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DUBLIN QUAKERS IN BUSINESS 1800-50

BY RICHARD S. HARRISON

The quakers, otherwise known as members of the Religious Society of Friends are popularly renowned for the part they have played in the establishment of numerous business and philanthropic schemes in whatever parts they have settled. Where any systematic scientific study has been undertaken into Irish Quaker business history the analysis has frequently been biased by assumptions adopted uncritically from an English historical background.

The Dublin Quaker community provides an area very amenable to an extended economic and social analysis. The survival of an internally consistent corpus of documentary and archival material recording the chief preoccupations of their Society over a period starting circa 1655 until the present day makes a useful resource for identifying connections between their doctrine and their business practice. Group patterns of multi-levelled and mutual disciplinary and administrative review led to a regularised pattern of business behaviour in the adherents. It provided a training ground in democratic procedures and administrative practice capable of application to a 'secular' context. Corporate supervision of marriage facilitated the
maintenance of capital in quaker hands and promoted the increasing homogeneity and sectarian characteristics of the Society. The records of the Society therefore, in conjunction with available private and company business archives, with the use of Parliamentary papers, newspapers and other documentation provide a relatively complete picture of the Dublin Quakers.

For the purposes of this thesis the period 1800–50 provides a suitable sample to sustain the requisite analysis. Whilst the preformative conditions of an assumed Dublin quaker business success had been completed in the period 1770–1800, the succeeding 50 years reveals the quakers at a point of maximum development and confidence with access to capital, and with positive political and commercial influence.

By the late 1850's the Dublin Quakers had retreated from the innovative and creative position they had occupied in the first three decades of the 19th century. They fell back to a restricted role appropriate to a rentier class. In tacit recognition of their heredity and as token of their place in the delicately balanced sectarianism of Dublin's commercial and philanthropic life specific areas of influence were retained for them. If Irish Quakerism is an Irish phenomenon the specific patterns of finance and investment and the emergence into the new professional classes should not be seen as typical of quakers per se. They shared a wider pattern with the financial and commercial elite of Dublin, a pattern only incidently qualified by their quaker attitudes.
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QUAKER TERMINOLOGY—SPECIAL USEAGES

1. Certificate of Removal/ of marriage/ of birth/ of death. A certificate agreed to by the men's or by the Monthly Meeting and sent to another monthly meeting as a sign of a member's transferral and of his good standing, or else in the case of birth, marriage or death constituting a record for safe keeping.

2. Concern. An insistent inspiration to engage in some practical work or specific religious activity, such a private inspiration to be recognised or 'united with' by a monthly meeting, a quarterly or yearly meeting before the individual would receive the backing of the Quaker community to go ahead. Often recognised by the issue of a Certificate.

3. The Discipline. Specifically the body of rules, regulations and transactions that expressed Friend's understanding of the Truth. Through its negative aspects it controlled and prevented Friends from getting out of line. In its positive aspects it reinforced them in leading a religious and upright life.

4. Ministering Friends, Public Friends, Recorded Ministers, varying names for those having a specific 'gift' for ministering in meeting and other places. Such a gift was often recognised in the minutes of the Monthly Meeting 'Recorded in the Ministry'. Such recognition did not imply that other Friends might not occasionally minister also.

5. Plain Dress. Originally, as implied in the name, simple dress. However, eventually it became a visible outward sign of inward commitment of the 'truth' as professed by Friends. It involved the maintenance of a form of dress that had long passed out of popular use.

6. Plain Language. The use of numbers for months and days to avoid using names derived from heathen deities. Also specifically, the correct grammatical usage of 'thee' and thoughto a single persona and 'you' and 'ye' to several. In the context of contemporary 17th century linguistic convention this was an assertion of an egalitarian viewpoint and an avoidance of flattering titles as also an avoidance of giving a false respect to persons by addressing a single person as if they were many! The Plain Language became eventually sectarian characteristic of the Quaker community.

7. Religious Society of Friends. A later form of the name the Friends adopted for themselves, otherwise Friends or Quakers.
8. **The Truth** The totality of customs, practice, 'discipline' constituting the inward truth as professed by Friends and its outward expression in their way of life. Alternatively used in a sectarian way to distinguish them from other groups of people, who were also sometimes referred to as 'the world's people'.
NOTE ON DATES

Dates in the style of the Julian Calendar have been retained for ease of identification in the use of the earlier Quaker Archives. Dates consequent on the adoption of the Gregorian Calendar in Great Britain in 1752 have of course been left accordingly. Similarly, in the use of dates the convention has been adopted of using Roman letters for the months. This is partly to assist in the avoidance of confusion that sometimes occurs in relation to months and days in the use of 'I' and partly as being consistent with Quaker usage.

Abbreviations occurring most commonly. A more extensive list is located as part of the Bibliography.

D.F.H.L. - Dublin Friends Historical Library
F.H.L. (London) - Friends House Library (London)
I.E.S.H. - Irish Economics and Social History
I.H.S. - Irish Historical Studies
N.L.I. - National Library (Ireland)
P.R.O. (I) - Public Records Office (Ire. nd)
P.R.O. (N.I.) - Public Records Office (N. Ireland)
R.I.A. - Royal Irish Academy
S.P.O.D. - State Papers Office (Dublin)
A GUIDE TO THE MOST FREQUENTLY OCCURRING NAMES OF MEMBERS
OF THE PIM FAMILY WITH BRIEF NOTES ON THE CHIEF
COMMERCIAL AREAS WITH WHICH THEY WERE ASSOCIATED

1. Jonathan Pim (Mountmellick) probably a Chandler
2. James (William Street) Poplin Interests
3. Thomas (William Street) Linen Interests
4. Anthony (Mountmellick) - A miller
5. Joseph Robinson (William Street) Shipping and merchant interests
6. Mary Harvey (From Youghal) of a merchant family.
7. Susanna Todhunter (Dublin) of a family involved in wood, shipping and corn.
8. John Malcolmson (Clonmel and Waterford) with corn, milling, cotton and shipping interest.
9. Robert Goodbody (Mountmellick) at first an agent for estates. His father owned tanneries at age 35 with a capital of £3,200. He bought out some Pim interests and started a flour mill with his sons. He expanded into weaving flax and jute into sacks.
10. James Pim (of Mountmellick and Dublin Townsend St.) Corn Merchant with brewing interests.
12. Eliza Hogg Linen interests (from the North)
13. Henry Pim (Dublin) Brewer
15. Thomas Haughton (Carlow) Miller

Further details in Appendix to Chapter II
A simple statement of isolated facts does not constitute a history. Neither does a series of facts listed in chronological order constitute an adequate historical account. The ordering and analysis of historical events is dictated by a specific view of the meaning of history. For the Christian as for the Marxist historian, history is to be understood in relation to questions of purpose and how the movements of history are made meaningful in terms of human destiny. To some extent therefore any analysis of history will reflect a number of assumptions about the nature of history.

This thesis will look specifically at the business and other developments of Dublin's Quaker community for the period 1800 - 1850. The historical analysis involved may well reflect wider theoretical and ideological preoccupations focused on to a relatively small area of human life in Ireland during the period under discussion. The Irish Quaker community, however, for a number of reasons provides an area very amenable to an extended economic and social analysis. An extensive and internally consistent series of documentary materials recording the chief preoccupations of the Religious Society of Friends in Ireland (otherwise to be referred to in different contexts throughout this thesis, as Quakers, or Friends) makes a useful source for
identifying patterns of business behaviour over a period starting from circa 1655. Whilst actual business material from individual quaker businesses remains somewhat disparate, such as exists may in conjunction with the official documentation of the Society furnish material to suggest connections between doctrinal and business patterns and practice.

Some writers have noted that the approach of quakers themselves is dismissive of history since the first quakers saw all history as fulfilled and cancelled in the awareness of an overriding spiritual presence in the here and now. Certainly, many modern quakers would profess a lack of interest in the historical analysis of their religious viewpoints and yet be obsessively concerned with the biographies of the founding members of their religious society, with its associated genealogies and the incidental sectarian assumptions that it has picked up in the course of time. Paradoxically, in spite of such dismissive claims, and in view of the concern of quakerism with the here and now and with the practical, it is uniquely obsessed with historical viewpoints. It is in a constant engagement to achieve a balance between the claims of daily life and the ideals of the 'other', of the Kingdom.

Quite apart from quaker assumptions about themselves the population at large also has a series of assumptions about them. In moving closer to a consideration of the background to the analysis that will appear in this thesis it is necessary to deal
with these also. Such assumptions have included those of business success and rectitude, of business interest modified by philanthropic concern, and of a general moral integrity aimed at the improvement of life for the good of all classes and creeds.

Such common assumptions, as also the perceptions of quakers about themselves and about their history have often been tested in the context of English quaker history and in that of America. To date no systematic study has been conducted into the Irish Quaker community. But one of the few Irish Quaker historians, Isabel Grubb, did indeed pioneer Irish Quaker historical research with her book *Quakers in Ireland* published in 1927.

Her earlier, little used, and unpublished thesis on Irish quakers revealed even more in a detailed analysis of a relatively modern type, which looked in detail at aspects of the social and economic history of the Irish Quaker community in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Her chief work, however, concentrated on the English Quakers, with only incidental allusion to the quakers of Ireland. It is worth noting that her research made use of contemporary works such as those of Tawney with its useful insights in to the economic base of many characteristic protestant attitudes in the dawn of capitalist modes of production. Apart from Isabel Grubb's own contributions, Olive C. Goodbody has done essential work to classify and organise quaker archives and manuscript material. Some of the results of this work were embodied in her book...
'Guide to Irish Quaker Records'. But no work has been done in the area of Irish quaker business history. We might except however, a recent thesis by John W. McConaghy which looked in a very useful way at the business patterns of an Ulster Quaker linen family. Two other theses in recent years have also made significant contributions to other aspects of Irish Quaker history. These were Cyril Brannigan's study of Irish quaker education and Jon Holt's study 'Quakers in the Great Irish Famine'.

Isabel Grubb assumed that the impact of quakers in the business life of Ireland was greater than that of their English brethren in the life of England. It is one of the intentions of this thesis to consider such an assumption and to test it in a rigorous manner on the basis of a comprehensive analysis of quaker commercial, financial and industrial involvement. The importance of doctrine and the body of quaker 'discipline' will be reviewed in terms of its impact on business behaviour. The quaker 'discipline', in view of its central position in any study of quakerism will be considered to see what elements in it may be directly related to business and entrepreneurial success, or which may indeed have militated against such success. There may be evidence to show that doctrinal considerations actually abbreviated some varieties of material success. A pertinent question might be to what degree Irish Quaker business patterns were unique or whether they merely reflected in microcosm the
business and economic patterns of a wider Irish commercial community.

The function of this chapter is chiefly to identify a number of formative trends and patterns in Irish Quakerism from its foundation. It is proposed to look at the social and demographic as well as the doctrinal background.

Quakerism grew up in the north-west of England. Its founder, George Fox, was born in 1624, the son of a weaver. Having endured much religious doubt and possessed of a highly sensitive character, he sought a sense of 'true religion'. He failed to locate effective human help in his search and when 'all his hope in men was gone' he felt that 'there was one, namely Jesus Christ, who could speak to his condition.'

However, George Fox's insight was not a mere expression of a traditional protestant individualism. His claim implied corporate activity and a common pattern of behaviour among believers. His claim that man could have direct access to the Divinity, through Jesus Christ, in the here and now, exactly as the apostles had once was to imply standards of corporate obedience. Obedience to the immediate teaching of Jesus Christ implied certain ethical imperatives which for George Fox
included a) egalitarian treatment of all men and women, b) a single absolute standard of truth telling, c) the setting aside of accepted customs of worship with their associated ecclesiastical forms, ministers, priests and prayer books and the avoidance of vain and superfluous fashion, (itself an egalitarian affirmation). Traditional protestants put their emphasis on the authority of the written words of scripture. The Roman Catholic looked for the authoritative teaching and interpretation which a church anchored in history and tradition could claim, but the quakers looked towards immediate inspiration to illuminate and confirm in their own experience the written word of scripture.

The quaker message spread rapidly in England from 1648. Quakerism, whilst preached by inspired individuals, constituted a movement rather than a creedal system. Its appeal was very much to radical and disaffected elements including levellers and baptists.

Some quaker interpreters of their own history, notably Rufus Jones, have attempted to link it with the history of mystical practice in the church.® The attempt to identify direct linkages does not appear very convincing and tends to obscure the genius of the original quaker movement. Approaches founded in the interpretation of economic and social factors might be exptected to provide more useful insights. The central element in quaker understanding of christian belief, it must be
emphasised, was the possibility of direct access by each individual to divine guidance in the context of the worshipping community without reliance on ritual or any intervening sacerdotal presence. This element transferred to a secular context will emerge over and over again as a prime distinguishing mark of quaker business patterns. In spite of a theology that accepted a traditional dualism of spirit and flesh the corporate activity of the Society of Friends was uniquely concerned with specific patterns of human management and welfare.

If we are to speak of the appeal of early English Quakerism to radical elements it is necessary also to make a small qualification in relation to questions of doctrine amongst the quakers generally. The assumption that there was a single set of doctrines held by early quakers does not stand up. A variety of doctrinal emphases existed among early Friends as it still does. This did not lead to any undue tensions at first. What was important was that early quakers shared a series of common attitudes to life. The structures that they developed for the society were capable of accommodating a wide spectrum of dissent. Their approach to religion as to business was to be pragmatic and experimental. The type of mentality that would be attracted to the quaker way of life was likely to have been the same as that which made them apparently successful in commerce.
We have necessarily moved away somewhat from Ireland. But
the quaker movement was not long spreading there also. Its
introduction can be chiefly attributed to the ex-Cromwellian
soldier William Edmundson, born 1627 at Little Musgrove in
Westmoreland. He set up business in Dublin circa 1652; this was
soon after his initial exposure to quakerism. Doctrinal
considerations as much as those of commerce encouraged him to
move North. The advance of the quaker message in Ireland was
not at first as rapid as it had been in England but already by
1656 had begun to penetrate the Cromwellian army. Again it
found a good reception there from the baptist radicals who
constituted important sectors of its rank and file. By 1656
quakerism was seen by some military men in Ireland as posing a
distinct political threat as well as a threat to army
discipline. With an implied pacifist viewpoint, an apparent
disregard for constituted authority, occasional interference
with the worship of other christian believers and the advocacy
of non-payment of tithes it was seen as distinctly sinister
and subversive. Henry Cromwell, the son of the Protector Oliver
Cromwell, went so far as to state in February 1656,
"I think their principles and practice are not very consistent
with civil government much less with the discipline of an army.
Some think them to have no design but I am not of that opinion.
Their counterfeited simplicity renders them to me the more
dangerous"

However Henry Cromwell's reading of the signs of the times
as far as it concerned the quakers was very far from the reality
of the situation. The structures which the quakers developed
for themselves and their church polity soon proved adequate to cool the ardours of initial excess and to bring the more extreme political and religious elements in their ranks into patterns of group discipline and self-restraint. The excesses of individualism were to be qualified by a sense of corporate procedure that helped to impress the authorities with a sense of the responsible behaviour of the quakers. Following on from this the authorities were to a large extent to become willing to extend a variety of toleration to them. But the very achievement of such toleration from the state also contributed to the withdrawal of quakers from the political arena. Christopher Hill in a recent historical study of radical religious groupings of the Commonwealth puts it this way:

"In the last resort, perhaps, quakers did not want to overturn the world, any more than constitutional Levellers wanted to overthrow the sanctity of private property. Quakers wanted life to be lived better, more honestly; they wanted to end the haggling and swindling of the market, by insisting that their yea was yea and their nay nay. This introduction of modern business standards of behaviour.... was a great achievement, a greater revolution than we realise; just because it was so complete and final.... But this was not overturning the world as Diggers and even Ranters had hoped."¹²

Many of the early quakers in Ireland had been Cromwellian soldiers.¹² The names of captains and colonels who had supported and entertained the itinerant preachers of the infant Society occur frequently. Names such as Pike of Cork, Clibborn of Moate and William Edmundson, the first 'apostle' of Irish Quakerism come to mind in this connection. Assumptions that the
origins of the first Irish Friends were proletarian is not born out by the evidence. In the case of the planters as well as the Cromwellians they appear to have come from a section of the English populace that was well acquainted with the assumptions of capital and often equipped with a knowledge of trade and of manufactures requiring capital. It is possible that their attraction to ideas that seemed radical related to a sense of economic grievance. Their move to Ireland was often in search of a wider economic freedom or else they came in search of increased opportunities that would not require too much capital. A high proportion of the English quaker immigrants, who either came as quakers or were converted in Ireland came from the North and West of England. Many were the younger sons of their families. Isabel Grubb on the basis of an analysis of birth places mentioned in early Irish Quaker registers states that of 129 of the first quakers in Dublin, 24 had come from Cumberland, 33 from Yorkshire and 12 from Gloucestershire with other significant proportions from Lancashire, Cheshire and Westmoreland. She found the same pattern reflected in overall national figures elucidated from 474 samples.

The type of trades in which the first Dublin Quakers were employed shows a predominance of merchants. It has to be admitted that there are factors in the disciplinary methods used by the quakers that would suggest that a wider section of their community did not always emerge in the records, but an analysis of trades represented in the wills of 97 individuals for the
period 1683 - 1755 gives at least some basis for the statement. Being a Dublin based sample, there are, as one might, expect no farmers mentioned. But a number of trades implying specific skills and 'professional' training are mentioned. Among the trades that occur are those of bricklayer, carpenter and patten maker. The predominant social categories however, are those of tallow chandler (10), weaver (10), clothier (13) and various types of merchant (21). Such a pattern is reminiscent of the social categories to be elucidated in a comparable sample among the first English Quakers also. The pattern was to remain very typical of Irish Quakerism. And, as with the English Quakers the proportion of small tradesmen and artisans was to decrease and the proportion of merchants with capital to increase at their expense. The assumption is that many of the early Irish Quakers had deliberately moved to Ireland in anticipation of opportunities opened up by the Cromwellian conquest. Fertile lands in the Midlands and in Cork promised good returns from farming. The export of wool seemed to promise a likely opening. The country was much depopulated by war and disease and a big return for a small investment seemed a reasonable hope to be realised from the export of wool for which there was big demand in England. A typical example of such a quaker immigrant might be that of Anthony Sharp who saw an opening in wool exports for himself and settled permanently in Dublin in 1669. His quaker belief had encouraged him to neglect the legal profession for which he had trained and to develop on the basis of a small inheritance an export and entrepreneurial
role for himself. He was highly successful in this as he was in the manufacturing business which he established. Besides becoming significant in the affairs of the Friends he came to be prominent in Dublin's commercial life. He won a high degree of public respect and recognition and was admitted to administrative and advisory roles in the guilds and governance of Dublin commercial life. Another contemporary example might be that of Joseph Pike, son of a captain in the Cromwellian army. When his father died he put a small inheritance into the export of wool in place of undertaking the management of his father's farm. His success in the venture was shown by his large business interests in Cork.

III

Central to any account of Irish or other quakers is the consideration of records. And even more pertinently, as already suggested, the function of the 'discipline' is inseparable from the faith and practice of the Friends. It represents the corporate genius of their Society. It is through quaker records that we can trace its establishment and development.

Beginning as a reaction against calvinistic viewpoints that assumed the total depravity of man, the quaker movement asserted the possibility of perfection and of victory over sin in this life. Exclusion of quakers from areas of political life and from parish relief forced the early quakers to create structures
to take care of their own members as well as to protect them from the impositions of the state. Such structures also served a useful purpose in curbing the excesses of some adherents and in striking a constructive balance between an extreme of authoritarianism on the one hand and total anarchy and antinomanism on the other. The economic and welfare role that the Society adopted in the care of its under-privileged members probably reinforced the way in which refractory or ultra radical elements could be curbed. The need to create 'alternative' structures to those of church and state as well as an initial exclusion from trade guilds probably encouraged them to explore methods of mutual review to guarantee a regularised pattern of business behaviour in the adherents, and consistent with the objectively argued out demands of justice and truth. There was a distinct connection between individual quaker business practice and the practices with which they were familiar in the worshipping group.

What was this 'discipline' and how was it operated? The church discipline of the quakers in Ireland was probably earlier in a fully developed state than that of their brethren in England. This may be explained in terms of three specific features. Firstly, there was the unique role of William Edmundson in introducing the quaker message to Ireland and he was therefore in a position to transfer the thoughtout position of George Fox directly into the new situation. Secondly the sense that quakers were like a beleaguered part of a beleaguered protestant
community and thirdly, the fact that in contra-distinction to the case in England there was no parish relief structure. The very welfare needs of the members demanded early disciplinary structures.

The 'Discipline' was at first formed through the united power of men and women with tried qualities of leadership and spirituality. As the corporate discipline developed this resolved itself into separate Men's and Women's Meetings. The Men's Meeting was constituted as a body of sage men recognised for their qualities of righteousness, sobriety and wisdom. Others with similar qualities would occasionally be invited to join the team. Women were encouraged to hold their own meetings but at the early period did not have the same degree of executive authority as the men. Their province was chiefly in the care of the needs of their own sex. It is important to note that the majority of adult Friends were not involved in business meetings that administered the affairs of the church.

The meeting for worship was the smallest local focus for transacting the affairs of the church. Meetings for discipline to transact the affairs of the church grew out of the local meetings for worship. A number of such disciplinary meetings together would constitute an administrative area known as the Monthly, occasionally, as in Dublin, the Weekly Meeting. The Monthly Meetings again formed units known at first as Six-Week Meetings and which, after a period of overlap, were to develop
into the Province Meetings of Leinster, Munster and Ulster. The final unit of discipline was known as the National or Half-Yearly Meeting. At the latter end of the eighteenth century this was to become the Yearly or 'Dublin Yearly Meeting'.

Dublin Friends, being the biggest single constituent unit of the Society carried out many of the ongoing judicial and administrative functions of the Half Yearly Meeting between sessions. Each business meeting had its own areas of activity and enjoyed a wide autonomy. The Meetings for transacting the affairs of the church were held in a spirit of worship designed to ascertain the will of God for the group involved in the exercise. They were held in a democratic manner but with a theocratic assumption. Being held on a basis of concensus no vote was ever taken. They enabled the young Society to hold together in the face of forces and individuals who might have destroyed it. Attendance at such meetings implied both business and administrative expertise as well as spiritual discernment. Such meetings supplied an environment in which administrative expertise could be learned and practically applied in a congenial atmosphere.

Business, that is, disciplinary meetings at every level, kept records of their proceedings, partly for the benefit of the members and partly as visible evidence of their proceedings at a time when the authorities and the populace at large continued to be suspicious of the quakers.
The business meetings at the Monthly Meeting level with which we will be chiefly concerned, dealt with such practical matters as assistance to the widow and orphan, the supervision of education and apprenticeships, the recording of births, marriages and deaths and the supervision of marriage procedures. They dealt with the collection of subscriptions, the visiting of persecuted brethren in prison, the collection of information about the distraints for tithes which Quakers resolutely refused to pay. At the Yearly Meeting level information was coallated and reviewed and proclamations and exhortations issued. Correspondence was carried on with other Yearly Meetings and requests handled for the collection and disbursement of funds that might be beyond the capacity of any local meeting to handle. The National Meeting represented the concentrated wisdom and leadership of the church. It was through that meeting that 'Advices' and 'Queries' on various aspects of corporate and individual behaviour were collected and circulated in manuscript. Such collections were to form the basis of a variety of government by custom and case. They incidently reveal the degree to which some Friends were to accommodate themselves with the world. Such accommodations had called forth the strictures of the Society that made 'Advices' necessary. Whilst not all Quakers lived up to the high standards that adherence to the Society demanded, groups such as those of the national and Men's Meetings set the key for the behaviour of Quakers.
The corporate procedures implied in the Men's Monthly Meetings, were used positively to ensure a publicly recognisable element of probity and trustworthiness. Such a publicly recognisable element was reinforced by the specific patterns of dress, speech and behaviour adhered to by the groups. Negatively the procedures could be used to bring the errant into line under the penalty of disownment. Besides the disciplinary aspects these meetings were involved in the care of those who suffered governmental or other persecution and made the necessary representations on their behalf. All transactions are recorded in the surviving and nearly intact corpus of Irish Quaker records. Such records provide a series of data documenting the behaviour of members, relations with the wider community and the procedures used in the formation of ethical patterns.

Of all the disciplinary procedures, however, two in particular are of particular relevance to this account. The procedures referred to are those related to marriage and to business failure. Quakers had from the foundation of the 'discipline' taken particular care to ensure that marriages should be regularised and above reproach, since they refused to countenance any procedure involving ecclesiastical dignitaries. Intending parties to a marriage were obliged to make several appearances over a period of time before their respective Men's and Women's Meetings, as well as to have clearly signalled parental consent to their marriage intention. Well attested
documentation related to the solemnisation of the marriage and from those who were its witnesses was also required.

Marriage involving non-quakers came to be discouraged. In many cases the parties involved in a marriage that was not according to rule, faced the possibility of suspension if not actual expulsion from membership. This depended on the degree of regret that might be expressed. The regret, of course, would not be for the marriage, but for the failure to conform to rule! The regulations in regard to suspension were not so rigorous at the beginning of the quaker movement. One incidental result of the disownment and marriage procedures was to reinforce existing property relations and custom relating to dowries, settlements and jointures. It encouraged not alone intermarriage within the group but the maintenance of capital in the families constituting the group. It facilitated the establishment of a group of families which was to dominate administrative procedures and the business life of the Dublin Quakers. This group which included the Fade, Willcocks, Strettell and Jaffray families emerged and was chiefly involved in linen.

The second set of disciplinary procedures related to failures in business. Any quaker who failed in credit was obliged to make over every part of his possessions to his creditors and if the due processes or law led to his imprisonment he was obliged to submit, and not to attempt to conceal himself. The quaker was also expected to pay back every
penny owed and not to force accommodations on his creditors. If he was willing to fulfil all these conditions the Men's Meeting would look more favourably at him and keep his case under review to see how he lived up to the expectations offered. He would of course be excluded from subscribing to the Society as long as he owed money. And, of course, the application of disciplinary procedures did not prevent individual members from endeavouring to prevent insolvencies or from helping their insolvent Friends. One particular example of such assistance occurred in 1740 and drew in the whole National Meeting when the Dublin Quaker Amos Strettell failed in payment of his debts. As a result of events connected with the South Sea Bubble he was unable to come up with ready cash to pay his creditors. It was clear that such a payment was within his capacity and since he admitted his sense of sorrow the National Meeting raised a large sum of money to tide him over. That example was an exceptional and not a typical example. Negative disciplinary procedures not alone helped to build up public trust in the business rectitude of the Quakers, it also ensured high standards of caution and avoidance of risk-taking by the members. Members were encouraged to seek advice of each other before embarking on any big ventures. Sometimes doctrinal considerations would encourage them to avoid large speculations or to curtail their businesses. Joseph Pike of Cork on one occasion had the opportunity to buy a big cargo of tobacco. This purchase would have put him in a monopoly situation and guaranteed him an immense and possibly unjust profit. Having a desire not to reflect on 'the Truth' - that is
the corporate embodiment of the quaker perception of Truth - he let the opportunity pass.\textsuperscript{23}

IV

Whilst the student of quaker history in Ireland is blessed with a plethora of records from the beginning of the Society it has to be admitted that the earliest material does not enable any sustained analysis regarding the numbers of quakers to be made. Disregarding for the moment such figures as may be derived from the systematised and retrospective registers of Births, Deaths and Marriages prepared in the 1860's, the records cannot be considered as providing a total picture of the quaker demographic structure. Much depends on the type of question we wish to ask. The records were designed for practical purposes related to the care of the quaker community. One reason for caution in reviewing available material is that those who were most active in the affairs of the church tended to have their names recorded most frequently. The names of the wider group of adherents does not generally emerge since they were not members of the elite Men's Meeting and hence had little part in the administrative proceedings, except when in need, or otherwise objects of the discipline.

In the quaker context a discussion of demographic questions therefore, partially resolves itself into a discussion of the significance and nature of the records used. The question(s)
becomes very much one of how 'membership' was defined at different periods of the Society's history. At first the Society had no membership procedures as such and no formal sign of admission into the community was ever made. It was not the same in the case of other religious groups, which at minimum admitted such outward 'sacraments' as water baptism and the communion of bread and wine. But the willingness of quakers to endure the persecutions consequent on attachment to an obscure and often despised sect would in itself have made such procedures irrelevant. Early family lists do exist for a number of Irish Quaker meetings. These do suggest numbers of adherents for each meeting. But the wide time scale involved for the entries often limits the value of the information. Discussion of the early quaker population must therefore to a degree be based on lists of members of the Men's Meetings specifically. At least such lists, in conjunction with other evidence, provide impressionistic samples of overall patterns.

The population of Dublin according to hearth returns for 1659 was calculated at 8,780 including 6,459 English and 2,321 Irish. Quakers would have been an insignificant minority in such a population. Sir William Petty in his estimate of the population of Ireland in 1672 assumed 1,100,000 people. Of 200,000 English he assumed 100,000 of them to be Presbyterians, Independents, Anabaptists and Quakers. The population of the country continued to rise. Petty's figures for 1687 indicate 1,300,000 in the country at large and including Dublin in that
Modern research throws doubt on Petty's figures. It is felt that a figure of 2 million for that date is probably nearer the reality. Recent research also suggests that in 1685 Dublin's population was in the region of 45,000.

Against such a background then, how big was the quaker population likely to have been? Undoubtedly, as in England, the proportion was likely to have been higher relative to the overall population than it was ever again to be. John M. Douglas in an article, 'Early Quakerism in Ireland', in the Journal of the Friends History Society in 1956, refers to a tithe document from 1680. The original archival item incorporates a list of adults who declared their determination not to pay tithes. By 1680 the quaker 'discipline' had been well established, and this item lists 28, apparently, Monthly Meetings, with 10 in Ulster, 9 in Leinster and 9 in Munster. According to later authority there were 50 meetings in Ireland in 1688. A total of 798 names occur in the document described by Douglas (not, as he calculates 780). Of those 49 refer to Dublin. It is clear that the figures do not relate to the total quaker population. Indeed, a more general subscription list towards the building of the Meath Street Meeting House in 1685 includes 116 names. It is clear that the figures referred to by Douglas are derived from the membership of Men's and Women's Meetings. A further reference to overall quaker population is implied in the issue of 2,000 copies of an exhortatory paper in 1690. This was issued to
heads of household. A number in the region of 5,000 - 9,000 quakers is suggested.\textsuperscript{31}

For the decades 1700-10 and 1711-1720 abstract registers show 341 and 346 births respectively for Dublin. The same decades show 239 and 241 marriages respectively on that basis and assuming again a household size of circa 5.1 it would not be beyond the bounds of possibility that there more more than 1,000 quakers in Dublin.\textsuperscript{32} The fact that a second Meeting House was built at Sycamore Meeting House would be consistent with that fact.\textsuperscript{33} Again on the basis of a pattern detected till now we may assume a fairly stable population of quakers in Dublin up that the 1720's. Being a notable economic and administrative centre it followed that job prospects would be better there. The city itself had been in a state of rapid growth and expansion up to 1682 and there would have been a constant inflow of quakers from rural regions. The story in rural regions was different and particularly in the comparatively poorer region of Ulster. The period 1682-1750 shows that out of 440, 54 adult Friends emigrated from Dublin to Pennsylvania. A closer look at the figures shows a big emigration in 1729 when 17 Friends left Dublin and 64 in total left Ireland to go to Pennsylvania. The same year had been very severe with widespread famine. Most of the Friends, 33 out of the total, left from Ulster. When the next biggest emigration of Irish Quakers occurred, however, only two Friends were to leave from Dublin.\textsuperscript{34}
A considerable fall in the overall population of Irish Quakers may be presumed to have occurred by the end of the 1720's. Whereas in 1721 it is noted that 5,000 copies of an exhortatory paper were to be distributed among Friends the national distribution figures for the Yearly Meeting's Epistle for 1732 had reduced to 1,000. Of the copies issued in that year 400 went to Ulster, 200 to Munster and 400 to Leinster, including a proportion of 100 to Dublin. It has to be admitted that the two items may well have been distributed on a different basis. On the basis of consistent practice it seems likely that they were sent to either all adult members or heads of households. That would locate 25% of the quaker population in Leinster and 10% of the national total in Dublin. Such a dramatic decline in population would have been contributed to certainly in the case of Dublin by the increased number of deaths in the decades 1710-1730, the reduction of births from 1720-30 and the continuing fall in the number of marriages over the same period. The falling number of marriages was also marked by an increasing proportion of marriages to non-members. The overall national figure for emigrations whilst probably only recording the emigration of heads of household in many cases, implies the emigration on a much bigger scale of the families and their children as well. If the Dublin pattern was widely reflected, and it seems highly likely that it was, the fall in Irish Quaker population could easily be accounted for. But the declension in membership in Dublin was probably to be
more significant than in rural and Ulster regions in particular.\textsuperscript{33}

The decade 1740-50 registers some remarkable features. The number of births, marriages and deaths had all shown a decline since the 1720's. The figures all indicate a fall in Dublin's quaker population. On the other hand (as shown in Appendix to this chapter) a fall in burials from 369 to 55 seems unusual if not impossible. It is hard to doubt the accuracy of the Dublin Registers. Of all Irish quaker registers they were the most scrupulously kept. Such a big fall in burial figures is not reflected in burial figures from Mountmellick where the period 1730-40 shows an increase in burials from 372 to 218 and then for 1740-50, a decline to 147.\textsuperscript{33} The only assumption that can be made for such a disparity, and assuming that there is nothing incorrect or missing in the recording of the original manuscript source, is that Dublin's quaker population had been predominantly old, that the younger members had 'married out' or emigrated and that the decline reflected a difficult economic environment. A national and overall population decline is certainly indicated following on a long period of famine and sickness c. 1729-30. Such difficulties re-emerged in the forties.\textsuperscript{33} Whilst Irish Quaker birth numbers continued to consistently fall, a breakdown of available figures suggests a much more rapid fall in Dublin than in the rural areas.\textsuperscript{40}
Up to the end of the 1730's we have had to rely on lists of Men's Meetings stray notes related to the publication of printed material etc. However the significance of subscription lists to Men's Meetings begins to change from the end of the 1740's. This reflects a redefinition of membership which came to include the total attendance at meetings. Such a redefinition was probably stimulated by a necessity to tighten up on welfare procedures and to exclude any irregularities. A similar procedure had occurred in England around 1730. But there is no evidence that the change occurred quite so suddenly by administrative 'diktat' in Ireland, or even at the same time. There was always a 'floating' population of those interested in attending the quaker meetings. Even when a more exclusive definition of membership based on heredity was arrived at, many continued to attend meetings, perhaps out of loyalty, even when they had been disowned, or because of quaker connections, or through a residual attachment and sentiment. But such a 'floating' population could not share in the business proceedings of the meeting. Even though continuing moves would be made to bring all the adult membership into the Meetings for Discipline, it is clear that a business, administrative and spiritual elite actually controlled the affairs of the church. It must however be allowed, that in the context of a quaker viewpoint the wider, silent, and less vocal membership could, in the atmosphere of worship, provide a powerful impetus towards decision making. Such influences not being quantifiable or
capable of record obviously cannot be called upon in this account.

