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Abstract

Despite modern conceptions, pirates were not typically cruel, greedy, and dishonest men of the lowest social ranks, but often began as privateers for local navies. It was only when they attacked an unassigned target that their status changed to that of piracy in the eyes of their patrons. However, if the illegal attack was against an enemy, the Crown often allowed the action to continue. This created a fluid status between legality and treason. This study examines the nature of piracy in the Atlantic and Caribbean in a broader context, using Edward Teach as a key figure to place piratical behavior into the larger scheme of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth centuries. To do this, I examine the actions of these individuals within the framework of the rational choice model, and use world-systems analysis to discuss how competing cores employed the skills of pirates and privateers.
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Chapter 1
Introduction

Problem Statement

Modern conceptions of pirates focus on lower class, cruel, dishonest and greedy men plundering the harbor of any city they come upon. These perceptions ignore the fact that many of these individuals were sponsored and encouraged by local political figures who would provide a safe port in return for a portion of the profits. They were not always of the lowest social class, but often began as respected members of the local navies where they learned to navigate the seas and control their ships. Pirates also were highly dependent on the local economy and shipping industries, as they had to familiarize themselves with the trade routes, merchants, and harbors of many areas in order to maximize profit from their ventures.

In order to study the pirate's place in politics, commerce, and the economy, I examine a wreckage discovered in Beaufort Inlet, NC that is said to be the pirate flagship The Queen Anne's Revenge. I ask the question currently faced by researchers at the North Carolina Maritime Museum and East Carolina University's Conservation lab: is this truly The Queen Anne's Revenge, formerly the French merchant ship La Concorde, which was taken by Edward Teach (who I also refer to by his more common alias, Blackbeard) and deliberately grounded in June 1718 before his execution?

At this time, there is no definitive answer to this question, but it is possible to compare the dates of the artifacts recovered from the site to those of La Concorde, and ultimately, The Queen Anne's Revenge. To do this, I examine the artifact assemblages recovered from the site in conjunction with the historical record and analyze artifact categories such as weaponry, personal assemblages, numismatics, hull dimensions, and other cargo in order to prove that the wreckage is indeed The Queen Anne's Revenge.
I examine primary source documents regarding the nature of the interactions between pirates and the colonial government. I also use secondary sources by Dan Parry, Robert Earl Lee, Angus Konstam, and Patrick Pringle - all leading scholars of piracy and Edward Teach. I consult field reports from the Queen Anne's Revenge (QAR) Project, which are available on the project's web site, to provide a clearer understanding of the assemblages found in the wreckage and analyze their significance to the broader political and economic systems of the period. In addition to written sources, I confer with David Moore, Nautical Archaeologist at the North Carolina Maritime Museum in Beaufort, NC in order to gain up-to-date information regarding the current progress of the QAR Project, images artifacts, and maps, as well as helpful guidance in examining other sources.

With this information, I place Edward Teach and The Queen Anne's Revenge in the larger context of piracy, the economics of trade, and politics using World-Systems Theory (WST). I present a detailed history of Edward Teach to examine his career as a pirate, his pardon from the Governor and service as a privateer, his return to piracy, and his death. An inspection of privateering along the Carolina Coast allows for an understanding of what could be gained from such prize actions. In addition, I examine the imperial commerce that led La Concorde to the Colonies, as well as Teach's economic motivation to overtake the vessel for his own use. I also analyze his actions in the larger world-systems framework to note how piracy and privateering were integrated into imperial commerce and politics.

By placing The Queen Anne's Revenge into this broader context, much is learned about the nature of piracy and privateering as well as the imperial competition of the time due to its beginnings as a French merchant ship. By analyzing the contents of the wreckage, it is possible to determine the sort of goods and supplies that may have been carried by the merchant ships or
used by the pirates after its capture, but also to provide a method of examining the economic and political systems that surrounded the crew and captain of the vessel. The assemblages and remains of the vessel also can be used to date the site to make the case that it is of the same period as the *Queen Anne's Revenge*, which can be used to buttress the argument that the ship is indeed Blackbeard's famed flagship.

**Review of Relevant Literature**

In this section, I outline the general history of piracy beginning with the Barbary corsairs and the Moors to provide a foundation for the period of privateering that followed, especially noting the relationship between Sir Francis Drake and Queen Elizabeth I and the role of Spanish and French privateers in Coastal Carolina. I also note the roles of Simon de Danser and Edward Teach in this system of privateering. An examination of the types of ships commonly used by pirates follows, as well as information regarding the conversion of ships and crews to piracy. I end the section with a brief discussion of nautical archaeology, including the underlying processes of chemical change and conservation.

**The Barbary Corsairs and the Moors**

Piracy can be defined as an action relating to human behavior that encompasses a blatant disregard for legal powers to determine and redefine personal property rights (Rubin 1988). The history of piracy traces back at least as far as 78 BC in the Aegean when Cilician pirates attacked a vessel bound for Rhodes, but the first accounts of modern piracy begin in the Middle Ages around the time of the Crusades with the renewal of imperial competition and economic stimulus. The revival of Eastern commerce brought about outlaws known as the Barbary Corsairs (so named for the Barbary Coast, the region that produced a number of these outlaws) that attempted to overpower merchant ships leaving Italian port cities. Mediterranean states
joined forces to protect their coasts against piracy, and their efforts were largely successful. In 1390, the Genoese had suffered a number of losses due to the Barbary corsairs and attacked the pirates on the Tunisian Coast to suppress the illegal activity (Gosse 1946).

The year 1492 marked the beginning of piracy on a larger scale as Ferdinand and Isabella drove the Moors from Spain into North Africa and greatly expanded the commerce of the newly-founded Spanish Empire. The Moors built new vessels equipped for speed, and an organization of labor was devised to ensure that the best trained men were placed into boarding parties (Gosse 1946). With these vessels, the Barbary Corsairs were known to take slaves as well as plunder. If the captives were of a noble family, a ransom would be offered for their return. However, the majority of the captives were placed in the galleys, and the women were sent into harems or brothels (Pringle 2001).

The first major raid by this new group of corsairs occurred in 1504 when Pope Julius II launched two war galleys to carry a shipment of valuables from Genoa to Civita Vecchia. The captain of the leading vessel was caught unaware of pirates in the area, as they had left the area relatively untouched over the last several years and had typically only attacked smaller ships. Soon the Moors had overtaken the ships, and many of the Papal crew were taken as slaves and chained to the oars (Gosse 1946).

This group eventually gained support from the Sultan in Algiers, one of the most powerful rulers at the time in the Mediterranean. This was augmented with alliances with neighboring countries and spanned the coast, creating a number of ports and safe havens for the corsairs. English seamen were often welcomed into these harbors as well, typically repaying the Moors by teaching them European practices of shipbuilding (Pringle 2001: 43). Until that point, the pirates had been limited to only the Mediterranean region. In fact, the Barbary Corsairs
gained such control that it became an annual practice to sail into the western Mediterranean to intercept Spanish vessels returning from the Americas. Spain continued sending fleets to quell the constant threat of these corsairs but were quite unsuccessful, to the point that Emperor Charles V lost 300 officers and 8,000 soldiers at the hands of these pirates in the 1540s (Gosse 1946). However, once the Moors were able to utilize new European methods of building sailing ships, their reach was expanded into the Atlantic and the English Channel. With this technology, the Barbary Corsairs despoiled English shipping routes until the nineteenth century (Pringle 2001).

**Privateering**

In spite of the many conflicts in the time of the Moors and the Barbary corsairs, the relationship between pirates and their respective Crowns were not always hostile. The idea that the acts of pirates could become legal under the existing political structure and supplement the treasury of the state became a particular interest of Queen Elizabeth I after Sir Francis Drake's expeditions of piracy, and from that time the notion expanded to other areas of the world.

In 1577, Sir Francis Drake began a three-year journey of plundering waters across the world. He returned in 1580, bringing treasures back to England valued at nearly £1.5 million and received a pardon and knighthood from Queen Elizabeth I for his deeds. Drake continued a number of successful raids to the West Indies, and this form of piracy was sanctioned by England to bring wealth into the country and defeat its enemies (Lee 2000).

Before this, Queen Elizabeth made every effort to suppress piracy and those in the navy that instead chose to follow its course. She was able to rid the English Channel of a number of pirates, but she was unable to gain control over the larger organization of piracy itself. This was due to the fact that the individuals at the head of the pirate groups operating outside the Channel
were often involved in England's internal affairs, and any attempts to extricate them would have likely resulted in a civil war. Instead, she focused her attention on those who threatened English waters, but turned her head to those operating farther off, especially those in Spanish waters. She also took notice of the finances that could be gained from the aggressions against Spain, and allowed the pirates to operate in times of peace in order to benefit the English Crown (Gosse 1946).

Another example of the relationship between piracy and the state can be seen in Simon de Danser, a Dutch commander and privateer in the service of the States General in the seventeenth century. After an unsuccessful campaign as a privateer, he docked in Marseilles and was tempted by the thriving economy. He spent so much money in the port that it became necessary for him to sell his ship, and he promptly squandered the money gained from the sale in Marseilles. Without a ship, de Danser recruited a number of locals and commandeered a small boat, which he used to procure a larger vessel. This vessel held nearly 300 men and 60 guns and allowed him to become a powerful force at sea. He used Algiers as his main port, just as the Barbary Corsairs before him and similarly gained control of the coast. Spanish and English fleets were sent to the harbor to overtake him in the event that de Danser might make residence there (Gosse 1946).

He bought an official pardon from King Henry IV of France and returned to Marseilles only to be met with much hostility. Here, he had to repay a number of the merchants for what he had previously stolen before he could leave the port for Paris to heed a royal summons. King Henry IV had ordered a fleet to attack Goletta at Tunis and had pardoned the corsair so that he might lead the attack on France's former allies. The King believed in the idea of requiring a thief to catch a thief, and the expedition was very successful, gaining 455 guns and loot valued at
nearly 400,000 crowns (Gosse 1946). Once again, piracy was favored so long as it was beneficial to the Crown.

