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Chapter I

CHANGING ECONOMIC CONDITIONS

In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries the direction of economic thinking was toward what is now called mercantilism. 1 Under mercantilism the nation became a consciously directed economic unit and the national government a directing force of vital importance. One of the chief goals aimed at was national economic independence. "Economic self-sufficiency," says Professor Lipson, a recent student of the English economy in early modern times, "was the kernel of Mercantilism." 2 By protecting and encouraging home industry, by forbidding the importation of foreign goods, particularly finished articles, and by closely controlling the export of raw materials, the government sought to free the nation from reliance upon foreign products which would adversely affect its balance of trade. Governmental direction of commerce and industry seemed more justifiable and even necessary as the local domestic economy changed to a

---

1 Lipson, E., in The Economic History of England (London, 1931), III, 1, says he could not find that the word mercantilism was used until after 1700.

2 Ibid., 2.
national economy. "The industries represented by many of the gilds had ceased to be confined to the supply of local demands, and had enlarged the scope of their production till they had become organs of a national economy; and it was this fact that justified an attempt at national regulation."²

The gild system which had served the needs of localized medieval industry was breaking down in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries under the impact of changes in organization and production techniques. The expansion of both the foreign and the domestic market, the growth of the domestic system, the shift in emphasis, particularly in London, from production to trade, and the rise of the merchant, without technical knowledge of the craft whose products he bought and sold, to a position of control over output and market -- these factors produced a struggle for control within the gilds between craft and trade interests and a contest between the gilds on the one hand and those on the other who sought by setting up outside city jurisdiction to escape restricting gild regulation and so were

---
threatening gild monopoly.  

Economic regulation, a policy which was generally accepted in early modern times, reached into many phases of economic life, as a selective list of proclamations issued by Charles I demonstrates. There were proclamations: for forbidding the export of hides and leather; to restrain the killing, dressing, and eating of flesh in Lent or on any fish days; to encourage the making of saltpeter; covering the retailing and the "sealing" or packaging of tobacco; prohibiting the importation of any merchandise in French ships; prohibiting the use of snaffles and commanding the use of bits for riding; for expelling Irish beggars and calling for the control of English rogues and vagabonds; forbidding the selling of ships to foreigners; regulating the manufacture of starch; curbing the use of carriages to prevent the deterioration of the highways; preventing the export of wools, yarn, fuller's earth, wood ashes and tanned and raw hides; forbidding the importation of wire; regulating the dyeing of silk; limiting the export of grain; setting the price and weights and measures of wines,

4 Ibid., 1-14, 70-102.
poultry, butter, candles, charcoal, fuel, bread, beer and ale; "prohibiting the making up of girdles, belts, hangers and other wares for men's wearing with brass buckles;" controlling the export of cloth to Germany and the Low Countries; stopping the import of glass; curbing the manufacture of gold and silver thread, because of its effect upon the quantity of bullion; prohibiting the wearing, buying and selling of counterfeit jewels; forbidding the importation of whale oil and whale fins by anyone not a member of the Muscovy Company; regulating the importation of gunpowder; restraining emigration to America; stopping the export of horns; and announcing the issue of patents for the manufacture of a great variety of commodities. 5

5 See Journal of the Court of Common Council (see bibliography), XXXIV, fols. 29, 53-55b, 79, 89, 177b; XXXV, fols. 96, 93-99b, 163b-67, 173-80, 185-86b, 204b-205, 213b-219b; XXXVI, fols. 71b-72b, 225-26; XXXVII, fols. 12-14b, 26-26b, 120-20b, 144-45, 163b, 186b-87, 204-95, 295; XXXVIII, fols. 152. Some but not all of these proclamations are in the State Papers, Domestic, Charles I. Usually just their titles are entered in the Calendar of State Papers, Domestic (hereafter cited as Cal. S. P. Dom.), for the reign of Charles.

On April 9, 1639, Charles issued a proclamation revoking certain patents and commissions. The list included, among others, licenses to export sheep- and lambskins, lamperns; grants of rights to "gauge" or measure red herrings, mark or stamp iron, seal bone lace; gauge butter casks,
In the proclamations and decrees of Charles I several reasons for the regulation of a particular craft or trade are consistently pointed out: the desire to develop local industry to prevent the export of treasure, concern for the good of His Majesty's subjects, and hope to increase Crown revenue. It is not apparent that any single motive predominated, but these reasons stand out fairly well.

One means of encouraging the development of industry was the granting of patents to inventors of special processes or new techniques. The soapboilers' Company of Westminster was formed originally to exploit an invention. The patent tendered to Harsey, Ramsey, Foulke, and Dudley weighed hay and straw coming into London and Westminster, seal linen cloth and buttons, and to gather rags; commissions for "compounding" or receiving fines from violators of proclamations dealing with tobacco, butter, logwood, insurance brokerage and book-selling; and grants of incorporation of hatband makers, gutstring makers, spectacle makers, comb makers, tobacco pipe makers, and butchers and horners. Price, W.H., English Patents of Monopoly (Cambridge, 1913), 173-75.

Until 1753, the British began their new year March 25 instead of January 1 and the calendar was also ten days behind the modern calendar. In this paper I have followed the system of the editors of the Calendar of State Papers, Domestic, who correct the year but do not correct the ten-day discrepancy, unless otherwise indicated.
for iron in 1623 specified that the grantees had a method for the more efficient making of iron. In 1624 Charles extended the glass patent to Mansell in recognition that his particular process used no wood. The patent to the South and North Shields Slatmakers, stated that one of the reasons for granting the patent was that formerly much of the salt was "brought from foreign parts and often times bought at extreme dear rates," a situation the patentees were to correct. A proclamation announcing the grant of an exclusive right to import whale oil pointed out that the monopoly was granted for the "better support of the fishing trade to Greenland...which...conduceth much to the common-good" of the kingdom. Self-sufficiency in war

6 Patent to Horsey, Ramsay, Foulke, and Dudley, 1638, ibid., 197.
7 Extension of Patent to Mansell for Glass, 1624, ibid., 236.
9 Proclamation inhibiting the importation of Whale Finns or Whale Oil, cited in Foedera, conventiones, litterae, et cujuscumque generis acta publica, inter reges Anglice et alios cuivos imperabores, reges, pontifices, principes, vel communitates ch...anno 1101, ad nostra usque temporis habita aut tractata; ex autographis...fideliter exscripta... (hereafter cited Rymer, Foedera), ed. by T. Rymer for vols. 1-15 and R. Sanderson 16-20. (London, 1704-22), XX, 16.
materials was aimed at by a grant of monopoly of the manu-
facture of saltpeter and gunpowder so that there should
"be always ready in his Majesty's Magazines or Storehouses,
such competent Proportions of good and serviceable Gun-
powder, as shall be necessary, not only for his Majesty's
own use, but for the supply of his Subjects."

A proclamation recognizing the malt and hops monopoly pointed out
that the method used by the patentees conserved wood and
"much cost and attendance spared."

By such means did
the government of England show its concern for the develop-
ment and protection of home industry.

Frequently great concern was expressed over the
welfare of His Majesty's subjects. The proclamations
creating the soap monopoly complained of "bad and stinking"
soap formerly manufactured. Many patents fixed prices
so that Englishmen would not have "to buy at high and dear
rates."

The playing card and dice monopoly sought "the

10 Ibid., 107.
11 Ibid., 191.
12 Price, English Patents of Monopoly, 203.
13 For example see Proclamation on Maltsters and Brewers,
Rymer, Foedera, XX, 157-59.
prevention of those common abuses, which have been . . . practised by the use of false Cards and Dice. Regulation of the quality of an article was accomplished by giving a certain organization the power of search and inspection, as in the case of tile and brick makers. Unskilled and careless workmanship was the cause for crumbling bricks and tiles,

Whereas through the unskilfull and deceitfull making of brick and tyle, and through the want of skill and deceit used by bricklayers in building manie of his Majestys loving subjects have bene and still are much dammified in regarde that by these abuses their houses fall sodainely to ruine, for preventing whereof a charter hath been granted to the Society and Companie of Tylers and Bricklayers to make an orderly and due search in all suspected places where the said abuses are conceived to be committed, to the ende the offenders may be punished and the offences amended by impos- ing of such fines or amensments as in like case are usuall.

Concern over wages was frequently voiced in statements from the Privy Council. For example, wages were set in a detailed fashion for workers in cloth and yarn. One cannot read the various proclamations, decrees, and

14 Proclamation Touching the Manufacture of Cards and Dice, ibid., 145-46.


18 Proclamation concerning constant reels, Rymer, Foedera, XX, 41.
materials from the Privy Council Register without feeling that the welfare of the people was of primary concern to the government.

Connected closely with the mercantilistic aims of Charles was his dire need for funds. "The first steps were extravagant, for they entered on a course and pursued it, in the hope that the money would be forthcoming somehow."17 From the meeting of Charles' first Parliament, it became apparent that a considerable party in the House of Commons was determined by financial pressure to force the King to surrender much of his administrative power to the legislature. Thus deprived of the wherewithal to carry on an expensive foreign policy which his father had bequeathed him, Charles sought financial relief by developing a program of extra-parliamentary income.18 Vicenzo Gussoni, the Venetian Ambassador in England, wrote to the Pope and Senate:

> With the shortness of money, which increases daily, and the disinclination to obtain it by the more and more detested means of Parliament, they have begun to invent devices and subtleties, never practised in the past. They have so arranged the whole business

---


of the manufacture and sale of soap which is consumed in this kingdom, into a monopoly, without any apparent imposition or tax, since by fundamental laws taxes and impositions depend on the arbitration of parliament alone, that the price of that commodity has been doubled, and they reckon that this enhanced cost will mean a considerable sum for the royal benefit. Accordingly they are contemplating very much greater increases, and it seems that they propose to do the same with corn, beer and all other kinds of merchandise, following the example of this new device. However it does not pass without exciting resentment and remonstrance among the people.

Virtually every patent cost its recipient a large initial sum and yearly payments thereafter. Some of those payments, if met as intended, were significant. The Soapboilers of Westminster were scheduled to pay £20,000 and later £20,000 annually.

