The English East India Company and the British Crown: c. 1795-1803, the first occupation at the Cape of Good Hope

by

Calvin Jordan

Submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

Department of History at Rhodes University

Supervisor: Dr Nicole Ulrich

January 2018

Abstract

My thesis aims to investigate the relationship between the English East India Company (EEIC) and the British colonial administration at the Cape of Good Hope during the first British occupation (1795 to 1803). Studies and literature that concern the EEIC have rarely gone beyond the surface, detailing the presence of the EEIC at the Cape, and neglecting the Company's involvement in the administration thereof. My thesis draws on prior works but attempts to address both temporal and spatial gaps in this literature on the Atlantic and Indian Ocean, and the history of the EEIC. This study takes note of the seaborne related activity around the ports, bays and islands at the Cape – including the regulation of these spaces and issues related to securing British trade and colonial possessions more generally. I question the framing of the Cape primarily as a constituent of a national unit by locating the colony within a broader global and maritime context. A key interest is to determine the degree to which the EEIC influenced and participated in the British governance of the Cape, particularly by exploring the maritime dimensions of the relationship between the EEIC and colonial governance during this particular period. This involves understanding the embeddedness of the Cape in British (Crown and Company) networks and the constitution of a 'British maritime zone'. This study uses archival sources drawn from the British colonial government records, Company records, and the private diaries and letters of Lady Anne Barnard that relate to the Cape. It is shown that a uniquely configured governance convention was constituted to secure the mutual commercial and imperial interests of both Crown and Company. By keeping the Cape secure, the British sought to keep their greater seaborne Empire secure. This study reveals that the EEIC was significantly involved in and influenced the way the British administration governed the Cape.

Declaration

I declare that this thesis is my own work and that all sources I have quoted or used have been indicated and acknowledged by means of complete references.

Calvin Don Jordan

January 2018

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank my supervisor Dr Nicole Ulrich for her unbelievable support, guidance and mentoring me through my thesis. A project that without you would not have been possible. I am immensely grateful and appreciative for your enthusiasm, confidence, patience and tireless engagement with my work over the course of this process. Your supervision has introduced me to worlds, stories, adventures, ideas and opportunities that have allowed me to grow academically and personally. I will always be thankful for all your insightful advice and reassuring words that have been instilled within me and guided me on this journey.

To the History Department and special thanks to Essie, Cynthia, Nicole and Gary for the unconditional help and administrative care. I will miss the morning coffee, company and conversation that importantly kick started and lit up my work day.

I am grateful too, for the support, company and insight of my friends for getting me through this process and making my experience at Rhodes University an unforgettably brilliant one. Your friendship, coffee, drinks, talks, adventures and academic insights and exposures have enriched my life beyond words. All of which has contributed to progressing and developing this thesis.

A special thanks to the Director of Research, Ms. Roberts, who made funding available for the purchase of the British Library archival document copies researched for this thesis.

I would also like to acknowledge and thank the Rodney Davenport scholarship for providing financial assistance.

Thank you to my examiners for their comprehensive reports and suggestions. Although I am not able to fully include all their suggestions due to constrains, their suggestions will be of great benefit when I develop some of this work further.

And finally, to my parents, sister and nanna. Thank you for your unwavering support and guidance. I will remain eternally grateful.

Fam. All of you are lit af. Stay shiny! And keep flourishing and slaying. Much love and hugs x

Abbreviations

EEIC – The English East India Company

The Company – The English East India Company

Cape – The Cape of Good Hope

VOC – The Dutch East India Company

Table of Contents

Chapter 1

Company and Crown at the Cape: Concepts and Methodology

The Honourable English East India Company at the Cape of Good Hope (1794 to 1803)

In 1600 the English East India Company (EEIC) was established by English merchants in London. These merchants were granted exclusive trading privileges against domestic British rivals over the 'East Indies',[1] by the British Crown. Over the course of its existence, the Company's transoceanic and transnational commercial, colonial, and military activities and networks lay the foundations in the Indian Ocean on which British imperial rule was built. In 1858, the EEIC came to an end when it was officially merged into the British state bureaucracy as a formal extension of colonial administration and governance.[2]

The first British occupation of the Cape of Good Hope (Cape) is notable for realising Britain's imperial interest in Southern Africa.[3] The British took the Cape in 1795 to establish a dual military and refreshment station. This was to secure mutual EEIC and Crown transoceanic and transnational imperial and commercial interests, particularly against its global enemy, France, and its allies at the time. The British occupied the Cape until 1803 (however, the British would occupy the Cape for a second time in 1806). During the first occupation the EEIC established an office at the Cape, the Company's first official trading operation in Southern Africa, through their agent John Pringle. This integrated the Cape into the EEIC's official expansive transoceanic maritime network, which extended from its many trading settlements and governments in the British East Indies Indian Ocean to its colony at St. Helena in the Atlantic Ocean.

This thesis examines the relationship between the EEIC and the British colonial administration at the Cape during the first British occupation (1795 to 1803). The extent to which the EEIC influenced the governance of the Cape is of primary interest. Given that much of the EEIC's trading Empire was seaborne, this thesis is especially interested in exploring the maritime dimensions of the EEIC relationship with the colonial government.

---

[1] East of the Cape and west of the Straits of Magellan.

[2] Robins, N. 2006. *The Corporation that Changed the World: how the East India Company shaped the modern multinational*. London: Pluto Press, pp.5-14.

[3] Geber, J. 1998. 'The East India Company and Southern Africa: a guide to the archives of the East India Company and the Board of Control, 1600-1858'. Doctoral thesis, University of London, pp.38; Bowen, H. 2012. 'Britain in the Indian Ocean Region and Beyond: contours, connections, and the creation of a global maritime Empire'. In: Bowen, H., Mancke, E. and Reid, J. (eds.). *Britain's Oceanic Empire: Atlantic and Indian Ocean worlds, c. 1550-1850*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp.57-59.

These dimensions did not only include the regulation of the colony's ports and bays but also involve issues related to securing British trade and colonial possessions more generally. It is within this context that I explore the centrality of the Cape in making, what I identify as, the 'British maritime zone' that covered a large area that included Britain's Portuguese allies in South America and St. Helena in the Atlantic; and Reunion, Mauritius and the Madagascar channel in the Indian Ocean. This concept of the 'British maritime zone' will be further discussed and expanded upon in this thesis.

Drawing on British colonial government records, Company records and the private diaries of Lady Anne Barnard (wife of the British colonial secretary, Andrew Barnard, of the Cape colonial government during the first occupation), I found that the EEIC played an essential role in the British army and navy's operations to invade and then occupy the Cape.[4] This is supported, although somewhat superficially, by secondary literature that examined this British taking of the Cape.[5] In collaboration with the local administration (a British Crown colony), the Company mobilised, managed and coordinated its own, and sometimes the Crown's, commercial, military, trade, civil, and personal resources to keep the Cape secure and sustain and maintain maritime-orientated security. As such, a uniquely configured governance arrangement was instituted to protect and promote the commercial and imperial interests of both Crown and Company. In short, the EEIC was significantly involved in, and influenced, the way the British Cape administration governed the Cape.

Decolonising the Colonial

At present, there is a lot of focus on decolonisation and recovering the histories of colonised people. However, these intellectual thrusts should also include research aimed at gaining deeper understandings of colonialism itself, especially with regards to identifying colonial

[4] GM Theal, Records of the Cape Colony (Government Printer, Cape Town, 1897) [Hereafter RCC], Volume I to V; British Library, digital microfilm [hereafter, BL], The English East India Company Indian Office Records [hereafter IOR], Cape Factory G/9/1 and G/9/6; Barnard,A. L. and Lenta,M., *Paradise, the Castle and the Vineyard :Lady Anne Barnard's Cape Diaries* (Johannesburg: Wits University Press, 2006), p.311.; Barnard,A. L., Lenta,M. and Le Cordeur,B. A., *The Cape Diaries of Lady Anne Barnard, 1799-1800* (Cape Town: Van Riebeeck Society, 1999).; Barnard,A. L. and Melville,H. D., *The Letters of Lady Anne Barnard to Henry Dundas, from the Cape and Elsewhere, 1793-1803, Together with Her Journal of a Tour into the Interior, and Certain Other Letters* (Cape Town: Balkema, 1973), p.303.

[5] Van Niekerk,J., "The First British Occupation of the Cape of Good Hope and Two Prize Cases on Joint Capture in the High Court of Admiralty". *Fundamina: A Journal of Legal History,* 2005: 11, (2005), pp.162-164.; Potgieter, T and Grundlingh, A, "Admiral Elphinstone and the Conquest and Defence of the Cape of Good Hope, 1795-96". *Scientia Militaria: South African Journal of Military Studies, Vol 35, Iss 2 (2011),* 35: 2, (2007), p.51.

assumptions and the construction of administrative categories. In this way, we can start to deconstruct and dismantle triumphalist imperial histories.

Most histories of the first British occupation have focused on the colonial administration as a single united entity. There is some discussion of the tension between the military and civil aspects of governance and about the role of British merchants in the reconstruction of the Cape's elite and stimulation of capitalism. However, as yet, not much has been written on how the EEIC, a key commercial player at the Cape and in the British Empire, more generally, shaped governance at the Cape.

At present, there is much talk about 'state capture' and 'white monopoly capitalism' in the South African press.[6] It is important to understand that linkages between the state and commercial organisations are not a new, post-apartheid phenomenon. This thesis seeks to contribute to the development of a deep history of the relationship between the state and commercial organisations.

Conceptualising Colonialism

Although dated, the large field of Colonial studies may provide some direction on how to theorise about the colonial state and related institutions, as well as the powerful men (and to a lesser extent women) who were on the forefront of colonial governance. Colonial studies look at the power relations and processes that created colonial 'polities' (states and institutions) and 'persons' (including categories and identities).[7] In their ground-breaking book *Tensions of Empire*, Ann Stoler and Frederick Cooper argue that European colonialism was not a singular process, but one of various interests and consequences.[8] They also note that any European imposition and institution of power was not omnipotent, all-knowing, or monolithic. Instead, colonialism needs to be understood as uneven processes of competing interests, uncertainties, ambivalences, and unintended consequences. They, therefore, warn against the conception of expanding and constituting European power as singular enterprises that are part of and produce a singular historical process directed toward the nation-state.[9]

---

[6] Davis, G., 'EFF: Ramaphosa Can't Be Friends with White Monopoly Capital'. Accessed 18 March 2018. http://ewn.co.za/2018/02/20/eff-ramaphosa-can-t-be-friends-with-white-monopoly-capital.; '[WATCH LIVE] Gigaba Appears before State Capture Inquiry'. Accessed 18 March 2018. http://ewn.co.za/2018/03/13/watch-live-gigaba-appears-before-state-capture-inquiry.

[7] Cooper,F. and Stoler,A. L., *Tensions of Empire* (Berkeley: University of California Press Berkeley, 1997), pp.1, 6, 9, 14, 21, 23, 27, 28, 30, 61, 157.; Cooper,F., "Decolonizing Situations: The Rise, Fall, and Rise of Colonial Studies, 1951-2001". *French Politics, Culture & Society,* 20: 2, (2002), pp.49, 54, 58, 67, 68.

[8] Cooper, F. and Stoler, A. (eds.). 1997. *Tensions of Empire*. Berkeley: University of California Press, pp.vii-56;

[9] Ibid, pp.6, 165.

Within this framework, they examine the contested construction of colonial categories and multiple strategies of inclusion and exclusion developed by the state and institutions.

Drawing on Stoler and Cooper, the colonialism at the Cape is viewed as consisting of not simply the state, but as a number of institutions that cooperate and compete. The EEIC is identified as an important constituent in shaping colonialism at the Cape. But, even though the EEIC may have collaborated with the colonial state, this framework acknowledges that the Company had its own, and sometimes competing, interests. The way I use Stoler and Cooper's approach is to focus less on the way in which colonial, settler and indigenous subjects contested and engaged with the colonial state. Instead, I unpack the various colonial agents' perspectives, assumptions and anxieties concerning order (and dissent), paying special attention to the ocean and maritime matters.

The most useful factor in using this conceptual framework is that it brings the imperial metropole and colony into one analytic framing in a transnational manner that goes beyond the confines of a nationally bounded shore. Thus, it was by using this contingent, contested, and particular notion of colonialism that this thesis seeks to improve our understanding of the EEIC's role in participating in the colonial administration and maintaining order in the Cape and broader British maritime zone of control.

In the literature it is recognised that the relationship between Company and Crown in the British imperial state differed from other configurations because the EEIC had its own significant political, commercial and judicial authority. This authority constituted an autonomy with the power to establish its own colonial administrations across Atlantic and Indian Oceans.[10] Company literature has examined these relationships in London, India, and St. Helena, but has not given much attention to the particular configuration at the Cape.[11] At the Cape, which was constituted as a British Crown colony, the EEIC did not exercise direct power and appeared to closely collaborate with the Crown supreme and colonial governments. This collaboration appeared to secure mutual trade and imperial interests at the

[10] Buchan,P. B., "The East India Company 1749-1800: The Evolution of a Territorial Strategy and the Changing Role of the Directors". *Business and Economic History,* 23: 1, (1994), p.52.; Farooqui,A., "Governance, Corporate Interest and Colonialism: The Case of the East India Company". *Social Scientist,* 35: 9/10, (2007), pp.44-51.; Galbraith,J. S., "The 'Turbulent Frontier' as a Factor in British Expansion". *Comparative Studies in Society and History,* 2: 2, (1960), pp.150, 151, 163.

[11] Stern, P. 2007. "Politics and Ideology in the Early East India Company-State: The Case of St Helena, 1673–1709". *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History*, 35(1), pp.1-23; Robins, N, *The Corporation that Changed the World*, p.4; Stern, P. 2009. "History and Historiography of the English East India Company: Past, Present, and Future!". *History Compass*, 7(4), pp.1146-1180.

Cape from threats imposed by mutual global enemies. The aim herein is to understand this particular configuration at the Cape.[12]

Subsequently, a key factor in understanding this configuration is that the Cape was a crucial aspect of security – protecting and promoting trade and colonial dominions in the Indian Ocean. To the EEIC and British Empire, this notion of security was characterised by maritime, commercial, political, and military orientated features that were framed by the protection of labour and material reproduction, and the control, access, and distribution of intelligence and maritime activity. This highlights the concept of 'reproduction' as a key part of this notion of security; a concept that draws on the work of Silvia Federici. Federici's work highlights the social sustenance and maintenance of the labour and material forces in a capitalist system, a transoceanic labour-based system pursued by the British Empire to expand and constitute its global authority and prosperity.[13]

The Cape is shown to be centrally positioned on this transoceanic shipping route as a refreshment and military station within a particular maritime zone, important to the realization of this notion of security. To the British, this particular maritime zone was displayed to be a transoceanic maritime space that covered the Brazilian Portuguese coast and Company St. Helena in the Atlantic Ocean, to the Indian Ocean Islands of Madagascar, French Mauritius and Reunion. As such, securing these waters involved taking and occupying the Cape as it was the best position to control maritime activity in this space. Additionally, occupying this position reduced the commercial and military risks against British transoceanic movement in it, and secured broader British imperial and commercial reproduction.