Earlier subscription lists, except on special occasions are probably to be identified with that of the central core of 'cadres'. Membership of such meetings was by invitation. To be invited to subscribe was regarded as a great privilege and one of the first signs of disciplinary procedures was to have one's subscription refused. A wealthy and respected Dublin quaker and banker describes in his diary making special trips into Dublin on 'subscription days'. Dubin subscription lists show on different occasions during the 1730's, 57 and 92 subscribers to various purposes. A list for 1736's shows 55 subscribers. Allowing 50 as the number of subscribers and assuming on a purely notional basis from available figures for the 1740's that the figure represented approximately one third of the total adult quaker population of Dublin we might assume a population in the region of 500-600.

We are on somewhat safer ground in looking at the Dublin Quaker population figures for 1740's. For 1748, we have, fortunately, a list of Dublin's adult membership. The list undoubtedly represents a realistic, street by street breakdown of male or female heads of household. 183 names are listed. A subscription list for a following year distinguishes between members and non-members, with 85 of the first and 16 of the
second subscribing. The membership has clearly and unambiguously declined.

A later account states that in the year 1750 there were 101 meetings in the country at large. Of these 49 were in Leinster, 31 in Ulster and 23 in Munster. An increase in the number of meetings by no means necessarily conflicts with indications of a fall in quaker population. It might rather indicate a wider diffusion of the membership in meetings often centered in private houses. Many of these must have been quite small and situated in rural regions. The population of the country had been rising slowly from, it is presumed 2.16 - 2.53 million in 1732 to 2.20 - 2.57 in 1753. From then on it began to increase more rapidly (and had by 1767 risen to 3,480,000). The increase was not immediately detectable in the Dublin statistics derivable from the abstracts of registers. Births began to show a slight increase. Various reasons have been advanced for the nationwide decline in mortality. The eradication of disease and improved commercial prospects have been suggested. Dublin's quaker population was undoubtedly increasing. The next available and significant membership list shows for 1778, 250 adult Friends. A near contemporary subscription list (c.1780 shows 124 subscribers to the Monthly Meeting funds. Dublin's population itself for 1772 was estimated by the eminent quaker physician Dr. John Rutty to be in the region of 128,570. A more recent estimate in 1778 shows 154,000.
It is necessary in connection with the phenomenon of an increasing quaker and national population to advert to the work of Eversley. His important statistical and demographic work was based on the use of computers and an extensive survey of both English and Irish Quaker material. His demographic conclusions would seem to be beyond reproach. Although it is noteworthy that his account does not allow for regional offences in Ireland. He concludes,

'that the Irish Quakers had a very different demographic regime from that of the English ones. They married earlier (especially the women), their childbearing period lasted longer their birth intervals were shorter and their marriages remained intact longer, because both partners survived. The fertility rates were accordingly different in kind as well as in degree, from that of the English Quakers'.

For Eversley this constitutes a paradox. Having accepted as he does a common assumption of quaker historiography that Irish Quakers were part of an English colony, he cannot on the analogy of colonial examples from other parts of the world, account for the 'similarities' between Irish Quakers demographic patterns and those of the wider Irish community. He states, '... propinquity does not create similarity. The British colonial population did not have fertility patterns closer to those of the native Asian and African populations than to those of their families at home'. He further states, 'If the traditional account of Irish catholic marriages before the Famine was
correct one might say that the Quakers were in some way influenced by those around them; but this is hard to believe since they did not otherwise conform to the social conventions of the host population'.

The give-away word in the above extract is of course the word 'host'. Whilst it may be allowed that at various times the Irish Quakers betrayed a variety of colonial mentality in areas related to political identifications they were in very many ways assimilated to the Irish Protestant population. That assimilation was to be betrayed in the high proportion of marriages 'out' and the frequent advices which were issued to counsel Friends against political and social identifications, thus indicating precisely the pull that such identifications exerted. The emergence of a private Quaker school at Ballitore where Protestants and even Catholics were educated together under the auspices of the Shackleton family is indicative also of much assimilations. Whilst the overall Quaker population was to register increases in the birth and marriage rates from the 1760's it seems that it would never reach again the heights which we have assumed for it around 1700. It seems apparent that the rural population of the Quakers was to drop whilst in cities and towns generally it was either to stabilise or to increase. The fall in the number of meetings is clear from the number existing in 1794 when there were but 54 left. Many of these were themselves undoubtedly very small. Rural emigration may be assumed to have continued and the big cities of Cork,
Waterford, Dublin and Limerick continued to offer wide opportunities for employment and apprenticeship to rural quaker youth. Emigration as a specific phenomenon scarcely affected Dublin at all. An examination of removal certificates for the period 1754 - 1791 reveals the removal of perhaps nine individuals to Philadelphia and 14 to England. Many removals recorded were only temporary or related to the movements of 'recorded ministers'. An examination of rural and specifically Ulster records has not proved possible, it seems highly likely that they would reveal a more significant pattern of rural emigration.

In spite of increasing birth and marriage rates among the quakers and areas of stability or actual increase in city areas, the quaker population paradoxically, overall continued to decline. Internal features of doctrine and disownments related to marriage procedures must be assumed. The phenomenon of a marriage related decline in quaker numbers in England was also to be remarked but against a backround of different demographic assumptions. Apart from the difficulties of procedure and dowry that might discourage potential marriage partners, the factor of disownment for marriage to non-members caused a continuing drain on the membership. The degree of latitude that had been admitted in such questions at an earlier period had now almost entirely disappeared. Parties not married 'according to rule' were rarely readmitted, and members of their families who had been so rash as to have attended the weddings of their own
children or relatives ran the risk of disownment also. A nation wide analysis of the number of Friends 'marrying out' is not possible on the basis of the marriage abstracts. Such marriages are not noted in a consistent manner. We are fortunate however, in that the Dublin registers regularly note marriages to a non-member (n.m.). A study of monthly Meeting Minutes 1761 - 1860 also enables us to analyse the number of marriage related and other disownments. A breakdown of the list for decennial periods 1761 - 1799 is of interest. As can be seen from the following table 332 persons were disowned from all causes during that period.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Marriage Out</th>
<th>Insolvency</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1761-70</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1771-80</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1781-90</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1791-1800</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table based on Webb List of Disownments 1760 - 1800. "Other" would include disownments for such offences as drunkeness, fornication, adherence to another christian group, hunting or attendance at a theatre, for example.

The year 1800 is conventionally accepted as marking a watershed in the spiritual, economic and political attitudes of the country. However many of these developments had been in process since the 1780's and continued without much change for a number of years. For quakers as for the wider population this was true. A number of trends were peculiar to the quaker community itself or at least variants on a wider theme that forced sectors of the protestant population back on itself by reaction to the events of 1798. A more rigorous application of the traditional quaker discipline revealed a distinct degree of anxiety. A temporary internal reaction of dissent against the formality of quaker doctrine and procedure did temporarily manifest itself during the period centring on 1800. This
reaction came to the surface very much with younger quakers and related in particular to the crux of marriage discipline. It was calculated that some of the procedures could involve journeys of up to 200 miles for intending parties to a marriage, on account of the number of presentations that might be required.\textsuperscript{60}

The population of Dublin continued to rise. It rose from, according to one account, 172,042 persons in 1802 to 175,319 in 1814.\textsuperscript{61} Against such a background, according to an author writing in 1816 the quaker population was in order of 650 persons and around 130 families.\textsuperscript{62} The same author stated that there were 42 quaker meetings and a total of 4,500 members. the author's Dublin figures agree very well with available Dublin membership figures\textsuperscript{63} and the national figures that he provides are consistent with those for ensuing years.

Dublin continued to act as a magnet for trade and employment. Of particular interest to this account two branches of the Pim family had come to prominence. The first branch had emerged in Dublin c.1740. The second involved the brothers Jonathan, Thomas and Joseph who came to Dublin from Mountmellick a little before 1800 and were by 1816 very well established indeed in Dublin's commercial life. The names of other Mountmellick quakers were to occur frequently during this period in connection with successful business schemes based in Dublin. Among those we may mention Chaytor, Perry and Garratt.
Throughout the decades from 1800 to 1860 the Dublin Quaker population was to rise as did the numbers of subscribers to Dublin Monthly Meeting funds. Indeed numbers of members topped the 690 mark in 1824 and were remain in that region until the 1840's when they rose to 715. The rise of quaker population in Irish cities and towns generally is suggested by a series of figures in a Government report 1834. The figures recorded there must be regarded with a degree of suspicion, particularly in relation to the numbers of quakers listed. It appears that the evidence for the report was derived mainly from individual ecclesiastical submissions that could have been motivated by subjective factors. This would account for the fact that some of the figures agree closely with quaker sources and in other cases seem very hard to reconcile with them. On the basis of figures for attendance at places of worship, and accepting in each case the highest figure of the range supplied we come up with 34 meetings and 2,495 members. A number of meetings appear not to have been noted at all, and it has to be remembered that the structure of quaker meetings did not coincide with ecclesiastical and parochial boundaries. Meetings are variously described as increasing, diminishing and stationary. Waterford, Limerick and Cork all show as stationary. Country meetings generally as might be anticipated emerge as small and diminishing. City and town meetings such as Belfast and Clonmel emerge as increasing. The figure for Limerick at 200 accords closely with one available for 1837 when it stood at 170 according to internal quaker records. But the figure of 150
recorded in the report as attending Eustace Street in Dublin must be regarded as suspect even if taken in conjunction with the figure of 60 for the new meeting of Monkstown, correctly described as 'increasing'. The disciplinary measures designed to ensure attendance at meetings would rule out the possibility for any discrepancy so large between the figures of the report and the internal records that suggest a membership of circa 700. The local priest of the Established church may be presumed to have been somewhat in ignorance about the attendance figures of quakers at their meetings in his parish. Incidentally the Government Census of 1831 declared that there were 204,155 persons in Dublin and 176,012 in Dublin County.\textsuperscript{67}

A brief look at quaker emigration in the first 50 years of the nineteenth Century suggests again that Dublin was scarcely affected by it. A survey of 'certificates of removal'\textsuperscript{68} suggests a small number going to America; perhaps a few more to England and a very minute sample to Australia. Occasionally emigration followed insolvency or expressed a wish to escape the quaker or other consequences of misdemeanours. But even in such cases the quaker disciplinary network would operate to ensure that all individuals conformed to the penalties of disownment. Those who emigrated with the blessing of their meetings would bring certificates of clearness with them. This would ensure that the meetings to which they gravitated abroad would endeavour to help and look after the emigrees. It is not possible to quantify the emigration to America or England. Much
quaker emigration proved temporary as far as Dublin records go. The overall impression is that a small trickle of Friends did emigrate to America, sometimes where Friends wished to oversee branches of business there or else due to cases of economic failure at home. It is possible that some emigration to England was slightly accentuated by improved transport and communication. In the case of Australia the greater number of quaker emigrants came from outside Dublin. Many came from well capitalised backgrounds. Indeed in cases of emigration to Australia a degree of capital would be implied from the outset to cover costs for the distance and difficulties of travel, and for the necessity of provision to tide the emigrants over until they would be settled in an often inhospitable climate. Between the years 1827 and 1860 there were only 11 examples of emigration from Dublin to Australia and nine of the individuals involved returned after a short time.

Little demographic change had occurred among the Dublin Quakers during the first four decades of the nineteenth Century. Poverty to a large degree had been eliminated amongst them. The decline in the number of insolvencies and disownments for that period was indicative of improved business practice.
### TABLE B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MARRIAGE</th>
<th>INSOLVENCY</th>
<th>RESIGNATIONS</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1801 - 10</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 - 60</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table based on Webb List of Disownments 1801 - 1860

A high proportion of the membership in Dublin was made up by merchants, middlemen and shopkeepers. Manufacturers were not so prominent as they had been in a previous century. Such funds as existed under the control of the Monthly Meeting were designed to assist the less well advantaged of the quaker community, such as widows and orphans, thus providing an elementary if not primitive social welfare service that left many members free for a wider philanthropy.

The 1840's showed Dublin with a quaker population circa 700 out of a total national quaker population of perhaps 3,066.
London at the same time was supposed to have a quaker population of 1,537 and the United Kingdom to have in the region of 15,000 members. The Society in Ireland had arrived at a state of near total integration of family structure. Marriage relations, disciplinary and doctrinal procedures, the implied access to capital, common social preoccupations were integrated inside a sectarian structure based on heredity and tradition. All these factors worked together to create a community inside Irish life, and a community that would never again be in the same position of power and influence.

A slight crack was however appearing. This was revealed in the big increase of the new category of 'resignation by dissent'. Resignations often followed on the decease of a dedicated quaker parent and several children can often be detected as having resigned together. In the wake of the famine and under the influence of evangelical doctrine the Society was to be poised for change.

Involvement in new industries and particularly in concerns related to transport and textiles created a need for more specialist skills and so for the emergence of a new professional class among the quakers. Often the younger son of a family would develop a new generation of entrepreneurial skill by learning how to handle a new and complicated technology in his father's business. Such work would prove very congenial to the practical and experimental bent of many quakers, who like their
brethren in England were very interested in scientific discovery and often involved in scientific institutions. Such institutions gave them a base where the ghosts of religious discrimination would not so easily be felt by them. Joshua Abell maintained a collection of mineralogical specimens. The Leckys also had a mineralogical interest; A. Harvey, of Waterford, became famous for his botanical interests and world wide travels.

The trend towards professionalism had been apparent from the beginning of the forties when a Dublin based school was set up for quakers in 1839 at Camden Street. This was established by a group of well capitalised and well concerned Friends, many of whom had been to school at Ballitore. The curriculum was designed to develop professional and linguistic skills that could be geared to a business career. The school was not successful and closed c. 1845. Its establishment was perhaps premature.

Talk of an emerging professional class should remind us that a degree of class consciousness existed inside the Society, between those in the higher ranks of merchants, families such as the Pims and those in the rank of small shopkeeper and capitalist. But perhaps the consciousness related to the differences between varieties of material success. Marriage patterns appear to have been highly localised in Monthly and Quarterly Meeting areas, a situation that was probably to change with the advent of improved transport. Mercantile alliances
between the highly capitalised appeared however to span wider geographical parameters. The Pim alliances reached as far as Cork and the big families of Munster. Dublin's patterns of alliance were perhaps wider than in most areas a factor due to its central location, its facilitating intermixture between different regions and the fact that many country Friends entered apprenticeships there, and stopped to set up business and to marry there.

Class differences among quakers and between quakers and the wider community might also have been accentuated by the physical removal of some from the older community associated with the liberties to the wider, new environs of Blackrock, Monkstown and Kingstown. The trend was not new but accelerated after the building of the Dublin and Kingstown Railway line. The attendance at the new Meeting House of Monkstown was made up largely by members of the Goodbody, Pim and Perry families. Not all quakers were as obviously affluent as the Pims and Perrys but there was effectively very little poverty amongst any of them.

Many of the wealthier had moved out of their traditional areas in the 'Liberties' and the area east from there out towards Monkstown on the route of the new railway line in which they had so largely invested. Such a move gave a physical emphasis to differences between rich and poor, employed and employer. To quote Alfred Webb writing at the beginning of the twentieth
century and reminiscing on the changes that had occurred around the 1840's:

'Our class have gained in many ways by suburban residence. The poor amongst whom we formerly lived, have lost. The children of our class lose in many respects. It was an advantage to live near the shop or workrooms in which the parent made his money and it was a pleasure to him to be near his family and children. We children had friendly relations with our work people whom we all knew by their christian name... Business was not then the remote thing to children of our class that it now is'.

By the sixties a whole new series of characteristics had developed in the Society of Friends. Such developments were not to be unique to Irish Quakers but occurred also in England. But it has to be borne in mind that the developments in Irish Quakerism occurred in a different social and political context. Whilst the overall membership of the Society in Ireland continued to decline it began to show significant points of regional growth. A better awareness of statistical questions among both Irish and English Friends had led to a renewed desire for consistency in record keeping. For the first time it becomes possible to establish adequate figures for the Irish Quaker population. The awareness of statistical questions undoubtedly played a part in stirring Friends to investigate the causes of decline in their Society. A dynamism became apparent which resulted in a new leniency on questions of marriage discipline and a more sensitive dealing with those who for one reason or another may have become insolvent. By 1867 there were 830 Quakers in Dublin out of a national total of 2,877.
There were in addition 722 'attenders' registered nationally. 'Attenders' were persons not in membership but who habitually attended the quaker meetings for worship. In Dublin there were 129 adults of such a class registered and 44 of their children. An accommodation with evangelical attitudes was to lead by the 1870's to a widespread accession of members, particularly in the North east corner of Ulster. Ulster, with its improving industrial and agricultural base would by the end of the nineteenth century for the first time contain the majority part of the quaker population. New commercial needs also were to produce a professional element into the Society. The process as already remarked had been going on for some time, certainly from the forties, but now an analysis of names assumed to be quaker in contemporary directories show a whole new generation earning their livings from such middle class occupations as solicitor, apothecary, land surveyor, insurance agent, actuary and secretary besides the occupancy of company directorships that appear to have been in effect hereditary.

It is against such a background of statistical and demographic change that this thesis will be developed. It is hoped to amplify the discussion in terms of different economic, political and social contexts and to suggest answers to some of the initial questions posed.
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LISTS OF BIRTHS IN DECCENIAL PERIODS COMPILLED FROM NATIONAL REGISTERS OF MONTHLY MEETINGS (1859) AND BROKEN DOWN INTO REGIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decennial Period</th>
<th>Dublin</th>
<th>Leinster (excluding Dublin)</th>
<th>Munster</th>
<th>Ulster</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1700</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>756</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dublin</td>
<td>Carlow</td>
<td>Edenderry</td>
<td>Moate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890-1900</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901-1910</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911-1920</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921-1930</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931-1940</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941-1950</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951-1960</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961-1970</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971-1980</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981-1990</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991-2000</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The table shows the number of births in each of the specified years and locations.
## Chapter I Appendix C.III

Births for Dublin Monthly Meeting compiled from national registers and arranged in decennial period. 1700-1870

| Date | A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | I | J | K | L | M | N | O | P | Q | R | S | T | U | V | W | X | Y | Totals |
| 1700 | 4 | 32 | 30 | 10 | 2 | 30 | 29 | 10 | 1 | 11 | 5 | 7 | 32 | 15 | 10 | 15 | 60 | 8 | 30 | 321 |
| 1800 | 7 | 30 | 22 | 5 | 11 | 2 | 8 | 12 | 5 | 7 | 7 | 8 | 23 | 7 | 20 | 21 | 4 | 31 | 238 |
| 1900 | 7 | 30 | 22 | 5 | 11 | 2 | 8 | 12 | 5 | 7 | 7 | 8 | 23 | 7 | 20 | 21 | 4 | 31 | 238 |

**Note:** Author has the material available for the totals, and also has in his possession all relevant statistical material extracted for use in compiling totals relevant to the monthly meetings.

Registers in possession of D.F.H.L.
### Table: Marriages for Dublin Monthly Meeting compiled from national registers and arranged in decennial period, 1700-1870

#### Total Noted as Marriages to Non-Members and Total Marriage of Members

| Date | A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | I | J | K | L | M | N | O | P | Q | R | S | T | U | V | W | X | YZ | Totals |
| 1700-09 | 7 | 15 | 18 | 9 | 19 | 13 | 18 | 12 | 5 | 16 | 19 | 5 | 1 | 9 | 13 | 28 | 8 | 2 | 16 | 2 | 57 | 239 |
| 1701-10 | 11 | 17 | 26 | 6 | 3 | 5 | 17 | 7 | 1 | 5 | 14 | 25 | 12 | 2 | 10 | 20 | 2 | 30 | 12 | 50 | 294 |
| 1702-11 | 13 | 17 | 25 | 6 | 1 | 5 | 17 | 7 | 1 | 5 | 14 | 25 | 12 | 2 | 10 | 20 | 2 | 30 | 12 | 50 | 294 |
| 1703-14 | 11 | 17 | 26 | 6 | 3 | 5 | 17 | 7 | 1 | 5 | 14 | 25 | 12 | 2 | 10 | 20 | 2 | 30 | 12 | 50 | 294 |
| 1704-15 | 13 | 17 | 25 | 6 | 1 | 5 | 17 | 7 | 1 | 5 | 14 | 25 | 12 | 2 | 10 | 20 | 2 | 30 | 12 | 50 | 294 |
| 1705-16 | 11 | 17 | 26 | 6 | 3 | 5 | 17 | 7 | 1 | 5 | 14 | 25 | 12 | 2 | 10 | 20 | 2 | 30 | 12 | 50 | 294 |
| 1706-17 | 13 | 17 | 25 | 6 | 1 | 5 | 17 | 7 | 1 | 5 | 14 | 25 | 12 | 2 | 10 | 20 | 2 | 30 | 12 | 50 | 294 |
| 1707-18 | 11 | 17 | 26 | 6 | 3 | 5 | 17 | 7 | 1 | 5 | 14 | 25 | 12 | 2 | 10 | 20 | 2 | 30 | 12 | 50 | 294 |
| 1708-19 | 13 | 17 | 25 | 6 | 1 | 5 | 17 | 7 | 1 | 5 | 14 | 25 | 12 | 2 | 10 | 20 | 2 | 30 | 12 | 50 | 294 |
| 1709-20 | 11 | 17 | 26 | 6 | 3 | 5 | 17 | 7 | 1 | 5 | 14 | 25 | 12 | 2 | 10 | 20 | 2 | 30 | 12 | 50 | 294 |

### Notes
- **Monthly Meeting**: Compiled from national registers and arranged in decennial period, 1700-1870.
- **Total Noted as Marriages to Non-Members**: The number of marriages noted as being to non-members.
- **Total Marriage of Members**: The total number of marriages involving members.

---

**CHARTER IV Appendix C iv**

Marriages for Dublin Monthly Meeting compiled from national registers and arranged in decennial period, 1700-1870.
### Total Noted as Burials of Non-Members and Total Burials of Members

| Date       | A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | I | J | K | L | M | N | O | P | Q | R | S | T | U | V | W | X | YZ | Totals |
| 1700       | 12| 21| 30| 16| 6 | 28| 15| 23| 1 | 6 | 2 | 11| 24| 11| 4 | 25| 18| 47| 13| 1 | 29| 19| 137| 343 |
| 10         | 8 | 39| 35| 19| 6 | 25| 19| 27| 18| 6 | 14| 35| 15| 6 | 14| 24| 56| 20| 1 | 2 | 32| 104| 419 |
| 20         | 10| 58| 33| 23| 12| 32| 22| 5 | 20| 3 | 13| 35| 18| 10 | | 29| 60| 18| 1 | 1 | 52| 62 | 475 |
| 30         | 6 | 63| 26| 8 | 4 | 17| 25| 22| 1 | 12| 9 | 4 | 20| 8 | - 10| 27| 50| 10| 2 | 4 | 37| 3 | 369 |
| 40         | 1 | 5 | - | 8 | 6 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 2 | 2 | - 6 | 2 | 13| 2 | - 5 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 50         | 5 | 25| 11| 6 | - | 7 | 22| 4 | 1 | 13| 2 | 2 | 7 | 2 | 1 | 8 | 1 | 15| 31| 1 | 2 | 1 | - 5 | 191 | DEATHS |
| 60         | 12| 16| 11| 12| 5 | 10| 15| - | 11| - 3 | 6 | 4 | - | 4 | 14| 15| 7 | 2 | - 7 | | | | | | | | | |
| 70         | 3 | 21| 15| 8 | 2 | 8 | 15| 6 | - | 10| - 5 | 15| 8 | - | 4 | 11| 12| 7 | - 19 | | | | | | | | | |
| 80         | 10| 45| 16| 13| 3 | 21| 6| 20| 13| - 16| 7 | 3 | 26| 6 | - 15| 20| 24| 16| 1 | 25 | | | | | | | | | |
| 90         | 5 | 51| 20| 18| 8 | 19| 7| 19| 25| 1 | 5 | 6 | 2 | 10| 19| 2 | 15| 25| 24| 24 | | | | | | | | | |
| 1000       | 4 | 32| 20| 10 | 11| 9 | 9 | 17| 3 | 11| 8 | 3 | 17| 6 | 4 | 18| 15| 15| 31| 1 | 1 | 59 | 10 | 58 | 209 |
| 1100       | 10| 5 | 47| 18| 4 | 7 | 12| 9 | 10| 15| 3 | 1 | 14| 7 | - 20| 16| 29| 23| 1 | 30 | | | | | | | | | |
| 1200       | 20| 6 | 29| 22| 12| 4 | 11| 19| 19| 7 | 4 | 3 | 22| 2 | 3 | 25| 16| 31| 17 | | | | | | | | | |
| 1300       | 30| 10| 41| 16| 10 | 8 | 17| 15| 16| 10| 12| 3 | 21| 5 | 2 | 24| 25| 16| 18 | 1 | 29 | 1 | 10 | 126 | 294 |
| 1400       | 40| 17| 30| 11| 3 | 4 | 8 | 13| 13| 10 | - 4 | 10| - 2 | 26 | | 7 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 25 | | | | | | | | | |
| 1500       | 50| 2 | 20| 6 | 8 | 7 | 10| 18| 8 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 23 | 5 | 1 | 21| 7 | 5 | 14 | 20 | | | | | | | | | |
| 1600       | 60| 2 | 1 | - | 1 | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

**Notes:**
- The table includes monthly meeting data for Dublin Monthly Meeting.
- Data compiled from national registers and arranged in decennial period, 1700-1870.
- The totals noted as burials of non-members and total burials of members.

**Editions:**
- Appendix C, page v
Proportions of the national charge by each meeting in Leinster. Review from Quarterly Meeting Minutes.

(a)  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Moate</th>
<th>Mountmellick</th>
<th>Edenderry</th>
<th>Carlow</th>
<th>Wexford</th>
<th>Wicklow</th>
<th>Dublin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29.V.1721</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>8.75%</td>
<td>3.75%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.I.1748</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15.83%</td>
<td>9.16%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.VI.1763</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15.83%</td>
<td>9.16%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.V.1777</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15.83%</td>
<td>9.16%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.VI.1796</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>16.25%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15.83%</td>
<td>9.16%</td>
<td>3.75%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) Numbers of Meetings in Different Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Ulster</th>
<th>Leinster</th>
<th>Munster</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1680</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1701</td>
<td>18 (18) Ulster</td>
<td>24 (10) Leinster</td>
<td>11 Munster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1750</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1794</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1867</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

John Douglas

Maps of Friends Meetings in Ireland 1794 (D.F.H.L.)
Printed Minutes of the Yearly Meeting 1867

(c) Membership of Dublin Monthly Meeting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Membership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1700 - 1720</td>
<td>30 - c. 1000 - 500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1778</td>
<td>membership but 250 adults (males)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

John Whitelaw

Maps of Friends Meetings in Ireland 1794 (D.F.H.L.)
Printed Minutes of the Yearly Meeting 1867

Abell

YM min 1867 830 members
CHAPTER I  Appendix D (contd.)

i An estimated figure, see text
ii 1778 membership list
iii Warburton
iv Membership lists
v Dublin Literary Journal
vi Printed Minutes of the Yearly Meeting 1867
In the preceding chapter we have analysed the doctrinal roots of the quaker 'Discipline' and seen how business meetings and meetings for worship were set up throughout the country. The concern of this chapter is chiefly to look at the development of that Discipline, whilst keeping in mind the political and commercial background and the internal events that elicited its application. The background will be further developed and particularised in ensuing chapters where it will be illustrated by the involvement of quakers in specific business schemes and companies. Central to this chapter will be a consideration of insolvencies, their treatment in disciplinary terms and the value of related monthly meeting reports for the understanding of contemporary business. Joint stock companies, chambers of commerce and the 'day to day' affairs of a monthly meeting figure in the account. Some attention will be given to changes in the structure of membership and in doctrine.

The word 'anxiety' may be taken to be a keynote to numerous aspects of this account. It is intended to show how a whole series of positive and negative responses to the demands of
Irish society at large were qualified by a sense of anxiety. This anxiety might account for the effectiveness of Quakers in the commercial areas in which they chose to operate. It might also explain their failure to constructively engage as a body in the resolution of their Irish identity. Their responses were developed in the internal polity of the society, in questions of education, oversight of members etc. and in the repetitive advice to avoid overt concern in 'politics'.

We must regard the Society in Ireland as a colonial phenomenon. But for that very reason must be wary of accepting that the organisational patterns of Irish Quakerism are identical with those of the English Quakers. They might represent identical responses to different problems. We might also assume that different causes produced similar results. Sometimes the interventions of Quakers from London Yearly Meeting inhibited the development of responses that Irish Quakers were attempting to make in their own world. From the first the Quakers who came to Ireland from England and Scotland were very conscious in a heightened manner of their Protestant heritage. Because they could not fully share in some aspects of the faith of other Protestants, it was important for them to present in very public terms their loyalty to the Protestant interest. Their peaceable views and their qualified allegiance to the state earned them persecution that marked them off from the other Protestants, as did their refusal to conceal the dissent. But neither could they totally identify with the
native and disposessed population, from whom they were distinguished by language, custom and ancestry. At the back of their minds all the time must surely have been the thought that has often been at the back of the minds of colonists that they might be disposessed themselves and lose all.

On the other hand quakers found a reconciling role for themselves and established such personal links with the authorities, through their fearless integrity that they were resorted to by offended parties to sue on their behalf for impartial justice. Such offended parties might be Roman Catholic or Protestant. The quakers were sometimes accused of being Jacobite in their sympathies, partially on account of the well known friendship and influence of William Penn with King James II.

