wool to finished stockings - could easily have involved three thousand islanders. Joan Thirsk calculated that the English domestic market employed somewhere between 90,000 and 220,000 knitters [35]. Her figures suggested that somewhere between 1.6% and 4.0% of the English population were involved in knitting stockings and she concluded that the industry was a substantial employer of labour. The Guernsey figures suggest that perhaps a third of the total island population of the island was engaged in the industry in the late seventeenth century.

The knitters were badly paid. In the early 18th century they earned no more than 4d a week by their knitting "but can hardly subsist thereby" [36]. In 1759 it was reckoned that there were very few who could earn one shilling per week "and the others not that sum" [37].

[36] The Case of the Inhabitants of the Island of Guernsey, in Relation to several Orders of Council obtained by the Commissioners of the Customs, for settling Custom-House-Officers in the Island, and subjecting the Inhabitants to the Laws relating to the Customs in Great Britain [c 1708/91].
[37] The Case of the Town Parish versus the Nine Country Parishes...1759 (Guernsey, 1843), p 9.
The merchants, on the other hand, seem to have made a relatively good profit. In the late seventeenth century — at a time when there was parity between market prices and the prices recorded by the English customs — Guernsey stockings imported into England were entered as worth 24 to 30 shillings per dozen pairs (i.e., approximately 2s 3d per pair). The St Peter Port merchants often dealt in high quality knitting. In 1677 Charles Trumbull recorded that the stockings manufactured in Guernsey were "generally of a finer sort than those in Jersey, some of them so curiously knit and so fine that they may be drawn through a ring, and worth 20 shillings or 30 shillings" [38].

De Vries has argued that this type of industrial activity was characterised by its "co-ordination by urban merchants and its dependence on distant markets" [39]. The St Peter Port merchants competed successfully in foreign markets by manufacturing stockings of high quality. In the second half of the seventeenth century the merchants regularly exported knitted goods to Paris where fellow Guernseymen acted as agents. Success depended in part in reacting swiftly to the transient fads of fashion. The correspondence of the merchants Matthew and Michael de Sausmarez illustrates this. While Michael collected orders in Paris, Matthew organised the knitting in Guernsey. The cousins used some 33 code numbers to identify different

---


designs and colours. Among those available were "marbled, fine marbled, very fine marbled, striped with a fiery red colour, plain white, white striped with blue, greyish white, greyish white striped, greyish brown, iron-grey, blue and white, and black" [40].

Whereas France was the major export market in the seventeenth century, England became the principal market in the eighteenth century. However, as the entrepot and its more profitable commerce developed, the knitting industry went into decline. In 1769 William Le Marchant observed "we do not so much as import two thirds of the 2000 tods yearly allowed us from England" [41]. Eventually the Guernsey industry was unable to compete with the cheaper textiles produced in English mills and the island manufactory died away.

The impact of the entrepot

During the 17th century there was little scope for growth in the urban or insular economies, the factors of production being relatively limited. In the 18th century the town economy was transformed by the development of the entrepot. As St Peter Port became increasingly important in the world of the Atlantic economy its population and wealth grew. Maritime commerce stimulated shipping


related occupations and led to the development of commodity related industries such as tobacco-working and coopering. The merchants accumulated more capital and underwrote more ambitious ventures; these, in turn, enhanced the prosperity of the entrepot. The earnings of those employed in the new industries fed back directly into the urban economy. The commercial success of the port attracted immigration; and the larger urban population required better "maintenance industries", especially for the provision of food and drink. As the inhabitants became wealthier they increasingly sought luxuries. This stimulated the retail sector. In short the development of the entrepot set in train a series of economic "multipliers". The tertiary sector was further stimulated c. 1780 by the arrival in St Peter Port of a much larger British garrison. The officers required tailors and a wide range of goods and services.

Shipping-related occupations

The entrepot and its shipping sustained a variety of specialist occupations such as sail-making and piloting. There was also a regular need for the repairing, modifying and fitting-out of vessels [42]. As we have seen in Chapter 3, in the late 17th and 18th centuries the Guernsey merchants usually operated vessels that had been built in France, England or, occasionally, the American colonies [43].

[42] Greffe, Amirauté vol 10, p 19, 15 Aug 1730 (Jacob Bart vers Margueritte femme du Sieur James Hubert re work on brigantine.
However a certain number of vessels were built locally. British colonial records show that the 40 ton sloop Two Brothers was built in Guernsey in 1739 and the 50 ton snow Charming Nancy in 1746 [44].

Shipbuilding was further developed towards the end of the eighteenth century. Typical of the vessels constructed was the Alarm, a lugger measuring "90 feet upon deck from stem to stern - 24 feet beam" which, like many others, had been built "in a field.... and when ready for launching was removed by screws to temporary slips on the beach" [45]. By 1804 there were 103 shipwrights working in local yards [46].

[44] PRO CO 33/16, part 2 f 64r (pencil diamond): the sloop Two Brothers, Henry Lambert master, cleared Barbados 22 April 1747 with 8170 gallons of rum bound for Falmouth. PRO CO 33/16, part 2 f 75r: the snow Charming Nancy, master Thos Roberts, 4 guns, 18 men, registered Liverpool 1749, Richard Barret owner, entered Barbados 18 Dec 1752 with 149 slaves from Africa.

See also P. Raban, 'War and Trade in the Mid-Eighteenth Century' TSG vol xxii, part i, for 1986 (Guersey, 1987), p 142 (Fox, 15 tons, built Guernsey Jan 1745; Lottery, 100 tons, built Guernsey Dec 1757); and P. Raban, 'Clandestine Trade in the Mid-Eighteenth Century' TSG vol xxii part ii for 1987 (Guersey, 1988), p 322 (Speedwell built Guernsey 1732).


The entrepot involved not just the trading of cargoes but also the working and preparation of certain commodities. Some of these ancillary services were labour intensive and played an important role in the urban economy. Tobacco leaf, for example, was regularly turned into roll or snuff. By the end of the 18th century there were nine tobacco manufactories employing a workforce of approximately eleven hundred (47). In 1800 Stiles observed that "many indigent boys and girls" were employed in this sector (48). In the early 18th century the St Peter Port merchants had prevented foreigners setting up tobacco manufactories in the island; but later in the century one of the large snuff manufactories was owned by George Watson of Bristol (49).

The transporting and distribution of large volumes of wine, spirits and tobacco required a ready supply of barrels of all sizes. Indeed, St Peter Port may, in part, have owed its development as an entrepot to the fact that many English smugglers were driven to the island from France in the 1720s when the directeur des aides banned barrels below 30 pots in size in the administrative election of Valognes (50). At


more or less the same time a certain number of English coopers settled in St Peter Port and helped to develop the craft locally. By the early 19th century there were some seven hundred coopers working in the St Peter Port entrepot (51).

There were two branches of this trade - that of the dry-cooper and that of the wet-cooper. The dry-cooper made casks for solid materials such as flour and tobacco. His work was far less exacting than that of the wet-cooper who had to construct water-tight casks that could "withstand the strain of fermenting liquids and rough handling during transport" (52). Further, the cask had frequently to be of an exact capacity and the quality of the wood employed was critical. When ordering from a Guernsey merchant in 1768 the Scottish firm of Alexander Oliphant & Co. requested that their wine should be shipped in pipes "in order to be more favourably dealt with in the gunde here so its no matter how large they are, but please take care they be good casks & sweet" (53). In addition to understanding the woods the wet-cooper required a mastery of nine skills: preparing the staves, raising the cask, trussing and bending, topping, cleaning down, bunging, heading, caulking, and fitting the hoops (54).

Coopers were involved not just in making new barrels but also in

[51] PRO HO 98/30, 5 Feb 1807 Doyle report.
attending to the storage of wine and the modification of existing barrels. As the St Peter Port wine merchant Guille explained to Thos and R Shuffield of Norwich: "Port wine is generally lodged in a vault or in a close cellar over a vault on the ground floor according to the directions we receive. When it is to remain some time in a vault we take off the wooden hoops and put additional iron hoops in their place which it is not so necessary to do when in a cellar" (55). Guille's letter outlined the services offered by the wine merchants (see Appendix 20).

One of the most important operations carried out in the cellars was racking, the transferring of wine from one cask to another, usually about once every three months. This was a process that could significantly affect the quality of the wine (56).

The coopers constituted a skilled section of the urban workforce and were essential to the working of the entrepot. When the smuggling trade was suppressed (1805-1810) the coopers were underemployed. It was this, probably, that encouraged local merchants to develop the island shipbuilding industry in the early nineteenth century.

The development of retailing and service industries

There was rapid capital accumulation in St Peter Port in the second half of the 18th century, especially among the negociants. The increase in sales of entrepot commodities such as tobacco, tea and spirits brought larger profits to the St Peter Port merchants.

[55] Priaulx 20763, 4 Oct 1792 Guille to Shuffield.
These profits were partly re-invested in maritime speculations and some money was invested in the British funds [57]. There still remained a surplus of wealth which was spent on induced imports [58]. During the second half of the eighteenth century there was an increasing demand in St Peter society for English goods. This phenomenon was analogous to the consumer boom in England identified by McKendrick, Brewer, Plumb and others. Their thesis has been criticised but most historians have accepted that this era witnessed growing conspicuous consumption among the wealthiest classes and patterns of increased spending in the middle classes [59].

Economic development, with increased *per capita* purchasing power, brought about changes in the supply of services and in the organisation of retailing. Artisans and professionals were engaged to cater for a more fashionable style of life; entertainers and actors amused the leisure hours of the affluent bourgeoisie. But these new specialists themselves became consumers. "In part, the producers of manufactured goods and the providers of urban services were the market" [60].

A retailing "revolution" took place during the late eighteenth century with the opening of many new shops in the principal streets of St Peter Port. Typical of these shops were the perfumery of James Grellier (opened in the High Street in 1794) and the chemist shop of John Hill & Co (opened in the Pollet in 1794) [61]. These were specialist shops, run by immigrants, and they catered for the affluent members of Guernsey society. In the new environment of consumerism shopkeepers exploited a variety of techniques to promote their goods and to increase their turn-over. Bow windows replaced the pentices of the early modern period and facilitated displays [62]. Advertisements were published in the newly established Gazette de Guernesey and customers were educated about the latest fashions and styles. The description "from London" was regularly employed in advertisements not just to designate the origin of goods, but also to indicate excellence and metropolitan fashionability. Edward Draper in the Pollet advertised "best quality London hats just in" [63]. Other traders advertised "carpets from London", "best plate gilted looking glasses from London", and "dwarf trees from London" [64]. Metropolitan expertise was similarly prized. Solovin, a tailor in the High Street, boasted that he employed a young man from London whom he would challenge against any workman in the island [65]. Shops carried larger stocks and

[61] Gazette de Guernesey, 14 June 1794.
[62] Plate 5 "St Peter's Fort, Guernsey" by Gosselin, BL K top LV 63:b.
[64] Gazette de Guernesey, 7 Nov 1796; 19 Nov 1796; 4 Feb 1797.
offered a wider range of choice. In July 1796 Cowan’s (watchmakers in the High Street) held a sale in which they offered “100 dozen gloves, 600 fans, 100 hats &c &c” [66]. The sale itself constituted one of the new retailing techniques.

Sometimes the locals helped visiting tradesmen to display their goods. Fitter from Bath advertised that he had on sale at Miss Harston’s, Pollet, “an assortment of articles in Silk, Gold and Silver, Laces, Bugle, Trimings in black, white and colours, Gold Earrings, Brooches, Necklaces, Beads in Patent Pearls, Lustre, Cornelian and Coral, Fans in Ivory, Wood, Silk and Spangl’d, and a number of articles too numerous for an advertisement”. Fitter returned from fashionable Bath to St Peter Port, which suggests that he found a good market in Guernsey [67]. Other tradespeople visiting the island included Hine, a staymaker from London; Mrs Synger from Nottingham with an assortment of black and white lace; Strickland from London, selling cambrics; Mrs Farmer, a corset-maker from London; and S. Baster, a milliner and dressmaker from Hoblyn’s of Bath and Weymouth [68]. Some travelling merchants offered goods for sale by public auction [69].

The service trades expanded to sustain the new style of public sociability. Hairdressers and wigmakers established themselves in the

[67] Gazette de Guernesey, 7 July 1810 p 106a (quotation above); 30 Nov 1811 p 191b.
town and provided the aristocratic ladies of St Peter Port with the latest London hair styles. Fencing, dancing, music and art masters gave tuition to the fashionable. Miniature painters executed correct likenesses. And, as we shall see in chapter seven, architects were increasingly commissioned to design elegant new houses for private and public sociability [70].

[70] All references are to the Gazette de Guernsey:

Hairdressers and wigmakers: H. White, 242 High Street, "from London" 30 Jan 1806, p 19b;
J. Wheadon, 140 Polllet Street, 2 Jan 1806, p 4b;
E. Norman, 2 Sept 1809, p 13b, from No 28 London St, Fitzroy Square, London, recommended "by Ladies of quality and of the first distinction in that City, to many ladies of rank in this Island", visiting for ten days.
Fencing master: M. Sordet, 13 July 1811, p 112c.
Dancing masters: Octavius Devall from London, 29 Sept 1798, p 172;
Mr Smart from London, 28 Jan 1804, p 16;
F. St Laurent "Professor of Modern, Scenic and Grotesque Dancing" 6 July 1811, p 106a.
Music master: Mr Williams, professor of music, 8 June 1811, p 91a.
Art masters: J. Jeremie, 14 Feb 1795, p 27;
A Frenchman offering to teach drawing, 2 Jan 1796, p 4;
Mr Caza-Nova, 4 March 1797, pp 35-36.
Artists: Hunt, profile painter, 23 Dec 1797, p 23b;
G. Emdin, from London, 13 July 1811, p 111c.
Architect: W. Damerum, 7/7/1802, p 168 (newspaper fragment).
Entrepreneurs introduced new facilities for leisure pastimes. Entertainment and the theatre flourished. The actor-impressario John Bernard supervised the construction of the first purpose-built theatre in St Peter Port (c 1792-3). He also established "a Vauxhall" close to the town. This project failed despite "two very pretty singers; supper-boxes and summer-houses; some thousands of variegated lamps; a loyal French band...fireworks, patronage, and other fanciful matters" [71]. But commercial failure was unusual at this time. The urban economy was flourishing and consumer demand outstripped supply. Even the world of children became a market. Schoolmasters, mostly from England, opened a host of academies and private schools in St Peter Port in the 1790s. Some schools capitalised on the requirements of the entrepot and promised sound instruction in arithmetic and accounting. Others taught accomplishments and catered for parents with social aspirations [72].

**Early 19th century problems and re-adjustments**

In the early 19th century the urban economy suffered two major setbacks. The entrepot declined when the British government suppressed smuggling (1805-1810); and at the end of the Napoleonic wars the British garrison in Guernsey was greatly reduced in size (1815). The slump in the entrepot particularly hurt the port workers and coopers. However, new jobs were created when the town merchants expanded the shipbuilding industry.


[72] See Chapter 6, subsection on Cultural Differentiation.
industry. The majority of the shipyards were located in or near St Peter Port, although a few vessels were built at Sampsons or in Sark. Between 1812 and 1827 the island yards built 4 ships, 26 brigs, 3 schooners and 35 cutters. Many of these vessels were used in the newly established trade with South America; the St Peter Port merchants were commissioning purpose-built boats for their own trading ventures [73].

Between 1805 and 1820 the upper classes in the town were sufficiently wealthy to weather the economic recession. Indeed there is plenty of evidence that they continued to enjoy a life of conspicuous consumption. Their servants also prospered; a correspondent writing in 1815 was so shocked by the sight of domestic servants decked in silk and lace that he wished to introduce sumptuary laws [74]. By the late Georgian era St Peter Port was essentially a market town with an affluent gentry element. The latter provided enough business to sustain the retailing and the service sectors. From c 1820 St Peter Port slowly developed as a resort and spa town. Initially there appear to have been only a small number of visitors but as transport links with England improved tourism acquired a growing importance in the urban economy. With its low cost of living and pleasant climate St Peter Port


[74] "Hardly do I dare to walk a yard, but I meet a greasy-fisted, red-elbowed wench, tricked out in her silks, her point, or mecluin lace, with a straw bonnet of the newest fashion, ornamented with rows of artificial flowers." The Sarnian Monthly Magazine, 1 July 1815, "Peregrinus" citing acts of 4 Oct 1574, 11 Apr 1575, 3 Oct 1631.
also became attractive to impecunious English gentlemen and invalids as a retirement town.

The census conducted in 1831 recorded the occupational structure of St Peter Port [75]. The classification was very simple and tended to reflect social class rather than economic status. At the top of the hierarchy were "capitalists" and professional men who formed one fifth of the number of employed males in the parish. There were very few manufacturers (nine); but those engaged in the retail trade and handicraft accounted for almost half of the total. There were only 74 male servants, but 917 female servants. English visitors were surprised when, in the absence of male butlers, they were served by females [76].

Conclusion

The internal economy of St Peter Port was shaped by the merchants engaged in foreign trade. In the seventeenth century the négociants employed hundreds of urban poor in a putting-out industry; the export of knitted goods to France and England neatly complemented the carrying trade of the island merchants. In the 18th century the négociants developed the entrepot and fostered ancillary crafts; by 1800 they were employing some seven hundred cooperers and eleven hundred tobacco workers. When the entrepot trade declined the négociants expanded the shipbuilding industry; in this way the merchants created a fleet of vessels purpose-built for their new trade with South America.

In each of these three stages the merchants harnessed the domestic

[75] See Appendix 27.
[76] Sir George Head, *A Home Tour through various parts of the United Kingdom* (London, 1837), pp 168-169
labour force to the requirements of foreign trade. There were three factors which facilitated their management of the economy. First, in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries the merchants dominated the urban and insular government; they were not opposed by any other interests. The merchants could consistently pursue pro-trade policies. Secondly, as has been seen in Chapter Two, they had the power to encourage or discourage migration flows. Consequently they could regulate the size and composition of the workforce, probably to a greater extent than was possible in English towns. Finally, in a small island the clique of wealthy merchants enjoyed more monopoly and monopsony power than merchants in England or France. They did not initially have to compete for labour. This gave them an advantage over some of their rivals abroad.

The entrepot trade created a host of ancillary jobs. The cooper and tobacco workers alone accounted for approximately 16% of the urban population in 1600. It may reasonably be conjectured that at least a quarter of the town's population was involved in port-related activities. The experience of St Peter Port was similar to that of other ports. Various estimates have been made for the port of London, one of which suggests that by the eighteenth century one quarter of the capital's population depended directly on employment in the port trades [77]. At Dunkirk in 1789 tobacco-working employed about five thousand

and distilling was also labour intensive [78]. At Bordeaux in the late 18th century shipbuilding employed between seven and eight hundred workers; sugar-refining three hundred; tobacco-working about five hundred. Glass and pottery factories employed another four hundred workers; rope and sail-making were labour-intensive. Finally, the 250 vessels of Bordeaux required at least 5000 sailors [79].

The entrepot created new forms of work organisation in St Peter Port. In the 17th and early 18th centuries the putting-out system involved the merchants in face-to-face encounters with the stocking makers. The tobacco industry, however, of the late 18th century was organised on a factory basis with eleven hundred workers located in some nine manufactories. It would be a mistake to characterise this as a shift to capitalism: the putting-out system was no less capitalist than factory production. However, the factory system increased the managerial control of the merchants and eroded traditional societal patterns. The structure of society is considered now in Chapter Five.

CHAPTER 5
THE STRUCTURE OF SOCIETY

This chapter examines the class structure, distribution of wealth and social geography of St Peter Port (changing patterns of sociability are analysed in chapter six). In the early modern period the social and economic structures of St Peter Port had affinities with those of French towns. The vocabulary of status (Monsieur, Le Sieur) was identical and helped to divide urban dwellers into four ranks. As in many other towns in France and England, the merchant elite tended to live in the centre of the town, the poorer on the periphery.

The commercial prosperity of St Peter Port in the second half of the eighteenth century created social tensions. The merchants competed in displays of conspicuous consumption and squabbled for the designation ecuyer; some energetic craftsmen climbed to higher status ranks; the lower orders jeered at the gentry entering the assembly rooms; and some strangers failed to show deference to the town constables. The island authorities tried to contain the situation with a variety of measures. They developed strategies to cope with the problems of poverty and vagrancy. However, they were not able to arrest the transformation of social attitudes. By the late eighteenth century the town parish housed many English immigrants and a sizeable British garrison. These newcomers arrived lacking the status titles of the Guernsey tradition and arrogated the titles they desired. As the old system of status crumbled, the St Peter Port elite discovered a new form of social stratification in physical segregation. By 1831 most of the wealthy inhabitants had moved from the centre of St Peter Port to the
periphery. The wealthy were now physically more segregated from other sections of society than they had been in the early eighteenth century.

The enquiry that follows is based on the tax records kept by the town constables from 1715 onwards. Three years have been selected to provide a framework for analysis: 1727, 1800 and 1831. Reliable population figures are available for these years; and these dates correspond to significant stages in the economic history of the town. The year 1727 stands at the threshold of the development of the entrepot; the year 1800 witnesses the entrepot at its zenith; and 1831 presents St Peter Port in its post-entrepot era. The analyses start with a lengthy "static" examination of the structure of society and residential geography in 1727. This is necessary, first to establish the significance of the vocabulary of rank used in St Peter Port in the eighteenth century; and secondly, to provide a foundation for comparative purposes. After this "static" snapshot there are two diachronic analyses. The first examines the changes that occurred between 1727 and 1800; the second analyses the years 1800 - 1831. These diachronic surveys are "anchored" by the data for 1727, 1800 and 1831. Finally, St Peter Port in 1831 is compared and contrasted with St Peter Port in 1727.

The tax ledgers list assessments of individuals, expressed in quarters of corn. When the authorities had established the tax-paying capacity of the town, they were able to determine the rate at which the tax should be levied. For example, in 1715 the town tax payers were assessed at 16,531 quarters. By levying 7½ deniers (about one half-penny) per quarter the constables raised 500 livres tournois (£35/14/3 sterling). Until 1824 tax was raised on income; thereafter it was based
Between 1715 and 1830 the wealth of the town increased nearly ten times (from 16,531 quarters to 152,930). Allowing for inflation and changes in the mode of living, Tupper estimated that the income assessed at 500 quarters in 1715 was fully equal to that assessed at 1,500 quarters in 1840. However, it is not clear that Tupper fully appreciated the economic implications of the system. In 1780 thirty pounds a year interest in the English funds was estimated at 40 quarters (i.e. one quarter = 15 shillings); but in the nineteenth century one quarter was reckoned as equaling £1 annual income. The quarter had a role analogous to that of gold; it held its value against money [2].

The structure of St Peter society, 1727

Altogether 394 people were assessed in 1727 [3]. Approximately a quarter of these were widows or the guardians of minors; the majority (76%) were adult males. No assessment was lower than 5 quarters, which represented a “threshold”, the poorer ranks of society being exempted from the tax burden. The town population at this date was about 4350, and so approximately 9% of all the inhabitants were being taxed. But some of the tax-paying females belonged to the families/households of male tax-payers; there is a risk of either underestimating the accumulation of wealth in a few families or of overestimating the spread of wealth if the figure of 9% is given undue

weight. What gives a better indication of the structure of society is to observe the proportion of adult males who were being taxed. The sex-ratio and age composition of the town at this date are not accurately known but militia figures and analyses of burial sex-ratios provide a rough guide. Tentative estimates suggest that in 1727 there may have been about 650 adult males in St Peter Port. It follows that over half of the adult males were not being taxed.