During King George's War (1739-1748), the port cities of the Colonies were greatly impacted by imperial warfare due to Spanish and French privateers. This particularly influenced the Carolina coast, especially between St. Simons Island and the Cape Fear River. The Spanish and French ships were men-of-war (see discussion merchantmen in the types of ships below), owned by private individuals rather than the Crown. These vessels were then able to provide wealth and resources to Spanish and French colonies and the individual without depleting the treasuries of the country or the colonies themselves. The Carolina Coast was such a target for these enemy privateers that the danger of being attacked in the Charleston harbor became a common fear throughout the colonies, especially during the later years of the war. It was estimated that enemy privateers captured at least 21 ships that made port in the harbor, and of all the ships taken from the harbor these privateers took nearly £150,000 sterling (Swanson 1997).

Although this notion of privateering was profitable for the Spanish and the French, it held little gain for coastal Carolina. Carolina's harbors were pivotal in colonial trade but were not well-equipped with a large military fleet to protect them from these privateers. Charleston was especially vulnerable, as it was a shipping point for rice and other agricultural products with few privately-owned vessels. In fact, Robert Dewiddle, the surveyor general of customs in 1740, informed the Board of Trade that Carolinian residents owned fewer than 25 ships, and on multiple occasions Robert Pringle noted the scarcity of mariners in the area. Even with some help from the Royal Navy, the resources were not available to prevent privateering attacks within the harbor. The lack of ships and the likelihood of an enemy privateer attacking the fleets
impacted the local economy as well, as shipping rates increased dramatically due to this uncertainty (Swanson 1997). This concept is discussed at length in Chapter 4.

Likewise, this lack of resources prevented the Carolinas from becoming a major hub for British privateering, unlike the thriving colonial harbors in Newport, New York, and Philadelphia (for a more detailed discussion of the impact on the lack of seamen in the Carolinas, see Chapter 4). This affected the revenue that Charleston received from captured prizes as well. During the course of the War, only 51 prizes were brought into the Carolina harbor, but the area only received large profits from 14 of these (see Chapter 4 for a discussion of these figures). The majority of prizes taken into the harbor were apprehended by privateers from other colonies, as well as private individuals. However, colonial policy allowed Charleston to realize a minimal financial gain from these other vessels, as fees and taxes were applied to all documents, loading, unloading, and storing of cargo, and selling goods (Swanson 1997; for a further explanation of how privateering was placed in the overall economy, see Chapter 2.)

**Blackbeard**

Another individual who was utilized briefly as a privateer by the Colonial government was Edward Teach, more commonly known as Blackbeard. Teach was born in Bristol, England around the year 1680, a time when the city was becoming the second largest city in England due to its sea trade. During his lifetime, England fought a number of sea battles with France and Spain. It is believed that Teach fought in Queen Anne's War, or the War of the Spanish Succession, although there are no records to denote his entrance as a privateer based in Jamaica. Shortly after the war, Teach moved his base from Jamaica to New Providence Island in the Bahamas and served as an apprentice to Captain Benjamin Hornigold in 1716. Soon, Teach was put in charge of a sloop taken during battle and equipped it with 70 men and a number of
cannons. In 1717, Hornigold and Teach captured a sloop from Havana containing 120 barrels of flour and one from Bermuda containing hundreds of barrels of wine. Later that year, the two returned to the West Indies and attacked a merchant ship near St. Vincent. This ship was *La Concorde*, a French guineaman that contained a wealthy cargo of gold dust, coins, plate, jewelry, and other merchandise (see Chapter 4 for a detailed listing of the cargo, as well as crew rosters). Teach immediately requested that he be given command of the ship, and Hornigold granted this shortly before his decision to retire from a career of piracy and accept the king's pardon. Teach renamed the vessel *The Queen Anne's Revenge* soon after (Lee 2000; Moore 1997).

In 1718, King Henry VIII of England required pirates to surrender, and under this act they were not required to capitulate their treasures. If an individual came forth, claiming that he had been robbed by the pirates, he could legally demand that the goods be returned, but most of the pirates seemed to have kept their acquisitions. Teach surrendered and likely left *The Queen Anne's Revenge* grounded in Ocracoke Inlet before traveling to Bath to receive a pardon from the Governor, Charles Eden, who placed him in service as one of the few privateers on the Colonial Coast (Lee 2000).

Despite the pardon, Teach left Bath and returned to the *Queen Anne's Revenge*, and sailed to the Bay of Honduras to procure a crew. He reverted to the old ways of piracy and decided to overtake the harbor of Charleston, South Carolina. Charleston stopped all vessels inbound and outbound, though nine ships were taken in as many as six days. From one ship, Teach took hostages and demanded the government of South Carolina supply his ship with medicine. This request was denied until Teach moved his fleet deeper into the harbor to attack. Only then did the Governor submit to the pirate's demands (Lee 2000).
One of Teach's final acts came at Beaufort Inlet, where according to court depositions, he deliberately grounded *The Queen Anne's Revenge* on a sandbar in order to downsize the number of pirates with whom to divide the profits (Moore 2001: 40; Figure 1.1). After grounding the vessel, Blackbeard fled with 40 crewmen and as much treasure as they could carry on foot (Moore 2001 40). The ship was heavily damaged and abandoned in the shallow waters of the Inlet (Lee 2000).

Figure 1.1. Map showing the location of the shipwreck site off Beaufort Inlet (Courtesy of the NC Department of Cultural Resources).
In late 1718, the Vice Admiralty Courts met and Blackbeard and his men were put on trial for their piratical action regarding a French vessel he had taken after grounding the *Queen Anne's Revenge*. The pirates claimed that they had found the vessel abandoned and claimed it and signed an affidavit with that assertion. Governor Charles Eden awarded the vessel to the salvors, due to the fact that abandonments were possible (though rare) and the lack of a French representative to counter their argument. Problems arose over disposition of the cargo. According to North Carolina salvage laws, a portion of all salvaged cargo was to be paid to the Crown or the local authorities. The ship had been carrying a cargo of sugar and other items, and it was recorded that 60 hogsheads (barrels) of sugar had been delivered to Governor Eden's plantation house in Bath, NC for this payment. It was also rumored that 20 hogsheads were delivered to the home of Tobias Knight, Governor Eden's secretary and the collector of customs (Konstam 2006).

In light of this, Governor Alexander Spotswood of Virginia vehemently claimed that these 20 hogsheads were not part of the fees the pirates had to pay, but was instead a payoff to Knight for his services in assisting the pirates. This was buttressed by Blackbeard burning the ship in Okracoke Inlet, claiming that the ship was leaking and would soon sink if appropriate action was not taken. This destroyed any chance of identification by the ship's former owners, thereby making it impossible for Eden's ruling to be challenged or overturned (Konstam 2006).

In addition to the burnt ship, Governor Spotswood cited another piece of critical evidence - a letter from Tobias Knight to Blackbeard (see Appendix A for the full text of this letter). Knight disclosed nothing in the text but instead stated that he would send the information with two different messengers. He also stated that the Governor (Eden) would be pleased to see the pirate before his departure, which supported Spotswood's claim of corruption. Spotswood
believed that the letter was to warn Blackbeard of an impending attack by three men, and he placed Knight on trial for his actions. However, Knight successfully conducted his defense and died shortly thereafter from illness. The case was never proven, but Spotswood was determined to exact justice on Blackbeard (Konstam 2006).

He began his efforts to bring Teach to justice in November 1718 with the help of Captain Ellis Brand of the HMS *Pearl* and Captain George Gordon of the *Lyme*. These men had been sent to Virginia by the Admiralty in London to protect against these pirates and agreed to aid Spotswood in his attack on Blackbeard. However, the men commanded vessels far too large to be sent to Teach's operations in Bath or the shallows of Okracoke Inlet. Because of this, Spotswood commissioned two civilian vessels, the *Ranger* and the *Jane* and employed First Lieutenant Robert Maynard to command the attack from the *Jane* in conjunction with Captain Gordon (Konstam 2006).

Maynard arrived in Okracoke at nightfall on November 21, 1718 and soon spied Teach's sloop. Blackbeard was entertaining the individuals who brought him Knight's letter several days earlier and had left only a small number of his crew on board. This was likely due the protection and security afforded to Teach by Governor Eden. However, the next morning, the pirates spotted a longboat and the two sloops Maynard had sent and raised the alarm. A battle ensued, which ended in Blackbeard's defeat. One of Maynard's men engaged Teach and succeeded in beheading Blackbeard. Maynard ordered the head to be suspended from the *Jane's* bowsprit as proof of the victory, as well as a warning to other pirates (Figure 1.2). Spotswood had succeeded in his quest to defeat the infamous Blackbeard (Konstam 2006).
Figure 1.2. Artist's rendering of the head of Blackbeard hanging from the Jane's bowsprit (Courtesy of the NC Department of Cultural Resources).

Ships

In the Golden Age of Piracy (1690-1730), the waters of the Caribbean Sea, the West African Coast, the Indian Ocean, and the Atlantic seaboard of North America were rampant with pirates awaiting well-stocked ships to pass. These individuals controlled a number of vessels, varying in size, speed, and armaments, although speed and smaller ships were preferable to a large number of guns or larger vessels. This was largely due to the need to clean the hulls of the ships to maintain the water displacement ratios that are critical to the efficiency of a vessel. This sail to water displacement ratio (discussed in further detail in Chapter 4) is higher in smaller vessels than in large schooners and allows the small ships to travel faster in favorable waters (Konstam 2003).

These small, fast ships were preferred to the heavily armed vessels because gunfire would be likely to damage the hull of a potential prize. Ships were most commonly converted to piracy
after being captured, and the process was largely random, depending on what vessels were in the area at the time. There was no way to identify a target and lie in wait for it. Once the target was in sight, the vessel was assessed in terms of size, hull structure, and armaments, then taken by intimidation, boarding, or cannon fire. If the hull was in poor condition, the ship would be abandoned or set ablaze. If it was of a suitable construction, the ship was taken in place of the current vessel and converted to the needs of the pirates. This conversion included the removal of all internal bulkheads but the captain's cabin in the stern, altering the rigging of the vessel for maximum speed, raising the black flag, and renaming the ship, although the exact process varied depending on each vessel. It was rare that a pirate would be able to trade vessels more than a few times, although Edward Teach and Bartholomew Roberts were able to capture and convert enough ships to eventually control large warships (Konstam 2003).