Quakers were under great political pressure to take up positions as aldermen under the corporation system of James II. George Fox sent a special letter of advice on the issue. Specific recommendations to those members affected also from the Irish Half Yearly Meeting. Until then it had been very difficult for quakers to join the guilds. This was chiefly on account of their conscientious refusal to take judicial oaths, although Samuel Claridge a quaker merchant had been admitted to the Merchant's
Their colonial heritage also began to be apparent in their scrupulosity in the application of the 'Discipline'. They took a more extreme developed view of its application and implications than did the English Friends. A self-analytical approach was forced on them regarding their own activity and discipline. This can be regarded as a variety of territorialism. They were forced to define themselves and their role against a population partially displaced and also against fellow protestants whose values they partially accepted but whose church structures they denied. The minute attention of Irish Friends to the implications of the Discipline have been remarked on by the nineteenth century writer, Robert Barclay, a descendent of the Scots quaker apologist Robert Barclay. He purported to see in the more 'philosophical' method of Irish quakers the working of a 'celtic mind'. That seems unlikely in view of the recent cultural and racial background of those quakers who had settled in Ireland, but if we see the disciplinary obsessions as a natural and induced reflection of the Irish environment to which they endeavoured to accommodate themselves there might be some validity in such an argument.

The attention to discipline appeared particularly in the establishment of special meetings for mutual review by quaker tradesmen of all kinds, whether as weavers, merchants, shoe
makers, shipwrights or woodworkers. The aim of these intimate and deep reviews was to keep members sensitive to the in-searchings of the divine light in order to see in what ways their business production and behaviour reflected its moral demands made on them. This led Quakers to aim at producing a consistent quality in their goods and to avoid pandering to any evanescent fashions. The purpose was not to increase their business. Indeed some of their 'religious' practice led to their business being curtailed. They were advised to help each other. But when people recognised that Quakers gave good value at a single price not subject to bargaining it certainly encouraged people to deal with them.

While Quakers basically aimed at keeping clear from party politics they naturally had a profound interest in the effect of political decisions on them and in 1698 they had set up a Parliamentary Committee. The function of this was to keep a watching brief on all political developments in the Dublin parliament and to channel all representations through it when not otherwise directed. The members of the Committee would try and find ways of getting legislation ameliorated in cases where it would appear to affect the interests of Friends as a religious body. The Dublin Men's Meeting took this committee as their special concern and annually appointed members to it when required by the National Meeting.
By 1699 those in a role of leadership in the Society had become aware of a slipping away from the primitive standards of behaviour practised and enjoined by the first quakers. This concern issued in the sending of epistles and advice from the Half Yearly Meeting to the subordinate meetings. There had been an increase in wealth, and an observable conformity to the 'world' among the younger generation.\(^2\) There was also a realization current that perhaps many of the young could not clearly understand the rationale behind the Society's testimonies. Insolvencies were becoming more common and the superior meetings were concerned to advise friends against overtrading,\(^3\) as also to advise parents when apprenticing their children not to encourage them to have views beyond their station by training them in trades they would not have the capital to support themselves in.\(^4\)

The concern about an education in which the values of the society would be predominant plus a disciplinary structure that developed negative and inward looking values and sought to avoid contaminating influence from the world led to a more introverted society. A 'closed' men's meeting had been set up in which\(^5\) those recognised as being solid and thoughtful in their approach to life would be encouraged to be active. A large part of the membership was excluded from these. At any time it was never a big group\(^6\) and may also be suspected as comprising the richer and better educated members of the society, who were doubly removed from their more humble brethren in the business of the
church. Besides, marriage procedures led to the exclusion of such friends as married before a priest or who married members of other persuasions. Marriage and partnership procedures tended to safeguard capital leading to the maintenance and increase of wealth in families thus allied. Exclusion from wider areas of social service encouraged quakers to concentrate on business.

The dawn of a limited degree of Tolerance was signalled in the Toleration Act of 1719, which allowed Friends the privilege of meeting for worship with the consent of the law subject to meeting houses being registered. It also permitted the use of affirmation in place of the oath in certain defined non-criminal instances. This removed a prime difficulty in the way of Quaker trapers. But as Wight and Rutty put it:

"It is observable, that in this time of outward peace and freedom from sufferings of diverse kinds, to which Friends had formerly been exposed, cause was given for complaints at the third month National Meeting, 1720, of the breach of minutes, through the prevalence of a loose, libertine spirit among many of our youth, and a careless, sleepy, sloathful spirit, with respect to religious duties among some more aged; and particularly about this time Friends were greatly afflicted on an observation of the failings of some, in relation to their trading and dealing beyond the bounds of truth and moderation, to the invading the properties of others and obstruction of the progress of truth."  

Such concern led to the institution of a Provincial Visit to the monthly meetings in Leinster and Ulster and the issue of a paper of advice originally written by Ambrose Rigge. The year 1720
had marked the insolvency of Amos Strettell partially as a result of the South Sea Bubble, and the Yearly Meeting was so understanding of his situation that they were willing to loan him the sum of £1,000. Some of his problems related not so much to lack of means to discharge his debts as to inability to come on ready sources of cash.\textsuperscript{21}

Epistles and advices were frequently issued throughout the eighteenth century concerning insolvencies, slackness, failures to attend meeting, conformity to the world etc. Advices on insolvency were issued in 1728 and 1732.\textsuperscript{22} Evidences of decline from perceived primitive and high standards of religious practice existed but the general populace felt able to attend Friend's meetings and a number of native Irish names begin to occur in the minutes. To quote Wight and Rutty in relation to this openness to the viewpoint of Friends in 1736:

"It was observable this year, as well as for some years past, in time of outward peace and tranquility that many of other societies frequently resorted to Friend's meetings, whose understandings were opened and their prejudices removed with regard to Friend's principles."\textsuperscript{23}

However the very smallest occurrence or sign of political disturbance was sufficient to alarm friends and make them draw in their horns. One such incident occurred in 1739 when a meeting house at Timahoe was burned because of ill-considered actions of some apprenticeboys, Friends were blamed by local Roman catholics.\textsuperscript{24} There were signs that the trouble would
spread and Friends with the aid of members of their parliamentary committee made an approach to the Lord Lieutenant for protection which was willingly supplied. An approach for protection implying the use of the military would have been unthinkable by a later generation of Quakers but it has to be understood that the Peace Testimony had yet to develop further. Such an appeal to authority for protection was similar to an application in the present day for the use of the police force. The sympathies of Quakers were very squarely with the Protestant interest and could be seen as a response of gratefulness for the degree of tolerance they had now achieved. It was important for them to show that they deserved the latitude they had been given in 1744. They issued a very explicit address of congratulation and loyalty to King George II. The address was occasioned by the defeat of the Jacobite rising in Scotland in 1745. It was signed by 55 members of Dublin Men’s meeting in which the names of Robert Jaffray, Joshua Clubborn and John Pim occur. In view of the ensuing portions of this chapter they are particularly worthy of note.

1760 – 1779

The lack of experienced Friends to conduct the affairs of the church in an inspired way, in addition to the general observed slackness in the behaviour of many led to the decision to be made in 1760 not to have exclusive Men’s meetings any longer but to make the business of the society equally open to all adult
male members who were in good standing. The women friends of course had a parallel form of organisation. Such a decision did not have the desired effect of encouraging bigger attendances at business meetings or of encouraging a wider participation by those who did attend, but one net effect was to expedite a new stage in the exclusiveness of the Society which would determine membership not by criteria of commitment but by criteria based on heredity and tradition.

Some Friends played a part in the Guild structure of Dublin. Since they were excluded from, and ostensibly not interested in overt expressions of political opinion apart from their generalised loyalty to the Protestant interest their involvement with the Guilds gave them a certain status. A Guild list for 1750 shows Quakers involved in three chief areas of trade organisation, with 16 merchants, 19 tallow chandlers and 18 weavers. The names of those mentioned in that connection happened also to be those whose names appear most frequently in the business of the Monthly Meetings.

By the 1760's the guild structures were not being found as totally efficient, particularly by some of the bigger and better capitalised merchants. The large-scale wholesaling merchant began to find the restrictions exerted by the guilds as somewhat irksome and the frequent round of social activity associated with them as somewhat redundant. Much of the energy of guilds went on what appeared personal and politically motivated
struggles related to the Corporation and the structure of power and privilege operated by the 'Undertakers'. It was natural enough for those merchants such as quakers who had the confidence derived from wealth and success and the education and constant experience of handling the affairs of their own society in a democratic manner to conceive of setting up new independent commercial structures to forward and protect their trade interests. The Committee of Merchants was set up in 1761. Its relation with the Guild of Merchants was not simply one of concerted opposition. The relation was more subtle than that. Membership of one did not exclude membership in the other. Its operations were strictly pragmatic on religious issues. A special place for Roman Catholics was created on the basis that they could all work together on commercial issues that affected them all equally. Not all quakers seem to have been members of the Committee of Merchants judging by the occurrence of names on its governing council. Of 30 quakers listed as members of the Merchants Guild in 1765 most of them had been registered, in the period 1750 to 1762. Of these 19 had registered by 'service', 3 by birth, 4 by fine and 4 by 'Grace Especial', John Pim, (Joshua) occurred in the last category. Alexander and Robert Jaffray occurred in the category of 'Service' having been admitted in 1761 and 1726 respectively. The names of those friends are significant in view of their activity in the business of the Committee of Merchants, the surviving minutes of which begin in 1767. Significance in this instance is determined by the frequency with which their names occur.
The year 1767 was the year in which the new Lord Lieutenant Viscount Townsend came over and who was eventually to break the power of the 'undertakers' who handled Irish affairs. Among addresses that he received was one from the Committee of Merchants, which with suitable compliments to him on his military prowess and the nobility of his ancestry expressed their loyalty and their trust that they could approach him on commercial issues. The Address was drawn up and presented by a committee of thirteen on which both Alexander and Robert Jaffray (probably junior) were included. A similar address was drawn up by the National Meeting operating through the offices of Dublin Friends among whom were Amos Strettell (junior) and Robert Jaffray, Joseph Willcocks and Joseph Pike. This Address was well received. The Lord Lieutenant stated in his reply that he would be failing in his duty if he did "... not take every opportunity", of advancing their welfare," I shall take it as a favour to secure your addresses and with pleasure shall do you a service at any time".34

The time was favourable to merchants. It was possible for the Lord Lieutenant to back them. They shared common areas of agreement in opposition to the aristocratic interest.35 The Corporation acted somewhat ambiguously and whilst on occasions sometimes using its energies to advance commercially useful objects sometimes also opposed those originated by the committee. A degree of tension arose over the plans to build a new Royal Exchange.36 A compromise was worked out whereby the
two organisations would have a joint share in the election of its trustees. Among the fifteen from the Committee were Edward Strettell, Robert and Alexander Jaffray. Edward Strettell was also the treasurer for the Committee and for the lottery. In view of the expressed opposition of quakers to lotteries his position is hard to understand.

Another area in which quakers expressed opposition was in relation to early forms of ‘combination’. Those in control of the affairs of the Society tended to think in terms of employers, an assumption visible in frequent advices to friends to treat their servants and employees well. In a case in third month 1770, Jacob Fuller, a quaker linen weaver was adversely affected by a combination that deprived him of raw materials. The Dublin Monthly Meeting gave him financial assistance to buy yarn.

A more serious case affecting the commercial interests of a Friend occurred in 1773. John Pim (Joshua) a successful quaker merchant and dealer in exports of bay yarn applied to the Committee of Merchants (in which he was active). They convened a public meeting to consider his case. They took 'into consideration the violent outrage committed on the fifth instant by an infatuated mob on a cargo of worsted on board the Britannia sloop in this harbour'. The cargo and the sloop were Pim's. The Lord Mayor chaired the public meeting. The agitation by the mob corresponded with a bad time for trade. It
was popularly believed that such exports deprived the native manufacturer and led to the decline of Irish industry. Besides publishing the arguments of the merchants on this issue the Committee made a sum of money available to encourage detection of those who had perpetrated the outrage.\textsuperscript{a1}

The degree to which many of these young merchants were now mixing with those of other persuasions to deal with problems that confronted them all in a similar way made some at least of the Society's testimonies appear either redundant or exceptionally irksome. They encouraged a sectarian distinction between quakers and other protestants and militated against a total identification with them. The Testimony against tithes was one of the chief areas of difficulty. Faithfulness to this testimony of all others was often the test of loyalty to the society. It was the younger merchants who were beginning to pay tithes, and not alone to pay them but to actively justify this. The process had abeen regularly reported since the sixties.\textsuperscript{a2}

By 1771 among those noted as paying ecclesiastical demands were Amos Strettell Junior, Samuel Gamble, Ephraim Bewley, Thomas Turner, Alexander Jaffray, Joshua Pim, Jonathan Chapman and James Martin.\textsuperscript{a3} By 1774 the number had increased still further but no significant disciplinary action had taken place except that Strettell and Bewley had been debarred from the meetings for discipline and the affairs of the church.\textsuperscript{a4} In the case of Strettell, who had now been joined by his brother Edward, they were also, in 1760, 'arraigned' for wearing mourning clothes on
the death of the King. They both declared they were no longer Friends, 20.ix.1774. In some cases it seems that mixed marriages were involved in which the wives paid the demands.

Soon after, Alexander Jaffray was debarred from the Meetings for Discipline. The Dublin Monthly Meeting decided,

'... and with respect to their opinion and advice to proceed to publish a testimony of disunity against those who continue in the practice of paying tithes towards the support of an hierling ministry... Agreeable to the directions of the Yearly Meeting of London of 1706 and that of this nation in 1750 this meeting or the major part of it do not disapprove of their judgement. But as some different sentiments appeared upon this head, in brotherly condescension one towards another and in tenderness to those particular persons, and their families, we conclude to forbear such procedure for a season, as we have already proceeded so far by record, as to debar them the privilege of sitting in meetings for discipline or collecting with friends for the necessary charges of the society'

A general pastoral visit by London Meeting Friends however, succeeded in bringing the issue to a new head. Alexander Jaffray refused a conference with them and resigned in eleventh Month 1777. The discipline was tightening up yet further and among others, in 1779, Joshua Pim was further dealt with. As far as the matter was clearly dropped since he remained a member in good standing.

Looking at these cases one cannot fail to detect the unwillingness to disown these powerful well connected and well capitalised friends. Such an unwillingness might have derived from the development of tolerance in their attitudes generally. In the dealing with Jaffray it was an unusual feature that an
admission of 'different sentiments' was made in a business meeting which aimed at establishing a concensus. Such meetings sought to be guided by a recognition of the presence of the Holy Spirit in the making of a decision.

1779 - 1798

The degree to which friends were identifying with the country in which they lived and therefore seeing themselves as Irishmen is revealed in the anxiety that was revealed on the formation of the Volunteers. The National Meeting of Eleventh Month 1779 issued a minute of advice to be brought to the attention of the young in particular, in each monthly meeting. The Minute of Advice, after a lengthy doctrinal introduction states, 'we understand that in most quarters of this nation many of the inhabitants are associating in armed companies (as they allege) for internal defense, and that in some parts endeavours have been used to draw in Friends as far as to contribute to the 'expense of clothing them'. The amount of concern expressed on this issue shows how real a danger there was to the quaker youth. And indeed, in spite of the care lavished, young friends were disowned for joining the Volunteers in Wexford, Carlow and Moate. If the peace testimony of Friends restrained them from being involved in military affairs, it seems reasonable to suppose that their sympathies would have been with any moves to put the trade of Ireland on a better commercial footing.
Practical patriotism was shown by quakers in attempting to improve the conditions of trade. This had already been shown through quaker participation in Guilds and in the Committee of Merchants. In 1783 a new organisation was set up on the basis of the old Committee but on the same liberal, pragmatic principles, with much input from individual members of the other group. This new organisation was the Dublin Chamber of Commerce. The theoretical basis for it was drafted by Joshua Pim the quaker and John Patrick and resulting from a meeting held on the Tenth of February. Some of its aims are outlined in a paper cited in Cullen's account of the establishment of the Chamber.

"The present important situation of this country, its lately renewed constitution, its fond hopes of rising commerce and consequently increasing opulence, the variety of commercial regulations necessarily incident to this change of circumstance and particularly requisite from the late revolution in the political system; every consideration appearing to demand a general union among traders and a constant unwearied attention to their common interests; from a view whereof to promote these laudable objects in this particular district and to hold forth an example for imitation and cooperation to the rest of the kingdom."  

Joshua Pim's was the only name of a quaker to appear on the list of 21 members elected to be the Council of the Chamber. But Alexander Jaffray, and Amos Strettel were also elected. They had both been active in the older committee. The names of William Alexander and Edward Forbes suggest some quaker connection. The two people of those names were also elected. The first subscription list to the Chamber includes 219 names.
The total number of subscribers to the Chamber in 1783 was 293. Among the 219 names 10 can be specifically identified as referring to Quakers or those of Quaker origin.

To a large degree the work of the Dublin Chamber continued that of the original Committee of Merchants. Joshua Pim acted as treasurer for the period of its existence and acted very much in the role of an information officer, obtaining copies of Acts of Parliament from London,\textsuperscript{60} obtaining the loan of the minute books for the Cork Chamber from a fellow Quaker in Cork.\textsuperscript{61} A continuing matter of concern for the chamber was what they regarded as the 'unequal and unjust terms of which Great Britain and Ireland at present trade'.\textsuperscript{62} But any overtly radical expression of sentiment was checked by the assurance that '... they feel as well as profess for the sister kingdom the most cordial affection and fully acknowledge this country to be so connected with her that they must stand or fall together.'\textsuperscript{63}

Cullen describes how the Chamber was gradually becoming politicised and suggests that this led to the withdrawal of a portion of the merchant body. Travers Hartley is specifically associated by him with this movement.\textsuperscript{64} The Chamber in 1785 was chiefly concerned about the '20 commercial resolutions' passed by the British House of Commons and on the 6th of August in that year agreed to a petition of protest which was to be sent to the Irish Parliament. An interesting light on the dissension in the Chamber is thrown by consideration of a remark by Joshua Pim.
when he was interviewed before a parliamentary committee in 1821. He claimed to have originated Pitt's Commercial Resolutions! If that was the case it would put his action at a very different remove from those whose aims were to achieve total political independence.

1798 - 1820

It had become the practice to introduce a younger element into the offices of the church to train them to take over from the older members. The net effect of this was eventually to encourage a review of some of the conservative patterns of behaviour and practice in the society. It had occurred particularly in relation to the position of women to encourage them to take a more active share in the conduct of business meetings related to the needs of their own sex, but without compromising the ultimate authority of the men on matters such as the admission to and the exclusion from membership. It was also issuing in a wish for new women to hold meetings for discipline together - not a common practice among any friends in any place at any time. The Society itself appeared to be more open to Irish society, instead of regarding possible contacts as potential breaches of the 'hedge of Discipline'. Native Irish names occur more frequently. The openness may be detected also in the wish to provide books for those interested to get information about the beliefs of the Society and the holding of public meetings often attended by priests and ministers of
various persuasions. Views which might be characterised as 'Republican' and Deist were at large. Even among the members of the Society a wish existed for a more egalitarian viewpoint, the effect of which would if promoted devalue the authority of elders and overseers. This emerged in conjunction with a more rationalist and selective view of the scriptures. It was observed by one authority that the Quakers of the North of Ireland were 'all' Republicans but that that situation did not also obtain in Dublin. It was also observed by the same authority that such Quakers were not considered as any threat on account of their peaceable opinions.

Oddly enough moves inside the Society reflected in an uncanny way the moves that had led to an assertion of Irish parliamentary independence. Although the Half-yearly Meeting looked over its shoulder to London Yearly Meeting and felt obliged to constantly reaffirm their historical and doctrinal links, the very affirmation betrayed a sense of unease about the relationship. In 1797 it was decided to discontinue the winter half yearly meeting and the remaining meeting was to be denominated The Yearly Meeting of Friends. The decision was associated with a discussion on a Quaker procedural point,

'The manner in which this meeting stands connected with the Yearly Meeting in London coming under consideration and there appearing to us, some inconsistency therein, it is concluded to annex to our answers to the Queries, the following proposition of the Yearly Meeting, viz. "We
propose to the Yearly Meeting for its deliberation and judgement, whether it is consistent for us to continue to send representatives thereto and answers to its queries, while we did not consider ourselves bound by any minutes therein unless adopted by this meeting". However the point was not to be pursued for much longer.

Doctrinal dissent emerged over an answer from Carlow to the query concerned with the Holy Scriptures. The answer had deliberately omitted the word 'Holy', implying doctrinal dissent as well as being a disuse of established custom. The matter might have been amicably resolved but two visiting American Ministers were determined that the Yearly Meeting should nip this apparent disagreement in the bud. The situation was also exacerbated by the abrasive views of David Sands, one of the American visitors. His ultra-scriptural viewpoint led him to a deliberate disregard of Quaker teaching on peace and the disuse of judicial oaths. In the Ireland of 1798 such viewpoints were not helpful to a Society which could with good cause claim that its very preservation as a Society had derived from its loyalty to the Christian view of peace.

The violence and bloodshed of 1798, the sectarian implications of the Rising served to reinforce the wish of Quakers to remain a 'peculiar people' and stand back from the political turmoil of the world. Their shock at an internal doctrinal dissent that seemed to threaten their united stand at
such a time led to a purge of dissident elements. This affected in particular the North of Ireland in the Province of Ulster. But a minor series of sessions occurred also in Dublin, again a situation that was exacerbated by the interference of Americans.\textsuperscript{77}

Paradoxically the achievement of a formally separate Irish Yearly Meeting was achieved at the moment that political unity with Great Britain had been achieved. The centre of political power was from then on to shift to London. The Irish Friends Parliamentary Committee had been laid down in 1798.\textsuperscript{78} Whilst Irish Friends would still have access to Irish Members of Parliament and, if occasion warranted, to the Lord Lieutenant, they would now depend on their own correspondents and on the Meeting for Sufferings in London if they wished to advocate any particular viewpoint in relation to their own religious society. Hence in many cases they acquiesced in whatever the English Friends might originate.\textsuperscript{79}

Apart from attempts to curb doctrinal dissent the Friends were also tightening up on internal discipline and administration. The holding of but one annual meeting made it all the more important to have some variety of standing committee to handle its affairs in between times. Such a committee of 20 members had already been in 1798. But the Yearly Meeting's Committee was set up with a well defined series of functions in 1805.\textsuperscript{81} And since it was easiest for Dublin
Friends to get together, much of its work devolved on them. The year 1811 saw the issuing of the first printed Book of Minutes and Advices which had been prepared by members of the same committee and also contained extensive explanation of quaker procedures and practice.\[^{62}\]

The decaying condition of the Meath Street meeting house and the awareness that many of the wealthier quakers were beginning to move out of the Liberties stimulated the Dublin Monthly Meeting to find ways to extend the Sycamore Alley premises to serve their needs. This was achieved in two stages. Firstly a committee was set up in 1806\[^{63}\] to handle a fund arising from the sale of Stephen's Green burying ground to the College of Surgeons for 4,000 guineas. The sale had occurred in 1805.\[^{64}\ \text{65}\]

The period of the Napoleonic wars made for high prices and prosperity in the country.\[^{66}\] The corn trade was prospering\[^{67}\] and saw the emergence of specialist 'factors', and in 1815 the needs of dealers in corn obtained organisational expression in the establishment of the Corn Exchange Buildings Company with a capital stock of £15,000.\[^{68}\] This was probably suggested by the highly successful Commercial Buildings Company established in the previous century. Among its 70 subscribers to the £50 shares were the quakers, William English, Joshua Fayle, Richard and James Pim, William Robinson Senior and Junior, John and Isaac Todhunter, and Thomas Harvey. The Company was
incorporated by Royal charter. An increased need for marine insurance was probably indicated by the setting up of the Marine Insurance Company by a Deed of Settlement dated 29.1.1811 with a capital stock of £10,000 in 200 shares of £500. Edward Clibborn and Thomas Pim were among its 32 initial shareholders.

Two other forms of investment resorted to occasionally at this time were to join up a business partnership or in an Anonymous Partnership, a form of organisation facilitated by Irish law and providing a degree of legal protection for those involved, being limited by specifications of time and capital. An example of the first might be mentioned. Jonathan and Thomas Pim together with their brother Joseph Robinson Pim set up a partnership with William Robinson of Inns Quay (probably a relative) in 1.7.1814. The Pims advanced £1,000 and Robinson advanced another £1,000 to the 'capital stock'. Robinson wished to embark in the 'woolen drapery business'. An example of the second anonymous partnership was set up in 30.9.1814 by Samuel Bewley and eight others. All were linen drapers or involved in the handling of textile related products. A capital of £1,200 was involved. The managing partner was to be John North who had six shares. The purpose of the partnership was to manufacture salt which had a distinct use in relation to the processing of linen.
The somewhat touchy independence of Irish Friends as regards their relation with English Friends is revealed in an event in 1819 when Dublin Friends were requested by Yearly Meeting's Committee to draw up a petition to the Legislature on the subject of the Death Penalty. This was duly drawn up by a committee of the Friends, Robert Fayle, Samuel Bewley, William Harding, Johathan Pim, John Todhunter and Thomas Fayle. The London correspondent was requested to forward this. The Meeting for Sufferings would not handle it on the grounds that they themselves had forwarded a petition already and '...were of the sense that it was not expedient for a part of the body to petition after one had been presented by a delegated body on behalf of the whole.' Dublin Friends did not like that at all and replied in a stiff manner, 'After considering the circumstances of the case although we do not unite in the sentiments expressed in said letter of its being inexpedient, nor do we see any injury likely to have arisen from the presentation of said petition; but on the contrary that it might rather have a tendency to strengthen their application, and that we feel regret that it was stopped in its progress: yet, from motives of brotherly condescension we feel not disposed to require its now going forward.'

All the time there was a sense of unease lest anything might be said or done that would upset the united front of the society, or indicate doctrinal dissent. A letter from Mary Leadbeater to Richard D. Webb dated Ballitore, 22nd February
1821 gives a sense of this. Webb had been educated at Ballitore school and had recently entered an apprenticeship with a Dublin Printer. The school had been at the centre of the doctrinal dissent at the beginning of the 19th century and had come to be closed by the withdrawal of pupils. The letter betrays an anxiety in case the school might ever be closed again for a similar reason:

My Dear Richard, it has come to me....that thou hast been so unguarded as to speak lightly of Barclay's Apology: a book written by a very wise and a very good man at a time when our society was misrepresented, misunderstood and reviled and which was calculated to explain their principles and motives to the public. I have never read much of the book yet from the character I hear of it from those who have and who have more solid understandings and clearer judgements than myself I hold it in high estimation, as perhaps thou wilt at a future day.'

But why would thou speak so inconsiderately - why not keep silence or own thou had not read the book? Young as thou art, candid and open hearted, I am far from wanting to inculcate disguise but I would have thee be prudent and have the appearance as thou hast the reality of modesty'.

'We are so partial to one another in Ballitore and understand each other so well that it is likely we make too much allowance for sentiment which we know flows from the guileless simplicity of hearts which feeling love, discard fear'....

Fears also constantly surfaced at the least consideration that political interest might taint their behaviour in the eyes of the world. Frequent advices reinforced the belief of dangers for their community if individual members became involved in politics. On one occasion in 1824 Daniel O'Connell, who was frequently to be involved with quakers in philanthropic and business schemes happened to refer to younger quakers as being
'orange'. He referred to a 'prominent family' of quakers, making references to the London Hibernian Society and Kildare Place, and distinguished between their behaviour and that of the older quakers. The Freeman's Journal, in which this was reported, reported again one week later that a delegation of quakers had visited him to disclaim any political connections whatsoever.\textsuperscript{99}

The Irish quaker concern for the 'Discipline' had tightened up considerably on questions relating to insolvencies which were occurring with greater frequency and involving larger capital losses. It is observable that their had always been a high degree of stability in quaker businesses. Families would cling with remarkable tenacity to a trade or group of trades over many generations. We might think of the Barrington family with its long association with the tallow and chandlery trades.\textsuperscript{lo} but from the beginning of the nineteenth century on, many quakers felt encouraged to enter the field of manufacturing. Whilst the fixed capital investment in such areas was still not excessive\textsuperscript{lo} it did mean that it was harder to arrange quick transfers into new areas in the event of difficulties. Money would be tied up in stock and credit and subject to rapid fluctuations in markets where goods could suddenly be 'dumped' from Britain.

A review of what appears to be the somewhat stricter application of the quaker rules regarding insolvencies and
resulting from the generally more efficient administrative procedures of the nineteenth century might here be of particular interest. Detailed information regarding insolvencies in the minute books of Dublin Monthly Meeting had been somewhat sparse in the eighteenth century although occasionally, documentation is available to supplement such accounts. Insolvents had been required as part of the Discipline to make their books available to appointed visitors from the Men's Meeting. With the coming of the nineteenth century there was an increasing desire on the part of Friends to record a specific outline of details relating to insolvencies of the members. This would help the Monthly Meeting to decide how to deal with each case in a systematic manner. There was besides a change of attitude which is detectable. In the eighteenth century one feels there was a bigger determination to help the 'malfactor' if he would express a willingness to co-operate with his creditors and make every attempt to help Friends in the resolution of his case. The records of the nineteenth century come across in a highly legalistic and judgemental manner. We may assume that individual Friends tried to help the insolvent member to get back on his feet and that sometimes preventative measures might be employed if it appeared likely that a Friend was in danger of over-extending his trade. Not every insolvency ended in disownment. Mitigating circumstances might be recognised, but in all cases without exception the insolvent was seen as having an unalterable obligation to repay his creditors at some time.
It was the common view of the time that insolvency was somewhat equivalent to a moral fault. Such attitudes, as we will see, motivated the opposition of quakers and others to the provision of too much legal protection to the promoters of joint-stock companies. But in the case of quakers they were unusual in employing the organised moral sanctions of their community to encourage, firstly, solvent trading, and secondly those who had failed in business to make them see that they did their utmost to repay their just debts and to go beyond the call of any legal discharge.

The Discipline was usually applied on the following lines. It would be announced in the Monthly meeting, probably by one of the overseers that a particular friend had 'failed'. A number of Friends, sometimes selected for their sensitivity and, knowledge of commercial procedures would be appointed to visit him. A report on the case would usually be brought in to the next Monthly Meeting. The report would include the general outlines of the case and unless there was any flagrant transgression of the customary laws of the Society the visitors would be encouraged to continue their 'care' of the transgressor and report back to a further meeting and so on for a number of months. The object of the procedure was to ensure that the transgressor would act according to the demands of the quaker view of justice in the payment of debts. He was expected to produce a letter of self-condemnation. In cases where there was some chance that the transgressor might be in a position at some
future time to fulfil his obligations the letter might be accepted. Where any insincerity was suspected, or where the malfactor had offended the Discipline in some other way, as by a consistent failure to attend meetings for worship, the amount of latitude extended would correspondingly be curtailed. Sometimes the malfactor would refuse to condemn himself on the very grounds that such would itself be an act of insincerity. On other occasions members were very hard to locate and were suspected of concealing themselves which was regarded as nearly as bad as actually absconding. But even here the quaker procedures would often be continued and as soon as friends became aware that one of their members was 'within the compass' of another monthly meeting - whether it was in America or England - the local Friends would be requested to discuss the particular case with the errant.

It is not possible to quantify or analyse these insolvency cases, for on the basis of the information provided, even in the more ample, descriptions the information is fairly sketchy. But what does emerge is that a very high proportion of the insolvencies recorded related to Friends starting with small capitals, people who specialised in a commission business which they assumed would be safer for them. Such a use of capital has been commented on by Professor Louis Cullen in relation to Irish trade of the eighteenth century. The pattern was to survive for most of the period with which this thesis deals. Cullen advanced the view that the tendency of Irish traders to opt for
commission business related to lack of capital. He stated that the stability of earnings in commission business, 'may be one of the factors accounting for the conservatism and want of enterprise of which Irish merchants have been accused traditionally'. The commercial conservatism of Irish Quakers however probably derives also from their fear of incurring the 'Discipline'. The larger the amounts of capital employed by a merchant the larger would be his risks. It is a testimony to the commercial abilities of the Pim family throughout the nineteenth century that they could walk the tightrope between employing large capitals, avoiding overtrading and speculation whilst remaining in the Society of Friends without transgressing its rules. Big merchants had to take big risks by providing long lines of credit. Joseph R. Pim remarked in 1826 on this factor in reference to sales of cotton yarn, when better banking facilities became available '...it has been of great advantage to those manufacturers in that respect, by giving them the raw material at a lower price than we could possibly have afforded it formerly, when we paid a high rate of interest, and at times a commission for negotiation.' Elsewhere Pim advances a further reason as to why raw materials might be more costly in Ireland when imported by an Irish merchant wholesaler such as himself, '... in England they are content with smaller profits; they are content with 1/4d in the pound; here it is not worth following, if we have not from #d to 3/4d a pound profit. The manufacturers there are men of capital, therefore the merchants run no risk in selling to them; here the manufacturers are not,
generally men of capital, and we have to give them a long credit on the raw materials, for which we must charge in the price to compensate ourselves." Such remarks are worth bearing in mind when considering patterns of insolvency in the Dublin Quaker community.