In this manner, I chose the concept 'maritime zone' over 'maritime frontier' as an analytical concept in the thesis. The 'frontier' is a concept that has been customarily used to frame and analyse the changing relationships between societies in the colonial encounter. Explaining the complex dynamisms that culminated in the constitution of European colonial power relations.[14] The result produced another 'frontier zone' in an adjacent geography in which

[12] Letter from Lieutenant-General Dundas to Lord Hobart, Lord Cape Town, 22 February 1803 in RCC, Vol V, p. 159; Letter from Lieutenant-General Dundas to John Pringle, 22 February 1803, BL: IOR G/9/1, pp. 185-186.
[13] Federici,S., *Revolution at Point Zero :Housework, Reproduction, and Feminist Struggle* (Oakland, CA: PM Press, 2012), pp.2, 5, 6, 7-8.
[14] Pratt,M. L., *Imperial Eyes :Travel Writing and Transculturation* (London; New York: Routledge, 2008), pp.7, 9.

these spatial processes occurred again, thus creating another 'frontier'. [15] We see here that there must be a change of societal relationships in this frontier space, and that an opportunity for this space to be repeated in another, adjacent, geographical zone, in which the Manichean duality of the colonial encounter against an 'other', must occur.[16] In this sense, the frontier concept is specific to the temporality of the landed colonial project to assimilate, enclose and subordinate 'other' non-white societies and peoples into its reality.[17]

Although, much like a landed 'frontier zone', there are overlapping geographical authorities in 'maritime zone'. But the human interactions in a 'maritime zone' are directed through central geographical contours (littorals, islands) orientated around a particular network of these places, whereby authorities attempt to control interactions moving into or through that particular space to be favourable to themselves. The maritime zone, however, is anchored by particular places that construct networks that make up the particular maritime zone, as opposed to moving and shifting from one adjacent geographical space to another. Here, the maritime zone is not limited to a space assimilating and subjugating 'othered' societies it encounters but is a more contested and dynamic space characterised by the networks within a particular maritime zone that are controlled by various powers.

Furthermore, in this 'maritime zone', I perceived the Cape to be characterised similar to Michael Pearson, Lakshmi Subramanian, Edward Alpers and John Keay's notion of 'littoral society' rather than a 'port city'.[18] Through my research in the archives, I came to interpret

---

[15] Legassick,M. and Legassick,M., *The Politics of a South African Frontier :The Griqua, the Sotho-Tswana and the Missionaries, 1780-1840* (Basel: Basler Afrika Bibliographien, 2010), pp.xvii, 2, 5-9, 319, 325.
[16] Pratt, *Imperial Eyes :Travel Writing and Transculturation*, pp.4, 6, 18.
[17] Penn,N., *The Forgotten Frontier :Colonist and Khoisan on the Cape's Northern Frontier in the 18th Century* (Cape Town: Double Storey Books, 2005), pp.1-3, 10.
[18] For literature on ports see Hornsby,S., 'Geographies of the British Atlantic World', in *Britain's Oceanic Empire: Atlantic and Indian Ocean Worlds, c. 1550-1850*, eds. Bowen,H. V., Mancke,E. and Reid,J. G. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), p.29.; Linebaugh,P. and Rediker,M., *The Many-Headed Hydra: Sailors, Slaves, Commoners, and the Hidden History of the Revolutionary Atlantic* (Boston: Beacon Press, 2000), p.149.; Hyslop,J., "A British Strike in an African Port: The Mercantile Marine and Dominion Politics in Durban, 1925". *The Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History,* 43: 5, (2015), pp.882-885, 897-898.; Hyslop,J., "Oceanic Mobility and Settler-Colonial Power: Policing the Global Maritime Labour Force in Durban Harbour c. 1890-1910.". *Journal of Transport History,* 36: 2, (2015), pp.249-252.; Ward,K. and Bentley,J., "'Tavern of the Seas?'The Cape of Good Hope as an Oceanic Crossroads during the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries". *Seascapes: Maritime Histories, Littoral Cultures, and Transoceanic Exchanges,* (2007), pp.144-148. and for literature on littorals see Alpers,E. A., *East Africa and the Indian Ocean* (Princeton, NJ: Markus Wiener Publishers, 2009), pp.107-168.; Keay,J., *The Honourable Company: A History of the East India Company* (London: Harper Collins, 1991), pp.106, 127.; Subramanian,L., *The Sovereign and the Pirate: Ordering Maritime Subjects in India's Western Littoral* (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2016), pp.1-3, 230-231, 236.; Pearson,M. N., *The Indian Ocean* (London: Routledge, 2003), p.91.; Hofmeyr, *The Complicating Sea: The Indian Ocean as Method*, p.589; Basu,H., *Journeys and Dwellings* (Hyderabad: Orient Longman, 2008), p.3.

the Cape as a maritime colony that was organised through an interdependent relationship between European colonial land, and sea activity and affairs, which were regulated and orientated through the two key Cape ports: Cape Town and Simon's Town. In this way, much like Subramanian, I came to conceive the Cape as a regulated littoral unit of analysis in order to unpack the maritime orientated links, movements and dynamics of politics, people, and commerce that happened there. This was to trace the agreements, anxiety, tensions and disputes that happened through, and in the course of British imperial desire and directive to regulate the access of imperial and colonial threats moving into, within and out of the Cape and its waters.[19]

Along the Grain

I examined volumes one to five of G. M. Theal's collection of *Records of the Cape Colony*, which contain documents of letters and other administrative records (marked as being an original or a copy). The letters were all official communication reports and updates to either: the colonial administration to British secretary of state Henry Dundas (and later Lord Hobart), of the British government war and colonial state department, and also within the colonial administration: civil and military, and general public announcements, proclamations or advertisements, to colonial and settler inhabitants.

I also examined digitised microfilms of the English East India Company, the Cape Factory, in the Indian Office Records, British Library.[20] Of the twenty-five volumes available, only volumes one and six contained documents relating to the first British occupation. Documents were mainly official correspondence letters, lists of officially sent communications (packets), invoices, commodity and ships accounts from agent John Pringle to the EEIC Secret Committee, EEIC Court of Directors and EEIC Secretary William Ramsay.

In addition, I closely examined *The Cape Diaries of Lady Anne Barnard 1799-1800*[21], *Paradise, the Castle and the vineyard: Lady Anne Barnard's Cape diaries*[22], and *The letters of Lady Anne Barnard to Henry Dundas, from the Cape and elsewhere, 1793-1803, together with her Journal of a tour into the interior, and certain other letters*.[23] The reason for

[19] Subramanian, *The Sovereign and the Pirate: Ordering Maritime Subjects in India's Western Littoral*, pp.26-28, 238-240.

[20] A special thanks to the Director of Research, Ms. Roberts, who made funding available for the purchase of these copies.

[21] Barnard, Lenta and Le Cordeur, *The Cape Diaries of Lady Anne Barnard, 1799-1800*.

[22] Barnard and Lenta, *Paradise, the Castle and the Vineyard :Lady Anne Barnard's Cape Diaries*, p.311.

[23] Barnard and Melville, *The Letters of Lady Anne Barnard to Henry Dundas, from the Cape and Elsewhere, 1793-1803, Together with Her Journal of a Tour into the Interior, and Certain Other Letters*, p.303

including this archival collection is that Lady Ann Barnard's diaries and published letters provide an important contrast to the colonial and Company records; in that, this collection is authored by a woman. In this work, Barnard provides useful social commentary, giving insight into the social life and relations of the colonial elite and broader political activities in Cape society.

I examined these archival records by drawing on Stoler once again, but this time on her notion of 'reading the archival records along the grain'.[24] To read along the grain is to feel and understand the complex and ambivalent affections and relationships, at particular moments, that are articulated in documents that have been accumulated to constitute a particular archive. To read along the grain is to trace the affective forces of the archive, and follow those grains to map and give shape to the topical knowledge that the archive was intended to house.[25] Here, the documentation of particular moments, such as events or incidents, disrupt and contest the epistemological framing of people, their relationships, and things that were specifically defined to be administratively captured and documented.[26] By reading along the grain, researchers are able to follow the paths of epistemological anxiety to locate the direction and focus of sentiment and affective attachment, highlighting the accumulation or the absence of particular knowledge. By understanding the organisation of the affections and sentiments documented by European administrative agents in the archive, researchers are able to understand and trace the threads of power and relations that organised colonial worlds into the ascribed imperial order.[27]

This method allowed me to address the various tensions in the narratives and dispositions of the documents examined. It also allowed me to investigate colonial administration perspectives and engage the geopolitical power relations and activities that informed these perspectives, from the vantage point of the colonial agents. This allowed me to consider the manner in which the colonial state was organised and how it produced the knowledge that informed relationships and networks in relation to the governance of the Cape colony. By reading these records along the grain, I was able to trace the attentions, affectivities and anxieties of these agents to ascertain the importance and weight they gave to topical subjects.

[24] Stoler,A. L., *Along the Archival Grain: Epistemic Anxieties and Colonial Common Sense* (Vancouver: Princeton University Press, 2010), pp.8, 49, 50, 53, 108.
[25] Ibid, pp.1, 22-23, 33, 43, 51.
[26] Ibid, pp.51, 111-112, 144.
[27] Ibid, pp.3, 9, 20, 23, 25-26, 64, 131, 233, 237.

Stoler describes the corporeal archive as if it was a factory. She explains that the production of accumulated documents shows the progressing and changing attentions, designations and framings of peoples and events. In these archives, documents are shown to materially gather and gravitate around social categories, which Stoler describes as ethnographic sites.[28] This allows researchers to trace the magnitude and significance given to people and events in time and place, and position that significance within the particular imperial order that was constituted at a particular time and place. In addition, researches are able to link and connect material documents, and their scope and weighting force, across a multitude of productions lines within the archive. This is in order to trace the threads of affection and sentiment that informed the psychic constitution of power and relations of the colonial world, and its imperial ordering.[29]

I relied a great deal on records that are transcribed and published (in the case of colonial records and Barnard's diaries and letters), and whilst the Company records were original, they were, however, digitised microfilms. Thus, it was not always possible to explore the materiality of the archive fully or examine the handwriting, scribbles or other markings in the margins, or on the back or corners of documents. Yet, the strength of published and digital records is that it enables access. On a practical level, such digital collections allow postgraduate scholars to undertake projects, such as this one. In addition, such digitised and printed archival documents enable transnational work, which relies on documents in different languages and located in different parts of the world.

Stoler confirms that having direct access to the source material is not the dominating factor that determines the benefits of reading along the grain.[30] She contends that "access" rests on knowledge of the history of colonial [situation], on changing perceptions of danger as much as the structures of command".[31] Indeed, I found that the feeling of the original records resonated immaterially through their published and digital counterparts. I was unable to look at the epistemological practice that went into the original records, but I was able to follow the processes of affectivities and ambivalences that were produced through that psychic space projected from the corporeal material records. This was because the "watermarks" (affectivities) in the archival grain were etched and impressed in immaterial form through

[28] Ibid, pp.35, 39.
[29] Ibid, pp.25, 49, 171, 248. 255, 278.
[30] Ibid, p. 9.
[31] Ibid.

published and digital mediums, allowing a para-textual spatial application of Stoler's method in the absence of original archival material.[32]

This shift in material to immaterial conception of the records, allowed me to engage in the psychic space into which colonial agents projected themselves. Through this shift, I could trace Stoler's archival "pulses" (feelings) that had produced the colonial order of understanding, as the social imaginaries of colonial agents could be traced through the psychic processes that unfolded in their writings.[33] Although this is different to the material archival process that Stoler describes, by engaging with the psychic space and processes of the published and digital documents, I could feel the "pulses" around subjects and topics that developed colonial agents' understanding of the corporeal worlds in which they operated. To read along the archival grain in a psychic space and follow it processes, I paid attention to the content of the documents as well as the manner in which they were written.

Stoler explains that reading along the grain is also a method of contrast.[34] This includes contrasting official circuits of communication from the colonial administration, to its directed imperial government department with archival material outside the colonial administrative space.[35] This accounts for "unanticipated" sources and, for Stoler, allows the researcher to navigate the prescribed and unprescribed sensibilities and attachments that constructed and developed the particular colonial world within its constituted imperial order.[36] Contrasting official and unofficial sources assists in tracing and identifying the particular, and overlapping, boundaries that confine changing and unchanging sensibilities etched into the "grain" that is being analysed.[37]

For example, in the Cape colony records, an ever-present subject in many of the correspondences from the colonial agents was a common attention to, and anxiety about, the 'security' of the Cape. In terms of EEIC records, much of Pringle's attention and concern was directed toward the safety of Company ships, and time delays that Company ships encountered while laying over at the Cape. In her diaries and letters, Barnard was concerned with the social dynamics of the Cape settlement, the office politics that played out in the Cape government, and the security of her husband's social status and respectability. The

[32] Ibid, pp.25, 49, 141, 245, 248, 253, 255, 278.
[33] Ibid, pp.19-20, 138, 231.
[34] Ibid, pp.8, 32, 230, 265-266.
[35] Ibid, pp.9, 13, 88, 107, 266.
[36] Ibid, pp.57, 100, 101-102, 160.
[37] Ibid, pp.11, 189-190.

anxieties and attentions of the various authors of these collections highlight power and authority in the colonial organisation and relationships in the British colony at the Cape during their first occupation.

Comparative investigation also revealed that the documents in the *Records of the Cape Colony* and the EEIC records are primarily authored by men, and that these archival collections are distinctly gendered in their collected memory. They were masculine and patriarchal in character, privileging and promoting the British colonial man's experience. The reading of Lady Anne Barnard's diary entries and letters highlighted the exclusion of women's voices, experiences, and memory from this formal knowledge repository.[38] Lady Anne Barnard's *Diaries* and *Letters* rupture this singular masculine narrative by including the British colonial women's position, agency and experience into the narrative. This contests the absence and silence of colonial women in Cape colonial archival memory construction, constitution, and imagination. Though, Barnard's diaries do not include or represent the perspectives of colonial subjects and poorer women. In this sense, the archive can be seen as an upper class and imperial account of the first occupation.

Stoler, through her own study on the Dutch East Indies in the nineteenth- and twentieth-centuries, argues that the organisation of colonial knowledge was situated and directed within the broader geopolitical space of imperial governance and order.[39] Additionally, the archives can also shed light on the nature, or location, of these spaces of governance and the connections of Empire. Unlike the records of the EEIC, that have a strong maritime orientation, the documents in the *Records of the Cape Colony* and Barnard's D*iaries* and *Letters* tend towards a more landed orientation. But, when reading these records together, each collection includes important insights into the others' dimension and worldview, illustrating important connections. For example, documents in the *Records of the Cape Colony* detail the Crown's military and civil personnel at the Cape and elsewhere in the Empire, while the EEIC records show that Company fleets transported many of these people across the Indian Ocean, and that inadequate harbour resources delayed the departure of many of these ships that laid over at the Cape. Barnard's diaries go on to show that she entertained and socialised with many of these people (Crown and Company). This

[38] Barnard and Lenta, *Paradise, the Castle and the Vineyard :Lady Anne Barnard's Cape Diaries*, p.311; Barnard, Lenta and Le Cordeur, *The Cape Diaries of Lady Anne Barnard, 1799-1800*; Barnard and Melville, *The Letters of Lady Anne Barnard to Henry Dundas, from the Cape and Elsewhere, 1793-1803, Together with Her Journal of a Tour into the Interior, and Certain Other Letters*, p.303.
[39] Stoler, *Along the Archival Grain: Epistemic Anxieties and Colonial Common Sense*, pp.88, 185, 253.

demonstrates not only the connections between Crown and Company, but also that the Cape was an active node in that the British maritime network connected with people travelling, disseminating news and distributing civil, trade and military resources.

Finally, it was also interesting to examine the temporal writing styles in the archival collections that were looked at. The commentary from the colonial, Company and diary records all reported on activity that had happened, was in the process of unfolding, and often proposed or commented on possible future actions. Past, present and possible (anticipated) futures intersected. The temporality assigned to topics discussed in texts produced visible "pulses" and "watermarks" that allowed for a deeper understanding of the authors' psychic dispositions, anxieties and social imaginaries at particular historical junctures, and how these changed over the chronological course of the records investigated.