Other less common methods of converting a vessel to piracy included the mutiny of a law-abiding vessel and privateering vessels willingly turning to piracy. Mutinies of entire crews were rare, as it was difficult to convince all hands to turn to piracy. Occasionally, privateers would turn to piracy once all of their assigned targets had been eliminated. The sailors would illegally attack a new target and immediately be considered pirates by the Crown, as privateering was closely regulated and all illegal acts were quickly reprimanded (Konstam 2003).

**Types of Ships**

The type of ship most commonly converted to piracy was the merchantman, used in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. These ships were large, somewhat slow ships with rounded hulls, square rigging, and three masts. Merchantmen were often crewed by a small number of seamen in order to eliminate the costs associated with wages, making it easy for enemies to overpower. There were a number of variations on the traditional merchantman,
including sloops, schooners, and barques (Konstam 2003). Sloops were often equipped with a single mast with a fore-and-aft mainsail and a job foresail. These were used by pirates such as Stede Bonnet and Edward Teach, and accounted for the largest number of attacks on colonial harbors. Schooners had a longer hull than sloops and were equipped with two masts. These were fitted with gaff-rigged sails topped with square-rigged sails. Barques were smaller than traditional sloops and were fitted with more beams. These ships were also preferred when carrying a number of armaments (Konstam 2003).

Fluyts were the most common type of merchant vessel in the late seventeenth century but were rarely utilized for piracy due to their small size. These Dutch vessels could be crewed with as few as 10 men, and if captured, were typically used to carry plunder. Smaller versions of the fluyt included fly-boats and balandras, and were utilized by the English and Spanish respectively. Balandras were smaller pinnace ships with a single gaff-rigged sail and were often used as scouting or raiding vessels. Pinnace vessels were often carried as rowed longboats for larger ships, and were fitted with lateen or gaff-sails on a single mast. These were typically 35 feet in length and could hold a cargo of 60 tons. The Dutch equivalent of the pinnace was the pingue, a small vessel displacing nearly 80 tons of water, while the Spanish favored the barca longa, a small fishing vessel with a single square-rigged sail. These were often used as raiding vessels in the late seventeenth century but fell out of use before the nineteenth century. Later, the term pinnace was used to describe a large armed vessel with three masts that could displace over 200 tons of water. The Dutch Postilijon, a 24-gun warship, was one of these later vessels (Konstam 2003).

The final type of vessel used by pirates was the brigantine, commonly used in the Golden Age. These were vessels with one square-rigged foresail and two topsails alongside a gaff-
rigged mainsail. A brig or snow was another type of brigantine equipped with square-rigged lower sails and a fore-and-aft sail. These were often associated with buccaneers in the seventeenth century (Konstam 2003).

**Nautical Archaeology**

In order to gain information about these types of vessels, one must turn to nautical archaeology. The discipline of nautical archaeology studies submerged settlements and shipwrecks in order to analyze information about shipbuilding, commerce, and navigational techniques. Archaeologists must often dive to reach these sites, and technologies developed after World War II to allow easier access to these submerged environments. These include magnetometry, underwater photography, submersibles, and the use of acoustics and computer equipment (Gould 2000).

Shipwrecks can tell much about the vessel, its cargo, and the sea around it. They may be sunk by the strong gales or waves of a passing storm, enemies in battles, or just general disrepair. Once sunk, the conditions present in the sea, as well as the seabed determine the condition of preservation. Water temperature, salt content, brackishness, depth, and the presence of microorganisms and divers all are responsible for the condition of a shipwreck. In addition, the types of metal found in the cargo are affected differently by these same processes. Iron, copper, gold, silver, and brass react to the water chemistry and the other elements around them, just as the timbers themselves undergo a compositional change. These factors call for the use of modern chemistry to conserve the artifacts, which are in themselves indications of the societies that constructed them (Throckmorton 1970).

In the next chapter, I examine piracy in the scope of the broader social, political and economic systems of England, Spain, France and the Early Colonial Period to determine where
these individuals fit in early commerce. I use World-Systems Theory to place these activities in a more extensive framework. I also examine the rational choice model as a way to explain a number of the practices and processes involved in piracy.
Chapter 2
Theory

In this chapter, I discuss the general theoretical frameworks that help explain the practice of piracy. I begin with an analysis of the rational choice model, a key factor in the actions of pirates, before moving to a discussion of World-Systems Theory which describes how the larger imperial system operated. Finally, I propose a model incorporating these theoretical perspectives to provide a context for piracy in this larger system and discuss how piracy was situated at the margins of a contested periphery.

The Rational Choice Model

The rational choice model suggests an underlying element of human behavior that functions unconsciously. This involves a series of decisions made by an individual to assess the costs and benefits associated with each action. The model has three underlying assumptions. First, the individuals involved are acting out of self-interest. They act out of regard for their own benefit, or for the benefit of the group of individuals closest to them. Second, individuals act rationally, and are able to achieve the goals suited to their own interests in the best possible manner. To do this, they then examine the situation and avoid costs in order to gain maximum benefits (Leeson 2009).

The rational choice model also encompasses various levels of priority, and allows the individual to make choices based on what is most beneficial to retrieve at the time and what can be put off until a later time. Kardulias (2007) applies this model to a system of embedded procurement. Embedded procurement addresses a number of secondary tasks within the process of obtaining the initial goal, but the rational choice model must be implemented to decide in what order the resources should be taken (Kardulias 2007). This model is discussed within the context of piracy in greater detail in the following sections.
World-Systems Analysis

The rational choice model can be placed into a wider structure with the use of World-Systems Theory (WST), which was developed in 1974 by Immanuel Wallerstein to analyze the development of the capitalist world economy in the context of European expansion, the development and control of the labor associated with methods of production in different areas, and the formation of strong states that would later become the core regions (Wallerstein 1974: 38). In addition, Wallerstein argued that the political and economic polities are interrelated within the world-economy. Economic decisions made by powerful core states were directed towards benefitting the world-economy while political decisions typically impacted society at a state-level. The class system is also a result of this world-economy that emerged from the economic and political framework of states (Wallerstein 1974). WST takes into account the interactions between societies and the idea that there is a hierarchy in which economically powerful regions exploit less powerful areas fostering the development of globalization (Hall 1999).

The result is the formation of three distinct zones that signify a specialized division of labor: the core, periphery, and semi-periphery. Core zones are the economically powerful areas where there is an emphasis on sophisticated technology and high profit activities. These are fueled by acquiring raw materials and agricultural products from peripheral zones (McCormick 1990:126). Because the core states control the major centralized production, transportation and communication facilities, they are able to incorporate peripheries into a capitalist world economy and exploit the resources available in these margins (Hall et al. 2011). An intermediary, which Wallerstein called the semi-periphery, is needed between these areas, however, to aid in
transporting goods. It also mobilizes local capital and houses lesser forms of manufacturing (McCormick 1990:126).

Hall et al. (2011) present a few existing assumptions when examining this version of WST. A key notion is that a core has the ability to maintain control of all centralized activities and regulate all trade and exchange. This allows for an unequal distribution of benefits in its favor as a means of controlling the periphery. However, the periphery benefits from this distribution, as obtains capital from the core region though this exchange.

The above description is still lacking, however, because this model fails to consider the abilities of peripheries to negotiate the terms of trade. Due to this, Hall et al. (2011) introduce and discuss the concepts of a negotiated and contested periphery. Kardulias provides a definition of negotiated peripherality as “the willingness and ability of individuals in peripheries to determine the conditions under which they will engage in trade, ceremonial exchange, intermarriage, adoption of outside religious and political ideologies, etc. with representatives of expanding states” (Kardulias 2007: 55). This process involves the amount of control the periphery maintains in determining conditions for interacting with the core. Individuals are responsible for this negotiation, and it is largely on their terms that agents of the core are allowed to remain on their land, at least initially (Hall et al. 2011).

Kardulias (2007) discusses this in greater detail as it applies to the Native American fur trade. Because agents of the core are bargaining for the periphery's resources, there must be an agreement that best encompasses the needs and wishes of both parties involved. This agreement cannot be static, however, as the situation and circumstances surrounding the terms may change at any moment.
In addition to the negotiated periphery, there is also the potential for a contested periphery (Allen 1996). In this case, multiple cores compete for control of the periphery with the ultimate goal being the sole procurement of the resources offered by the periphery. Contested peripheries may also be situated in areas between core areas, although this is not always the case (Hall et al. 2011). Many times they have less power to name their own terms than a negotiated periphery, and are merely pawns of the core states vying for full control of the resources.

**Rational Choice and WST in Piracy**

This competition can be carried out directly or indirectly (Figure 2.1). When a core state placed its agents in the periphery, especially individuals capable of enacting regulations on peripheral activities, it gained the ability to limit contact and trade negotiations with other core states. This allowed one core to procure a great number of resources for its own use, but it also created greater hostilities with the other core states. Many times, this led to declared warfare between the cores, a method of direct competition. During periods of war, states with a strong naval force would employ individuals to become agents of the core. These individuals were privateers, and were legally able to attack enemy merchant and warships at will without fear of consequence from core administration. Privateers were given official orders from the administration of the core, and were only allowed to attack their given targets. Once the target had been taken or eliminated, privateers were allowed to keep only a small portion of the spoils, except in rare cases when the core allowed its agents to keep the entirety of what was taken.

In privateering, individuals are often unable to fully employ aspects of rational choice when attacking specific targets. They may not be able to take the richest ships from another core if they are permitted to take only certain vessels, and the benefits may not be enough to offset the risks involved in the attack, especially given the percentage that is to be returned to the core. It
was likely these reasons caused privateers to illegally take other vessels once their assigned targets had been eliminated. If these other vessels belonged to a competing core, the actions of the privateers were overlooked, and often praised (in the case of Sir Francis Drake). If the ships belonged to allies of the core, or even the state itself, the actions were immediately considered illegal and the privateer was labeled a pirate.

Privateers and other men in the Royal Navies also may have turned to piracy willingly at the conclusion of a war. The men were experienced seamen, and piracy was generally more profitable than legal ventures. Individuals employed the skills they knew in the best way to maximize their benefits. They were able to assess the benefits of attacking certain ships, and make choices concerning what ships/targets to attack while trying to offset the risk of punishment from the core.