It is also noteworthy that disownments in the eighteenth century related in many instances to actual or implied fraudulent proceedings or to varieties of mismanagement which were related to the use of 'accommodation bills' a factor regarded with particular disfavour by Friends. Such examples of fraud are rarer in the nineteenth century material, although problems connected with accommodation bills do figure with some frequency in the first three decades of the nineteenth century. Other problems related to the availability of ready cash. It was perfectly possible for a merchant to have adequate resources and yet not have available cash to settle his debts.

Looking at the surviving Quaker accounts of insolvencies one becomes aware also of the background of business partnerships. These were commonly based on family and kinship groups which would be presumed to imply a degree of legal security based on trust backed up of course by the moral sanctions of the community. Two brothers might be involved in a partnership or two brothers-in-law or between cousins. Enter into business commonly followed on the completion and apprenticeship and was after followed by marriage in which the
young man would receive his wife's marriage portion. Occasionally a more extensive partnership might be set up for a limited time and a specific purpose. One such extensive partnership seems to have been set up in 1810 as part of a rescue package to obtain a mortgage for Richard Pim who had secured the notice of the Monthly Meeting in 1808 on account of insolvency. But he later became insolvent for a second time and it was learned that he had joined the Masons. To join a secret society was not acceptable to Friends and consequently he was disowned.

The occurrence of insolvencies in Quaker records parallels that of periods of general business crisis as does the issue of fresh advices from the yearly meetings of both London and Ireland. The provisions of the London Yearly Meeting were sometimes adopted by Ireland Yearly Meeting for recommendation to its own members. The years 1800 and 1808 occasioned the issuing of advices. Part of the Dublin Advice for the year 1808 reads as follows:

'Another subject hath engaged our attention at this time, which we incline to revive, which is the want of punctuality in fulfilling engagements; this we believe may in great measure be the consequence of launching out into business beyond the limitation of truth; sorrowful experience in diverse instances serve to evince the want of care in this particular and we caution all Friends against
this dangerous practice, whereby many have brought distress
not only on themselves and their family but on others, to
the great reproach of the Christian name: we recommend that
monthly meetings, overseers and other concerned friends be
particular in timely giving advice and caution herein.

Having said that insolvencies correspond to some degree
with periods of wider business distress it has to be recognised
that the effects of such periods might not have been immediate
but appeared only after a delay of several years as in the case
of Robinson and Fayle, which came to the attention of the
Monthly Meeting in 1834. The two Friends involved had been in a
partnership business dealing in wholesale woollen and Manchester
goods. The Banking crisis of 1820 adversely affected them.
They had adequate resources to meet their commitments. Their
lack of liquid assets, however, led them to borrow money from
the Government and which was duly paid back at interest. In the
effort to do this they were obliged to mortgage some of their
property. The fall in the value of their property reduced them
to insolvency in 1834 when we are informed the partnerships had
debts of £10,000 with property to the value of £6,000. They
also had about £6,400 borrowed on mortgage which appeared 'well
secured'. They were attempting a settlement with their
creditors for 8/- in the pound. I have not discovered a
specific reference to the disownment of William Robinson but
Joshua Fayle was disowned in fifth month 1835.
The period following the end of the Napoleonic wars in 1815 shows a much higher proportion of Quaker insolvencies than usual. These were very probably directly related to the fall in prices and property values consequent thereon. Such a pattern was probably occurring throughout the Yearly Meeting and elicited a strongly worded advice from that body in 1817.

'The lamentable consequences of too great an extension in trade have spread widely amongst us. Some of our members knowing their affairs were involved in difficulties, and many others who were unmindful of the repeated recommendations to close inspection into the state of their affairs have gone on risking property not their own, until ruin and reproach have been experienced by themselves and their families; wives and innocent children plunged into distress... Although we are ready to admit that in the present day there may be great difficulties to encounter, yet we are persuaded that if a steady adherence to the checks and limitations of Truth were attended to, we should be preserved from bringing dishonour on our Christian profession... we fear some who have not fallen into insolvency, whose expectations have not been disappointed, but who on the contrary may have large capitals, for want of due attention to those checks and limitations, may by their example, lead others into an extension unwarranted by their means and circumstance.'
Many failures involved young and inexperienced Friends who started with very small capitals and then expended too much on outfitting their places of business, or who in order to oblige relatives or friends gave credit without the means to cover it. Some failures resulted quite simply from inadequate accounting procedures, the effects of which might have been obviated by regular reviews of stock, of sales, of credits and of debits. Such inadequacies of accounting procedure have been described by Pollard as 'heresies' derived from the confusion of capital and revenue, and in the confusion where interest was received 'on the actual amount held... while profits were shared out on the original formula' of a partnership agreement.'" Pollard also refers to the failure to see 'capital as an autonomous concept and aim in a business, a failure reflected in a notion of a static partnership capital.'" Again, in many cases if Friends would obey the advice of their Yearly Meeting and its officers, it is clear that some insolvencies might have been avoided. Such an advice was issued by London Yearly Meeting in 1819 and adopted by Ireland Yearly Meeting,

'It is the duty of all, frequently to inspect into the state of their affairs and if arrears should occur, to ascertain and know for themselves, that they are fully justified as honest, upright men, in going on with their business. Such an examination would be greatly facilitated by all being very careful to keep clear accounts; that whether they may be taken off by death, or it may be
needful to exhibit those accounts to others, the same may appear perspicuous and intelligible.

The same advice encourages Friends to consult with others to prevent the sufferings of kith and kindred and also to make themselves available to 'enter with kindness into the situation of others to prevent ... sufferings'. Such advices were also effected in formalised structures of group review. Every year a committee of the Monthly Meeting would be appointed to visit every family and obtain a report of who had made wills and who kept accurate and systematic accounts.

But no procedure could be totally watertight. One particular case of insolvency occurred in 1819. Samuel Stott became insolvent. He was a son of the long established linen merchant Jonas Stott, a man who had been much esteemed and often appointed to offices in the society. The monthly meeting account of his insolvency is somewhat sketchy. Samuel and his father had entered into partnership. Samuel was to receive 1/3rd of the profits. But no regular settlement of accounts had been arranged and there was no proper deed. Samuel believed his father had a capital of around £10,000 and a big commission from his trade. On his marriage the son received a marriage settlement and an annuity which his wife had in her own right. He constantly drew money from the firm for personal expenses. But his losses by trade were, before his insolvency, stated not to be much more than £2,000 at time unspecified. He had also paid £3,000 for a house in the country. There was property surviving
to the value of £4,000. He owed £10,000 and had a 'deficiency' of £6,000. He was disowned in Fourth Month, that is, April, 1820.

A much more pitiful case was that of John Cozins. He had been a weaver. It appears that he had become insolvent in 1800. His letter of self condemnation is still available dated 12th Fourth Month 1800:

'Dear Friends, I have sorrowfully to acknowledge that by not rightly attending to that guide that would have lead me safely along, I have missed my way by which I have brought a reproach on the truth, loss to my creditors and trouble to myself... being in a measure sensible of where and how I have erred I hope my future life will be more guarded and that in time I may be able to make up the deficiency to my creditors, is dear Friends the wish of your affectionate Friend John Cozins' (II8)

The letter appears to have been accepted. He started again with a small capital with some success and widened out his trade into cotton manufacturing. But in 1808, in a period of commercial distress he was forced to stop payment and compound with his creditors for a sum of 12/6 in the pound. Again the Monthly Meeting accepted his letter in 15 March 1808 (II9) and for the third time he failed in 1814, not having been able to correct his original problems. It was felt he had no capacity for business on the scale in which he had undertaken it. His debts amounted to £1,400 of which he
had but half available to meet that sum. He was disowned in Fourth Month 1815. But the meeting continued to help his family. They paid for the education of his children at Leinster Provincial School and apprenticed one of his daughters to a mantua maker, besides paying him an apprenticeship fee to train one of his sons. Cozins eventually emigrated to America and at a later period Dublin Monthly Meeting approved of his re-admission as a member there where he had been recognized as a man of good standing.

Even the best and most valued Friends could and did become insolvent through no visible fault of their own. Friends who had served faithful years in the various offices of the Society could suddenly find themselves at the receiving end of the discipline which they had themselves effectively promoted. Joshua Edmundson, the linen draper to whom Thomas Pim had served his apprenticeship (circa 1785) had entered partnership with one of his apprentices Robert Newsom who by degrees came to manage the business for him. They edged into debt and ended up owing £40,000 possibly in 1806. They were both disowned in 1807.

Occasionally a committee would be set up to see how well those whose letters had been accepted had succeeded in paying their creditors. Occasionally also a person would be accepted back into membership when it became clear that all his
debts had been cleared. In such an event great pleasure was expressed by the Monthly Meeting at the performing of such an 'act of justice.' But as long as a man was either not in membership or under the discipline he was not permitted to join in the affairs of the Monthly Meeting or to subscribe to its collections. One example of a Friend who was disowned and then accepted back into membership was Stephen Dalton, grocer and oil manufacturer. But he had the misfortune to become insolvent a second time and thus to forfeit his membership.

The young wholesale provision merchant Joshua M. Chaytor from Mountmellick had done very well for himself. His name appeared frequently as an officer of the Society and he was to be noticed as a director of companies and a shareholder in many. He had started with a small capital yet became insolvent in 1826. He blamed his insolvency on the insolvency of his London factor to whom he had consigned 'goods to a "large amount" 'and 'drawn bills on account of same.' In addition he had negotiated bills drawn on the same person by another individual in the South of Ireland. His letter was accepted in Eleventh Month 1826. He must eventually have cleared his debts in some way for he remained a respected member of the Society and was heavily involved with the Pims and Perrys in various company promotions.
By 1824 the so called mania for joint stock companies had begun. There was a superabundance of capital seeking profitable investment and government stock had ceased to appear attractive as an investment having fallen in value from the heights to which it had reached during the Napoleonic Wars. In addition there was a widespread expectation that the monopolistic situation which the Bubble Act had supported since 1720 was about to be changed. The monopolistic situation referred to related chiefly to the rights of one or two London insurance and other companies which had the protection by law for their activities as joint stock companies. But the Bubble Act had not made it easy for companies to obtain even the minimum protection which an Act of Parliament might permit, a protection which conferred the right to sue or be sued by 'a public officer'. However, a bill for repeal of some of the provisions of the Bubble Act received the Royal Assent on the 24th June 1824. The new act did not totally satisfy the needs of new companies which were being set up. They still had very little legal protection but could occasionally obtain a costly private act of Parliament for their own particular company. It was also possible for companies to obtain a Royal Charter. The advantage of having the right to sue or be sued by a public officer was itself an advance since under the legal provisions of the period every proprietor of shares in a joint stock company was totally responsible for all possible debts that that
company might incur. There was no question of any limitation of responsibility although it might be observed that in the case of insurance companies the degree of risk could be limited by the provisions written into each particular policy issued as well as in the careful wording of the deed of settlement which itself laid out the structure and responsibilities of a company.  

According to the evidence given in 1844 to a parliamentary committee on joint stock companies, ten such companies had been promoted in Ireland in the years 1824 - 25. The witness who gave that evidence admitted to relying on available prospectuses for his information. The actual number of companies was much greater. Several mining Companies and a number of insurance companies are not listed at all.  

Quakers were not immune to this flurry of speculation and were prominent in the promotion of many of the most successful and long-lasting companies. It is not always possible to quantify their influence in actual financial terms - in terms of quaker shares held or numbers of quakers listed as shareholders but their regular appearance as directors and promoters indicates the faith of many proprietors in their abilities. Often the promotion of a joint-stock company was seen as the best, if not the only possible was to develop necessary ancillary services. It is noteworthy that Irish quakers relied chiefly on their own financial resources at this period (in the 1820's) to promote Irish companies. There is no evidence of any
big inflow of capital from English quakers to business as with steam-ship and insurance companies.

There was also a big need to develop such public utilities as gas companies. And in the case of Ireland there was always a hope that sufficient mineral resources would be found to enable the country to develop on similar lines to England with its big industry and manufacturing interests. A degree of practical patriotism may be presumed in such promotions and was indeed claimed by quaker promoters and others in their company prospectuses, or signified in the names they chose for their companies. We have only to think of the National Insurance Company, the Patriotic Insurance Company, the Mining Company of Ireland etc. It would be of interest here to outline briefly the careers of two companies in which they were involved. They are of interest because they relate to public utilities. Most of these were financial services or public utilities. Of the latter, two major companies involved in mining and gas supply have considerable political interest as well as special features in their financial history.

An early attempt had been made in 1812 to set up a Gas Company in Dublin. The chief argument for its establishment was that it might lessen the expenditure on oil for lighting. In 1815, 6,000 street lights were used each night in the city. The Paving Board which was responsible for lighting spent £14,348 of its annual budget of £51,492 on the service.
visiting English expert produced a properly costed plan which he would be willing to make operative at a rental with decreasing interest until the total capital cost of the project would be covered. This public opposition orchestrated through the corporation and 'fueled' by a fear that gas pipes would pollute the water supply led to the defeat of the scheme.

However in 1820 the Dublin Gas Light Company was set up by an Act of Parliament with a capital of £50,000. It was closely followed in 1823 by a second one, the Hibernian Gaslight Company with a capital of £100,000 in shares of £50 each. Unfortunately we have no information on the amounts of shares held by individuals but among the 41 promoters mentioned in the Act of Parliament the following names of quakers occur, viz. William Harding, Joshua M. Chaytor, James and Richard Garratt, John and Samuel Tolerton, Jonathan and Joseph Pim, George Milner, Henry Perry, William and Edward Alexander. William L. Guinness was appointed the first Governor and Joseph R. Pim his Deputy. Among the Directors were Daniel O'Connell and the two quakers, William Harding and Joshua M. Chaytor.

The large amounts of capital needed to set up a gas company or similar public utilities could obviously not be raised by individuals. The joint-stock company provided an obvious solution to the difficulty. But an important factor in obtaining permission by an Act of Parliament to promote such an undertaking was to agree to provide street lighting through a
public contract. Such contracts were not as profitable as the supply of gas to manufactories, businesses and private houses.\textsuperscript{143} The contractors were obliged, as they were in the case of Dublin, to provide gas at a price not more than it would have been available in London or Westminster.\textsuperscript{150} There was often great competition between rival gas companies and the Act for the Hibernian Gas Company carefully distinguished the territorial boundaries of its operation. But the two companies were only too well aware of the great English competition and indeed the highly capitalised London company the United General Gas Company had sent its emissary over to obtain a contract.\textsuperscript{151} There was besides a distinct feeling among the populace at large that English contractors would do a better job at a lower price.\textsuperscript{152} It was important for the Hibernian to engage in proper publicity as to its abilities and to counter any critical rumours that might damage its interests.\textsuperscript{153} The Hibernian and the Dublin Companies arranged a joint meeting with the Lord Lieutenant's chief secretary Henry Goulbourne. The Governors and Directors of both companies attended in company with Sir Robert Shaw, 'one of the City Members' to seek a clear reply, as to the awarding of contracts.\textsuperscript{154}

But by 1829 a further Act was passed in parliament. It adverted to the progress of the company (the Hibernian).

'...and whereas the capital and sums subscribed, with a very trifling exception, for the purposes of the said Act, have been subscribed by and do belong to persons generally
resident in the City of London who are thereby become the proprietors of the said undertaking it would very much favour the dispatch of the business of the said company if power were given to the proprietors and directors to hold general special assemblies and meetings in Dublin and London...".156

At a meeting reported in the *Freemans Journal* on the tenth of February 1824, it was decided to set up the Mining Company of Ireland.156 This was to be one of four mining companies set up to exploit the mineral resources of Ireland157 and was to prove the longest lasting of them all. Judging by available comparative statistics it was probably the most profitable also.156 The meeting was chaired by Thomas Spring-Rice who had notable connections with a number of schemes in which quakers were associated. He maintained a correspondence for many years with Jacob Harvey of Limerick and New York.159 The same Harvey was a relative of the Pims of Dublin and Mountmellick. The quakers John Barrington and Joseph R. Pim were involved in the initial committee.160 The original plan was to set up the Mining Company with a capital of £500,000 divided into 4,000 shares limited to 25 shares per person.161 An Act of Parliament had been obtained by June.162 We do not know the exact size of holdings of each proprietor but a share list for 1824 shows 1218 proprietors including 77 with Quaker names and with 36 of them holding the maximum number of shares a number which qualified them to become directors.163 Samuel Bewley and Pim were amongst...
the first directors. They had tied for the position with 423 votes. The maximum number of votes cast had been 558 for Richard Purdy who was to act as secretary for the company. The Deed of Agreement set out as part of the Aims of the Company that it '...would very much promote manufacture in Ireland and tend to give employment to various artificers, labourers and workmen at present unable to procure employment and would otherwise be of great benefit and advantage to that part of the United Kingdom called Ireland.' This the Company was destined to do. Without delay they were able to state in their first half-yearly report (26th June 1824) that agreements had been made to lease '43 extensive royalties' of copper, lead, antimony, coal, iron and slate. In a report dated 1st April 1824 they had stated that, 'It was also their intention to bring in to view the mischief to be apprehended from the multiplicity of conflicting bodies, which the unsatisfied avidity of the public for the shares of the company, combined with other manifestations, gave reason to expect; and at the same time to suggest such measures as on their judgement were best calculated to prevent the evil and to preserve the great and substantial and legitimate objects we aim at, from falling a sacrifice to the rage of boundless speculation. Thomas Spring-Rice had encouraged them to incorporate their company with one of similar capital which had been set up in London to exploit Irish mineral resources. The plan was not pursued but it was hoped that the two companies would maintain friendly relations.'

- 95 -
In the Half-yearly report for year ending 1.12.1826 the suggestion was made that the directorial qualifications be raised beyond 25 shares, partly on account of the difficulties involved in arranging elections with the possibility of a large number of candidates and we must presume because many of those who had larger capital resources saw a safe home for larger amounts of their money and wanted to invest it in the Company. Also presumably the feeling was that those who were better capitalised would also be better able to manage the company and wished to be in a position to protect their investment. It is not clear when the recommendation was put into effect but a share list for 1833 shows Joseph, Thomas and Jonathan Pim with 1547 shares between them and with James Pim Junior as having 224 shares. Between them they had 8.8% of the total Capital of £500,000. Besides that numerous of their relatives and others of the Friends had a very big portion indeed of the Company's capital. But even for large shareholders there was still a maximum voting power of ten votes. The unit cost of the shares was smaller.

A big enemy of Irish success in mining was that very often an English product, such as coal could be delivered cheaper and in bigger quantities than its Irish equivalent. This could lead to the temporary closure of mines or to stockpiling until the market could be better utilised. But coal mining did remain markedly profitable for the Mining Company of Ireland. The establishment of a smelting works at Ballycorus for lead
smelting and silver extraction also proved very profitable, as did the export of copper from Knockmahon in Waterford to Swansea.\textsuperscript{173} Again markets were always subject to wider British or world factors. The Yearly and Monthly Report for half Year end of vi.1828 makes a statement that as a result of an Act of 1825 '...authorising importation of foreign ores and metals for consumption in the United Kingdom; at reduced rates of duty' the income of the company had dropped very considerably. The proprietors were reminded that a loss of income amounting to £12,000 could have been the equivalent of a 15\% dividend on the entire of the capital embarked.\textsuperscript{173} The help of Spring Rice was forthcoming however and a Petition was produced for him to forward. It stated that apart from £100,000 that had been spent, 2,000 people were employed and least 10,000 others in subsidiary ways.\textsuperscript{182} The Company had fulfilled the promises in their claims to obtain an act of Parliament.

However, not all joint-stock companies were equally popular or considered desirable. The Liverpool quaker James Cropper, a friend of the Pims in Dublin and Mountmellick and of the Harveys of Limerick came at the end of the year 1824 on a tripartite mission. He had it in view to forward schemes to reduce Irish poverty, and to abolish slavery by setting up manufactories which would only use cotton from India thereby cutting off the sources of capital which kept the slave owners of America in business.\textsuperscript{176} He had also come to persuade the business community to give support to the Liverpool and Manchester
Railway, support that was readily forthcoming from the Dublin Chamber of Commerce. Various committees were also set up around the country to set up manufactories concerned with cotton. But the committees did not achieve very much, while in Waterford the Quaker Malcomsons decided to take a scheme in hand themselves, a venture in which they were very successful. The Dublin quaker John Todhunter was on the Dublin Committee. As a result of all this activity Thomas Spring-Rice presented a Bill to Parliament. The Dublin Chamber of Commerce made big criticisms of this which they described as 'purporting to promote and encourage trade and manufacture in Ireland by means of British capital and a Joint Stock company.' Considerable alarm was expressed, 'Under the authority of this bill the members of the company would have acquired full power to establish and carry on trades and manufacturers of every description, to engage in fisheries, reclaim bogs, make canals, roads or railways and in short to embark in all and every speculation which they might themselves think proper to undertake, with the advantage of a legislative sanction and a limited responsibility.' The rebuff was a cause of great surprise to James Cropper. The Council of the Chamber of Commerce approved of the introduction of British capital and expertise but felt the Bill as originally projected was of a distinctly monopolistic cast and hence properly to be resisted. It eventually was passed but in a much restricted form. The Act is probably to be identified with the Act Cap. CXLI 6. GEO. IV 'An Act for establishing a Joint Stock Company
for the erection of buildings and establishing machinery for the purpose of promoting and encouraging the manufactures of Ireland.'

However there could be more fundamental objections to the establishment of joint-stock companies. Such objections were widely current in both the eighteenth century and the nineteenth century and were fully shared by Quakers particularly in relation to the dangerous element of speculation they could induce and in relation to the responsibility of individuals for the debts of any partnership into which they might enter. Some part of such an argument was developed in this manner by an author in 1859. Admittedly the extract cited here is from a somewhat later period than the time immediately under review but it could be taken to typify contemporary viewpoints,

'In the scheme laid down by Providence for the good of the world there is no shifting or narrowing of responsibilities, every man being perfectly answerable for all his actions. But the advocates of limited responsibility proclaim in their superior wisdom that the scheme of providence may be advantageously modified and that debts and obligations may be contracted which the debtors though they have the means shall not be bound to discharge. ' 

The collapse of the Saint Patrick's Insurance company in 1827 had severely shaken the Dublin business community and was to inhibit investment in joint-stock companies for many years to
come. Quakers, obviously like other people, recognised that a great variety of schemes of 'public utility' could not easily be advanced without such companies, but concern with the failures consequent on badly managed if not downright fraudulent and speculative schemes encouraged a strongly worded advice from the Yearly Meeting in 1837:

'We believe it right to revive the wholesome advice of our society that all friends keep within the limitation of Truth in their trade and other outward concerns. Were these holy limitations observed we believe some of our members who have embarked in joint-stock speculations and other plausible schemes involving liabilities beyond their means would have been restrained from such undertakings. We advise our dear friends when they are tempted with the prospects of large acquisitions in this or any other way to examine the motives which would lead them forward; and if their origin be unlawful, being tainted, as we apprehend they would be found to be, with covetousness, let them seek for strength to turn from the temptation and in Christian moderation and contentment, they would find safety.'

Another important aspect of commercial development from the second decade of the nineteenth century, besides that of joint-stock companies, was that of chambers of commerce. The Dublin
Chamber was to be particularly vital in the stimulation of commerce. It was to prove one further area in which Quakers found ample scope for their energies. As has already been outlined in this chapter, Quakers had been prominent both in the promotion and operation of the first Dublin Chamber of Commerce. But that body had slowly lost its effectiveness and come adrift on the rocks of political controversy. No similar body had come to take its place. An attempt to set up such a body in 1805 had involved at various times the Quakers, John Todhunter, Thomas Pim, Samuel Bewley and Jonathan Pim. But the effort to sustain it had not been maintained. Nevertheless, as the effects of the Act of Union came to be seen more clearly, and probably also in the absence of political organisations to channel and express the special interests of Ireland, it was seen that an organised body would be needed to express mercantile opinion in particular. A revival of the Dublin Chamber of Commerce was called for in a world very favourable to the development of free trade viewpoints. The Pim family were to the fore in this and the contribution of Joshua Pim to the original Chamber was recognised by his appointment as president of the new body in 1820. Samuel Bewley and Joseph R. Pim were elected to the Council of the new body. Professor Cullen explains the structure of the Chamber thus, 'The regulations which were approved were more elaborate than those of the past. The annual general assembly should elect a president, four vice-presidents, and committee of 21 members. In a clear effort to prevent the emergence of a self perpetuating clique not more than 14 of the
21 members of the preceding council were to be eligible for re-election each year. There should be four general meetings of the Chamber every year, and the Council should meet regularly once a month. The way in which Quakers were continually developing areas of co-operation with non-Quakers in both commercial and philanthropic areas more and more began to contribute to and reflect a fractured and sectarian viewpoint by members of the Society. Commerce, like philanthropy, required specific organisation. If a religious motivation was central to their business behaviour it was expressed through separate and distinct channels and they left themselves open to new varieties of political pressure inside the Chamber.

Such a Chamber of Commerce could aid the promotion of necessary legislation and provided a forum for self-education, both at the practical and theoretical level. It could help promote improvements in the handling of goods and use of customs procedures. Its function could be 'remedial' as much as 'preventative'. As far as Quakers were concerned, besides the consistent and effective contribution of Samuel Bewley and Joseph R. Pim, it lay, perhaps in the introduction of a specific atmosphere into the proceedings of the Chamber. This atmosphere related to their religious practice and reflected their specific experience as a colonial community. Their survival as a community had been much dependent on the avoidance of party politics and by their own group discipline. It was the experience derived from that background that they applied to the
affairs of the Chamber of Commerce. The annual printed reports constantly emphasise, at the early period of the Chamber, the necessity for the promotion of neutrality independent of party viewpoints, itself an unusual viewpoint at a period of increasing sectarianism and heightened and increased political and religious sensitivity. Harmony and unity were advocated. The Report of the Chamber for 1826 refers to the, '...not uninstructive example of an association, general in its character and comprehensive in its principles, inviting for the attainment of a common good, the indiscriminate accession and cordial co-operation of all commercial classes and pursuing its appropriate objects in that spirit of liberality and mutual kindness which a community of interests alone can "perish or preserve".'

A similar lesson is pushed home in 1827, 'Since the formation of the Chamber, it has been the anxious wish of those by whom its affairs have been directed, to maintain that strict neutrality on all extraneous topics, so suitable to the character and so indispensible to the usefulness of a commercial institution.' Such a message is observable in the proceedings of other organisations in which quakers were involved at this period. Nevertheless the Chamber was under pressure to introduce politics. Such pressures must have elicited the didactic responses mentioned. The Parliament itself in an inquiry on Irish revenue in 1822, revealed a degree of suspicion about latent political viewpoints in the motivation of the Chamber when they closely cross questioned Joshua Pim.
In 1825 the Dublin Chamber of Commerce had 498 members. Of these at least 38 quakers and not including a number of others who had been quakers. At the time there were 129 adult male subscribing members in Dublin on the books of the Society. The members of the Chamber were chiefly wholesale merchants manufacturers although James Pim Junior was a stock broker. The membership list of the Society reveals a greater number of tradesmen adding a more specialist description to their activities, at least as far as trade descriptions in directories can be relied on. One factor worthy of note shows the great decline in the number of tallow chandlers who had always previously constituted a big proportion of the Dublin quaker membership. There was also a big increase in the number of retail grocers and linen drapers. In 1825 the council of 21 members included the quakers Joshua M. Chaytor, Joseph R. Pim, John Todhunter and Samuel Bewley who also operated as Treasurer. A look at some of the activities in which these four individuals had been involved in the previous year shows the immense amount of voluntary work that was undertaken in addition to the demands of their own businesses, the demands of their Religious Society, and the numerous directorships which they were beginning to accept. In one year Joseph R. Pim was appointed to the committee for commercial intercourse, the publications committee, the charter committee and the committee on warehousing charges. Similarly John Todhunter whose business was concerned with timber imports and Joshua Chaytor (a provision merchant) played an active part in sub-
committees where they were able to employ their specific abilities. Samuel Bewley who acted as treasurer played a powerful role. He had played a central part in the defense of the silk interest before the Fourth Commission of Inquiry into revenue arising in Ireland, an inquiry in which, incidently Pim and James Perry the hardware merchant were among those extensively interviewed. We may suspect Bewley's influence was also to be seen in the drafting of many of the Reports of the Chamber. The message there inculcated is so much of a piece with his other expressions of opinion. On the twentieth of May 1824 he is able to inform the council of the exertions of Irish members of parliament in the passing of the Silk Bill in the House of Lords. He mentions John Newport, Henry Parnell and T. Spring-Rice. The name of Sir H. Parnell whose constituency included the Quaker town of Montmellick, was to come up again in 1826 where he received favourable mention in the Chamber's annual Report for his efforts in obtaining a pledge that there would be set up a Parliamentary Committee to investigate the butter trade. Parnell was also able to use his influence on behalf of the Saint George Steam Packet Company.

The Chamber was regularly used to promote or develop a particular trade. An example of this was the tea trade. The trade had suffered from numerous restrictions imposed by the monopoly of the East India company. Nevertheless it continued to grow. Anticipation of the ending of the monopoly encouraged some preparatory organisation. A clue to the creative
commercial intelligence of Samuel Bewley occurs in a report of the Chamber in 1830 where there are considerations about the East India company's charter. Some members obviously failed to see that the repeal of the charter might have a wider significance for Ireland. The assumption is that Bewley had some special input into the preparation of the Annual Report, a supposition that in this case is born out by the subsequent activity of the Bewleys. The Report had anticipated possible criticisms and pointed out how the legislation that ended the monopoly would also permit the creation of structures to facilitate a direct trade to Dublin from the East. And sure enough in August 1835 Bewleys of William Street were described in the *Dublin Mercantile Advertiser* as receiving the second ship 'ever freighted from China for this port'. It was loaded with 8,623 chests of tea. The Chamber's Report for 1836 was already describing a further move. A Memorial had been sent to the Lords of the Treasury requesting additional bonded warehousing for teas. The Commissioners of the Customs were not proving very co-operative. The council were further concerned to find out why they should not be allowed to export teas to London since London merchants were permitted to export them to Dublin. The Report notes that teas had since been sent from Dublin to London as a result of the representations of the Chamber.
But at the centre of all the business activity of those quakers who were to the fore in the commerce of the city was the quaker meeting. The quaker meeting exerted something like a field of gravity over their daily lives, a force from which they could not escape and which was made visible in the uniform of their dress and in the 'plain language' which was still largely maintained. The Society constituted the community of people with whom they habitually worshipped and whose ancestors like themselves had endured suffering on account of their faith. They were mostly inter-related and to its discipline they voluntarily submitted. An element of trust existed amongst them which backed up by the sanctions of the Society made for a high degree of business effectiveness.

In many ways their business procedures as used in the affairs of their own Society were not so very different from the business procedures of the 'secular' world in both its philanthropic and commercial manifestations. The Society did not issue an annual report as such, unless we are to regard the Yearly Meeting epistles as a suitable equivalent but the whole of its procedures at every level were a series of constant and mutual reviews related to moral progress, statistical procedure and financial matters. The business of the Monthly Meeting related of course to religious concerns but a large proportion of it was strictly practical in its content. It related to
schooling and apprenticeships, the selection of officers, the care of their poor and the collection of subscriptions for the assistance of members, the upkeep of buildings and the receipt of rents from such properties as the meeting owned. If the Quakers did not observe any particular days as being holy above any others there was still a rhythm of activities and events which had developed in relation to their practical necessities. Once a year a committee would be appointed to visit all friends and ensure that correct and careful accounts were made, and that wills had been made to spare trouble for surviving relatives and children. Even at this period lists were regularly drawn up of the sufferings and constraints endured by Friends at the hands of the Established Church. Such lists would be received by the next meeting and forwarded to the Quarterly and ultimately to the National Meeting.