Table 17: Male taxpayers in St Peter Port, 1727

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment in quarters</th>
<th>Income p.a. £ sterling†</th>
<th>% of male taxpayers</th>
<th>% of adult males</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100 +</td>
<td>50†</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 +</td>
<td>10†</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>10?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 +</td>
<td>2.5†</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>18?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not taxed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>55?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: the estimate 'income p.a. £ sterling' is based on the fact that in 1727 a quarter was valued for rente purposes at £7-10-0 tournois, approximately 10 shillings sterling.

At the bottom of society were the untaxed poor, with an annual income of less than £2-10-0 (£2.50). Many of these knitted stockings, for which they received 4d a week. These urban poor corresponded to the cottagers and paupers of Gregory King's England who
had an average income per head of £2 sterling per annum [4]. Some clue
to the standard of living of the Guernsey poor is provided by the bread
rates laid down in 1727. A loaf of the low quality "pain a tout"
costing one sol (approximately three farthings) had to weigh 1 lb 1½
oz. when corn was 5 l.t. a quarter (the loaf was lighter when wheat was
more expensive) [5]. It would have cost a pauper approximately eighteen
and a quarter l.t. (approx. £1-6-8 sterling) to purchase one such loaf
each day of the year. It seems that the poor of St Peter Port
depended upon occasional labour and charity to survive.

Above the poor was a labouring class assessed as worth between
5 and 20 quarters. In English terms they had an annual income of
between £2-10-0 and £10. An index of the meaning of such a sum is
provided by the fact that some fifteen years later it cost 50 to 55
shillings sterling apiece to maintain the poor in the Town Hospital
"their whole charges and expense included" [6]. In terms of income
these tax payers can be compared to the labouring people and
outservants of Gregory King's England with an average income per head of
£4-10-0 (£4.50) sterling per annum [7].

Above these, and assessed at twenty quarters up to (but not
including) one hundred quarters, were 42% of the tax payers. These
people enjoyed the equivalent of an annual income of £10 to just under

£50 per annum and were in easier circumstances. Finally, at the top of the pyramid were those assessed at one hundred quarters and more, some 18% of the tax payers, the wealthy with an income of £50 and more per annum.

In making the above analysis 20 quarters and 100 quarters were used as dividing points. The reason for this is that the distribution of assessments seems to indicate that those levels were considered significant by contemporaries. In practice one hundred quarters marked the dividing line between those designated le Sieur and their social betters styled Monsieur. In this connection it should be noted that there was a correlation between income and status in 1727 [8]. Again twenty quarters in practice marked the dividing line between those designated le Sieur (usually 20 quarters and above) and those designated simply by their name (usually under 20 quarters). Some confirmation for the significance of twenty quarters as a “boundary” is to be found in a parish decision of 1758 when, during a time of food shortage, it was decided that those assessed at less than 20 quarters should receive assistance. Those assessed at 20 quarters and above were clearly deemed to be able to fend for themselves [9].

The tax assessments suggest that there was a pyramid of wealth in St Peter Port very similar to that found in early modern English towns, the base very broad, then rising sharply to a narrow peak.

[8] See Table 20.
[9] See Appendix 4, details for 1758.
Cumulative analysis reveals a concentration of wealth in a relatively few hands.

Table 18: Cumulative contribution of all taxpayers, St Peter Port, 1727

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tax payers assessed</th>
<th>% of tax payers</th>
<th>% of tax</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>up to, and including, 10 qu.</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 qu.</td>
<td>40.1</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 qu.</td>
<td>51.8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 qu.</td>
<td>73.9</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90 qu.</td>
<td>82.2</td>
<td>32.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160 qu.</td>
<td>90.1</td>
<td>48.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9.9% of the tax payers were contributing 51.3% of the tax; more approximately, one tenth of the tax payers were contributing half of the tax. The tax assessments reflected income and can be used as indices of income distribution. The St Peter Port figures can be compared with the English estimates of King (1688) and Massie (1759). King calculated that the top 10% of income recipients accounted for 45.1% of the gross total of income; Massie calculated the same 10% as receiving 40.5% of the gross total of income (10). The St Peter Port

figures suggest a greater concentration of wealth among fewer people. This is not surprising as the distribution of wealth was likely to be particularly uneven in a port town, with its rich négociants [11].

A Lorenz curve showing the cumulative percentage of taxpayers and the cumulative percentage of tax assessments (= incomes) illustrates the unequal distribution. (see Fig 28). If distribution were equal, all the points would lie on the diagonal. The nearer the curve is to the rectangular boundary, the more unequal the distribution. This graph can be expressed in terms of a single figure - the Gini coefficient. This measures the area enclosed between the curve and the diagonal as a percentage of the whole triangular area. It varies, therefore, between zero, in the case of complete equality, and unity, at the extreme of inequality. The Gini coefficient for the Lorenz curve representing the 1727 St Peter Port tax assessments is 0.643, which represents considerable inequality [12]. In fact the income distribution in St Peter Port in 1727 was actually more unequal than is suggested by the Gini coefficient because the graph represents solely the taxpayers and takes no account of the exempted townsfolk. Were they to be aggregated, the curve would come closer to the rectangular boundary (and the Gini coefficient closer to 1).

Three status ranks were recognised in the 1727 tax

Fig. 28: Lorenz curves to illustrate the distribution of income amongst St Peter Port taxpayers in 1727 and 1831. The Lorenz curve for 1800 is almost precisely the same as that for 1831.
assessments. The lowest designation was simply the tax payer's name, with no title. Above this were those styled le Sieur. The highest rank was that of Monsieur/Mr. Where appropriate, advocates, clergymen and captains were styled with their professional ranks, sometimes with status and professional rank (e.g. Monsieur l'avocat). The frequency of the different designations was as follows:

Table 19: The status designation of male tax payers, St Peter Port, 1727

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Male Tax Payers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr/Mons</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>le Sieur</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name only</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Not taxed]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The titles given to women in part reflected social standing, in part marital status (no title, dame, madame, demoiselle, veuve; and combinations thereof, e.g. Madame veuve...). As in France under the ancien regime there was often a consciousness of the maiden name of females [13]. With widows it is not always immediately apparent whether their status was determined by birth or by marriage. In this respect an analysis of status in the male sector is less ambiguous. The correlation between wealth and status was as follows:

Table 20: The correlation between the status and the income of male taxpayers, St Peter Port, 1727

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>MODE</th>
<th>MEDIAN</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>S. DEVIATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr/Mons</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>181.1</td>
<td>170.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>le Sieur</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>54.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name only</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It should be noted that the designation Mr/Mons was dependent on lineage and that there were a few relatively poor gentlemen. On the other hand the acquisition of wealth appears to have translated the poor into the realms of le Sieur and so there were no wealthy tax payers designated by name alone. The following chart attempts to summarise the correlation between tax assessments, status designations and occupations; and to give some idea of the composition and structure of St Peter Port society in 1727.
Table 21: Wealth, status and occupations in St Peter Port, 1727

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarters</th>
<th>Status designation</th>
<th>Occupations represented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>500 +</td>
<td>gentlemen,</td>
<td>merchants, shipowners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr/Mrs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 +</td>
<td>captain, Revd.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60+</td>
<td>advocate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50+</td>
<td>le Sieur</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40+</td>
<td>Revd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>shipwright</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>captain, carrier,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(no title)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>sailmaker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This table initially suggests that there were three ranks in St Peter Port society in 1727. However, it needs to be remembered that the analysis above represents the taxed section of the community. Below the taxpayers designated by name alone were those exempted from paying tax. It is more accurate to consider St Peter Port society of the early eighteenth century as having four, not three, ranks.

Such a social and economic structure has affinities with that found in eighteenth century French towns. At the top of the third estate in that society were gentlemen and negociants, "l'elite roturiere". Below those came "la classe moyenne", advocates, doctors, notaries and bourgeois, designated le Sieur. The third rank was comprised of the "petite bourgeoisie", an artisanat referred to by name alone. In the fourth and lowest rank were "le menu peuple" who were inadequately clothed and lived on bread, soup and water. In ancien regime Paris "le menu peuple" formed some 55% of the total population, while in Lyons they comprised 39% [14].

Residential patterns in St Peter Port, 1727

An analysis of the tax assessments reveals a concentration of wealth - aggregate and individual - in the centre of the town, with over half of the wealthiest inhabitants living in the three vingtaines of Carrefour, La Grande Rue and Rue du Pilori. Several of the houses in these vingtaines were insured for five hundred to a thousand pounds.

sometimes the contents being insured for a sum equal to that of the
house [15]. The poorer vingtaines generally lay on the periphery of the
town. It should be noted, however, that there were some poorer areas
near the heart of the town, rue de l'Eglise in particular.

The wealthiest vingtaine was the Carrefour, situated half­
way between the town church to the south and the Plaiderie (court house)
to the north, and close to the harbour to the east. This vingtaine
boasted 16 tax assessments of 100 quarters or more and was inhabited by
some of the great negociants. The second concentration of wealth was in
La Grande Rue, the site of the street market. Here there were 13 tax
assessments of 100 quarters or more, Mr Nicolas Carey, gentleman and
merchant, (400 quarters) and Mr Jean Mauger (450 quarters) being the
wealthiest. Rue du Pilori was the third wealthiest vingtaine in terms
of aggregate wealth and second in terms of per capita wealth but the
neighbouring vingtaine of rue de l'Eglise was relatively poor, ranking
eighth. Only four inhabitants were assessed at over 100 quarters. The
combined vingtaines of Cimetiere-Beauregard had just three inhabitants
assessed above 100 quarters, of whom one was Mr Pierre Carey "de la
brasserie", assessed at 550 quarters. This Mr Carey was not only a
brewer but also a negociant and shipowner. Most of the other residents
of this area seem to have been "classe-moyenne" or "petite bourgeoisie".
Fountain Street housed a few merchant-shipowners together with a
number of artisans. The vingtaines Contree Mansell- Hauteville- Mt
Durand-de Putron, and St Jacques-Couture- Bouet, and Truchot lay outside

Fig 29: The numbers of taxpayers with low assessments (5-19 quarters), middle assessments (20-99 quarters) and high assessments (100+ quarters) in the vingtaines of St Peter Port, 1727. The vingtaines are:
(1) Carrefour (2) Follet (3) Grande Rue (4) Berthelot (5) Fontaine
(6) Pilori (7) Eglise (8) Cimetiere, Beauregard (9) Contree Mansell,
Hauteville, Mt Durand (10) de Putron (11) St Jacques, Couture, Bouet
(12) Truchot. See Appendix 24.
The "barrières" of the old town; they were still essentially rural and were relatively poor. It is essential, however, to stress that there were some wealthy individuals who lived in the "poor" vingtaine; and, conversely, some less wealthy artisans were to be found in the "rich" vingtaine. Thus, the "poor" vingtaine of the Truchot could also boast three inhabitants assessed at 300 quarters or above. Nonetheless, a pattern emerges: a higher than average number of wealthy townspeople lived in the three central vingtaines. Here there was a concentration of merchants and gentlemen, together with some artisans. The "outer" vingtaine was relatively poorer and contained more petite bourgeoisie and probably many of the unassessed menu people. The picture suggested by the data is similar to that argued by Schwarz in his analysis of social class and social geography in London and one has to recognise, as Peter Borsay suggests, that "any tendency towards segregation was only a tendency, since all parishes accommodated a significant sprinkling of the various tax-paying categories" [16].

From 1727 to 1800

As we have seen the period between 1727 and 1800 saw considerable growth in population (from 4350 to approximately 11000) and assessed wealth (from 24415 quarters to 94455 quarters). The number of tax payers rose from 394 in 1727 to 696 in 1800. The population was 2.5 times larger and the taxed urban wealth 3.9 greater. The Lorenz Curve

representing the tax assessments of 1800 has a Gini coefficient of 0.660 as against 0.643 in 1727. This demonstrates that among the taxpayers of St Peter Port in 1800 there was marginally greater inequality of distribution of tax assessments - and therefore of income - in 1800 than there had been in 1727. Initially this seems to confirm Professor Hoskin's hypothesis that "as the average wealth of a community rises...... the inequality in the distribution of that wealth itself increases" [17]. And yet on closer inspection the shift was minimal - as may easily be seen from a graphical representation (see Fig 28).

Between 1727 and 1800 the merchant families of St Peter Port prospered; by 1780 there were six taxpayers assessed at over 1000 quarters. A note in the tax book for that year indicates that £30 a

Table 22: The six highest St Peter Port tax assessments, 1780

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Capital</th>
<th>Livres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Carey</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>£39,500</td>
<td>553,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elisha Tupper</td>
<td>1850</td>
<td>37,000</td>
<td>518,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicholas Maingy senr</td>
<td>1650</td>
<td>33,000</td>
<td>462,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Brock's heirs</td>
<td>1420</td>
<td>28,400</td>
<td>397,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Mourant</td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>392,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard de Beauvoir</td>
<td>1020</td>
<td>20,400</td>
<td>285,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

year interest in the English funds was estimated at 40 quarters and £1000 capital at 50 quarters. Whereas the leading merchants of St Peter Port in the early eighteenth century compared with the "second class" English merchants of King (1688), the leading St Peter Port merchants of the late eighteenth century came close to the "first class" English merchants of Massie (1759) [18]. The St Peter Port fortunes are not comparable with those of some of the East India Company merchants in London, nor with those of the millionaires (livres tournois) of Nantes. Nevertheless, they do represent considerable wealth. In some instances it needs to be noted that there were other highly assessed members of the family, in addition to the chief tax payer, and that the combined wealth of some families was very great. Marriages created wealthy partnerships. Jean Carey's success was due in part to his alliance with "Madame veuve Mr James Le Ray", the widow of one of the town's most successful négociants of the 1760s. The characteristic of St Peter Port in the eighteenth century is that there was no one family of enormous wealth that totally dominated the mercantile scene but rather a cluster of wealthy families. By 1800 there were fourteen persons rated at 1000 quarters or higher, the wealthiest being the négociant Elisha Tupper, assessed at 2,450 quarters (nearly £50,000 in capital by the 1780 criteria).

The fact that there was a grouping of wealthy families is of significance as it led to conspicuous consumption of a competitive nature. Such behaviour stimulated the urban economy and benefitted the

ranks of the bourgeoisie and artisans who supplied goods and services to the upper ranks. This was a commercial world in which the hard-working craftsman could rise. Guillaume Henri, a silversmith, appeared in the tax books in the 1720s with no title and assessed at 20 quarters. By the 1740s he was rated at 40 quarters and by 1755 he had achieved the designation le Sieur. Between 1757 and 1763 his assessment rose from 50 quarters to 100 quarters and he had changed residence from the Cimetiere-Beauregard area to Fountain Street. He clearly did well during the Seven Years' War, perhaps thanks to the nature of wartime trade or to profitable investment in privateering (19).

Guillaume Henry's rise was not unique. The flourishing nature of the port trades helped other craftsmen. Peter Lihou the cooper held £150 worth of 3% Consols in 1784, the Dobrees of London acting as his agent/banker (20). Jean Guerin, cooper, was assessed at 10 quarters in 1757 but by 1761 was designated le Sieur and was assessed at 15 quarters. Similarly, Daniel Delisle, carpenter, rose from an assessment of 10 quarters in 1756 to an assessment of 25 quarters in 1761 (21).

The rising wealth of the inhabitants of St Peter Port was accompanied by, and probably helped to cause, phases of social tension as sectors of the community worried about their status designation. One such phase occurred shortly after the Seven Years' War. In 1765 a


[21] COF A22 pp 251, 382 (Guerin); 239, 383 (Delisle). (Jean Guerin and Delisle both in Fontaine vingtaines).
member of the Le Marchant family complained that he should receive the designation "Ecuyer" when his name was written in the tax book. On 15 June 1765 the Royal Court issued instructions that the jurats, Procureur and Controle du Roi should be accorded the designation ecuyer (The bailiff was already so styled). The constables and douzaine of St Peter Port resisted the instruction of the Royal Court, arguing that the latter was arrogating to itself a power that properly belonged to the Crown and not to the Court [22]. Eventually the parish authorities capitulated and entered the designation Ecuyer as instructed.

This manifestation of "gentrification" was accompanied by an ordonnance of the Royal Court in 1756 which forbade "mécaniques et gens de basse condition" to participate in cockfights, on the grounds that the gambling losses, waste of time and drunkenness associated with the sport were detrimental to family life [23]. However, gentlemen and those assessed at 50 quarters and above were allowed to attend cockfights. This ordonnance can be construed as having established a boundary between the people and the "public" [24].

[22] Friaulx 31458, pp 343-359, 'Observations against an act of the Royal Court ordering the Douzainiers to give the Title of Esquire to Jurats & the Procureur and Comptroller'.
[23] Ordonnances vol 1, p 288.
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As St Peter Port became busier with its entrepot trade and larger garrison, the town constables and island authorities found it harder to maintain law and order. The authorities were confronted by a series of problems. Some strangers had little respect for the constables and were quite prepared to engage in altercations [25]. Some of the disorderliness had undertones of class tensions. For example, in December 1797 troublesome boys hurled "immondices & saletes" at the gentry who were entering the assembly rooms [26].

The presence in the town from the 1780s of large numbers of soldiers and sailors encouraged the running of disorderly houses and brothels [27]. Wartime prizes in the harbour attracted thieves; and shops


became the target of "smash and grab" raids [28]. The 1790s were particularly difficult because, in addition to the usual crowd of English smugglers, sailors and soldiers milling around the town, there were also companies of French royalists and Russian soldiers garrisoned temporarily on the island. Tempers sometimes ran high, with duel and death ensuing [29]. The authorities reacted to these difficulties by trying to make the streets safer. They had installed oil-lamps by 1799 [30].

[28] BL Add Ms 45928 (i) f 270r, Memorial: increase in crime because of strangers and soldiers in the island; need for more court sittings. Greffe, Livre de Crime vol 15 f 126r, 20 Nov 1779, William Lee from Polperrow, Cornwall, stealing from prize vessel; vol 19 pp 289–290, 3 Jan 1797, Rachel Draeade wife of William Kerby (soldier in Dumbartonshire Fencibles) stole chintz, linen, silk etc.

[29] Greffe, Livre de Crime vol 19 p 254, 10 Oct 1796, Alexander Thomson, officer in the Dumbartonshire Fencibles, challenged Francois James Scott Esq., major in the Dumbartonshire Fencibles, to a duel; vol 19 pp 256–258, 18 Oct 1796, Mons Louis Florent Victurnier, one of the Chasseurs nobles of the regiment of Mons le Duc de Mortemar, found dead and another officer seriously wounded.

[30] Priaulx Library: a manuscript note by W.V. Carey records that Russian troops (stationed in Guernsey in 1799) drank oil from the lamps. (Note in H. Ross-Lewin, With "The Thirty-Second" In the Peninsular and other Campaigns (Dublin, 1904), p 43). There had been no lamps in 1798: W.T. Money, 'A Trip to Guernsey in 1798', ed. E.Carey, TSG vol xi, part ii, for 1931 (Guernsey, 1932), p 250.
The provision of assistance to the poor was another urban problem. It has already been remarked that the poorest inhabitants of St Peter Port lived on the breadline (31). The price of bread cereals and the state of the urban economy determined the number who were in need. In the late 1720s and the 1730s St Peter Port experienced some economic difficulties; for over a decade the aggregate taxable wealth of the town did not increase (32). During these years the parish frequently had nearly two hundred poor people to support. A weekly allowance was paid, sometimes amounting annually to upwards of £500 sterling. This provision was funded partly from contributions made at the church, partly by legacies, partly by bequests of rentes, and finally by a tax specifically for the maintenance of the poor in St Peter Port. In addition taxes were raised in several years to pay for the importation of corn and to subsidise the feeding of the poor (33).

Different strategies were employed to try to reduce the growing burden of supporting the poor. In March 1730 the "chefs de familles" decided in favour of "badging". Youths and men up to forty years old were to be provided with "un bonnet, un casaquir, une paire de culote le tout fait de carisett bleu, & une chemise blanche", bearing the mark

[31] Vide supra.
[32] See Fig 27.
of the parish to distinguish them ("St Pierre Port"). The design of clothes for those above forty was different and was not to carry the badging. Girls and women to the age of forty were to be provided with "une coiffe blanche, un corset, une jupe, de carisett bleu, & une chemise blanche" badged in a manner similar to the men's outfit. Women over forty were excused the badging. Material was to be ordered from England sufficient to clothe twelve or fourteen of each sex [34].

Badging sought to stigmatise the poor and it may have controlled the situation for a limited period [35]. But from 1734 onwards the problem seemed to have increased and the parish had to raise 4,000 livres tournois annually for poor relief. Part of the problem was that insufficient alms were being collected in the church. There were complaints that the poor misspent their relief money in drunkenness and riotous living, instead of maintaining their families. It was asserted that "the children were usually left by their parents destitute about the streets, and brought up to all manner of vices, without any care taken of their education" [36].

In the late 1730s the town merchants initiated a more ambitious plan to control the problem of the poor and founded a hospital (=workhouse). The terms for entrance were sufficiently rigorous that of

[34] TC DdGdF, p 12, 4 March 1730.
the two hundred who received the alms of the parish "not above seventy" decided to enter the hospital when it was opened [37]. In 1751 Dicey recorded that the one hundred and twenty inmates then lodged in the hospital included "mad, naturals, lame, sick, bed-ridden, lying-in women, infirm old people, and destitute poor children, left by sailors and soldiers, besides the children belonging to the parish (whereof several are bastards)". The hospital gave relief to the poor and served as an instrument of control: "several lewd women, incapable of subsisting honestly" were also detained there in 1751 [38].

Much of the money subscribed for the building of the hospital came from merchants and the hospital had a work ethic. The initial regulations [1741] envisaged a daily regime as follows:

Table 23: The daily regime of the Town Hospital

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Summer</th>
<th>Winter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rise</td>
<td>6 a.m.</td>
<td>7 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breakfast</td>
<td>7 a.m.</td>
<td>8 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>7 a.m. - 7 p.m.</td>
<td>8 a.m. - 6 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td>1 p.m.</td>
<td>1 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supper</td>
<td>7 p.m.</td>
<td>6 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bed</td>
<td>9 p.m.</td>
<td>8 p.m.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Priaulx 29121/408C, Watkins Ms vol 3, Town Hospital rules.

[38] Ibid, p 191.
The inmates were assigned work that was useful to the town economy and, in particular, to the merchants. The men and boys picked oakum, made twine, laid cordage and cast lead. The women spun wool and the girls knitted stockings; in the 1750s Mr Jacques Combeau, a master weaver from Cherbourg, organised textile manufacture in the hospital. Depending on the season, the inmates helped at hay-making, apple-picking and grave-digging (39). Children of an appropriate age were farmed out to town tradesmen. Between 1743 and 1757 some 83 were apprenticed as cooper, tailors, smiths, servants, gardeners, carpenters, stone-cutters and, most frequently, as sailors (40). Eleven girls and five boys were taken from the hospital in March 1752 by Captain James Flight to be indentured in Boston (America) (41).