With this relationship, the line between privateering and piracy is largely blurred, placing these individuals in a liminal area in regards to the legality of their actions. Inversely, the opposite was true as well, allowing pirates to become privateers. In a number of cases, cores employed pirates who had committed crimes against them and offered the seamen letters of pardon if they attacked certain competitors. This process can be seen in the case of Simon de Danser, as discussed in Chapter One. This process allowed individuals an escape from punishment and offered a legal way of making profit, although in many cases the gains were considerably less than what would be acquired from piracy.

Pirates were offered letters of marque when the existing navies and privateers proved to be inefficient and failed to eliminate a specified target. It appeared that the task was better suited to an experienced pirate. Because piracy was illegal and placed under municipal criminal law and the Admiralty courts, a number of individuals faced the threat of hanging if the Crown was
able to capture them, and these letters offered amnesty for previous crimes (Rubin 1988). A pirate would then weigh the costs (such as losing a percentage of their profit to the Crown and not being able to choose the richest targets at will) to the benefits (their record wiped clean and no fear of hanging, allowing them to resume their illegal practices if they so wished) to determine if his best interest was to support the government. Occasionally, a pirate would be offered a choice between the letters of marque or being hanged for treason. In this case, it would be most beneficial for the pirate to become a privateer.

In addition to this direct conversion from piracy to privateering, these individuals also were overlooked if they attacked an enemy of a certain core state. Orders against pirates were only issued if they encroached upon their own state (see the example of Sir Francis Drake in Chapter 1). If this was the case, pirates had to take extra precautions in their assessment of the risks and benefits of continuing to attack vessels of their own state. Occasionally, marginal areas would be used as a base for pirates, allowing them to evade capture and punishment (hanging) by gaining the protection of the ruler of these locations.

Overall, piracy can be placed into the model as both a legal and illegal practice, depending on what state the actions are against, as is shown in Figure 2.1. If they are commissioned by the core state to act against a competitor, they are legally acting as privateers to the Crown. In the same way, the actions are considered legal, or at least overlooked if the actions are not commissioned, but provide benefit to the core itself. However, once any action is taken against the state, the individuals are immediately placed into criminal status. In order to make a decision on which action is most profitable, pirates weighed the costs and benefits of each situation, which can be placed within the framework of the rational choice model.
As pirates operated their enterprises, they allowed certain vessels to pass unharmed or gave the orders to attack another ship based on what action was more beneficial to their own interests (Figure 2.2). Pirates had to observe the origin of the vessel, its potential cargo, the number of crewmen, and the amount of armaments present on the ship before deciding the proper course of action. If the decision was made to attack the oncoming vessel, more decisions had to be made during the confrontation. Questions regarding hull strength, speed, number of crewmen required, and how much profit overall could be gained from the ship's capture had to be addressed to determine if the enemy vessel was to be taken or burned. The method of attack
would also be affected by this, as pirates were less likely to fire upon vessels intended for capture. In fact, one could argue that every action employed by pirates was an unconscious result of the rational choice model.

Figure 2.2. The rational choice model most likely employed by pirates when encountering enemy ships.

By placing piracy in a larger world-system context and examining the rational choice model, one is better able to understand the actions and motives involved in this competitive society. Because these individuals operated on the periphery, they were able to greatly profit from legal and illegal gains. These choices allowed the individuals to maximize their gains depending on which status was more beneficial at the time. They also provided a means of
determining what was best in terms of negotiating with the cores to gain the benefits that were the most desirable.

In the next chapter, I discuss the methods I employ in my study. I outline the types of sources I use and manner in which I analyze the information I have collected. In addition, I explain the process I follow in examining the ship found in Beaufort Inlet, NC to place the wreckage into the broader scope of piracy and support the claim that it is in fact Teach's flagship, *The Queen Anne's Revenge.*
In this chapter, I outline the general approach that I use to examine the role of piracy in the larger world-system. I discuss the nature of the sources I use to collect data and provide the types of analyses that I employ in order to examine the significance of the source.

A number of sources are primary documents, namely colonial letters from governors to pirates, privateers, and other political figures. Ship rolls reprinted in journals are also used to examine the sort of individuals that made up pirate crews. In addition to the ship rolls, I use copies of inventory lists to determine what sort of materials would be taken in a pirate raid in regards to luxury goods and staples. I also examine reported accounts of acts of piracy, including descriptions of attacks, how pirates were portrayed, and the sorts of items commonly taken. I also examine piracy laws of the period. In regards to a pirate's image, I focus on the descriptions of Blackbeard, the Queen Anne's Revenge, and the crew using 17th and 18th century accounts as well as modern conceptions of the individual found in popular media.

I also use data compiled from journals and economic texts in order to examine the scope of piracy and privateering. I examine data tables indicating the number of attacks on colonial harbors during King George's War, which include both colonial and enemy prize actions. The number of warships owned and operated by each colonial harbor also is examined in order to determine if the presence of such vessels affected Carolina commerce.

To analyze this information, I examine the data in regards to its broader repercussions on the economy. I reveal if there is a relationship between the number of pirate and privateer attacks made on each harbor and the number of warships owned by the harbors. I also employ the data obtained in the muster rolls to determine the function of rational choice when a ship was taken by pirates.
I also make use of information found on the *Queen Anne's Revenge* Shipwreck Project's (which I also refer to as the QAR Project) web site (www.qaronline.org), including site maps depicting the wreckage of the *Queen Anne's Revenge* as well as field summary reports from 1997 to the present. I examine the types of artifacts recovered from the site in order to compare the cargo to historical accounts of the ship's abandonment in Beaufort Inlet and the surviving inventory lists. Conservation reports from 2002 to 2010 also are available on the QAR Project site and are useful resources, as a number of the artifacts have been recovered in a state of concretion and can only be identified by x-rays in East Carolina University's Conservation Lab. In addition to the project's online resources, I contacted David Moore, Nautical Archaeologist for the project stationed at the North Carolina Maritime Museum where a number of artifacts from the *Queen Anne's Revenge* are housed and displayed.

In the next chapter, I present the data on the economic impact of piracy and privateering. Furthermore, I also describe the artifacts, hull structure, and crew of the *Queen Anne's Revenge* and include a discussion of the QAR Project where I present site maps and information regarding the artifacts recovered from the site.
Chapter 4
Data

This study examines piracy within a broader context in order to place these individuals as key figures in the larger world-system. To do this, I present information outlining the nature of piracy (including ships, individuals, and cargo), the economic impact of these actions, and how they were viewed and documented by colonial governments. With the help of the QAR Project, I highlight the actions and vessel of one individual, Edward Teach, as a case study to arrive at a wider interpretation of piratical action along the colonial coast. In this chapter, I begin with an explanation of what makes a ship better suited to piracy before moving to a discussion of the structural remains associated with the *Queen Anne's Revenge* wreck site. I describe the types of individuals most likely to be forced into piracy by their captors as well as those that went willingly into the service of pirates. Next I describe a number of artifacts found at the QAR wreck site which appear to indicate the ship's capture and subsequent use as a pirate vessel. I also outline the nature of privateering on the Carolina Coast in regards to prize actions and its effect on the economy. The chapter concludes with a discussion of historical documents that demonstrate the colonial government's involvement with pirates.

What Makes a Ship a Pirate Vessel?

When examining the place of piracy on a broader scale, one must be able to make the distinction that a vessel has been outfitted for the purpose of piratical activity. The majority of evidence that identifies a vessel as having flown the black flag consists of the remains of the ship itself, the history of the ship (including ownership, captain(s), and crew members), and the artifacts present at the site. Because a number of ships had either been burned when captured or abandoned, or had been wrecked and left to rot beneath the ocean, many times the only portion of the vessel that remains is the hull below the bilge (Babits 2001). This removes a number of
modifications typically made to pirate vessels (see Introduction), including the lack of internal
cabin bulkheads and altered rigging (Konstam 2003). In some instances, mast steps may be
found within the wreckage, though these are not diagnostic and have been found on non-pirate
vessels (Babits 2001).

Knowing the documented history of the vessel, artifacts recovered from the site are
perhaps the best indicators of pirates (although even these do not distinguish whether or not the
individual had been given a letter of marque and was working as a privateer). In the case of the
Queen Anne's Revenge, its history dictates the sort of artifacts that ought to be found at the site -
basic French equipment, items relating to the slave trade, a number of European and Colonial
artifacts, and armaments (Babits 2001).

**Hull Remains and Structure**

According to data presented by David Moore (2001) of the QAR Project, a portion of the
hull has been excavated and conserved and consists of a visible articulated structure measuring
9.45 m in length and 2.75 m in width (see Figure 4.1). This included 24 frame components,
measuring an average of 17.78 cm in width (Moore 2001). Possible floor fragments and the
futtock were also recovered (QAR Online 2011).

There was no evidence of a keel or keelson. These components were held with basic
square butt joints, with transverse bolts placed between components on each side of the butt
joints. The planks recovered at the site averaged 30.48 cm in length and 6.98 cm in width, and
were pocked by a number of holes for iron spikes (1.27 cm in diameter). All planking and frame
structure belonged to the Quercus species of white oak, and much material had been eroded by
natural degradation and wood-boring organisms (Moore 2001).
The lower portion of the sternpost was also recovered in this excavation, and includes the lower gudgeon strap that held the rudder with a "VI" depth indicator on its surface. The rabbet (in which the planks were placed) and the lead shoe which was to prevent fouling and other damages was also present. Fragments of these frame components and bottom planking were found with associated sacrificial sheathing, which was also found attached to the sternpost. While the majority of the frame was white oak, the sacrificial planking was made from a *Sylvestris* group pine (QAR Online 2011).

In addition to the organic material found at the site, numerous lead strips were found from bow to stern and had multiple nail holes along its length. These would have been used to patch the internal planking of the hull to temporarily fix leaks. An adhesive comprised of tar and bovine hair has been found on some of these strips and the sacrificial planking (QAR Online 2011).
The structural components were first dated using dendrochronology, which matches or compares existing chronologies to the yearly growth rings of trees, and thus wooden objects such as a ship's hull. Samples were taken from the planks where they had been sawn during recovery, but unfortunately the ring sequences were much too short to allow the timbers to be dated. Researchers then turned to radiocarbon dating, which measures the decay of $^{14}$C, a radioactive carbon isotope, into $^{14}$N. This is possible due to a known half life and consistent ratio of $^{12}$C/$^{14}$C in the atmosphere over time. Samples were taken from the frame, planks, anchor stocks and other components, and the material was dated to AD 1630-1670. The data was deemed consistent with a ship that was built between 1690 and 1710 (Moore 2001).