Further committees during the course of the year included one to visit any friends who might be selling 'Spiritous liquors' and to encourage them to think of getting into some more useful trade, and a bigger committee to consider of an addition to 'those in the station of overseer'. Other business central to the meeting would include the noting of presentations of marriage and ensuring the 'clearness' of all parties concerned, arranging apprenticeships and visiting those who were known to or suspected of having made infractions of the Discipline. Births, marriages and deaths were publicly recorded and a great deal of the written work which was required in
connection with the proceedings was done by the Recording Clerk who acted also for the Provincial and yearly meetings and was unique in being the only paid officer of the Society. In 1835 it was Henry Russell who had taken over from Jonathan Hill.  

Monkstown (Kingstown) Meeting had been suggested in 1830 primarily on the initiative of the powerful Pim and Perry clans, who had begun to settle there. In Tenth Month 1835 an account was brought in for payment on the approval of the Monthly Meeting. The implications of the request for payment encouraged considerations of how the financial aspects of the Meeting could be improved. Jonathan Pim Junior and Richard Allen were among the younger members who were appointed to the committee that was set up to consider the same. The committee brought in its recommendations in writing to the next meeting. They suggested that Monkstown Friends must look after the heating, lighting and caretaking of their own premises but continue to subscribe to the central funds of Dublin Monthly Meeting. They also recommended that the Monthly Meeting set up a standing committee to look after its financial affairs. They added 'It is hoped that the arrangement would save the time of the Monthly Meeting and prevent its being occupied unprofitably at times with questions relating to its money concerns.' But they stated with a significant degree of respect to the corporate authority of the meeting, 'It is not however proposed that the finance committee shall be invested with any power to
grant money for objects not especially sanctioned by the Monthly Meeting or that it shall supersede the necessity of an annual examination and report on the Treasurer's account by a committee of the Monthly Meeting as heretofore.' The report was signed by Joseph Bewley. 226.

Not only were Friends liable for office in their own preparative and monthly meetings, they were also liable for office in the provincial and yearly meetings each of which had its own range of temporary and standing committees and sub-committees and many of them with their own financial structures and treasurers. It is no wonder that Friends, or some of them at least should find it easy to move into a world of commerce involving mercantile as well as philanthropic co-operation.

But of all the Testimonies which effectively marked the Friends off from the wider Protestant community that of their refusal to pay tithes probably appeared the most puzzling. As good and useful citizens the testimony must have seemed to others to be potentially subversive of the State and the Established Church. In spite of the fact that other dissenters and the Roman Catholics objected to the payment of tithes, their objection to tithes tended to be not because of principle but because they happened not to make such payments to the particular church in question. In the case of quakers the objection was more fundamental, they were opposed in principle to the very idea of paying for the upkeep of any established
authoritarian and priestly ministry that, as they saw it, usurped the priesthood of Christ. And quite apart from declaring this they consistently refused to pay 'ecclesiastical demands'. They also advised their members not to confuse their passive suffering of distrants with any secular protests against their collection.

The testimony against tithes was a powerful if negative incentive to keep clear from 'worldly affairs' and prevented members from any easy identification with their protestant peer group. But the pressures for such identification were becoming stronger all the time in the face of a resurgent Roman Catholic nationalism. The protestant community and to some extent the quakers felt beleagured. However the climate for entering overt political activity was not yet ripe. The Yearly Meeting of 1835 issued an advice cautioning members from taking an active part in political affairs or in the election of M.P.s. 'Seeing the lamentable extent to which political animosity prevails amongst the inhabitants of this land, the devastating effects of party spirit and that on every side there is much with which we cannot unite...'  

The question of tithes had been partially solved by the Tithes Corporation Act of 1836/1838 but legislation still permitted under the Statute 17 and 18 Chas. II c.7 the levying of a tax known as Minister's Money in certain cities and towns including Dublin. Judging by the lists of 'Sufferings' which
Friends assembled each year the distrainsts were not extensive or increasing. But they were a continuing cause of annoyance and petty irritation. Tithe lists were compiled by quakers on the basis of specially printed forms which set out the details of each distraint, its value and the value which had actually been demanded. Goods and materials would be taken out of houses and shops and were often worth much more than the amount of the actual demand made by the local minister. Dublin lists show that in many cases the tithe was demanded but not taken and in some cases not demanded at all. Only in a very few cases was it actually distrained. The indications are that to a large degree the scruple of the quakers was recognised and accepted. But Alfred Webb writing at the end of the century reminisced, 'As before at home, when our parent's chairs and tables were levied and taken away, and as afterwards when I saw the goods taken off the counter of Uncle James' shop, so at Growtown my little heart swelled with indignation when I saw Aunt Mary's cows driven off for tithe.'

Not all quakers were equally patient with quaker procedures relating to tithes, procedures which as already mentioned involved the assembling of lists which were presented to the Government as they had been from the beginning of the Society. Richard D. Webb, Alfred's father made a very public case about the distraint of the chairs and table referred to. They had been distrained by George MacNeill the priest of Saint Mark's Church which stood directly opposite the Webb's household and
printing works. MacNeill spent much of the year in England. Webb noted that he would not even greet him if they passed in the street and felt that if he was paid for the care of souls he should earn his money a bit harder! Webb argued his case in a series of four powerfully worded letters to the *Freeman's Journal*. He was somewhat critical of the quieter methods of protest employed by his brethren and recognised in a very explicit manner the link between an oppressive tithe law and the whole structure of oppression associated with war and the rampant imperialism of the Victorian era. He also wrote to the leading Evangelical Friend in England, Samuel Gurney who wrote back with quiet words of advice related to the doctrinal background of Quaker protest, '...they cannot actively obey a law which is opposed to their own conscientious and religious views. All that they can do is to abstain from any resistance to the arm of the law and to lie passive under its operation.'

1844 - 1860

As a group, the Quakers were remarkably homogeneous with a markedly conservative viewpoint that was often distinctly Tory in its complexion. But Friends were still careful to keep clear of any overt identification with political parties. In the event of any threat to their commercial ambitions or civil rights, or indeed if they sought for legislation on any issue
relevant to either their private interests or those of their Society they were able to resort to what may be termed para-political methods. Firstly, their history of contacts with authority, as also their high 'public profile' made it possible for them to obtain a direct access to the governmental sphere if so required. Secondly, through their use of commercial organisations and the use of philanthropic and business contacts they had access to a wide spectrum of politicians. In 1845 Richard Allen, a well known Dublin Quaker and importer of woolen goods came under threat from an attempted revival of the Guilds. With the help of Daniel O'Connell with whom he had many philanthropic contacts and with the assistance of Jonathan Pim Junior, through the instrumentality of the Dublin Chamber of Commerce (which likewise saw a threat to a wide area of mercantile interest) - an Act was rapidly passed and the Guilds effectively out of action for ever.
However the influence of the Evangelical revival had already cast a large shadow across the Society, even though its individualistic values had been qualified by the Quaker approach to corporate guidance. It may be also that a particularly disturbing appearance of doctrinal dissent by a group known as the White Quakers had reminded Friends that they would always have more in common with non-Quaker groups who valued their Bibles than with any anarchistic manifestations that would threaten the basis for Quaker belief. Evangelical viewpoints facilitated the identification of values held dear by many Quakers with those of the wider Protestant world. Evangelical belief enabled a reaction to take place against the hereditary and sectarian community which in many ways the Society had become. Resignation 'by dissent' became a common feature of monthly meetings. Younger members of families would commonly resign together to join the Established Church, which in itself was a somewhat ironic situation. Alfred Webb describes the change from a 'deistic' type of religion to one that, '... is now almost entirely evangelistic. The Son has now taken the place of the Father.' Such a viewpoint possibly concealed a variety of revolt against parental authority. Resignations often occurred on the decease of a parent.

But as regards the Society itself, whilst some members were inclined to take a somewhat qualified view of various manifestations of 'Evangelicism' few questioned its reliance on the Bible. Such a qualified view was communicated by James
Nicholson Richardson to 'two friends in the station of Minister' to dispose of as they wished on his decease. The implication is drawn in the extract between the wealth of those chiefly identified with ultra-evangelical views and 'high stations' in the church. Such an association is now uncommon in documents relating to doctrinal questions.

'. ..I think I have arrived at the conclusion that 'at present there is little room to move for those who love, and most surely believe in the ancient doctrines and testimonies committed to our worthy elders and promulgated by them to the world fearlessly through deep sufferings, grievous scourgings and buffetings...which they did not count dear in comparison of being found faithful to the Holy Leader, our dear Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ...'

'My mind seems to settle down in the belief that the compact is so strong and the influence so great of these unquakerly Episcopalian doctrines and views that the humble minded faithful believer in the true Christian views of our worthy predecessors, must be willing to suffer all the appointed baptisms'.

But the evangelical views referred to were eventually to become so influential in the Society that it was difficult for many quakers to explain why the Society should exist as a separate body at all if one was not to fall back on some argument or rather assumption related to heredity and tradition,
in which a class assumption substituted for a properly reasoned belief and commitment.

The Society had become thoroughly middle class and in some cases had an overtone akin to that of an aristocracy derived from wealthy tradition. The business of the Society continued to devolve on a relatively few friends who in many cases were those most involved in commercial affairs or who had a high degree of wealth to afford them the leisure to devote to its affairs. They did not appear to act in any sense of leadership or to be to the fore in commercial affairs, but their names continued to appear with monotonous regularity in lists of Directors and Institutions, just as those of their more creative fathers had done. A new professional class was emerging in Dublin. There were fewer merchants as such but more specialists in particular aspects of business. There were fewer manufacturers and now the names of friends appear who were solicitors or land surveyors or engineers. There were besides numerous agencies for British companies and new types of trade as gas fitter. Among the friends there was a plethora of grocers and linen-drapers. The subscription lists are somewhat harder to analyse in terms of trade description by comparison with such directories as *Thoms*. The names of men and women are listed indiscriminately, it is not always possible to identify the likely head of a business or his relation with other people of the same name. But in so far as we are able to do so the results support the above analysis.
Again, as has been frequently suggested in this account, quakers traditionally eschewed overt political involvement. Now with a history of wide philanthropic and commercial contact with individual politicians, and a doctrinal vehicle that freed them from a degree of self restraint, the way was opening for quakers to consider political involvement. Irish quakers did not widely respond to the opportunity as had English quakers, where Pease, Sturge and Bright were household names. In Ireland the name of Jonathan Pim Junior surfaced. He was an obvious choice for political office, with his 'liberal' stance, the identification of his family with commercial organisation, the respect of the populace for his work in famine relief, besides his obviously well thought out views on how to ameliorate the condition of his fellow countrymen in a long term manner. He was bound to attract the attention of politicians and he stood and was elected to parliament in 1865, 1868 and 1874 occasions as a Liberal, but on the fourth occasion his vote went chiefly to the new Home Rule Party.
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Names and trades of Dublin Quakers in different years with a list of 1749 chosen as a core sample.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>1734</td>
<td>Elijah Chamberlain</td>
<td>Gentleman</td>
<td>1745</td>
<td>Abraham Clibborn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dan.Cowman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Robert Clibborn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>1745</td>
<td>Joseph Fade</td>
<td>(M)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Joseph Fade</td>
<td>(M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jono.Fletcher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Joseph Fade</td>
<td>(M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Samuel Fuller</td>
<td>(Cordwainer)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Joseph Fade</td>
<td>(M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thomas Gamble</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>1748</td>
<td>Andrew Dale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nathanial Card</td>
<td>(M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>William Darragh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Joshua Clibborn</td>
<td>(M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Benjamin Dawson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>John Crutchet</td>
<td>(W)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jonathan Dawson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Joseph Doyle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Anthony Deaves</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thomas Edwards</td>
<td>Maltster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Joseph Eves</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thomas Evans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>1750</td>
<td>Jonathan Dawson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Joseph Eves</td>
<td>(TC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Anthony Oeaves</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>John Crutchet</td>
<td>(W)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Joseph Doyle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thomas Edwards</td>
<td>Maltster</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thomas Evans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>John Crutchet</td>
<td>(W)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Joseph Doyle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thomas Edwards</td>
<td>Maltster</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thomas Evans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>1755</td>
<td>Nathanial Card</td>
<td>(M)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Joshua Clibborn</td>
<td>(M)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>John Crutchet</td>
<td>(W)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Joseph Doyle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>1765</td>
<td>Barclay Clibborn</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Joshua Clibborn</td>
<td>(M)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Joshua Clibborn</td>
<td>(M)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nathaniel Card</td>
<td>(M)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Edw. Dawson</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>John Dawson</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Edw. Dawson</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>John Dawson</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rd. Dawson</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Robert Giles
Jonathan Gloster
George Glenny
Fade Goff
Joseph F. Goff
John Goulbee
Thomas Goulbee
William Greenhow
Samuel Greenwood

* TM
* M
* W

Edw. Garnett
George Garnett M
William Gill
Robert Gill
Jacob Goff
Jacob Goff
Joseph Green

* Timber M

Thomas Handy
Joseph Haughton
Jonathan Hayes
Jacob Hewitt
George Holmes

* W

Isaac Jackson
Joshua Jackson
Gilbert Jaffray
Robert Jaffray
James Johnson
Peter Judd
Samuel Judd

* M

John Jeffries
(cordwainer)
Francis Knight

* TC

Fran Johnson
Paul Johnson
Peter Judd Jnr.

* W

Samuel Gamble M

Alex. Jaffray M

Ged. Garnett
(TC)

Robert Gill
(Apotheary)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1734</td>
<td>George Lecky, Jacob Mark, Phil. Martin, Thomas Martin, Samuel Mickle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1745</td>
<td>Samuel Lapham, William Lapham, Thomas Lecky, Robert Lingwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1755</td>
<td>Evan Neale (bricklayer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1765</td>
<td>John Pemberton, John Penrose, Thomas Phelps, Joseph Pike, John Pim, Richard Powell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1765</td>
<td>Edwin Parvin, M. Henry Pemberton, Henry Pemberton, John Pettigrew, M. James Pettigrew, John Powell, Robert Pettigrew (GE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Clothier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1734</td>
<td>John Pettigrew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1745</td>
<td>John Radford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1745</td>
<td>William Richardson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1745</td>
<td>John Robert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1745</td>
<td>Abraham Robinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1745</td>
<td>George Rooke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1745</td>
<td>Francis Russell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1745</td>
<td>Francis Russell, Jnr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1745</td>
<td>John Russell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1745</td>
<td>Samuel Russell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1745</td>
<td>Samuel Russell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1745</td>
<td>Samuel Russell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1745</td>
<td>Thomas Russell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1745</td>
<td>John Rutty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1745</td>
<td>Luke Rice (clothier)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1745</td>
<td>Henry Russell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1745</td>
<td>Edwin Read TC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1745</td>
<td>Benjamin Bradford TC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1750</td>
<td>Wm. Penrose M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1750</td>
<td>Joseph Pike M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1750</td>
<td>Joshua Pim M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1755</td>
<td>Wm. Robinson M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1755</td>
<td>Wm. Robinson M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1755</td>
<td>John Read TC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1765</td>
<td>Wm. Robinson M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1765</td>
<td>Wm. Robinson M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1765</td>
<td>John Read TC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter</td>
<td>Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I 1734</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II 1745</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III 1745</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV 1748</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V 1750</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI 1765</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
List of sources used in compiling appendix A  CHAPTER II

1734 A Subscription of Friends of Dublin Meeting for defraying Disbursements for the Relief of the poor etc. 28.iii.1734 MM II A.8(5.1.1734-29.iv.1742)

1745 A Subscription of Friends of Dublin Men's Meeting and of other Friends of the City for defraying Publick charge 9.v.1745

1750 An Alphabetical list of the Freemen and Freeholders of the City of Dublin who polled at the election of members of Parliament 24.x.1749-11.xi.1749 (Dublin 1750) in Haliday Collection no 214 (R.I.A.)

1755 Wilson's Dublin Almanack

1745 Faulkner's Dublin Journal 1-5/10 1745 'List of merchants and others' undertaking to accept as cash the notes of the 6 Dublin Banks. (For this reference I am grateful to Dr David Dickson)

LD Linen Draper M Merchant TC Tallow Chandler LW Linen Weaver W Weaver
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Alexander Barrington</td>
<td>Accepted large amount of bills without value in hands. Engagements extended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Isaac Burton</td>
<td>His partner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>H. Hughes</td>
<td>Irregular conduct. Attempted to palliate creditors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>J. Russell</td>
<td>Spent more than his capital in buildings and in furnishing a timber yard. Some losses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Wm. Chapman Jnr.</td>
<td>Extended trade beyond capital. Imprudent purchases of materials for manufacture without working out prices. Also a fall in the prices of the article. Considerable losses in purchases and in previous management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Jacob Barrington</td>
<td>Particularly in reference to John. Entered the partnership with no capital. Benj. trusted John's knowledge. John was to get half the profits. Benj. did not keep an eye on affairs. John misled him with the accounts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Joshua Edmundson</td>
<td>Partner with his previous apprentice Robt. Newsom. Traded beyond common prudence or dictates of truth. Debts upwards of £40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Isaac Wilson</td>
<td>Started with small capital. Imprudent/unjustified obtaining of credit to big amount.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>W. Wright</td>
<td>Entered a business he did not understand. Did not inspect affairs. Drinking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Robert Newsom</td>
<td>See above. Joshua Edmundson.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>R.R. Dawson</td>
<td>N.L.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Edward MacDonald</td>
<td>General tenor of trading unacceptable. Creditors will suffer great loss. Does not seem sensible of the impropriety of his conduct.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>John Cozins</td>
<td>Little capital. Some success. Launched into a wider trade believed he had no capacity for same. Losses. Stopped payment. Composition of 12/6 in the £ to creditors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>William Malone</td>
<td>Total lack of co-operation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
26. William Thacker
Extended business beyond capital. Heavy losses. Settled with creditors for 15/- in the £.

27. J. Shaw
Accommodated another person with his name on paper. Other person failed. Had to stop payment.

28. Joseph Morris
Little aptitude for trade. Spent some hundreds of pounds on fitting up his premises. Several losses from shipping goods for foreign markets. Bad debts.

29. Anne Clarke
Did not administer her father's estate properly or keep accurate accounts. Lent her brother money.

30. Edward Murphy

31. William Allen
Small capital; heavy losses. Not regular in his affairs. Undertook to manage effects of an insolvent. Could not pay when called on.

32. Isaac English
Responsible for debts of partnership concern. Intends to make good the deficiency. Insolvency due to affair of a few days over which his remonstrances had no power.

33. J. English
A few years back joined his brother joined partnership. Large capital. Chiefly in commission line. Competent profit. 'But that political occurrences took place which stopped their said business'. Therefore engaged on own account. Yielded much management to brother whose approach was more speculative. Some articles returned to sellers. Composition 15/ in the £.

34. John Gough
Small capital. Borrowed money in an expensive manner leaving little capital for creditors. Trustees appointed.
35. Thomas Morrison  
Endorsed bills for country friends and relatives. Entered into city accommodation transactions.

36. John Shannon  
Small Capital. Took stock of person who had been in trade. Gave renewal of notes adding interest and stamps. Did not keep account. Accommodated an obliging creditor.

37. Stephen Dalton  
Accepted bills to big amount from person who could not give him money to meet remittances. Has offered up property to creditors.

38. William Parvin  
Little if any capital. Became insolvent. Informed creditors who sold by auction his goods.

39. John Cozins  
Causes connected with his previous failure. In present stoppage owes c. £1,400 and has about half the amount to meet it.

40. Joseph Jackson  
Entered partnership with uncle whom he considered solvent. Big debts. But apparent large stock. Drew bills without giving value.

41. Thomas Simmons  
Partnership. Put in large capital. Entered bill trade. Big losses failed in debts on death of partner ten months ago. Under heavy engagements to some houses that have failed. Stopped payment. Has offered up property to creditors.

42. W. Johnson  
N.L.

43. Wm. Fuller  
N.L.

44. John Robinson  
Moderate capital. Speculated with son. Heavy losses. Accepted bills from country. One 'young house' took advantage of the facility. Accepted bills beyond capital. Have made over large portion of their property. His son William to be visited about morals.
45. George Bell

Two years before had big capital. Extensive commission business. Met big losses. Over extended his trade. Not attending meeting.

46. Joseph Boardman

Declining trade for many years. Big law case. Little payment made to creditors or property adequate for same.

47. Sampson Clarke


48. Geo. O. Neville


49. William Chapman

After former failure recommenced business. Sister accommodated him by endorsing bills which when due he could not pay. Got them repeatedly renewed when getting them discounted etc. Wasted the property. Intends making use of insolvent debtors Act.

50. Joshua Waring

Small capital borrowed £100 plus from his brother and sister. Gave credit. Losses. Trade too extensive for his capital or abilities.

51. James Phelps


52. Jono. Hill Jnr.,


53. John J. Wright

Partnership with his father. Samuel to receive 1/3rd of the profits. No regular accounts or deed S. believes his father had a capital of £10,000 and a big income from commission in trade. On his marriage he received a sum of money and an annuity which his
wife has in her own right. He did not pay much attention to accounts. But drew for personal expenses. Samuel drew out too much. Trade losses not more than £2,000. Paid £3,000 for country house. Owes £10,000. Has surviving property worth £4,000 and a deficiency of £6,000.

55. William Sproule


56. John Robinson

No capital. Made some property. Business turned worse. Arrested for small debt. Liberated under insolvent debtors act. Debts not much more than £100. Intends to pay back.

57. Wm. A. Roberts

A few years in partnership. Small capital. Profits not equal to expenses. Dissolved partnership. Carried on own account. Lost some property by bad debts. Expense of bankruptcy unlikely to leave much for creditors.

58. James Hanks

Started business with c.£650. Lasted 1¼ years. Had to stop payment. Owes £6,500. Has lost £1,600 in bad debts. Has proposed composition of 8/4 in the £.

59. James Barton

Business without capital. Took house. Agreed to pay a fine, part of which he paid. Debts now c. £300. No property to discharge.

60. John Manders

Small capital. Trade did not answer expectations. Debts £250. Liberated under insolvent debtors act. Also not attending meeting.
61. Catherine Smithson  
No capital. Four years before. Made some bad debts. Business bad. Owes £2,000. Property value £1,250 exclusive of any interest she may have in a house. All creditors but one agreed to 10/- in the £.

62. Joshua M. Chaytor  
Magnitude of engagements. Smallness of capital Unwarranted extension of trade/letter expressing sorrow. Cause was insolvency of his London factor, '..to whom he had consigned goods to a large amount.' and drawn bills on account of same...that in addition he had negotiated bills drawn on the same person by another individual in the South of Ireland. Engagements contracted in those ways c. £16,000. Entire debts £22,000.

63. Hannah Webb  
Started on borrowed capital. £190. Spent money on house and fixtures. Loan recalled. Had more than enough to repay but agreed with creditors for 15/- in the £. Debts c. £600

64. Geo. Dawson  
Capital c. £120. Lasted a few years. Losses. Stopped payment. Debts c. £1,700. Has sold off stock. Not expected to produce more than 6/8 in the £.

65. S. Dalton  
Commenced with £400 6 years before. Heavy losses. Engagements exceed £1,500.

66. Anne Eves  
Precarious health. Meeting accepts her acknowledgement ref. debts.

67. Thos. Goodbody  
Got into difficulty through accepting accommodation bills.

68. Isaac Todhunter  
Did not keep regular accounts. Therefore hard to account for loss. No adequate means to pay debts c. £7,000.

69. Jono Hill Jnr.,  
Had been trading on own account for several years (6).
beginning of that period took the stock/undertook the payment of a composition on debts of the house in which he had been a partner. Property that came into his hands was inadequate. Therefore no capital. Business yielded some income. In last 12 months several bad debts. Stopped payment.

70. Jos. MacQuillan
A few years before 1826/Moderate business/Sufficient profit. Added to capital £700-£1,000. Spent too much money on ground and buildings. Raised money by accommodation bills. Agreed to pay creditors 20/- in the £ plus interest at stated periods. Made partial payments. Could not meet composition agreed. Agreed therefore at 10/- in the £. Debts c.£4,800 incl. £900 secured by mortgage of holdings.

71. H. Woods
Little or no capital. Had use of large amount of money on loan. Has since repaid some. Extensive credit trading. Losses composition 10/6 in the £. Debts c.£4,800.

72. S. Thompson
No significant details available

73. John Smithson

74. Geo Milner
Several years in trade in the city. Withdrew some capital. 'Embarked in an extensive manufactory'. Not productive. Owes £10,000. Effects not likely to realise that sum.

75. Wm. Locke
A former bankruptcy in 1827 and before legal discharge entered commission line. 1-2 years. At wind up had therefrom £750 subject to debts due to him. Probably not
76. Thomas Goodbody

Commenced as a miller c. 2 years since. Capital. £80 lent/advanced by friends. Had to spend £400 in repairs/lost £300 in prosecution of his trade and family expenses. Owed £300 to a few creditors with permission from his friends to give 12/- in the £ to creditors.

77. Wm. Robinson

Started 1816 with large capital. Heavy losses c. 1820 by failure of others from whom they accepted bills. Capital in excess of needs but not available. Borrowed from government to meet instalments plus interest. Had to mortgage property at heavy interest/depreciation of property/reduced capital in last 2 years. Debts c. 10-11 thousand £. Value of property c. £6,000/attempting settlement with creditors for 8/- in £. Also about £6,400 borrowed on mortgage. Appears well secured.

78. Joshua Fayle

Commenced with big capital/used with little benefit/losses. Father gave him big money advances/not repaid or claimed. Vain amusements/tightened up affairs/stopped payment. Claims of creditors c. £300/sold stock/8/- in the £.

80. George Williams


81. Joshua Fayle

See above Wm. Robinson


84. Thomas Wilson Not located


86. J. Anderson Many years in building trade. Started with little capital. In last three years received insufficient remuneration. Has been sick. Schedule produced by him in insolvent court c. £1,100 including sum of £700. Also not often at meeting.

87. Juliana C. Jacob From Waterford. Commenced boarding school at Monkstown on borrowed capital. Property at Waterford acctd. profitable on which was a heavy loss. Other losses. Contracted debts c. £1,500

88. Richard Garratt Details in Chapter V of this thesis. Also censured for musical education of daughters and disowned with his wife Isabella.

89. Thomas G. White Entered partnership with his brother in 1840. Joint capital of £1,000. Traded with advantage for a few years/extended/gave and took credit/losses from bad debts dissolved partnership. Debts of £7,000/Effects would have been adequate to discharge debts but he started business again. Transactions/speculations. Debts of £3,600 or 7/6 in the £. Also engaged on own account as stock or
share broker but not much loss in

Wholesale and retail grocery in
Capel Street 1834. Capital
£1,500. Successful till 1846 when
capital equal to c. £6,000.
Helped an insolvent with £3,000
and then incurred a loss when a
commercial connection became
insolvent. Considerable trade
losses during period of
merchandile depression ref.
Famine. Injured his credit.
Could not buy goods on fair terms.
Ruinous rates of interest. Debts
now £16,000. Direct commercial
liabilities ref complicated series
of accommodation bills with chief
creditor. Assets £400.

George Mark
Started c. 1842. Capital £140 and
£100 advanced by a relative. Some
property speculations. Became
security for someone. Litigation
involved. Diverted interest from
business. Did not usually take
stock. Debts c. £10,100 and
£5,784 due to two parties. Final
debts £13,142.0.10. Assets £1,500
also large house in Blackrock £126
p.a..

Edward Gatchell
See details in Chapter V of this
thesis.

Thomas Barrington
Would not co-operate.

Mordecai Johnston
Started 1845 with two others. One
advanced £650. The capital was
afterwards increased to £1,000.
Spent £1,100 on outfitting. 1847
the connection was dissolved and
he was left with capital plus bad
debts at £2,300. A dividend of
8/6 in the £.

List compiled from monthly meeting minute books and in
conjunction with Thomas H. Webb. Lists of disownment (D.F.H.L.)
relevant dates and individual referances available in work-
sheets used for this Appendix. FURTHER DETAILS FOR ABOVE
DISOWNMENTS ON PAGE FOLLOWING THIS.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>Case</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>Case</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>Case</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Acctd.</td>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
<td>dd.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>V.1815</td>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
<td>dd.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Acctd.</td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>66</td>
<td>Acctd.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>15.VI.1802 dd.</td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>VI.1802 dd.</td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>V.1815</td>
<td></td>
<td>68</td>
<td>XI.1827 dd.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>X.1802 dd.</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>69</td>
<td>III.1827 dd.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>IX.1802 dd.</td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>IV.1815</td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td>XI.1829 dd.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>IX.1802 dd.</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>71</td>
<td>V.1830 dd.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>III.1805 dd.</td>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Acctd. IX.1815</td>
<td></td>
<td>72</td>
<td>VII.1830 dd.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>? Acctd.</td>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>IX.1815 dd.</td>
<td></td>
<td>73</td>
<td>IX.1831 dd.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Acctd. VI.1806</td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>XII.1815 dd.</td>
<td></td>
<td>74</td>
<td>Acctd.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>IX.1806 dd.</td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>III.1816</td>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
<td>II.1832 dd.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Acctd.</td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>76</td>
<td>XI.1832 dd.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>V.1812 dd.</td>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>VIII.1816</td>
<td></td>
<td>77</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>I.1807 dd.</td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>78</td>
<td>See 81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>I.1807 dd.</td>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>79</td>
<td>III.1834</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>III.1807 dd.</td>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>III.1817</td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>V.1835 dd.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>VIII.1807 dd.</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Acctd.</td>
<td></td>
<td>81</td>
<td>V.1835 dd.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>VIII.1807 dd.</td>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Acctd.</td>
<td></td>
<td>82</td>
<td>V.1836 dd.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>dd.</td>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
<td>IX.1807</td>
<td></td>
<td>83</td>
<td>II.1837</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>III.1807 dd.</td>
<td></td>
<td>53</td>
<td>X.1806</td>
<td></td>
<td>84</td>
<td>IV.1837 dd.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Acctd.</td>
<td></td>
<td>54</td>
<td>IV.1820</td>
<td></td>
<td>85</td>
<td>XI.1840 dd.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>dd.</td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>VIII.1810</td>
<td></td>
<td>86</td>
<td>I.1840 dd.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>dd.</td>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
<td>XI.1831 dd.</td>
<td></td>
<td>87</td>
<td>V.1841 dd.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>dd.</td>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>I.1824</td>
<td></td>
<td>88</td>
<td>I.1843 dd.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Acctd.</td>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
<td>V.1813</td>
<td></td>
<td>89</td>
<td>IX.1848 dd.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>XI.1813</td>
<td></td>
<td>59</td>
<td>dd.</td>
<td></td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Acctd.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>II.1814</td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>dd.</td>
<td></td>
<td>91</td>
<td>X.1852 dd.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td>61</td>
<td>dd.</td>
<td></td>
<td>92</td>
<td>XI.1852 dd.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>dd.</td>
<td></td>
<td>62</td>
<td>Acctd.XI.1826</td>
<td></td>
<td>93</td>
<td>VII.1852 dd.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>XII.1815 dd.</td>
<td></td>
<td>63</td>
<td>dd.</td>
<td></td>
<td>94</td>
<td>III.1852 dd.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

dd = Disowned  Acctd. = Accepted

Material extracted from Dublin Monthly Meetings Minutes DFHL
APPENDIX C

LIST OF ADULT MALE SUBSCRIBERS TO DUBLIN MONTHLY MEETING IN THE YEAR 1825

Joshua Abell - Schoolmaster
Edward Alexander - Linen Factor (w)
Richard Allen - Woolen/Draper
Edward Barrington - Tallow Wholesaler
Richard Barrington
William Baker - Secretary to the European Ins. Co.
Christopher Bentham, Printer
Samuel Bewley, Silk Merchant

Charles Bewley, Merchant (w tea 1835)
Alex. Bewley, Merchant

Wm. Birkett, Tallow Chandler and soap boiler.
William Birkett, Jnr.,
George H. Birkett, Tallow Chandler and soap boiler
John Bradley, Clerk (w)
Samuel Bradley,
Adam Calvert, Grocer and candlewick manufacturer
William Calvert
Henry Chapman (w)
Joshua M. Chaytor, Provision Merchant wholesale grocer
Richard Corlett, Fancy Hardware
Edward Clibborn, Linen Factor
William Card, Soap manufacturer (w)
Nathaniel Card Junior
George Dawson. Grocer
Josiah Dalton. Grocer
James Doyle. Wholesaler Linen
William Doyle. Wholesale Linen
Wm. R. Elly
John Eustace. Physician (w)
Samuel Eves. Linen/Draper
Joshua Fayle. Merchant
Robert Fayle. Blanket and Irish Linen. W. Hee
Joseph Fayle
James Garratt. Wholesale linens.