The protection of one industry frequently injured another, as will be pointed out in the section on the soap monopoly. While His Majesty's subjects might benefit by fixed prices and wages on one hand, they were hurt by such conduct as these saltpeter men exhibited:

As in digging in all places without distinction, as in parlours, bedchambers, threshing and malting floors, yes, God's own house they have not forborne; so they respect not times—digging in the breeding time in dove-houses and working sometimes a month together, whereby the flights of doves are destroyed;

and without respect to harvest time (digging) in barns and in malting houses, when green malt is upon the floor; and in bedchambers placing their tubs by the bedside of the old and sick, even of women in childbirth and persons on their death-beds. They have undermined walls and seldom fill up the places they have digged. 20

In his desire to get receipts for the exchequer, or to further an invention, a new patent frequently foisted poor quality material upon the King's subjects. These contradictions become apparent in the ensuing section on the soap monopoly.

By the seventeenth century the old gilds, with their clearly-defined work areas and clear distinctions between master, journeyman, and apprentice, were becoming more oligarchical in management with great disparities between the rich master and the poor master. "With the increasing application of capital to industry, the master craftsman who could not afford to keep a large stock in trade and rent a shop in the business part of the town was obliged either to hawk his wares about the streets or to dispose of them to one of the wealthier trading masters. In this way, though he became virtually an employee of others, he retained his

position as a householder.\textsuperscript{21} The poorer of the masters and some of the journeymen were in the same economic predicament. The desire to own a shop, the ever mounting restriction of the gilds, and the rather large amount of capital needed to set up in business forced this class to seek remedy outside the gild for the plight in which gild leadership placed it.\textsuperscript{22}

By the end of the sixteenth century many of the gilds of London had come under the domination of merchants

\textsuperscript{21} Unwin, Industrial Organization, 52-52.

\textsuperscript{22} Unwin says, "Just at the time when, as far as purely economic conditions were concerned, it was becoming easier for a journeyman to set up for himself, the degeneration of the handicraft organizations into close corporations was hedging the mastership about with an ever-increasing amount of artificial restriction, which led of necessity to persistent evasion by those excluded from the corporation, and which gave rise to frequent adjustment from within and intervention from without, fill finally it was dealt with by sweeping legislation . . . Journeymen who could not afford the luxury of formal mastership took to working secretly in chambers; or else they followed the more open course of retiring to the suburbs, where they were beyond the jurisdiction of the city corporation, whilst still within reach of employment by the city merchants. From this cause the suburbs . . . of London were becoming during the sixteenth century the main seat of the domestic industries." Ibid., 54-55. See also Unwin, George, The Gilds and Companies of London, 3rd edition, (London, 1923), 242-66.
who knew nothing of the craft which the gild represented. In 1628 the small craftsmen in leather complained that the Company of Leathersellers, a powerful London livery company or gild, no longer represented or was controlled by "such as made, dressed and sold wares of tanners leather," and insisted that "the company is long since changed to those that know not leather, for generally the Master and Wardens and Body . . . are men of other trades." Earlier in the century those who dominated the Company of Joiners had successfully fought off the demand of small craftsmen in the gild that the offices of the Company should not be held by any but craftsmen. The same trend is observable in the Clothworkers' Company which, by the reign of James I, was made up of three classes, craftsmen, merchant employers and exporters, the last two of which dominated the gild.

---

23 State Papers, Domestic, Charles I, CCCLXXXVI, No. 90, quoted in Unwin, Industrial Organization, 129.


This drift of the livery companies away from the craft and in the direction of trade was made possible by the nature of the constitution of the City of London.

There were three means by which a man might become "free" of a livery company: by serving an apprenticeship in the trade; by patrimony, that is to say, he had a right to membership in the company if his father had been a freeman or member; and by redemption, which meant that he might be given the freedom of the company by one of the company officials who as a perquisite of their office might give or sell membership in the company to a limited number during their term of office. By the last two means many entered the companies who had no knowledge of or interest in the craft. Furthermore, any citizen of London could practice any craft in which he had served an apprenticeship, without

---

26 For a description of the "rights and privileges" of the City of London see George Norton, Commentaries on the History, Constitution and Chartered Franchises of the City of London, third ed. (London, 1869), and W. de Gray Birch, The Historical Charters and Constitutional Documents of the City of London (London, 1834). Sir Henry Calthrop, the Recorder of the City of London in the 1620's, drew up in 1642 a concise statement of the City constitution, adding many customs hitherto unpublished. His treatise, The Liberties, Usages and Customs of the City of London (London, 1642), is extremely rare. The copy made available to me is a microfilm of the volume deposited in the Guildhall Library in London.
having to belong to that particular company. For example, a man might be a practicing goldsmith or pewterer or hatter, or nothing but a trader, and be free of the Vintners' Company because his father had been a Vintner or because he had purchased membership from the Master of the Vintners' Company. 27

As the gilds in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries came under the domination of men who had no

---

27 The Company of Brerers petitioned the Court of Aldermen in 1666 that the Company was "much decayed and unable to govern, there being but six beer brewers and a small number of ale brewers who were freemen of the said Company, the rest who make beer and ale in London being freemen of other Companies and foreigners, and thereby it is thereby [sic] humbly prayed for relief of the said Company that there may be granted unto them forty or thirty persons to be made free, using the trade of brewing and not free of any Company." Minutes of the Court of Aldermen, June 15, 1666, Repertories of the Court of Aldermen (see bibliography), XL, fol. 554b-53. See also the complaint of the Company of Painter-strainers, that the upholsters were "daily setting on work" several painter-strainers who were not freemen of either company. July 14, 1666, ibid., XL, fol. 325v. In 1620 the Mercers' Company petitioned the Court of Aldermen against "divers persons, not serving any freemen within this City according to the custom thereof, have been either by friends or money set free and have set up any trade within the space of seven years." The Mercers asked redress against William Pick, who had bought his freedom in the Ironmongers' Company and had set up shop on London Bridge and practice the craft of a mercer. Sept. 16, 1620, ibid., XXIV, fol. 634b-55. See also Unwin, The Gilds and Companies of London, 161-49.
interest in the crafts, the small practicing craftsmen in each company found themselves cut off from control of their own craft and members of a company which had no interest in their problems. These small craftsmen sometimes sought relief by organizing new gilds of their own, and the number of such gilds incorporated in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries reflects the widespread use of this means of obtaining relief. For example, the felt hat makers and the beaver hat makers broke away from the Haberdashers' Company, the glovers from the Leathersellers' Company, the distillers of vinegar from the Vintners' Company, and the pin makers from the Girdlers' Company. 28

Another way of escaping the domination of the oligarchic leadership in the City companies was to move into the suburbs. There, outside the jurisdiction of the Lord Mayor, the small craftsmen could follow his trade free of crippling restrictions. But this trend faced the national government, obsessed with the philosophy of regulation and "order," with the problem of reducing the growing anarchy in the suburbs and of bringing industry and trade in the outskirts of London under some system of control.

The two cases to be considered here bring out clearly the changing industrial and commercial situation in seventeenth-century England, and typify the way in which the government of Charles I sought to meet that change. In the one case the Crown recognized the growth of new industry in the suburbs and the movement of small craftsmen into the outskirts to escape City gild control, and attempted by setting up the Corporation of Tradesmen and Artificers of Westminster to extend regulation and "order" in an area where production was fast slipping away from all control. In the other case the government saw an opportunity to profit by catering to new capitalist interests which were challenging an old monopoly, and agreed to the organization of the Company of Sorpmakers of Westminster as a new monopoly to replace the old. The one monopoly, that of the Corporation of Tradesmen, sought simply to bring regulation to an area of production that so far had escaped control. There was no promise of profit here for the Crown. The creation of the other monopoly, that of the Company of Sorpmakers, sought the dual gain of income to the treasury and promotion of home industry. To analyze the inauguration and the operation of these two typical Caroline monopolies and to weigh their success is the purpose of this investigation.
Chapter II

CORPORATION OF TRADESMEN AND ARTIFICERS OF VICTORIA

The rapid increase in size of the suburbs of London, and the resulting confusion and break-down of regulation of production standards and market conditions, were factors which prompted Charles to create the Corporation of London Tradesmen and Artificers for the suburbs in 1636. The creation of the New Corporation, as it came to be called, was typical of the Crown's attempts to come to grips with the changing socio-economic conditions caused by an expanding economy and rapidly extending metropolitan area.

The rapid growth of London in Elizabethan and early Stuart times caused "the greatest difficulty in maintaining any effective industrial and social regulation in such a rapidly increasing centre of population, and the machinery of municipal institutions, which had been very highly developed, proved insufficient to grapple with the situation."¹ This growth was in great measure the result

¹ Cunningham, W., The Growth of English Industry and Commerce, II, 312. The population of London had been estimated at 42,000 in 1377, 50,000 in 1500, 92,000 in 1560,
of the growth of the area itself as courtiers, and the craftsmen and shopkeepers to serve them, gathered round the royal court at Westminster. But certainly some of that growth can be attributed to the movement outside the City of small craftsmen who worked on goods owned by merchants using the putting-out system. Since they did not work their own goods and sell at retail there was no need for them to live inside the City and pay its high rents. In 1619 there were said to be "not above forty members of the leather trades, and those glovers only, residing within the freedom of London, whilst there were glovers, leather-dressers, vellum and parchment-makers outside to the number of 3,000." The drift away from the authority of the Lord Mayor and from the limiting restrictions imposed by the livery companies produced a break-

150,000 in 1595, and 224,000 in 1605. (F.C. Dietz, in Economic History of England, New York, 1941, 134). It is probable that as many as 100,000 of those in 1605 were living in the suburbs, i.e. outside the jurisdiction of the Lord Mayor. In 1621 the Lord Mayor reported to the Council that 160,280 were living "in the City and liberties." Lord Mayor to the Council, Dec. 6, 1621, Remembrancia, Index, 389. See also Norman G. Brett-James, The Growth of Stuart London (London, 1925), 500.

down in the gild control of industry that had served a
mediaeval economy. "This migration," Unwin suggests,
"widened the breach already made between the trader and
the craftsman, and made it impossible for both to con-
tinue to combine satisfactorily in a single organization.
It placed great difficulties in the way of the exercise of
effective authority by the companies over the industries
they were supposed to regulate. It made the nominal
share of the handicraft members in the companies' freedom
less and less of a reality; while at the same time it lent
increasing force to their demand for a separate incorpora-
tion." Occasiona]ly this demand for a separate corpora-
tion was met by the Crown's allowing the creation of a new
gild, such as that of the pin makers, the felt hat makers,
the wire drawers, the distillers, and the like. But for
crafts whose membership was not sufficiently numerous to
justify erection of new gilds, and for those whose members
were not interested in retailing, the organization and
regulation problem could be solved to the Crown's satis-
faction most easily by incorporating the various unorgan-
ized crafts of the suburbs into one company.