These techniques have allowed me to investigate and engage with different colonial agents' perspectives, especially their anxieties and priorities, and gain a better understanding of the definitions and configurations of the political mobilisations that the colonial agents found themselves in at the Cape. They also allowed for the detection of the various interests and contestations that informed the colonial governance and strategies. In consequence, by using Stoler's notion of "reading along the grain", I was able to address the tensions in the narratives and dispositions contained within the examined historical documents and archives, and analyse the archival forms of imperial governance and political information through the moods, feelings and attitudes of the records' space, to identify the social knowledge productions that directed the perception and practice of colonial agents at the time.[40] This means that I investigated the way the colonial state organised and produced its knowledge in order to better understand the colonialism at the Cape.

Chapter Outline

Following this introduction, the thesis is organised into four additional chapters and a conclusion. Chapter 2 reviews and draws on secondary literature: Ocean, Corporations in Southern Africa, and EEIC, in order to situate my study. Literature concerning the taking of the Cape and the Cape, itself, are elaborated on in Chapter 4 and 5. In the wider context of Atlantic and Indian Ocean historical literature section, the Cape will be shown to have been acknowledged, but not recognised as a significant part of either Atlantic or Indian Ocean history. Following this, the examination turns to the context of the EEIC, which was a

[40] Ibid, p.20.

company that existed in these two historical Ocean worlds. In this literature on the Company, the Cape is highlighted to be important at the turn of the nineteenth-century, however, the EEIC's presence at the Cape has been superficially explored at the turn of the nineteenth-century. This is similarly noticeable in both Cape literature and literature on Corporations in Southern Africa at the time of the first British occupation. The reviewed literature on the Oceans and the EEIC has predominantly concentrated on its northern hemispheric experiences. While studies concerning the EEIC at the Cape during the first occupation remain at the surface of its presence and involvement. My thesis draws on these works, but through the EEIC seeks to add insight into the temporal gaps of the literature.

Chapter 3 investigates the presence of EEIC at the Cape during the first British occupation in the longer history of the Company. By tracing the history of the Company across two Oceans, from its inception in 1600 to its formal merger into the British state in 1858, I provide a deep historical understanding of the Company. This includes: its development, and commercial and political formation, purpose, structure and organisation; and the Company's dynamic relationships with various European rivals, European and Asian imperial polities, non-state maritime political threats, domestic British trade and internal Company servant rivalry and competition, and the British Crown government. Consequently, this chapter locates and contextualises the EEIC's significant presence at the Cape.

In Chapter 4, I show that to European organisations the Cape, as a way-station on shipping and transport routes, was significant because it reduced the risk of losing essential transoceanic travelling labour and material forces that were needed to promote and protect their imperial and trade interests. As such, this ensured that the EEIC had a long interest in the security of the Cape, and during the 1770s and 1780s global hostilities and uncertainties were shown to endanger that transoceanic security. This increased threat and uncertainty kept Company attention directed towards the Cape, and eventually motivated the Company to initiate joint diplomatic and military plans of action with the Crown to take and keep the Cape secure. Through this, and EEIC Cape agent John Pringle, I highlight interrelated themes: the notion of security and its features; the significant role that the Cape played in securing broader British imperial (Company and Crown) resources; and the early construction of a transoceanic British maritime zone.

In Chapter 5, I aim to demonstrate that the British Cape administration was a uniquely configured imperial and colonial convention, constituted to keep the Cape secure. I argue that

in that particular constituted convention, the EEIC's role was primarily as an object to, and subject of, the occupation's goal to secure the Cape. To achieve this, I look at the 1796 Order-in-Council, EEIC ships and their suggested impact on Cape governance through Lady Anne Barnard's accounts, the dismissal of Governor George Yonge, and the British evacuation of the Cape. I highlight and unpack the way in which the security notion features of maritime-orientated political, trade, reproduction, intelligence, and regulatory activities were realised and constituted to keep the British Cape secure. Whilst similarly looking at the interrelated British administrative efforts to constitute their constructed Cape transoceanic imperial and colonial maritime zone. I aim to argue that occupying and keeping the Cape secure was intended to keep the British seaborne Empire secure from their global enemies. Agent Pringle will be illustrated to be actively collaborating with the colonial government to administrate the colony. In this, the EEIC, through Pringle, was significantly involved in actions to support and reproduce the British maritime-orientated security of the Cape, and consequently displays the EEIC to have had great influence on the way that the British colonial administration governed the Cape colony to secure mutual imperial and trade interests.

Chapter 2

Literature Review

Introduction

This Chapter is a review of the literature that has informed my study of the EEIC at the Cape during the first British occupation; and stresses the maritime components of this history. The reviewed literature relates to: oceans, corporations in Southern Africa, and the EEIC. I highlight the gaps in this literature that I aim to contribute to. Subsequently, the EEIC was a transoceanic organisation that operated across the Atlantic and Indian Oceans. In the ocean literature of the Atlantic and Indian Oceans, there appears to be an interpreted separation of their histories. Both of these ocean literatures give a great deal of attention to their northern hemispheric histories, and as a consequence, much of their southern regions' histories require more attention. This means that the Cape remains largely neglected and peripheral to oceanic studies.

However, there are scholars who challenge this oceanic separation by drawing attention to the connection between these oceans, noticeably through those created by European imperial networks. A few of these scholars have attended to the Atlantic and Indian Southern Ocean periphery to reveal the Cape as an important historical imperial maritime node in the transoceanic network. Even so, there is a recognisable temporal gap in that these studies focus mainly on the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. In doing so, there is a neglect of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries (the period under review). Thus, an analysis of the first British occupation, part of the Cape's 'transition period', still needs to be located within a connected oceanic world.

There is an extensive body of literature that concerns the EEIC. Prominent themes and subjects of analysis in this literature include trade, imperial and business topics. These topics relate to the Company's organisation, expansion and ascendance within British, Mughal and Chinese imperial and commercial politics. Much of this scholarly examination is focused in the continental Indian Ocean and London, with considerable devotion paid to the Company's northern hemispheric historical activities and accounts. Yet, such focused dealings neglect much of the Company's Southern Ocean historical activity, particularly EEIC presence at the Cape, and does not detail the history of the EEIC at the Cape during the first occupation, nor its relationship to the Crown government during that time.

This study focuses on a corporation at the Cape. As such it is vital to recognise that there has been literature on corporations and colonialism in Southern Africa. However, the focus on those companies has been on their legal power. By examining this relationship between Company and Crown during the first occupation, this study seeks to provide further understanding into the ways in which corporations participated in European colonialism in Africa.

Atlantic and Indian Ocean Literature

Over a 257-year period, the Company established a vast maritime network of trading and colonial settlements between the Atlantic and Indian Oceans. [1] It was the constitution of this transoceanic operating network that gave the Company footing to expand, promote and protect its commercial, political and military activity in the 'East Indies'. [2] This continued EEIC commercial, political and military activity propelled its ascension to a landed political and military authority in Mughal Asia. This lay the foundation for British imperial rule in the Indian Ocean and the later created British India.[3] It is important to note that the Company's trading and operating network was perceptively transnational. But as it was a maritime organisation, its transnational character was distinctly transoceanic. This means the EEIC's historical activity extended into and across both the Atlantic and Indian Oceans.

However, in the literature of these oceans, many of the scholars project a perceived separation of their histories. In addition, they focus on the northern hemisphere of the oceans, subsuming the history on networks, movements and connections in these oceans. Atlantic narratives have included themes and analyses that mainly look at: Atlantic waged and slaved labour networks and mobility, where the invisibility and banality of these labourers lives have been contested[4]; and transnational and transoceanic organised subaltern mobilisations and resistances through piracy, mutiny, strikes, revolts on ships and in port cities against exploitative and oppressive labour regimes.[5] In addition, other themes include: the

[1] East of the Cape and west of the Straits of Magellan.
[2] Robins, N. *The Corporation that Changed the World*, pp.5-14.
[3] Ibid.
[4] Gilroy,P., *The Black Atlantic :Modernity and Double Consciousness* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press ;London, 1993), pp.3, 17, 65.; Rediker,M., *Between the Devil and the Deep Blue Sea: Merchant Seamen, Pirates, and the Anglo-American Maritime World, 1700-1750* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), pp.1-18.
[5] Anderson,C. et al., *Mutiny and Maritime Radicalism in the Age of Revolution*Cambridge University Press, 2013), pp.4, 7-11, 61-67.; Featherstone,D., *Resistance, Space and Political Identities: The Making of Counter-Global Networks* (West Sussex: John Wiley & Sons, 2008), pp.3, 22.; Linebaugh and Rediker, *The Many-Headed Hydra: Sailors, Slaves, Commoners, and the Hidden History of the Revolutionary Atlantic*, pp.4, 16, 35, 147, 271.

ideological, cultural, commercial and political exchange, and expansion and institution of European colonial and imperial interaction and influence in the Americas and Africa[6]; along with the myths of the British naval and European imperial superiority.[7] An overarching theme in these narratives has been European capitalism; most notably concerning its establishment, development, and contribution to modernity, and resistances against it.[8]

Indian Ocean narratives, on the other hand, have included themes and analysis that have chiefly looked at the emergence and ascendance of European imperial and commercial power and authority.[9] In relation to this, European, African and Asian pirate, privateer and corsair resistance and depredations, as consequence to this presence and expansion, have also been explored.[10] While indigenous forced and migrant labour,[11] identity and organisation of trade, food and labour networks and communities,[12] that include islands and littorals, remain crucial subjects of analysis.[13] It is within this context that Indian Ocean studies have located the Indian Ocean centrally in the broader modern, maritime and oceanic, historic narrative.[14] A prominent theme in many of these narratives has been examinations on the development and

---

[6] Armitage,D., *The Ideological Origins of the British Empire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), pp.Preface, 2, 97, 152, 155, 157.; Bowen,H. V., Mancke,E. and Reid,J. G., 'Introduction: Britain's Oceanic Empire', in *Britain's Oceanic Empire: Atlantic and Indian Ocean Worlds, c. 1550-1850*, eds. Bowen,H. V., Mancke,E. and Reid,J. G. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), pp.3, 4, 9.; Thornton,J. K., *A Cultural History of the Atlantic World, 1250-1820* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), pp.5-90.; Vickers,D., "Beyond Jack Tar". *William and Mary Quarterly,* 50: 2, (1993), pp.418-424.

[7] Rodger,N. A., *The Command of the Ocean: A Naval History of Britain, 1649-1815* (London: Penguin Books, 2005), pp.1-51.; Thornton, *A Cultural History of the Atlantic World, 1250-1820*, pp.1-28.

[8] Anderson et al., *Mutiny and Maritime Radicalism in the Age of Revolution*, pp.3-6, 61-67; Featherstone, *Resistance, Space and Political Identities: The Making of Counter-Global Networks*, pp.3-5, 22; Linebaugh and Rediker, *The Many-Headed Hydra: Sailors, Slaves, Commoners, and the Hidden History of the Revolutionary Atlantic*, pp.1-5, 10-16, 271; Bayly,C. A., *The Birth of the Modern World, 1780-1914 :Global Connections and Comparisons* (Malden, MA: Blackwell Pub., 2004), pp.86-88, 106-120, 468-469.

[9] Pearson, *The Indian Ocean*, pp.1-12, 120.

[10] Alpers, *East Africa and the Indian Ocean*, pp.3, 22, 140, 143, 151; Rogoziński,J., *Honor among Thieves: Captain Kidd, Henry Every, and the Pirate Democracy in the Indian Ocean* (Mechanicsburg: Stackpole Books, 2000), pp.xvii, 206, 230.; Subramanian, *The Sovereign and the Pirate: Ordering Maritime Subjects in India's Western Littoral*, pp.1-3, 230-231, 236

[11] Ewald,J. J., "Crossers of the Sea: Slaves, Freedmen, and Other Migrants in the Northwestern Indian Ocean, c. 1750-1914". *American Historical Review,* 105: 1, (2000), pp.75, 76.; Alpers, *East Africa and the Indian Ocean*, pp.3, 131.

[12] Alpers, *East Africa and the Indian Ocean*, pp.xii, 3, 7, 9, 16; Subramanian,L., 'Commerce, Circulation, and Consumption: Indian Ocean Communities in Historical Perspective', in *Indian Ocean Studies: Cultural, Social, and Political Perspectives*, eds. Moorthy,S. and Ashraf,J. (London: Routledge, 2010), pp.136, 137.

[13] Alpers, *East Africa and the Indian Ocean*, p.81; Hofmeyr, *The Complicating Sea: The Indian Ocean as Method*, pp.585-587; Pearson, *The Indian Ocean*, pp.15, 38; Subramanian, *Commerce, Circulation, and Consumption: Indian Ocean Communities in Historical Perspective*, p.137; Subramanian, *The Sovereign and the Pirate: Ordering Maritime Subjects in India's Western Littoral*, pp.26-28, 238-239, 240.

[14] Vink,M. P., "Indian Ocean Studies and the 'new Thalassology'". *Journal of Global History,* 2: 1, (2007), pp.41, 43, 61.

connections of Britain's oceanic and continental Empire, which include the institution of British colonial and imperial maritime labour networks to promote and protect British political and commercial ascendance.[15]

Furthermore, in terms of the Atlantic, the focus centres on the north Atlantic. Similarly, Indian Ocean histories concentrate on the Indian sub-continent and the trade networks of the western Indian Ocean. The consequence of such attention has meant that many Atlantic and Indian Southern Ocean histories have been neglected and peripheral to these oceanic studies.[16] As a result, the Cape, being located at the intersection of these oceans and at the southern periphery, tends to be neglected. Authors such as Jan Rogozinski, Michael Pearson, Edward Alpers, Jane Ewald and Greg Dening, who investigate Indian Ocean history, and John Thornton, a historian of the Atlantic, have acknowledged that the Cape served as an important portal and way-station between oceans.[17] Yet, their dealings with the Cape remains limited.

However, there is a growing school of scholars who contest the separation of the Atlantic and Indian Oceans, and draw attention to the connections between these oceans, especially those created by networks of Empire. Some have also turned their attention to the southern

---

[15] Stern,P. J., "British Asia and British Atlantic: Comparisons and Connections". *William and Mary Quarterly,* 63: 4, (2006), pp.693, 694, 696.; Stern,P. J., 'Company, State, and Empire: Governance and Regulatory Frameworks in Asia', in *Britain's Oceanic Empire: Atlantic and Indian Ocean Worlds, c. 1550-1850*, eds. Bowen,H. V., Mancke,E. and Reid,J. G. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), pp.130-135.; Travers,R., 'Constitutions, Contact Zones, and Imperial Ricochets: Sovereignty and Law in British Asia', in *Britain's Oceanic Empire: Atlantic and Indian Ocean Worlds, c. 1550-1850*, eds. Bowen,H. V., Mancke,E. and Reid,J. G. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), pp.98-105.; Anderson,C., *Subaltern Lives: Biographies of Colonialism in the Indian Ocean World, 1790-1920* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), pp.Preface, 4, 8, 10, 88, 170.; Bowen,H. V., Mancke,E. and Reid,J. G., 'Britain's Oceanic Empire: An Afterword', in *Britain's Oceanic Empire: Atlantic and Indian Ocean Worlds, c. 1550-1850*, eds. Bowen,H. V., Mancke,E. and Reid,J. G. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), pp.433-450.; Bowen,H. V., 'Britain in the Indian Ocean Region and Beyond: Contours, Connections, and the Creation of a Global Maritime Empire', in *Britain's Oceanic Empire: Atlantic and Indian Ocean Worlds, c. 1550-1850*, eds. Bowen,H. V., Mancke,E. and Reid,J. G. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), pp.45-50.