Edward Gatchell. Ironmongery and paper warehouse.
Thomas Gatchell. Ironmonger and paper warehouse.
Hancock Gatchell
Samuel Glorney. Thread tape and trimming warehouse.
Joshua Harvey. Physician (w)
Joseph Harvey
Wm. Haughton. Merchant & flour factor.
Edward Haughton
Robert Hudson. (Saddler (w))
Joseph Humphreys
Wm. Harding. Woolen draper (w)
Rd. Jackson. Chandler (w)
Joshua Jacob. Grocer (w)
John Knott. W/sale thread, garter and tape manufacturer
Wm. Locke. W/sale linens
Jos. MacQuillan. Grocer
Francis Malone
Robert Millner. Wool Merchant
William Millner.
Samuel Newsome. Grocer
Thos. Nicholson. Linen Draper
Henry Perry. Ironmonger and hardware merchant
James Perry
Chas. Phelps
George Phelps
Henry Phelps
Joseph Phelps. Merchant
James M. Pike. Gentleman
George Pim
George Pim
Henry Pim. Brewer
James Pim Merchant
James Pim Jnr., Stockbroker
Jonathan Pim
Joseph Pim. Merchant
Joseph Pim (Wicklow)
Joseph R. Pim. Merchant
Thomas Pim Merchant
Tobias Pim. Linen Factor
Henry Pim
William Pim. Gentleman
Paul Roberts
Wm. Robinson. Wholesale wool and Manch. warehouse
Henry Russell
Robt. Roberts. Linen Draper
Thos. Saunders Merchant
Musgrave Shannon
John Shaw
Alex Shelly
Wm. Sinton
Thos. Smith
Isaac Simmons. Poplin manufacturer
John Smithson. Wholesale silk manufacturer
Chas Shannon
George Taylor
John Taylor
Rd. Thacker
Isaac Todhunter. Rope Manufacturer
John Todhunter. Merchant
John Tolerton. Thread and tape manufacturer.
John Tolerton Jnr., Silk Manufacturer
Samuel Tolerton. Wholesale trimming warehouse
Joseph Todhunter. Secretary to National Insurance
Thos. C. Wakefield
Edw. Walpole. (possibly connected with Simmons of Suffolk Street in Linen
John Walpole. Grocer
Thos. S. Walpole

John Wardell

Mark Watson. Linen and Thread and tape manufacturer (w)

Samuel Watson (Tea Dealer 1830 (w))

James Webb. Wholesaler retail linen draper

James R. Webb

John Webb. Linen Draper

Rd. Webb. Linen Draper

Wm. Webb

Hugh White, (was merchant)

Benj. Whitton

John Whitton

Nathaniel Williams. Merchant

George Williams. Wholesale Grocer

Samuel Woodcock. Linen Draper

Nehemiah Wright. Linen Draper

John Wright Woolen Daper

Robert Wyly. Shoe Maker

List compiled from MM II M. 10. Trades supplied from Wilsons Directory 1824

(W) Supplemented from T.H. Webb, Residences of Friends with notes 1876 Port. 7 B, item 6, Rm. 4, (D.F.H.L.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME OF COMPANY (with Nominal Capt.)</th>
<th>Date of Sample Price</th>
<th>Share</th>
<th>Henry</th>
<th>James</th>
<th>Robert Henry</th>
<th>James</th>
<th>James</th>
<th>Jonathan</th>
<th>Joseph</th>
<th>Thomas</th>
<th>William</th>
<th>Joseph</th>
<th>Joshua</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BANKS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural and Commercial</td>
<td>(1836)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>N.K.</td>
<td>N.K.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hibernian</td>
<td>(1824) £100</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>N.K.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial</td>
<td>(1826)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>N.K.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal £1.5m.</td>
<td>(1836) £500</td>
<td>100s</td>
<td>100s</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100s</td>
<td>200s</td>
<td>300s</td>
<td>200s</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INSURANCE COMPANIES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>(1799) £500</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>N.K.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>(1777)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>N.K.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hibernian</td>
<td>(1779)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>(1812) £500</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>N.K.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National £1m.</td>
<td>(1823) £250</td>
<td>2s</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2s</td>
<td>10s</td>
<td>8s</td>
<td>10s</td>
<td>10s</td>
<td>10s</td>
<td></td>
<td>10s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patriotic £1.5m.</td>
<td>(1824) £100</td>
<td>15s</td>
<td>15s</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25s</td>
<td>25s</td>
<td>25s</td>
<td>25s</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RAILWAYS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dublin &amp; Belfast (Kells)</td>
<td>(1845)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>£2000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

s = number if shares of monetary value N.K. N.K. = number of shares or monetary value unknown
### CHAPTER II APPENDIX D
### RAILWAYS (contd.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Railway</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Capitalisation</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dundalk and Enniskillen</td>
<td>1845</td>
<td>£1,300,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.S.W. Extension</td>
<td>1845</td>
<td>£4000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.W.(Irl.) Athlone £lm.</td>
<td>1845</td>
<td>£50</td>
<td>£3000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingstown &amp; Bray</td>
<td>1845</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£3000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterford and Limerick</td>
<td>1845</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolton &amp; Preston</td>
<td>1841</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SHIPPING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Capitalisation</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brit.&amp; Am. St. Nav. Co. £lm.</td>
<td>1836</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>N.K.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Dublin</td>
<td>1828</td>
<td>£230,000 (in 1826)</td>
<td>2s 2s 24s 26s 27s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cork St. Pckt.</td>
<td>1844</td>
<td>£170,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.L.S.N. £300,000</td>
<td>1825</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>N.K.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St.Geo. St. Pckt. Co.</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>£300,000</td>
<td>144s 282s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterford Commercial St.</td>
<td>1835</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterford Comm. St.</td>
<td>1841</td>
<td>£600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### OTHERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Initial Investment</th>
<th>Number of Shares</th>
<th>Value of Shares</th>
<th>Number of Shares</th>
<th>Value of Shares</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comm. Buildings Co.</td>
<td>1804</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corn Exchange Bldng.</td>
<td>1815</td>
<td>£350</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>N.K.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Canal Co.</td>
<td>1820</td>
<td>£100</td>
<td>£1000</td>
<td>£2050</td>
<td>£12500</td>
<td>£2500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hibernian Hemp &amp; Flax £1m.</td>
<td>1825</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hibernian Gas Light £100,000</td>
<td>1833</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>N.K.</td>
<td>N.K.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining Co. of Ireland</td>
<td>1833</td>
<td>£25</td>
<td>27s 53s 20s</td>
<td>25s 224s 462s 735s 350s</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shannon Navigation Co.</td>
<td>1825</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>N.K.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>N.K.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterford Gas Co.</td>
<td>1841</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterford Steam Co.</td>
<td>1841</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*For Dublin & Kingstown see Chapter III App.D(i)(ii)*

- s = number of shares of monetary value N.K.
- N.K. = number of shares or monetary value unknown.
EXPERIENCE AND PRODUCE ACCOUNT FOR THE MINING COMPANY OF IRELAND 1827-1845

Values in pounds 'sterling'

Graph also illustrates the progress of the four most productive areas (apart from state) of the company during the same period

(figures derived from half-yearly reports of the company)
Dear Friends,

'It is not without some painful feelings that I have looked towards withdrawing from connection with a society which is characterised by much with which I can cordially unite and to which many whom I love and esteem are warmly attached, but as on various fundamental points its principles have long appeared to me untenable, I cannot with consistency continue apparently to make profession of them'.

'I believe as a professing Christian Church it is our place to receive the holy scriptures which George Fox designated "the words of God" as the primary rule and sole standard of faith and practice, and that the acknowledged writings of the Early Friends, which as it appears to me contain much unusual doctrine should not be recognised as the standard of our religious profession, - In their extravagant and unscriptural doctrines of an inward light, -in representing the Gospel as a dispensation of light rather than of grace and love, - and in
their statements of the grounds of a sinner's justification and acceptance with God, -and on other cardinal points of Christian doctrine, I believe there is much of error. I am aware that on these subjects considerable latitude of opinion is admitted and that much diversity of view exists in the Society, and I rejoice that many of our recent publications are marked by much more of the simple gospel truth, but as long as we set up erroneous standards of human authority, I apprehend it will be found to exercise a pernicious and withering influence, to impede the free course of gospel truth, and retard our spiritual growth and prosperity as a church. Much therefore as I look up to the judgement of many of my friends, I feel constrained, in consistency with my own convictions to separate from it as a system. I desire not to separate from any in it or out of it who love the Lord Jesus in sincerity, but, on the contrary I desire, that weaned from sectarian prepossessions and from all self will in the substitution of tests of fellowship, which the Lord has not seen meet to establish and which sadly divide his Church, we might in subjection to His word and taught by his spirit be led more and more into fellowship one with another and into that manifested unity which cannot but believe it is the will of our Heavenly Father should characterise the whole family of his adopted children.

I am your affectionate friend,

Henry Bewley.
It is the intention in this chapter to look at those areas of land and sea transport in which Quakers were involved. Transport was central to merchant activity. The promotion of canals, the provision of improved shipping, and eventually the pioneering of railway companies could all be seen as the logical extension of mercantile interests. In the case of the Quakers it does not appear that there was a high degree of speculative interest in their promotions. There was not usually in the last decades of the seventeenth century any demand for Irish merchants to invest in infrastructural developments such as roads or canals. With the increase of commerce from the mid-decades of the eighteenth century the need for canals and improved road services became marked. The increased availability of capital for investment encouraged merchant participation in such promotions. By the second and third decades of the nineteenth century a vastly improved technology and the development of the joint-stock company as a mechanism for investment encouraged the promotion of steamships and railways.
In spite of the importance of shipping to many aspects of the commercial life of Quakers in Ireland and indeed the importance of shipping to them for communication with their scattered brethren in America and England, it is noticeable how infrequent are references to shipping in the minutes of Monthly Meetings. As one might expect the earliest references as far as Quaker archives go, relate to the maintenance of moral standards in the conduct of trade. But even from such a stray series of references it is possible to appreciate the extent of the trade of Quaker merchants. The names of France, England and Philadelphia occur.

Many Quakers were small traders and shopkeepers. But the question of shipping must be considered in the context of merchant activity. The merchants occupied the central financial position in the distributive processes. They alone had sufficient capital to invest in ships and the contacts to organise foreign and local trade, the purchase and sale, the import and export of goods. In the case of Quakers it is significant that those merchants with the most prominent public profile were also those whose names occur most frequently in the minutes of the Men's Meetings. The Men's Meetings did not compass the total male membership of the society. Neither were all Quakers equally active or vocal. But available lists of members of the Men's Meeting indicate that merchants constituted a significant and stable proportion of the Quaker population.
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For example a quaker list of 1734 shows on the basis of 49 identified occupational samples that 18 were merchants. A similar list for 1745 on the basis of 35 positive identifications shows that 16 were merchants. It has to be admitted that there is a degree of ambiguity in finding a definition of the word merchant which was applied to a wide species of activity. But usually each merchant had a central interest in wholesale dealing in one particular product or group of products. It is instructive to compare the number of merchants in the list of the Men's Meeting with two extensive lists of merchants that is printed in Faulkner's Dublin Journal in the same year of 1745, 260 merchants are listed there of whom 24 were certainly quakers. The second list gives a figure of 5 quakers out of 38 merchants.

To recap, by 1750 the quakers occupied a recognizable position as exporters of linen to England and the Colonies and had founded a portion of their commercial success on the export of bay yarn. Some imports of silk were also made direct from the Levant. As we find in 'Proclamations' dated from 1749 and 1758 when Robert Jaffray a Dublin quaker silk merchant petitioned the Lord Lt and Council for compensation. He had bought 4 bales of Calabria silk which were shipped at Leghorn by the ship Friendship but because of infection there the goods were sunk by order of the Irish Council.
Subjective factors could come in to play in the analysis of listings of merchants if we were to rely simply on an identity of name to indicate quaker allegiance. But there is fortunately a degree of evidence to correct our assumptions about who was or was not a quaker merchant. Such quaker lists of members as do exist whilst not complete can be correlated with lists of merchants derived from printed sources such as directories. If suitable allowance is made for the period of time in which a merchant may have flourished and for the fact that the lists do not perfectly agree in temporal terms we can still get a fairly adequate picture of the quaker merchant community. The Guild of Merchants still exerted a powerful influence on Dublin commercial life in 1750. Its support was useful for a merchant. A list of members of the Guild of Merchants for that year shows 448 persons, of whom a manuscript addition notes 16 as being Quakers and 107 as dissenters. At least four others are listed who were certain to have been quakers (Joseph Fade, Ebenezer Shackleton, Amos Stretts and Charles Willcox.) There is a big discrepancy between the number of merchants listed in the guild and the number determined as merchants in a near contemporary Directory (1751) where a recent analysis by Professor Cullen noted a total of 236 merchants, sugar refiners and wine merchants. Such a discrepancy might be accounted for by prevailing partnership practice, the wide meaning given to the term merchant, the method of selection employed by the compilers of the directory. Guild membership of course was wider than the
commercial classes. It seems best to accept the Guild List as most pertinent to our analysis in this instance.

It was not usual practice for a merchant to have exclusive ownership of a ship. Besides the question of the amount of capital involved, it was generally considered better to spread the risks of ownership by having shares in a number of ships and thus split the risks with other merchants. It was also the practice to share cargo space in the vessels of other merchants and sometimes to entrust the cargos to supercargos or factors who would make the best possible deal at a suitable port. Such patterns of ownership and commerce are visible in the case of Peter Nicholson, a general merchant, in 1750. He had been disowned for bankruptcy and removed to England where he appealed the case against Irish Friends. The case was the last Quaker arbitration to be appealed to London Yearly Meeting. A collection of 37 documents details the case and reviews all that had passed between Nicholson and the Dublin Men's Yearly Meeting. In an apparent act of kindness he had undertaken to dispose of 328 gallons of rum imported from Philadelphia by another Quaker Isaac Jackson. Jackson appears to have been somewhat advanced in years and lacking knowledge of customs procedures. He was also anxious to recoup his money by a quick sale. Nicholson offered his services having represented to Jackson that any further delay would lead to the seizure of both ship and cargo by the customs. He also volunteered to make a quick and profitable sale. The other Friend agreed to the offer.
but Nicholson disposed of the goods and Jackson never saw the colour of his money after. Nicholson went bankrupt. When required by the Dublin Men's Meeting he produced a list of monies owed by and to him.

Nicholson's trade involved dealings in linen and tobacco. The biggest item which he owed is shown as £2,750 to Gale and Bell, probably Irish Linen merchants or manufacturers. The sum is mentioned in connection with the London merchants Harrison and Wilson. Listed as part of his stock were one-sixteenth shares in the ships Wilson (£28.10), Newton (15/-), Improvement (12/10) and 1/32nd part in the Love (26/5). 10

By the 1760's it becomes apparent that many merchants had become conscious of their own role and power as a class to organise a defence and promotion of their interests. This would be outside of the traditional parameters provided by guild structures. Just as catholics were contesting the right of traditional guilds to control their commercial and mercantile behaviour so the dissenting and quaker Merchants had joined in setting up a Committee of Merchants in 1761. 12 The quaker John Pim Joshua appears on its committee. 13 This did not mean that merchants were hence forth to disregard the guilds. Indeed the Guild of Merchants in 1765 recorded 594 members of whom 21 are identifiable as quakers. 14 Such a figure might be compared with a sample of sixteen merchants out of a total of 46 identified
occupations in a list of 75 subscribers to the rebuilding of the Meath Street Meeting house circa 1767 - 79.

The Quakers, whilst not yet free of the disabilities imposed by church and state, or of the latent hostility of some classes of the populace were launched on a consistent career of commercial success and to some apparent increase in their own numbers. There was a distinct move of quakers to the bigger towns, often at first as apprentices and then to take advantage of new commercial prospects. A recognition of the role of individual quakers and their commercial expertise is to be detected in the occurrence of 'Quaker' names on the committee of the Ouzel Gailey. This had been set up in 1705 to determine questions of arbitration relating to shipping. It was comprised of a self-electing body of merchants commonly esteemed for their commercial wisdom. Among its early quaker members may be noted Nathaniel Card who was admitted in 1753 and the Robert Jaffray already mentioned. He was according to the rules of the Society admitted in 1755. Strangely enough for a quaker he was admitted as a 'Gunner' in 1768 and in 1772 as a 'Lieutenant'! Other Quakers admitted at an early period were John Pim Joshua 1756, Joseph Fade 1757, John Dawson 1764 and Edward Strettell.

The next fourteen or fifteen years from 1770 show quakers as sharing in the increasing prosperity of the country generally. Their position as merchants came to be ever better secured in the Dublin community. Their new decisiveness and self
confidence, as that of the merchant class generally, is to be recognised in their initiation of a further trade association to prosecute their aims. This took over the functions of the original Committee of Merchants in 1783. It was to be the ancestor of the present Dublin Chamber of Commerce. Joshua Pim, son of John Pim, Joshua may be particularly noted as drafting the original plan for the Chamber. Many of these merchants now had capital to invest. Necessary commercial infra-structures such as canals and insurance companies offered them ample scope.

As already remarked many of the most prosperous Quakers had built up their business on the basis of textile related goods. If, in the case of the Pims it had been on the basis of bay yarns, in the case of the Stretton it had been linen. But prosperity has also its costs and there were longstanding signs of dissension in the Society of Friends. Such dissension had already surfaced with some of the richer members paying tithes and attempting to justify it to their brethren. The names of Gamble, Jaffray and Stretton occur in this context. Such tensions indicate a wish on the part of some of the richer and more successful Quaker merchants to identify with their non-Quaker commercial peers. If they did not necessarily leave the Society they were definitely drifting away beyond its discipline. But we must regard them as within the ambit of this account because of their upbringing, the capital they had inherited and the extensive network provided by their kinship groups.
There are a number of good reasons to regard the years 1784 and 1785 as useful starting points for an analysis of quaker and quaker originated business. Quite apart from the dynamic emergence of the Pims and the revival of the linen trade, the decade saw the establishment of the Bank of Ireland and other institutions indicative of national pride and commercial confidence. Secondly, and in connection with this we have a number of lists relating to merchants and quakers. Thirdly, two series of Dublin shipping lists exist for 1785 which enable us to quantify to some degree the patterns of imports and exports of some individual quaker merchant houses. The first of these lists, that of Robert Bell was issued for a period of six consecutive months. The second was issued for a period of three months by Richard Eaton, an officer in the Custom House. The lists do not perfectly agree but are near enough in accuracy. There was rivalry between the two editors and Eaton was not willing to share the material he had privileged access to!

The quaker list referred to is basically a list of subscribers to the Monthly Meeting between the years 1779 and 1786. But it was certainly in use for some time after as shown by the removal of the name Barcroft Boake who was disowned in 1788. Out of a total of 114 names listed it has proved possible to positively identify the occupations of 61 members. Of those 31 can be identified as merchants. A list in Wilson's Directory for 1789 (a year selected as best relating to the evidence of
the list under discussion) shows 435 merchants of whom 28 are identifiable as quakers. (Professor Cullen on the basis of a similar count of merchants in a 1783 directory noted 425 merchants).  

The year 1784 had shown 2804 ships as invoiced into the port of Dublin. The figure includes ships in the coastal trade as well as ships from England and other foreign ports. No breakdown is available on the ownership of these vessels but an aggregate of 228,956 tons was recorded. In relation to Eaton's and Bell's commercial lists simple observation reveals that the majority of the traffic was with British ports such as Liverpool, Chester, Bristol and London. Few entries occur in connection with Baltimore, New York or Philadelphia. A number occur in relation to the Straits and Leghorn, and to Rotterdam and Bordeaux. Merchants continued to deal in a wide spectrum of products, but each had usually some special and central interest. Looking at quaker merchants specifically Samuel Gatchell, for example, specialised in hardware as did Joseph Pike. Samuel Payle often imported materials for dyeing from London. John Bewley, a grocer imported refined sugar in loaves from London and on one occasion 2,392 pounds of green and black teas from the same place. Joseph Barcroft and Samuel Stephens both exported bacon flitches and bacon hams.

But in terms of the central textile interests of many Dublin Quaker merchants more significant listings occur in relation to
the three houses of Wilcocks and John Phelps, of Joshua Pim and of Jaffray, Fayle and Hautenville. These Quakers were, incidentally, active in the recently formed Dublin Chamber of Commerce. The Phelps specialised in the export of linen, which itself was in a position of remarkable national export expansion in the 1780's. They sent their linen mainly to Bristol and Yarmouth. In the first three months of 1785, according to Eaton's list, they exported 75,000 yards or 0.94% out of a total export from Dublin for the same period, of 7,918,911 yards. Other quaker houses were involved in the linen export trade but it is convenient to record the relevant figures in a separate appendix to this chapter. The Phelps also imported such items as hair, beaver's wool and pig-iron from Chester, flower pots and smalts from Rotterdam and port wine from Oporto.

Joshua Pim's trade was centered on the traditional business of his family the business of his father John Pim Joshua, namely the trade in bay yarn. This trade had declined by the 1780's but was still significant and was shared with the non-quakers Peter and Abraham Wilkinson who also operated from Dublin. In a three month period Pim shipped 544 great stones of bay yarn to Liverpool as against the 1,427 great stones in toto of bay yarn which the Wilkinsons shipped to Bristol and Liverpool. These exports represented nearly a quarter of the total Dublin exports for that period of 5731 great stones of bay yarn. Most of Pim's exports were through Liverpool or Bristol. He also
exported quantities of linen which in a six month period according to Bell's lists amounted to 5,200 pieces.\textsuperscript{34}

Jaffray, Fayle and Hautenville were a firm with Quaker antecedents or, at least with Quaker antecedents only recently shed. The partners were, it seems, related by marriage. The house specialised in the import of silk. The silk trade in Dublin was in a period of prosperity. On the basis of a count of specific listings of individuals dealing in silk related trades, Dublin directories show a rise from 39 weavers, dyers, manufacturers etc in 1765 to 76 in 1789.\textsuperscript{35} The figure includes 6 Quakers. Quaker sources in a contemporary subscription list of 1779–86 on the basis of an identified sample indicates 3 Quaker silk weavers and 4 silk manufacturers.\textsuperscript{36} It seems likely that Jaffray Fayle and Hautenville had silk manufacturing interests but there is no evidence that this was the case. Most of their imports of raw silk were made direct from Leghorn. These included thrown and unthrown silks of Italian and Chinese organzé. A proportion of their imported silk came from London and Chester. On one occasion 1,124 great pounds of Bengal silk were imported via Chester. Their trade occasionally was via Rotterdam. Smaller imports included such items as chip and straw hats, hemp, marble and salad oil! As regards the exports of the house these included butter, hides and linen. The export of hides was quite large. On one occasion 2,000 were sent to the Straits, which as far as the first six months of 1785 were
concerned was the destination of the vast majority of their exports.\textsuperscript{37 39}

The decade 1780 to 1790 saw the emergence of the \textit{regular trader}. The regular trader was a ship providing a regular specialist service on defined routes. It represented a separation of function from some of those traditionally associated with merchant practice. A typical entry in \textit{Wilson's Dublin Directory} for 1789 shows 5 such traders engaged on the London route, 5 to Liverpool, four to Bristol and 3 to Chester.\textsuperscript{39}

The methods of ownership had, however, probably changed very little in the preceding decades but it does seem likely that individual merchant houses would now be in a position to own their own vessels outright as well as to spread their investments in the more traditional manner. There is no specific evidence for the ownership of ships by Dublin quaker merchants. But on the basis of evidence relating to the quaker merchants of Cork and Waterford it would be remarkable if they did not have such interests.\textsuperscript{40} It may be that a degree of Dublin's shipping was foreign or British owned. Wakefield gives a figure of 1,016 ships of 60,776 registered tons as belonging to 'the several ports of Ireland' in 1788.\textsuperscript{41} If 2,004 ships, as already mentioned, were invoiced into Dublin alone but four years previously, a great majority of ships must therefore have belonged to other than Irish ports ?\textsuperscript{42}
Dublin was still the chief port of Ireland... For the years 1797/98/99, out of a registered tonnage of 68,900 with the ports of Belfast, Cork and Waterford it had a proportion of 33,485 tons or 48.59%. The proportions for Belfast and Cork being respectively 18.90% and 19.48%. The number of ships invoiced inwards to Dublin for the year 1800 was 2,779 of a gross aggregate burthen of 280,539 tons. Among ships regularly to be seen in the port there were eight 'regular traders' on the London route, eight on the Liverpool route and two to Bristol. There were besides, 25 vessels owned by Dublin merchants and which were primarily engaged in the West Indies trade. And although the American trade was vital to the Irish economy, it appears that none of the ships entering New York in 1800 were owned by Irishmen, although a fifth of the shipping entering that city has been stated to have been Irish in origin. Ireland exported linens and manufactured products to New York and in exchange received flax-seed, potash and other items useful to her own economy. As already mentioned a long tradition of exporting provisions existed but as far as quakers went, as for merchants generally, the trade remained more significant for the Southern ports of Cork and Waterford. Certainly some export of provisions existed from Dublin, but it may be presumed to relate primarily to the trade with Britain. Not much evidence remains to link it with particular quaker business houses established in the city. Neither, unfortunately
is there evidence to link Quakers with the ownership of particular vessels during the first decade of the nineteenth century. But it is certain that Joshua Pim of Ussher's Island owned a 1/16th share in the regular trade Irene. His frequent appearance on the committee of the Ouzel Galley is itself indicative of a wider shipping interest concomitant with his position as a prosperous and highly capitalised merchant.

An extensive linen trade was still concentrated in Dublin in the first decades of the nineteenth century. Exports of plain linen cloth to England from Dublin in 1804 amounted to 141,931,905 yards and to New York of 996,015 yards representing in each case a proportion of 47.1% and 62.5% of the national exports to those two places. The small American trade suffered some set back as a result of the non-importation acts of 1806.

The evidence is not extensive enough to say very much about the specific business activity of the branch of the Pim family which emerged into the commercial life of Dublin from 1800, or for that matter about the business activity of any other Quaker merchant family at that period. Three brothers, Thomas, Jonathan and Joseph Robinson Pim were involved in the business partnership with which it is proposed to deal in the course of the next few pages. On the evidence of their letters it is clear that the Pims were from the earliest years involved in the import of cotton wool from New York and of yarn and of old and
new draperies from England. The nature of their business was therefore to a large degree both dependent on and formed by the nature of shipping business. Their cotton wool was purchased in Liverpool and occasionally from visiting American merchants in Dublin, as in 22.ii.1806 in a letter to Thomas who was on a buying trip in England, Jonathan wrote '...there are several Americans arrived here and more are daily expected. They have not much cotton and the owners are looking for high prices'.

This younger branch of the Pim family did not come into focus in any significant way in connection with extensive commercial or business schemes until around 1816 when they were well enough capitalised to accept a mortgage of James Greenham's cotton manufacture at Greenmount, Harold's Cross. It is worth noticing the appearance of Thomas Pim's name as an original shareholder in the Marine Insurance Company set up in 1811.

In spite of a temporary depression consequent on the ending of the Napoleonic wars the Port of Dublin continued to prosper. In 1817 £1,046,318 in customs dues were received, and 3,164 ships of 318,142 tons burthen invoiced. Warburton comments on this, 'Thus then, it appears that for sixteen years before the union, the commerce of Dublin was stationary or rather declining, and for the same period since the Union, it has increased more than one-eighth, notwithstanding that the last was a year of unexampled embarrassments to the commercial interest of the United Kingdom.'
The greater part of Dublin's trade to America was described as carried on in American ships. We presume that the Pims did not as yet have any vessels of their own trading directly to North America. But their trade already covered the South of Ireland. A letter of 1814 shows them as involved in the delivery of cargoes of bark, tobacco and hoops from Southampton to Cork. Their knowledge of shipping and commerce is suggested in a letter from William Harvey, a relative of Thomas Pim and living in Youghal. Harvey writes in 1815 to suggest making up a mixed cargo for a voyage to Newfoundland. The cargo might include 'slops' such as the 400 shirts mentioned by Joseph R. Pim. He suggests that three or four merchants might purchase a vessel of 100-150 tons and have a share in its cargo proportionate to his share in the vessel. Pork is proposed as the chief item of cargo to the value of £2,000 to be contributed by the Harveys. The balance of cargo would be made up by the Pims to the value of £3,000. The letter is the suggestion of a young man who has not yet decided on how to further his career as a merchant and was probably not taken up.

The amounts of plain linen exported from Dublin in 1817 to New York amounted to 1,609,544 yards (or 61.50%) out of a national total of 2,617,060 yards. This represented a percentage increase of 61.8% on the total amount exported from Dublin to New York thirteen years before. An extensive and increasing commerce was carried on with the West Indies. Ten Dublin owned vessels traded with Barbados, Antigua and Trinidad and twelve
were noted as dealing with Jamaica. Eighteen further vessels were also occasionally chartered by Dublin merchants to carry on the commerce with the West Indies. The usual imports from those places were rum, cotton, coffee, spices and muscovado sugar. Out of a total national import of 25,735 cwt of muscovado sugar imported in 1817, 17,152 cwt came into the port of Dublin which had recently set up and extended its system of bonding to include that product. It is worth noting in the context of the Pim's trade in the course of the next few years from that date.

The Pim trade was concerned with three main areas: (1) Exports of linen to New York and imports from there of potashes, flax seed and cotton wool. (2) Exports of linen and poplin to England and imports of wide varieties of fine and Manchester Goods as well as worsted and cotton yarns and the cotton wool in which they specialised. (3) Exports to the West Indies, probably were of coarse cotton goods, provisions and linen, with the imports from there of spices and muscovado sugar among other items. We must also make some allowance for a degree of business which the Pims may have had through the port of Cork. The Pims endeavoured to import only goods that would not interfere with home production. Imports of New Draperies into Dublin from England in 1822 amounted to 80% of the national import. Similarly, the import of Old Draperies into Dublin from the same place amounted to 76% of the total national import.
By 1824 the Pims seem to have owned three ships, the Hannah, the Margaret and the Hibernia. The Hannah was described as a 'coppered brig'. The Margaret and the Hibernia were probably similar vessels. The Hibernia was chiefly used on the New York run, making two sailings in the year, one around December or January and one around August with occasionally a mid-February run to Barbados. A typical voyage in 1824 saw her arrival in Dublin in February after an exceptionally short time of 21 days from New York, with a cargo of 236 bales of cotton wool, 200 barrels of tar, 75 barrels of turpentine, 78 barrels of staves. On its outward voyage it would probably have carried linens and similar manufactured goods, possibly also coarse cotton goods for the 'colonies'. This at least was their later practice. An intriguing note in the Dublin Mercantile Advertiser for 2.vii.1824 records that the Hibernia has sailed for New York with a cargo of salt. Such a trade was traditional. Salt had commonly been exported to North America from Ireland. It seems that the Pims continued in this trade. But it is linens that constituted their chief export business to New York. How extensive the export of linens was from Dublin is suggested by the last figure available from the Custom House registers in 1823 and referring to 1822. 780,000 yards of plain linens out of a national total of 1,240,931 yards were exported to New York. The comparative figure for the increasing trade of Belfast was 431,127 yards. So Dublin still had 62.9% of that export market as against 34.7% for Belfast (Rest = 2.4%).
The advantage of having their own ships involved in the direct dealing with New York can be seen. Joseph R. Pim found it cheaper to export directly rather than via Liverpool. The costs of bonding, landing and re-shipping were against them there. And although they were permitted to warehouse calicoes in England for re-exportation, the charges levied made it an unrealistic proposition. 'It is better to send direct, certainly, the freight direct is low and the charges less'.

The Pims were much in favour of the free trade conditions promised in the 1800 Act of Union. During the Revenue Inquiry of 1822, Joseph R. Pim was earnestly looking towards the day when it would be possible to import duty-free cheap ranges of goods from England and to include them in mixed re-exports to America from Dublin, or to send goods to Liverpool for re-export from there.