3 Unwin, Industrial Organization, 128.
On May 2, 1625, a few weeks after Charles I came to the throne, he showed his concern over the City's growth by issuing a proclamation ordering a stop to all new building in and around London. The proclamation recalled similar orders of Elizabeth and James and forbade the erection of any new buildings in London and within three miles of the City except on existing foundations. A similar proclamation, issued in 1632, pointed out that the inhabitants in and about the City were getting to be so numerous that they could neither be "governed nor fed." It was commanded that all earlier prohibitions against building be enforced. The Crown apparently gave up trying absolutely to prevent new building, and gave its consent for a price. "Three years' fine at a rack rent is [being] required [now] for all new buildings [which have been erected] in and about London ever since the second year of King James." Some time during the reign of

---


5 Proclamation, July 16, 1632, Rushworth, Historical Collections, II, 144.

6 Anthony Mingay to Framlingham Gawdy, April 11, 1624, Gawdy MSS. (Historical Manuscripts Commission) (hereafter cited as H. M. C.), 146-47.
Charles, the Earl of Clare put up a new building between Lincoln's Inn Fields and Drury Lane, "erected by license under the Great Seal which cost above £1,000." 7

Coupled closely with the growth of the suburbs was the fact that many trades and crafts were no longer carried on within the City, but were located in the suburbs. Some who left the City to settle in the suburbs did so in search of lower rents. Others, such as goldsmiths, pewterers, haberdashers, drapers and tailors, may have been drawn into the western suburbs to be near those who lived permanently near the court at Whitehall or others who came to Westminster in term time. In July, 1625, the Privy Council ordered the Court of Aldermen of London to see that no one but goldsmiths be allowed to occupy shops in "Goldsmiths' Row" in Cheapside and Lombard Street, that all who practiced "meeker trades" be removed, and that goldsmiths keeping shops elsewhere be forced to move into the Row. 8

Goldsmiths living outside complained that they could not

7 Marquis of Bath MSS. (H.M.C., Rep. III), 193.

8 The reason for forcing all goldsmiths to live in one area was that it made easier the recovery of stolen goods. In 1621 the Queen's chambers had been entered and plate and jewels of great value stolen. See the Lord Mayor's precept to the Aldermen, Sept. 25, 1621, ordering a search for the valuables to be made of "suspected places." Journal of the Court of Common Council, XLIV, fol. 243.
afford the high City rents, and must give up their trade if forced to move into Cheapside. Giles Allen at the Fleet Bridge, Thomas Paulson and Thomas Turner in Fleet Street, Michael Barksteed and James Prince in the Strand, John Parker within Newgate, and William Maddox in Southwark were dealt with to remove themselves from their now dwellings into the Goldsmiths' Row in Cheapside or Lumber [sic] Street. They argued that they had always lived in their present locations, and complained that they could not move into the City "in regard of the great rents there." Maddox and Paulson insisted that they were "but workmen to the trade and poor men." Maddox certainly enjoyed lower rent in Southwark than he could have obtained in Cheapside. But it may be questioned whether the others were concerned so much about rents as anxious to stay in the western suburbs where their clients, the courtiers, lived.

The growth of the western suburbs, particularly, was in part the result of the gathering of nobility and gentry at court. This tendency had been observable in Tudor times, and had been especially noticeable in the reign of

---

9 Minutes of the Court of Aldermen, July 21, 50, Sept. 8, 15, 1635, Repertories of the Court of Aldermen, YLIX, fols. 276b, 286b, 295b, 302-3b.
James. In 1620 Charles commanded the gentry to keep their residences in the country. The proclamation stated that the gentry were living in London without employment and, furthermore, that great sums of money, drawn out of the counties from which the gentry came, were being spent lavishly on foreign apparel, to the detriment of the English gold supply. They were given forty days to return to their country homes. Fines for infraction of such royal orders were severe. One Mr. Pomer was fined £1,000 in the Star Chamber for living in London contrary to the Proclamation, yet he was a bachelor, and his mansion house in the country lately burnt. The constables search out in every ward the names of persons lodging in town last vacation.  

---

10 Proclamation, June 70, 1620, Rushworth, Historical Collections, II, 144; Rymer, Foederer, XIX, 274-76. The Crown strove diligently to curtail this resort to the London are, but apparently with little success. See the frequent proclamations in the reign of Charles, especially those dated Nov. 22, 1626, and Nov. 27, 1627, (Journal of the Court of Common Council, XXIV, cols. 56b-57, 134b), ordering the nobility and gentry to return to their homes in the country. See also Orders in Council, May 29, 1623, Oct. 15, 1624, Jan. 9, 1624(5), Remembrancis, Index, 470.

11 Sir Edmond Moundeford to Framlingham Grady, Nov. 12, 1622, Grady MSS. (H. M. C.), 141. The search in every ward of the City, to which Moundeford refers was ordered by the Privy Council in a letter to the Lord Mayor and Aldermen, Oct. 23, 1622, Remembrancis, Index, 419.
The City of London, unwilling or unable to control the suburbs, began to appeal to the Crown to correct the disorganization in the area. In October, 1655, the Lord Mayor and Court of Aldermen petitioned the King to do something about the beggars who infested the outskirts and overran the City, and called attention to the burden upon the sewage disposal facilities and water supply which the overcrowding of the suburbs produced. The following year the Council responded by suggesting that the suburban areas be divided between the cities of London and Westminster, but the Londoners turned down the suggestion.

The Justices of Peace of Middlesex received a letter in 1655 from the Privy Council, noting that the Council was "daily importuned by the pitiful petitions of the tradesmen and shopkeepers of the City of London and

---

12 Brett-James, in his Growth of Stuart London, 282-48, charges that the City was unwilling to bring the suburbs within its jurisdiction, but gives no reason for its refusal. The reason undoubtedly lay in the fact that most of the suburbs were overcrowded, especially with poor, and in times of economic distress and of visitation of the plague, the poor would become a heavy financial burden upon the City. London accepted responsibility for relief of all the poor within its jurisdiction.

Westminster and parts of the county of Middlesex that their labors and livelihood are taken from them by the multitudes of strangers and foreigners exercising all manual works and trades within the places aforesaid, so that they for the most part having served apprenticeship in several trades, and diverse of them having no means to maintain themselves, their wives and children, being home-born subjects, but by their hard labors in the several trades and occupations, are utterly undone or brought to great necessity by the means aforesaid. * The letter required the Justices of Peace to classify the strangers living or exercising trades within the county and to certify the number to the Privy Council. 14

The foreigners, or non-Londoners, who had migrated into the London area practiced their trades without limit or restriction, and often without having served an apprenticeship, thus taking trade away from the legitimate tradesmen and artificers who had served their seven-year apprenticeships and who had become free of the

14 Privy Council to Justices of Peace of Middlesex, July 10, 1625, Privy Council Register 2, (see bibliography) XLV, fols. 20-21. The word stranger was loosely used in the seventeenth century. It sometimes referred to aliens or non-English, but often indicated anyone who was not a citizen of London.
City. The freemen of the City consequently suffered both financial loss and loss of reputation.

Early in 1636 the City was informed that the King contemplated incorporating the suburbs, and London showed its concern by directing its Solicitor to ascertain to what extent such an incorporation would be harmful to the City. What objections the City at this time raised to the proposed Crown action is not recorded, but the City's protest was of no avail. In April of 1636, a grant of incorporation was given to the tradesmen and artificers who lived within London, but who were not free of the City, and those who practised their trade within three miles. The Crown stood to gain financially because

---

15 Unwin, Industrial Organization, 140, shows that Elizabeth's statute of Apprentices was being violated within ten years of its passage. Indentures of apprentices "by private and obscure means, and not made by the clerks of the several companies of this City, by reason whereof diverse persons are made free by false and counterfeit indentures and other indirect means contrary to the ancient custom of this City," was the subject of the report of a committee appointed by the Common Council, Common Council, August 20, 1640, XXXIX, fol. 121.


17 Minutes of the Court of Aldermen, March 10, 1625(6), Repertory of the Court of Aldermen, L, fol. 151b.
each new member must pay an entrance fee: native-born Englishmen who had completed their apprenticeships were to pay four shillings; those who had not served apprenticeships must pay twenty shillings; aliens were assessed forty shillings; and all apprentices were to pay one shilling and were to be bound for at least seven years. All who were not in the New Corporation by Christmas of 1636 were to be forbidden to practice their trade. The privileges and customs of London, Southwark, Westminster, and the liberties of the Tower were to remain unimpaired.18

Near the end of the month, the City Recorder reported to the Court of Aldermen that the petition for the incorporation of the suburbs was about to pass under the Great Seal, and that in his opinion “it will be very prejudicial to the City.” The Court of Aldermen voted to petition the King to stay the sealing until the City had been heard by a committee on the matter.19

On June 2, 1636, the Great Seal was fixed to the letters patent.20 Later in the month, the privy


19 Minutes of the Court of Aldermen, April 26, 1636, Repertory of the Court of Aldermen, L, fol. 191b.

20 Proclamation, Rushworth, Historical Collections, II, 452.
Council made provision for a more orderly system of bringing the large number of tradesmen into the New Corporation.\textsuperscript{21} The proclamation was republished February 24, 1667. It stated that a great number of Englishmen and aliens who had never served as apprentices in any trade or craft had intruded into the London area, and that without restraint or order these workers practiced the trades. By these means, the suburbs had become "noisome and contagious, wares were falsified and sophisticated," and the tradesmen and artisans living there, who had served out their apprenticeships according to law, were "very much impoverished and disabled to maintain their families." The most effective way to correct these malpractices, according to the privy Council, was to incorporate the tradesmen and artisans who resided within three miles of the City proper and who had served the required seven years as apprentices. If the Corporation were organized, the tradesmen who had completed their apprenticeships would be admitted into full freedom of the said body. Aliens and natives who had not served their apprenticeships were to be admitted if they had openly practiced their trade for a "reasonable" length

of time. Aliens would be admitted to the freedom as were the others, but after the date of activation no other alien should henceforth be admitted. The tradesmen were to have until November 1, 1627 to join the New Corporation, after which date none was to be admitted except through apprenticeship. To facilitate the incorporation the churchwardens, constables, and other officers of each parish were to deliver to the chamberlains of the New Corporation, Mr. Lewkenor and Mr. Reading, the names together with their occupations of all tradesmen and craftsmen in the area. The patent further prescribed that such government as existed, i.e., parish and county government, was not to be unduly disturbed.