The town hospital eased the problem of poverty but could not entirely solve it. Further measures that assisted were the foundation of a similar workhouse for the rural poor in the Catel parish (1751); and the deportation back to England (or France) of any stranger who seemed likely to become a burden on the Guernsey taxpayer. Finally, the problem of poverty became less burdensome as the town became richer. The entrepot trades created employment which reduced the pool of the underemployed. Referring to the number admitted to the hospital in the late eighteenth century Berry commented that "the Island being prosperous, the number had been on the decline, and was little more than

Moreover, the wealthier the town grew, the lighter became the burden of supporting the poor. In 1740 the authorities raised four thousand livres tournois for the poor on inhabitants assessed at 21,948 quarters; in 1790 seven thousand livres tournois were raised for the hospital on 77,100 quarters. In 1740 it was necessary to levy 3 sous 6 deniers per quarter; but in 1790 nearly twice as much money could be raised by a tax set at 2 sous per quarter - almost half the rate imposed in 1740.

Thomas Dicey, writing in 1751, was very impressed by the hospital. He felt that it was "a very laudable undertaking brought to perfection within these few years" and he accordingly devoted a supplement of fourteen pages to a description of it. He hoped that the St Peter Port hospital might be "regularly imitated" in every county in England. The standard of administration of the hospital fell in the late eighteenth century and reforms were implemented in the early nineteenth century. In general, however, the hospital seems to have been an effective institution in the eighteenth century.

---

[42] V. Berry, *The History of the Island of Guernsey* (London, 1815), p 159. In 1811 - during the trade recession - the number admitted to the Hospital rose to 250; in 1812-1815 on average 230 were admitted (Ibid., p 159).

[43] COF A22 pp 1-34; A25 (not paginated).


Changing residential patterns, 1727–1800

Between 1727 and 1800 the status of the town vingtaines changed considerably. In 1727 the Follet contributed only 2.2% towards the town taxes and in this respect ranked eleventh among the vingtaines. The Follet taxpayers were among the least wealthy of the town, approximately half being assessed at 10 quarters. But this vingtaine (together with the Truchot) was developed by the merchants in the 1740s and 1750s and by 1800 the Follet ranked third in the order of aggregate wealth, fourth in per capita tax assessment (46).

Extensive growth occurred in the "peripheral" vingtaines in the latter part of the 18th century. As late as the 1760s Hauteville was one of the poorest vingtaines. Yet by 1800 it had become the residence of several merchants and had risen to fourth in terms of aggregate wealth. Berthelot Street, with its new urban developments to the west of the old town, had emerged by 1800 as the vingtaine with the highest mean tax assessment. This was the area to which the rich were gravitating. From the 1780s onwards there was a shift of wealthy inhabitants away from the mediaeval town centre to the periphery, a process similar to the suburbanisation that occurred in many contemporary English towns. As the periphery became wealthier, so the Carrefour and Grande Rue became relatively poorer. These vingtaines had contributed 37.6% of the tax revenue raised in 1727 and 41.9% in 1766 but by 1800 they contributed only 26.7%. An even greater decline occurred in the central vingtaines of Eglise and Pilori.

[46] See Appendix 25.
Fig 30: The numbers of taxpayers with low assessments (5-19 quarters), middle assessments (20-99 quarters) and high assessments (100+ quarters) in the vingtaines of St Peter Port, 1800. The vingtaines are:
Changes between 1800 and 1831

Between 1800 and 1831 the population of St Peter Port increased from approximately 11000 to 13893; the aggregate tax assessment rose from 94455 quarters to 143025 quarters; and the number of tax assessments in 1831 was 824. There was greater wealth at the upper end of the "pyramid", there being 42 assessments of 700 quarters and above in 1831 as against 27 in 1800. The mean assessment in 1831 was 173.6 quarters as compared to 135.7 quarters in 1800, but the mode remained constant at 20 quarters. The Lorenz curve for the tax assessments of 1831 has a Gini coefficient of 0.658, almost identical to that for 1800 (0.660).

The values of the old seigneurial world continued to be challenged by the wealth of the nouveaux riches. Success in trade elevated some ordinary men to the ranks of the wealthy. This was resented by the "old families" and led to exclusion strategies. In 1814 Berry, an English resident, observed that the self-made man unable to boast of the "dignified ancestry of jurat, douzaine, or constable" could scarcely ever join "what is called the first class". The divisions were repeated at every level in society. Below the merchant came the tradesman. Then, "sinking in gradations that might almost puzzle an able mathematician to define, the lower orders of people degenerate into a state of abject servility" (47).

The tensions of the era 1800-1831 are precisely those adumbrated by de Tocqueville in his analysis of the status anxiety engendered by the

fading of aristocracy and the challenge of money and democracy. "Secret hostilities then arise in the community". The same individual simultaneously seeks to raise himself into a higher circle and to defend himself "against the intrusion of those below him" [48]. A correspondent to The Star grumbled that persons in Guernsey "arrogate to themselves titles, with impunity, to which they are not in the least entitled" and that whereas rich and well bred farmers and tradesmen were called le Sieur, others of mean and low birth were honoured by the title Monsieur. The correspondent hoped that the Royal Court would establish proper rules or abolish the custom of admitting titles altogether to diminish "that spirit of discontent which, on this subject, is so very prevalent" [49].

Changing residential patterns in the early 19th century

After 1800 the status of "taxpayers was no longer inscribed in the parochial tax registers. With the disintegration of the traditional structure and vocabulary of rank, the elite felt compromised. They found a new form of social stratification in physical segregation. Between 1800 and 1831 they moved in increasing numbers from the mediaeval centre of St Peter Port to the Grange, New Town and Hauteville. It would be mistaken to interpret this move as solely a quest for social segregation; there were good health reasons for seeking the suburbs [50]. Nevertheless, by 1831 the elite enjoyed greater isolation than

[50] See Chapter Seven.
The distribution of taxpayers in St Peter Port, 1831

The numbers of taxpayers with low, middle and high assessments in the vingtaines of St Peter Port, 1831. The vingtaines are: (1) Rue des Forges (2) Pollet (3) Marche (4) Eglise (5) Vauvert (6) Grange (7) Ville-Neuve (New Town) (8) Hauteville (9) St Jacques (10) Glatney. See Appendix 26.
they had in 1727. This can be demonstrated by an examination of the indices of dissimilarity and segregation (appendix). By 1831 there was a concentration of high income residents in the Grange, New Town and Hauteville. Only two low income taxpayers were to be found in the Grange, and less than 10% of the taxpayers in New Town and Hauteville fell within that category.

Conclusion

Between 1727 and 1831 St Peter Port society re-organised itself. The traditional vocabulary of rank collapsed; and the elite moved from the centre to the suburbs. This re-arrangement of spatial structure occurred in other eighteenth century towns. Dr Baigent has suggested that residential patterns in Bristol in the 1770s were transitional between the pre-industrial and the modern. "The central parishes were wealthy and housed many commercial and professional men as they always had done, but they were being eclipsed as the highest status areas of the city by the new residential suburbs" [51]. Dr Baigent has discussed the Bristol evidence in terms of a shift from Gemeinschaft to Gesellschaft. Like several other urban studies the work on Bristol is based on a single source of information and cannot capture the dynamic forces. The St Peter Port data are of interest precisely because they furnish material for une histoire sérielle in which spatial re-organisation can be related to economic and social developments.

Fig 32: The aggregate tax assessments of three vingtaines, 1781-1827.
The central vingtaines of Grande Rue and Pilori/Eglise slowly declined as
the elite moved to peripheral vingtaines such as Berthelot. (After 1822
Pilori/Eglise were aggregated with other vingtaines. A different principle
of tax assessment was used in 1825.)
The commercial success of the entrepot disturbed the traditional order, c. 1763. As artisans prospered, the upper ranks asserted their superiority by employing a dichotomous classification of society rather than the traditional "four class" model. The community was divided by ordinance into those who could legally engage in cock-fighting and those who could not. The legislation emphasized the divide between the rich and the poor, between elite and plebeian. At the same time the upper ranks reinforced their status by arrogating the title Ecuyer (Esquire).

The Carrefour and Grande Rue continued to be the most select residential areas during the 1760s and 1770s. Le Sieur Pierre Mourant, assessed at 160 quarters, moved from the Pollet to the Grande Rue in 1772 in what seems to have been a "betterment" step. In 1776 he was wealthier and his designation was revised upwards from le Sieur to Ecuyer. Mourant remained in the Grande Rue until the 1780s. He then moved to his newly built house at Candie, on the outskirts of the town. Mourant's move marks a watershed for he was one of the first of the wealthy négociants to leave the town centre. Unlike many of the négociants Mourant had no ties to an ancestral home in the Grande Rue. A house move was easier for a "new man". His motives are not known. He may have wished to escape the crowds of working people thronging the Grande Rue; or he may have wished to demonstrate his commercial success by a show of conspicuous consumption. In one sense his motives are unimportant; it was his deed that was significant. His handsome new house and extensive gardens constituted deliberately or accidentally a challenge to the other négociants.
The influx of English migrants in the 1780s and 1790s accelerated the collapse of the traditional schema of ranks. There was no automatic congruence between the migrants' perception of their own status and the Islanders' evaluation of the 'gastarbeiter'. These social frictions were exacerbated by economic changes. The migrants were working in a booming port town in which factories established new forms of organisation.

Societal changes in St Peter Port were contemporaneous with transformations elsewhere. The *ancien régime* vocabulary of ranks was abolished by the revolutionaries in France in the 1790s. From 1800 the constables of St Peter Port followed suit, listing just the names of taxpayers. Distinction was no longer proclaimed by the vocabulary of status. The only way in which the town elite could now assert their superiority was by the public display of wealth. The building of grand new houses on the outskirts of the town was the ultimate expression of economic power. It also offered the aristocracy the opportunity to avoid the urban proletariat. From c 1810 onwards the wealthy moved in increasing numbers to the new residential suburbs and by 1831 they were living in greater segregation than they had in 1727. Their move may have been accelerated by two factors. First, with the collapse of the entrepot trade, harbour-side houses lost some of their economic significance. Secondly, the development between 1790 and 1820 of the New Town, with neat houses for the middling classes, may have spurred the elite to modernise.

The town taxpayers were much wealthier in 1831 than they had been in 1727. And yet curiously the Gini co-efficient remained virtually constant throughout this era. The pattern of distribution of wealth had
not appreciably altered over the century despite the rapid economic changes that had occurred. This does not fit easily with the prevailing theory about urban development in the eighteenth century. It is generally understood that in the early modern period (16th - 17th centuries) urban society resembled an inverted T - "a low podium containing some 95% of the population, while balanced on top of this was a thin skyscraper of more wealthy people". That contrasted with the modern structure of society - a "lozenge or diamond in its general shape". Dr McInnes viewed early eighteenth century society "as being about half way between these two models". The change occurred because the middle sections of society were growing; this altered the inverted T into a "pyramidal or conical" shape. "The middle band was thicker... but not so broad as in the lozenge shaped society" (52).

The St Peter Port data reveal no shift in the structure of wealth distribution between 1727 and 1831. The number of those belonging to the middle sections of society did increase; but as there were also more wealthy taxpayers the profile of societal structure did not alter. It is possible that the greater occupational specialisation of the late eighteenth century has created the mirage of a disproportionately larger middle class. Peter Borsay has commented: "A larger and more diverse middling stratum would seem to fill the space between rich and poor, and lead to the emergence of a less polarised society. Whether in reality this was the case is debatable" (53).

In the following chapters the development of sociability and the physical transformation of the town will be examined in greater detail. Chapter Six explores, *inter alia*, the ways in which new forms of sociability mitigated the disruptive impact of the entrepot economy. Chapter Seven sets the spatial re-organisation of St Peter Port society against the background of topographical, legal and environmental determinants.
In the 16th and 17th centuries, the social life of St Peter Port was relatively simple and integrated. However, with the development of the entrepot in the 18th century, the town became more sophisticated. With its clubs, promenade, assembly, theatre and circulating libraries, St Peter Port increasingly resembled English provincial towns in the expression of its forms of sociability. Three inter-related factors promoted change: greater wealth, immigration, and the increasing influence of English manners. The establishment of a larger garrison at Fort George (c. 1780) accentuated the impact of English culture. In St Peter Port, as in other colonial towns of the nascent British Empire, the officer class set a certain style and standard to the local population.

Change engendered social tensions and problems. Seigneurial traditions were dissolved in the entrepot economy; cultural differentiation emphasized the divide between rich and poor; and immigrants brought different creeds. By the nineteenth century, St Peter Port's population was divided by linguistic, religious and cultural differences. There was little cohesion between such disparate groups as the English labourers lodged in slums near the harbour, the patois-speaking Guernsey women working in the markets, the Guernsey elite living on the outskirts of the town, and the English gentry, often of reduced means, living in New Town. Challenged by colonial dominance from above, and by English immigrants below, the elite of St Peter Port tried to assert its hegemony in religion and education. In a reaction against English culture, it resurrected the feudal chevauchee
and explored antiquarian byways of island history; but even in this the Guernsey gentry were imitating the English cult of the gothic.

Social life in St Peter Port c 1700 - c 1750

At the end of the seventeenth century the institutions of St Peter Port society seem to have been working together with a degree of harmony. The apparent absence of overt conflict can be attributed to the oligarchic hegemony of the merchants who simultaneously held political power, economic strength and the prestige of high status. Ordonnances summarily made by jurats in their capacity as legislators were subsequently enforced by the very same jurats in their capacity as judges. The jurats were merchants or from the families of merchants; thus political, legal and economic decisions were made by, and for, the same interest group. This power was legitimised by an ideology based on traditional practice and it was reasonably easy for the ruling elite to preserve its authority.

Apart from the small English garrison and a few immigrants, the vast majority of the town inhabitants were francophone. There was just one established (Anglican) parish church and it enjoyed a spiritual monopoly as there were no nonconformists or catholics resident in St Peter Port in the early modern period. As late as 1749 Samuel Bonamy was able to write that "the church of England is the only communion among us, there being not one disserter to my knowledge, either protestant or papist". The church maintained

[1] There were instances of power conflict between individuals; and of conflict involving extra-urban agents; this does not vitiate the substantive point.

morality both directly, by condemning sinners on Sundays, and indirectly, by exercising control over the schools in the parish. Conformity of behaviour was also achieved by the training of the able bodied men of the parish in the Guernsey militia. In church, school and militia the governing elite held both the instruments to promote a particular code of cultural values and the sanctions to discipline those who did not conform to social norms. Stability and continuity were achieved by cultural reproduction [3]. Samuel Bonamy rejoiced that he and his fellow Guernseymen were “perfectly united” in their sentiments of religion and government [4] “Pluralism” was considered undesirable in the traditional world. Yet already by the early Georgian period some of the agencies of cultural pluralism were being imported.

Although there is very little evidence about the social life of the common people in the early eighteenth century, that of the urban elite can be reconstructed to some extent. By the 1720s and 1730s leading members of the political and economic sectors met regularly together in club and assembly, enjoying a sociability that was in some degree modelled on, and fashioned by, English conventions. Membership of La Société de la Chambre was exclusive, being limited to seventeen, and constituted a small clique of the most powerful men in Guernsey. Members included a bailiff, a procureur, a controller, a doctor, a divine, jurats and merchants, the surnames representing a roll-call.


of the leading insular families of the eighteenth century (5). The club provided facilities for dining and for recreation (cards and backgammon) but, perhaps most importantly, it subscribed to English magazines and newspapers. A rule stipulated that the newspapers were to be opened inside the club and that they were not to be removed from there (6). It seems reasonable to conjecture that the Société de la Chambre was where the St Peter Port "establishment" exchanged new ideas of fashionability.

Guernsey did not possess a landed gentry in the English sense of the word. An "estate" of fifty acres was vast by island standards. Nevertheless, the letters and journals of wealthy Guernsey families suggest that by George I's reign it was a common practice to spend the summer months in the country and to reside in St Peter Port for the rest of the year. Associations such as the "Public Assembly for Dancing" - founded in the 1720s or 1730s - met during the winter months (7). This mirrored the practice of English provincial capitals and shire towns where, as Peter Borsay has shown, most cultural activities were packed into the "winter season" (8). Already then in the early eighteenth century the traditional patterns of sociability were being modified and the Guernsey gentry were adopting English ways. But the changes were limited; the major transformations came in the second half of the eighteenth century.

(6) Ibid., Jean Cornelius fined, April 1752.
(7) Saumarez Manor, letter book of Mathieu de Saumarez, p 309, 14 Sept 1733,
de Saumarez to Slowley, 14 Sept 1733
The transformation of social life in the late 18th century

The social life of St Peter Port was transformed in the second half of the eighteenth century. The extensive development of the entrepôt in the 1740s soon brought considerable wealth to the merchants of St Peter Port and this directly accelerated change in the character of the town's society and culture. There was much surplus money. Some index of the capital accumulation is afforded by the fact that the inhabitants of St Peter Port had "upwards of two million pounds" invested in the British funds by the early nineteenth century (9). The upper ranks of St Peter Port society had increasing opportunities to indulge in consumerism in this era of the commercialisation of leisure. There was a greater demand for fashionable goods, for entertainments, for more and better services.

But the development of the entrepôt had a much deeper impact on urban society. By stimulating the retail and service sectors, and by attracting a large numbers of migrants, it drew St Peter Port more deeply into the British colonial system. Initially this was an economic phenomenon based on the greater volume of trade between St Peter Port and the English ports. However the colonial status of St Peter Port was re-emphasised by the building of a fort and barracks at Fort George, c.1780, and the strengthening of the garrison. This brought a large

(9) PRO HD 98/30, 5 Feb 1807 Doyle to Treasury. In 1759 the money of the St Peter Port merchants in the public funds had been worth 9,000 quarters (in income), a quarter of wheat being valued at ten shillings. The Case of the Town Parish versus the Nine Country Parishes...1759 (Guernsey, 1843), pp 30, 59.
number of British officers to the town with important social consequences. Technically the garrison was in Guernsey not to impose its rule on the islanders but rather to defend the island against the threat of French invasion. Nevertheless, the presence of a large British army contingent was a colonial phenomenon and exercised a considerable impact on the urban culture. As Professor King has observed: "the life style and cultural behaviour of local populations may be modified as they emulate the ruling colonial elite" [10].

By the mid-eighteenth century "most people of fashion" in Guernsey lived in St Peter Port [11]. Urban sociability increased in the second half of the eighteenth century with the establishment of a formal promenade (1760), the founding of masonic lodges and clubs, the opening of a coffee house (c 1775), the introduction of the printing press (c 1775), the building of a new assembly room (1780-1), the construction of the Royal Theatre (c 1793) and the opening of academies and circulating libraries. By the late eighteenth century St Peter Port resembled some of the spas and resorts of England, such as Southampton and Weymouth. Indeed, there is some evidence that as early as 1795 a small number of English visitors were coming to the town in the summer season as tourists [12]. During these years St Peter Port was a community undergoing rapid economic and cultural transformation. It was a commercial entrepot developing as a gentry town; its French speaking


community was being assimilated into an English colonial system; and the urban population was increasingly a mixture of native islanders and English migrants. The social life of the period developed amidst these contending pressures. The next paragraphs trace the growth of conspicuous consumption and the quest for fashionability among the wealthy. The elite created arenas of display and spent more of their leisure time in associations. But as St Peter Port became more fashionable it became increasingly the town of the gentry. Cultural and social divides became deeper.

**Conspicuous consumption**

The patterns of conspicuous consumption and the quest for fashionability were clearly influenced by women, especially merchants' wives. Jack Dobree joked that as he proposed to remain a bachelor he had money enough to lead a lazy life [13]. The married merchants could find themselves involved in considerable domestic expenses. In April 1766 Peter Lihou wrote to his London suppliers, Messrs Peter & Peter Perchard, and expressed satisfaction with everything that had been sent "except the coffee pot which my wife thinks is not fashionable" [14]. In 1771 Lihou wrote to William de Jersey in London requesting that some material be dyed green "le plus à la mode". The stuff was to be made into "un petit veste & culotte à un enfant de 4 à 5 ans" along with a

---


matching "petite côte". Lihou's tailor would be able to advise on the type of material "la plus propre pour l'effet". The outfit was to be accompanied by a hat "des plus à la mode" for about a guinea [15].

These episodes from merchant Lihou's domestic life illustrate the growth of conspicuous consumption in St Peter Port. But more than that, they reveal that costly goods were not in themselves sufficiently prestigious, the coffee pot and child's clothing had to be in fashionable styles. Status could be established by projecting an image of affluence and of taste. Expensive items were not ultimately sufficient. Taste could bespeak "the elegant self-assurance of inherited wealth" and create a distance from "the flashy arrogance of the nouveaux riches" [16].

The quest for the costly and distinguished manifested itself particularly in the design of houses, the choice of clothing and the selection of food. The wealthy merchant Isaac Dobree ordered outfits embroidered in gold and silver from Paris, the capital that was the ultimate arbitre elegantiae. Later on English fashions prevailed. A nineteenth century commentator felt that the islanders had copied too much from England in their style of living; "a soirée à la Française

[17] Greffe, Amirauté vol 13: 15 Dec 1750 (Dobree actioned by Mr Jean Pierre Beuselin for 2647 livres - 14s - 6d [French currency] for "deux habits, vestes & culottes brodés, l'un en or, & l'autre en argent que l'acteur lui a fait faire à Paris").
would become them more than champagne dinners and suppers, which often partake quite as much of ostentation as of hospitality" [18]. The merchants of St Peter Port not only had the necessary capital for lavish living but were also well placed to secure choice commodities. At least one merchant family used a relation in the East India Company to secure a dinner set from China with each plate bearing the family coat of arms [19].

Areas of display - the promenade and the assembly

The desire to project an image of wealth and status accelerated the development of locations and situations for display. The promenade at the New Ground was an opportunity "to see and be seen", a means by which polite society "could establish and re-inforce its sense of identity" [20]. Elizabeth Ham likened the promenade at the New Ground, St Peter Port, to the Esplanade at Weymouth "in so far as it was the general resort of the Naval and Military Officers, who were the real magnets, though the bands were the ostensible ones, that drew gaily dressed Belles to the evening Promenade on the New Ground" [21].

The other principal arena of display was the assembly [22].

---

the 1770s this was held weekly in a large room at the bottom of the Pollet [23]. Correspondents wrote of the brilliance and gaiety of the social life and contrasted the "carelessness and freedom of the Guernsey assemblies" with the "stiffness and formality" of Jersey society [24]. The assembly was pre-eminently a place for the young and the unmarried. In January 1778 Mrs Dumaresq complained that at the last assembly she was the only married person there of both men and women. The absence of parents and chaperones was, perhaps, an expression of the greater freedom granted to children in the eighteenth century to choose their own marriage partner [25].

In 1777 the planned construction of a new market provided the opportunity for the building of a spacious upper room to serve as an assembly. To this end a sum of one thousand pounds was subscribed by twenty three members of leading families. These founding members held shares and controlled the running of "the Rooms". This enabled them to regulate the membership of the assembly and to exercise the ultimate judgment on the eligibility of newcomers to Guernsey high society. When the application of a Mr Price was turned down, Martha Dobree explained in a letter: "there are above a dozen, I might say twenty families, who

have at least as much right as him who are only waiting his introduction to propose themselves; the line we have happily kept drawn once broken through, we should not know where to stop..." [26]. Membership of the assembly was very select. As the English visitor Berry observed, only first class people were admitted; but he found it difficult to define the criteria: "ample fortune will not accomplish it and neither business nor lack of noble ancestry is any bar to it" [27].

The fashionability of the assembly was enhanced by the presence of officers from the British garrison. The assembly served as the setting for balls and suppers given by gentlemen of the island in honour of the garrison; the officers reciprocated by giving a ball on the 4th of June, George III's birthday. The English visitor Elizabeth Ham found that these balls "always caused great heart-burnings from their exclusiveness" [28]. Among its other functions the assembly was a marriage mart at which eligible bachelors were introduced to the daughters of leading Guernsey families. The entertainments grew increasingly expensive. The cost of throwing a ball for nearly two hundred people amounted to £36 4s 8d in 1786 but thanks to "senseless extravagance" a similar entertainment cost about £500 twenty five years later [29].