The Pims not only imported direct from New York in their own ships. They also shared surplus cargo space with other merchants. This is indicated in an advertisement in the Dublin Mercantile Advertiser of 11.x.1824. The Pims advertised a big auction of 326 bales of upland cotton. Some of the bales had been offloaded from the Mount Vernon, a ship of 350 registered tons belonging to the merchant James Gray of Dublin. Others had been shipped in the Dublin Packet and the Bibby which were 'regular traders' employed in the London and Liverpool runs respectively. Others were loaded from the Messenger and from
the *Wilson*, while the balance was carried in their own ship the
*Hibernia*.\(^7\)

In any account such as this we are hampered by a lack of
detailed statistical information on the specific trade of the
Pims, just as we are also hampered by a lack of statistics from
the Custom House at Dublin after 1823. An account such as this
can therefore at best be only schematic. Nevertheless, even
allowing for the fact that advertised figures in newspapers for
the Pims imports of cotton wool are not necessarily total, their
auction in Dublin of 326 bales does appear big. On the basis of
available figures as shown in an appendix the Pims had in 1824
at least a 7.56% of the Dublin cotton market.\(^7\)

The ships *Hannah* and *Margaret* were chiefly engaged in the
Barbados trade. The *Margaret* only went on her first voyage in
1824. There is not very much to be said about her. The *Hannah*
usually set out around May and November. Sometimes the Pims
made surplus cargo space available to other merchants as on the
seventh of June 1824 when they offered to carry heavy freight in
the *Hannah* for 20/- - a ton and offered place for a few
passengers also.\(^8\)

There is no evidence that a big trade in provisions was
carried on from Dublin to the West Indies. The Pims had
occasionally exported butter there, but the export of linens and
course calicoes probably constituted the bulk of their exports
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to that place. The total Dublin export of plain linens to Barbados in 1822 had amounted to 40,973 yards. It may be that Pim exports were in the form of manufactured goods? Their ships on return would bring aloes, tamarinds, cayenne pepper, ginger, arrow roots and cocoa nuts. The chief item of import however was undoubtedly moscovado sugar. In 1824 the Hibernia was sent on the Barbados run. She returned in August of that year with a cargo of 200 hogsheads of moscovado before setting off again for New York. By November the Hannah had returned from Barbados and been to London to collect, among other items 40 casks of yellow candle tallow.

Sugar was often auctioned by a broker on behalf of the Pims. The sugar broker was one of the few workers who continued to operate that class of business from the Commercial Buildings complex. In the case of the Pims it was the broker Richard Franklin who sometimes handled the business for them. There were continuing vexations at the Custom House, particularly in relation to the landing of sugars. Joseph R. Pim, referring to the activities of the land-waiters stated,

'If a ship comes in from the West Indies they will allow goods to be landed in the morning, but at one o'clock they must stop and then they go and weigh them. If they were to attend to their duty and mark them off, and discharge them as they go on the ship might continue to discharge two hours later, and it would be better for the goods if they were put up at once; there is no protection from the weather, and a heavy shower of
rain is exceedingly injurious to the sugars. There is likewise a good deal stolen.37

But perhaps the anxiety of Pim about sugar was not so great as that of Joseph Grubb of Clonmel who had settled in London and entrusted the brokerage of his Irish sugar dealings to that other Pim, John Pim (son of John Pim Joshua) who like himself had settled in London. Grubb did not find John Pim’s brokerage activities at all satisfactory and particularly in consequence of the loss of a ship in which Pim had placed sugars on his behalf. Grubb it appears had a scruple about insuring goods just as at the beginning of the decade he shared the quaker scruple about handling sugar suspected to be the product of slave labour.38

Another area in which the Pim brothers dealt was that of the import of silk and the manufacture of poplin. They imported some of their silk direct from the Levant.39 They exported poplins to England and hoped for an increased demand for the same from America.40

But it was the silk house of Samuel Bewley and Corry Fowler of Suffolk Street which was peculiarly associated with the silk manufacture. By 1824 the silk manufacture of Dublin had much declined. In 1809 it was said to have engrossed a capital of £250,00041 and employed 3,760 workers.42 In 1815 6,400 yards of
poplin were exported to Great Britain and 80,000 yards to the United States of America.

The pattern of ship owning relative to silk was somewhat different from that which obtained in shipping involved in the trade with the West Indies and with New York. Although both Bewleys and Pims imported direct from the Levant it seems that the trade was carried on in chartered vessels as it certainly was in 1818. Bewley saw this as one of the chief difficulties of his trade, that there was a '...want of a regular and frequent succession of ships at the ports contiguous to the place of its growth' bound for Dublin. Such a difficulty encouraged imports of Indian and Italian silk via London, but that tended to put up costs because of the necessity to rely on middle men and pay for transport from there.

Samuel Bewley, in producing figures to challenge official government statistical returns stated that the direct imports of his house for the year ending 5.1.1820 amounted to 5,690 lbs of prepared silk and 2,378 lbs of raw silk for further preparation in Dublin. The total value in British currency was £11,400. The goods paid £4,005 in duty.

One positive side effect of the high costs involved was to stimulate the imports of unprepared silk, both direct and via London, and thus give extra work to the Irish throwster.

Bewley stated that the highest import ever since the Act of Union had occurred in 1818, while exports of poplin to England in 1821 had amounted to half the £7,000 import of silk out of £13,000. Bewley estimated a total direct import 1795 -
1818 inclusive as running at an average of 80,000 lbs. Thomas give an average of 73,000 lbs for 1820 and for 1824/1825/1826, of 25,983 lbs.

As was the pattern of the time Bewley engaged in a degree of general merchant activity also. The first specific record of his owning a ship occurred in 1826 when he owned a 'coppered' brig, the Cherub, which was engaged in the Barbados trade. In November 1824 he imported quantities of Eastern goods particularly drugs and dyestuffs from Smyrna, on the ship Commerce. The cargo included 1500 drums of new Turkey figs and 60 tons of valonia. On the eighth of November he was advertising such items as gum arabic, opium, galls, liquorice paste, Gallipoli oil, silkworm gut and turkey carpets. Alexander Bewley, a relative of his dealt in similar exotic items. He obtained a delivery on the first of March, via London on the ships Happy Return and Favourite from which he landed 50 casks of Petersburgh yellow candle tallow. He had also on sale 10 chests East India Indigo, 8 bales safflower, 109 pipes liniseed oil, 50 barrels pot ashes, 5 barrels pearl ashes, 30 casks cos oil, 10 chests shellac, 1 bale fine sponge, 20 bags East India rice, 20 bags cocoa shell, 100 bags rough saltpetre, 20 casks palm oil, 30 tons of barilla, 20 tons alum, 2 puncheons molasses, 2 casks smalts besides Roman cement, Terra Sciena, Sal ammoniac, Ivory Black, Pumice stone, arrowroot, boxwood, soft soap, argol, cheviot wool, cotton goods etc. ...a very mixed bag indeed!
The extension of the positive effects of the Act of Union and moves to put the trade between England and Ireland on the same footing as the coastal trade had seen at the same time the increase of the shipping invoiced as entering the Port of Dublin. In 1823 this amounted to 3,412 vessels of a gross aggregate tonnage of 363,685. This represented a corresponding increase in both exports and imports, in the amount of trade and business transactions, particularly with England. The Pims showed great interest in the establishment of steam vessels. The interest cannot be seen as fortuitous but is to be seen as the result of a conscious strategy to expedite and simplify the wholesale imports and exports of the goods they chiefly dealt in. Increasingly, imports of cotton for the factories which the Pims supplied, as also the increasing demand for New Draperies and Manchester Goods was to be channelled through Liverpool. Control of the transport in and out of Ireland would be the key to the control of imports and exports and could conceivably and incidently have been seen as a defense of the Irish economy against the highly competitive and capitalised industry and business interests of England. It could also have been seen as an attempt by the Pims to ensure that they would control a market which might otherwise have been under threat by the activities of men of smaller capital. The smaller capitalists would inevitably use whatever improved transport facilities emerged to bypass them and buy direct from
English manufacturers without being obliged to invest heavily in
stocks of their own.

The very employment of considerable amounts of capital in
steam boats could not have been the result of any speculative
flourish or fashion. Neither could it be, as in earlier times,
the result of a limited low-risk investment by a family or small
partnership in one or two ships. Such an investment of capital
implied the sophisticated use of extended partnerships in joint-
stock companies needing dynamic management to organise the
collection and disbursement of resources in the most effective
and profitable way.

In 1821, primarily at the instigation of the Pims, the Saint
George Steam Packet Company was set up and went into operation
in 1822. Charles W. Williams of Dublin who was to be one of
the founders of the City of Dublin Steam Packet company was said
to be one of the partners in this pioneering scheme also.

The Company was set up to operate from Cork which had long been
a base for many of the Pim enterprises. And as a base Cork was
to become more important as the cotton manufacture increased in
that region. The indications are that the company was set up to
serve the interests of three major groups, firstly, the Pims,
secondly local Cork interests among which were Pim family
connections, local entrepreneurs, clergy, lawyers, single ladies
and the ubiquitously named class of 'gentlemen', all of whom were
able to provide small and useful pockets of capital. Thirdly
there was the area represented by English capital which was provided by merchants, manufacturers and friends of the Pims, many of whom would have found it reciprocally in their interests to co-operate in setting up the Saint George Company.

The total capital of the company was probably £500,000. The Pims had a holding of £59,450. Cork interests, including holdings of several people around Bandon where cotton interests were located, amounted to around £113,500. The third grouping of primarily English capital was in the region of £152,700. A brief analysis of the chief interests in that grouping is revealing. £23,225 was held by the Crewdsons, a family of prosperous quaker bankers and silk and woolen merchants of Kendal. £23,225 was held by the Hutchinsons of Bury, woollen manufacturers, spinners and wool staplers. The Woods family had holdings of £5,000. They were bankers and dealers in woollen goods. They were, besides, Presbyterians, indicating that the demands of contemporary business were a powerful incentive to quaker and other capitalists to abandon their traditional preference of dealing with their own religious brethren. Other significant and noteworthy holdings in the third group were those of the quaker draper and cotton spinner, Swainson of Preston (who with Crewdson was to be involved as a sleeping partner to John Duffy, the Dublin calico printer). The balance of the company's capital was held by Dublin interests of which the biggest holdings were those of the quaker Richard Garratt with £3,000 and of James Dawson with £3,000 also. The total
capital which appeared to have been subscribed was in the region of £372,075.

The first ships of the company, the Saint Patrick and the Saint George were launched respectively on the 21st and 22nd of April 1822, the first for the Dublin-Liverpool and Dublin-Bristol Channel route, and the second for the Liverpool-Isle of Man-River Clyde route. The service they provided was initially linked in with the Patriotic Insurance Company in which the Pim Brothers played a major shareholding and directorial role. The idea of that particular linkage was to simplify the access to marine insurance under the conditions of increased speed which steam vessels operated. The early ships of the Company were built in the names of different groups of trustees for each vessel, and the initial registrations were in Liverpool which is where the first two vessels were built at the yard of Thomas Wilson.

Some difficulties were experienced by the Saint George company in getting a satisfactory profit out of their investment. A prime and continuing problem for steamship companies to ensure profitability was the securing of government contracts for the carriage of mail. Steam vessels were not yet of themselves cost effective in the carriage of general freight on account of the room taken up by engines, machinery and coal bunkers, which detracted from the amount of available cargo space. The transport of mails promised to be a suitable way to recoup
money, but that service was legally confined to government owned packets. The speed of steamships encouraged many people to send advices of a business nature by such technically illegal means, and thus to defraud the public revenue. As early as 26.vii.1824 and earlier the Saint George Company had entered a memorial to the Lords of the Treasury to carry government mails and even offered to sell three of their ships, the Saint George, the Hibernia and the Emerald Isle to the government for £60,000. The Government rejected the offer and four new Government steamships were built, the Etna, the Comet, the Thetis and the Dolphin. The arguments expressed in the Saint George memorial of 1824 are worth reproducing. The revelation that the Company had contracted to convey troops as well as the approbatory tone which is used in reference to the navy seem somewhat unusual for a company with such a controlling interest by quakers many of whose members would in 1798 not even sell a length of rope for fear that it might be used to hang someone!

"...The high commanding situation this kingdom bears among the nations of Europe and the strength and prosperity thereof is mainly attributable to the care and liberal management given by the Government to the shipping interest whereby a nursery for seamen for His Majesty's Navy (the bulwark and defence of the Kingdom) is formed, at the expense and enterprise of private companies and individuals: That the policy of our legislature has ever been, to grant every encouragement to shipping and navigation; and the preamble to the general consolidation Act for registering vessels, passed the last
year states... a joint stock company was formed in Liverpool two years ago, called the Saint George Steam Packet Company for the purpose of building large steam packets with engines and machinery of considerably greater power than had hitherto been used in navigation; that in this undertaking, the adventurers incurred very considerable risk, particularly in the construction of the machinery and have expended a capital of £60,000...your memorialists have established a regular line of steam vessels between Liverpool and Dublin, superior to any in communication between the two Kingdoms than was before contemplated: That they have contracted and agreed with His Majesty's Secretary, at war to convey troops at all seasons between Liverpool and Dublin. That your memorialists made a tender last year to carry the mail and letters between Liverpool and Dublin by their steam packets, which tender was not accepted; that your memorialists now learn that the Postmaster-General has determined to have the mail-bags and letters between the said two ports conveyed by steam navigation suggest that the plan to provide government boats would unnecessarily jeopardise their capital investment'.

Nevertheless, the obvious success of the Saint George company encouraged the Pims to set up a second company to operate primarily between Liverpool and Dublin.' This was the Dublin and Liverpool Steam Navigation Company. Details of its capital structure are not available except in relation to its later amalgamation with the City of Dublin Steam Packet Company, about
which a few words must be said first of all. It was set up in 1824\textsuperscript{122} under an Act of GEO III for encouraging partnerships.\textsuperscript{123} It was capitalised to the tune of £24,000.\textsuperscript{124} Its first ships were launched just prior to those of the Dublin Liverpool Steam Navigation Company (D.L.S.N.) The D.L.S.N. launched its first three ships in September and December 1824 and in July 1825. These were the Liffey, the Mersey and the Commerce.\textsuperscript{126} The Liffey and The Mersey were of 305 tons and 110 h.p., 240 tons and 90 h.p.\textsuperscript{126} respectively. A brief but courteous 'warfare' ensued which reduced prices to uneconomic levels. Sample initial prices in the Liffe-V on 30.vii.1824 were cabin 21/-, child and servant 10/6, steerage and berth 10/6, deck 5/-, 4 wheeled carriages (no 'slinging money charged') 3 guineas, stage and mail coaches £3.13.6, 2 wheeled carriages £1.11.6, gentlemen's horses £2.2s, dealer's horses £1.11.6\textsuperscript{27} But within a few months cabin fares were reduced to 5/- and steerage to sixpence!\textsuperscript{128}

It was only reasonable as a result of these highly competitive conditions, plus a need to realise the best return for capital invested, and a knowledge that they would be in competition with the government service that induced the two companies to amalgamate. The Deed of Settlement of the restructured company suggests that the 'united capital' of the company was on 1.vii.1825, £74,000 and upwards which sum was then increased on £100,000.\textsuperscript{129} The Articles of Agreement had been signed on the 10.v.1825 by William Laird and Joseph R. Pim on behalf of the
The current trustees of the C.D.S.P. Co., were C.W. Williams, Richard Williams and James Jameson. The six necessary additional trustees required by the Deed of the new Company (25.v.1825) were elected by 130 'duly qualified proprietors' out of thirteen people nominated. The number of votes cast show the amounts of stock represented in the case of each trustee elected of whom Joseph Pim was the only quaker.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trustee</th>
<th>Votes</th>
<th>Stock</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joseph R. Pim</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>£86,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Ferrier</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>£80,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Dixon</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>£79,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir J. Tobin</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>£82,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex. Parlane</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>£73,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Parsons</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>£75,400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 1826 trade of the Pims differed little from the few preceding years except in its increasing scale. They still had some occasional dealings in butter, chiefly for their cousins in Mountmellick. But the bureaucratic obstacles put in the way of that trade in Dublin encouraged them to ship the product through Waterford. They were also engaged in spinning and manufacturing cotton as the result of the failure of Greenham whose enterprise they had helped to capitalise. Their imports continued to be Manchester goods, cotton goods and worsted goods. They claimed to have a policy of only importing such goods as would not interfere with home manufactures. Besides various classes of cotton yarns they
also imported worsted yarn from Bradford which was prepared for sale in a manufactured form in Dublin. Besides their exports to New York and England they were also exporting Irish manufactured goods to South America, probably via Liverpool. In his evidence before a Parliamentary Committee of 1826 Joseph R. Pim stated that his Dublin Liverpool dealings had increased ten-fold with a packet everyday from Dublin. He anticipated having business for two very soon and stated that he had vessels running Cork to Liverpool and Cork to Bristol. He was planning to run one from Waterford to Liverpool soon. The two companies with which he was involved expected soon to have 30 trading and passenger vessels.

The Pim Brothers were very quick to appreciate the possibilities that steam vessels made for their business and not necessarily to the prejudice of any interests they might have had in sailing ships. Two examples may illustrate this. The Pims had always had a trade in flaxseed which was chiefly imported direct from New York. This was usually delivered in time for the spring sowing. The coming of the steamship enabled them to expedite supplementary supplies from stocks accumulated in Liverpool. Some of their supplies were still coming direct in their own vessels also. In II.iv.1825 the Pims expected 1,000 hogsheads of flaxseed for delivery to any Irish port where it might be required. They also had 400 hogsheads of the item in cargoes on board the Euphanu and the Hawk at Liverpool bound for Cork. On the 18.iv.1825 they were advertising
3,000 hogsheads of New York flaxseed and 500 of old, and Baltimore seed with 200 of Dutch and 700 bags of English. In view of the fact that the *Dublin Mercantile Advertiser* reported 19.ix.1825 that 14,731 hogsheads had been imported into Dublin alone we can gain some idea at least of the significance of their trade in this item. We cannot say if by 1826 their trade had grown yet further but in an advertisement on the thirteenth of March that year they state they had 3,200 hogsheads and 300 barrels of New York and Philadelphia flaxseed for sale with 160 hogsheads of Dutch and 1,100 sacks of English seed. They had agents appointed in Newry, Londonderry, Westport, Galway, Limerick, Belfast and Cork. In the last three mentioned towns the agents were quakers.

A second illustration relates to the use the Pims were able to make of steamships specifically to speed up their deliveries and cut down on unnecessary warehousing and on costs direct to the consumer. They advertised on the 16th of February 1826, 'Having now a regular supply of cotton and worsted yarns direct from the spinners on consignment offer their present stock for sale at very reduced prices; in addition they will undertake to supply, after a short notice any description of yarns ordered from them, deliverable either in Belfast or Cork by steam boats.'

As already mentioned both the C.D.S.P Co., and the Saint George Companies sought for mail contracts from the Government. A further series of developments exacerbated the situation. Not
alone were the private companies denied mail contracts but the government provided a more competitive passenger service. Paradoxically, if private companies needed mail contracts to subsidise their services, so did the government need a substantial amount of passengers to make its steam services profitable! After some unsuccessful negotiations with the Post Office the C.D.S.P. Co., published their side of the story 29.vi.1826

'The Post Office having now established packets on the station have, with a view of covering the heavy expenses incident to the same, endeavoured to engross the trade in passengers, carriages and horses etc., to the great injury of this and other companies while at the same time they are exempt from the payment of port dues and other charges... which are already a tax on this company to the amount of £10,000 per annum. Under terms so unequal and disadvantageous it is evident this opposition has none of the ingredients of fair competition, were such even justifiable, when government on the one hand and private shipowners on the other are competitors?'

There was undoubtedly some justice in the complaint of the company for their revenue from passenger traffic was reported to have fallen from £6,100 in the first half of 1826 to £2,170 in the second half of 1827. But in August of that year an informal arrangement was made to permit them to develop freight traffic and carry deck passengers without such an excessive degree of competition from the government. The government
challenge also encouraged the Saint George Company and C.D.S.P.C. to make a pooling agreement '...by which the parties undertook not to run ships in opposition to each other and promised to divide their receipts on the basis of the number of trips provided by each company on each of the routes served'\textsuperscript{151}

The Saint George company persisted in its submission of tenders for the carriage of mail and in 1828 a full scale debate took place in the House of Commons on their most recent memorial.\textsuperscript{152} A degree of political support for the Saint George Company is suggested by the number of politicians who defended its interests against misrepresentation. Among these were Leslie Foster, Henry Parnell and Lord Stanley. It had been noteworthy also that among early shareholders of the company had been Lord Blayney, Major General Preeth and Sir John Tobin.\textsuperscript{153} During the debate mention was made of a recent tender from the C.D.S.P. Co., which had proposed as a precondition that the £10,000 presently payable by the company in port fees be paid by the Treasury.\textsuperscript{154} In the event neither the tender of the Saint George company nor that of the C.D.S.P. Co., proved acceptable.

The challenge to improve its services and to overcome the competition posed by the government service had probably provided part of the argument for the company to increase its share capital. It also successfully obtained an Act of Parliament giving it the right to sue or be sued. The preface
to the Act states part of the argument. The reference to inland navigation will be seen to be of some importance.

'Whereas that part of the United Kingdom called Ireland abounds in cattle, corn and various agricultural products, the speedy and regular conveyance of which by steam vessels to Great Britain has been found of great advantage to both countries and whereas from the peculiar circumstances of Ireland and its want of inland navigation, it is desirable to encourage the investment of capital so that the produce of that part of the United Kingdom may be conveyed at lower rates and with more facility and advantage than heretofore, whereby the employment of the labouring classes in that country will be promoted.'

The capital of the C.D.S.P. Co., in 1828 was declared to be £220,257 in shares of £100. Of this, £220,257 was declared to be bona fide paid up. In comparison with such figures the Saint George Company comes to seem very large with its capital of £500,000 and its twelve vessels in 1828. The Deed of Settlement of the C.D.S.P. Co. gives some idea of the proportion of shares held by Joseph R. Pim (who with William Dixon was one of its assistant managers. He held, himself in 1828 26 shares which with those of his brothers and other members of the Pim family amounted to a total of £8,200 shares. The chief shareholders of the original company, the Williams family could muster £218,000. But numerous quakers had shares in the concern including small amounts held by the Perrys and Bewleys, not to
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mention the one or two shares each held by the quaker draper Webb or Christopher Bentham, bookseller.

Another series of difficulties confronting companies involved in operating in the Dublin Liverpool trade was that of the prohibitive costs involved in operating from Liverpool. The Mersey Dockboard was considered as providing very inadequate facilities in return for the expenditure of £10,000 which the company obliged to make each year. It is conceivable that there may have been some connection between this and the increasing number of registrations and re-registrations of Irish ships in Irish ports. Most of these had been registered at Liverpool. A parliamentary return of 1829 certainly lists 14 steamships engaged in the coasting trade and which are identifiable as Irish ships out of the total of 34 vessels. The figure could well have been higher. Most years had shown Liverpool as a net loser of tonnage to Ireland. The increase in steam tonnage entering Irish ports is reflected in a parliamentary return of 1830 and retrospective to 1824, where a falling off in the number of ships and an increase in tonnage for ships using the Port of Dublin since the year ending 5.1.1828 is incidently accounted for in a footnote, '...by the general employment for the first time, of trading vessels navigated by steam, most of which are upwards of 200 tons which had the effect of displacing a number of small sailing vessels previously employed in the trade with Liverpool and other ports.'
By 1833 a ship broker, John Astle complained that there was a surplus quantity of shipping in Dublin and that this was primarily because of the amount of trade the steamship now carried. He was thinking chiefly of sailing ships. His chief complaint was that freight prices had 'been reduced to a ruinous rate'. He had known corn conveyed to Liverpool at 2/- a ton! An effect of the steamship had been to encourage tradesmen to go direct to Liverpool with small quantities of goods. Developments of this type had been anticipated by Joseph R. Pim as far back as 1826 when questioned by a Parliamentary committee concerned with the butter trade. He had then no doubt that if restrictions were taken off the butter trade individuals would go across with quantities as small as five firkins...for they go with a smaller value in fowls, and they go backwards and forwards frequently twice a week.

A similar pattern of trade relations existed between Belfast and Liverpool. But Belfast had an inadequate supply of its own shipping and relied on foreign shipping and the shipping of other ports to make up the deficiency. In the absence of direct documentation concerning the trade of the Dublin Pims it is interesting to note the type of trade engaged in by a relative of theirs in Belfast. This was John Pim. He was a merchant with a considerable business in cotton and coal. He also acted as an agent for the paddle ship Solway. His dealings in cotton were with the Liverpool firms of Gibbs, Bright and Co., John O. Johnston, Harrison and Jenkinson, and
Molyneux and Taylor. He also received some of his supplies from William Kelly of Glasgow. He received cambrics from John Swainson of Preston (a Quaker mentioned as a shareholder in the Saint George Company). His coal he received chiefly from Ayr, Troon, Carlisle and Girvan. He also had dealings in seed and flour with Dublin and Waterford. 165

As far as Dublin is concerned, although an increasing proportion of its trade was directed through and from Liverpool the Bewley family of William Street, near neighbours of the Pim Brothers, were among the pioneers of a direct sailing route to China. 169 Around the 1830's the family of Samuel Bewley had probably diversified into and concentrated to a larger extent on the tea trade as a result of the virtual demise of the silk business in which they had previously been chiefly engaged. Not alone was the demand for tea continually increasing but the ending of the East India Company's monopoly on that item in 1834 promised an even bigger demand and cheaper prices. At first there were to be three Dublin ships engaged in the trade. Two of them at least were owned by the Bewleys, who also held an agency for the Duncan Gibb sailing direct to Bombay. A report in the Dublin Mercantile Advertiser states (17. viii. 1835), 'The Mandarin, consigned to our esteemed fellow citizens, the Messrs Bewley of William Street, the second ship ever freighted from China for this port arrived at Kingstown Harbour on Friday morning with 8,623 chests of tea'. Another delivery had only recently been received by the Bewleys from their ship, the
Hellas, described as a 'first class coppered schooner' (from Batavia and China) which was freighted from Canton with 300 chests of Bohea, 1,599 of congou and a 100 boxes of orange pekoe with a 100 of caper congou teas. A similar development in relation to direct imports of tea to cork is referred to in Barry's. History of the Port of Cork Steam Navigation.

1835 - 1843

Proceeding, as we must, by suggestion and analogy to define an assumed central role for the Pims in a number of steamship enterprises we are hampered by the lack of direct evidence on their motives in investment. But the fact that in the year 1835 a contemporary, James Clarke of Street could describe Joseph R. Pim as 'an Irish Friend well known as principal manager of, I suppose, nearly half of the steam packets in the Kingdom, indicates his important entrepreneurial position. The frequency with which his name occurs indicates the validity of such a conclusion. An advertisement of 1831 for steam packets and issued from his office, The General Steam Packet office at 11 Eden Quay shows him as an agent for steamers of 'His Majesty's War Office' sailing for Bristol, Plymouth, London Liverpool, Caernarvon, the Isle of Man, Cork and Newry. His own company the Saint George, operating from the same offices advertises routes serving Cork, Dundalk, Newry, Beaumaris, Liverpool, London, Bristol, Hull, Hamburgh, Rotterdam and Glasgow, to mention but a few. The chief offices of the company are
described as being in Liverpool, Hull, Dublin and London.

And Joseph R. Pim was still investing in new steam lines. In the year 1835 the Waterford Commercial Steam Company was set up with a capital stock of £100,000 in 1,000 shares and debentures of £100 with 948 shares issued. This represented primarily the investment of local Waterford Quakers from the Strangman and Malcomson families in a port described by Lewis as not having much shipping of its own. Pim appears among the Waterford company's shareholders as having £1,000 invested in the venture.

The fact that an increasing trade with the United States was now directed through Liverpool turned people's thoughts increasingly to the possibility of opening up steam routes to that country. In the decade 1830-140 the trade of Liverpool, '...had consisted of small packets of finished manufactures for export, and import of bulk items such as cotton and timber'.

A years' export from Dublin to Liverpool in 1831 had, quite apart from large quantities of livestock and provisions included such items as 3,648 boxes of linen cloth and 2,100 bales of printed cottons. The Liverpool Quaker James Cropper who had dealings in Irish grain and cacaoes had pioneered a regular mail line, the Black Ball Line to America and a Philadelphia Quaker had set up the Cope Line to perform a similar service.

But both of them had employed sailing vessels. The possibility of direct steam links had already been anticipated as early as 1825. An intriguing reference occurs in a prospectus for a
joint-stock company, which was issued in that year to a
steamship of 300 tons as having already crossed the Atlantic.
The same prospectus was designed to interest the public in a
company for transatlantic steam navigation to America and the
West Indies. In it, a bill was stated to be going through
Parliament for the proposed company which was to have a capital
of £600,000 in 6,000 shares of £100 each. Valentia harbour was
envisioned as being the centre of its operations. There is no
further evidence as to what happened to the scheme. But in
1828 an Act was obtained incorporating the Valentia
Transatlantic Steam Navigation Company with a proposed capital
of £24,000 in shares of £50. The first steamer of the company
was to cost £21,000, be of 800 tons and 200 h.p., and make 6
round voyages a year, carry 50 cabin and 50 steerage passengers
and 200 tons of cargo exclusive of bunkers. It has not been
possible to identify the names of the promoters of the company
or any evidence that the company ever got off of the ground.
But a Parliamentary return does mention The Irish Shipping
Company with a capital of £300,000 in 6,000 shares of which some
had been paid. The return refers to the year 1825. Perhaps
the company was the same as the 1825 company referred to above.
It seems, anyway that by 1828 the climate for investment had
deteriorated partly on the failure of a number of joint stock
companies and the consequent inhibitions of the public from
investing in such ventures.
Several quakers were prominent among the promoters of the British American Steam Navigation Company, among them Joseph R. Pim and James Beale of Cork. They were among its eleven first directors. The capital of the company was one million pounds in 10,000 shares of £100. The capital was probably primarily derived from England as suggested by the names of the directors and that its operations were to be directed from London. But for its success it would seem to have relied on Irish expertise and on the structures which the successful Irish steamboat companies had already developed.

The structure of agents for the company duplicates to some extent the structures previously utilised by Pim in his other enterprises. Shares were advertised as being available from offices of the Saint George Company as well as from the quakers, John Malcomson, Edward Carroll of Birmingham and R.W. Fox and Co. of Falmouth. Further connections may be noticed in the name of Alexander Laird of Glasgow and Greenwich (who also acted as an agent) and that the secretary of the company was MacGregor Laird. The Lairds had already built vessels for the Pims and were destined to set up their own famous steam lines. The names of banking companies prepared to offer shares also duplicates a familiar pattern of contacts and are frequently found linked in Pim initiated enterprises, as Prescote and Grote, the London and Westminster (both in connection with the Royal Bank), the Agricultural and Commercial and the Union Bank of Liverpool.
The object of the company was stated to be '...to establish a regular and certain communication between Great Britain and the United States of America'. It was planned to have four departures each month from both New York and London. The time of passage was not anticipated to exceed 15 days as against an average time of passage of 29 days for sailing vessels. The revenue of the company, it was anticipated would 'be derived from passengers, carriage of letters and the freight of specie and valuable goods'. 'From these sources', it was averred, would be made 'an ample return on the capital invested'. The prospectus gives a breakdown of costs based on the use of eight steam vessels costing £400,000 to build, and suggesting on the basis of anticipated receipts a gross income of £330,000 (including allowances on freight at 15% (£49,500) giving £280,500. An analysis of the anticipated gross receipts would give 88% for passengers, 9% for freight, carriage of specie and fine goods, 3% for carriage of letters. Expenses were allowed for as a total of £188,660 on the basis of 48 voyages with a) fuel at 29.3% (754,660), wages, b) wages, provisions for the crew etc (£4,000 per annum per vessel) or 17.1%, c) wear and tear, interest, insurance etc. (£100,000) at 53.6% of the total expenses. A net profit of £93,840 (or 50.3% on expenses) was anticipated!