On March 15, the Recorder and a few Aldermen informed the Privy Council that many complaints were made that the officers of the New Corporation were pressing freemen and apprentices of London to join the New Corporation. Evidently, Mr. Lewkenor and Mr. Reading proceeded vigorously to its organization. The Privy Council answered that it was not His Majesty's intention to infringe upon the privileges of London. Sir William Becher, Clerk of the Council, was ordered to proceed to the New Corporation and

to require its officials to desist from importuning Lon-
don freemen and apprentices. But this order was vacated
only four days later when the Lord Mayor and Aldermen ap-
peared before the Council together with the Chamberlains of
the New Corporation, Mr. Lewkenor and Mr. Reading. The
Council ordered the incorporation to proceed as ordered,
and stated that all freemen of London might join save wea-
vers, brickmakers, and tilemakers who were relieved until
further order should be given for their admittance. The
New Corporation was to be allowed to take in aliens who
would pay five pounds to the King and who must obligate
themselves to take only English apprentices. Duke's Place,
Blackfriars, Whitefriars, and Cold Harbour were excluded
temporarily from the jurisdiction of the Corporation be-
cause it was alleged that these areas had been added to
the liberty of London in the sixth year of James' reign.
It was further declared that London might require an oath
whereby the freemen of London who entered the New Corporation
would be obliged to bind their apprentices to London liv-
ery companies as formerly they had done. These appren-
tices would become free of London eventually, subject to

**March 15, 1626(7), Privy Council Register 2, XLVII, fols. 242-43.**
duties and fines "notwithstanding they be likewise subject to the orders and government of the New Corporation."
The several gilds of London were still to have the right to search and view wares of the various retailers within the suburban corporation. Finally, it was again stated that November 1 was the final day for becoming free of the new organization.24

That there was stubborn opposition to joining the Corporation is evidenced by a petition which was exhibited before the Court of Aldermen on November 14. This petition, presented in the names of the Companies of Carpenters, Painter-Stainers, Masons, Plumbers, Bricklayers, Blacksmiths, Joiners, Plasterers, and Glaziers, contained complaints that many thousands of freemen from the petitioners' Companies obtained part or all of their livelihood from areas outside the liberties of London, i.e., in the area of the New Corporation, and that they were prevented from working in the area. Many of them had been served warrants by the Justices of the Peace and, indeed, some were in jail. The repertory of the Court of Aldermen does not mention the five-month period which the peti-

tioners had had in which to join or remain outside and suffer the penalty. The Court ordered one Mr. Marsh, the City Solicitor, to discuss the petition with the Recorder and then to advise the Aldermen of a course to be taken for the relief of the troubled freemen. A week later, the King, in order to remove all possibility of injustice, issued a proclamation for the further incorporation of the unfortunates. The document suggested that the delay had been caused "partly by reason of the sickness and infection" with which the suburbs "have been much visited, and partly through the delay of some of the said tradesmen and artificers, who out of a misunderstanding of our royal intentions" had failed to qualify under the proclamation. Nevertheless, as soon as the November 1 deadline had passed, great numbers had applied for admission. The King ordered the Governor, Wardens, and Assistants without delay to admit the tradesmen and artificers who should belong. Weavers and brickmakers, who had been exempted by the King's order of March 19, were to be included, as were the brewers who had been exempted heretofore. The deadline was extended until Christmas next for taking up

---

25 Nov. 14, 1627, Repertory of the Court of Aldermen, LII, fol. 12.
the freedom of the New Corporation, that the Governor and Assistants "may after the said Feast the better attend the expelling and keeping out foreigners and aliens and the regulating and ordering of the said Corporation and members of the same according to the Trust we have reposed in them."²⁶

The City, it may be noted, had been very jealous of the New Corporation from the beginning. In April, 1628, the Governor, Wardens and Assistants of the New Corporation petitioned His Majesty stating that the City was obstructing the work of the New Corporation. Some persons, without cause, refused to submit to its government. Charles set May 6 for a hearing to remove these obstructions.²⁷ At the hearing, the Recorder of London, the two chamberlains of the New Corporation, and the Attorney-General were ordered to meet and compose all differences between London and the recent incorporation. Such differences as could not be solved by the conference were to be settled by the King in Council.²⁸


²⁷ April 23, 1628, Privy Council Register 2, XLIX, fol. 137.

²⁸ May 22, 1628, Privy Council Register 2, XLIX, fol. 211.
Eleven days later tradesmen and artificers living in the privileged places of Blackfriars, Whitefriars, Duke's Place, St. Bartholomew's and Cold Harbour, which were exempted by the Order in Council of March 19, 1657, were ordered enrolled. The allegation made originally, that these areas were added to the City's jurisdiction in James' time, was by-passed, and the City was advised to take action at law to recover these areas if it felt itself aggrieved. 29 There is no evidence to indicate that the City took action to recover these areas, but the following March there is on record a suit between the City and the New Corporation over the admission of freemen. 30

From March, 1628, there is little evidence of what actually happened to the New Corporation. 31 Apparently it simply passed out of existence for in 1649 the inhabitants of the Borough of Southwark petitioned the City that they might become enfranchised or incorporated.

29 June 3, 1628, Privy Council Register 2, XLIX, fol. 251-52.
30 March 20, 1628(9), privy Council Register 2, L, fol. 173.
31 Brett-James, The Growth of Stuart London, 237, says, "The further history of this Incorporation . . . is extremely difficult to discover."
separately or within the City of London.\textsuperscript{22} In the following year there is a record of a petition from the Inhabitants of Westminster to the Parliament stating that the petitioners desired incorporation. Discussion over these incorporations continued until April, 1637, after which time the latter seems to have been dropped. In March, 1661, a petition for a new incorporation of the suburbs came before Charles II, which suggests that the Re Corporation established before the Civil War was no longer in existence.\textsuperscript{23}

The evidence seems conclusive that there was a need for organization and regulation in the suburbs of London, due to the rapid growth of London and the inability or unwillingness of the City authorities to extend their jurisdiction over the area. But, then the Crown attempted to bring the outskirts under effective

\textsuperscript{22} Sharpe, R. R., \textit{London in the Kingdom}, (New York, 1894), II, \textit{c}. 4-5.

control, the commercial interests in and the City
government opposed it.

During the Civil War the King lost touch
with the London area, and the Corporation of Traders
fell into disuse. With its collapse other groups
returned, and Charles II was confronted, as his father
had been, with requests to organize industry and trade
in the metropolitan area.

24 Civil craftsmen and traders in the suburbs complained
to the House of Commons in 1661 that great harm, "in
presumably those in control of the London livery companies," were causing "alien, French, 1,000, 2,000, and Irish," to the detriment of native craftsmen who had served charac-
teristically. The petitioners brought the matter to atten-
tion to the employment of such foreigners, "the care of many of such aliens are Roman Catholics, and it is alleged
of them live together in single houses to their public indi-
ference of disease and infection." Petition "to his majesty
of London and Westminster to the House of C., 1661, 1661,
Mr. Yele C. Long, Esq., (C. L. C., Pe. II), 71.
Chapter III
THE CAROLINAN SOAP MONOPOLY

One of the most careful students of English mercantilistic policy as it operated in the early seventeenth century has suggested that the soap monopoly was peculiarly typical. "The manipulation of the soap industry," says Lipson, affords a striking example of the mixture of motives which inspired the economic activities of the early Stuart: the desire to create new sources of revenue, which would make the crown independent of parliamentary control, was associated with a policy of industrial protection designed to make the kingdom economically independent.¹

As far back as 1608 Sir John Brickdale had petitioned the crown for a monopoly of the manufacture and sale of soap, and his proteges were awarded a patent for the making of hard and soft soap that same year. The petitioner, Roger Jones and Andrew Aster, claimed to have a method which would economize fuel and use native materials.²

¹ Lipson, The Economic History of England, III, 163-64.
² Unwin, The Gild and Corporation, p. 174, cites skeptically on the new processes which excused the creation of the monopoly. The king was "gratified" with £15,000 and it was proposed to put a tax of 24% on the view to producing 200,000 for the Stuarts, the economic use of peat-straw and help may be regulated...
The use of components found in England was considered particularly important because it saved "many thousands of pounds sterling yearly which are now expended on foreign commodities bought and brought from beyond the seas, and employed here in the making of soap in the manner now ordinarily used." These patentees were given the exclusive right of soap making in England, Ireland, and Wales for twenty-one years.

The London soap boilers, who were not incorporated and therefore unprotected from this trespass upon their livelihood, complained of the new soap's unserviceable and unsalable. The King asked the Court of

negligible factor in the project." Unwin does not indicate the source of his information about the diamond, and I have not discovered it.