However, while radiocarbon analysis offers a date range consistent with the Queen Anne's Revenge, there are no diagnostic features to determine where on the ship the hull structure was positioned beyond the sacrificial planking, which was below the waterline. Because the remains make up only a portion of the vessel, it is difficult to determine if this ship was indeed used for piracy by looking only at the structural components.

**Who Were these Pirates?**

The individuals aboard the vessel are also important to examine when considering how pirates operated within the larger world-system. Particular skillsets were more appropriate to piratical endeavors, and this is reflected in depositions of colonial officials that examine what crew members were forced to join the pirates and who went willingly after a ship was captured.

Muster rolls from La Concorde, the French slave ship, indicate that between 70 and 80 individuals were present aboard the vessel in March 1717 (see Appendix C for complete muster roll). These men were assigned to a number of tasks on the ship, with positions that included captains, mariner officers, skilled craftsmen, seamen, surgeons, and clergy and were paid
according to their rank aboard the ship. Monthly pay ranged from 5 livres to 100 livres, with the cabin boys receiving the least and the captain garnering the most pay (Moore and Daniel 2001).

Of these individuals aboard La Concorde, a large majority were allowed to return to Nantes, their home port. These included the captains, chaplain, the quartermaster, the steward, nearly half of the seamen, the purser, and the volunteers. The chief surgeon and the second (or assistant) surgeon, the first pilot, the caulker, the second cook, and two gunsmiths were forced to join the pirates. However, according to the muster roll, a number of crewmen joined the pirates voluntarily. These included at least two seamen and two cabin boys (Moore and Daniel 2001: 22-23).

The Artifacts

Tens of thousands of artifacts have been recovered from the site to date, with a large amount of material left beneath the ocean or inside concretions at East Carolina University's conservation lab. The recovered material can be divided into eight encompassing categories: arms and armaments, ship's ballast, ship, tools and instruments, sustenance, storage, personal possessions, and intrusive materials (see Appendix D for a listing of artifacts typically found on pirate vessels).

In determining whether a ship has been outfitted for piracy, it is particularly important to look at the armament found within the wreck. At the QAR shipwreck, 24 cast iron cannons had been located as of 2008 (Figure 4.2), along with cannonballs ranging from two to 24-pounds (QAR Online 2011; Babits 2001). Of these, two were consistent with six-pound barrels and ten were consistent with six to nine-pound barrels. The six-pound shot matches two of the cannons recovered. However, no 24-pound barrels have been found at the site to date, making it possible
that the 24-pound shot is not associated with the vessel, but may have instead been fired at a Union fleet from nearby Fort Macon in 1862 (Babits 2001).

In addition to the iron cannon shot recovered at the site, other types of ammunition were recovered from the QAR wrecksite. Lead shot has been found both loose and in concretions and was concentrated in the southern-most portion of the site (Figure 4.3). These ranged from musket to partridge sized. The smaller drop shot measures between 1 mm and 5 mm in diameter. Molded lead shot was larger and account for nearly 76% of the shot (by weight) recovered at the site, though they do not appear as frequently. These range in size from 6 mm to about 19 mm. Two grenades were also found. These were attached to a pewter platter and were made of cast...
iron and had a hollow wooden fuse (QAR Online 2011). A number of personal firearms were also excavated. One blunderbuss was recovered. Pieces of smaller arms, such as muskets or pistols, were found in concretions and included gunlocks, heelplates, sideplates, trigger guards, and gunflints (Babits 2001; QAR Online 2011). However, because the *Queen Anne's Revenge* was abandoned deliberately after it ran aground, it is likely that there would not be many personal firearms among the remains.

Figure 4.3. A dredge unit containing lead shot (Courtesy of the NC Dept of Cultural Resources).

Among the artifacts, perhaps some of the most diagnostic are the within the category of sustenance. For example, 28 pieces of pewter flatware were located primarily in the aft-stern of the ship. These pieces were over 93% tin and were some of the finest pewter available at the time. Ten of the items had clear makers marks and were produced in London by four specific
pewters: George Hammon, John Stiles, Henry Sewdley, and Timothy Fly. These artisans worked in the late 17th and early 18th centuries, which is consistent with the dates obtained from the ship's structural components (QAR Online 2011).

A number of bottles and bottle fragments were also found at the site, and the majority could be grouped into two broader categories (flacon bottles and squat wine bottles), with other types being representative of a flask and a gin case bottle. Of the flacons, three lip and neck pieces, a base fragment, and 402 side panel and shoulder fragments were recovered. This type of bottle was comprised of blue-green glass blown into dip molds, and was produced in France in the 18th century. The second largest group, the squat wine bottles, were of English manufacture and date to the first quarter of the 18th century. Two entire bottles and 56 base and body shards were recovered from the site. These were hand-blown and of an olive green color, and appear to date to 1708 on the Williamsburg bottle chronology. Other glassware at the site included stemware decorated with embossed crowns and diamonds, which were associated with the coronation of George I (QAR Online 2011; see Appendix E).

Ceramics are also an important part of the assemblage, and include bowls, jars, jugs, and plates (see Appendix F). Sherds from two bowls were found - one is earthenware originating from Northern Italy or Southern France with a marbled slip decoration under a lead glaze. The second was produced in Southwestern France and has a distinctive flattened rim tooled edge with a green slip under the lead glaze. Jugs of high quality salt glazed stoneware were of German manufacture. The one ceramic plate recovered was of a buff or tan earthenware and exhibited small red-grog and fine-grain tempering. The interior of the plate is coated in a deep green lead glaze while the bottom is unglazed. Based on the glaze and its flattened rim with tooled edge, it
was likely produced in the Saintonge region of Southwestern France between 1700 and 1750. The jars are not diagnostic of any region or time period (QAR Online 2011).

Artifacts associated with the ship's rigging and fixtures were also recovered from the site. Among these, perhaps the most interesting is a large bell from mid ship (see Figures 4.4 and 4.5). This bell is clearly dated 1705 and is inscribed with IHS MARIA [Iesus Hominum Salvator]. It weighs 21 lbs and has a height of 32.5 cm and a diameter of 21 cm at its base. However, it is unknown if this bell was used as part of the ship's equipment or if it was among the cargo or personal possessions. Thirteen sail cloth fragments were also found and represent 2x1 half basket and 1x1 plain weaves (QAR Online 2011).

Figure 4.4. Ship bell dating to 1705 (Courtesy of the NC Dept of Cultural Resources).
Other interesting artifacts recovered from the QAR wrecksite include two leg irons (also known as shackles or bilboes) which were used to restrain human cargo\(^1\). One displays evidence of cord wrapping, which may have been used to protect the limbs of the enslaved individuals on the ship. Cufflinks were also identified within a concretion and appear to be similar to examples that date between 1715 and 1781. Buckles could also be dated, and three types were identified. A loop-shaped buckle dates between the 1690s and the 1720s (Figure 4.6). A second is a buckle frame made of copper alloy that is similar to the Spanish/French military shoe buckles and dates ca. 1710-1730 (Figure 4.7). The third example (Figure 4.8) is a clothing fastener that may have been part of a weapon strap, as a bit of leather is still attached to it (QAR Online 2011).

\(^1\) *La Concorde* was formerly a French slave ship, so this is not unusual cargo. Teach also was known to have transported a number of slaves (Moore 2001: 27).
Gold dust\(^2\) was also present at the site (Figure 4.9). Over 2,000 pieces of natural gold have been found, primarily near the stern. Based on the composition of the material, it is likely that these had been panned in Africa or the Americas. No other valuables have been recovered from the site (QAR Online 2011).

\(^2\) Gold dust is the historical terminology. Material found at the site ranged in size from as small as grains of sand and as large as a pinky fingernail (David Moore, Personal Communication, 2012).
Privateering on the Carolina Coast

Because piracy and privateering were closely linked by letters of marque and the country the action was against, the motivations of the competing crowns must also be taken into account. I present the example of Colonial Carolina compared to other colonies during King George's War in terms of the number of private vessels, prize data, enemy prize actions, and enemy cruising areas as they relate to the economy of Coastal Carolina and Charleston in particular.

During the War of Jenkin's Ear (1739-1743), the Carolina Coast was reportedly free from enemy privateers in 1739 although nearly every merchant along the Atlantic seaboard was braced for attacks by Spanish men-of-war. However, it was not until April, 1740 that a Spanish ship appeared off the coast of Havana, and was subsequently captured by the Shoreham and brought into Charleston harbor. After 1744, the presence of Spanish and French men-of-war increased dramatically and greatly impacted Carolina commerce, and the economies of the other port cities as well (Swanson 1997).

As the War of Jenkin's Ear began, South Carolina was a very wealthy colony due to rice production which began in the 1690s. The colony did not possess a river system capable of transporting rice in the same way that Virginia and Maryland transported tobacco for export, but instead used a network of shallow inland waterways to send the product to the Charleston harbor to be dispersed. The amount of rice that was exported was great, especially when compared to the population of Charleston itself. For example, in 1700, Charleston had a population of 2,000 and exported 2,112 barrels of rice. This number increased dramatically to 9,115 barrels in 1720, even though the population had only grown to 3,500. Ten years later in 1730, Charleston's population was reported at 4,500 and the harbor exported 41,722 barrels of rice (Swanson 1997).
With such a great commodity, Charleston merchant ships were likely targets for enemy privateers. This, compounded by the lack of privately-owned vessels in the colony, created a concern among the Carolinians. Robert Dinwiddie stated that in 1740, Carolinians owned a meager 25 vessels, but even these were not solely owned by Charleston residents. Subsequently, there was also a lack of sailors for these ships, which severely limited Charleston's participation in privateering during the war (Table 4.1). In fact, Charleston failed to even assist the efforts in 1739, 1741, and 1742 due to this lack of vessels and manpower, and as a result, no prizes were taken into the harbor during these years (Swanson 1997).

Table 4.1. Total number of privateering actions taken during the War (Swanson 1997:17, Table 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Port</th>
<th>Number of Cruises</th>
<th>Relative Frequency (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NEWPORT</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>27.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW YORK CITY</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEST INDIES</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHILADELPHIA</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOSTON</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHARLESTON</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: See note 10

* This category includes all Bermuda privateers, as well as those from the West Indian Colonies.