[16] For Atlantic Ocean see Rediker, M. 1989. *Between the Devil and the Deep Blue Sea: merchant seamen, pirates and the Anglo-American maritime world, 1700-1750.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp.5-18; Thornton, J. 2012. *A Cultural History of the Atlantic world, 1250-1820*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp.5-90; Rodger, N. 2005. *The Command of the Ocean: a naval history of Britain, 1649-1815.* London: Penguin Books, pp.1-51 and for Indian Ocean see Wigen, K. 2006. "Oceans of History". *American Historical Review*, 111(3), pp.717-21; Kresse, K, Simpson, E and Zentrum. (eds.). 2011. "Between Africa and India: thinking comparatively across the western Indian Ocean". *Ssoar,* (ZMO Working Papers 5), pp.1-3;

[17] Alpers, E. 2009. *East Africa and the Indian Ocean*. Markus Wiener Publishers, pp.vii-23; Rogoziński, J. 2000*. Honor Among Thieves: Captain Kidd, Henry Every, and the pirate democracy in the Indian Ocean*. Mechanicsburg: Stackpole Books, pp.vii-xxii; Pearson, M. 2003. *The Indian Ocean*. London: Routledge, pp.1-12; Ewald, *Crossers of the Sea: slaves, freedmen, and other migrants in the Northwestern Indian Ocean*, pp.69-91; Dening, G. 1994*. Mr Bligh's Bad Language: passion, power and theatre on the Bounty*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp.3-44; Thornton, J, *A Cultural History of the Atlantic World*, pp.5-27.

periphery and shed some light on the Cape as a significant node in Empire.[18] Kerry Ward looks at the Cape as an important location in the Dutch East India Company's circulation of convicts.[19] John McAleer examined representations of Southern Africa in the imperial British public imagination, British Indian Ocean troop movements from the Cape, and British maritime connections in the South Atlantic, of which the Cape was part.[20] Clare Anderson shows how the Cape and Robben Island continued to be of significance in the transportation of convicts under the British Empire.[21] While Clare Anderson *et al* (Clare Anderson, Niklas Frykman, Lex Heerma van Voss, Marcus Rediker, Karwan Fatch-Black, Nicole Ulrich, Mattias van Rossum, Christopher Magra, Aaron Jaffer, Hamish Maxwell-Stewart, Ian Duffield and Anita Rupprecht) demonstrate that the transoceanic exchange and meeting of maritime radicalisms (idea and action) happened in a global context.[22] On the other hand, Isabel Hofmeyr considers the ways the nation state is contested and complicated by political maritime communities that exist beyond the nation.[23] Jon Hyslop has also started to explore the politics of maritime labour, but tends to focus on Durban and South Africa more generally.[24] Yet, there is a notable temporal gap at the turn of the nineteenth-century in this particular literature that is not critically examined by these authors at the Cape. My work will draw on these studies, but also contribute by addressing this gap.

EEIC Literature

Subsequently, there is a substantial body of literature on, and related to, the EEIC, and it is perceptible that the EEIC's presence in most Atlantic literature is not as visible or critically examined as it has been in Indian Ocean based literature.[25] In Company literature, themes and

---

[18] Ulrich, N. 2011. 'Counter Power and Colonial Rule in the Eighteenth-Century Cape of Good Hope: Belongings and Protest of the Labouring Poor'. Doctoral Thesis: University of Witwatersrand, pp.19;

[19] Ward, K. 2009. *Networks of Empire: forced migration in the Dutch East India Company*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp.10-26.

[20] McAleer,J., *Representing Africa: Landscape, Exploration and Empire in Southern Africa, 1780–1870*Manchester University Press, 2010), pp.2, 6, 8.; McAleer,J., "'The Key to India': Troop Movements, Southern Africa, and Britain's Indian Ocean World, 1795–1820". *The International History Review,* 35: 2, (2013), pp.294-296.; McAleer,J., "Looking East: St Helena, the South Atlantic and Britain's Indian Ocean World". *Atlantic Studies,* 13: 1, (2016), pp.78-80, 91.

[21] Anderson, C. 2012*. Subaltern Lives: biographies of colonialism in the Indian Ocean world, 1790–1920*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[22] Anderson et al., *Mutiny and Maritime Radicalism in the Age of Revolution*, pp.1-2.

[23] Hofmeyr, *The Complicating Sea: the Indian Ocean as method*, pp.584-590.

[24] Hyslop, J. 2015. "Oceanic Mobility and Settler-colonial Power: policing the global maritime labour force in Durban harbour c. 1890–1910". *The Journal of Transport History*, *36*(2), pp.248-267.

[25] Farooqui, *Governance, Corporate Interest and Colonialism: the Case of the East India Company*, pp.44-51; Chaudhuri, K. 2006. *The Trading World of Asia and the English East India Company: 1660-1760*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp.1-18; Bowen, H.V., 2005. *The Business of Empire: The East India Company and imperial Britain, 1756–1833*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp.1-27; Hejeebu, S. (2005). "Contract

subjects of analysis include the multifaceted political, corporate and economic features in its particular governance over, and colonialism in, territories and people it instituted its authority over.[26] Additionally, topics covered the Company's role in establishing the British Empire and shaping English society[27]; development of its imperial politics and ideology[28]; the extent and instrumental use of jurisdictional power it exerted over English subjects and Mughal Indian waters to constitute its position and authority[29]; increasing military presence through the expansion of its navies and armies in British India[30]; the economic and commercial activity and affairs of the Company in South Asia [31]; and its transnational connections and influences through the British imperial space.[32] Along with, the impact of its legacy in contributing to the creation of the modern world,[33] and development of its accounting and commercial practices, and the increased professional proficiency its servants operating in those roles.[34] However, much like the ocean literature, a lot of attention is given to the

Enforcement in the English East India Company". *Journal of Economic History*, 65(2), pp.496-520; Philips, C. 1940. "The Secret Committee of the East India Company". *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, 10(02), pp.299-315.

[26] Buchan, *The East India Company 1749-1800: The Evolution of a Territorial Strategy and the Changing Role of the Directors*, 52; Farooqui, *Governance, Corporate Interest and Colonialism: The Case of the East India Company*, 44-51; Galbraith, *The 'Turbulent Frontier' as a Factor in British Expansion*, pp.150, 151, 163.

[27] Bowen,H., "400 Years of the East India Company". *History Today,* 50: 7, (2000), 1.; Marshall,P. J., "British Society in India Under the East India Company". *Modern Asian Studies,* 31: 1, (1997), pp.90, 91.

[28] Stern,P. J., "Politics and Ideology in the Early East India Company-State: The Case of St Helena, 1673–1709". *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History,* 35: 1, (2007), pp.1-15.

[29] Bowen,H. V., Mancke,E. and Reid,J. G., *Britain's Oceanic Empire: Atlantic and Indian Ocean Worlds, c. 1550-1850*, eds. Bowen,H. V., Mancke,E. and Reid,J. G. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), pp.6, 130, 131, 344.; Ogborn,M., "Writing Travels: Power, Knowledge and Ritual on the English East India Company's Early Voyages". *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers,* 27: 2, (2002), pp.161, 166.; Philips, *The Secret Committee of the East India Company*, pp.299-315.; Subramanian, *The Sovereign and the Pirate: Ordering Maritime Subjects in India's Western Littoral*, pp.1-4, 26-28; Sutherland,L. S., "The East India Company in Eighteenth-Century Politics". *Economic History Review,* 17: 1, (1947), pp.16-18, 23-24.; Hejeebu, *Contract Enforcement in the English East India Company*, p.520.

[30] Reid,S., *Armies of the East India Company, 1750-1850* (Oxford: Osprey Publishing, 2009), p.6.

[31] Bowen,H. V., ""so Alarming an Evil:" Smuggling, Pilfering and the English East India Company, 1750-1810.". *International Journal of Maritime History,* 14: 1, (2002), p.6.; Chaudhuri, *The Trading World*, pp.2, 15-18.; Hejeebu, *Contract Enforcement in the English East India Company*, pp.496-497, 514, 520.

[32] Bowen, Mancke and Reid, *Introduction: Britain's Oceanic Empire*, p.1-13; Bowen, Mancke and Reid, *Britain's Oceanic Empire: Atlantic and Indian Ocean Worlds, c. 1550-1850*, 45; Bowen, Mancke and Reid, *Britain's Oceanic Empire: An Afterword*, pp.433-439; Stern, *British Asia and British Atlantic: Comparisons and Connections*, pp.693-694, 711-712.

[33] Robins,N., *The Corporation that Changed the World*, pp.xii, ix, x, 4-6, 10, 14, 18.; Keay, *The Honourable Company: A History of the East India Company*, 106; Bowen,H. V., *The Business of Empire: The East India Company and Imperial Britain, 1756–1833* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), pp.ix-x, 189, 297-298.

[34] Baladouni,V., "The Accounting Records of the East India Company". *Accounting Historians Journal,* 8: 1, (1981), p.67.; Samkin,G., "Trader Sailor Spy: The Case of John Pringle and the Transfer of Accounting Technology to the Cape of Good Hope". *Accounting History,* 15: 4, (2010), p.2.

Company's northern hemispheric activities and accounts, and comparatively little attention is given to the Cape during the period of the first occupation.

Many of these historical narratives on the EEIC note that the British occupation of the Cape marked a significant moment in the cooperation between Company and Crown; with regards to the protection of imperial and trade interests, especially in relation to India.[35] This can be seen in the work of a few scholars. Mary Condon looks at the British Crown Transport Board during wartime in this period, and explains that one common method of Crown transoceanic military transport was to negotiate the hire of EEIC trading vessels Company ships to carry troops and supplies in the Atlantic to the Cape and in the Indian Ocean.[36] John Day focused on the infrastructure and management of Britain's overseas naval bases, and reveals that Company transport and military resources were importantly used to support British naval needs.[37] Jill Geber's work provides an index to EEIC's archival records and documents that concern the Company's interest in Southern Africa, and she gives an overview of the Company's presence, agency and agent's duties at the Cape; particularly in the broader context of Southern Africa.[38] While, Marcus Arkin is the most notable scholar to specifically look at the EEIC at the Cape. Arkin sought to piece together an economic history of the EEIC Cape agency in two separate works that spanned from 1794 to 1815, and 1815 to 1836.[39] Though, much like the work of Condon, Day and Geber, it can be seen that Arkin gave no critical attention to the Company's role in administration in the first British occupation beyond an overview of trade related matters.[40] Indeed, there is little discussion of the EEIC at the Cape that goes beyond trade or archival indexing.

In Company literature, there has been some discussion of the relationship between Company and Crown in London, India, and St Helena.[41] At these three places there were different

[35] Keay, *The Honourable Company: a history of the English East India Company*, p.295; Bowen, H, "Britain in the Indian Ocean region and Beyond", p.79.
[36]Condon,M. E., "The Administration of the Transport Service during the War Against Revolutionary France, 1793-1802" (Doctoral, University of London, 1968), pp.31-32, 312.
[37] Day,J. F., "British Admiralty Control and Naval Power in the Indian Ocean (1793-1815)" (Doctoral, University of Exeter, 2012), pp.25, 72.
[38] Geber,J. L., "The English East India Company at the Cape and the Cape of Good Hope Factory Records 1773–1836". *South African Archives Journal,* 36: (1994), pp.3-6, 74.
[39] Arkin,M., *John Company at the Cape :A History of the Agency Under Pringle (1794-1815) Based on a Study of the "Cape of Good Hope Factory Records"* (S.A.: , 1960), p.Preface.
[40] Ibid, pp.209-210.
[41] Stern, P. 2007. "Politics and Ideology in the Early East India Company-State: the Case of St Helena, 1673–1709". *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History*, 35(1), pp.1-23; Robins, N, *The Corporation that Changed the World*, pp.4; Stern, P. 2009. "History and Historiography of the English East India Company: Past, Present, and Future!". *History Compass*, 7(4), pp.1146-1180.

relationship configurations between the Crown and Company. In London, the EEIC had its headquarters, and developed a close collaborative relationship, including overlapping personnel and financial interests with the government for mutual benefit. The Company provided employment patronage networks for financial and political security.[42] At St. Helena and in India, the EEIC exercised direct political authority over their trading settlements, but was indirectly supported by the Crown, mainly through the provision of military assistance.[43] The archival records show that the Cape, during the first occupation, was interesting because, even though it was a Crown colony, the relationship between the Company and Crown resembled the London configuration. In the Cape, the Company and the colonial government were autonomously organised.[44] However, in spite of recognising this importance, there appears to be close collaboration between Crown and Company to secure mutual trade and imperial interests from shared enemies that endangered these interests, that remains uncritically explored during this first occupation.[45] It is this relationship that this thesis will explore further.

Corporation and Colonialism in Southern Africa Literature

In this light, this study focuses on the Company at the Cape, and it is important to acknowledge that there has been literature on corporations and colonialism in Southern Africa.[46] Nicole Ulrich and Bill Freund have examined the Dutch East India Company, which directly ruled and administered the Cape colony from 1652 to 1795.[47] Ulrich argues that this form of 'merchant colonialism' was not benign as is often argued, but was based on conquest and a particularly harsh labour system.[48] There is also literature on the British South African Company (closely associated with Cecil John Rhodes and Leander Jameson) that received a

[42] Bowen, H, *The Business of Empire*, pp.ix-x.
[43] Chaudhuri, K, *The Trading World,* pp.1-16; Stern, P, "Politics and Ideology", pp.1-15.
[44] Letter from Lieutenant-General Dundas to Lord Hobart, Lord Cape Town, 22 February 1803 in RCC, Vol V, p. 159; Letter from Lieutenant-General Dundas to John Pringle, 22 February 1803, BL: IOR G/9/1 pp. 185-186
[45] Arkin, *John Company at the Cape*, pp.209-210; Condon, *The Administration of the Transport Service during the War Against Revolutionary France, 1793-1802*, pp.31-32, 312; Day, *British Admiralty Control and Naval Power in the Indian Ocean (1793-1815)*, pp.25, 72; Geber, *The East India Company and Southern Africa: A Guide to the Archives of the East India Company and the Board of Control, 1600-1858*, p.74.; Samkin, *Trader Sailor Spy: The Case of John Pringle and the Transfer of Accounting Technology to the Cape of Good Hope*, pp.10, 15, 21.
[46] Boone, C. 2006. *Merchant Capital and the Roots of State Power in Senegal: 1930-1985*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; O'Brien, P. 2000. "Mercantilism and Imperialism in the Rise and Decline of the Dutch and British Economies 1585-1815". *De economist*, 148(4), pp.469-501.
[47] Ulrich, *Counter Power and Colonial Rule in the Eighteenth-Century Cape of Good Hope: Belongings and Protest of the Labouring Poor*, pp.48-79; Freund, B. 1984. *The Making of Contemporary Africa: The development of African society since 1800*. London: Macmillan, pp.39-58;
[48] Ibid.

royal British charter in 1889. Much like the earlier merchant companies, the British South African Company was invested with political powers and administered territories directly (Northern and Southern Rhodesia – Zimbabwe, Zambia and Botswana). [49] Although this, much later, form of merchant colonialism was also based on a harsh labour regime, it was significantly more extractive and capitalistic in outlook. According to Moeletsi Mbeki, "the British South African Company, imposed a system of land appropriation and forced labour to open up the country to mining and farming industries. These measures ruined the indigenous economic systems without actually building an industrial country to mining and farming industries."[50] These arrangements differed from the EEIC at the Cape, which remained separate to the colonial governance during the first occupation. An investigation of the relationship between the Company and Crown can thus shed light on the ways in which corporations were involved in African colonialism. In spite of this importance of 'merchant colonialism' in Southern Africa, the EEIC's presence is either superficially examined or neglected in much of the existing literature.