3 Secretary Conway to Sir John Bouchier, Sept. 25, 1633, Cal. S. P. Dom. 1632-35, 32; Patent to Jones and Palmer for hard and soft soap, 1633, Price, 307-13. See also Dietz, English Public Finance, 1588-1841, 265. The King in his proclamations talked of saving the nation's gold and protecting his "loving subjects" from inferior soaps. Rushworth, Historical Collections, II, 126, starts his report on the incorporation of January 29, 1622(3), by saying, "In order to increase the Crown revenue by way of grants ..." Citizens had complained of "bad and stinking" soaps. See Price, 305. Both financial and qualitative aims were behind the grants of monopoly of the manufacture and sale of soap.
Aldermen of the City of London⁴ to determine the quality of soap by putting it to a public trial,⁵ and the Aldermen named a committee to test the soap and compare it with the old soap.⁶ The committee found that the new soap, if used by skilled laborers, would wash coarse linen as well as any soap in the land, "but they were of opinion it was far inferior to the best soft soap ordinarily made."⁷

Little was done with the monopoly and apparently the patentees lost the confidence of the Crown. On July 27, 1676, Nathaniel Edwards who was not a member of the

---

⁴ The Court of Aldermen, composed of the alderman from each of the City's twenty-six wards, was the upper house of the City's bicameral legislature. It also served, under the chairmanship of the Lord Mayor who was also an alderman, as an executive committee administering the City's government. It was in session daily and its records or reports, called the Repertories of the Court of Aldermen, are the chief source for the study of London government in this period. The Repertories are in manuscript and are deposited in the Record Office of the City of London. For an excellent description of the machinery of London government see Webb, Sidney and Beatrice, *English Local Government* (London, 1903), III, 583-592. A recent brief analysis of City government appears in K. C. Wren, "The Disputed Elections in London in 1641," *English Historical Review*, January, 1949, 24.


⁶ Order of the Court of Aldermen, April 6, 1674, *ibid.*, 225.

monopoly, was given a royal license to fish and trade in Greenland to secure fish oil for his soap works.3

It was not until December 17, 1661, that the charter granting right of production by the new method was confirmed. The patentees received the exclusive right in England to manufacture soap with the new method for fourteen years. A month later a second and extended grant was made when the Company of Fishers of Westminster was incorporated to produce five thousand tons of soap annually. They and their successors were given power to admit persons to their society and to purchase lands and "hereditaments." The patentees received the sole right of burning and preparing bean straw, fern, kelp, per straw, and other vegetable matter found in the kingdom, for the purpose of making ashes and potash. Tallow and ashes were no longer to be exported, and there was a prohibition against importing potash. Sir Richard Weston, who was Lord Treasurer of England, was appointed the first governor, with Mr. Compton and others being named as assistants. The Corporation covenanted on May 3, 1667, to set up a plant to produce the required five thousand tons annually. Actually the only new exclusive privileges the company gained in their

---

3 License to Edwards, July 28, 1666, G-1. L.P. Issn. 1665-26, 266.
second grant was that of searching for and testing of soap. 9
The soap makers of the London area were offered, for a price, an income within the Corporation of the Soapmakers of Westminster. They refused to have anything to do with the offer. 10

A later proclamation forbidding the importation of soap or potash, and specifying that all soap must be made from olive or rape oil, insured the company full power over the manufacture of soap. Actually it mattered little what raw materials the company used since it had complete control over inspection. Thus, in a few steps, an almost absolute monopoly was established. This proclamation is particularly interesting for its clarification of the King's reasons for setting up the Westminster Corporation or the "Society of Soapers" as it was called in this royal order. "His Majesty, intending the advancement of the native commodities of this realm, and the prevention of divers deceits commonly used in the making of soap with foreign

9 Indenture between Westminster Soapmakers and Carver, Nov. 11, 1625, Cal. S. P. Dom. 1625, 474; Summary of indenture, Rushworth, Historical Collections, II, 146; proclamation concerning the making of good soap, May or June, 1622, ibid., 142; Carr, Select Charters, 156; price, 120.

and unsweet materials, and of the excessive rate in the
sale of ill soaps at the pleasure of the soap boilers,
being no body politic nor governed by any good order; and
resolving to make that manufacture of soaps and potshes
a work of his own people [i.e., encourage their manufac-
ture in England and so avoid reliance upon imports].
incorporated the "Society of Soapers" on January 29,
1629. 11 In order to enforce his proclamations concerning
soap, Charles issued an order from the Court of Star Cham-
ber, which established an office "for keeping the Patterns." This office was to make an assay of all soap made in the
kingdom. Francis Coningsby was appointed the first Assay
Master and all persons were prohibited from selling soap
not assayed and marked by him. On the same day it was
commanded that the Soapmakers of Westminster "should use
no other Oil in making ... soap but Olive-Olive and Pope-
Oyl." 12

11 This proclamation of June 29, 1629, is given in full
in Journal of the Court of Common Council, XXXV, fols.
502-503. The entry in C. L. 2. Dom. 1621-22, 566, is
very brief. Rushworth, Historical Collections, II, 142,
carries parts of it under date of May or June, 1622.

12 Journal of the Court of Common Council, XXXV, fols.
502-503; Rushworth, Historical Collections, II, 192;
Proclamation concerning soap, June 29, 1629, C. L. 2.
Dom. 1621-22, 266.
On November 27, 1657, information was exhibited by the King's Attorney General in the Court of Star Chamber against Thomas Overman and fifteen others, who were old soap makers of London. They were charged with illegal combination, opposing the patent of the new corporation, fixing prices of oil, soap, and tallow, using fish oil, opposing searchers, selling unmarked soap, and with importing fish oils from Greenland. The independent London soap makers, who had not come into the new Company and who could only make soap illegally, lost no time in violating a proclamation that kept them from following their trade.

To this charge the defendants filed a plea of some forty pages in length, citing that they were freemen of London and as such enjoyed the right to practice their profession, and protesting that the patent to the Soap-makers of Westminster was a monopoly in violation of the Statute of Monopolies passed by Parliament in 1652. Section VI of that Act declared that patents were legal to the true and first inventor and inventors of such manufactures which others at the time of making such letters

13 B. N. No. 1156 (6), Relation, 7; Rushworth, Historical Collections, II, 352-53; Certificate of Lord Chief Justice Richardson in a case between the Attorney General versus Thomas Overman and others, Jan. 23, 1657, Col. 692. Encl. 1821-22, 500.
patent and grants shall not use, so as also they be not
contrary to the law nor mischievous to the state, by
raising prices of commodities at home, or hurt of trade
or generally inconvenient." The defendants claimed
that the process had been invented in 1622, but was not
used by the first inventors, and therefore the defendants
should not be prohibited from making old soap in the old
way. The plea was referred to two judges of the Star
Chamber who said it was insufficient, and the defendants
were ordered to submit another by a given date. Then the
defendants submitted another plea, saying substantially
the same thing in fifty pages, but were committed to the
Fleet on March 3, 1623, for not answering by the time
ordered, in spite of the fact that the defendants sub-
mitted affidavits to the effect that they could not meet
the deadline. Overman and two others were fined 21,500
each, some were fined 21,000, and the rest were fined 2500
each. The author of A Short and True Relation Concern-
ing the Scon Business insists that even beds were seized

in lieu of some of the fines. 15

In April, 1668, Sir John Gore and eight other Aldermen and Commoners of London made a trial of the new soap and reported to the Lord Mayor and Court of Aldermen that with much labor it would wash coarse linen, and if it was used by skillful washers it would wash as well as the best soft soap. But they complained that for "goodness, sweetness and merchantableness," it was "far inferior to the best soft soap, and not fit to be used for washing fine linen." 16 There was also official testimony of public dissatisfaction with the new soap. In Council later in the year admitted that certain women and others complained that the new soap "spoiled and burnt the linen, and fretted the hands of the washers." It was suggested that the Lord Mayor and others should test it. Sir Ralph Freeman, Lord Mayor, Sir Henry Spiller and others made a private test in the Lord Mayor's house. They certified that the new soap washed as white and left the wash

15 P. K. No. 6158 (8), Relation, 10-11. Rushworth, Historical Collections, II, 456, says they were fined £1,500, £1,000, 1,000 marks, and £500. Uning, Bills and Companies of London, 251, says that two of the men sent to the Fleet died in prison.

16 Sir John Gore and others to the Lord Mayor and the Court of Aldermen, April, 1668, Ct. L. 2. Or. 1661-62, 231.
sweeter than the old soap and other persons, including countesses, viscountesses, ladies, and ordinary laundresses, testified that the new soap was better than the old.\footnote{17}

Up to this time, the old soap makers of London were not prohibited from making soap, but they were prevented from making it from fish oil, from importing ashes, and from selling soap that was not assayed by the assay master appointed by the Star Chamber decree of June 13, 1638. In January, 1634, a proclamation absolutely forbade them to make soap. The order pointed out that the old soap makers constantly violated earlier proclamations and that, though they had been offered an income within the Corporation of the soap makers of Westminster, they had refused. This same proclamation commanded that all pans, vessels, and other equipment employed in soap making contrary to the letters patent should be destroyed.\footnote{18}

In February, 1634, those London soap makers who had been thrown in the fleet a year earlier received freedom to go with their jailer to the soap makers of Westminster. They supplied a bond that they would not make

\footnote{17 B. M. No. E156 (6), Petition, 11.}
\footnote{18 Ibid., 13; Cal. S. P. Dom. 1632-34, 420.}
soap without leave of the monopoly, and thereby obtained their freedom. But the bitter strife continued between the Crown and the Soap-makers of Westminster on one hand and others of the old soap-makers of London on the other. Attachments were awarded from the Star Chamber against Messrs. Blackall and Quinling, and it was ordered that they and forty others should have their equipment destroyed. 19

By now, several of the old soap-makers were ready to compromise and moved to be permitted to practice their trade within the new corporation, but they were turned down by the Star Chamber. 20

It is evident thus far that the monopoly was troublesome, at least to the old soap-makers, and that the Westminster Company encountered serious resistance. The monopoly had been granted with certain purposes and objects in view, namely, to promote the welfare of the people, to encourage invention and stimulate domestic manufacture, and to raise revenue. But it is doubtful whether the people benefitted from the beginning, and revenue was not forthcoming as expected. On July 15, 1624, a proclamation gave

---

19 B. M., No. E156 (6), Selection, 16.
20 Ibid., 17.
authority to the patentees of Westminster to sell oil soap made of fish oil.\textsuperscript{21} Evidence is not available to demonstrate exactly why this proclamation was issued, but some surmises may be ventured. It is possible that the new soap was not of good quality. It may be that the people preferred the cheaper fish oil soap. It is not unlikely that the Privy Council sought to destroy the independent outlaw soap makers of London by permitting the Westminster Company to make fish oil soap and so cut into the trade of the Londoners. Or, finally, the proclamation may have been the result of pressure exerted by the merchants of the Greenland Company to find a market for their whale oils. It is not unreasonable to assume that all four reasons were operative. But the important fact is that, whereas one of the original purposes of the monopoly was to produce soap without using fish oil, and whereas many old soap makers of London had been imprisoned for using fish oil, now the new company was given the right to use it. The monopoly had been granted to certain individuals on the plea that they had discovered a new process which would use less of

the scarce supply of wood. With the authorization now to use fish oil, the excuse for the monopoly disappeared and opposition to it increased considerably.