* This category includes privateers from Cape Fear, North Carolina; Virginia; Frederica, Georgia; New Hampshire; and New Jersey.

During King George's War (1739-1748), a total of 51 vessels were captured by English predators and brought into Charleston harbor. Of these, only 14 were taken by Carolinians - 10 by privateers, two by the coast guard, and two by Carolina privateers working in conjunction
with men-of-war from other colonies. This number is small compared to the 23 prizes taken by privateers from Massachusetts, New York, and Rhode Island. Because of this, Carolina ports did not receive much, if any, of the prizes from captured ships. However, Charleston was able to benefit from the court and admiralty fees that were issued regarding the prizes. (Swanson 1997).

Because of its rice exportation and lack of mariners and private vessels, Carolina was often the target of enemy attacks (Figure 4.10). Nearby capes, such as Okracoke Island and Cape Lookout were protected rendezvous points for Spanish and French privateers, making the Carolina Coast an easy target for enemy prize actions (Table 4.2). As a result, French and Spanish ships were often found in Carolina waters, either as they made their way north to Virginia and Delaware or on the return voyage to their home ports (Swanson 1997).

![Figure 4.10. Enemy prize actions against Carolina Commerce (Swanson 1997: 19, Figure 1).](image-url)
Because of these frequent attacks, Carolina rice exports were dramatically affected during King George's War, as were their imports from Britain. The number of exports dropped considerably, as is shown in Figure 4.11. Prices also fell, with a great negative impact on Carolina's economy.
The Colonial Government's Observations and Interactions with Pirates

While these privateers enjoyed the safety provided to them by colonial governments, those who resorted to piracy were closely watched by the same authorities. Depositions were sent from colonial governors to the Council of Trade and Plantations in London to outline piratical activity and provide warnings to officials in the area. These documents provide a great deal of the historical basis on which it is possible to examine the significance of the muster roll, artifacts, and areas of piracy, which I discuss in the next chapter.

Depositions often described the types of individuals involved in piracy and the sorts of cargo that was kept on board. One such deposition is that of Henry Bostock dating from Dec. 19, 1717. Bostock was the quartermaster of the sloop Margaret, and met with Captain Tach (Teach) off Crab Island. He was forced aboard a French Guineaman equipped with 36 mounted
guns and 300 men while Tach's crew took his cargo of cattle, hogs, arms, instruments, and
books. The captain asked for information about traders on the Puerto Rico coast, and informed
Bostock that they were planning to lie in wait for the Spanish Armada. They also asked Bostock
where Captain Pinkethman's location, and the quartermaster replied that he was at St. Thomas to
look at the wrecks. Tach forced two crewmen to stay and one individual voluntarily went with
the pirates. Bostock also denotes that there were a number of plates aboard and a fine cup, and it
was believed that there was a great deal of gold dust on board as well (Headlam 1930).

Another document, the deposition of Thomas Knight, also reveals that a captain was
ordered aboard a pirate vessel and asked for information on various ships and ports. In this
exchange dated November 1717, Benjamin Hobhouse spotted ships he believed to belong to
Bristol and Guinea and began to approach them to ask them for letters (of marque). As he drew
nearer, he saw the Death Head in the stern and attempted to refuse the offer of going aboard.
The attempt was unsuccessful and Hobhouse and his men were forced on board, where they were
questioned about the guns and vessels at Plymouth, Kinslale, and other areas (Headlam 1930).

Captain Mathew Musson discussed pirate bases on the Bahamas, and explained what
pirates were stationed there as well as the number of arms and men they had at their disposal.
Musson discussed five pirates that made Providence harbor their rendezvous point. These
included Hornigold with a 10-gun sloop and 80 men, Jennings with a 10-gun sloop and 100 men,
Burgiss with an eight-gun sloop and 80 men, White with a small vessel with small arms and 30
men, and Thatch (Teach) with a six-gun sloop and 70 men. He stated that all the pirates but
Jennings would take a ship of any nationality (Jennings refused to attack English ships), and they
had taken a 32-gun Spanish ship to use as a guardship. Musson also appealed to the government
to protect Providence Harbor and rid the inhabitants of the pirates for good (Headlam 1930).
In the next chapter, I present an analysis of the data above in order to place piracy in a world-systems context. I examine artifacts and hull materials from the *Queen Anne's Revenge* site, as well as the historical and empirical data to provide a better understanding of a pirate's place in the early eighteenth century.
Chapter 5
Analysis

Given the data in the previous chapter, it is necessary to view the individual categories in the context of the nature of piracy itself. While details regarding ship construction, cannons, and other artifacts are interesting in themselves, they mean very little when examined alone. In order to gain a clearer understanding of these details, they must be understood as part of the whole enterprise of piracy. In this chapter, I examine the information presented in Chapters 1 and 4 and discuss them in the broader context of the theoretical models found in Chapter 2.

The image of pirates has been highly fictionalized since the time of Edward Teach. From the popular novel *Treasure Island* which features the peg-legged Long John Silver, to recent films such as the *Pirates of the Caribbean* series, the image of the pirate has been romanticized into some combination of a cunning rogue and a lying cheating villain (Babits 2001). With the introduction of the *Pirates of the Caribbean* series, polls from the *Guardian* indicated that in 2005, most children wished to grow up to be Captain Jack Sparrow, the clever and lovable scoundrel who continually attempts to escape the British officials, privateers, and other pirates (Land 2007). In one such venture, Captain Sparrow even meets the legendary figure Blackbeard, whom filmmakers presented using an image drawn from a number of stories about the individual. Here, Edward Teach was shown with fuses in his beard and a harsh and fearsome temperament, stating that if he did not occasionally kill a man they would forget who he was - a quote which was in fact actually attributed to Blackbeard (Marshall 2011; Lee 2000). However, in spite of a number of apparent accuracies, filmmakers took many other liberties (considering Teach had already been beheaded at the time of the film's setting) which can be attributed to the overall romanticizing and fictionalization of these pirates.
This is not only a recent convention. In fact, images of Blackbeard as a fearsome and dreadful pirate have been in circulation since Captain Charles Johnson published *The General History of the Pyrates* in 1724. Since then, every edition of the book has featured a different image of Teach, each one influenced by the changing styles of the time, which can be seen in images from the 1720s, 1740s, and 1780s especially (see Appendix G for each image in chronological sequence).

Because of this romanticism and high degree of fictionalization in modern conceptions of pirates, theoretical perspectives are especially important in order to gain a clearer understanding of who these individuals actually were and what their motives were in engaging in piratical actions. In particular, it is important to view these actions in the context of a larger world-system. With the use of World-Systems Theory, it is possible to examine these individuals in terms of the fluid status between piracy and privateering, based largely on what Crown the individuals were acting against, as discussed in Chapter 2 (see Figure 2.1). Competition between the European states (cores) created a negotiated periphery within the Colonies. These states attempted to gain full control of the area by means of legally declaring war against another, which in turn led to the hiring of individuals as privateers in service to the Crown. These individuals were ordered to attack enemy vessels, and their actions benefitted their state's economy.

Other individuals chose to take matters into their own hands and became pirates with no direct association with any state. The Crown occasionally employed these individuals to become privateers, but more commonly, the state simply ignored the illegal actions when they were against a competing state because the pirates were essentially buttressing the economy by eliminating an enemy that would otherwise harm it. However, if the pirates attacked the state
itself, their actions became illegal and punishable by death. The nature of piracy was quite subjective, and the state's interpretation of piratical action varied depending on the circumstance. Because pirates interacted with a number of polities and frequently chose not to establish what nationalities of ships could be taken and which were to be unharmed, these individuals held a fluid status in the greater world-system that allowed them to move between piracy and privateering depending on what state their 'illegal' actions benefitted most.

The broader motives of these pirates also may be examined within the rational choice model, which discusses why pirates chose to take specific actions over others, accounting for the items and people they chose to take and what was deliberately left behind (see Figure 2.2). In this, it is important to examine the underlying thought process behind a pirate's actions. Each time a vessel came into view, the captain made a choice to engage it or let it pass unharmed and wait for another prospective target. If a ship was large enough to be carrying valuable cargo and was not more heavily equipped than the pirate vessel, it was more likely to be attacked and overpowered. Once the pirates engaged the vessel, they could continue fighting, or they could flee if needed. If they overpowered the ship, they could have chosen to use it as their own or burn it, depending on the condition of the hull. The actions of taking ships, plunder, and crewmen were all the result of a series of decisions that the pirates made, and although the idea of rational choice appears to be largely unconscious, it is a critical aspect for understanding nearly all elements of piratical behavior.

These models are particularly helpful when considering the artifacts found on the abandoned wreckage of the *Queen Anne's Revenge*. Few personal items besides the discarded buckles and cufflinks have been retrieved due to the fact that the ship was grounded and intentionally left behind. The presence of large quantities of shot appear to indicate that the ship
that Teach likely acquired after the QAR was abandoned already contained a cargo of ammunition. This would eliminate the need to transport heavy shot, allowing the pirates to focus more on valuables and other useful items. Given this, only a few small, portable arms have been recovered, which leads to the conclusion that the pirates took these with them when they left the ship. In addition, over 2,000 pieces of gold dust (Figure 4.8) have been found at the site. No coins or other valuables remain, as it was likely that Teach and his crew removed as much wealth from the ship as possible.

The idea of rational choice also played a key role in Teach's capture of *La Concorde* in 1717. At the time, the ship was reported at 200-300 tons, with an average overall length to beam ratio of 3.55 French feet, and an overall beam to depth in hold ratio of 0.460 French feet (Moore 2001)\(^3\). This meant that it was a large cargo ship which was likely to contain a great many valuables, making it an enticing target for the pirates. The broad dimensions also allowed a large number of cannons to be placed on board, making it a good choice for a pirate vessel. Because of this, Teach and his crew had to be careful not to damage the hull while raiding the vessel in order to maintain the possibility of using the ship as their own.

This same careful thought also can be seen in which individuals aboard *La Concorde* were forced into piracy. Teach only took the most experienced members of the crew that would most benefit his own. Carpenters and caulkers were needed to repair the ship, and surgeons were critical to aid ill or wounded crewmen. A few of the highest paid (thus likely most experienced) seamen were also forced into piracy, as was the first pilot, who likely knew the waters quite well. Teach only took the individuals that he believed would prove most useful to his crew. A few individuals also made the choice to join the pirates voluntarily. These were primarily low-paid

---

\(^3\) 1 French foot = 0.3248m
cabin boys, who likely saw piracy as a way to gain a better wage, even if the practice was essentially illegal.