The figures were, as one might anticipate from a prospectus somewhat optimistic, in view of the beginning of a period of recession. A comparison with the figures over a three year
period of the General Steam Navigation company might help to put them in context. Admittedly they are derived from a trade with somewhat different necessities but in view of the similar capital structure and economic conditions in which the company tried to be cost effective the figures may be considered to be instructive.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Coal</th>
<th>Repairs</th>
<th>Total Operating Receipts</th>
<th>Total Operational Profits</th>
<th>As % of Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1835</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>£105,462</td>
<td>£50,043</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1836</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>£164,153</td>
<td>£57,519</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1837</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>£193,664</td>
<td>£53,053</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Due to the bankruptcy of the firm making the engine for its first ship, as also a decision during construction to increase its tonnage to 2,400 tons, the ship was not launched until the 24th May 1838. But the directors, aware of the competitive environment and the importance in publicity terms of being seen to be the first to New York chartered the Sirius from the Saint George Company. This left London in March 1838, touched at Cove and succeeded in reaching New York before its rival the Royal William of the C.D.S.P. Co.
By 1838, however, it was clear that a number of companies with which Joseph R. Pim was concerned were in difficulties. Business generally was in a state of depression, and, particularly relevant to the steam ship business, the cost of coal had risen steeply in 1837 (to 27/4 the chaldron from an 1835 figure of 22/6). In spite of a slight drop in 1838 the price of a chaldron was still 26/8. The failure of the Agricultural and Commercial Bank in which Pim had been described as 'a large shareholder' must also have been a severe blow to his finances with possible repercussions for shipping companies. 1833 had seen the loss of the ship Lord Blayney.

The St. George company had lost routes to new local companies on the Isle of Man and Newry routes. Failure to be able to fulfil mail contacts to Hamburgh had forced the company to hand over to the General Steam Navigation Company. Such scattered details indicates the severe nature of the difficulties both personal and general which were being experienced by Pim and the companies with which he was involved, particularly the Saint George. The diffuse nature of his operations in sheer geographical terms, in a time of relatively undeveloped land communications must also have contributed to the inefficiency of the Saint George company and its operations. New shipping lines were being established and a lack of directoral vigilance meant they were failing to make the best of a highly competitive situation. An extract from the 1839 report of the General Steam Navigation Company can be taken to explain some of the
difficulties which confronted steam companies at this period, in
their efforts to remain profitable.

'The expenses required to maintain steam-ships in a proper
state of efficiency and repair have been found to reach so
large an amount that, of the numerous steam companies which
have been formed scarcely one has been found, upon a review of
their operations for ten years able to maintain for the
average of that period, a dividend of 5% consistently of a
proper sum to the maintenance of their capital while in many
instances the operations have terminated in the loss of almost
the whole of the property embarked.'

In the case of the Saint George Company, quite apart from the
factors which have been suggested as causes of the company's
decline in profitability, the blame for its failure was
popularly and partly attributed to its English directors,

'The latter did not, however, appreciate the development of
this Irish cross-channel trade, and could never be persuaded
to keep pace with the times, so much so indeed that the Saint
George company never possessed an iron-built steamer in their
very large fleet. There was also a disposition on the part of
the Board to prevent younger men joining it, which, with some
other drawbacks, ultimately ended in the break up of the
company.'
The process of winding up the company took until 1844. Details of some of the financial arrangements resorted to have been given in the chapter on finance. A number of copies of letters to and from Crewdson a key shareholder, show some of the difficulties that had to be contended with. One refers to a disgruntled shareholder who threatens legal proceedings if the company will not advance £1,000 on the basis of the £4,000 worth of shares he has. Another, from G.B. Crewdson himself, sets out his position on the possibility of any further doses of capital,

'In the meantime I wish to say that though I expect the arrangements for closing the concern will be carried out, I question whether our firm will incline to make any further advances without the directors offering some inducement for doing so as some of them think the amount advanced collectively and individually is already too large. I therefore beg to suggest for the consideration of the directors whether they would undertake in case it is found that the proposed plan cannot be carried out to give us a mortgage on a vessel (say the Sirius, if she be not already mortgaged) for the £,000 now required and our old uncovered balance, say £10,000 make altogether £11,000...'

The letters indicate the complex nature of a business, in which financial, freight and family connections had to be delicately weighed up. The particular letter referred to considers the transferring of company boats at Hull to another company in
order to form a coalition against the Hanseatic Line. Such a proposal is rejected as having been already tried,

'J. Sanderson has not enough goods to fill the Hanseatic boats and therefore we could not calculate on the Eiger having much more than one third of a cargo and at present freights (if not lower) Brownlows would most likely be against us because Gee is a relation of either Pease or Liddle, one of whom holds a third of the Rob Roy with Gee and P. and L. are Brownlows bankers whom (I was informed) he is not in a situation to offend. If it can be managed, I am satisfied it is the best to adopt J. Pims proposition and withdraw altogether'.

Possibilities for retrenchment, however, existed. In Cork particularly the Saint George Company remained in a strong position. Hall described it as controlling the trade of the port. It is noteworthy that the average registered tonnage of Cork for a three year period (1840/41/42) at 101,349 tons now outpaced Dublin's registered tonnage of 94,742 tons. At a meeting of the company's shareholders on the 17th of February 1843 a proposal was made by the Quaker Ebenezer Pike to set up a totally new company with a capital of £50,000. But this meeting was probably merely to crystallize an effective policy to take over from the present management. The initial strategy was to set up a new company as distinct from a move to take over the assets and debts of the old one. Ironically enough it was Pike who with other Cork merchants had run a steam ship in opposition to the Saint George Company in 1826. But under
his effective and determined leadership the City of Cork Steamship Company was established in October 1844. It took over the 20 steamers owned by the Saint George Company and retained seven, the Lee, Severn, Tiger, Jupiter, Victory, Ocean and Sirius, under the name Cork Steamship Company, with a capital of £170,000 in 1,700 shares of £100. Although now owned primarily by Cork merchant interests, the line received a large injection of capital from Joseph Malcomson of Waterford who also purchased one of the Saint George ships for his Waterford Company.

1840 - 1860

In spite of difficulties for many companies the decades of the forties and fifties were undoubtedly the heyday for Irish shipping interests. For the first time the restricted tonnage of both Cork and Belfast outpaced that of Dublin. While Dublin's trade centred more and more on Liverpool, both Belfast and Cork retained a significant degree of foreign trade. Neither should it be forgotten that although a significant proportion of registered shipping tonnage was comprised of steam vessels that proportion was still outweighed by sailing ships. Dublin alone had a registered 26,623 tons of sailing ships in 1844 to a mere 8,769 tons (34.22%) of steam vessels. Waterford also had become significant in its tonnage.
Alfred Webb, later to become an M.P. gives boyhood memories of Dublin's shipping scene in the forties.

'The district between our street and the quays was then thickly populated largely by a sea going swarthy complexioned people, many perhaps with foreign blood in their veins'. 'The quays from what is now Tara Street down to Sir John's Quay were lined often two deep by coal brigs and schooners. When there was a long continuance of westerly winds they were detained on the English coasts and when the wind was long easterly they could not sail. In both cases coal was dear. When cheap and plentiful it was stored by dealers... in yards and held for a rise. At corners along the coal quays lounged coal porters ready to carry on their backs coal brought from the vessels by the sack.'

The year 1844, for one example had seen 4,349 sailing vessels and 791 steam vessels registered as entering Dublin port inwards engaged in the coastal trade.

Certainly steamships had not been of equal advantage to all members of the community. The quaker hardware merchant Edward Gatchell blamed 'the steam boat intercourse with England, by means of which our wholesale trade was greatly curtailed' as a partial cause of the failure of his business. James Perry, prominent in railway promotions, who also engaged in the hardware trade and had advanced from a turnover of in the region of £15,000 a year in 1822 was still in business and would probably not have had the same complaint!
An ancillary development to that of steam boats had been that of quakers and others to use their expertise to set up boat-yards. Cork had some tradition in this, a tradition partially derived from the pre-steam era. The name of Joshua Carroll occurs in that connection. Ebenezer Pike had a ship building yard at Water Street 1848-60 and R. and J. Lecky, as also George Robinson had others adjoining that. Carrolls, Pikes, Leckys and Robinsons were all quakers. The Lecky yard built the first screw steamer the *Rattler* in 1846. A ship building tradition existed also in Waterford. The quaker family of Penrose may be noted in that connection. And in 1843 the Malcomson family established the Neptune Iron Works, where many ships were built and launched. In Dublin, at this period (I have no date for its establishment) the C.D.S.P. Co., set up the Dublin and Liverpool Steamship Building company with a capital of £300,000 in shares of 50. No names of Quakers appear among members of its provisional committee. James Perry, hardware merchant set up the Ringsend Iron Foundry. This is probably connected with the ship building yard of Frederick Barrington and Wight Pike, whose firm built the hulls for a number of canal passage boats.

New shipping companies were coming to the fore. Richardson Brothers and Company, quaker linen merchants of Belfast, and coming from a background of ownership of sailing vessels, set up in 1849, the Liverpool and Philadelphia Steam Ship Company. They withdrew from this in 1854 rather than permit the charter
of company vessels to the British Government for use in the Crimean war. That course of action contrasts with a decision of the Saint George Company when it had been prepared to charter vessels for military use without apparently severely compromising the grounds for any scruples which the Pims and other Quaker interest may then have had. Belfast Quaker interests were also observable in the promotion of the Belfast Steamship Company in 1852 and in the Inman line.

The Pim Family of Dublin actively used available steam and sail for the export of Greenount goods to America. They maintained an export of coarse calicos and fine linens and poplins to New York and occasionally as in 1862 and presumably earlier found it convenient to import American grain, an import that was vastly increased nationally. The Pims owned a steam mill at the Grand Canal Docks. Sometimes, during the American Civil War they accepted deliveries of cotton as being a more convenient and profitable way of having their bills paid without recourse to a fluctuating and often unprofitable rate of exchange.

Besides a house in London at Noble Street, they had their own agency in New York and had long dealings with the old established firm of Abraham Bell, a commission agent and Quaker originally from Belfast. A network of agency businesses existed in Liverpool to handle commissions and transport for New York. The Civil War which temporarily dried up supplies of cotton might have threatened trouble for the Pims as it did for the Malcomsons. '...however the result might be the South
will want everything of clothing of the masses except cotton goods of coarse kinds. There is one thing that may affect their power as customers --- if they carry out their threat of buying cotton and all other stocks when they have to retire from the North. This would destroy the means of exchange for imported manufactures and greatly lessen the market otherwise would be for goods like drills and ducks'. In the event the war probably stimulated demand for their linens and opened up a new phase of development in the family business which was already one of the few large firms surviving in Dublin, which both manufactured and exported linens. '... but we still have hopes that... military purposes will cause a demand for the Greenmount goods.'

The speed of a ship could prove a disadvantage as much as an advantage. Rates of exchange had to be considered. As in the Civil War political decisions could complicate business. 'It is only when the Inman steamer is slow and the Cunard are following very swift that we can hope not to incur storage under 'general order'. By chance I escaped the charge on the lot of Etna and made the Inman Company pay it because they unloaded her too soon after arrival owning to their wish to run a good boat that week in opposition to the Southampton and Bremen Steamer and thus get more freight for gold'.

But the Firms who have proved so central to this account, whilst remaining prosperous and running a successful business that was
to continue well into this century had disappeared from the world of shipowning. For although they may have held a few directorships or maintained a few shareholdings in shipping firms (facts not established) they had moved from a positive promotional role to a passive position in the world of the steamship. The day of shipping being related to the specific needs of a few family businesses and controlled by a relatively small group of merchants was essentially finished. The emphasis was to be on shipping as a specialist function to serve the interests of disparate types of business and of businessmen with diverse needs.

Inland Waterways and Railways related to Shipping Strategies with Particular Attention to the Role of James Pim Junior

As has already been suggested in this account the use of inland waterways was intimately connected to efforts to make steam services profitable. An important part of any strategy to capitalise on the promotion of steam packet services related to an easily accessible hinterland to feed goods into the centrally located port. In the case of Dublin a network of waterways existed in the Grand and Royal Canals. The canals were not consistently profitable but provided an important service in conveying increasing amounts of grain for the export trade to England. The export trade to Liverpool was highly profitable and constantly increasing. In the year 1831, 40,000 barrels of wheat were exported from Dublin alone with 19,356 sacks of...
For a five year period ending October in the same year 1,625,000 barrels of corn and flour had been exported from the same place. Total amounts of grain carried on the Grand Canal soon rose 49.07% from 11,424 tons in 1719 to 23,277 tons in 1825. But from the standpoint of shareholders in the Grand Canal there was little real value in their investment except in the service the canal provided and in the relative safety of their shareholdings. Indeed a dividend was not paid from 1812 to 1835 at all.

Quakers had not been prominent among the promoters of the original Grand Canal Scheme. It is possible that since the Government and many aristocratic interests were involved in its funding they felt no stimulus to contribute also. It may be remarked however that in 1789, the Quakers John Dawson Coates, John Phelps and Joseph Pike had investments in it of £1,400, £250 and £1,500 respectively. Quakers often also invested their personal or institutional surplus funds in Canal stock. In the year 1820 John Phelps had an investment of £8,000, Joshua Pim had an investment of £200 and John Fayle had an investment of £1,200 in canal funds. A Thomas Unthank also had an investment of £10,000 in the canal. He was certain to have been either a Quaker or of Quaker background.

The relatively few Quakers who appeared to have subscribed to Canal Stock makes it all the more intriguing that from 1824 James Pim Junior began to increase his shareholding in the Grand
Other members of the Pim family had shares in that year also. Joseph R. Pim for example had £300 worth of stock. But James Pim Junior who had in that year £800 worth of stock had by 1825 increased the figure to £1,850 and the figure continued to rise annually thereafter. By 1830 it had risen to £5,600. We know that branch of the Pim family had flour and milling interests, as well as family farms in the Mountmellick area and a wide connection in the milling trade. They were related to the Grubbs of Anner Mills near Clonmel.

The father of James Pim Junior owned the brewery at City Quay and they were therefore dependent on barley for the raw material of their product. Richard Pim and James Pim were among the promoters and stockholders of the Corn Exchange Buildings Company which had been incorporated in 1815 with a capital stock of £15,000 in shares of £50 each.

The assumption on the basis of the facts outlined is therefore that the Pim family in general and the branch of the family represented by James Pim Junior in particular would have a natural interest in the use and export of grain and grain based products from Grand Canal.

James Pim father and son were not prominent in the promotion of shipping ventures. This differentiates them to some degree from their brother quakers and cousins the Pirns of William Street.

The increasing interest of the Townsend Street Pims, (if we may call them that to distinguish James Pim (Snr.) and (Jnr.) from the 'other branch') in Canal shareholdings was coincidental with the promotion of two canal related developments, firstly
that of the Shannon Navigation and secondly, the construction of
the Mountmellick branch of the canal between the years of 1827
and 1831... and which by 1845 was to be carrying 1,974 tons of
grain and 7,219 tons of flour towards Dublin. As regards the
Shannon Navigation a pioneering series of steam packets had been
operated there since 1826 by a man called Grantham. He was
probably funded by a quaker initiated company. The company may
have been identical with Shannon Navigation company set up
circa 1827 - 28 ...'with a large capital for the expeditious and
safe conveyance of goods and merchandize between Dublin and
Limerick and all the intermediate places along the line, and in
the vicinity of the Grand canal and River Shannon, means of
their fly boats towed along the Shannon by a powerful steam
vessel'. Quaker interests of both Limerick and Dublin were
involved. The Dublin agent of the Company was James Doyle
the name of James Pim (Jnr.) appears as treasurer. But by
1830 the concern appears to have been absorbed in the Irish
Inland Steam Navigation company which represented an
amalgamation between the new company and the two previous
concerns involved. The new company was set up by C.W. Williams
the promoter of the C.D.S.P. Co., Among advantages
advertised,

'Graziers and cattle dealers will find great advantage in this
mode of water conveyance as stock of all kinds will be brought
to Dublin at moderate rates and without the delay, fatigue and
loss of weight and condition necessarily attendant on overland
driving; and if intended for the Liverpool market and
consigned to the company's agent will be reserved without any charge for the agency, and may be insured against sea risks and the risk of the Shannon Navigation. Shareholders also would have an additional benefit in that they would be entitled to a return of not less than 5 per cent on the amount of freights paid by them besides other benefits not detailed in the advertisement.

The strategies of the Pims come to be more explicit in the evidence of James Pim Junior which he gave to a Parliamentary Commission in 1835 (a year in which the C.D.S.P. Co was augmenting the number of its vessels for the transport of grain, wool, flour and heavy goods etc.). He saw the extension of the canal system as an extension that would be beneficial and advocated (for railways and canals) that the Government should provide one third of the capital and one third more in the form of a loan, leaving the final third to be made up by private capital. He advocated the extension of the existing system of canals rather than the construction of any new ones. This would enable the conveyance of agricultural produce on the cheapest terms to Dublin.

But the strategies originally considered in relation to canals and ships were to lead to further considerations. The difficulties of getting ships into Dublin port and the consequent series of delays and frustrations had led to the development of Kingstown as an alternative port. But the
distance of that port from Dublin created a new series of
difficulties. It proved to be a cause of great delay and
expense to get goods from and to the Grand Canal system which
itself gave access to the markets of the Midlands. In 1826
James Pim in conjunction with another merchant and a non-quaker,
Mr. James Dawson, raised a subscription to pay Mr. Killally, the
engineer of the Grand Canal, to initiate a survey. The
purpose of the survey was to ascertain the feasibility of a
canal link from the Dublin docks of the Grand Canal to
Kingstown. It was eventually decided that the cost of such a
canal link would be prohibitive. A visit in 1824 from James
Cropper, a quaker merchant of Liverpool, may well have helped
to stimulate James Pim Junior to think about a rail link.
Cropper had come to advocate schemes for the regeneration of
Ireland as also to canvass Irish support for the Liverpool and
Manchester Railway. He was a friend of the Pims and stopped
with them in both Dublin and Mountmellick. But, it was James
Pim (Jnr.) who considered the rail-link as a substitute for the
rejected canal to Kingstown. He it was who paid another
engineer, a Mr. Nimmo to make a feasibility plan for such a
railway.

Previous to the promotion of this scheme two short freight
schemes had existed in Ireland, one at Arigna and one at the Dún
Laoire quarry. Lee states that in the joint stock boom of
1825 30 British schemes for railways had been proposed and 5
Irish Schemes proposed for Ireland. A Parliamentary paper of
1844 refers to two such schemes as having been set up in 1824. The Royal Hibernian General Railroad with a capital of one million in 10,000 shares and the Limerick and Waterford Dock and Railroad with a capital of £300,000 in 6,000 shares. These schemes never came to fruition.

As a result of the report prepared by Alexander Nimmo a meeting was summoned to set up the Dublin and Kingstown Railway Company and to apply to Parliament for an Act. Lee states that the company was originally promoted in 1825, though that statement does not agree with Pim's statement that he initiated a feasibility survey after 1826. But the Bill to establish the railway company was passed on the 6th September 1831, with a capital of £200,000 and powers to borrow up to £70,000. The scheme encountered great public opposition. Daniel O'Connell himself was scornful of the commercial possibilities of the scheme in spite of the £66,700 capital which had been subscribed initially by solid commercial interests, to support the company's application to Government. The scheme being new and involving large sums of money with what was seen as the uncertain possibility of any return was not popular. The Directors of the Company knew that the climate for investment was not good, especially after a series of commercial failures such as that of the Saint Patrick's Insurance Company which had led to great financial losses in the Dublin business community. But it was the capital of the Quakers and the Pim family especially that got the Dublin and Kingstown Railway
established. Capital provided by the Pim family amounted to 20.8 per cent of the initial subscription list and by other Quakers to the amount of 18.29 per cent. It was their willingness to risk all of their investment in a well calculated manner which was ultimately to encourage an inflow, firstly of English and then of further Irish capital, in addition to their own initial subscriptions.

The Dublin and Kingstown was promoted as a solid commercial proposition for the transport of goods from the Grand Canal to Kingstown and from thence to Great Britain. In this emphasis on goods traffic it had much in common with similar promotions in England and, like them, it was to prove the case that the chief profits were actually to be derived from passenger traffic. Some function at least was envisaged for passenger traffic to service an increasing conurbation in the Kingstown, Blackrock and Killiney areas. Many of the Pims themselves were at this period living at Monkstown.

After the initial period of surveys the Directors held their first General Board Meeting on the 2.xii.1831 at the Chamber of Commerce. James Pim Junior acted in the temporary capacity of Secretary. There were 10 Directors present, of whom 4 were quakers. The chief task at the next meeting was to prepare an application to the Board of Works for a grant. Their arguments related to the provision of employment and housing which the railway would generate. They also anticipated how the building
of their railway would make the centre of the country more accessible through the consequent link-up with the canal system. They saw that the transmission of the mails also would be speeded up as the Kingstown harbour developed to become the 'ultimate station' for Holyhead and Liverpool packets. The skills developed in negotiating with the Government were undoubtedly to be useful in consequent railway developments in Ireland.

James Pim Junior was appointed treasurer to the company in 1832 at a salary of £500 per annum plus a gratuity of £500 '...in consideration of his previous services in the formation and advancement of the company and of the zeal, ability and perseverance with which he successfully surmounted the various difficulties incident to the undertaking' It was also agreed that he might, at any time, accept in lieu of his salary, a quarter of the net annual profit of the company after payment of all outgoings. But, as was the custom of the times he was required to get securities to ensure his fidelity to the company. These were provided in 1834 by his uncles Jonathan and Joseph Pim, his father and his partner Alex Boyle, to the total value of £10,000.

The role of individual Quakers in the promotion of the Dublin and Kingstown Company was large. But it is hard to view it except in specifically biographical terms related to James Pim Junior, his character, organisational abilities and commercial
links. He saw a pioneering function for the line in stimulating public confidence and in encouraging the development of an Irish railway system. He saw it as an instrument of national regeneration. If Pim was motivated by a high degree of idealism and a stated practical concern of the poorer classes who might benefit from his schemes, he was practical and astute enough not to risk what he could not be sure to recoup. He reminisced on the amounts of money wasted on the promotion of many railway schemes. He protested at the lack of interest often shown at Government level in extending the Irish railway system. He set out such ideas in an open letter published in 1839 in the wake of the Drummond Commission. His thesis was simple. He felt that the indiscriminate application of English initiated railway legislation would produce not positive but positively deleterious effects. He felt that Ireland needed a large input of state money for the promotion of railways and that as distinct from the situation in England such promotions should not be left to the ill-directed efforts of private capitalists and monopolists who would not be amenable to state control. He regretted the opposition of English interests to such provisions for state finance. He suggested that the Government itself was perhaps misled on the need Ireland had for finance towards railroads, since the Government itself tended to receive its information form monopolistic interests which could not be expected to comprehend Ireland's needs. But, he notes, he had not always felt that the State, '...ought to undertake
the construction of railways; my altered opinion has been the result of a long, patient and disinterested investigation. 307

Pim like others had anticipated the development of a great Western packet station for America. 308 He saw such a station in conjunction with a feeder network of railways. He foresaw a Valentia station as becoming central for a vast European traffic to America. As an earnest of this he prevailed on the Directors of the Dublin and Kingstown to initiate a rail survey of possible routes to Valentia and estimated a cost structure for such a line. 309

Another quaker much associated with Pim was James Perry. Like Pim he was from Mountmellick. After his apprenticeship 310 he had set up a hardware business in Dublin. He had not been particularly noticeable in the specific promotion of companies before 1834 although he had a number of small and limited investments and had been the director of several companies. But the promotion of railways was to prove very attractive for him, probably as much for the challenge it gave to his domineering character as for any financial reasons. Pim and Perry were to be closely occupied in railway promotions. They both emerge as shrewd entrepreneurs in such promotions. Lee details an extraordinary series of manoeuvres by Perry and Pim both in promoting and in defending a number of lines in which they were to become involved. Their methods if not objectively dishonest reveal a variety of deviousness and 'politicking' much at odds
with the received picture of quaker business behaviour.\textsuperscript{305} Both were also able to bring a degree of political influence to bear, as when Pim made personal application to Lord Morpeth to arrange for a visit of the warship \textit{Madagascar} to Kingstown or as when he undertook the extension of the D. & K. with an atmospheric railway he could count on assistance from Peel.

It is hard to quantify a specifically quaker influence in the promotion of other lines than the Dublin and Kingstown. It may be that the maximum financial and organisational influence of Quakers \textit{per se} had already waned before the major promotions of railways in the mid 1840's. James Perry and his brothers Robert and Henry held between them £7,500 of shares in the Irish Great Western Railway in 1845. James Perry also, in the same year held £4,000 of shares in the Great Southern and Western besides being a Director on the boards of both companies. Lee suggests a major promotional role for him in the affairs of these two companies. Various members of the Pim family also had shares in a number of Irish lines, as has been detailed in an appendix to this chapter. But the economic behaviour of the Pim and Perry families in the promotion of railways appears in the context of Irish Quakerism somewhat atypical. It is at least on a par with the promotions of railways encouraged by English Quakers as in the case of the Liverpool and Manchester and the Stockton and Darlington lines.\textsuperscript{313}
Apart from the investments of James Pim Junior and James Perry in lines outside of Dublin there is no evidence that Irish Quakers generally invested very largely in any lines other than those where their local and particular commercial interests were served. But there is evidence that where some local lines were promoted Quakers as local businessmen or manufacturers often provided the initial impetus. It was mainly local capital mobilised by local patriotism and encouraged perhaps by the example of some Quakers that encouraged the promotion of railway companies. In Waterford, for example, the Malcomsons were to the fore in promoting the Waterford and Limerick Line (and were able to count on some Pim assistance also). It appears therefore that the specific financial and investment patterns of the Pims and Perrys in the promotion of Irish Railways should be seen not so much as typical of Quakers *per se* but as part of a pattern they shared with the financial and commercial elite at the hub of Dublin's business life and only incidently qualified by their Quaker attitudes. Such a conclusion would be supported by the frequency of the same set of names of Dublin capitalists on the boards of Railway companies.
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APPENDIX A

Exports of Linen, by the Quaker merchant houses of Joshua Pim, Jonas Stott, J. Fayle, and Wilcocks and John Phelps (January to June 1785)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Destination</th>
<th>Pieces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15.1.1785</td>
<td>165 ct. linen year to</td>
<td>Liverpool by J. Pim</td>
<td>Feb. 275297 pieces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.11.1785</td>
<td>3,900 pieces of linen</td>
<td>to Chester by Jonas Spott</td>
<td>TOTAL March 35133 pieces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.4.1785</td>
<td>63 pieces of linen to</td>
<td>Rotterdam by J. Fayle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4.1785</td>
<td>1,000 pieces of linen to</td>
<td>Liverpool by J. Pim</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4.1785</td>
<td>5,000 pieces of linen to</td>
<td>Bristol by W. and J. Phelps</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.1785</td>
<td>1,000 pieces of linen to</td>
<td>Liverpool by J. Pim</td>
<td>(April 74998 pieces)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.v.1785  2,000 pieces of linen to Bristol by J. Pim

20.v.1785  1,000 pieces of linen to Bristol by J. Pim

31.v.1785  5,200 pieces of linen to Bristol by J. Pim

7.v.1785  159 ct. 2 qr. Linen Yarn to Bristol by J. Pim (May 45249 pieces)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BELL</th>
<th></th>
<th>EATON</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>203 gt stones Bay Yarn</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jan 203 gt stones</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>300 gt stones</td>
<td></td>
<td>Feb 341 gt stones</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>360 gt stones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar</td>
<td>145 gt stones</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mar 527 gt stones</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>627 gt stones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr.</td>
<td>210 gt stones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>225 gt stones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>225 gt stones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>180 gt stones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>240 gt stones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>180 gt stones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>375 gt stones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 3,270 gt stones
APPENDIX C (Chapter III)

REPRESENTATIVE FIGURES CONNECTED WITH THE TRADE IN COTTON WOOL THAT WAS
CONDUCTED BY THE PIM FAMILY OF WILLIAM STREET IN THE YEAR 1824

In the absence of actual ledgers and business material from the Pim concerns
the following figures have been compiled in an impressionistic manner to
suggest at least the scope of their trade.

Again we are hampered by a lack of overall national and Dublin statistics
after the Custom House combined its administrative procedures more closely
with those of England. Figures of cotton wool imports for the year 1822,
however state Total Imports to Dublin from New York as 81,084,961bs
Total National imports from New York as 1,750,718lbs.
The total Dublin percentage therefore was 46.75%

To find from Thomas Directory (1846) that the total national import of
cotton wool (average for a three year period including 1824) was 4,368,656lbs
Assuming that the proportion of Dublin's imports of the product had remained
static at 46.75% we arrive at a figure of 2,042,346lbs on Dublin's import
of cotton wool in 1824.

According to their advertisements in the Dublin Mercantile Advertiser, Pims
offered for sale the following quantities of cotton wool in the year 1824

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Ship</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nov 9, 1824</td>
<td>Hibernia</td>
<td>236 bales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 1, 1825</td>
<td>Mount Vernon</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 1, 1825</td>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 1, 1825</td>
<td>Dublin Packet</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 1, 1826</td>
<td>Hibernia</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 2, 1825</td>
<td>Bibby</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 1, 1825</td>
<td>Mount Vernon</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 1, 1825</td>
<td>Messenger</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>644 bales</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These were the quantities actually offered for sale. We must assume that
other deliveries took place from various sources and that such imports
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would have been absorbed by various private transactions as well as by the
Pim connected manufacturing concerns.

The weight of a bale of cotton wool has been assumed to have been 240lbs.

A discussion of the variable weights of bales may be found in Baines, Edward,
History of the Cotton Manufactory in Great Britain (2nd ed.) London 1966
p.307 and also in Wadsworth, A.P., and Julie de la Mann, The Cotton Trade
and Industrial Lancashire (Manchester 1931) p. 188

On the basis of this information 644 bales would be equivalent to 154,460lbs
which would be equivalent to 7.56% of the assumed Dublin import for the year
1824, as it has been discussed above. This suggests that the Pim imports
of cotton wool were very big indeed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of subscriber</th>
<th>Further details</th>
<th>Sum subscribed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edward Alexander</td>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Barton</td>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonard Dickerstaff</td>
<td>Gentleman</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander Boyle</td>
<td>Public Notary</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Carleton</td>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua M. Chaytor</td>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Cuming</td>
<td>Artist</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Dargen</td>
<td>Civil Engineer</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander Ferrier</td>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Ferrier</td>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Garrett</td>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Henden</td>
<td>gentleman</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Jackson</td>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua Kincaid</td>
<td>Land Agent</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Low</td>
<td>Notary Public</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Hagee</td>
<td>Printer</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Mahony</td>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Martin</td>
<td>Linen Draper</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Phelps</td>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Phelps</td>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Pim</td>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Pim</td>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Pim (junior)</td>
<td>Broker</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonathan Pim</td>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonathan Pim (junior)</td>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonathan G. Pim</td>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua R. Pim</td>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Pim</td>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Pim</td>
<td>Gentleman</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of subscriber</td>
<td>Further Details</td>
<td>Sum Subscribed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Roe</td>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td>£1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Roe</td>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td>£1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Scallen</td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>£100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Symes</td>
<td>Stock Broker</td>
<td>£1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua Todhunter</td>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td>£200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry T. Williams</td>
<td>Public Notary</td>
<td>£2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Williams</td>
<td>Public Notary</td>
<td>£5,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*OUAKERS*

(Above Details extracted from document in keeping of the House of Lords Record Office, London)

A list of 'Proprietors per transfer ledgers' and dated T.111.1836 occurs in the Fim Manuscripts, N.L.I. mss. no 8668. Where 129 proprietors are listed with a holding of, in total 2,000 shares.
Amounts of share capital held by Irish Quakers in railway subscription contracts. Information extracted from List of Names, Descriptions and Places of Abode of all persons subscribing to amount of £2,000 and upwards to any railway subscription contract deposited in the Private Bill Office during the present session of Parliament, the amount subscribed by each person for every railway to which he might be a subscriber and the total amount of each subscription by each person. (Brit. Parl. Papers 1845(317))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>76</th>
<th>77</th>
<th>91</th>
<th>194</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Henry Bewley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Bewley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,650</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reuben Deaves (Cork)</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas H. Deaves (Cork)</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Perry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Perry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Perry (Salthdowny)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Malcolmson (Waterford)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua Malcolmson (Clonmel)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Malcolmson (Clonmel)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Malcolmson (Portlaw)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Pim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Pim (jnr.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Pim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Pim (jnr.)</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William H. Pim</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

40. Dublin & Belfast Junction (Branch to Kells) 76. Great Southern and Western (Extension to Cork & Limerick) 77. Great Western (Irl.) (Killingher to Athlone) 91. Kingstown & Bray 194. Waterford to Limerick

Some further details of railway holdings by Irish Quakers are also to be found in Appendix D to Chapter II of this Thesis.