In September, 1624, upon petition from the Company, the Governor of the Company was given a "warrant dormant" to apprehend all violators of the proclamations and decrees concerning soap. Anzolo Correr, Venetian Ambassador to England, remarked in an official dispatch that "there is an outcry against the bad quality of the soap" and against the monopoly of which the Lord Treasurer, Sir Richard Weston, was governor. The Company admitted at this time that it had thus far spent £6,000 in law suits.

After it received permission to use fish oil, the Corporation of Westminster began sub-contracting the manufacture of soap. Thomas Houmcke, one of the sixteen who were sentenced in March, 1622, was given a permit to produce old soap for the Company. Apparently there was a real demand for the old soap, for nearly £500 worth was sold in one day.

---

22 Correr to the Doge, Nov. 10, 1624, (new style), Col. 2. P. Ven. 1624-26, 295.
23 D. M., No. E156 (6), Relation, 19.
24 Ibid., 20.
The absolute character of the monopoly was broken when, in May, 1624, the Company of Soapboilers of Bristol was recognized and ordered by the Privy Council to come to an agreement with the Corporation of Soap-makers of Westminster. The Bristol Soapboilers were permitted by the Westminster Corporation to make only six hundred tons of soap yearly, which might be sold in any part of the kingdom without restraint. Later in the same year the Council ordered that the soap manufactured by the Soapboilers of Bristol could be sold only in Bristol and westward beyond the Severn River, and that they should pay eighty shillings per ton to his Majesty. Production of the six hundred tons of soap allotted to the Bristol Soapboilers was to be divided among its members according to the proportion the individual soap boiler made in the years 1620, 1621, and 1622. Richard Tovy of Bristol, a member of that Corporation, complained in a petition to the Crown that although he had averaged eighty tons a year in 1620, 1621, and 1622, he was allotted but twenty-four tons by the Bristol Soapboilers. Apparently there were

---


26 Petition of Richard Tovy of Bristol to the Lords of the Treasury, 1622, Cal. C. P. Doc. 1621-23, 45.
disagreements among the Bristol Soapmakers as well as in the London area.

An attempt to force stricter conformity to Crown regulation of the production of soap was made by a proclamation, dated January 25, 1625(6), providing further for the "well ordering and settling the manufacture of soap." The government noticed that, in spite of earlier proclamations, some were still making soap contrary to law. There was repeated once more the prohibition of the making of soap by anyone not "free of the Company" unless with the Company's consent. The Company's right of search was reviewed, and also its right to seize and reboil for its own use any soap surreptitiously made. Rewards were named for those who informed against illegal producers. Repetition of the prohibition against importation of soap implies that the earlier prohibition had been violated. Even the owners of houses in which the tenants were making soap outside the "rule and government" of the Company were to be proceeded against. 27

In July and August, 1625, Orders in Council

27 Journal of the Court of Common Council, XVII, folio 39-40; P. H., No. E156(6), fol. 31. This proclamation is not in the State Papers.
noticed that "divers refractory persons have presumed to
make sorb and in other things willfully to disobey his
Majesty's proclamation [January 23, 1625] concerning ap,
others have resisted the execution of royal commands in the
same proclamation expressed, and many such insolences re
daily committed, by which his Majesty's profit is much
lessened, and the Company of Soap-makers is exceedingly
damnified." To reduce this disrespect for government the
justices of peace were ordered to proceed against such
violators and to commit them to prison until they were
ordered released by the Council board.28 A similar order
in Council the following month complained of the same
malpractices and directed all sheriffs, mayors, etc. to
commit all offenders to jail.29 By such steps, the Com-
pany's control over soap manufacture was made more effec-
tive. Searchers were deputized by the Privy Council to
ferret out violators. On July 18, Michael Coningsby was
appointed "to search for and carry away all manner of un-
marked soap;"30 on July 25, John Keith was appointed to
"search for and carry away all manner soap or lyes for

28 Order in Council, July 20, 1625, C. 1. 2. 2. deck.
1625, 233.

29 Order in Council, Aug. 5, 1625, ibid., 239.

30 Reptutation, July 13, 1625, ibid., 323.
making soap prohibited by proclamation; on July 27, Allan Crickett was appointed to do the same; on October 3, Griffin Divall and Robert Greaves were appointed searchers; on October 27, William Deksins was appointed to search for and destroy illegally-used vessels; and on May 4, 1666, Robert Hunt was similarly deputized.

In April, 1666, a new covenant was drawn up between the King and the Westminster Corporation of Soap-makers, by which the Company was permitted to make any kind of soap and to have half of all confiscated soap manufactured in violation of its chartered rights. According to the terms of the charter, the Corporation was to continue making five thousand tons annually, but the payment to the King was increased from 24 to £3 per ton. In return for the higher profit to the King, the Company was allowed to raise its soap prices.

---

31 Deputation, July 25, 1665, ibid., 203.
32 Deputation, July 27, 1665, ibid., 296.
33 Deputation, Oct. 2, 1665, ibid., 411.
34 Deputation, Oct. 27, 1665, ibid., 451.
36 Charter dated April 17, 1666, B. M., No. E156(C), Rel-tion, 32.
On December 13, 1636, the Company petitioned the King for a commission empowering it to call up offenders and to examine them upon oath, and to compound with them if it found them guilty of infringement of its privileges. Charles ordered the commission drawn up. On the last day of the month, Orders in Council commanded all officers of the peace to apprehend any such violators "as the governor for the Company of Soapmakers shall nominate for contempt." All unmarked soap was to be seized and the apprehended persons were to be brought to the Council Chamber to be tried. The same day William Dakins was deputized "to search for and carry away all soap and lees prohibited by those proclamations, and to break all tubs, pans, cisterns, and other vessels employed for making soap." All officers of the peace were ordered to "assist William Dakins, breaking open doors or houses, apprehending all offenders against the said proclamations, and such as shall oppose the due execution of his Majesty's service in this behalf, and if such violent opposition be

---

made that the service cannot otherwise be performed, the persons addressed are charged to use such power and strength as shall be needful to subdue resistance." Ships were also to be entered and searched, probably to prevent soap illegally manufactured in London from being smuggled on board and sold in other ports in the realm. 29

The Westminster Soapackers and their searchers were not timid. Edward Rossingham, one of the most famous news-letter writers of the period, wrote to Sir Thomas Puckering that officers of the Corporation "came with a warrant under the hands of some of that society, with a constable also, and attempted to break into his Majesty's storehouse, that had Charles R. upon the door, to take out there a parcel of Castile soap, of six thousand pounds weight at the least, which his Majesty's searchers of the Custom House had seized upon, being goods forfeited by his Majesty's proclamation; and, therefore, a third part of the said goods, so forbidden, belonging to his Majesty's searchers, which the society of soapboilers would have taken from them was recovered." It is interesting to note that only the would-be executors of the warrant were sentenced

29 Order in Council, Dec. 21, 1626, ibid., 349.
for this impropriety, and not the persons who issued the warrant. 40

Local officials who set about carrying out the orders of the Privy Council ran into defiant opposition. Sir Thomas Jay, a Justice of the Peace for Middlesex, complained to the Council that when he made known his authority to four suspected soap boilers in East Smithfield, "and charged them to open the doors . . . the persons within thrust long pikes through the walls at them (Jay and deputies), and cast or squirted scalding liquor or lees upon them, whereby many of the officers were dangerously hurt. The said persons also showed themselves armed with naked swords, pistols, and a great mastiff dog and in contemptuous manner affirmed that they there boiled soap and would boil soap, and threatened to kill whosoever should enter upon them, desperately saying they would die rather than yield." 41


There can be no doubt that many of the old soap boilers suffered, especially those who but recently had finished their apprenticeships. Consider William Nixon's petition to the Privy Council on behalf of himself and two servants. He had served his time of eight years to the trade of soap boiler and having no other profession to get his living by, in the late time of suppressing the soap works in London by the patentees he suffered very much. Has endeavoured by all means to join the new soap boilers with his labour and stock of £150, but was admitted to work only at 9s. per week wages for some time at their pleasures. Having been driven to make some small parcels of soap for the maintenance of his wife and charge, he employed Sheering and Brewer to assist him. Very lately the searchers appointed by the new patentees seized on his soap and committed himself and his servants (Sheering being dangerously wounded by one of the searchers) to the Gatehouse until bail was given. Prays pardon and that either the new company may take him in amongst them, or that he may have toleration to follow his profession.\textsuperscript{42}

\textsuperscript{42} petition of Nixon to Council, 1657?, Col. 2. 2. Comp. 1625-56, 45.
Stephen Harrison had been a freeman of London for fifteen years and had served a nine-year apprenticeship in soap making. He had not violated the law and found that he could not make a living retailing the new soap produced by the Company. He claimed he had lost "all he had gained in twenty-five years before." He petitioned the Privy Council to be allowed to work with the new soap makers. Many other petitions of a similar nature are recorded, where the petitioners pray that they be allowed to work in the Company. Frequently the Lords recommended to the Corporation of soap packers that it should consider an old soap boiler for employment, but in a communication to the Council in February, 1616, the Company insisted that it had taken as many soap boilers as it could employ. Judging from the many references to the friction between the searchers and


44 For example, see Petition of Williams et al to Council, Dec. 7, 1615, ibid., 525; Order in Council, Dec. 18, 1625, ibid., 530; and Westminster Soapmakers to Council, Feb. 1626, Cal. S. P. Dom. 1625-26, 473-77.