The EEIC differed significantly from these other companies. Although it was vested with general political authority and had set up its colonial administrations in various parts of the Atlantic and Indian Oceans, the EEIC did not exercise this power directly at the Cape, as the Cape was formally constituted as a British Crown colony. [51] Yet, this does not mean that the EEIC was only concerned with trade and was apolitical. Rather, it can be perceived to have utilised different means to involve itself in the colonial administration. This investigation of the relationship between Company and Crown sheds light on different ways in which corporations were involved in the colonialisms in Southern Africa.

Conclusion

This thesis draws on a range of literature, and in this Chapter I highlight notable gaps that this study will address. In the case of the literature on the Atlantic and the Indian Oceans, the tendency in the literature has been to treat these oceans as historically distinct, and to focus on the northern regions of the oceans. Although there is growing literature that recognises the

[49] Mbeki, M. 1980. "Mugabe's Economic Inheritance". *Economic and Political Weekly*, 15(32), pp.1343-1344; Sillery, A. 1974. *Botswana: A Short Political History*. London: Methuen & Co LTD, pp.80-96; Phiri, B. 2006. *A Political History of Zambia: from colonial rule to the third republic, 1890-2001*. Asmara: Africa World Press, pp.1-26.

[50] Mbeki, "Mugabe's Economic Inheritance", pp.1343.

[51] Buchan, *The East India Company 1749-1800: The Evolution of a Territorial Strategy and the Changing Role of the Directors*, p.52; Farooqui, *Governance, Corporate Interest and Colonialism: The Case of the East India Company*, pp.44-51; Galbraith, *The 'Turbulent Frontier' as a Factor in British Expansion*, pp.150, 151, 163.

connectedness of these oceanic worlds and recognises that Southern Africa and the Cape were important in both Atlantic and Indian Ocean worlds, there is a temporal gap in that these studies deal with later nineteenth centuries. This means that there is still much to be done in order to locate the earlier history of the colonial Cape in the Atlantic and Indian Oceans world.

In addition, literature that deals with corporations has tended to focus on companies that simultaneously serve as colonial rulers and are intimately involved in administration and governance. What then of companies such as the EEIC that were separate from the state, but were connected and able to influence the state?

This thesis attempts to address these concerns by placing the first British occupation within the broader maritime context of the British seaborne Empire that spanned the Indian Ocean and parts of the Atlantic and considers the ways in which the Company related to the Cape colonial government. Chapter 4 and 5 will discuss the literature dealing with the Cape in more detail. However, it is important to note that this 'transition period' in Cape history has been recognised as an important moment in the development of state-led imperialism and the establishment of the modern colonial state. [52] Therefore, when considering the influential role of the EEIC, it is important to consider whether such a characterisation is entirely accurate.

[52] Ulrich, *Counter Power and Colonial Rule in the Eighteenth-Century Cape of Good Hope: Belongings and Protest of the Labouring Poor*, pp.48-79; Freund, *The Making of Contemporary Africa: The development of African society since 1800*, pp.39-58.

Chapter 3

The Honourable EEIC

Introduction

The EEIC started operations in the Cape of Good Hope in 1794.By this time the Company was firmly established. It already had colonial settlements and factories (trading posts) across the Indian Ocean: in Mocha, Bombay (now Mumbai), Goa, Madras (now Chennai), Calcutta (now Kolkata), Macao, Canton (or Guangzhou), Malacca, and Run. The EEIC had formal authority over the tax collection of more than 10 million people from whom the Company received over £150 million in annual profits after 1765, and employed over 150 000 military, trade and civil servants by 1805.[1] In this Chapter, I outline the broader history of the Company – discussing its character, operations, and trajectory. In this manner, I show how the EEIC was created as a trading company and developed into a polity that pursued its own self-determined interests, and cooperated with the British Crown on occasion, for their mutual benefit.

I examine the Company's commercial significance, as well as its political and military ascendency. I note the various internal and external relationships that the EEIC created. I show that rivalry and competition within and outside the Company caused closer collaboration between the EEIC and the British Crown government to protect their mutual interests. Finally, I consider the legal revision to its monopoly trade Charter, that indicated that the Company was increasingly assimilated into the formal administrative machinery of the British imperial government, specifically the Colonial Office.

Formation

In 1599, a group of London merchants came together to organise and formalise a maritime trading venture to the East Indies: a venture that specifically voyaged through the south Atlantic to the East Indies. This company was formed in order to profit from the direct engagement with the Indian Ocean spice trade, and to challenge the Portuguese maritime merchants who had customarily dominated this trade route. To formalise and secure their intended commercial venture, these London merchants applied for and were granted a Charter from the British Crown in 1600.[2] This Charter granted the Company exclusive

[1] Robins, *The Corporation that Changed the World*, pp.3, 157.
[2] Keay, *The Honourable Company: A History of the East India Company*, pp.4, 75, 196, 230, 261.

trading rights eastward of the Cape of Good Hope and westward of the Straits of Magellan, against English trading competitors and rivals. It also provided Crown protection to this EEIC venture against enemy and rival threats to its trade. Subsequently, the granting of this Charter led to the formation of the English East India Company, officially known as 'The Governor and Company of Merchants of London Trading into the East Indies'. This Charter represented and outlined the Company's initial purpose: trade and profit. John Keay explains that this initial Charter only related to trading rights and maritime conduct, and did not empower the Company, from the Crown, to legally hold overseas territories.[3]

The Charter was a written document that represented a contract struck between the Company and Crown to negotiate commercial monopoly privileges granted to the EEIC.[4] The Charter was a recognition of the fixed costs invested by the Company to establish its transoceanic trade, and it gave the EEIC control to regulate domestic competitors who sought to also enter the East Indies trade to procure and supply commodities and goods to Europe. The Charter carried an expectation that the Crown would aid the EEIC against European rivals and enemies that threatened their trade. In return for the monopoly and security privileges, the Crown government viewed this Charter as a tool for its own economic and political benefits - specifically to extort loans and bribes from the Company to fund its own activities, such as wars against its continental imperial European rivals. Here, the Charter was an object that symbolised an alliance between the Crown and Company and acted as a medium to formally organise their relationship. Furthermore, it was also a point of tension between these two independently directed and managed organisations, as they both sought to promote their own interests through the Charter.

The Commercial Ventures and European Rivals

For the EEIC, initial trade to the East Indies was organised around separate and successive voyages. Its individual commercial ventures were financed by investors, subscribers and shareholders who were only interested in the potential profit to be gained from each venture. This funding of individual ventures lasted until 1612. After 1612, the EEIC introduced its first joint-stock operation to secure finance for multiple voyages: 1613 to 1616.[5] This joint-stock trading system and structure continued, and became permanent, in 1657. This mode of

[3] Keay, *The Honourable Company: A History of the East India Company*, pp.4, 75, 196, 230, 261.
[4] Ogborn, *Writing Travels: Power, Knowledge and Ritual on the English East India Company's Early Voyages*, 159-160; Hejeebu, *Contract Enforcement in the English East India Company*, p.498.
[5] Keay, *The Honourable Company: A History of the East India Company*, p.67.

operation was officially accepted as the Company's formal financing system in the granting of the 1661 Charter.[6]

Keay determines two types of investors in the Company venture: the short-term investor with no obvious interests in the trade; and those investors who interpreted the longer-term advantages of the trade itself - this included the pursuit and exploitation of political and social interests outside the Company.[7] These different types of investment goals influenced the internal structure of the Company, as short and long-term investor interests were separated. Those short-term investors joined the General Court, where they annually voted in committee managers and regulations of policy. While those with longer-term interests, such as those who had the foresight of a greater role that the Company could play in the national English economy, campaigned to be elected onto the Court of Committees (those committed to the Company).[8] These second-type of investors played a more direct role in executive decisions, and directed and decided on policy that would benefit the Company and its investors, to ensure continued commercial prosperity. In consequence, Company management, organisation and policy evolved to promote and instruct collective profit, before individual power and loyalty toward the Company before the British Crown. This Committee annually elected a new Governor and Deputy-Governor to lead this management and drive the elected committees to achieve the Company's commercial and business goals.[9]

The opening voyages, starting in 1602, focused on establishing the Company's direct access to the Indian Ocean Spice Islands (the Banda, in Indonesia). Commanded by James Lancaster, the first Company venture reached the Banda Islands in 1603. At these islands, the British commander claimed the Island of Run as a Company trading settlement and British possession. From the Island of Run, the venture acquired nutmeg and mace that was brought back to London. [10] These early ventures took the Company as far as Japan in its search for trade opportunities in and around the Indian Ocean. At the Spice Islands, the Company competed with, and increasingly antagonised, the VOC as it established its commercial and political maritime ventures amongst South East Asian denizens and polities. This included

[6] Geber, *The East India Company and Southern Africa: A Guide to the Archives of the East India Company and the Board of Control, 1600-1858*, p.34.
[7] Keay, *The Honourable Company: A History of the East India Company*, p.16.
[8] Chaudhuri, *The Trading World*, p.29.
[9] Ibid.
[10] Keay, *The Honourable Company: A History of the East India Company*, p.13.

setting up trading bases from which to operate from, such as their first factory post at Bantam in 1603.[11]

However, rival VOC competition at this Indonesian archipelago proved too strong and forced the Company to re-orientate its East Indies base of operations. In these early years, persistence to establish itself led the EEIC to move its activity of recognised trading interests to the littoral coast of the Asian sub-continent in the Mughal Empire. With the approval of the Mughal Emperor, it established a factory at Surat in 1613. [12] Surat became the Company's main base of operations. Through Surat, the Company accessed and integrated into the Indian Ocean trading and commercial world. Bombay would take up this primary role for the Company in 1688, after the Company had acquired it from the British Crown.[13] Jill Geber explains that this acquisition of Bombay stimulated an organisational process that consolidated factory settlements into three independent Presidencies: Madras, Bombay, and Bengal. Here, factories along, or connected through, the same littoral trade network were formally organised together so that the management of trade in an overarching area could be more coordinated, effective and focused on maximising collective Company trade benefits.[14] Kirti Chaudhuri details the organisational development of this regional East Indies Presidency trading structure in the Company. He explains that by 1661 the chief factor (the president of trading operations) of Surat at the time, had exercised authority over subordinate factories at Broach, Ahmedabad, and Tatta in Sind in the north; Karwar, Kayal, and Rajapur further south; Gombroon and Isfahan in Persia; Basra in the Persian Gulf; and finally, Mocha in Yemen.[15]

At this same time, Company trade with imperial Qing China proved different to its way of operating with the Mughal Empire. The Qing Empire refused the introduction of the Company's factory system and prevented any of the European trading companies from freely trading at any of its ports. In response, the EEIC adapted to this situation in both its structure and strategy.[16] It introduced a system of trading from Company ships, through a system of supercargoes. In this particular trading system, the EEIC supercargo acquired trading privileges on behalf of the Company from the Qing Empire in order to trade at Qing ports.

[11] Keay, *The Honourable Company: A History of the East India Company*, p.13
[12] Geber, *The East India Company and Southern Africa: A Guide to the Archives of the East India Company and the Board of Control, 1600-1858*, p.34.
[13] Ibid.
[14] Ibid, p.35.
[15] Chaudhuri, *The Trading World*, p.49.
[16] Ibid, p.55.

Canton was the most prominent Qing port that that Company supercargoes operated from.[17] This system continued, and remained in place, for well over a century, even as supercargoes were permitted to permanently reside in their Canton factories, from the 1770s.[18]

This period of expansion in the Indian Ocean saw the Company weather threats in London. For example, the English Civil War in the 1640s stifled the number of trading ships the EEIC could send to its East Indies trading settlements. Throughout this war, the EEIC supported whoever was in power at the time. It did this to protect and maintain its monopoly trading privileges. [19] This strategy proved successful, as Oliver Cromwell (victor in the civil war) granted the Company a new Charter with more political, civil and military powers in 1657. This particular Charter formally acknowledged the Company's financial structure operating as a united joint-stock (where it organised its finance through the continuity of capital investment), and legally allowed the Company to fortify and colonise its own settlements. Finally, this Charter granted the EEIC authority to transport its own settlers, provisions and weapons to those settlements. The EEIC fully realised its new legal powers at St. Helena, the Company's first colonial settlement, in 1659.[20]

Chaudhuri finds that from 1660 onwards, the EEIC and other European transnational trading companies created an increasingly formalised and integrated maritime global trade network.[21] In this network, the Company exchanged American gold and silver (bullion) for Indian Ocean commodities to redistribute in Europe, other European settler colony markets, and African trading stations to make a profit. Chaudhuri shows that the EEIC, along with the VOC and other maritime trading companies, functioned as central distribution agencies: marketing and distributing acquired commodities of the Indian Ocean throughout the European, colonial and imperial world. To acquire these commodities, the EEIC had to redistribute and trade South American bullion throughout the Indian Ocean world. In this exchange, the EEIC traded in a global emporium of commodities and materials: gold, silver, textiles, pepper, raw silk, coffee, tea, porcelain, slaves, indigo, saltpetre, cotton, wool, and opium, to name a few.[22] This flow

[17] Ibid.
[18] Keay, *The Honourable Company: A History of the East India Company*, p.248.
[19] Ibid, p.87.
[20] Ibid.
[21] Chaudhuri, *The Trading World*, p.454.
[22] Ibid, pp.132.

and movement of trade was global, and the requested supply shifted and fluctuated according to the demand of the Company's chosen consumers.[23]

In these early years, Company officials learned about, and adapted to, the natural (monsoons winds, currents and shoals) and human (wars, pirates, rivals and markets) opportunities and threats in the Indian Ocean world that it had entered. The EEIC had to adapt to Indian Ocean existing trade and commercial networks, and political dynamics, and then had to persevere in these spaces to prosper and profit. To overcome and exploit these natural and human threats and opportunities, the EEIC used various strategies to solve the time and spatial problems of long-distance trade.[24] These strategies were interesting because they show a sophisticated understanding of the various human and natural (commercial, political and social) problems that they encountered and had to manage over different times, places and spaces.[25]

Organisation and Structure

To ensure its commercial success and longevity in these uncertain environments, the Company based its operational structure on an impersonal bureaucracy. This diffused individual servant power and authority into its various courts and committees that made up its collective, but without weakening the individual contribution of its servants to the Company.[26] This professional managerial body worked through an effective administrative system that planned and organised the Company's business and logistics through carefully made timetables and extensive channels of communication. This organisational system limited the risk of its commercial ventures against factors out of its control.[27] For example, the strength of this internal risk management of external factors through extensive and superior intelligence and planning, allowed the EEIC to effectively bribe the English Crown for political and military support, and to hold and enforce the exclusivity of its granted Charter to check detrimental servant activity. This risk management ensured that the Company realised a successful political and operating base system in the Indian Ocean, that limited risk to its goal of making continued commercial profit. For example, the establishment of its own fortified and semi-sovereign enclaves (presidency and factory system) could be supported by a powerful Crown naval fleet that limited risk from human

[23] Ibid, pp.237, 279, 313, 343, 359.
[24] Ibid, p.xv.
[25] Ibid, pp.120, 125.
[26] Ibid, p.459.
[27] Ibid, pp.29-37.