In fact, the economic benefit of piracy and privateering was tremendous. The profits brought by privateering into colonial harbors during King George's War from prize actions and tariffs greatly buttressed the economy. Because of this, it was beneficial for residents of colonial ports to own private vessels that could be employed for privateering cruises. In this, businessmen saw privateering as both an opportunity to earn capital for themselves, while simultaneously protecting the commodities of the colony itself, which also allowed them to make a profit.

Enemy (piratical) prize actions resulted in economic loss for the colonies, especially in Charleston. Here, enemy privateers (who were considered pirates by colonial merchants) greatly affected the profits from rice exports. This effect was not only seen in the colonies, however, as the Barbary Corsairs (see Chapter 1) had despoiled English and Spanish shipping routes, as well as Papal shipments, as early as 1504 (Gosse 1946; Pringle 2001). Another example of this is seen in the deposition of Captain Mathew Musson. Captain Musson feared the five pirates that made berth in Providence harbor, as they could have easily disrupted commerce if English ships were attacked. However, it is likely that if they were to attack a Spanish or French vessel, their actions would be largely overlooked, just as Queen Elizabeth disregarded a number of actions by Sir Francis Drake. This provides a critical example of the liminality of pirates, as the actions were seen as being evidence of privateering when it was a colonial vessel operating against a designated enemy of the state, and piracy when it was an action against colonial harbors.

In some cases, individuals were given letters of marque to attack the enemy pirate vessels due to the hostilities brought about by King George's War. These letters were also given in other
cases, as can be seen in the example of Simon de Danser. When King Henry IV's privateers were unable to defeat an enemy, de Danser was provided a letter of marque and was granted a pardon in exchange for his service to the Crown. The same was true for Edward Teach, who received a pardon from Carolina's Governor in 1718 when pirates were required to surrender to colonial governments. Under this act, Teach became a privateer, but he soon reverted back to piracy as he blockaded Charleston harbor shortly after receiving the pardon. It is likely that Teach saw a greater benefit from piracy, and as a result, he abandoned the status of a privateer in spite of the legal protection it offered.

Teach was not alone in his decision to disregard his letters of marque. The fluid nature of the status of pirates and privateers allowed individuals to move from one side to the other, and often back again, depending on what rewards could be gained by joining a particular group. As privateers for the Crown, individuals were limited in terms of what vessels they could attack. They were assigned specific targets, and as such were unable to lie in wait for the wealthiest or most suitable ships. If an unauthorized target was attacked, the individuals would once again be considered pirates, and could be tried for their treasonous actions, unless of course these actions were against an enemy Crown. Profits were also considerably less, as the captain and crew were only entitled to a small percentage of the treasures they plundered from another ship. This notion placed more limits on privateers, as individuals no longer had the ability to decide which vessels would provide the most benefit in return for the effort exerted in order to take the ship.

In return for their actions, these privateers were offered protection under the state, and in some cases, a full pardon of past piratical behavior. However, this did not seem to be a very compelling reason to remain in the service of the Crown, as Teach, de Danser, and others eventually turned back to piracy. Many pirates were greatly feared by their own Crown, so this
protection did not mean much to powerful individuals such as Blackbeard. The depositions of Captain Musson and Thomas Knight allude to this, as Musson ended his letter with a plea to the colonial government to rid Providence harbor of the pirates and protect the inhabitants, and Knight stated that Hobhouse grew fearful at the sight of the Death Head as he approached the vessel to check for their letters of marque (see Chapter 4).

The fine border between piracy and privateering provides an example of how individuals were able to benefit from a contested periphery (refer to Figure 2.1). The competition between the European states was established by direct and indirect means in terms of declared warfare and individual actions, respectively. These individuals could have chosen to legally become agents of the core as privateers or could have taken actions into their own hands and be pirates. Privateers solely benefitted their own Crown by taking actions against enemy vessels in order to positively affect core profits. Pirates may have also attacked these enemy vessels. In this case, their actions are typically condoned as they eliminated a threat to the royal economy. However, if the pirates took a vessel from their own country of origin, the Crown immediately considered them to be criminals because the attack negatively affected its profits.

Individuals may have also crossed the line between privateering and piracy a number of times within their nautical career. The seamen were able to weigh the costs and risks associated with each of their actions before making the decisions which would place them in one group or the other. For example, a privateer assigned to attack a specific target instead of a wealthier vessel within range may have decided to risk retribution from the Crown and take the ship with a higher value in order to make a profit for himself instead. However, if it appeared that the wealthier vessel would be more difficult to successfully attack, he might have kept to his orders, letting the other pass unharmed. In the same way, a pirate who feared capture could have
negotiated with the Crown to obtain letters of marque which legalized his actions and ensured some degree of safety for himself as well as for his crew. Others might instead have chosen to continue their piratical actions in favor of a hefty profit.

These choices also influenced which individuals became part of a pirate crew and which were returned to shore after a vessel was captured. It was beneficial for the pirates to force experienced seamen and specialized individuals (such as the surgeons, carpenters and pilots) into piracy in order to maintain their own vessels and crew. In the same way, a life of piracy appeared advantageous to some of the individuals on the captured ship. In many cases, cabin boys and lower-paid seamen could maximize their own gains by turning to piracy, despite the risk of punishment from the government.

The conversion of the French slave ship La Concorde into the famed Queen Anne's Revenge, and the figure of its captain, Edward Teach, provide specific examples of how piracy fits into the broader world-system. During the eighteenth century, piracy held a fluid status in the contested periphery in regards to the targets being attacked and the economy that was being affected by these actions. As a result, these individuals employed their own choices within the system in order to maximize their gains and offset the risks associated with the behaviors while at the same time moving between legal (or condoned) and illegal actions. With these examples, Blackbeard and the Queen Anne's Revenge present one case study in the broader scope of piracy, a contested frontier, and the influence of rational choice.
Chapter 6
Conclusion

With the use of World-Systems Theory and the idea of rational choice, it is possible to examine the actions and motives of pirates and privateers in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, as well as analyze the place of these individuals in the larger scope of competing European core states. The case study of Edward Teach and the *Queen Anne's Revenge* provides one specific example of the fluid nature of that status of pirates in the Golden Age of Piracy.

Historical examples, such as Simon de Dansem and Sir Francis Drake, set a precedent for this liminality and provide a basis for examining Teach's behavior. These individuals moved back and forth between piracy and privateering at various points in their careers, gaining and losing the favor of their respective Crowns in turn. The decision to change status often was dependent on the costs and benefits of a particular circumstance. If a privateer could have gained more by ignoring his order and attacking an unauthorized target, he made a conscious choice to turn to piracy. However, if his illegal actions were towards a competing state, his actions were condoned, and he was then considered to be in service to the Crown. In the same way, pirates were often ignored if they attacked particular states, and they could be given letters of marque by the Crown to legalize their actions. Because the Crown would condone certain actions on a case-by-case basis, the seamen were able to change status and maintain a level of fluidity within the larger world-system.

Furthermore, these actions largely benefitted the state's economy. Privateers and merchants brought a great deal of wealth into their colonial harbors, as can be seen in Charleston's rice exports in the 1720s and 1730s. As King George's War progressed, Charleston faced a lack of privateering vessels, which caused an increase in enemy attacks. While the other colonies were benefitting from having a large number of prize actions brought into their harbors,
Charleston only profited from minimal tariff fees and a small number of prizes brought in by Carolina privateers. Blackbeard's ability to barricade Charleston harbor also accounts for this lack of seamen and the great impact enemy actions could have on the local economy.

The artifacts found at the QAR wreck site, as well as the listing of the muster roll also provide important information in regard to the idea of rational choice. Pirates only attacked ships which appeared to hold a wealthy cargo or had been sent to attack them. This is reflected in the wealth of items recovered from the site, including the ceramics, stemware, pewter plates, and gold dust. In addition, recruiting the most skilled individuals, such as surgeons, carpenters, and navigators, allowed the pirates to better maintain their ships and crewmen. Lower-paid crewmen also were able to benefit from the pirates. These individuals could choose join the pirates to increase their economic gains considerably.

Overall, this study presents an examination of world-systems theory at a localized scale. The example of Blackbeard, piracy, and the Carolina coast provides much information about the fluid nature of piracy and privateering within the competition of the European core states, and greatly impacted the economies at both the local and national levels. To further expand this study in the future, I would like to examine a number of documents that discuss legislation relating to piracy, as well as accounts of pirate trials, such as that of Major Stede Bonnet. It would also be helpful to include information from treasury reports and other depositions regarding piratical action. I believe it also would be beneficial to include information about the various Spanish and French actions in Charleston harbor during King George's War. With this added information, it is my hope to expand the study to fully encompass the impact of piracy in coastal Carolina on the larger world-system.
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Glossary of Terms

bilge: the compartment at the bottom of the hull of a vessel where water collects.

bow: the front section of a vessel.

bowspirit: a spar extending forward from a ship's bow, fastens the forestays.

bulkhead: upright partition dividing a ship into compartments, serving to prevent the leaks or the spread of fire; also provides structural integrity for the vessel.

fore-and-aft: parallel with the keel of a ship.

fore-and-aft sail: any sail not set on a yard whose normal position is in a fore-and-aft direction.

forestay: stay extending to the bowspirit used for controlling the motion of the mast.

futtock: a curved timber which forms the lower part of the compound rib of a ship.

gaff: a spar attached to the mast and used to extend the upper edge of a fore-and-aft sail.


gudgeon: the socket for the pintle of a rudder.

hull: the frame or body of a ship, not including masts, engines, or the superstructure.

keel: principle structural component of a ship, runs lengthwise along the centerline from bow to stern; attaches to frame.

mast: vertical spar that rises from the keel or deck of a vessel to support the rigging.

mast steps: wooden or steel foundation supporting a mast.

pintle: the pin on which the rudder turns.

purser: the officer who controls financial matters on a ship.

quartermaster: an officer responsible for navigating and steering a vessel.

rabbet: a rectangular groove near the edge of a piece of wood that allows another piece to fit into it and form a joint.

rib: a transverse timber forming the frame of a ship's hull.
**rigging:** system of ropes, chains, and tackle used to support and control the masts, sails, and yards of a ship.