45 Westminster Soapmakers to Council, Feb. 6, 1626, Cal. S. P. Dom. 1625-26, 212.
violators, the difficulties were rather common.46

The soap makers and makers of saltpeter frequently came into conflict over ashes. The latter complained that the agents of the Corporation of Soapmakers enhanced the price of wood ashes and that they bought up the available stock so that the saltpeter men lacked an adequate supply for their own manufacturing. The commissioners for saltpeter ordered the Corporation of Soapmakers to give pre-emption of wood ashes to the saltpeter men.47 On April 4, 1635, the soap makers offered to supply the saltpeter men with ashes.48 Ten days later an order in Council was suggested, to urge the saltpeter men to advise the soap makers of their weekly needs of ashes, and the soap makers to furnish the specified needs.49 In May of the

---


48 Governor of Soapmakers to Lords of the Admiralty, April 4, 1635, ibid., 8.

following year, at a conference between the two industries, the saltpeter men put before the soap makers the requests: (1) that the soap boilers be restrained from gathering ashes within twelve miles of any saltpeter works or "pitches", (2) "that a strict course be taken to prevent the exportation of ashes," and (3) that no ash gatherers should do business unless licensed by either the saltpeter men or by the soap makers. Two days later the commissioners for saltpeter issued an order substantially in agreement with these requests.

It has been shown that the soap monopoly met with resistance by the old soap boilers of London because they lost their means of livelihood and by the population because of the poor quality of soap. Since its Governor, Sir Richard Weston, was a Roman Catholic, there was some opposition, also, because the soap company was regarded as "popish".


51 Order of the Lords Commissioners for Saltpetre and Gunpowder, May 19, 1636, ibid., 437.

The Corporation of Coompeakers of Westminster had been protected and upheld by Sir Richard Weston who had become Lord Treasurer and the Earl of Portland, in spite of the fact that the Company had not fulfilled its obligations to the treasury.

After Portland died, and Juxon became the new Lord Treasurer, the old London soap boilers were incorporated under the name of Governor, Assistants and Commonalty of the Society of Coompeakers of London. The King paid the Westminster Corporation £40,000 for surrender of its charter and there were £2,000 charges, all of which was later paid to the King by the Coompeakers of London. The King’s share was raised to 28 per ton, or double the amount originally paid by the Westminster Company.53

The introduction to the letters patent stated:

There are divers and sundry persons under no government have made bad and unserviceable soap without any lawful warrant and in secret and obscure places to the great deceit and damage of our loving subjects. We, minding to provide for the prevention and reformation of the said deceit and abuses for the time to come, have thought fit by the advice of our Privy Councillors to incorporate into one body politic sundry meet persons of this our Realm such as

53 B. M., No. 4156(6), Relitto, 55. According to Unwin, Gilds and Companies of London, the London Coompeakers took over from the Westminster Company plant and material for which the Londoners paid £20,050.
have been exercised and trained up in the said trade of making of soap, who being invested with power and authority from Us may take care for the regulation of the said trade hereafter in a just and orderly way without deceit to our people and for the good government of all the members of the said body.

Thus the Crown admitted that enforcement of the old monopoly had failed. The officers of the new LondonSoapmakers consisted for the most part of the sixteen individuals who had been arrested and thrown into the Fleet in 1634. The quality of the opposition to the former or WestminsterSoapmakers is suggested by the fact that the Governor of the new London Society ofSoapmakers was Edward Bromfield. Knighted in 1627, Sir Edward, a member of the Leatherrellers' Company, was alderman of Dowgate Ward from 1628 to 1637, and of Walbrook Ward from 1637 to 1647, and served as Lord Mayor of London in 1636-1637.55

The new company's charter stated that the Society should:

Admit and receive into their said Society and make free of the same all and every person and persons not being aliens as have heretofore used the said trade by the space of seven years at the least or

54 Carr, Select Charters, 160-61.

55 In 1636 he "translated" to the Fishmongers' Company, where he immediately was chosen one of the Wardens. Beaven, Alfred B., Aldermen of the City of London (London, 1912), II, 59.
which shall be bred up and exercised in the said trade of soap-making and have been and shall be apprentices unto and served by the space of seven years or more in the said trade or be the sons of Freemen of the Society aforesaid, unless the (Society or a majority) shall have some reasonable and just cause to the Contrary, The same sons of Freemen so to be hereafter admitted not being under the age of one and twenty years, and the same other persons that have been or shall be apprentices and served as aforesaid and so to be hereafter admitted not being under the age of four and twenty years, so as every of the said persons so to be admitted shall first desire to be made free of the said Society and shall offer and pay unto the said Society for the time being at the time of such his admittance such reasonable fine or sum of money as the (Society or a majority assembled in any Court duly appointed) shall require and think fit to accept of them, the same not exceeding the sum of thirteen shillings four pence for every one or their admittances on that behalf.

In substance, the old SOAP makers of London adopted their old apprenticeship regulations. The patentees could make any kind of soap from any kind of raw material, providing that the "soap shall be good, merchantable and fit for the use of our loving subjects, and also that they (the Society etc.) shall and may at all times hereafter at their will and pleasure vent, sell and dispose of the same soap so by them to be made at reasonable and moderate rates and prices to any person or persons whatsoever in such quantities as to them and their successors, agents and servants

56 B. II., No. 158(6), Filiation, 183.
shall seem expedient." The new company was to have extensive powers to make laws for the good government and rule of the soap trade throughout England and Wales.\(^{57}\) Thus the new company had authority beyond and above that of the "papist" company of Westminster.

Later the same year a decree prohibited the importation of any hard or soft soap and provided that if any foreign potashes were imported they must be sold only to The Society of the Soapmakers of London. Mayors, bailiffs and other chief officers with the assistance of two justices of the peace in every city or town were to set reasonable prices on soap. The deputies and officers of the London Society with the assistance of the constable of the parish were to have authority "to enter into any houses, cellars, shops, or other places, and also into ships, barks, or other vessels, to search for, seize, take and carry away all such soap, as shall be found to be unduly made, not under the rule, government or allowance of the said Society." Apart from the commanding position that the Soapmakers of London were thus given, they were specifically prohibited in this decree from interfering with the

\(^{57}\) *Ibid.*, 162.
making and selling of the allotted quotas of soap by the Companies of Soapmakers of Bristol, Bridgewater, Exeter, Somerset, Dorset, Devon, and Cornwall. 58

The new monopoly proceeded as sternly and ruthlessly as had the old to impose its regulation upon those who sought to practice the trade of soap-making outside its organization. "Distressed" soap boilers besought Parliament for relief, petitioning that all patents and proclamations granting the monopoly of soap-making to the corporation of soapers may be called in, and the corporation punished for their oppressive and illegal proceedings." 59

When the Long Parliament moved against the Stuart monopolies, however, it became apparent that not all of them were objectionable to the House of Commons. Some, including the London Society of Soapmakers, managed strangely to survive Parliament's wrath against Caroline

58 Decree from Star Chamber, Dec. 28, 1627, Rushworth, Historical Collections, II, 453-59. These towns and counties in west England enjoyed monopolies in small trades comparable to that given earlier to the Soapmakers of Bristol.

59 Petition to the House of Commons of the distressed soap boilers, (1640), House of Lords Writs (H. V. C., Rev. IV), 57. Dietz, Economic History of England, 265, says, "There were independent soapmakers who thought that the London Company was as bad as the Westminster Company, since any monopoly was objectionable to them."
corporations. It may be suspected that the interests of men like Sir Edward Bromfield, the Governor of the London Soapmakers, some time Lord Mayor of London and a man of tremendous financial influence in the City, were dealt softly with by the parliamentary leaders who must look to London for financial support in the struggle against the King.

Prior to the formation of the Soapmakers of Westminster, there were generally two types of soap on the market, common soap and sweet or black soap. The latter usually sold for about four times as much as the former. During the early part of the century sweet soap sold for between three pence and four pence per pound. After 1633 there is no record of its selling lower than four pence. Occasionally it reached a figure of seven pence, but most frequently sold at four. Apparently soap varied in quality and the prices varied accordingly. One Caryll bought a firkin of brown soap for eighteen shillings six pence.

in 1622, which was about three pence half penny per pound. At the same time he bought a firkin for sixteen shillings six pence or about three shillings and six pence or about three pence half penny per pound. In the same year Mr. Mendham bought a firkin for twenty-five shillings or slightly more than four pence half penny per pound. Soap varied considerably in price and a substantial saving was made by purchasing in larger quantities. A decree issued from the Star Chamber in 1621 mentioned that in the original indenture the Corporation of the 50 yeakers of Westminster had agreed to sell sweet and good soap for three shillings per pound, "which was a cheaper rate than other sweet and merchantable soap was sold for." A proclamation issued a year later states that London sweet soap sold for six pence, eight pence, and ten pence, and even twelve pence.

---

61 Soap was sold by the pound, dozen pounds, firkin (64 pounds) and by the barrel (256 pounds). \[\text{Ibid.}, \text{V, \#51.}\]

62 \[\text{Ibid.}, \text{V, \#740.}\]

63 Decree from Star Chamber, August 28, 1621, Richworth, \textit{Historical Collections}, II, 180.

64 Proclamation concerning the well ordering of the trade of making and selling soap, July 12, 1624, Journal of the Court of Common Council, \textit{XVI}, fols. 275-75b; \textit{Cal.}, \#2, fols. 1854-55, 144-45; B. M., No. \textit{El56(6)}, \textit{Rel. inn}, 17.
prizes of London soap grew to this height, by reason of the extreme badness of the white soap. Formerly this white soap had sold in London for two pence or two pence half penny.

In the proclamation mentioned above, the Soap-makers of Westminster were to be allowed to mix soap with fish oil, but they were not to sell it above three pence per pound, which was a penny more than "soap of the like goodness was usually sold for by the soap-makers of London before their trouble." The following April the Westminster soap-makers obtained a new arrangement with the King. In this agreement, they promised to sell white soap made from whole oil and good tallow at three pence half penny per pound, or at seventy-four shillings eight pence per barrel. Good crown soap, the speciality of the Westminster soap-makers, made from the best olive and rose oils was to sell at four pence half penny per pound and ninety-six shillings the barrel. Apparently no reduction was

65 B. R., No. E166(6), Petition, 17. See also Licker, An Economic History of England, 784.
66 P. M., No. E166(6), Petition, 13.
67 Ibid., 28.
offered to those who bought in large quantities, as had been true earlier. The old London soap boilers had sold white soap at fifty, fifty-two, and fifty-four shillings per barrel and occasionally had sold it cheaper. Olive oil and rape oil soaps had formerly sold for sixty-four shillings, sixty-six shillings, and rarely above seventy-two shillings. Good crown soap had been selling at four pence half penny since 1665 when the Company was authorized to sell at this figure so they could "undersell the undue makers of soap."  