Voluntary associations

The growth of affluence and leisure-time produced more complex patterns of sociability. As in England an "increasingly fashionable way of articulating economic success was through membership of societies" [30]. There was a mushrooming of different types of clubs, associations and societies in St Peter Port. These all shared certain characteristics, convivial eating and drinking in particular. They also represented a social phenomenon that distinguished urban from rural life and made living in town an enjoyable experience. Moreover they helped to preserve social cohesion during a period of rapid urban expansion. In these respects clubs, associations and societies can be treated under one heading. Nevertheless, there were differences between the associations. Some of the clubs were the preserve of the upper ranks of society, the lower orders being excluded; other associations actively recruited across the boundaries of rank and order. The clubs of local elites were quickly formed and as easily dissolved; the masonic lodges on the other hand belonged to a wider world, with a philosophy, constitution and rule book influenced by practice in London.

Little detailed evidence about the clubs has survived but some indication of club life is furnished by the diaries of Dobree and Mollet who at various dates attended the Fermain Club (just outside St Peter Port); the Friendly Club; the Port Club; the Follet Club; the Town Club; and "Liberty Hall". Apart from the men's clubs there was a club "des dames & demoiselles" and Elizabeth Ham visited the Hum-drums.

an assembly "confined entirely to Ladies". The entertainment consisted of "Cards, Hoyle, and abundance of rich, sweet cakes" [31]. Some clubs seem to have been frequented by young people and to have been the setting for "amours" [32]. George Bell, bewitched by Miss Condamine, was forbidden by his parents to go to her club [33]. The clubs entertained one another. In January 1773 Mary Le Mesurier commented: "It is customary that all clubs give each other suppers at this time of year but we do more we give likewise a dinner" [34]. The members of "Liberty Hall" owned a boat in which they went on trips to Herm and France [35] but this club also had a political basis. It had been founded by Captain Bellier Gosselin and others who admired Tom Paine and the leaders of the French revolution [36]. This club was possibly the same as the Société Indépendante which in December 1792 solemnly pledged the loyalty of its two hundred and fifty odd members to King George III. The members asserted that their club had no subversive intent and that it

---


[33] Priaulx, LeMesurier mss, 14 Jan 1778 Dumaresq to LeMesurier.

[34] Priaulx, LeMesurier mss, 9 Jan 1773 Le Mesurier to LeMesurier.


was devoted to conversation, literature and amusement [37].

Club meetings usually took place at taverns, Viings in the Pollet being a popular rendez-vous. There was frequently heavy drinking [38]. One evening in the winter of 1775 Billy Carey and nine others drank 34 bottles of claret. When Carey wished to leave, his companions took the key from the locked door. Carey jumped out of the window of the upper chamber and fell to his death [39].

The records for masonic bodies are particularly good. The first regular lodge to be opened in Guernsey was at the Lily Tavern and was constituted by the Modern Grand Lodge on 10 May 1753 [40]. The merchant Thomas Dobree was appointed Provincial Grand Master for Guernsey, Jersey, Alderney Sark and Herm on 22 December 1753 [41]. Two other lodges were constituted by the Moderns in 1760 and 1774 but the remaining lodges founded in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries were all Ancients' foundations [42].

[37] Gazette de Guernesey, 29 Dec 1792 pp 40-42.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Style</th>
<th>Foundation No.</th>
<th>Meeting place</th>
<th>Demise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Three Crowns</td>
<td>Moderns</td>
<td>1760</td>
<td>No 256</td>
<td>Three Crowns 1768.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>Ancients</td>
<td>1763</td>
<td>No 116</td>
<td>Three Crowns (soon elapsed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmony</td>
<td>Moderns</td>
<td>1774</td>
<td>No 472</td>
<td>Pollet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mariners' Lodge</td>
<td>Ancients</td>
<td>1784</td>
<td>No 222</td>
<td>Royal George</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange Lodge</td>
<td>Ancients</td>
<td>1789</td>
<td>No 141</td>
<td>1828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodge of Harmony</td>
<td>Ancients</td>
<td>1805</td>
<td>No 334</td>
<td>King's Arms 1829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doyle's Lodge</td>
<td>Ancients</td>
<td>1807</td>
<td>No 336</td>
<td>1828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodge of Unity</td>
<td>Ancients</td>
<td>1806</td>
<td>No 337</td>
<td>1828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyalty Lodge</td>
<td>Ancients</td>
<td>1810</td>
<td>No 349</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Members of the lodges came from upper and middling rank backgrounds. Doyle's lodge had military origins and contained many members from the army (43); but it also contained numerous merchants, a minister, sailmaker, shipwright, musician, stationer and lawyer (44).


In the 1790s the Orange Lodge included a tavern keeper, pilot, ship's captain, musician, carpenter and merchant [45]. Between 1806 and 1810 the Mariners' Lodge reported initiating fifty three mariners, three shipwrights, one ropemaker, one pilot, a ship's captain and nineteen others [46]. These lodges were "Ancients" and the evidence of their composition, although slight, corroborates the observation that the "Ancients" were less elitist than the "Moderns" [47]. In transcending occupational and national divides the lodges helped to promote cohesion in St Peter Port society at a time when the town was growing rapidly and experiencing social tensions.

Eighteenth century freemasonry consisted of "pseudo-mysticism and charitable works" [48] but informally it offered more to its members. Brothers travelling abroad had access to an international network of contacts. Captains initiated in Guernsey had entry into the various American lodges [49]. Conversely, foreign merchants and seafarers found hospitality in St Peter Port lodges. In 1808 Mariners'

[48] Ibid. p 10.
Lodge included members who originated from Sunderland, Bristol, London, Jersey, North Shields, Oporto, Swansea, Plymouth, Gravesend and Rhode Island. The masonic system particularly reinforced the links between St Peter Port and London. Freemasonry represented one of the exemplars of metropolitan culture exported from England to all quarters of the British Empire. The St Peter Port lodges were in communication with the Grand Lodge in London and this strengthened the influence of English practice. In 1813 Mariners' Lodge resolved that any Brother who should speak any other language than the English should pay a fine of sixpence.

Lodge activities included convivial drinking with guests. On 10 November 1801 the Mariners' Lodge decided to hold a meeting weekly on Fridays for members and friends "and to pay for cold grog twopence per glass and for warm, ditto, with sugar, threepence. Wine two shillings per bottle, and porter tenpence per glass". Philanthropy was sometimes combined with entertainment. In 1802 Brother Marshall of the Theatre Royal was given a "benefit" by the Brethren of Mariners' Lodge. Parading in public and church attendance were other features of masonic life. On 20 June 1807 Mariners' Lodge decided that "the Brethren should walk hand in hand with their Jewels to the Trinity Chapel to hear Bro. Isdell preach" and on 13 August 1810 the Worshipful Master and officers of Mariners' "walked from the Lodge in Town to St Martin's, and enjoyed a

[50] United Grand Lodge, London, A 50 CDC fol, E Cochrane, op. cit..
Festival at Bro. Gore's house" to celebrate the birthday of the Prince of Wales [52]. Public appearances were of value to freemasons because of the enhanced status that could accrue to a member. "The knowledge that substantial friends, as well as kith and kin, would stand by a tradesman increased his creditworthiness" [53].

Friendly societies formed another group of clubs. Regular subscription to La Société des Veuves (or "Widows' Society") ensured that on the death of a member of three or more years' standing, the widow received an annual pension of £30 for the duration of her widowhood or until she re-married. This club was started on 26 January 1764 by nineteen merchants, a timber merchant, two clergymen, an advocate, two surgeons, a brewer, a public notary, a sea officer and a land officer. Many of these founding members belonged to the highest rank of urban society and were wealthy. A further twenty nine members were admitted to the society on 8 February 1764 but this second cohort included an innkeeper, mariners, a bricklayer, a cooper, a shopkeeper and a tobacconist along with a gentleman and more merchants. Many of the members admitted in February belonged to a socio-economic rank lower than that of the founder members of January [54]. Far from seeking exclusivity, the society seems intentionally to have been bridging occupational and social divides. Robert Morris has argued that

[54] _Articles of the Friendly Society, of the Island of Guernsey_ (Salisbury, 1764), pp 15-18.
many voluntary societies were founded "as a response to a specific urban crisis" [55]. It has already been demonstrated that there was some degree of status friction in St Peter Port in the mid 1760s, and it is possible that the founders of the "Widows' Society" were consciously trying to re-establish their authority during a period of rapid social change [56]. Apart from cementing relationships in St Peter Port, the "Widows' Society" helped to strengthen commercial ties by admitting at least two influential English merchants - Mark Gregory and William Seward [57]. The Society met on the second Wednesday in every month between 8 and 11 p.m., when members and guests dined together [58].

La Société l'Alliance, founded in August 1774, was essentially a "box club" for urban wage earners. It paid members five shillings a week when they were indisposed. The society provided a form of health insurance and in return it demanded certain standards of morality. The members dined together once a year [59].

[57] An Additional Article, of the Friendly Society in Guernsey (Southampton, n.d., 1769?), p 9, entries 88 and 90. See Chapter Three footnote 54 for Mark Gregory. William Seward of Southampton is frequently mentioned in the correspondence of the Guernsey merchants.
[58] Articles of the Friendly Society, of the Island of Guernsey (Salisbury, 1764), p 5.
[59] Articles et Ereglements d' une Société d' Amis (Guernsey, 1775).
Cultural differentiation

Cultural differentiation in eighteenth century English towns is a well attested phenomenon and its impact has been seen as powerful and pervasive. However Peter Borsay has warned that this differentiation should not be overemphasised and Jonathan Barry has recently argued that the cultural/social divides in eighteenth century Bristol should not be exaggerated [60]. The experience of St Peter Port was significantly different from that of English towns. In Guernsey cultural differentiation occurred not just between the elite and the populace but also in the context of two quite different traditions—that of patois speaking islanders and that of English speaking immigrants. There were, essentially, four sub-groups in St Peter Port in the second half of the eighteenth century: Guernsey-born elite; Guernsey-born lower orders; immigrant lower orders; "colonial" elite.

The most obvious divide between the islanders and the immigrants lay in their different languages. English was both the language of commerce and of high society. A lack of fluent English could place the St Peter Port merchant at a disadvantage. The trader Guerin had to throw himself on the goodwill of an English supplier: "As I am in want of many sorts of goods, of which I donth [sic] know the names in English, nor how you sells them, if you can favour me with an explication in English and French ..." [61].


[61] Island Archive Office, AQ P002/05U Guerin ledgers, 13 Feb 1788
Guerin to John Clark & Co.
The education offered in St Peter Port in the eighteenth century was not adequate for "the new intercourse which the English brought here on affairs & matters of business" [62]. This encouraged the St Peter Port merchants to send their children to England to be educated. A homesick boy begging to return to Guernsey from a boarding school was advised to remain in England where he would learn to pronounce English with "that propriety you must unavoidably attain by constantly hearing it spoken by the natives" [63].

Closer contact between the islanders and the English "created a new order of things, and much of the manners and customs began to wear away" [64]. Children sent to England were severed from their cultural roots. W.P. LeCocq wrote from his boarding school at Chesham "I wish somebody would come here who understood Guernsey French as I don't wish to forget it, because it is my native tongue" [65].

The linguistic collision was accelerated in the late eighteenth century with the establishment of several academies in St Peter Port. The migrants running these schools made a feature of teaching "good" English. Mr Seager advertised that at his "Academie Anglaise" there would be "un soin particulier à la prononciation" and that pupils would learn to speak "sans aucun mauvais accent" [66]. A.B. Fisher stressed

[64] Priaulx, Lukis ms., E. Carey transcript.
[65] Priaulx, Le Cocq letters/SE, 4 Feb 1800 W.P. Le Cocq to parents.
ease of pronunciation of English at his school \([67]\); and R.V. Courtenay taught reading "according to Sheridan's pronunciation" \([68]\). Clearly there was not only a cultural divide between islanders and immigrants based on the difference of language but also social differentiation based on pronunciation.

There was a certain amount of bilingualism and language mixing in St Peter Port in the late Georgian period. Elizabeth Han commented about one resident: "Poor Mrs Price spoke a funny sort of language, a mixture of Guernsey French and bad English" \([69]\). Edward Sapir and Benjamin Lee Whorf have hypothesised "that a speaker's native language sets up a series of categories which act as a kind of grid through which he perceives the world, and which constrain the way in which he categorizes and conceptualizes different phenomena" \([70]\). The hypothesis is contentious but suggests that linguistic differences can produce cognitive differences and that language can condition a person's view of the environment \([71]\). Ann Dobree experienced such a culture shock in the early nineteenth century when some of the St Peter Port streets were re-named in English. She complained: "The streets are all labelled to

\[67\] Gazette de Guernesey, 17 Nov 1796.
\[68\] Gazette de Guernesey, 5 Nov 1796
\[71\] Ibid. p 26.
my great mortification as it unGuernseyfies us....the profonde rue is promoted to St James Street...ninety-nine steps changed into Constitution Steps et les Cotes to Rosemary Lane" (72). In St Peter Port, as in British India, English, the language of modernisation, promoted change "through the transformation of cultural meaning and value" (73).

Cultural differentiation increased as English became the predominant language of literacy in St Peter Port. By the early nineteenth century there were four circulating libraries in the town, of which one was French, three English. An English visitor found these "well stocked with the best modern novels and other light, popular publications of the day, which, with all the periodical magazines and Reviews, are obtained here almost as soon as they are published in London" (74). In 1813 Mrs Seager advertised that she had just received from London an extensive circulating library "consisting of Travels, Voyages, Antiquities, Lives, Memoirs, Romances and Novels; comprising

[72] Priaulx, Dobree family file, 1 Aug 1818 Dobree to Routh.


[74] (Anon) A Summer Stroll Through the Islands of Jersey and Guernsey (Jersey, 1809), p 31. Cp. P. Borsay, The English Urban Renaissance (Oxford, 1989), p 287: "Simply by purchasing a newspaper or borrowing a periodical or book from the local circulating library or club, a country dweller could be put in contact with national and international news and fashion".
nearly 2000 volumes..." [75].

Between 1791 and 1836 some twenty-two newspapers and magazines were launched in St Peter Port. Many enjoyed only a short existence but it is significant that of the 22 titles 14 were English [76]. Many papers carried material in English and French, but invariably one language predominated. It is possible to detect differential patterns of advertising, the language selected regularly being determined by the group identified as potential consumers.

Theatrical entertainments in the town during the second half of the eighteenth century were usually in English. In the 1790s the audiences were frequently composed of the numerous traders and strangers who were in the island. An argument in favour of encouraging the visit of an English touring company to St Peter Port was that listening to the actors would correct the horrible pronunciation of the youth of the island [77]. The construction in St Peter Port c.1795 of a purpose-built theatre ("The Royal Theatre") by the English actor-manager Bernard afforded a permanent venue for dramatic and musical performances. Instead of being an occasional port of call for strolling players, the town became fully incorporated into the circuits of touring companies from the West of England. This bound the island ever closer

[75] Gazette de Guernesey 24 Apr 1813 p 67c.
[77] Gazette de Guernesey, 28 Nov 1795.
to English canons of taste and fashionability (78).

Social and cultural problems

As we saw earlier, with St Peter Port's growth there were increasing social problems in the town. At the same time the old Anglican conformism was challenged by various new denominations. Respect for authority seemed to be on the decline. The local authorities tried to re-affirm the status quo by devoting more attention to education and church building. In the latter sphere they were aided by the British government and its representatives. But English culture constituted a threat to traditional insular values and as the nineteenth century wore on the islanders increasingly cherished their Norman heritage. This was partly a nostalgia for a lost world, partly a repudiation of Anglo-Saxon culture.

Religious uniformity came to an end in the last quarter of the eighteenth century, principally because of the arrival in the town of non-anglican migrants. The first nonconformist mission arrived in St Peter Port in the 1770s when the Quaker Claude Gay made some converts (79). The Anglican Dean of Guernsey was tolerant at first; but later became concerned when the Quaker Peter Le Lâcheur opened a free school for the labouring poor at five o'clock in the morning. When told to desist Le Lâcheur replied that if the Dean, "or any of his clergy, would

---


undertake to teach his poor neighbor, as he did, without a view of gain" he would desist and he heard no more of the matter [80].

There was a sustained effort to win converts to Methodism in the 1780s, some English Methodists seeing the Channel Islands as the key to a mission in France. The islanders' attitude to Methodists was equivocal but the bailiff (William Le Marchant) gave considerable help by selling them land in St Peter Port to build a chapel [81]. Some Methodists provoked hostility by refusing to perform militia drill on Sundays, even during wartime, and the British authorities deplored "the delinquency of about an hundred Methodistical sectaries" who were "loose & ill charactered aliens residing on (not natives of) this island" [82]. Despite some friction, Methodism grew steadily and by 1835 there were approximately 440 adult English-speaking and 1060 adult French-speaking members of the Wesleyan sect on the island. However, according to an estimate of 1836 the adult population attending services in the Wesleyan chapels throughout the island amounted to four thousand five hundred [83].


[82] PRO HO 98/24, 22 July 1794 Small to Amherst; 29 July 1794 Small to Amherst.

Dissent in Guernsey was an urban rather than a rural phenomenon. In the ten years from 1821 to 1830 only 5% of the unregistered (i.e. non-Anglican) baptisms in Guernsey were in the nine country parishes, 95% being in St Peter Port [84]. The non-Anglican baptisms in St Peter Port in that decade represented 18.1% of the total number of baptisms in the town, which might suggest that approximately one fifth of the urban population was non-conformist or Catholic. However, the true figure was almost certainly higher because baptismal rates are likely to have "lagged" behind conversion rates.

Confronted by a growing range of social and cultural problems, the local authorities re-acted, as in English towns, with a variety of educational and religious responses designed to re-assert control. An Anglican Sunday School was established in 1789 and by 1791 some 150 boys and 81 girls were receiving instruction in French and English [85]. In 1812 it was amalgamated with the newly opened National School which gave an elementary education combined with Anglican religious instruction. The Reverend Durand reported to the Bishop of Winchester that he thought that by this they had "effectually counteracted the introduction of the Lancastrian system" into the island [86]. Nevertheless the nonconformists supplied education. The

---

Wesleyans and French and English Independents founded Sunday schools in the town and by 1827 over six hundred pupils were inscribed on their registers [87].

In the sector of secondary education the elite, with the cooperation of the Lieutenant-Governor, responded to the challenge of private academies, dissent and "upward mobility" by re-founding Elizabeth College (1824). Although the Tudor foundation had, by implication, been a free school, the re-founded college charged £12 per annum for its education. This was defended on the grounds that free classical instruction "tended only to excite hopes which could not afterwards be realized" [88].

The Guernsey establishment campaigned for a new church. In 1815-1816 Admiral Sir James Saumarez and others petitioned the English authorities for permission to build another Anglican church in the parish. They claimed that the Town Church could not contain more than 1500 persons "while the population of the parish is estimated at more than 12,000, one third of which consists of English residents" [89]. The petitioners noted that English residents were defecting to the nonconformist chapels "to the great prejudice & danger of the Established church" and asked permission for a new church to serve "an increased and increasing English population". This petition led to the building of St James (1817-1818).

[88] Ibid. p 357.
In the late Georgian era the elite of St Peter Port found its hegemony challenged from both below and above. This accelerated the movement of the leading citizens from the town centre to the suburbs. This strategy re-affirmed differentiation in the social hierarchy but there still remained the challenge of English culture. The elite responded to this by resurrecting, in June 1813 and in June 1825, a long discontinued mediaeval ceremony called the chevauchee. This was a feudal form of "beating the bounds" and involved a wealth of pageantry. Jacobs described it as "attended with customs entirely local" [90]. The resurrection of this mediaeval ceremony was a symbolic affirmation of insular traditions. It was accompanied by an increasing antiquarian interest in the heritage of the island. Some of this interest may be attributed to the growing Romantic fashion for the gothic. Even here, however, the St Peter Port gentry in trying to redefine their sense of identity were actually using English cultural language through local cultural artefacts.

Conclusion

Throughout the Georgian era St Peter Port developed new forms of sociability modelled on English practices. It is possible to identify two competing systems. On the one hand clubs and societies offered the opportunity to assert the exclusiveness of status. Membership of the Société de la Chambre and the Assembly was prestigious precisely because entry was strictly limited. On the other hand there were several associations which intentionally brought together employers and employees. The Société des Veuves and the Masonic

lodges bridged occupational and ethnic divides. The stability of St Peter Port during a time of rapid economic change was, in part, secured by these associations. Nevertheless, the entrepot trade generated a degree of wealth and of immigration that destroyed traditional patterns of urban life. By the early nineteenth century St Peter Port society was riven by deep cultural divides. These were emphasised by the spatial re-organisation of the town. The elite living in their neo-classical villas on the hill above St Peter Port controlled from afar the urban proletariat lodging in ancient slums near the port. The urban morphology is the subject of the next chapter.
There have been studies of the architecture of St Peter Port but these have focused principally on existing buildings and on styles [1]. Little attention has been paid to the study of the spatial organisation of St Peter Port or to the interaction between geographical, legal, economic, social and political factors in the creation and transformation of the town.

Fundamental to the understanding of the urban geography of St Peter Port are two aspects of mediaeval insular law. First, the law of succession inside the barrières of the town differed from the feudal code that prevailed throughout the rest of the island. Secondly, land transactions in Guernsey shared certain features with the Scottish feuing system. This introduced an inflationary factor into the land market and favoured the building of tall houses.

In the late 17th and early 18th centuries the fabric of St Peter Port was still essentially mediaeval. In 1748 a French commentator saw the town as being "petite et mal bâtie" [2]. Yet by 1823 Professor Dobree of Cambridge was able to praise the urban improvements: "This place is very much improved in its general appearance, besides two or

three very glorious things they have done to beautify it" [3]. In analysing this transformation it is convenient to subdivide the period into three phases. First, from 1680 to c. 1750, the town hardly grew in size but considerable effort was expended in improving the harbour, building warehouses and constructing a hospital to house the poor. The second phase, c.1750 - c.1800, witnessed rapid urban expansion into the fields to the west of the old town. This was accompanied by a new ethic of leisure and civic consciousness. Stone and brick replaced Tudor timber. The mediaeval street market gave way to a handsomely built market-cum-assembly; the ancient court was abandoned for a fine new complex. The wealthy left the crowded High Street for the privacy of the suburbs. Population pressure led to the construction of new residential areas. Streets were levelled and widened and provision was made for lighting the town. In the third stage, c.1800 - c.1830, there was a shift from the concept of individual and parochial responsibility to the idea of collective action at an island level. A series of ambitious schemes - public and private - brought about the demolition of large parts of the mediaeval centre of St Peter Port. Fine new markets and a shopping arcade replaced the vermin-ridden slums of the cramped venelles around the church. The physical transformation of St Peter Port was accompanied by a growing concern for the provision of better urban facilities. The government of the town had become increasingly complex.

Paintings in the Legge Survey show that in 1680 St Peter Port retained much of its Tudor form and size (4). The town was still much as Camden had described it, "a little town...long and narrow" bordering on the haven (5). The Legge Survey draws attention to the location of St Peter Port "on the side of a steep hill". This hill constituted what geographers call a fixation line and it exercised an important physical control over the development of the town (6).