threats.[28] This approach to risk management informed the EEIC's desire to regulate the Indian Ocean and set the EEIC's political tone to secure itself in the Indian Ocean. The Company drew on its maritime and naval resources as strategic deterrents to protect the vulnerability of its landed factories. As such, all its investors and proprietors, including the Crown, favoured the security of its continued prosperity and the uninterrupted profitability of its trading arrangements.[29]

This is corroborated by Keay, who argues that the EEIC continually adapted to be successful. It adapted against those natural and human elements that threatened it, be it pirates or trade winds.[30] Strategies included giving its overseas servants (or factors) trading latitude in the East Indies to make profits privately (called the country trade), but only as long as that private trade was in the Company's interests.[31] For instance, John Galbraith explains that appointed servants of high rank exercised conscientious agency due to the time-place lags between the Britain office and the East Indies factories. Subsequently, these high rank servants increasingly exercised authority and management over Company policy and societal organisation in the East Indies.[32] Over time, increasing numbers of East Indies resident people and territory fell under Company supervision and protection. In response to territorial expansions, the London EEIC had to expand its committees, departments and their functions to manage, organise and respond effectively to the new information it needed to process and act upon. This was to better manage these overseas servants and check their potentially damaging activity to the EEIC's benefit.[33]

Michael Fisher explains that this was achieved in the Indian Ocean by the perpetual collection and codification of knowledge and information gathered from Company servants and diplomats from across the East Indies.[34] This information was sent to the Company's headquarters in London, where it was collated into uniform knowledge. This knowledge was then redistributed back to provide the servants and diplomats with a common knowledge base from which to act.[35] Fisher argues that to protect its political and commercial position,

---

[28] Ibid, p.461.
[29] Ibid, p.462.
[30] Keay, *The Honourable Company: A History of the East India Company*, pp.133, 145.
[31] Ibid, p.131.
[32] Galbraith, *The 'Turbulent Frontier' as a Factor in British Expansion*, p.168.
[33] Buchan, *The East India Company 1749-1800: The Evolution of a Territorial Strategy and the Changing Role of the Directors*, p.52.
[34] Fisher,M., 'Diplomacy in India, 1526 - 1858', in *Britain's Oceanic Empire: Atlantic and Indian Ocean Worlds, c. 1550-1850*, eds. Bowen,H. V., Mancke,E. and Reid,J. G. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), p.256.
[35]Ibid.

overseas Company and Crown representatives projected their own conceived united image of Britain onto Mughal audiences to hide the tensions and factionalism between the two British polities.[36] For example, Fisher explains that the elected Company Governor-General in Calcutta aimed to control the reception of news received from London about Crown and Company antagonisms, so that Company goals and objectives in Mughal Asia would be achieved.[37] As carriers of this news, ships were essential to securing EEIC interests.

Keay and Geber explain that in this early phase, EEIC ships stopped over at St. Helena, the Cape and Mozambique for safety, repair and provisions on their way to and from their Indian Ocean destinations.[38] In 1620, in an attempt to secure the Cape from their VOC rivals, two EEIC commanders attempted to claim dominion over the Cape, in the name of the Crown, but were not able to get official recognition for their effort.[39] Geber explains that it was only in 1652 that the VOC took the step that the other maritime powers had not, and officially claimed the Cape as its own territory. This act led the EEIC to claim the abandoned Atlantic Island of St. Helena for itself in 1659. St. Helena was to function as a safe provisioning and repair base for its own homeward bound ships.[40]

Philip Stern argues that for the EEIC, St. Helena acted as an important node of connection and linkage to Asia, America and Britain.[41] This island station facilitated the movement of people, ideas and commodities, often acting as an example and experience of governance and precedent guide for Company East Indies factories and governed settlements.[42] For Stern, the colonisation and social, political and economic development of St. Helena represented the Company's imperial ambition, where it functioned as a vital fulcrum in the EEIC's global trade entrepôt and emporium.[43] In that, St. Helena was a crossroad between transoceanic social and trade worlds. It was a place from which the Company merged, experimented, tested and traded: commodities, people, crops, experiences, governance, from Atlantic, Indian and Pacific Ocean spaces.[44] Stern notes that, as early as 1688 the island was used for the

[36] Ibid.
[37] Ibid.
[38] Keay, *The Honourable Company: A History of the East India Company*, p.62; Geber, *The East India Company and Southern Africa: A Guide to the Archives of the East India Company and the Board of Control, 1600-1858*
[39] Geber, *The East India Company and Southern Africa: A Guide to the Archives of the East India Company and the Board of Control, 1600-1858*, p.33.
[40] Geber, *The English East India Company at the Cape and the Cape of Good Hope Factory Records 1773–1836*, p.1.
[41] Stern, *Politics and Ideology in the Early East India Company-State: The Case of St Helena, 1673–1709*, p.4.
[42] Ibid, p.7.
[43] Ibid, pp.15-16.
[44] Ibid, p.4.

transportation of criminals and colonists to and from the Company's Indian Ocean factories. For instance, the island acted as a waylay point for transporting and distributing Madagascar slaves, and a staging base to seek other Atlantic islands that might also be suited to settlement and experimentation.[45]

Stern explains that EEIC rule on St. Helena was both emblematic and exceptional because it engaged with state building - developing political ideology and economy that went beyond a 'delegated sovereign', 'state within a state', or 'semi-sovereign' (as argued by Kirti Chaudhuri, John Keay and Nick Robins).[46] Stern explains that efforts to develop, sustain and expand Company civil societies independent of its factory and trading operations resonated with its later institution of south Asian factory settlements.[47] The Company designed these settlements and their civic infrastructure, which were ruled by its own law and judiciary, administered by its own government, maintained an ascribed moral order, and encouraged settlers to immigrate to these settlements, for its own interests. Later, St. Helena became a place from which EEIC institutions and guiding principles were developed, applied and exported elsewhere.[48]

At these self-sustained settlements, the EEIC acted as a state. It aimed for continued effective and just management of populations and resources.[49] In this manner, it also flew its own flag, struck its own coins, issued its own titles and charters, conducted diplomacy on its own behalf, fought wars in its own name, and competed against rival polities and sovereignties for political power and authority to protect and pursue its own self-determined interests.[50] To secure these interests, Company settlers were encouraged to fulfil communal duties (like paying taxes, upholding a particular moral behaviour, militia, and engage in civil obligations) for the common good and well-being of the EEIC body politick.[51] Stern illustrates that this was achieved through a plutocracy, similar to that of the Caribbean plantations. Here, a social and dynastic society, through a landed elite, was cultivated in order to consolidate Company power and allegiance to it.[52] Stern also shows that St. Helena was used as political leverage

[45] Ibid, p.5.
[46] Stern, *Politics and Ideology in the Early East India Company-State: The Case of St Helena, 1673–1709*, pp.2-3; Chaudhuri, *The Trading World*, p.20; Keay, *The Honourable Company: A History of the East India Company*, p.97; Robins, *The Corporation that Changed the World*, p.42.
[47] Stern, *Politics and Ideology in the Early East India Company-State: The Case of St Helena, 1673–1709*, p.2.
[48] Ibid, pp.5, 7.
[49] Ibid, p.6.
[50] Ibid, pp.3, 8.
[51] Ibid, pp.13-14.
[52] Ibid, p.15.

by the Company to negotiate with the VOC to allow their ships to use the island in exchange for similar privileges at the Cape and other Indian Ocean settlement posts.[53]

Imperial Ambition

This imperial ambition manifested itself actively and openly through the Sir Josiah Child's period of governorship of the Company, from 1681 to 1690.[54] Child's aggressive policy of war led the Company into a brief war against the Mughal Empire, from 1688 to 1689. This failed war became a lesson that taught the Company that the Mughal Empire got its wealth from its lands. Additionally, this showed the Company that its naval power was best utilised as a preventive strategy as opposed to an active tactic to advantage itself. For example, the strategic use of port blockades to negotiate business relations in unfavourable or antagonistic situations toward itself. [55] The EEIC and the Mughal Emperor made peace with each other at the end of this war. In an effort to maintain material prosperity in his conquered territories, the Emperor granted the Company a 'nishan'. [56] This action acknowledged the EEIC as a political autonomy amongst the Mughals, as a sovereign polity that represented itself when conducting its trade activity and commercial affairs.

Ascending in the Indian Ocean world, and especially in the Mughal Empire, was not an easy process for the Company. From the 1680s, the Company had to contend with Anglo-American pirates disrupting diplomatic and commercial relations, and trade opportunities in the Indian Ocean. For these pirates, the Indian Ocean became a place of plunder, prosperity and material well-being – by raiding European East India ships, Mughal convoys and other vessels in the Red Sea, Persian Gulf and south Asian seas for bullion and commodities.[57] Jan Rogozinksi shows that there was much Anglo-American pirate activity and movement between, and in, the Atlantic and Indian Oceans.[58] For example, many pirates, like William Kidd and Henry Tew, launched themselves seasonally from the Atlantic to go raiding in the Indian Ocean. A pattern that many Euro-American pirates who did not settle on St. Mary's, Reunion or Madagascar followed.[59] Chaudhuri supports this by explaining that this Euro-American pirate activity, from 1691 to 1693, disrupted EEIC Red Sea trade by decreasing

[53] Ibid, p.4.
[54] Chaudhuri, *The Trading World*, pp.118, 462.
[55] Ibid, pp.182-186.
[56] Ibid.
[57] Rogoziński, *Honor among Thieves: Captain Kidd, Henry Every, and the Pirate Democracy in the Indian Ocean*, p.viii.
[58] Ibid, p.138.
[59] Ibid, p.93.

their imported commodity supply from that trading zone. By 1695, such triumphs led these pirates to establish themselves at the Island of St. Mary's (off the east coast of Madagascar), from where they raided into the Indian Ocean. From St. Mary's, these pirates planned their raids in accordance to the established movements of the seasonal monsoon winds that directed commercial shipping.[60]

This culminated in 1696, when Henry Tew and his crew successfully raided the Mughal Emperor Aurangzeb's ship, the *Gunsway*. Tew plundered the Emperor and his court's wealth of bullion and jewels that were being transported. This angered the Emperor and his court against all English-associated persons. He retaliated against the raid by imprisoning Company servants at Surat, and committing the English, Dutch and French Companies to protect his ships in the Red Sea. To protect their threatened Indian Ocean trade, the Company successfully lobbied and pressured the London government to condemn the pirates' actions and actively outlaw their activity in both the Atlantic and Indian Oceans.[61] Although successful in stifling pirate activity in the Atlantic, this counteraction did not completely stop Euro-American raiding in the Indian Ocean: John Bowen plundered a rich Mughal vessel in 1700. John Taylor and Oliver La Buse successfully raided a rich Portuguese vessel with bullion, diamonds and commodities worth more than $400 million in 1721.The Company continued to face the potential threat of indigenous pirates in the Indian Ocean long after, notably in the Madagascar channel by Malagasy raiders who were distinctly active from 1765 to 1820.[62] This period shows that the EEIC was a key agent in driving the change of British imperial policy against transoceanic piracy to protect its trade and diplomatic position with the Mughal Empire. This maintenance of commercial and diplomatic relations with the Mughal Empire was a key driver in attempting to extirpate the Anglo-American pirates and limit human risk to Company trade.[63]

Nevertheless, it was not only Anglo-American and Malagasy pirate threats that the EEIC faced to establish itself in the Indian Ocean.[64] Lakshmi Subramanian explains that, while the Company sought to commercially and politically establish itself in the Indian Ocean, it clashed with other sovereign powers, such as the Maratha, Mysore, and other local coastal

[60] Chaudhuri, *The Trading World*, p.361.
[61] Rogoziński, *Honor among Thieves: Captain Kidd, Henry Every, and the Pirate Democracy in the Indian Ocean*, pp.81-89.
[62] Ibid, pp.ix, 225.
[63] Ibid, pp.82, 150.
[64] Subramanian, *The Sovereign and the Pirate: Ordering Maritime Subjects in India's Western Littoral*, p.7.

powers, along the Indian sub-continent's western Malabar littoral. To the EEIC, these maritime clashes were defined as indigenous acts of piracy against it.[65] These Indian Ocean pirates were privateers of these local Indian powers, who competed with and challenged the Company's trade assertions to juridical and political rights to sea space and control over maritime trade routes.[66]

To establish itself, the EEIC had initially bought passes from the coastal powers, like the Maratha, and others, in order to trade in and through their waters.[67] Bombay became a key political and commercial site of littoral contestation of land and sea for the EEIC against these local Indian powers, particularly over the legality of trade rights and the use of shipping routes.[68] The EEIC collaborated with the Mughal Empire to mutually protect their commercial vessels against these common rivals and enemies.[69] This was a contributing factor to the increasing Indian sub-continent inter-state rivalry, and the concurrently growing political ascendance of the EEIC, through the eighteenth-century, during these contestations.[70]

In this way, it was part of the Company's agenda to construct these maritime rivals as pirates to legally and politically secure its own Indian Ocean political and trade interests.[71] These contestations and clashes with various rivals continued from 1669, and escalated through the eighteenth-century, to 1820.[72] This happened simultaneously with large Maratha's maritime campaigns against their own politically declining rival, the Mughal Empire,[73] and the EEIC's dedicated objective to subjugate and get rid of all commercial Indian Ocean rivals' legal claims to official trade; in order to enforce Company's own authority on all shipping.[74] Consequently, it was only from 1798 to 1805, under Governor-General Wellesley (Lord Mornington), that the EEIC defeated their long-time rival and enemy, the Sultanate of the Mysore. This ended a 30-year conflict, in which a broader Malabar rebellion was perceived to

[65] Ibid, pp.8, 52-54.
[66] Ibid, p.14.
[67] Ibid, pp.13-14.
[68] Ibid, pp.31, 42.
[69] Ibid, p.19.
[70] Ibid, p.42.
[71] Ibid.
[72] Ibid, pp.7, 21.
[73] Ibid, p.42.
[74] Ibid, pp.42, 57-60.

have been stopped.[75] Robins explains that conflict with the Marathas, however, continued, and only came to an end in 1818.[76]

These contests and challenges against Anglo-American, African, and resident Indian Ocean maritime political and commercial rivals and enemies are shown to be legal strategies by the EEIC to advantage itself. These legal strategies were executed to secure and protect Company political and commercial authority, and control over its Indian Ocean trade interests. In consequence, pursuing maritime security for itself is demonstrated to be an enduring theme of EEIC maritime and littoral political and commercial strategy, and operational goals in the Indian Ocean. This security can be described and attributed to their pursuit and protection of political and commercial authority and power, in order to accumulate and constitute the control of trading relations and networks to the Company's benefit.