**rudder:** vertically hinged plate of wood mounted at the stern of a vessel, used for steering.

**sacrificial sheathing:** strip of material running the length of a vessel's hull to protect the hull.

**spar:** wooden pole used to support sails and rigging.

**square-rigged sails:** rigged with square-shaped sails.

**stay:** brace of heavy rope used as support for the mast or spar.

**stern:** the rear section of a vessel.

**sternpost:** the main upright timber at the stern of a vessel.

**yard:** a tapering spar slung to a mast to support and spread the head of a sail.
Appendix A

Letter from Thomas Knight to Edward Teach (Konstam 2006: 236-237).

My friend,

If this finds you yet in harbour I would have you make the best of your way up as soon as possible your affairs will let you. I have something more to say to you than at present I can write; the bearer will tell you the end of our Indian Warr, and Ganet can tell you in part what I have to say to you, so referr you in some measure to him.

I really think these three men are heartily sorry at their difference with you and will be very willing to ask you pardon; if I may advise, be ffriends again, its better than falling out among your selves.

I expect the Governor this night or tomorrow, who I belive would be likewise glad to see you before you goe, I have not time to add save my hearty respects to you, and am your real ffriend.

And Servant

T. Knight
Appendix B

Illustrations of Various Types of Ships

Colonial Sloop (Swanson 1997:22).

1720s British Sloop (Swanson 1997:16).
Large Snow-rigged Privateer (Swanson 1997:26).

## Appendix C

### Muster Roll of CONCORDE'S Crew, March 1717 (Moore and Daniel 2001: 22-23, Table 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function aboard Concorde</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Pay Rate per month in livres</th>
<th>Miscellaneous Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>Pierre Dosset</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Returned to Nantes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Captain</td>
<td>Charles Baudier</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Boudier*, returned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenant</td>
<td>Francoise Ernaud</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Returned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensigns</td>
<td>Pierre Sanquia</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Fauquier, 1st ensign**; Fantier, 2nd lieutenant*, died enroute* (20 Oct 1717)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joseph Dupuy</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Died enroute* (5 Dec 1717)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaplain</td>
<td>Claude le Cam</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Chaplain, returned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surgeon</td>
<td>Jean Dubert</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Jean Dubert Gascon, chief surgeon,* forced by pirates*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Mariner Officers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Pay Rate per month in livres</th>
<th>Miscellaneous Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Master</td>
<td>Laurens Pousse</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Master or quartermaster, returned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilots</td>
<td>Charles Duval</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2nd pilot*, forced by pirates*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pierre Sagory</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2nd pilot **, returned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charles Raguideau</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pierre Emery</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Louis Urpinosé</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Despinote, died enroute* (18 Oct 1717)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boatswain's Mate</td>
<td>Jean Gouet</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gunner's Mate</td>
<td>Jean Gibouteau</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpenters</td>
<td>Esprit Perrin</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Esprit Perrin*, master carpenter*, forced by pirates*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rene Duval</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2nd carpenter*, forced by pirates*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steward</td>
<td>Francois Fumelles</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Returned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surgeon's Aids</td>
<td>Marc Bourneuf</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Bourgneuf, assistant surgeon, 2nd surgeon*, for forced by pirates*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nicolas Gautrain</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Surgeon's aid, assistant surgeon, returned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seamen</td>
<td>Nicolas Pommerays</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Nicollas Pommeraye*, coxswain*, joined pirates*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Francoise Lemarquis</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Returned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Michel Hervé</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Returned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thomas Guillaume</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Returned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jean Coups</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Jan Coupard*, cooper*, died enroute* (13 Nov 1717)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dominique Demis Indien</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Returned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Georges Bineau</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Returned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mathuren Estan</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Returned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leonard Giraudais</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Returned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pierre Peron</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Perron*, cook*, died enroute* (23 June 1717)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Francoise Maurice</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Returned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Etienne Faverneau</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Returned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Francoise Nestier</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Baker*, died enroute* (18 Nov 1717)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jean Mourel</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Morel*, drowned enroute* (17 Apr 1717)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jean Puloin</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Pueloin*, caulker*, forced by pirates*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jacques Caret</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Died enroute* (1 Oct 1717)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pierre Pere</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Pierre*, cooper*, returned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function aboard Concorde</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Pay Rate per month in livres</td>
<td>Miscellaneous Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seamen (Cuir.)</td>
<td>Noël Cayeau</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Returned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Richard Robin</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Returned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Michel Mandin</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Returned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Françoise Druet</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Deruel*, joined pirates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nicolas Hue</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Returned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Philippe Charlet</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Trompette*, returned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pierre Lemoine</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>le Moine*, cooper*, died enroute* (28 Oct 1717)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paul Charlas</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Returned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jean Daniel</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Returned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tanquy Le Saule</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Returned, drowned after being paid (30 Jan 1718)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yves Rolland</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Returned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vincent Fraux</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Returned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guenolé Quelaret</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Guenolé Quellare*, died enroute* (22 Sep 1717)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pierre Chauvet</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Returned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Georges Bardeau</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2nd cook*, forced by pirates*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Louis Colas</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Returned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>André Lejeune</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Returned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joseph Lequer</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Returned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Françoise Lombard</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Cosseman*, died enroute* (16 Oct 1717)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jacques Gautier</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Died enroute* (26 Sep 1717)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jean Gobin</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Returned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pierre Lambert</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Died enroute* (16 July 1717)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jacques Éden</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Returned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jean Bart</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Returned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guillaume Creuzet</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Forced by pirates*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>André Guillard</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Returned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jacques Boucard</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Died enroute* (29 Aug 1717)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jacques Mezaut</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Returned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pierre Laroche</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Returned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joseph Alabard</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Negro from Juda, returned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>François Roulet*</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cook, picked up in Martinique*, died enroute*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gunsmiths</td>
<td>Jean Jacques</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Forced by pirates*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Claude Dehaye</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Desthayes, 3rd surgeon*, forced by pirates*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ship's Purser</td>
<td>François Martin</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Returned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteers</td>
<td>Jean Hinouet</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Returned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Louis Dies</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Returned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabin Boys</td>
<td>Fleury Dousset</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Dosset*, volunteer*, died enroute* (23 Aug 1717)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Julien Joseph Moisant</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Julien Joseph Mouezan*, volunteer*, joined pirates*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Louis Arot</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Joined pirates*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note—Names & functions are taken from Concorde's 1717 muster roll (ADLA Marine 337, J 3597). Other data are gleaned from either the Francois Emanuel deposition (ADLA Serie B 4578, Folio 59v–60v, denoted *) or that of Pierre Dousset (ADLA Serie B 4578, Folio 56v–57, denoted **).
## Appendix D

### Pirate Inventories

**Table 1.** 1718 Pennsylvania Pirate Inventory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Quantity 1</th>
<th>Quantity 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 Great Guns &amp; Carriages</td>
<td>4 Sponges</td>
<td>2 Swivel Guns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Crows</td>
<td>3 Pateratoes</td>
<td>0 Organ Barrels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Chambers</td>
<td>7 Cutlasses</td>
<td>30 Muskets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Great Gun Cartridge Boxes</td>
<td>5 Blunderbusses</td>
<td>8 Cartridge Boxes for small arms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Pistols</td>
<td>53 hand Granadoes</td>
<td>4 Old Chambers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Barrl. Powder</td>
<td>20 Guns Tackles</td>
<td>4 Caggs of Cartridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Breechins</td>
<td>2 Powder Horns</td>
<td>2 Guns, Worm &amp; Ladle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Acct. of Sails, Rigging & Stores**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Quantity 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Main Sail</td>
<td>2 Runners &amp; Tackles 1 ffore sail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a Small Quantity of Tallow &amp; Tobacco</td>
<td>1 Jib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Compasses</td>
<td>1 Top Sail 1 Doctor's Chest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Sprit Sail</td>
<td>1 Black fflagg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Red fflagg</td>
<td>1 boat Main Sail &amp; ffore Sail 2 Ensignes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Spare Blocks</td>
<td>2 Pendants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Stoppers</td>
<td>1 ffore halliards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Topping Lift</td>
<td>1 main Halliards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Water Casks</td>
<td>1 Jib Sheet, the other for Bow fast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 barl. of Tar &amp; a peice [sic]</td>
<td>1 Flying Tack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Dead Eyes</td>
<td>1 Fish Hook &amp; Pendant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 iron pots</td>
<td>1 Broad Ax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Wood Ax</td>
<td>1 Cables [sic]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 old piece of junk</td>
<td>1 pair of Canhooks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 hammer</td>
<td>2 Top Sail Sheets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Boom Tackle</td>
<td>1 plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Iron work &amp; Lumber</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Pennsylvania 1718)

Pennsylvania Pirate Inventory (Babits 2001:10).
Table 2. Alabama Pirate Inventory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Quantity/Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 Mosquito Bar</td>
<td>2 pr Pantaloons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Piece Gingaws</td>
<td>2 Vest &amp; one Coat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Bed Sack</td>
<td>9 Bags</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Old Guns</td>
<td>10 Pistols</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Sords [sic]</td>
<td>1 Spade and Haste [sic]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Quadrant</td>
<td>2 Compasses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Charts</td>
<td>8 Kegs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Sail Bag</td>
<td>1 Boat with 3 sails &amp; 9 oars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Hatchets</td>
<td>1 Hammer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Hand Lead</td>
<td>1 Small box containing Sundry Articles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Sands 1818)

Alabama Pirate Inventory List (Babits 2001:11).
Appendix E


Neck piece of a flacon.

Base fragments of a flacon.
Shoulder fragments of a flacon.

Squat wine bottle.
The single case gin bottle recovered from the QAR wreck site.
Stemware associated with the coronation of George I.

Detail of the embossing on the stemware.
Appendix F


Earthenware from Northern Italy or Southwestern France.

Rimsherd originating from Southwestern France.
Bottom of plate.

Interior of plate.
Appendix G

Images of Blackbeard

Rendering of Blackbeard from the 1720s (Babits 2001:8).
Rendering of Blackbeard from the 1740s (Babits 2001:8).
The most common rendering of Blackbeard from the 1780s (Babits 2001:6).