Urban growth was constrained in a second way. From the mediaeval period a ring of barrière stones marked the boundary of the town wall. Although royal permission was granted in the fourteenth century for the construction of a wall, Professor Le Patourel doubted whether it was actually built (7). The existence of such a fortification - designed to protect St Peter Port against French attacks - would certainly have hindered urban growth. But regardless of whether the wall did or did not exist, the barrière line was invested with a more potent constraining force: it constituted the demarcation line.

(4) The original of the Legge Survey is in the National Maritime Museum, Greenwich. There are copies in the British Library (King's Ms 46); and in the Royal Court Library, St Peter Port.
(5) V. Camden, Britannia (Amsterdam, 1639) p 455.
between town and country, a line of critical importance to the island advocates in settling inheritance matters. The legal system in Guernsey was so arranged that the law of succession inside the town's barrière line was a modified version of the feudal code which prevailed throughout the rest of the island. The fact that the town enjoyed this privileged legal position is probably one reason why Guernsey's merchants were all to be found living in St Peter Port [8].

The area of land inside the barrières was limited and consequently expensive. The high cost of land favoured vertical rather than horizontal development. This was one reason why so many town houses were built with narrow frontages and were raised five (and sometimes six) storeys high. A similar phenomenon occurred in Scotland. Richard Rodger has argued that the conferment of burghal status "fixed highly restrictive boundaries which in the event of commercial development pressurized land availability and forced building-operations skywards" [9].

[8] Outside the barrières the eldest son automatically inherited a vingtième (twentieth part of the whole) and préciput (the house and its appurtenances). J.H. Le Patourel, op. cit. p 173, comments that 'to give the eldest son a "préciput" in an urban area would amount to giving him the whole, or almost the whole property'. The rule can be traced back to the sixteenth century and may have been made in the medieaval period.

Dr Rodger has identified a further factor that explains the construction of the high-rise dwellings characteristic of even the smallest of townships in Scotland. He has shown that the Scottish system of “feuing” combined aspects of freehold and leasehold and that this mixture tended to inflate land prices [10]. Guernsey had a feudal system of land tenure similar in certain respects to the Scottish [11]. In Guernsey the purchase of land could be made by the immediate payment of the price agreed upon; but usually it was “by the payment of a part only, and the conversion of the remainder into rents to be annually paid; or, finally, by converting the whole of the price into such rents” [12]. The Scottish and Guernsey systems shared inflationary elements. In Scotland the mixture of freehold and leasehold in one contract could prompt vendors to impose an onerous feu duty over and above the maximised land value equivalent to the freehold sale. In Guernsey the mixture of part payment and annual corn rent almost certainly exerted a similar influence on land prices. Moreover, in Scotland feu duties were an attractive form of investment, “competition for which may in itself have forced up the level of feu-duty” [13]. There was comparable investment in rents in

[10] Ibid.

[11] It is worth noting in this context that both Scottish and Guernsey law are ultimately based on Roman Law.


The barrière stones were situated in the Follet, rue des Forges, Berthelot Street, Fountain Street, Beauregard and by the Town Church [15]. Inside this fixation line there was a compact urban core with relatively small and valuable plot divisions. Outside the line was a "fringe belt" with a different pattern of land division. In 1660 St Peter Port was still essentially confined by the fixation line and most of the fringe belt consisted of fields (see Plates 1 and 2). However, there were two zones where the fixation line had been broken and where development had occurred in the fringe belt. There had been expansion to the west of the town with suburban ribbon development along the valley of Fountain Street; and there had also been building along the sea-shore to the north of the town, linking St Peter Port to the little fishing village known as the "territoire de Glatigny" [16].

Much of the fabric of the town was mediaeval and by the late 17th century did not impress visitors. In 1678 Charles Trumbull commented: "Besides the Pier the Town has nothing remarkable in or about it, the houses generally not built for ornament but for present use.


without ceilings and with most untoward chimneys" [17]. Even in 1748 a French writer described the town as "petite et mal bâtie" [18]. But a year later Samuel Bonamy presented a more favourable picture of the town. He conceded that the streets were narrow and irregular but boasted that some of the three to four hundred houses were "very good ones, because most people of fashion live in the town" [19].

The important buildings were the mediaeval court house (known as the Plaiderie) situated towards the north of the town; and the parish church at the southern end of the town. The Plaiderie and the church represented the juridical and ecclesiastical powers located in St Peter Port. These two buildings were linked by the Pollet and the Grande Rue, the junction of those streets with the Rue des Forges being "Le Grand Carrefour". In the early modern period this "Great Crossways" constituted the geographical centre-point of the town, being almost equi-distant between church and court and also approximately halfway between the northern and southern limits of the barriers line. Le Grand Carrefour was where some of the wealthiest merchants lived [20]. They enjoyed a commanding view over the street-market and harbour. Ships'
cargoes were unloaded almost directly into the cellars and vaults of the houses; and from the upper windows the merchants kept an eagle eye on port business and any suspicious activities [21].

Changes between 1680 and c.1750

Between 1680 and 1750 there were three principal areas of improvement in the town - the extensive development of the harbour (1706-1730); the construction of excellent warehousing facilities in the Truchot and Bordage vingtaines (1740s); and the building of the Town Hospital (1741-3). The warehouses and hospital were built in the fringe belt, outside the barrières, where there was space for relatively extensive developments. The hospital site alone covered more than an acre [22]. These projects were costly capital investments of significance in the development of the urban economy. The harbour improvements were financed by voluntary contributions from the town inhabitants and cost about 12,000 livres tournois [23]. Subscriptions and endowments from wealthy merchants and other town dwellers raised about twelve or fourteen thousand livres tournois to erect the town hospital [24].

[23] *The case of the Town Parish versus the nine country parishes...1759* (Guernsey, 1843), p 19
It is instructive to notice what the town merchants did not do during this period. The Plaiderie was in a poor state of repair and in 1737 the Marquis de Montendre suggested that it would be better to build a handsome new court house than to spend money upon the old. He promised that if the gentlemen of the island would raise about four hundred pounds towards the project he would add one hundred pounds of his own (25). The gentlemen demonstrated their priorities by investing not in a "creditable new court house....for their honour" but in the unglamorous infra-structure of the economy. The enlargement of the harbour and the construction of the warehouses were vital for the development of the entrepot. The building of the Town Hospital was a practical method of controlling poor relief and exacting useful work from the indigent.

Eric Jones and others have demonstrated that between 1660 and 1780 many provincial towns in the south of England were improved, thanks to mounting investment in the public and private urban fabric. Brick replaced timber, thatch gave way to tiles and slates; street-paving, drainage and street-lighting were improved. Georgian towns began to present a more attractive appearance (26). The stimulus of internal trade and a profitable agricultural sector had already brought about considerable advances by the mid-18th century. St Peter Port lagged

behind those provincial English towns in most respects.

In the early 18th century the streets of St Peter Port were still narrow, poorly repaired and dirty. There was an ancient obligation on householders to repair and keep clean the part of the street in front of their house but this duty was not always honoured [27]. Any cleaning that did take place consisted of sweeping dirt into the open gutter in the centre of the street. The gutters carried away not just rainwater and dirt but also foul domestic water and drainage from the venelles. "These passages, not more than a foot or a foot and a half in width, received the drainage from the court-yards or small gardens in the rear of the houses, and also the household water and other filth thrown from small windows opening on them" [28]. In 1739 a rate was raised on the householders living in the centre of the town to pay for the hiring of Simon Eeynard as a scavenger. His duties were to include sweeping the streets with a brush and removing domestic dirt, ash and dust three days a week (Tuesday, Thursday and Saturday) [29].

The one sphere in which the town authorities did make consistent efforts was in fire prevention and fire-fighting. St Peter Port was packed with multi-storied houses crammed close to one another. Many of the houses had timber frames and thatched roofs and they were not easily

[28] Priaulx, Lukis ms.
accessible. This in itself constituted a fire hazard but the risks of a major conflagration were increased when the merchants stored large quantities of inflammable goods in their cellars. There was also a fire hazard at the harbour when vessels were breasted. St Peter Port was a "potential firebomb" [30]. At the meeting of Chief Pleas, 1 October 1683, it was proposed that money should be found to buy some leather buckets, ladders and equipment for fire-fighting [31]. The Court found this reasonable and gave instructions for the raising of a tax of 250 livres tournois. Those who owned thatched houses within the barrières of the town were ordered to cover their houses with slate ["ardoise"] before St Michael's day of the following year; the penalty for failure to comply with this order was set at 500 livres tournois. It was probably this proposal that led to the renewing of the barrières stones in 1684 [32]. With the boundary clearly marked no householder could plead ignorance.

As the trade of St Peter Port grew, the risk of fire increased. In November 1707 the town constable Nicolas Dobre paid William Dobre in London £32 sterling for "deux engins à eau" and in 1710 a sum of 200 livres tournois was spent on fire buckets from London [33]. The fire-


[31] Priaulx, Lukis ms.


Fig 33: The development of St Peter Port

- **St Peter Port, 1680**
- **Developments, 1700-1750**
- **Developments, 1750-1800**
engines of the period were often ineffective but the St Peter Port authorities seem to have been trying to keep up-to-date with the fire-fighting techniques practised in England [34].

When the Sun Fire Insurance Company decided to underwrite insurance policies on properties outside London the Guernsey merchants were swift to respond. Arrangements were usually effected through the agency of Guernsey merchants in London, "Mr Perchard at the Pewter Corner of Abchurch Lane in Cannon Street", "Mr Dobree on St Mary Hill" and "Dobree, Botolph Lane". The archives of the Sun Fire Insurance Company contain numerous policies taken out by merchants and householders in St Peter Port [35]. Either through luck or vigilance the town seems to have escaped major fires during this period.

Urban improvement c 1750 - c 1800

In the second half of the 18th century the citizens improved the fabric and amenities of St Peter Port. Population increase led to urban growth; greater prosperity financed architectural fashionability; and new canons of sociability suggested the spatial re-organisation of the town. There was "infill", with the building of a market hall and assembly room near the town church, on what had previously been the rectory garden. There was replacement; the cramped mediaeval "Plaiderie" was abandoned in favour of a handsome new court-house, built at a cost of £7000 on fringe-belt land (1792-1803) [36].

[34] J.P. Warren, 'Fire Marks and Early Fire-fighting in Guernsey' TSG vol xvi, part i, for 1955 (Guernsey, 1956), pp 35-46 for later story of fire fighting

(1792-1803) (36). With no room left inside the barrières for further development, St Peter Port burst its mediaeval corset and sprawled far beyond the old fixation line. A theatre and chapels were built and new residential areas were developed (37). Much of the new building was on the hill to the west of the old town. The LeMarchant family released fields and orchards here in the 1780s and 1790s. Further to the west the estate of the "New Town" was systematically developed by Peter de Havilland from 1792 onwards. There was also residential development in the Hauteville area, in the Canichers, Park Street, Bordage and Foidavin Street (38).

A certain number of mediaeval and Tudor houses were demolished and replaced by "more commodious" buildings in hewn stone (39). The Tudor houses with their narrow timber frontages, jettied structures and carved religious texts had probably exhibited a strong urban consciousness in their day but they were antiquated by the Georgian period (40). The new fashionability was

---

(36) C.E.B. Brett, Buildings in the town and parish of Saint Peter Port (Guernsey, 1975) p 36.

(37) See Maps.


(39) Priolux, Lukis ms.

(40) Ibid. An inscribed lintel from a house in the Grande Rue is preserved at the Guille Alles (LA PAIX DE DIEU SOIT CRANS. FAIT LE 16 OCTOBRE 1578 DE PAR ANDRE MONAY). Lukis also recorded "EN DIEU J'AI MIS MON APPUI ET SA PROVIDENCE M'A CONDUIT".
represented by the town house of the Saumarez family built c.1760. Its three storeys with six bays of dressed granite and a long frontage facing the street expressed a certain grandeur new to St Peter Port (41).

By the early 1770s there was a move towards the use of brick. Brick houses were more fashionable, offered better protection against fire, harboured fewer rats and were easier to keep clean; the urban habitat became correspondingly healthier (42). In 1772 quantities of bricks were being shipped from Lymington (Hampshire) to Guernsey by the merchant Priaulx (43). The Customs records show that in 1775 some 272,000 bricks were shipped from the English outports to Guernsey (44). As 30,000 bricks were needed for an average fourth grade house, this represents the amount for some nine houses (45). By the end of the century a brick-kiln had been established in the island; in 1798 an English visitor found that it had "ample employment" (46).

(41) C.E.B. Brett, Buildings in the town and parish of Saint Peter Port (Guernsey, 1975) p 29, plate 88.
(43) Sausmarez Manor 68K, 3 Mar 1772 Burrard to de Saumarez "when Priaulx comes here for bricks, which he often does".
(44) PRO CUST 3.
(46) V.T. Money 'A Trip to Guernsey in 1796' (ed. E. Carey), TSG vol xi, part 1i, for 1931 (Guernsey, 1932), p 249.
By the early 19th century there were several brickfields in the fringe belt around St Peter Port [47].

The desire to project an image of wealth and status accelerated the development of locations for display. In 1760 Cambridge Park ("L'Hyvreuse") was levelled to make a drill ground for the militia and to create walks for the fashionable. Before 1760 the gentry of St Peter Port had promenaded along the harbour pier. Cambridge Park, with its commanding views over the town, sea and surrounding islands, proved a more attractive and spacious setting for fashionable walking [48].

Some inhabitants wished to imitate the metropolitan improvements of fashionable London. There was talk of paving the streets of St Peter Port like those of the English capital [49]. This developing civic consciousness was coupled with a sense of aesthetic propriety. Mrs Dobree was delighted when, in [47] Brickfields advertising in the Gazette de Guernsee: Sarchet’s Brick-kiln, 30 Jan 1808, p 18c; Joseph Guillick by New-Ground Barracks, 24 Jun 1809, p 88c; brick and lime manufactory at Mares-Pirovin near the Long-Store, 30 Sept 1809 p 154c; M. Torode & Co at Brick-field opposite Mr Bosetti’s garden, 28 Jul 1810, p 118c; Thomas Richard & Co "au Bouet, proche le Fort Arrive" 28 Sep 1811 p 155c.

[48] Brice, A. The Grand Gazetéer (Exeter, 1759), p 665: the pier "is used as the chief Place of Rendezvous, on Parties of Pleasure, by the fashionable Part of the Town". See Plate 7.

[49] Nantes, Archives Municipales, fonds Dobree, 23 Oct 1772, Mother to Dobree: "on a bien parlé ici de paver les rues comme ceux de Londres"
1773, she heard that a proper market was to be built to replace the street market of La Grande Rue: "c'est quelque chose de scandaleux de voir les provisions dans la rue" she commented. Some of the wealthy merchant families were spurred on by a taste for competitive display. "We have agreed for the two houses in town between your uncle & I, and we propose to pull 'em down next spring, and to build two new houses together, which will be two of the best houses in town" wrote John Le Mesurier to Fred Le Mesurier.

Population pressure was an important agent of change. The numerous migrants flocking into St Peter Port needed accommodation. This created a buoyant housing market in which it paid speculators to build new houses or to convert existing buildings. In 1791 Charles Mollet, a gentleman and sometime merchant, sensed the new market and converted a warehouse in the Profonde Rue into two houses. Population growth prompted other changes. The presence in the town of more consumers stimulated the opening of shops. In 1798 Dobree grumbled that their cousin Elizabeth Le Marchant (Mrs Andros) had sold her father's house for 96 quarters: "they have sold it to Mr Nartel the watchmaker who means to make many shops round the house which will dishonour..."

[50] Nantes, Archives Municipales, fonds Dobree, 6 Feb 1773 Dobree to son.
[51] Priouix, Le Mesurier ms., 22 Nov 1773 Le Mesurier to Le Mesurier (almost certainly a reference to St Peter Port; otherwise to St Anne's, Alderney; but in any case the comment is of evidence of the prevailing competitive spirit in the bailiwick).
[52] Priouix, Mollet journals, 15 June 1791 (houses insured 24 November).
As the town was extended outwards, it was simultaneously reorganised internally. In the late 18th century the wealthy merchants started to move to the outskirts of St Peter Port; meanwhile the High Street was taken over by retailers. By moving into suburban villas the wealthy escaped the filth, noise and crowds of the streets. The High Street was often blocked and almost impassable. Moreover, life in the High Street lacked privacy; passers by looked in at the first families as they ate. "So homely were the manners and customs of those days that the windows of the sitting rooms would be thrown open that friends would lean over and have a friendly chat through the casements as they passed" (55). Suburban villas provided the privacy in which the gentry could cultivate "propriety, discipline and cleanliness" (56).

The hillside houses enjoyed fine views. Peter Mourant of Candie had "the sweetest place in Guernsey, about a quarter of a mile from the Town, yet so far above us, losing the view of its irregular pile of buildings, to command the

---

(53) Nantes, Archives Municipales, fonds Dobrees, 16 July 1798, Dobrees to Dobrees.
(54) Peter Mourant, who had Candie House built in the 1780s, was one of the first to move to the suburbs; see Chapter Five, Conclusion.
(55) Priaulx, Lukis ms.
most picturesque scenery of the other islands, the Coast of France, the Frigates in the Roads..." (57). As in similar developments in England, the new villas were surrounded by gardens (58). Peter Mourant erected a hot-house in his grounds in 1792 or 1793 and within three decades there was scarcely a gentleman's house without one or more of these (59). Exotic plants were another form of conspicuous consumption. Suburbia was where surplus capital bought status and displayed distinction.

One of the most ambitious developments in the fringe belt was undertaken by Peter de Havilland, a retired négociant (60). In 1792 he acquired three fields known as La Bataille. Over the course of the next thirty years de Havilland developed this area. By temperament he was cautious and he usually preferred to sell building plots rather than meet the building expenses himself. His son Thomas was bolder and on 7 March 1793 wrote to his father Peter suggesting that "by building a row of 6 or 8 houses at once, you would not only make the Street regular, but by raising them up as they do in London slightly & leaving a small piece of ground behind each home for a garden etc. it appears

---

(57) W.T. Monney, 'A Trip to Guernsey in 1798' (ed. E. Carey), TSG vol xi, part ii, for 1931 (Guernsey, 1932), p 239-240.


to me you might make more money...you might perhaps get the bricks made on the spot which would avoid a great expense...I should think you might easily run up ½ doz. of these houses in a year...[61]. The suggestion was rejected by Peter as too rash. As the landowner he was able to work at his own slower pace, controlling the development of the site. He superimposed a grid-iron layout of streets and was able to influence the building styles. Thus, after various vicissitudes, "New Town" was developed with four streets declared public roads in 1809 (La Rue Havilland, La Rue Allez, La Rue St Jean and La Rue Saumarez). Buildings continued to be constructed for several years after that. The houses in this area were mainly purchased by the middle classes [62].

The third phase, c.1800-1831

In the Regency period the Grange became the most prestigious residential area of the town. English architects were employed to design handsome houses in classical styles. Such houses constituted "cultural capital" [63] and helped the owners to gain greater social status and prestige. The development of the Grange was made easier by the levelling of Smith Street in 1812. The improvement of the roads leading out of the town was probably both a product of suburban growth and an encouragement to further such growth. A larger population, more trade and increasing traffic were other factors that made street and road improvements essential. In Smith Street there had been a danger

[61] Information kindly supplied by E. Hocart Esq.


"from the continual passing and repassing of the carts". Vauvert Road was widened because children were in danger of being crushed to death between the wall and passing carts [64].

The road improvements involved not just the parochial authorities but also the States of Guernsey. The participation of the insular government in major urban developments was a characteristic of this third phase (1800-1831). The States financed the building of a new prison in St Peter Port in 1809 by levying a tax on corn [65]. The next major project undertaken by the States was to improve the public market in St Peter Port. Construction work was delayed by the poor economic position of Guernsey. The States had a debt of £19,137 "and an annual charge for interest and ordinary expenses of £2390, the revenue of three thousand pounds left only six hundred for unforeseen expenses and improvements" [66]. In 1816 a States committee reported with an imaginative suggestion. It recommended that the expense should be met by the issue of States Notes of £1 sterling to the value of £6000 and that these notes would be available for the payment of the new market in St Peter Port and various other projects elsewhere in the island. The scheme involved the redemption of the bank notes by the income from a duty on spiritous liquors, by rents and by lotteries. A large capital sum was raised without any interest being paid. The project anticipated

the idea of "social credit" and, in some respects, Keynesian economics. Using this scheme, the States carried out a series of major works in St Peter Port. The High Street was widened, Smith Street levelled, sewers and pavements were built, the new markets were constructed, the Court House was enlarged, Elizabeth College was rebuilt. The States were proud of their achievement and claimed that their work had "excited in all classes a similar spirit of improvement". They noted that in the town parish 401 houses had been built between 1819 and 1829 at an expense of upwards of £207,000 [67].

The new markets were built in the area to the west of the church. Once the heart of the mediaeval town, this had become a slum area by the early nineteenth century. It was an insalubrious place of "low houses", of "shops and public houses of an inferior grade", behind which lay "a labyrinth of narrow alleys and courts which few respectable persons cared to venture into" [68]. This warren of mediaeval slums was systematically demolished. Then the whole area was redeveloped following plans drawn up by the architect John Wilson. The new meat market was opened in 1822 and the fish market in 1830. At least twenty-three houses were demolished on both sides of Fountain Street which was widened from eight to thirty feet [69].

[68] Priaulx, Lukis ms.
The development of the market area by the States was rivalled by an ambitious private scheme financed by the businessmen James and George LeBoutillier. They demolished the medieval houses in rue Tanquael, to the north-west of the church, levelled an extensive portion of the hill, and constructed a commercial arcade. The project involved the carting of 120,000 loads of earth or gravel and 6,000 loads of stone to the south beach. The scheme bankrupted the LeBoutilliers and as a result the arcade was not covered as had been intended. Nevertheless they succeeded in transforming a medieval cul-de-sac into a busy retailing centre [70].

In 1829 the States claimed that few towns "present a more animated scenery around them, or one whose ornament and comfort are more generally united" [71]. English visitors were equally impressed. Walmesley wrote of the "many very excellent houses in the higher part of the town", houses which the Revd Skinner described as "neat" and "well arranged" [72].

The transformation was not just architectural. In the early eighteenth century rates and taxes had been raised irregularly and on an ad hoc basis. Parochial problems and improvements had been handled at the parish level. By the early nineteenth century the parish authorities were responsible for a wide range of services and they

[70] Priaulx, obituary of Le Boutillier, unidentified newsclipping.
administered an annual budget. The States helped with some major projects; but that support was bought at the cost of urban autonomy.

Conclusion

The morphology of St Peter Port was initially determined by a variety of topographical and legal factors. Until well into the 18th century these forces constrained urban development. However, the entrepot trade generated the growth of industry, population and wealth. Warehouses were constructed and new houses were built. St Peter Port burst beyond its ancient bounds as the wealthy monopolised the outskirts with their spacious new villas, gardens and walks. The shift to the suburbs accelerated after the collapse of the entrepot trade and in the context of "class" friction. The move to the suburbs - and the abandonment of the town centre to the poor - can be seen as the segregation of the wealthy. In fact it was as much a matter of the segregation of the poor. The spatial re-arrangement of the town was a form of social control. The indigent had no reason to frequent the new, high status residential areas; their legitimate social area was around the harbour. The elite increasingly used the States to manage urban affairs. In this way they were able to promote major building developments and impose their plans on the old quarters of St Peter Port. They were also able to block the development of the harbour. Négociants with interests in the South American trade had no reason to invest in port developments linked to local shipping and the requirements of shopkeepers.
As the 19th century progressed, St Peter Port's role as a minor entrepot (serving the South American trade) slowly declined. The free-trade policy pursued by Peel's administration in the 1840s finally spelled its end.