Toward A United Company

In 1695, the Company faced an investigation by the British Crown for bribery and corruption. This led to the British Crown authorising the establishment of a rival, new EEIC. The new EEIC at the time, though, encountered trouble. Unlike the older established Company, this new EEIC lacked factories and forts, an established local network of suppliers, agents and financiers. The new EEIC also lacked trading capital to secure its own trading privileges, and that limited the investment it could make to establish itself in the East Indies.[77] In addition, the new EEIC was established at a time when Anglo-American pirate activity had antagonised the Mughal Emperor too far. The new EEIC representatives were forced to make extravagant promises to support the Mughal Emperor's campaign against these pirates. This included backing financial and military commitments the Emperor wanted from them to protect Mughal ships.[78]

These Mughal commitments were increasingly trying for servants of the older established Company at these overseas factories. These demands aggravated their refusal to recognise and cooperate with the new EEIC, whom the old servants considered a rival to their own established operations.[79] These two rival EEIC's operated concurrently until 1709, when they formally merged into a 'United English East India Company'. Chaudhuri argues that after the

[75] Robins, *The Corporation that Changed the World*, pp.144-145.
[76] Ibid, p.146.
[77] Chaudhuri, *The Trading World*, pp.123-124; Bowen, *The Business of Empire: The East India Company and Imperial Britain, 1756–1833*, p.30.
[78] Keay, *The Honourable Company: A History of the East India Company*, pp.128-130.
[79] Ibidi, p.138.

merger, the Company became more stable in internal and external organisation.[80] For instance, the Court of Committees became the Court of Directors, the positions of Governor and his deputy became the Chairman and Deputy-Chairman, its accounting system become more organised, and the Company now got its Charter issued from the British parliament instead of the Crown.[81] This happened at the same time as the establishment of the Anglo-Scottish Union, 1707, where the united kingdoms of England and Scotland formed a Greater Britain.[82] The Company replaced the English canton on its flag with that of the Greater Britain Union canton.[83]

Commercial and Political Ascendancy

Lucy Sutherland shows that in the eighteenth-century, the British Crown was only nominally responsible for the administration of the British imperial state.[84] The Crown relied on the landed and commercial classes of the time to maintain the government's administrative system: through parliament and powerful moneyed companies – such as the Bank of England, South Sea Company, and the EEIC. This means that the EEIC was in a domestic, political position of financial usefulness to the Crown government. For instance, Sutherland argues that the Court of Directors' commercial connections in London, and their networked support in the Court of Proprietors was valued by the government during election time, and as a revenue source, through loans, that were needed by the Crown to wage its wars.[85]

The EEIC increasingly got involved in local Mughal politics and diplomacy. The repercussion of this involvement destabilised the London headquarters management capacity. For example, the increased private servant wealth and rivalry in Mughal India after the battle of Plassey, 1757, made its way back to London.[86] Accordingly, this distorted perceptions about the EEIC's perceived wealth, which had detrimental consequences on the domestic British economy. This constitution and ascendance in Mughal India suggests that the Company was not only concerned with securing domestic British arrangements, but affirms it

[80] Chaudhuri, *The Trading World*, pp. 43-44.
[81] Ibid, pp.43, 436
[82] Armitage, *The Ideological Origins of the British Empire*, p.21
[83] "The Striped Flag of the East India Company, and its Connexion with the American "Stars and Stripes"," Flags of the World, https://flagspot.net/flags/gb-eic2.html.
[84] Sutherland, *The East India Company in Eighteenth-Century Politics*, pp.16-18.
[85] Ibid, pp.23-24.
[86] Ibid, pp.20-21.

as a self-determining political organisation that was equally driven by its own interests in Mughal India.[87]

The EEIC's early eighteenth-century stability was reflected in the consistent sending of 10 to 15 ships (from time of the established 'united' Company for around 30 years) from Britain to acquire and distribute commodities from Madras, Bengal, Canton, Mocha, Sumatra and St. Helena, to its designated market places in the Atlantic.[88] In this 30-year period, the Company consolidated and fortified itself within the increasingly fractious Mughal Empire. The Mughal Empire, after the death of its Emperor Aurangzeb in 1707, progressively spiralled into a growing political vacuum of internal Nawab[89] rivalry, and external war with the Marathas Confederacy.[90]

In its united form, the Company successfully pressured the new Mughal Emperor Farrukhsiyar to grant it three imperial 'Farmans' - one each for the regions of Bengal, Hyderabad and Ahmadabad, in 1717.[91] This Farman positioned the Company as one of the most privileged trading organisations in the Mughal Empire: making it was exempt from Mughal customs, inland and at ports, throughout the Empire.[92] This Farman granted territorial and commercial privileges, but also integrated the Company into Mughal political affairs - Mughal provincial Governors and officials sought to financially benefit from the Company's improved status, and played the Company in their own political and military manoeuvrings and rivalries against each other.[93]

This increased involvement in Mughal politics encouraged the EEIC's Presidencies to progressively invest in armed forces to protect Company factories against Mughal Nawab intimidations, European rivals and local Asian pirates, to defend its acquired trading privileges from such threats. For example, this can be seen by the Bombay Presidency's extended period of naval hostilities against the Marathas confederacy in the early eighteenth-century over shipping routes, and trading rights and authority.[94] In turn, the Company's Presidencies armed forces were recruited by these same Mughal provincial Governors to defend against rival Nawab incursions and antagonisms. Company Presidency councils used

[87] Ibid, p.20.
[88] Keay, *The Honourable Company: A History of the East India Company*, p.161.
[89] A Mughal provincial Governor.
[90] Ibid, p.149.
[91] Chaudhuri, *The Trading World*, pp.119, 124
[92] Ibid, pp.123, 124.
[93] Ibid, pp.119, 124.
[94] Keay, *The Honourable Company: A History of the East India Company*, p.185

these Mughal political manoeuvrings and games to their own advantage, to bribe and manipulate these same officials to the EEIC's commercial benefit and political advantage.[95]

From the 1720s, the French East India Company (the *Compagnie de Indie*) progressively imposed itself as the main rival to the EEIC and the VOC in the Indian Ocean.[96] The French East India Company played an important role in these Nawab political and military power struggles, affairs and rivalries. This forced the EEIC to reluctantly follow suit, as they sought to protect and consolidate their own position against the French Company. The aggressive French strategy blazed a new way for European organisations to successfully participate and impose themselves in Mughal imperial affairs, through assertive trade and war, to promote their commercial interests.

In response to this threat, the Company sent military specialist Stringer Lawrence to their Mughal Presidencies to train up and command an armed force.[97] The EEIC also acquired Crown naval and military forces, on their own account, to support and augment these military forces. Under Lawrence, the Company's Presidencies armed forces established an effective structure and organisation to adjust to this changed way of operating – this included formalizing local recruits into sepoy (indigenous Indian soldier recruits) regiments under Company command.[98] With progressing and escalating Nawab political and military contestations and power struggles on the Asian sub-continent from the 1730s, the French and English Companies increasingly adapted to the causes of rival Nawabs to promote their own interests and agendas. Stuart Reid shows that there was a great desire by the Company to protect its own factories and militarily escort merchants and officials against military threats that it faced from the French Company, Mughal Nawabs, Mahrattas, and Mysore Sultanate.[99] From the 1740s, these many-sided threats instigated Company servants, such as Robert Clive, to promote 'armed negotiation' to protect the Company's, and their own private, investments and agendas in the East Indies.

Internal political and civil antagonisms continued to escalate within the Mughal Empire. While these antagonisms continued, European hostility, rivalry and war in the Austrian Succession, 1740 to 1748, followed participants into the Indian Ocean. This initiated the

[95] Reid, *Armies of the East India Company, 1750-1850*, p.3; Keay, *The Honourable Company: A History of the East India Company*, p.163.
[96] Chaudhuri, *The Trading World*, pp.66, 98, 134, 205.
[97] Reid, *Armies of the East India Company, 1750-1850*, pp.2, 3, 8.
[98] Keay, *The Honourable Company: A History of the East India Company*, pp.197, 204.
[99] Reid, *Armies of the East India Company, 1750-1850*, pp.2, 3, 8.

French and English East India Company's aggressive contestation for Indian Ocean trade and commerce. However, their goals were to stifle each other's trade, instead of fighting for conquest.[100] In addition, the time of the war of Austrian Succession also saw an increased collaboration between the armed forces of the EEIC and the Crown's military, to secure mutual interests. For the Crown, prestige and power in Europe was perceived to depend on the success of the Company in the Indian Ocean.[101]

Continuous wars in Europe and Mughal Asia over the latter eighteenth-century saw a labour shortage for ships. For instance, this was particularly pertinent through wars such as: The War of Jenkin's Ear (1739 to1741), War of Austrian Succession (1742 to 1748), The Seven Year's War (1756 to 1763), and the EEIC war with Mysore (1766 to 1769 and 1780 to 1781).[102] As a solution to the maritime labour shortages, the EEIC and British Crown collaborated to create the Asiatic Articles. These Articles were created to ensure that a cheap and regulated supply of indigenous labour could be procured for Company ships from East Indian ports.[103] These Asiatic Articles were British labour laws that regulated and recruited lascars (Indian Ocean maritime labourers who worked on European ships).[104] These Articles safeguarded the labour supply for and on Company ships, while restricting the lascars transoceanic movement to ships by denying these maritime labourers permanent settlement in British ports.[105]

Keay explains that willing French and English participation as proxy forces, for Mughal Nawabs, led their Companies into the Carnatic Wars in the 1750s.[106] During these wars, these two European companies emerged as terrestrial powers on the Asian sub-continent. For these two Mughal based organisations, terrestrial acquisition meant political and territorial control of valuable cotton production sources. Commercially, this meant that increased territory became equivalent to increased financial revenue.[107] It is viewed that Company servants, particularly Robert Clive, consolidated and legitimated the EEIC's ascendency to an

[100] Keay, *The Honourable Company: A History of the East India Company*, p.184.
[101] Philips, *The Secret Committee of the East India Company*, p.19.
[102] Rodger, *The Command of the Ocean: A Naval History of Britain, 1649-1815*, pp.270, 274, 292, 366.
[103] Pearson, *The Indian Ocean*, p.209.
[104] Robins, *The Corporation that Changed the World*, p.20.
[105] Pearson, *The Indian Ocean*, p.209; Robins, *The Corporation that Changed the World*, p.20.
[106] Keay, *The Honourable Company: A History of the East India Company*, p.194.
[107] Ibid.

important political, military and commercial position in the Mughal province of Bengal, after the battle of Plassey, in 1757.[108]

Keay and Robins describe this event as a revolution, as the Mughal province of Bengal came under authority of a sovereign polity, the EEIC: a foreign and commercially-driven organisation.[109] The Company ascended up the Mughal imperial hierarchy to serve as a legitimate and acknowledged administrator of the Bengal province. Robins views this success at Plassey as a revolutionary moment, perceiving it as a corporate takeover of Bengal that eventually founded a 'corporate Empire' that would "[exercise] sovereignty over more people, with a larger revenue and a larger army' than the British state".[110] He explains that when the Company took control over the authority of the Bengal province through the use of its own armed forces, it gained a substantial territorial foothold in Southern Asia.[111] The Company's control changed the underlying organisational dynamics and political systems of the Mughal province. It directed Bengal society toward the production of Company prosperity for its shareholders, instead of the Bengal inhabitants that it now governed.[112] The EEIC is described as governing the Bengal state to the detriment of these inhabitants. This was done by changing the social order and economic system toward its own commercial profit goals, and this developed a corporate state that laid the foundations for later terrestrial British imperial incursions.[113] But, Keay argues that this 'revolution' was more of a palace coup, that was an expedient way of transferring commercial and political powers in the province to the Company, while maintaining positive relations with other Mughal allies, investors and supporters.[114]

Clive led and consolidated the Company's position in Bengal by increasing the Company's armed forces to secure his and the EEIC authority. He, and many of his Bengal Presidency colleagues, opportunistically enriched themselves through this new political and economic authority that he and the Company now held – these servants would later be known as the Bengal Club.[115] For the London Directors, the EEIC's authority over Bengal came to

[108] Ibid, p.198, 220.
[109] Keay, *The Honourable Company: A History of the East India Company*, p.218; Robins, *The Corporation that Changed the World*, p.59.
[110] Robins, *The Corporation that Changed the World I*, pp.61, 156.
[111] Ibid, p.74.
[112] Ibid, pp.61, 72.
[113] Ibid*I*, pp.73, 74, 78, 80.
[114] Keay, *The Honourable Company: A History of the East India Company*, p.213.
[115] Ibid, p.244.

represent a different prospect. To them, correspondence and financial records related and revealed Bengal as a place of thriving trade but of little profit.[116] At the Bengal Presidency, revenue replaced commercial profit, and administration of that revenue increasingly replaced the focus on trade. The Mughal Emperor officially acknowledged Clive's victory, and through him, the Company's position of authority by granting the EEIC the imperial 'Diwani' (or governorship) over the Bengal province. This responsibility "entailed the management of a province's revenue and the remission of part of it to the imperial treasury" in 1766.[117] Robins shows that after getting the Diwani over Bengal, the Company exploited their new dominion, and used Bengal's abundance of poppy crop to produce and trade opium.[118] The EEIC used the opium trade to stimulate and grow their increasing trade for Qing tea, which was redistributed into European markets, continental Europe, and colonial settlements. Company tea at this time was growing to exceed the demand for the Asian sub-continent textiles they had traditionally imported. After 1780, tea and opium increasingly became central to the Company's trade strategy to maintain commercial profitability.[119]

Company success in the Indian Ocean trade had customarily created wealthy servants, such as ex-Bombay servant Lawrence Sulivan, who came back to London with both wealth and experience.[120] Both resources (wealth and experience) were utilised by these returned servants to gain Director positions in the Company. However, Clive not only became wealthy but also famous. On his return to London in 1760, Clive, with the support of the Bengal Club, began to impose himself on the Court of Directors and the General Court to contest the operation and management of Company affairs. Clive went up against Sulivan in a decade-long competition and rivalry to control the business and political direction of the Company. Clive wanted to use his and the Company's position to exploit more from local Mughal authorities, and advocated for the right of EEIC servants to protect their own private profit and privilege available in Bengal. Keay argues that Clive's intention was for the Company to cede administrative control authority of Bengal to the British Crown.[121] Robins argues that this was because Clive had been looking out for the Company's best interests.[122] Sulivan, on

[116] Ibid, pp.218, 219.
[117] Ibid, p.252.
[118] Robins,N., "Loot: In Search of the East India Company, the world's First Transnational Corporation". *Environment and Urbanization,* 14: 1, (2002), p.81.
[119] Robins, *The Corporation that Changed the World*, p.151.
[120] Keay, *The Honourable Company: A History of the East India Company*, pp.244, 245; Robins, *The Corporation that Changed the World*, p.84.
[121] Keay, *The Honourable Company: A History of the East India Company*, pp.252.
[122] Robins, *The Corporation that Changed the World*, p.76.

the other hand, championed the Company's independence from the British Crown. He desired to expand the Company's control and operations over the East Indies Presidencies in order to keep overseas servant action and activity in line with overarching Company interests.[123]

This competition between Sulivan (and his supporters) and Clive (and his Bengal Club colleagues and supporters) created a volatile and unstable managerial situation and political environment at the London headquarters during the 1760s. Both men used their wealth and patronage resources in the Company's General Court of Proprietors to gather support for themselves and their candidate allies at quarterly meetings.[124] These quarterly meetings were traditionally designed to elect Directors, approve dividends, and to automatically agree on the elected Courts decision-making policies. But, these meetings became internal political battle fields and power struggles - the continuous change of management personnel and the constant discussion over policy decisions disrupted the London headquarters stability and effectiveness. To counter stagnated management decision-making, P.B Buchan explains that, during this volatile period the Examiners (Correspondence) Office was established in 1769.[125] It held enormous power and knowledge at a time when continuity was needed to stabilise Company activity. This Correspondence Office, through growing administrative capacity, analysed, and processed the increasing and diverse information and intelligence the London headquarters received from the East Indies, in order to relay informed and suitable instructions to the office's superiors to administer EEIC overseas Presidencies, factories and servants.[126]

However, internal decision and policy making turbulence resulting from the power struggle, stifled effective action from the Directorate. This happened while a drought unfolded on the Asian sub-continent in 1769. These parallel problems pushed the Company close to bankruptcy and London into a financial crisis from 1771 to 1772.[127] Over this volatile period, the EEIC became financially dependent on the Crown government, who provided a necessary loan to the Company.[128] This loan led the Crown government to negotiate with Company

[123] Keay, *The Honourable Company: A History of the East India Company*, pp.244-252; Buchan, *The East India Company 1749-1800: The Evolution of a Territorial Strategy and the Changing Role of the Directors*, pp.54, 56-57.
[124] Buchan, *The East India Company 1749-1800: The Evolution of a Territorial Strategy and the Changing Role of the Directors*, p.57.
[125] Ibid.
[126] Ibid, p.60.
[127] Robins, *The Corporation that Changed the World*, pp. xv, 92-93, 124.
[128] Robins, *The Corporation that Changed the World*, p107; Buchan, *The East India Company 1749-1800: The Evolution of a Territorial Strategy and the Changing Role of the Directors*, pp.54, 58.

management on how best to resolve the bad and unfavourable domestic economic situation, that had been created from EEIC volatility. The negotiation between the two parties led to the passing of the Regulation Act in 1773, to bring stability and security back to the Company in London. Robins and Buchan explain that the Regulation Act sharply restricted EEIC shareholder rights.[129] The threshold for voting at Company proprietor meetings was raised from £500 to £1,000, and shareholder influence limited to only voting in 6 of the 24 Directors each year.[130] This increased the power of the Company's Directors and decreased the power and influence of the general shareholders in Company affairs.