The soap monopoly failed to provide the Crown with the revenue that was anticipated. When the Corporation of Soapers of Westminster was organized in 1621, it paid £10,000 directly for the privilege it received and promised to make five-thousand tons of soap annually, on which the King was to receive eighty shillings per ton or £100,000 per annum. Apparently, however, the King did not receive the anticipated revenue.

---

69 B.M., No. El58(6), Relation, 93.
70 Secretary Windebank to Attorney General Bankes, August 1, 1621, Cal. S.P. Dom. 1621, 211.
71 All sources except Rushworth, Historical Collections, II, 128, say eighty shillings per ton. Rushworth, perhaps mistaken, says 83.
not receive anything but the initial £10,000 until the year 1624 when the income to the Treasury from the soap makers was £11,974 5s 5d. 72 This figure demonstrates that neither the quantity of soap manufactured nor the volume of income to the Crown reached expectations. If the five-thousand ton figure is an indication of the amount of soap used in England, then all the illegally-made soap sold may have made it impossible for the Company to sell more than the two thousand eight hundred tons suggested by the receipts for the year. 73 The best year for the Crown as far as income from this source is concerned was 1629 when it received £24,809 16s 11d. 74 This was at a time when the soap business had been returned to the Soapmakers of London and when they were laying eight pounds per ton to the King. Thus it appears that about

72 Dietz, F. R., Receipts and Issues of the Exchequer during the Reigns of James I and Charles I, (Smith College Studies in History, XIII, No.4) (Northampton, Mass., July, 1908), 144-45; Dietz, In Economic History of England, 234, says the soap monopolies of London and Bristol were the only monopolies which brought profits of any consequence to the Crown.

73 There is a reference to illegal soap cutting into the Westminster Company's business in Order in Council July 29, 1625, C.1. E. P. Dom. 1625, 288, which states that the Company suffered ("exceedingly diminished") from this illegal competition.

74 Dietz, Receipts and Issues of the Exchequer, 159-51.
four thousand three hundred and fifty tons were manufactured that year, which shows a fifteen hundred ton increase from the high of the Westminster Company. From the evidence available, it appears that crown revenue from the soap monopoly was very irregular. While the King received £11,584 in 1634, the following year, there is no figure as such recorded as income from the sale of soap, but only a £10,000 loan to be "defaulked" from their rent. This may indicate the approximate income for that year. In 1636, after the duty was raised fifty per cent, the King's revenue from this source was £18,860. In 1637-1638, for reasons not accounted for after the soap monopoly was broken up and the business restored to the Soaperers of London, the incomes were £3,762 and £8,319, respectively. The largest amount of revenue was received in the years 1639 and 1640. The high reached in 1639 was £34,890, and

---

75 This might indicate the amount of illegally-marked soap which, if true, means that one of every three tons sold was illegally made and sold.

76 Dietz, English Public Finance, 75-76, writing of this loan says, "In spite of the more tempting offers of another group to double the royalties payable to the crown, the original syndicate, with Cottingham's support (well paid for by a bribe of £20,000), maintained its position, and advanced £10,000 to the crown in this year 'to be defaulked from their rents.'"
in 1640 it was £23,565. The 1638 income of £13,560 was about 2.6 per cent of the total cash receipts of the Crown for that year of £433,237, which is not an inconsequential amount. The 1640 figure, holding to about the same percentage, was 3.3 per cent of the total cash receipts of £847,715. 1640 was the last year in which the Crown received money from soap, as the King suspended the obligations of the London company to the Crown. While the Crown had expected to receive £30,000 annually with the old rate of four poun'ds per ton, £30,000 at the six-pound rate, and £40,000 at the eight-pound rate, it never received two-thirds of the expected yield in any year, and in some years received nothing. Thus it may be concluded that, while the revenue in some years was of significant proportions, in general the soap monopoly failed to reach the estimate. Probably the forecast had been too high.

The monopoly was created with various objectives in mind, none of which was fully achieved. The first of these was revenue for the Crown's coffers. The soap monopoly of Westminster should have provided £10,000 for

---

77 Above figures are from Dietz, Receipts and Issues of the Exchequer, 146-155.

78 The Earl of Strafford's Letters and Dispatches, William Knovler (ed.), (Dublin, 1770), I, 148.
the Crown while it was in existence. However, it provided slightly less than £40,000, or about one-third of what had been anticipated. One of the main pretenses for granting the monopoly was that the patentees possessed a new method of making soap. This method did not fulfill its promise, however, as the evidence suggests that the soap was not satisfactory and was not accepted by the consumer. A third general reason for setting up the monopoly was the mercantilistic hope to prevent the export of gold and to use local resources as much as possible. This hope, too, vanished, and the Company was granted leave to use imported ashes in the third year of its existence. A fourth goal sought by the Crown in granting the Company a charter was the regulation of the soap business for the good of the King's subjects. This goal was not achieved due to the inadequate supply of satisfactory soap, which forced the prices up, and the quality of legally manufactured soap was apparently poorer than that of the old soap. Then, too, the monopoly had worked great hardships upon the soap boilers of London. A contemporary writer asserts that "many Citizens of London were cut out of an old Trade, in which they had been bred all their time, and which was their only lively- hood, by Knights, Esquires, and Gentlemen,
never bred up to the Trade, upon pretence of a project and new invention, which in truth was not so. Their prosecution of the Soape-makers of London in Star Chamber, being beyond example, both in respect of the manner of proceedings, and of the Sentence itself, who for using fish-oyle, and not obeying their searchers, were fined at great sums; imprisoned at three severall times about twenty moneths; their goods extended; their Pennes, Pats, etc., broken and destroyed, their houses of a great yearly value made unusefull; their families dispersed and necessitated; and their estates almost ruined. 79

The estimates for revenue from soap were not reached after the King made his peace with the soap makers of London in 1637. The new Soape-makers of London by their indenture with the King should have provided £160,000 during the four years in which they paid excise on their products, but instead they only provided £34,430. 80 After the London soap makers were re-established, soap prices rose considerably. The rise might be accounted for by the


80 Dietz, English Public Finance, '36, says the soap makers of London and Bristol together yielded £66,000 in revenue in the biennium 1639-1640.
eight-pound-per-ton rate paid to the King, only by the
Company's having to pay £62,000 for the re-settlement of its business.\(^{31}\) The London Company was just as aggressive and vigorous in defense of its grants as had been the
Westminster Company.

The company of Westminster failed to achieve any of its objectives, but the destruction of the monopoly and the granting of even greater privileges to the cloth
weavers of London accomplished little more.

\(^{31}\) £40,000 grant was 1, £6,000 charges, £2,000 for rent
and materials. ibid., 5.
Chapter IV
CONCLUSION

The government of Charles I, operating in a period when sympathy for state intervention and direction and regulation in the economic field was shown by theorists and business interests alike, was faced with the problem of dealing with rapidly changing economic conditions by applying the then popular philosophy of government intervention. Two aspects of the economic change which the seventeenth century was experiencing are revealed in this study, which seeks to discover the ways in which government moved to meet them.

There was first the decline of gild control over the economy as small craftsmen and journeymen moved into the suburbs of London to escape high rents and to seek freedom from regulation by gilds which were coming more and more to be dominated not by craftsmen but by the new trading interests of the nation which centered in London. This movement into the suburbs brought to the small craftsmen who engaged in it the freedom they sought, but it carried with it the threat of complete economic anarchy in the rapidly growing outskirts. There was no
effective regulation of industry and commerce in the suburbs, for the justices of the peace had early moved to be incapable of enforcing such restrictive legislation as Elizabeth's statute of apprentices. This drift into suburbs from the City of London, and recreation to the suburban population as artisans moved from the country into the metropolitan area, had been observable through the previous two reigns, but nothing was done by government to establish control of the area outside City jurisdiction until Charles set up the New Corporation of Tradesmen in 1666. The failure of the solution applied was in great measure the result of the political crisis which deepened after 1660, but the problem remained and plans to meet it were put before the governments of Cromwell and Charles II.

There was in the second place a desire by new commercial and industrial interests for new monopolies which challenged the position and power of the old. New production techniques were being invented, and those who were willing to finance them clamored for monopoly of output and sale in order to protect their investment. These new financial interests were willing to pay for such protection and Charles I, who was never able to
balance his budget, welcomed the addition to his income promised by these new enterprises.

Objections to Caroline monopolies were fully voiced in the Long Parliament, in Calvert's speech in the House of Commons in 1647 indicating:

These men [i.e., the new landlords], like the Frogs of Egypt, have gotten nore of us of our dwellings, and we have scarce been free from them. They are in our Cave, they sit in our Fire, they sit by our Fire; we find them in the Eye-Tub [dyer's vat], Wash-Bowl, and Frying-Tub. They have made us live, and sell us from Head to Foot. . . . They have a Wizard to ride . . . themselves under the Name of Corporation; they make By-Laws which serve their turn to squeeze us and fill their Purse.1

But it seems apparent that the attack raised against monopolies was more political than economic. "As shown by the treaties accorded to the London Corporation," says Professor Piets, "not all monopolies were ended during the period of the Long Parliament, Corporate, and Protectorate. 2 Tenths for new inventories were allowed to continue; those to individuals in favor with the republicans might be allowed to stand."3

These two aspects of changing economic conditions, the collapse of gild control and the rise of

---

1 Rushworth, Historical Collections, III, 317.
new commercial interest, Charles I dealt ill. In the prevailing politico-economic climate of the day by erecting the new Corporation of Traders and the Societies of Brokers. The analysis of the founding of these Caroline monopolies, of the obstacles which they faced, and of the story of their brief career, has been the purpose of this investigation.
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