Table 25: Alcohol imported into, and exported from, Guernsey, 1833-1834, in gallons.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>IMPORTED</th>
<th>EXPORTED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brandy</td>
<td>196,578</td>
<td>45,216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geneva</td>
<td>43,766</td>
<td>13,416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rum</td>
<td>6,432</td>
<td>746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wine</td>
<td>352,736</td>
<td>207,023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: E.C. Barrington, 'The Human Geography of Guernsey' TSG vol xi, part iii, for 1935 (Guernsey, 1936), p 370. Contrast with the volume imported into St Peter Port in the late 18th century - Chapter Three.)

St Peter Port experienced little growth during the Victorian era, its population hovering between 15 to 18 thousand. By 1901 the town inhabitants constituted only 45.2 % of the island population, as opposed to 57.1% in 1841. The country parishes prospered and grew thanks to a variety of commercial enterprises. Large quantities of granite were quarried in the northern parishes and were shipped from St Sampson's harbour to England. In many of the parishes horticulture was developed, the fruit and flowers being exported principally to England.
Table 26: The population of St Peter Port and Guernsey, 1841-1901

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1841</th>
<th>1851</th>
<th>1861</th>
<th>1871</th>
<th>1881</th>
<th>1891</th>
<th>1901</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St Peter Port</td>
<td>15,220</td>
<td>17,070</td>
<td>16,388</td>
<td>16,166</td>
<td>16,658</td>
<td>17,008</td>
<td>18,264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island, total</td>
<td>26,649</td>
<td>29,757</td>
<td>29,804</td>
<td>30,593</td>
<td>32,607</td>
<td>35,243</td>
<td>40,446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St PP as %</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>57.4</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>45.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


However, it would be wrong to paint too gloomy a picture of St Peter Port's fortunes during the Victorian era. The urban economy re-adjusted to changing circumstances; and the population did not decline. In fact the population figures partly conceal important flows of migrants into, and out of, the town. Islanders who emigrated were in part replaced by immigrant settlers. Hundreds of English families were drawn to the island - principally to the parish of St Peter Port - by the mildness of the climate, the beauty of the scenery and the comparatively low cost of living [1]. Moreover, St Peter Port boasted a large number of genteel dwelling houses, its suburbs being admired for the number of delightful villas and elegant mansions [2].

[2] Brett, C.E.B., Buildings in the town and parish of St Peter Port (Guernsey, 1980) lists and illustrates some of these..
The establishment of regular steam packet routes linking Plymouth, Weymouth, Southampton, Jersey, St Malo and Granville to St Peter Port encouraged the growth of tourism. By the 1840s Guernsey was reckoned a place of fashionable resort in the summer season. After the construction of the London - Southampton railway line, the travelling time from the capital to St Peter Port was reduced to approximately sixteen hours. However, the improvement did not match that of the transport revolution in England. Consequently, St Peter Port was relatively more remote from London in the Victorian era than it had been in the eighteenth century. This in part accounts for the provincialism of the town in the 19th century.

St Peter Port survived as a market town, administrative centre and minor "gentry town". The class divisions of the 1820s and 1830s continued into the Victorian era. From the 1820s onwards, the town traders and shopkeepers lobbied for the improvement of St Peter Port harbour. However, their petitions were resisted by some of the elite whose financial interests were no longer centred on the port. It was not until the 1870s that St Peter Port harbour was enlarged.
The argument of this study is that during the eighteenth century the merchants of St Peter Port established the town as a major entrepot in the Atlantic economy. This brought considerable wealth but radically transformed traditional cultural and societal patterns. In the process St Peter Port was converted from a "French" into an "English" town.

In the mid 17th century St Peter Port was a relatively poor town of some 3000 inhabitants. It was in most respects French, the laws, customs and patois of its Guernsey folk being Norman. The nine country parishes sustained the town market and provided the wealthier bourgeoisie with rentes. The status titles used in St Peter Port were identical to those of ancien regime France. At the summit of the urban hierarchy were a number of merchant families. This mercantile oligarchy organised the insular administration, legislation and economy. The merchants controlled the domestic and foreign trade of the island and operated a putting-out industry which complemented their carrying trade. For a very low wage a large population of peasants and urban poor knitted high quality stockings which the capitalist entrepreneurs exported to France. The power of the merchants was such that the inhabitants of Guernsey and St Peter Port were "cocooned" from external cultural influences.

In the early 18th century the merchants developed St Peter Port as an entrepot. This was a successful economic strategy that capitalised on the ambiguous constitutional position of Guernsey in the first British empire. Thanks to their entrepot, the merchants of St Peter Port were no longer constrained by lack of land, labour and
capital; the entrepot offered a commercial service valued by merchants from several countries. In the world of mercantilist legislation the entrepot was a channel for free trade; and as the entrepot thrived the St Peter Port merchants became progressively wealthier. St Peter Port rapidly became one of the principal entrepots in the Atlantic economy in the second half of the 18th century. Trade, not privateering, was the fundamental source of the town's prosperity.

The entrepot proved economically more successful than the carrying trade of the 17th century. But the carrying trade had involved Guernsey merchants in financial transactions in foreign ports such as St Malo and London. In direct contrast, the entrepot trade attracted foreign merchants and migrants to St Peter Port. The town experienced a commercial revolution in which the old economic order was radically altered. The organisation of the new tobacco factories (employing over a thousand workers) was more impersonal than the old putting-out system. Moreover, there were no bonds of kinship between the merchants and the migrant workers as had existed between the merchants and islanders in the hey-day of the knitting industry. By the beginning of the 19th century the town was awash with adventurers from all parts of the British empire and elsewhere. This produced cultural pluralism and altered the structure of St Peter Port society. Between 1680 and 1800 the town population increased from approximately 3,000 to 11,000. Large flows of immigrants affected the ethnic composition of St Peter Port's population; and differential rates of migration altered the age and gender structure of the community. By the 1820s the town had a large surplus of females aged between twenty and forty years old.
During the 18th century St Peter Port became more closely linked to London. With its bankers, insurers and agents the metropolis dominated the commercial world of the Atlantic economy. Wherever they traded the St Peter Port merchants depended ultimately upon the financial services provided in London. The Guernsey merchants were aware of metropolitan taste and imitated its fashions. English mores and fashionability were re-emphasised in St Peter Port when the garrison was strengthened at Fort George in the 1780s. By the late 18th century the town had acquired many of the amenities characteristic of Peter Horsmay's "English urban renaissance" - a promenade, a theatre, assembly rooms, purpose-built markets and new civic buildings.

When the British government suppressed smuggling during the Napoleonic Wars the St Peter Port merchants were forced to revert to a carrying trade. But the social "damage" had been done; St Peter Port was a divided community. With the influx of English labourers, artisans and retailers the traditional French system of status designation had broken down. The wealthy merchants fashioned new forms of segregation by distancing themselves from the town centre. The town in turn was divided from the country parishes by deep linguistic and cultural differences. In St Peter Port English was the language of business and ordinary intercourse; in the country French was in general use.

There is much about the history of St Peter Port during the long 18th century that conforms with the general pattern of English urban history. As in many English towns the wealthy moved from the town centre and built handsome new houses on the outskirts. The St Peter Port evidence suggests that the shift to the outskirts occurred after the
collapse of the traditional system of ranks and in the context of "class" friction. Seeking isolation in the suburbs and abandoning the town centre to the poor is usually seen as the segregation of the wealthy. In fact it was as much a matter of the segregation of the poor. The indigent had no reason to frequent the new, high status residential areas; their legitimate social area was around the harbour. The rearrangement of the urban morphology was a form of social control.

There are several aspects of St Peter Port’s experience that are challenging. Natural increase consistently played a significant role in the population growth of the town. We are reminded of the sceptical attitude of van der Woude who was not convinced that natural decrease was a "law" of urban demography. More case studies may reveal the extent to which St Peter Port’s demographic experience was typical or exceptional for a port. Van der Woude’s suggestion that higher rates of rural-urban immigration could bring about a rise in urban fertility is compatible with much of the St Peter Port data [1]. However, the principal explanation for natural increase in the town is probably to be found in the combination of positive factors that rendered St Peter Port healthier than many contemporary towns.

As the only town on a small island the experience of St Peter Port was in several respects different from that of towns in neighbouring England and France. In that sense St Peter Port was sui generis. But as the solitary town on an island St Peter Port on Guernsey bears a striking similarity to some of the theoretical models

beloved by economic theorists. From the point of view of analysis one of the advantages of St Peter Port's location is that there is no difficulty in identifying its rural hinterland; there is no distraction in having to differentiate between the zones serving, and served by, competing towns. This has immediate relevance to the debate about urban parasitism.

Towns have often been viewed as parasitic, "a centre for consumption, levying a tribute upon production in the countryside" [2]. As Professor Wrigley has observed, the debate about parasitism hinges on the definition of the word. In Sjoberg's terms St Peter Port in the mid 17th century might arguably be judged parasitic. But the development of the entrepot generated a degree of wealth and industry in the second half of the 18th century such that Guernsey was housing a population far larger than the island could sustain by its own agricultural production. "Functional specialization was the gateway to economic improvement in pre-industrial times" [3]. The entrepot represented a highly successful form of functional specialization and brought into being a town that was a stimulus to the economic development of the island. A Marxist analysis might conceivably suggest that the prosperity of the urban bourgeoisie was gained through the exploitation of the rural peasantry and town proletariat; and there would be some truth in such an interpretation. But it equally needs to


[3] Ibid. p 308.
be recognised that had the port not been developed as an entrepot, many
of the poorer islanders would have been forced to emigrate (as, indeed,
happened in the 19th century when the British government suppressed the
smuggling trade).

The St Peter Port data also have relevance to the debate
about the rise of the middling classes. It is generally understood that
in the early modern period (16th - 17th centuries) urban society
resembled an inverted T - "a low podium containing some 95% of the
population, while balanced on top of this was a thin skyscraper of more
wealthy people" (4). Dr McInnes and others have argued that change
occurred in the eighteenth century because the middle sections of
society were growing. This altered the inverted T into a "pyramidal or
conical" shape. This thesis has suggested that a certain caution is
necessary in discussions about the rise of the middling classes in the
18th century. It has been suggested in Chapter Five that it is
possible to have simultaneously (a) more occupational diversity; and,
(b), an unaltered profile of wealth distribution. The St Peter Port
evidence is challenging and seems to support Dr Borsay's observation: "A
larger and more diverse middling stratum would seem to fill the space
between rich and poor, and lead to the emergence of a less polarised
society. Whether in reality this was the case is debatable" (5).

In recent months Lord Renfrew has argued that the prehistory
of the Channel Islands should be investigated in terms of "centre" and


(My emphasis, GSC).
"periphery" (6). This model has been employed with success by a number of historians to interpret eras of Ottoman, American and Scandinavian history (7). The model has some relevance to the study of St Peter Port and is implicit in the discussion about the cultural and hegemonic relationships between Guernsey and London. But it is, at times, too easy to impose paradigms on historical phenomena. In the 18th century the urban history of St Peter Port differed in significant ways from that of St Helier in Jersey (8). The centre-periphery model, when applied to Channel Islands history, can easily mask these urban variables. The distinctive urban history of St Peter Port was the product of a mercantile culture. In the face of changing economic opportunities the entrepreneur of St Peter Port repeatedly re-adjusted their trading patterns; and as they re-organised the structure of their trade and industry, so they re-fashioned the town as their workplace and home.

[6] Lecture delivered in Jersey and reported on Channel Television.


[8] There is still much scope for research into the history of St Helier. Provisionally the present writer would draw attention to the following features. First, the Jersey merchants were not concentrated in St Helier at an early date in the manner in which the Guernsey merchants were all to be found in St Peter Port. Secondly, the Jersey merchants were more involved in trade with France, and less with England, in the 18th century. Thirdly, the Jersey merchants kept more to the knitting industry and
Newfoundland fishing than their Guernsey counterparts. Fourthly, the St Peter Port merchants enjoyed a better reputation in international trade than the Jersey merchants. Fifthly, Jersey boys tended to be sent to France for their education, while Guernsey sons went to England. Sixthly, in the late 18th century St Helier was not as affluent a town as St Peter Port.

These impressions need to be tested against more evidence. Provisionally I would suggest that while the St Peter Port merchants became negociants engaging wholeheartedly in international trade, the Jersey merchants clung rather conservatively to a mixed economy of "putting-out", Newfoundland fishing, petit cabotage and some grand commerce.

It is difficult to escape the conclusion that there was a difference in the culture of the two islands. The centre-periphery model seems inadequate as an analytical tool in this context.
**APPENDIX 1: Summary of population figures for St Peter Port and Guernsey, 1680-1831**

**St Peter Guernsey**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1680</td>
<td>2,865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1727</td>
<td>4,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1735</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1745</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1765</td>
<td>5,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1781</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1789</td>
<td>18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1794</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800</td>
<td>18,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1807</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1814</td>
<td>19,321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1821</td>
<td>20,302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1827</td>
<td>22,116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1831</td>
<td>24,349</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Estimate based on militia figures: p 51.
- Corn calculations - food shortage: p 49.
- Church estimate - exaggerated (?): pp 51-52.
- Census; COf B44.
### APPENDIX 2: The population of Guernsey, 1727 and 1800.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Sq km</th>
<th>Pop 1727</th>
<th>% of Pop 1727</th>
<th>Density 1727</th>
<th>Pop 1800</th>
<th>% of Pop 1800</th>
<th>Density 1800</th>
<th>1800/1727</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St Peter Port</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>4350</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>669</td>
<td>10950</td>
<td>56.7</td>
<td>1865</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Martin</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>993</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>1132</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castel</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>937</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>1453</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Peter/Vood</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>849</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>1130</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Saviour</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>794</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>933</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vale</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>602</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>842</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Andrew</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torteval</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Sampson</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>652</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9 Country</strong></td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>10246</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>19655</td>
<td>100.1</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes and sources:** The population, percentage of total population, and density of population per square kilometre, of the ten Guernsey parishes in 1727 (c) - (e) and in 1800 (f) - (h). Column (i): population 1800 /population 1727. Areas based on *Statistical Digest Guernsey* (Guernsey,
Guernsey, 1993), p 6; the figures for Vale and St Sampson have been adjusted to allow for the land reclamation at the Braye in the early 19th century. For population sources see Chapter 1.
APPENDIX 3: Guernsey militia returns, 1621, 1656, 1680

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>1621</th>
<th>1656</th>
<th>1680</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[a]</td>
<td>[b]</td>
<td>[c]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Peter Port</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Martin</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castel</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Peter/Vood</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Saviour</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vale</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Andrew</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torteval</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Sampson</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|          | 1157 | 100.1| 1418 | 100.1| 1902 | 100.0| (100.0) |

Notes and sources: The number of men serving in the Guernsey militia, by parish, and the percentage of the total number, in 1621 [a] - [b], 1655 [c] - [d] and 1680 [e] - [f]. The figure for Torteval, 1680, looks erroneous and the percentages are reworked in [g] on the assumption that the Torteval figure should read 69 (Guernsey total 1802). G.E. Lee (ed), Note-book of Pierre Le Ray (Guernsey, 1893), p 15; F. Tupper, The History of Guernsey (Guernsey, 1854), pp 463, 465, 467.
APPENDIX 4: Food shortages and crises in St Peter Port and Guernsey, 1659 - 1775

1659 July Great loss of corn because of a storm; Le Roy p 21.

1662 "a great scarcity of corn in this Island, such as no man living had ever seen, barley being worth 4 livres the bushel, and wheat 5 livres tournais" Le Roy, p 33.

1697 June "Grande disette" affecting island and town; supplies from Southampton delayed. Actes vol 2 p 53.


1727 Jan/Feb See Chapter 1 footnote 2.


1751 Nov Mediocre island crop. Actes vol 2, p 199.

1752 May Possible need to import wheat and barley. Actes, vol 2 pp 200 - 203.

1756 June Large supply of cereal expected from abroad. Actes vol 2 p 214.

1757 Feb/May Concern in February. Supplies bought from English vessel and sold at subsidised price to town poor: 9 l.t. per quarter to poor, 9 - 18 l.t. to others, depending on their means. TC DdCdF pp 109,110, 112; Actes vol 2, pp 214-216; Cof A22 Taxes 21 Nov 1757, p 289.

1758 Feb/May Two hundred quarters of wheat needed for town poor and those taxed at less than 20 quarters. Corn from
1765 May
3580 quarters of corn required to feed town population from 19 May until Michaelmas. TC DdCdF p 143.

1766 Jul/Aug
"Grande disette". Vessel laden with corn for Brest arrested in harbour, July; available to poor at 9 l.t. per quarter. TC DdCdF pp 147, 148.

1767 April
Six hundred quarters of wheat required by town. Duc de Choiseul permitted two or three thousand bushels of grain to be exported from Cherbourg to Guernsey. TC DdCdF p 151; Dupont vol 4 p 534.

1768 April
Five hundred quarters of wheat and one hundred quarters of barley needed for St Peter Port. Some supplies from Southampton. TC DdCdF p 155.

1772 Nov
Three thousand l.t. voted for import of corn for town poor. TC DdCdF p 172.

1773 March
Town decision to import 1000 - 1200 quarters of wheat from Quebec and 300 quarters of barley from Danzig. August: wheat sold at subsidised price to poor. TC DdCdF pp 177 -178; COF B2 pp 56-63.

1774 March
News sought from James Le Marchant at Rotterdam about corn prices at Danzig; flour to be imported to the town from Southampton. December: Town constables authorised to import wheat from America. TC DdCdF pp 185, 197; COF B2 pp 71-72, 82-87.

1775 Jan
Barley to be imported to St Peter Port from Wells (Norfolk). Feb - August: price of wheat, barley, flour fixed. TC DdCdF pp 199, 200; COF B2 p 90.
APPENDIX 5: Corn shipped from England to Guernsey, 1744–1763

Quantities in quarters and bushels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year ending</th>
<th>Barley</th>
<th>Malt</th>
<th>Oatmeal</th>
<th>Rye</th>
<th>Wheat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christmas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1744</td>
<td>353/4</td>
<td>612/3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>775/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1745</td>
<td>6/</td>
<td>356/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>251/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1746</td>
<td>586/4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>166/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1747</td>
<td>240/</td>
<td>901</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>525/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1748</td>
<td>10/</td>
<td>625/4</td>
<td>7/4</td>
<td></td>
<td>406/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1749</td>
<td>830/4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>260/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1750</td>
<td>250/</td>
<td>884/4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>540/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1751</td>
<td>353/</td>
<td>1213/</td>
<td>6/</td>
<td></td>
<td>655/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1752</td>
<td>912/2</td>
<td>1022/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>771/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1753</td>
<td>178/</td>
<td>404/7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>153/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1754</td>
<td>137/4</td>
<td>722/6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>463/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1755</td>
<td>408/1</td>
<td>506/3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>564/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1756</td>
<td>447/</td>
<td>1037/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>663/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1757</td>
<td>302/2</td>
<td>1255/1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>433/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1758</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>1168/5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1227/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1759</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>381/2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1059/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1760</td>
<td>18/6</td>
<td>1155/2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1780/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1761</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>512/1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1691/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1762</td>
<td>179/3</td>
<td>1167/6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2105/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1763</td>
<td>214/</td>
<td>918/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1659/7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: BL Add Ms 38387 f 32v – f 52r
APPENDIX 6: Population of St Peter Port, 1827: indices of dissimilarity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>d</th>
<th>e</th>
<th>f</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a Natives, males</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b &quot; females</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c Migrants, settled, males</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d settled, females</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e recent, males</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f recent, females</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes and source: recent migrants = resident in St Peter Port for not longer than one month. Source: COf B44 Census August 1827

The index of dissimilarity "allows the distribution of a subgroup of the population to be compared to the distribution of other subgroups" (J.R. Short, Urban Data Sources (London, 1980), p 82). The ID values can range from 0 to 100; values close to 0 imply that the two subgroups have similar spatial distribution, whereas values close to 100 indicate that the spatial distributions are dissimilar. The analysis above shows the correspondence between spatial distance for different origin/gender groups. The highest indices of dissimilarity – 36 and 35 – are to be found between the settled migrant females and the recent migrant arrivals in St Peter Port (male and female).

A second analytical approach which throws further light on residential patterns is the index of segregation. This is considered in Appendix 7 below.
APPENDIX 7: Population of St Peter Port, 1827: indices of segregation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NATIVE</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIGRANTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settled, males</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settled, females</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recent, males</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recent, females</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: As for Appendix 6 above.

The index of segregation "facilitates the comparison of a subgroup distribution with that of the whole population" (J.R. Short, op. cit., p 82). The index of segregation values can range from 0 to 100, the values closer to 100 denoting a greater degree of residential segregation. The table shows the extent to which the migrant groups (c,d,e,f,) did not exhibit a similar spatial distribution to the distribution of the total population. The category of "settled migrant females" (IS 27) exhibited the greatest degree of residential segregation.

The indices of dissimilarity and segregation "provide a measure of the degree of association between the spatial distribution of different groups of the population" but they measure the whole subgroup across the town. A third technique employs the calculation of the location quotient which measures the degree of concentration of particular groups, area by area. This analysis is considered in Appendix 8 below.
### APPENDIX 8: Population of St Peter Port, 1827: location quotients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street</th>
<th>NATIVES</th>
<th>SETTLED MIGRANTS</th>
<th>RECENT MIGRANTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>males</td>
<td>females</td>
<td>males</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Grande Rue</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Pollet, Forest</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. r des Forges</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. r Berthelot</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. r de l'Eglise</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. r du Marche</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. r de la Fontaine</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. r du Bordage</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Cornets, Beauregard</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. La Tour</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Haute-Ville</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort George</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Haut Fave, Ruelle Brulée</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Contree Mansell</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. r Poidevin</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. r du Parc, Charroterie</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Grande et Petite Marche</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Subgroup 1</td>
<td>Subgroup 2</td>
<td>Subgroup 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Havilland</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt Durand</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vauvert, Cordiers</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grange, Vaudinerie</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rohais, Foulon</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Jacques</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L'Hyvreuse</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doyle Road</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ville Neuve</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truchot</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canichers &amp;c</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glatagny</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salters' St, Piette</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r de Paris, Amballes</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bocquet</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couture, Hamee</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terres, Hubits, Heras &amp;c</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: as for Appendix 6 above. The location quotient measures the degree of concentration of particular groups. If a subgroup in an area has a location quotient less than 1 the subgroup is under-represented in that area; if the location quotient is greater than 1, the subgroup is over-represented.
APPENDIX 9: "Foreign" male migrants in St Peter Port (arriving in 1830 and still resident in the town in December of that year)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MIGRANTS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of single male migrants</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of male migrants with dependents</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPENDENTS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of dependents</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggregate of migrants and dependents</td>
<td>311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean no. of dependents per male migrant</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard deviation</td>
<td>1.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE of migrant males</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>31 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard deviation</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORIGIN</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>79.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsewhere</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: COf B44, Census of migrants, 1830.
APPENDIX 10: Occupations of 1009 migrants, St Peter Port, 1830

(The classification of occupations is a somewhat arbitrary affair. For example, inn-keepers are sometimes seen as belonging to the service sector, sometimes to the food and drink sector. For that reason the full analysis is given).

LABOURERS: 25.5% [257]

CONSTRUCTION: 20.5% [Carpenters 47, masons and stonemasons 25, sawyers 21, painters 19, plasterers 18, shipwrights 15, joiners 11, cabinet-makers 10, stone-cutters 9, wheelwrights 8, brickmasons 5, bricklayers 4, turners 4, coachmakers 2, builder 1, stone dresser 1, thatcher 1, moulder 1, chairmaker 1, gilder 1, millwright 1, upholsterer 1, varnish maker 1]

PESTONERS, GENTLEMEN & PROFESSIONALS: 13.8% [Pensioners 68, gentlemen 45, merchants 12, clerks 4, shipowners 2, schoolmasters 2, professor of languages 1, attorney 1, surgeon 1, officer 1, engineer 1, student 1]

SERVICES & MISCELLANEOUS: 11.8% [Servants 32, gardeners 21, shopkeepers 15, miners 9, printers 5, auctioneers 3, chimney sweeps 3, gas-workers 3, rope-maker 3, musicians 2, agent 1, artist 1, bandboxmaker 1, billiard-table keeper 1, butler 1, cattle-dealer 1, chemist 1, cigar-maker 1, coal-meter 1, grave-digger 1, rag merchant 1, razor-grinder 1, grinder 1, rigger 1, soapmaker 1, shopman 1, signalman 1, stationer 1, tobacconist 1, trunkman 1, trussmaker 1, ware-merchant 1]

FOOD & DRINK: 8.6% [Bakers 22, butchers 18, innkeepers 12, brewers 9, millers 7, distillers 5, maltsters 3, confectioners 2, cider merchant 1, curer of hams 1, publican 1]
LEATHER TRADES: 7.8% (Shoemakers 51, cordwainers 13, boot & shoemakers 4, saddlers 6, dyers 3, curriers 2)

METALWORK: 5.2% (Blacksmiths 14, smiths 10, plumbers 4, founders 4, watchmakers 4, braziers 3, iron-founders 2, tailors 2, timbers 2, brassfounder 1, gunsmith 1, hardwareman 1, lathe-maker 1, locksmith 1, plater 1, whitesmith 1)

CARRYING/TRANS. 3.4% (Carter 11, coachmen 4, livery stable keepers 4, seamen 3, stable-keepers 2, grooms 2, sailors 2, gigman 1, master mariner 1, pilot 1, boatman 1, porter 1, waggoner 1)

TEXTILES: 3.1% (Tailors 30, hatter 1)

AGRICULTURE AND FISHERY: 1.0% (Farmers 4, husbandmen 2, oystermen 2, fisherman 1, nurseryman 1)

Sub-analysis, occupations of the French, Irish and Scottish migrants

Occupations of the French migrants:
Braziers 2, cabinet-makers 3, carpenter 1, distillers 5, dyers 2, gardeners 5, gentleman 1, hatter 1, innkeeper 3, labourers 51, masons 4, merchants 5, oysterman 2, painter 1, professor of languages 1, razor-grinder 1, grinder 1, seamstress 1, servant 1, shipowner 1, shopkeepers 7, stone-cutter 1, student 1, tailor 1, turners 2.

Occupations of the Irish migrants:
Baker 1, band-box maker 1, boatman 1, boot & shoemaker 1, brewer 1, cigar-maker 1, gardener 1, gentleman 1, hatter 1, innkeeper 3, labourers 22, miller 1, tailors 2, pensioners 3, seamen 2, servants 5, shoemakers 7, shopkeeper 1, signalman 1, timber 1, occupation unknown 2.

Occupations of the Scottish migrants:
Baker 1, butcher 1, cabinet maker 1, carter 1, coal miner 1, gardener 1, gas worker 1, gentleman 2, innkeeper 1, joiner 1, labourers 4, painters 4, pensioners 7, servant 1.

Source: COF B44 Census of migrants, 1630
APPENDIX 11: Alien merchants residing in St Peter Port, 18th century.

John Taylor, vintner, TC burial 9 Nov 1742.

Richard Keyt, vintner, TC burial 9 Feb 1743.

Andrew Affleck, vintner, from Hampstead, Middlesex; will proved 19 Jan 1743; EC Wills (1738-1754), p 91.

Abraham Frecker, vintner, from Gosport, Isle of Wight; will proved 19 Sept 1763; EC Wills (1754-1762) p 205.

James Stewart, wine merchant; BL Lansdowne Ms 657, f 24r - f 25r 1 Feb 1752
Harris to Ligonier. Harris saw Stewart in St Peter Port c 1748 and considered him responsible for the scheme whereby St Peter Port merchants imported wine into Guernsey for British colleagues who thus evaded duty payable to the King. Harris described Stewart as being "just then broke from being Lord Provost of Edinburgh" but "at this day the greatest wine merchant in Europe".

William Bell, wine merchant, see Chapter Three.

James Campbell, merchant, PRO CUST 62/66, p 184 1 Feb 1747/1748, Southampton customs to London.

David Thomson, merchant, probably from Montrose, Scotland; will proved 8 Feb 1796; EC Wills (1795-1803), pp 44-46.

Daniel Vardon, merchant, from Atis, Normandy; will proved 25 July 1793; EC Wills (1780-1795), pp 302-308.

Louis Duniere, privateering agent (and merchant?), from Quebec; see P.L. Wickins, 'The Economics of Privateering: Capital Dispersal in the American War of Independence', Journal of European Economic History vol 13 no 2 - Fall 1984, p 389.
John Harvey, merchant, from Cornwall (? Falmouth); Stevens-Cox collection, Harvey papers.

Mr Lagerman, merchant; PRO VO 34/108 f 31 r, 5 Jan 1782 Irving to Amherst: "German merchant who has resided here some years"; PRO VO 34/108 f 39r, Irving to Hill: "from Morlaix".
(See Appendix 15).

Mr Adam, merchant, German; PRO VO 34/108, 14 Jan 1782 Irving to Hillsborough.

Isaac Crousaz de Prelaz, wine merchant, Swiss, resident by 1783 (family papers belonging to Mrs Grant).

Minian Douglas, merchant, "in the island of Guernsey", mentioned in the will of Benjamin Douglas, s. of George Douglas of Jedburgh; will proved 30 Dec 1796; EC Wills (1795-1803), pp 70-72.

There are others whose surnames suggest that they were of foreign origin (e.g. John Cornelius).
**APPENDIX 12: The farm of the Chaussee (harbour), 1737-1780**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>livres tournois</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1737</td>
<td>1705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1738</td>
<td>1535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1739</td>
<td>1720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1740</td>
<td>2075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1741</td>
<td>1540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1742</td>
<td>2055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1743</td>
<td>1805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1744</td>
<td>2305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1745</td>
<td>691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1746</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1747</td>
<td>1336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1748</td>
<td>1800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1749</td>
<td>2415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1750</td>
<td>3505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1751</td>
<td>2670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1752</td>
<td>2670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1753</td>
<td>3715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1754</td>
<td>3700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1755</td>
<td>3005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1756</td>
<td>3050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1757</td>
<td>2105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1758</td>
<td>2265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1759</td>
<td>2250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1760</td>
<td>2365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1761</td>
<td>2500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Greffe, Commonplace book (Greffe collection 113))
### APPENDIX 13: Foreign vessels carrying cargoes to St Peter Port, 1746-1762

**COUNTRIES OF ORIGIN OF CARGES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>France</th>
<th>Holland</th>
<th>Portugal</th>
<th>Sicily</th>
<th>Spain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>wine,</td>
<td>brandy,</td>
<td>chestnuts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td></td>
<td>wine,</td>
<td>oranges,</td>
<td>lemones</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>brandy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holland</td>
<td>wine,</td>
<td>port</td>
<td>oil</td>
<td>fruit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>brandy,</td>
<td></td>
<td>wine</td>
<td>wine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>merchandise</td>
<td></td>
<td>brandy</td>
<td>brandy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>fruit</td>
<td>brandy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>brandy</td>
<td>wine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>merchandise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>wine,</td>
<td>oranges,</td>
<td>lemons,</td>
<td>molasses,</td>
<td>cork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>brandy</td>
<td>wine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td></td>
<td>wine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source and notes: Priaulx 29118/408C, Dobree Protest Book. The number of cases recorded in the Protest Book is too small to allow sound statistical analysis; but the cases do reveal patterns of trading.)
APPENDIX 14: Guernseymen acting as agents and factors overseas
18th - early 19th centuries

BRAZIL
Bahia
Le Breton, Lhou & Co [Priaulx library, Priaulx papers; the surnames suggest Guernsey origin].

CANADA
Quebec: Mr Brehaut "went to Quebec, and established there other Guernsey gentlemen" [Priaulx, Lukis ms. p 27].

ENGLAND
"As merchant agents in England there were Jacob & Job de la Combe, and Messrs C. Priaulx kept one of the firm in Cornwall. The Messrs Maingy & brothers had Peter Maingy (Fox) in Cornwall. Wm Lukis lived in Devonshire and Cornwall. Between these connections were formed such as the marriage of Peter Maingy to Miss de la Combe, whose two daughters married respectively Mr Thos Bell and the Revd R. Potinger, their brother being Mr Anthony de la Combe Maingy. Mr Uttermark came to Guernsey and married Miss Dobree" [Priaulx, Lukis ms. p 27]. Note also the Guernsey banking houses in London (see Chapter Three).

FRANCE
Bordeaux and Charente: "they have been obliged lately to send several of their own people to Bordeaux and Charente as factors for the rest, the like having never been practised by
Jean Piott, a Guernseyman at Bordeaux, 1720s; Jean Martell (born in Jersey, but became interested in the spirits industry in Guernsey); in Cognac and Bordeaux in the 1720s. See A. Bourde de la Bougerie, 'La Famille Martell' in TSG vol xi, part ii, for 1931 (Guernsey, 1932), p 260 (citing R. Firino, La Famille Martel, Paris, 1924).

Bordeaux: William Carey [BL Add Ms 38389 f 144r, 15 Mar 1786; Carey resident in Bordeaux for eighteen years, eleven of which in business].

Nantes: Pierre Frederic Dobree [Nantes, Archives Municipales, fonds Dobree; see Chapter Three].

Sète: Peter de Havilland [de Havilland papers; information courtesy of Richard Hocart].

ITALY

Naples, Trieste: John Maingy, H. Dobree and others [Priaulx, Lukis ms. p 27].

Trieste: Metivier, Bates & Carey [Priaulx library, Priaulx papers - headed letters; see also W.W. Carey et al.,...
The History of the Careys of Guernsey (Guernsey, 1938), p 219.

Madeira

Thomas Lihou & R. Robinson [Priaulx, Lukis ms. p 27]

Ostend

Reserson and Tupper, founded 1781 to facilitate the operation of the house of R & T at Barcelona [Priaulx, Reserson ms].

Spain

The "Careys & Toppers had their correspondent in Spain - as at Alicante, Barcelona and Valencia" [Priaulx, Lukis ms. p 25].

Alicante: Carey & Co (V.W. Carey et al., The History of the Careys of Guernsey (Guernsey, 1938), p 199.)

Barcelona: Guille [Priaulx 18459/ER and see p 157 above].

Nicolas Reserson and Guillaume De Vic Tupper, house established 1775; house put under the name of George Henri Rol READ, a German employee, in 1778, when France declared war on Britain [Priaulx, Reserson ms].

Metivier, Betts & Carey (V.W. Carey et al., The History of the Careys of Guernsey (Guernsey, 1938), p 219.)

Sweden

Elsinborg: John Le Marchant's eldest son [Priaulx, Lukis ms. p 27].

West Indies

Antigua: George Betts [Priaulx, Lukis ms. p 27].

Santa Cruz: Abraham John Le Messurier [Priaulx, Lukis ms. p 27].
APPENDIX 15: St Peter Port merchants handling wine shipped from the Iberian Peninsula on behalf of English merchants, 1760-1788.

| Name                  | 68 | 69 | 70 | 71 | 72 | 73 | 74 | 75 | 76 | 77 | 78 | 79 | 80 | 81 | 82 | 83 | 84 | 85 | 86 | 87 | 88 |
|-----------------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| W Bell                |   +| +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  |
| W Bell Jr             |   +|    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Brock & Co           |   +|    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| H. Brock             |   +|    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Jean Carey snr       |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
|                       |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| P de Carteret        |   +|    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Thos Dobree          |   +|    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Pierre Frere         |   +|    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Jean Guille          |   +|    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| (jnr & senr)         |   +|    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| B Lageman            |   +|    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| J & T Le Marchant   |   +|    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| W Le Marchant       |   +|    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| E & J Le Memurier   |   +|    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| H Le Memurier       |   +|    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |

...
James Lihou  
D McBride  
F Hourant  
H. de 
Sausmarez  
D Thomson  
E Tupper  

---

*Source: Greffe, Livre de Certificats. The wine was shipped in English vessels principally from Oporto, but also from Algarve, Alicante, Barcelona, Cadiz, Canary Islands, Lisbon, Malaga and Seville.*
APPENDIX 16: British government estimates of spirits and tobacco handled through the St Peter Port entrepot

Spirit annually brought into Guernsey and Alderney

(Summary of BL Add Mss 38759 f 105v – f 106r; estimate c. 1802-3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alcohol Type</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Geneva</td>
<td>2,268,000 gallons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandy</td>
<td>3,350,000 pipes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rum</td>
<td>500,000 puncheons</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

60 vessels supposed to be employed bringing

geneva into the island from Holland, calculated

@ 150 tuns spirit in each ..................2,268,000

Brandy 28000 pipes brought in

@ 120 gallons each .........................3,350,000

Rum: 500 puncheons, 100 gallons each ....... 500,000

6,128,000

The quantity is increased at least 1/6 part by water mixed with the spirits in the island 1,022,000

7,150,000

The quantity of spirit consumed in the island, what is shipped for other countries, what is lost, cannot exceed ........................................ 1,000,000

6,150,000

Tobacco

5000 hogsheads of tobacco annually brought into

the island – duty on 1200 lbe per hogshead @ 1.7 per lb ........................................... £475,000
[An alternative calculation of the spirits smuggled]

150 vessels employed in smuggling, on average
15 trips annually, bringing 500 tubs; tubs contain
4 - 9 gallons, computation made on 6 gallons........6,750,000 gallons

Spirits and tobacco exported from Guernsey, Nov 1806 - Feb 1807

[Summary of An Account, presented to the House of Commons, of the number and names of vessels Cleared out from the Port of Guernsey, in the Months of November and December 1806, and January and February 1807: with the Amount of the excise and custom duties thereon (London, 1807), p 10 in Parliamentary Papers, House of Commons, Accounts and Papers, session 27 June - 14 August 1807, iv, (57), pp 85-95.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lost duties</th>
<th>Customs</th>
<th>Excise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>400,560 gallons brandy</td>
<td>29,471 - 15 - 2</td>
<td>302,923 - 10 - 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49,570 gallons rum</td>
<td>2,244 - 8 - 4</td>
<td>25,714 - 8 - 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109,395 gallons geneva</td>
<td>7,429 - 14 -10</td>
<td>82,729 - 19 - 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>850,300 lbs tobacco</td>
<td>11,165 - 16 - 3</td>
<td>27,732 - 1 - 8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

£51,599 - 5 -11  £439,099 - 19 - 9½
### APPENDIX 17: Ships clearing from English and Welsh ports for Guernsey, 1710-1717

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1710</th>
<th>1711</th>
<th>1712</th>
<th>1713</th>
<th>1714</th>
<th>1715</th>
<th>1716</th>
<th>1717</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunderland</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chichester</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portsmouth</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southampton</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cowes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poole</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weymouth</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyme Regis</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exeter</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dartmouth</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plymouth</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looe</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fowey</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penryn</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falmouth</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gweek</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penzance</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Ives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Padstow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bideford</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minehead</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristol</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neath</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swansea</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Llanelli</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milford</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: PRO CO 388/18; CO 390/8)
**APPENDIX 18: The South American trade in the 19th century**

Guernsey vessels arriving in Rio de Janeiro, Jan 1825–June 1826

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vessel</th>
<th>Owners</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Tonnage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alexander</td>
<td>Mansell &amp; Price</td>
<td>Ship</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alfred</td>
<td>Jones and Lidstone</td>
<td>Cutter</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blossom</td>
<td>Bonamy &amp; Co.</td>
<td>Brig</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline</td>
<td>Boucaut &amp; Co.</td>
<td>Brig</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>Le Nouri &amp; Co.</td>
<td>Cutter</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collingwood</td>
<td>C Priaulx &amp; Co.</td>
<td>Brig</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dolphin</td>
<td>C Priaulx &amp; Co.</td>
<td>Brig</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke of Gloucester</td>
<td>Mass Collings</td>
<td>Brig</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprize</td>
<td>C Priaulx</td>
<td>Schooner</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>J. De Putron</td>
<td>Cutter</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura</td>
<td>Mallish &amp; Co.</td>
<td>Brig</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisa</td>
<td>Bonamy &amp; Co.</td>
<td>Brig</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercury</td>
<td>J. LeQuesne</td>
<td>Ship</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>Han Sheppard</td>
<td>Brig</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace</td>
<td>Thoume &amp; Co.</td>
<td>Brig</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princess Charlotte</td>
<td>W. Le Lievre</td>
<td>Brig</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel and Mary</td>
<td>Thoume &amp; Co.</td>
<td>Brig</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward</td>
<td>H. Sheppard &amp; Co.</td>
<td>Ship</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St George</td>
<td>Vidamour &amp; Co.</td>
<td>Brig</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swift</td>
<td>Bienvenu &amp; Co.</td>
<td>Brig</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three Sisters</td>
<td>J. Le Quesne</td>
<td>Brig</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Brothers</td>
<td>J. Benouf</td>
<td>Cutter</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 19: THE TRADE OF PRIAULX, TUPPER & CO., RIO DE JANEIRO

Major cargoes shipped by Priaulx, Tupper & Co of Rio de Janeiro, 1827-1831 (Source: Priaulx library, Priaulx papers).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Coffee: bags</th>
<th>Coffee: barrels</th>
<th>Sugar: cases</th>
<th>Sugar: boxes</th>
<th>Sugar: bags</th>
<th>Sugar: barrels</th>
<th>Hides</th>
<th>Horns</th>
<th>Tobacco in rolls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1827</td>
<td>28322</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>1296</td>
<td></td>
<td>2000</td>
<td></td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1828</td>
<td>27265</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>1314</td>
<td>1414</td>
<td>573</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1829</td>
<td>47326</td>
<td>2175</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>5728</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1830</td>
<td>39350</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>2175</td>
<td>751</td>
<td>2600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1831</td>
<td>47805</td>
<td>21708</td>
<td>1414</td>
<td>929</td>
<td>3399</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It appears from the accounts that 8.7% of the coffee in bags exported from Rio de Janeiro between 1827 and 1831 was shipped by Priaulx, Tupper & Co. The firm sent cargoes (various) in 1831 to Antwerp, Cowes, Guernsey, Hamburg, Leghorn, London, Rotterdam and Trieste.
Fig 34: Ports of departure of Guernsey vessels sailing to Rio de Janeiro, Jan 1825 - June 1826.
Fig 35: Ports of destination of Guernsey vessels clearing from Rio de Janeiro, Jan 1825 - June 1826.
APPENDIX 20: The work of porters and cooperers

Charges on 1 pipe of wine:

Duty 2/5
Landing & stowing 1/3
Shipping & putting out 1/3
Cooper to receive in cellar 3d
Candles & bung cloth 3d
Cooperage, hoops &c from 2/ to 2/6 or 6/6 if trimm'd entirely new according to what is done on it.
Warehouse room 6d. per month
Commission 2/6
If forced or rack'd [variable]

APPENDIX 21: Inhabitants of St Peter Port insuring with the
Sun Fire Insurance Company, London, 1718-1731

[Source: London, Guildhall Library, 11936; references below to vol/page/policy number].
Abbreviations: d.h. = dwelling house.

MERCHANTS

Samuel BONANY: for goods and merchandise in his appartment belonging to Mr Dobree at the lower end of Cornet St.; and for goods and merchandise in his cellar under the d.h. of Mr Nicholas Maftell, the upper end of Cornet street [12/212, 213/19679, 19680].

Nicholas CAREY, gentleman: d.h. in High St., goods and merchandise in d.h. [12/228/19737, 19738].

Peter CAREY Esq.: house, late the d.h. of Peter Martin Esq in the Great Street. Peter Carey Esq for his goods and merchandise in his warehouse near his brewhouse [11/3/16815, 16816].

Peter Anthony COUTART merchant: Elisha La Marchant & Peter Anthony Coutart - goods and merchandise in their warehouse by itself in the upper end of "la profonde rue" near Mr de Havilland's gardens - not exceeding 4500 [22/148/38530].

Henry DE JERSEY, merchant: for his goods and merchandise in his d.h., Fountain St [10/212/15593; see also 10/421/12230].

Nicholas DE SAUGHAREZ, merchant, for his house being the d.h. only of Carterette Rougett, High St. [10/126/15191]; d.h., High St. [12/440/20600]
Elisha Dobree senior, merchant: for his d.h. and for his goods and merchandise in his d.h. [10/283/15940, 15941].
John Dobree: d.h. and house adjoining to his dwelling house, Pollet [9/126/13465, 13466].
Nicholas Dobree, merchant: d.h. and warehouse adjoining to d.h.: goods and merchandise in warehouse adjoining d.h., Forge St. [10/105/15083, 15084; 14/267/26036. See also 22/132 for house and barns at Portsea].
Thomas Dobree, merchant: d.h. situate between the houses of Aaron Guillaume & the heirs of Elisha Saumarez [10/421/-]...
John Grangerau, merchant: for his household goods and stock in trade in his d.h., lower end of Fountain St. [23/381/40729].
Mathew Guerin, merchant: d.h. at the top of Fountain St. insured for £500 [22/148/38511].
John Jersey, merchant: for his goods in trade only in his shop in the house of Mr Daniel Naftel called Newhouse - £500 [23/420/41047].
John Le Mesurier, merchant: for his d.h., Fountain St. [9/84/13262]; stoned and tiled d.h. £500; his goods and stock in trade therein £500 [30/200/50249]. Briard House, Great St, in possession of Saxon Eviere, house only, £1000 [14/385/26478].
John Le Roy, merchant: d.h. Fountain St. [10/35/14763].
Thomas Massey, merchant: d.h. only, £500 [14/390/26503].
Charles Mauger, merchant: house called the Grand Boscq now empty [10/201/15588]; goods and merchandise in house called Bosse [10/436/16680].
Elias Mauger, merchant, d.h. High St [13/56/22374].
GENTLEMEN AND OTHERS

John BOWDEN, brewer: house at Mrnt Chibell, brewhouse and house next
door [9/60/13146, 13147; 9/126/13467].

James CAREY: d.h. Fountain St [10/128/15190].

Eleazar LE MARCHANT, gentleman: d.h. [9/297/14307].

Thomas LE MARCHANT, gentleman: house at Great Crossway, High St. insured
for £1000 [16/174/30322].


Rachel MAUGER, widow: d.h. Market Place [11/58/17056].

Capt Daniel NAFTELL: d.h. near the church [9/112/12221].

Capt Nicholas NAFTELL, mariner: [9/343/-].

Elizabeth PERCHARD, widow: d.h. Fountain St, goods in d.h.
[12/103/19126, 19129].
APPENDIX 22: Vessels built in Guernsey, 1812-1827
[Numbers; aggregate tonnage in brackets]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Ship</th>
<th>Brig</th>
<th>Schooner</th>
<th>Cutter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1812</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 (16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1813</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1814</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 (250)</td>
<td>1 (32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1815</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 (140)</td>
<td>3 (118)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1816</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 (61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1817</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (113)</td>
<td>1 (22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1818</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 (204)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1819</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5 (544)</td>
<td>2 (199)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1820</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (716)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1821</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (1110)</td>
<td>1 (112)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1822</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1823</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 (395)</td>
<td>5 (109)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1824</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 (409)</td>
<td>11 (264)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1825</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 (146)</td>
<td>7 (280)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1826</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 (354)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1827</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 (696)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source and notes: J. Jacob, *Annals of the British Norman Isles* (Paris, 1830), pp 456-457. A few of these vessels were built at St Sampson's or in Sark; the vast majority were constructed at yards in the town or parish of St Peter Port).
APPENDIX 23: Commercial establishments in St Peter Port, 1834

PROFESSIONS: Academies and schools, 21; advocates 7; law agents, 14;
notaries, 7; professors and teachers, 16; surgeons, 19; surveyors, 4;
veterinary surgeon, 1;
SERVICES & MISCELLANEOUS: auctioneers, 6; banks 2; baths, 2; bed-feather dealers, 3; bookellers and stationers, 10; china, glass and earthenware dealers, 10; chemists and druggists, 9; coal merchants, 9; coopers, 6;
fire insurance agents, 13; inns and hotels, 8; libraries, circulating, 1;
lottery office, 1; merchants, general & commission, 20; newspapers, 4;
opicians, 1; perfumers and hairdressers, 7; piano forte tuners, 2;
printers, 5; public reading room, 1; rope makers, 2; ship and general agents, 14; soap and candle manufacturers, 4; taverns and public houses, 31; tobacco and snuff manufacturers, 8; umbrella makers, 3; watch makers and jewellers, 13; furniture polisher, 1; commission agent, 1;
surgical instrument maker, 1; brush and sieve dealer, 1; furniture broker, 1; lathe regr., 1; stationer, 1; optician & mathematical instrument maker, 1; religious tract depository, 1; trunk maker, 1; brush, bellows & last maker, 1
CONSTRUCTION: block and pump makers, 3; boat builders, 2; brick makers & lime burners, 6; cabinet makers, 13; carpenters, painters, glaziers, builders, 29; carvers and gilders, 2; coach makers & wheelwrights, 3;
painters, house, sign and ornamental, 8; plasterers, 12; sawyers, 7; ship builders, 5; stone and marble masons, 3; stone merchants, 2; timber
merchants, 6; turners, 5; wheelwrights, 3; slate merchant, 1; millwright, 1.

FOOD & DRINK: bakers, 28; brewers, 7; butchers, 36; confectioners, 2; corn merchants, 9; distillers, 2; grocers, 16; grocers, wine and spirit merchants and dealers, 33; millers, 6(?); wine and spirit merchants, 17; wine merchants, 6; spirit dealer, 1; chocolate manufacturer, 1; eating house, 1.

LEATHER TRADES: boot and shoe makers, 49; dyers & scourers, 7; saddlers &c. 4; tanners, 3.

METALWORK: blacksmiths, 13; brass founders, 2; braziers and tin-plate workers, 7; ironmongers, braziers &c. 8; plumbers, 4; white smiths & bell hangers, 13; nail manufacturer, 1.

CARRYING/TRANSPORT: livery stable keepers, 10.

TEXTILES: clothes salesmen, 4; fancy repositories, 9; hat manufacturers, 3; linen and woollen drapers, 17; milliners & straw bonnet makers, 12; pelisse and dressmakers, 3; sail makers, 3; silk manufacturer, 1; tailors, 8; stay maker, 2; truss maker & furrier, 1; silk mercers, 1.

AGRICULTURE: nursery & seedsmen & florists, 5; seedsman, 1.

(Source: J. Stevens Cox (ed.), Guernsey Commercial Directory for 1834 (Guernsey, 1980).)
### APPENDIX 24: Residential patterns and wealth by vingtaine, 1727

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vingtaine</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>quarters</th>
<th>% of total</th>
<th>mean rank</th>
<th>mean per caput</th>
<th>rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carrefour</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>5060</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>99.2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grande Rue</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4115</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>82.3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berthelot</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1020</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>56.7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilori</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2875</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>89.8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EGLise</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1225</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cimetiere +</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2275</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fontaine</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2695</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>51.8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contree Mansell +</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1065</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de Putron</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.15.0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Jacques</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>54.1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truchot</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1390</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>69.5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pollet</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total         | 394    | 24415    | 100.0      | 62.0      |

Notes: * Vingtaines aggregated in the original assessments:

Cimetiere with Beauregard;
Contree Mansell with Hauteville and Most Durand;
St Jacques with Couture and Bouet.

In the following analyses the tax payers are classified with regard to their tax assessment:

- **Low**: assessment of taxpayer less than 20 quarters;
- **middle**: assessment of taxpayer between 20 and 99 quarters;
- **High**: assessment of taxpayer 100 quarters and above.
LOCATION QUOTIENTS, 1727

"The Location Quotient is calculated by dividing the percentage of the subgroup of the population in an area by the percentage of the total population in the same area...If an area has an LQ value greater than 1 then that subgroup of the population is over-represented in that particular area" [J.R. Short, Urban Data Sources (London, 1980), p 81.

In St Peter Port in 1727 the highly assessed tax payers were over-represented in the vingtaines of Carrefour, Grande Rue, Pilori (and marginally in St Jacques).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carrefour</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grande Rue</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berthelot</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilori</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eglise</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cimetiere</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fontaine</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contree Mansell</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de Putron</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Jacques</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truchot</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pollet</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THE INDEX OF DISSIMILARITY, 1727

The Index of Dissimilarity provides a measure of the similarity in the spatial distribution of two socio-economic and/or birthplace groups...
The ID value ranges from 0 to 100. When the ID value is close to 0 this implies that the two populations have similar spatial distributions. Conversely, the closer the calculated value is to 100 the more dissimilar are the two spatial distributions and hence the greater the degree of residential segregation" [J.R. Short, op. cit., pp 76-77.

In St Peter Port in 1727 there was greatest dissimilarity in the spatial distribution of the Highly and the Lowly assessed tax payers (ID 31).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td><em>x</em></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td><em>x</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>x</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THE INDEX OF SEGREGATION, 1727

The Index of Segregation "measures the extent to which a specified subgroup has a similar spatial distribution to the distribution of the total population...The IS value ranges from 0 to 100 with values closer to 100 indicating a greater degree of residential segregation" [J.R. Short, op. cit., pp 78-79].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX 25: Residential patterns and wealth by vingtaine, 1800

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vingtaine</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>quarters</th>
<th>% taxed of total</th>
<th>mean rank</th>
<th>per caput rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carrefour</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>15665</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>198.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follet</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>11060</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>175.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grande Rue</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>9510</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>257.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berthelot</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>13080</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>319.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eglise</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3475</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>93.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cimetiere +</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>7095</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>168.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fontaine</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>8265</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>87.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contree Mansell+</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>5420</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>80.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hauteville +</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>9540</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>99.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Jacques +</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>3200</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>47.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truchot +</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>8145</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>111.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total            | 696    | 94455    | 100.0            |           | 135.7          |

**Notes:** + vingtaines aggregated in the original recording:
- Cimetiere aggregated with Beauregard;
- Contree Mansell with Mont Durand;
- Hauteville with de Putron;
- St Jacques with Couture and Bouet;
- Truchot with Glateny.

In the following analyses the same definitions of LOW, MIDDLE and HIGH are used as in the analyses for 1727 (see Appendix 24, which also provides definitions of Location Quotient, Index of Dissimilarity and Index of Segregation).
### Location Quotients, 1800

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carrefour</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failet</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grande Rue</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berthelot</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eglisee</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cimetiere</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fontaine</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contree Mansell</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hauteville</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Jacques</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truchot</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Index of Dissimilarity, 1800

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Index of Segregation, 1800

Low 17
Middle 9
High 18
APPENDIX 26: Residential patterns and wealth by vingtaine, 1831

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vingtaine</th>
<th>Number assessed</th>
<th>Quarters</th>
<th>% per caput</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Mean per caput</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rue des Forges</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>17850</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follet</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>11520</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>122.6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marche</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>5635</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>86.7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eglise</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>4075</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>72.8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vauvert</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>15790</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>135.0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grange</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>30285</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>426.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ville-Neuve</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>16865</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>219.0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hauteville</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>25360</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>253.6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Jacques</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>6885</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>91.8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glatney</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>8760</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>93.2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LOCATION QUOTIENTS, 1831

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vingtaine</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rue des Forges</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follet</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marche</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eglise</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vauvert</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grange</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ville-Neuve</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hauteville</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Jacques</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glatney</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### INDEX OF DISSIMILARITY, 1831

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### INDEX OF SEGREGATION, 1831

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX 27: Census of St Peter Port, 31 May 1831 (Source: COF B44)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Inhabited houses</td>
<td>1725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Houses building</td>
<td>??</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Houses uninhabited</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Families - employed in agriculture</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in trade, manufacture, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>all other families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Males (French-164)</td>
<td>5969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Females (French-141)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Males upwards of 20 years</td>
<td>2874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Agriculture - occupiers 1st class</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2nd class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>labourers in agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Manufacturers</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3 cement, 3 tobacco, 1 brick &amp; lime, 1 soap, 1 gas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Retail trade &amp; handicraft</td>
<td>1348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Wholesale and capitalists, clergy, office-clerks, professional and other educated men</td>
<td>581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Labourers, not agricultural</td>
<td>423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Quarry men 2, miners 12, fishermen 10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. All other males of 20 years</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Male servants - upwards of 20 years</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>under 20 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All female servants</td>
<td>917</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Maps and Plates

References to Brett are to C.E.B. Brett, Buildings in the Town and Parish of Saint Peter Port (Guernsey, 1975).

Map 1: The situation of Guernsey in the Channel Islands. (From J.P. Warren, Our Own Island (Guernsey, 1926), fig 13, p 30.)

Map 2: Guernsey and its parishes. (From Statistical Digest Guernsey (Guernsey, 1993)).

Map 3: Manuscript "bird's eye view" of St Peter Port from the report by Colonel George Legge 'The Present State of Guernsey' 1680. The survey was conducted by Thomas Phillips of the Ordnance Department (after the Royal Court Library copy; the original is in the National Maritime Museum, Greenwich; there is also a copy in the British Library - King's Ms 481).

Map 4: The east coast of Guernsey as depicted in 'A New and Exact Chart of the Islands of Guernsey, Sark, Herm & Jethou'. This was executed from a survey made by Nicholas Dobree; engraved by Emanuel Bowen; and published in 1746. It was issued with an accompanying pamphlet of navigational observations - Observations sur les cartes des Isles de Guernesey with a text in French and English (BL Maps 30.b.80). This Dobree map helped to establish St Peter Port as a major entrepot. It was published again in 1779 and 1786.

Map 5: 'Plan de la Ville et des environs de St Pierre Port', 1759. A manuscript map, executed perhaps by the French admiralty (private collection).
Map 6: St Peter Port, 1787, as depicted in 'An Accurate Survey and Measurement of the Island of Guernsey. Surveyed by Order of His Grace the Duke of Richmond'.

Map 7: St Peter Port, c 1800. St Peter Port harbour could accommodate forty or fifty vessels but was not sufficiently large for the booming entrepot trade. This map envisaged the construction of a new harbour to the north of the town. The suppression of smuggling in the early 19th century and the development of St Sampson's harbour relieved the pressure on St Peter Port. [Priaulx, de Magnac ms.].

Map 8: St Peter Port, early 19th century. A few details appear to have been added after the original drafting of the map. [Priaulx, de Magnac ms.].

Map 9: St Peter Port, early 19th century. A few details appear to have been added after the original drafting of the map. [Priaulx, de Magnac ms.].

Map 10: Island of Guernsey, 1814. Part of a map executed by the architect John Wilson, published in William Berry's History of Guernsey (London, 1815). The map shows clearly the military barracks in and around St Peter Port.

Plate 1
View of St Peter Port c.1676 (British Library K LV 62). The harbour is represented as having a north pier; in fact this was not completed until the eighteenth century.

Plate 2
View of the harbour and town of St Peter Port, 1680. From the report by Colonel George Legge The Present State of Guernsey 1680 (see plate 1 and Map 3 above).

Plate 3
'Prospect of St Peter's Port & town in the Island of Guernsey taken from Castle Cornet' (Bastide del., W.H. Toms sculp., printed and sold by John Tinney, Golden Lion, Fleet Street, London, c 1746).

Plate 4
'A View of Guernsey', watercolour, 1769 (artist unknown; Stevens-Cox collection).

Plate 5
'St Peter's Port, Guernsey' by Joshua Gosselin, late 18th century (EL K top LV.63.bl). Note the shops on the right, with the lowered shutters providing outside counters.

Plate 6
A View of St Peter Port, by Joshua Gosselin, 1793. Sold at Sotheby's, London, 14 April 1994 (lot 394 in the sale of the late Cornish Turbock's collection of British watercolours and drawings. Presently on exhibition at Candie Museum, St Peter Port. Photographs do not do justice to the fine detail of the original).
Plate 7
'St Peter Port, Guernsey, from Castle Cornet' from *The History of the Island of Guernsey* by William Berry, London, 1815.

Plate 8
A view of Guernsey pier and part of the town. Lithograph, c 1830, published by Moss.

ENTREPOT

Plate 9
The north pier of St Peter Port harbour; a detail of part of a print by Bastide, c 1746 [see Plate 3 above].

Plate 10
18th century wine cellars situated at the junction of the Canichers and Doyle Street, St Peter Port. Converted into the Cellar Club in the 1950s; demolished (along with many other eighteenth century buildings) in the 1980s.

Plate 11
Catalogue of the auction sale of the Chinese cargo of the Danish Asiatic Company's ship *König von Danemarck*, Copenhagen, 1757. This catalogue was forwarded to the merchant family of Priaulx in St Peter Port. [Priaulx library, Priaulx papers].

Plate 12
Carl Christoffer Arfwedson (1735-1826), a member of the leading mercantile family of Gothenburg which supplied tea and other goods to the St Peter Port merchants. [Stockholm, Statens Konstmuseum - Svenska Porträttarkivet].
Plate 13
Advertisements for auction sales of prize goods in St Peter Port.

Plate 14
St Peter Port church. From V. Berry, *The History of the Island of Guernsey* (London, 1815). The print illustrates the style of cart developed locally to transport wine tuns.

ASPECTS OF SOCIAL LIFE
Urban consumption reflected the wealth of the entrepot.

Plate 15
Dutch tile, c 1800. In the late 18th century many houses in St Peter Port were decorated with Dutch tiles imported in vessels conveying gin from the Netherlands to the island. [Tile in author’s collection; from an 18th century house demolished in the 1980s.]

Plate 16
Armorial plate made in China. Several of the wealthiest families - Dobree, Le Mesurier, Perchard - commissioned the production of armorial china. This plate illustrates a dish manufactured in China bearing the Dobree coat of arms. [Private collection.]

Plate 17
Ironmongery from Southampton. By the end of the 18th century manufactured goods from the Midlands and North of England were being shipped to St Peter Port from Southampton (see p 157). [Saumarez Manor archives.]

Plate 18
Horse-racing. As in England, horse-racing became a popular pastime and the occasion for sociability.
Plate 19
The title page of the book generally considered to have been the first printed in Guernsey. The patrician motto betokens the social and intellectual snobbery of the author.

Plate 20
Piano-forte maker from London visiting St Peter Port, c 1800. In the late Georgian era many specialists came from London to cater for the various needs of the St Peter Port aristocracy. [Sausmarez Manor archives].

Plate 21
An advertisement for Bernard’s “Vauxhall Gardens”. In the mid 1790s the actor-manager John Bernard set up his gardens on the outskirts of St Peter Port. [Sausmarez Manor archives].

Plate 22
La Plaiderie, a medieval building used as the court house until the end of the 18th century (see Plate 26 for the new court house). La Plaiderie was demolished in 1929.

Plate 23
Old Fountain Street, St Peter Port. From a copy made in 1892 of a sketch of 1799 (artist unknown).

Plate 24
The old Carey house opposite the west porch of the Town Church. Demolished in the 19th century (to make space for market buildings).

Plate 25
The junction of Church Street and Fountain Street. Watercolour, c 1825 (author’s collection).
Plate 26
The Pullet, from the sea side. After a painting by an unknown artist, c. 1820.

NEW ST PETER PORT

Plate 27
The Town Hospital. Built in 1741-1742 and subsequently enlarged in the early 19th century. The entrance gateway dates from the 17th century and originally stood at L'Hyvreuse house; it was moved to the Hospital site in the 19th century. (Brett, p 41. Lithograph published by Moss, c 1830).

Plate 28
The French Halles and Assembly Rooms. The plan to build a meat market was launched in 1771 and gained government approval in 1776. The development created the opportunity to build new Assembly Rooms as an upper storey. Building started in 1780 and the Rooms were opened in 1782 (Brett, p 32. Lithograph published by Moss, c 1830).

Plate 29
Royal Court House. Constructed between 1792 and 1802 to replace the medieval Plaiderie (see Plate 22). The building cost £7000. (Brett, p 36. Lithograph published by Moss, c 1830).

Plate 30
The Arcades and the New Meat Market. The Arcades were built in 1830 as a fish market. "Both in its accommodation and the abundance of its supply is admitted to be unrivalled in any place in Europe". The architect was John Wilson who was also responsible for the New Meat Market built in
The cost of the New Meat Market was £4222 [Brett, p 32. Lithograph published by Moss, c 1830].

Plate 31
Moore's Hotel. The town house of the De Sausmarez family, built c 1760 near the centre of the town. It was not until the 1780s that the wealthy started to move to the outskirts of the town [Brett, p 32].

Plate 32
"Grover's Hotel, New Ground". From W. Berry, *The History of the Island of Guernsey* (London, 1815). This seems to have been purpose-built to serve as a hotel. Assemblies and similar social functions were held here in the Regency period (see plate 18). The hotel stood beside L'Hyvreuse, the land laid out in the 1760s for promenades.

Plate 33

Plate 34

Plate 35
"Havelet, the Residence of the late William le Marchant, Esqre." From W. Berry, *The History of the Island of Guernsey* (London, 1815). William le Marchant was Bailiff of Guernsey from 1771 to 1800. This large villa, with lawns and ornamental trees, commanded a good view over St Peter Port to the north.
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A LIST OF KITCHEN FURNITURE, AND OTHER ARTICLES; MANUFACTURED IN COPPER, TIN, IRON, &c; AND SOLD BY H. B. LANEKESTER, FURNISHING IRON MONGER, &c; AT NO. 129, HIGH STREET, SOUTHAMPTON.

COFFER & BRASS WARES, BREWING AND WASHING COPPER OF ALL SORTS, WITH OR WITHOUT COATS.

TIN WARES; BEER & CIDER.

LARGE ASSORTMENT OF THE BEST COPPER AND TIN CUPIDS, WITH AND WITHOUT POTS.

Oval and Round Pots
Turbo Pans
Slewed Pans, Ditto
Tea Kettles
Preserving and Pickling Pans
Warming Pans
Soup Pots
Omelet Pans, Ditto
Ditto Bowls and Ladies
Brass Fire Guards and Fenders
Drip Pans with Wells
Cop and Brass Puts
Common and Hard Metal Plates
Bottle Stands
Beer Jugs and Jacks
Knife and Spoon Trays
Patent and Spring Scissors
Pewter & Britannia Metal Wares.

Waxedwood Boxes
Red Boxes and Chamber Vases
Candlesticks and Vases
Candle Holders
Handsome assortment of Pewter trays and Warren Piece Trays

A great Quantity of fashionable Britannia-Metal Teapots, Candlesticks, Snifs, Turners, &c, &c.

Large Assortment of plated Candlesticks with Silver Edges.

N. B. BELL, HANGING ON THE NEWEST PLANS, AND SMITHS' WORK IN ALL ITS BRANCHES.

Plate 17; Ironmongery from Southampton.
Guernsey Races.

On Thursday 3rd Feb. 1814

At 1 o’Clock,

THE TWO WELL BRED MARES

Jane Driver & Betty Bolter

WILL START FOR

A Stock Purse of Twenty Guineas,
For ONE MILE HEAT, from Rohais House.

CAPTAIN PEARCE . . .  } STEWARDS.
LIEUT. GLEDSTANES .
JUDGE . . . . F. P. HUTCHESSON, Esq.
Signed,—C. J. Selwyn, Clerk of the Course.

N. B. Should the Weather be unfavourable it will be deferred to the following Day.

There will be a Ball in the Evening at Grover’s Hotel.

GREENSLADE, PRINTER.
Plate 19: Title-page of the book that is generally stated to have been the first printed in Guernsey
J. TAYLOR,
PIANO-FORTE MAKER,
From Broadwood's, and late of Brook Street, Bond Street,
Respectfully announces to the Public of Guernsey, that he is taking a Circuit from London, to repair and rectify the most intricate imperfections in Pianos from what cause they may arise; such as a bad tone, hard touch, defective either in power or brilliancy, rattling and noise in the keys, not answering the finger; pedals added to Pianos that have not got them, additional keys also added, & more particular, Instruments that have lost their tone, brought to their former pitch and mellow tone; in a word, J. T. will do anything on the spot equal to any house in London.— As his stay will not be long in the Island, he will be obliged by an early application at Mr. Charles Malwand's, Haut Ville.
COTTAGE, TEA GARDENS.

M. BERNARD and BARRY, present their respects and beg leave to inform the Public, that they propose opening the Gardens on Monday, July, the 11th, with a

GRAND GALA,

In honour to his

MAJESTY'S BIRTH DAY:

To consist of

Music-Singing, Illuminations,

and

FIREWORKS

The subscribers to have twelve Mondays for Gala Nights; and twelve Saturdays, for Promenade Nights.

Tea, Coffee, Music, &c. for the 24 Nights: one Pound eleven and six-pence: Mondays, and Saturdays, the Gardens will be open'd—

to Subscribers only:

Every Wednesday the gardens will be open'd and

A GRAND GALA

offer'd to the Public in General

Tickets for Tea and Coffee, two Shillings.

Music, Singing,

and

FIREWORKS, GRATIS.

The Gardens will be illuminated Mondays and Wednesdays with 400 BRILLIANT Lamps,
of different Sizes, Sorts, and Colours.

N. B. Cold Suppers on moderate terms.

Tea and Coffee Sunday Evenings;

one Shilling.

The Proprietors assure their Friends and the Public in General that every effort will be exerted to render the Gardens worthy their Patronage.

Subscriptions receive'd at the Cottage from nine till one.

Plate 21: An advertisement for Bernard's "Vauxhall Gardens"
Plate 22: La Plaiderie.
Plate 23: Old Fountain Street
Plate 24: The old Carey house.
Plate 25: The junction of Church Street and Fountain Street, c 1825.
Plate 26: The Pollet.
Plate 27: The Town Hospital.
Plate 28: The French Halles and Assembly Rooms.
Plate 29: Royal Court House.
Plate 30: The Arcades and the New Meat Market.
Plate 31: Moore's Hotel.
Plate 32: 'Grover's Hotel, New Ground'.
Montville, the Seat of Thomas Priaulx Esq.

Plate 33: 'Montville, the Seat of Thomas Priaulx Esq.'
Plate 34: 'Beau Sejour, the seat of Harry Dobree Esqre.'
Plate 35: 'Havelet, the Residence of the late William le Marchant, Esqre.'
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