Increasing EEIC and Crown Government Collaboration

However, financial assistance and management intervention did come with certain terms. The Regulation Act stipulated that the Company must first inform the Crown government of correspondences with India on topics that dealt with military, political and revenue matters. The Act also created the position of Governor-General, based in Calcutta, to supervise the factory at Sumatra and the Presidencies of Bombay and Madras.[131] Keay notes that the inclusion of this last stipulation can be attributed to Sulivan - who had desired more London control over overseas servant activity.[132] Yet, in the Regulation Act, the Company was able to negotiate with parliament to create a bill, the Tea Bill. This bill became the Tea Act, which allowed the Company to "claim back all customs duty paid on tea that was subsequently re-exported to the American colonies", and to directly sell tea to those same colonies.[133] The Regulation Act symbolised the alliance between the Crown and the Company, an effort to mutually assist each other's interests. The Crown government needed domestic financial and economic stability and security from the EEIC's India customs revenue. This Act gave the Crown a legal means to indirectly monitor Company affairs, by giving them access to the Company Indian correspondence that held topics of financial, political and military interest to them. While the Company needed internal management stability and more oversight over its East Indies servants. This Act raised the stock qualification for voting in the Proprietor's Court and decreased the number Directors to be changed in the annual elections to only a

[129] Ibid.
[130] Robins, *The Corporation that Changed the World*, p.107.
[131] Ibid, p.108.
[132] Keay, *The Honourable Company: A History of the East India Company*, p.270.
[133] Ibid, p.258.

quarter, in order to promote better continuity of leadership and decrease the volatility created by internal rivalry and the undesired influence of the general court.[134]

The Tea Act, however, proved to be a political mistake for the Crown. The arrival of Company tea in Boston, in 1773, re-sparked British North American colonial protests against unjust Crown taxes. The tea coming from the EEIC gave these American patriots protesting against the Crown an added grievance. Robins argues that the colonists identified this arrival of tea as an action of a dreaded organisation seeking to expand its perceived despotic rule (tainted by experiences with Asian imperial states), into the settlers north American colonies.[135] These patriots dumped the Company's tea into the Boston harbour. This prompted these settlers to form the Boston Tea Party and openly rebel against British Crown authority in 1775. This is acknowledged as a key element in instigating the thirteen North American colonies successful revolution against imperial Great Britain, which ended in 1783. Huw Bowen argues that, after this American Revolution, a more considered approach and a growing awareness of the multifaceted nature and organisation of imperial British global interests occurred within the British Crown government.[136] As a result, Crown officials expressed a greater interest in, and sensitivity to, EEIC activity and affairs on the Asian sub-continent - a place where the EEIC held authority and jurisdiction independent of, and separate to, the Crown government. For example, after losing its North American colonies, the new Crown Prime Minister, William Pitt the Younger (a son of a former Company servant who acquired wealth through service at the Madras Presidency), passed the India Act in 1784.

The India Act mandated the creation of a Secret Committee in the EEIC: made up of no more than three EEIC members – usually the Chairman, his deputy and another senior Director.[137] This Secret Committee acted as medium between a Crown government created Board of Commissioners for the Affairs of India (better known as the Board of Control, to correspond to Company Presidencies in India), in an attempt to subordinate the EEIC as a political power. Under this Act, the appointment of the Company's Governor-General was now subject to Crown government approval.[138] Jill Geber, John Keay, and Nick Robins argue that

[134] Ibid, p.258.
[135] Robins, *The Corporation that Changed the World*, p.111.
[136] Bowen,H. V., "British Conceptions of Global Empire, 1756–83". *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History,* 26: 3, (1998), p.19.
[137] Philips, *The Secret Committee of the East India Company*, pp.700, 703.
[138] Geber, *The East India Company and Southern Africa: A Guide to the Archives of the East India Company and the Board of Control, 1600-1858*, p.38.

this curtailed Company independence and agency, such that its activities and affairs were subordinated to the British state to become a puppet or quasi-state department of the Crown government.[139]

However, Stern offers a contested view. He explains that the India Act represented another battle in the Company's continued struggle with the Crown government over the extent of its power to license public and private trade, in Eastern and Southern Asia to Europe and the Atlantic.[140] Here, the EEIC became increasingly integrated into a more formalised and unified system of the global British Empire, which Stern identifies as happening in the early nineteenth-century.[141]

But, according to Philips, this idea of subordination was impractical because the Secret Committee enjoyed more advantages over the Board. The EEIC, through its Committee and resources, was usually both more knowledgeable and experienced in Indian affairs: Company Directors were life-long members and the Committee had, at the Company's service, first rate permanent staff - whose job (usually in the Examiners correspondence department) was explicitly to manage EEIC information, intelligence and interests.[142] On the other hand, the Board of Control had Presidents who were often ignorant of Indian business, held shorter-terms in their government office, and had inferior and underpaid staff, compared to the EEIC's own servants.[143] This meant that the Company, through its Secret Committee, long enjoyed more power than it legally claimed. Robert Travers echoed this by saying that, the India Act realised a greater Britain imperial negotiating framework, which the Company-state and the Crown-state could formally cooperate with, preserving the EEIC's legal sovereignty in imperial Britain.[144] For Philips, another weakness of this Act was that it was implemented at a time when EEIC political and commercial affairs were closely interwoven. As such, EEIC directives concerned managing political action through its commercial goals.[145]

Through their advantages, members of the Secret Committee often managed, organised and designed the content of correspondence passed on to the Board of Control. This content was

---

[139] Geber, *The East India Company and Southern Africa: A Guide to the Archives of the East India Company and the Board of Control, 1600-1858*, p.38; Keay, *The Honourable Company: A History of the East India Company*, p.261; Robins, *The Corporation that Changed the World*, p.136.
[140] Stern, *Company, State, and Empire: Governance and Regulatory Frameworks in Asia*, p.149.
[141] Ibid, p.150.
[142] Philips, *The Secret Committee of the East India Company*, pp.701-702.
[143] Ibid.
[144] Philips, *The Secret Committee of the East India Company*, pp.701-702; Travers, *Constitutions, Contact Zones, and Imperial Ricochets: Sovereignty and Law in British Asia*, pp.98-99, 111, 117, 129.
[145] Philips, *The Secret Committee of the East India Company*, p.703.

used by the Board of Control to advise on British foreign policy. In this new closer collaborating relationship, the EEIC exercised much authority and influence on how denizens of Greater Britain conceived and perceived the exercise of British foreign activity.[146] Philips shows this through an examination of Britain's war with revolutionary France. In 1792, before the war, the EEIC's Secret Committee outlined the Company's commercial and political situation and proposed a plan to the Crown if war did break out.[147] This plan proposed that a convoy system be set up between St. Helena and the Cape of Good Hope to protect homebound Company fleets. It also identified French naval and military forces at the French Islands of Bourbon (Reunion) and Mauritius as the greatest threat to EEIC interests in the "East", especially if those enemy forces captured Dutch settlements at the Cape and Ceylon (Sri Lanka). The Company's Committee proposed a blockade of the Cape to protect both the Cape and Ceylon from these French maritime threats. It is interesting to note that Henry Dundas, president of the Board, followed these proposals fairly closely when war with France did break out - including establishing the convoy, occupying the Cape in 1795, and capturing Ceylon in 1796.[148]

Conclusion

In this chapter, I outlined the broader history of the Company. The chapter traced its creation from a trading company of merchants seeking to enter and prosper from the East Indies spice trade, to becoming a maritime polity with its own self-determined interests that set up its own colonial and trading settlements and stations, establishing its own judiciary's and civil constitutions, creating its own private military, making war and diplomacy on its own behalf, and controlling and administrating extensive terrestrial dominions under its own authority.

Through this I was able to characterise the EEIC as a commercially driven self-determined maritime organisation that sought to prosper from its Ocean-directed trade in the East indies, dealing most prominently with the Empires of Mughal India and Qing China. It engaged extensively in political and military activity to establish and constitute itself in the Indian Ocean, and ascended in power and position through commercial, legal, political, and military alliances and collaborations against rivals and enemies to promote its trade interests. The EEIC defined itself distinctly through the financial profit and political influence it generated for itself, and stockholders, from its trading pursuits.

[146] Ibid, pp.706-707, 709-710.
[147] Ibid, pp.704.
[148] Ibid.

The Company was a transnational organisation that operated in the Atlantic and Indian Oceans, distinctly through the Southern Oceans. It structured its transoceanic organisation to promote collective authority, check the influence and abuse of individual servant power and authority, while not weakening individual contributions to the benefit of itself. These servants were loyal to the EEIC before all else. Subsequently, the Company had to continually transport administrative, trade and military servants to and from the Indian Ocean in its ships. Here, the Southern Ocean route presented human and natural threats that it sought to secure. Its transoceanic transported labour-force was crucial to the reproduction and reconstitution of its transnational, collective managerial and organisation structure. To achieve this, it used a professional managerial body to administer and plan the extensive transoceanic business and logistics required to pursue the commercial, military and political interests, which it sought to secure and risk manage against. Commercial, political and military security was a significant concern of the Company's, to protect against threats to its self-determined interests.

In Britain, it used its financial resources to bribe the Crown government to support it politically and militarily. While in the Indian Ocean, it established fortified trading settlements to impose authority and control over littoral trade and shipping routes against maritime rivals and enemies. In this manner, the Company created relationships to promote its security and to ensure its continued prosperity. For example, political, commercial and legal developments that the EEIC went through involved a changing relationship with the Crown government to keep its interests secure, these changes promoted mutual benefits for both parties.

During the 1760s sustained internal servant rivalry in London created a volatile political environment inside the Company's managerial body that pushed it toward financial crisis. The Crown government came to the Company's aid with financial assistance and managerial intervention to stabilise Company affairs and limit the economic and political collateral impact for it. Similarly, in the 1770s, after losing its colonies after the American Revolution, the Crown government came to rely on the EEIC to right its political and economic problems that resulted from the loss. Furthermore, in the 1790s the Company and Crown collaborated against mutual global enemies, the Dutch and French, for mutual interest and security.

In consequence, maritime-orientated security has been a prominent theme for the EEIC. Through its historical trajectory, character and operations, the Company continually pursued trade profit through commercial, political, legal and military enterprises and collaborations.

These actions constituted, protected and promoted the EEIC's interests. To do so, the Company managed the human and natural risks and threats that it faced to secure its own maintenance and sustenance. In so doing, the Company ascended commercially, politically and militarily significantly in the Indian Ocean over time. This made it a significant constituent within, and producer of, the British seaborne Empire.

Chapter 4

Securing the Cape: Company interest, plans and the mission to take it, c. 1780 to 1795

Introduction

The American Revolution instigated a volatile period of global revolution, hostility and uncertainty, and unsettled the existing balance of power and trade in the Indian Ocean. Within this changing context, the Cape became central to the British imperial interests of both the Company and the Crown. First, the strategic location of the Cape, seen as the entry-point from the Atlantic into the Indian Ocean, meant that a French occupation of the Cape would pose a dire military threat to passing British naval ships and EEIC trade. Second, it is not often noted, but the Cape played a crucial part as a refreshment station, or a place of reproduction, that provided essential healthcare and food provision to travelling labour, and as a place to repair ships. The EEIC, like other European companies, depended greatly on the transoceanic movement of its labour and material force to establish, expand and ascend in the Indian Ocean, and keeping the reproduction of labour (even at a minimal level) and technology secure proved important.

The aim of this chapter is to examine the role of Company involvement in the invasion and first British occupation of the Cape in 1795. I will demonstrate that the EEIC had a long interest in the Cape and was a primary instigator of the British invasion and occupation of the Cape. The Company played an active and significant role in the preliminary British discussions to invade the Cape, as well as the actual military occupation of the Cape. By examining the EEIC roles, I highlight the theme of security: the significant role that the Cape played in securing broader British imperial resources, as well as matters directly related to securing the Cape. These matters include intelligence, the early re-construction of a transoceanic British maritime zone, and the reproduction of maritime and military labour of the British Empire and its enemies.

Literature on the British Actions to Secure the Cape for the First Occupation

In literature that specifically deals with the British securing the Cape for the first occupation, Johan Van Niekerk, Thean Potgieter and Albert Grundlingh, Henry Bredekamp, and Thean Potgieter have examined this topic. They all describe the British securing the Cape for their

first occupation as a significant event and underline the maritime dimension as a key space of influence and contestation.[1]

Van Niekerk examines cases of legal contestations between different British imperial parties, who claimed prizes of property after battles that secured the Cape colony against British enemies.[2] He looks at the way authority was exercised and the legal rationale behind the Admiralty Court's decisions on these contested cases, and argues that the cases dealt with complex issues pertaining to joint capture of these prizes.[3] EEIC ships and servants are described to be notably involved in the taking of the Cape, and are articulated as an associative force to British military success. But, in the related cases that claimed prizes, the Admiralty Court ruled that this involvement was passive and not intended for military action.[4] Potgieter and Grundlingh look at the securing of the Cape in relation to Admiral Keith Elphinstone, who, they argue, played an important role in securing the Cape for the British first occupation. They explain that this was because he was an experienced naval officer and was perceived as being well acquainted with the Cape and "Far East".[5] In this examination of Elphinstone, Potgieter and Grundlingh highlight that it was the EEIC imperative and direction that initiated the Crown government to rally and organise its own resources into taking possession of the Cape.[6] Additionally, in this period, Henry Bredekamp looks at the *Corps Pandouren* (A Dutch Khoisan regiment) creation and participation in the military action in Cape VOC Dutch security of the Cape. He shows that this indigenous military labour was important to the Dutch military efforts to keep the Cape secure, against both maritime and colonial frontier threats.[7] Bredekamp's study was done to better

---

[1] Van Niekerk, *The First British Occupation of the Cape of Good Hope and Two Prize Cases on Joint Capture in the High Court of Admiralty*, pp.157, 159, 168; Potgieter and Grundlingh, *Admiral Elphinstone and The Conquest and Defence of the Cape of Good Hope, 1795-96*, pp.39-42; Bredekamp,H. C. J., "The Battle of Muizenberg (1795): The Moravian Missionaries and the Telling of Corps Pandouren History". *Kronos: Journal of Cape History,* 22: 1, (1995), pp.39-40.; Potgieter,T., "Maritime Defence of the Cape of Good Hope, 1779-1803". *Historia,* 48: 1, (2003), pp.283-284, 285.; Johnson, D., *Imagining the Cape Colony: History, Literature, and the South African Nation* (Edinburgh University Press, 2011).; Worden, N., *Cape Town between East and West: Social Identities in a Dutch Colonial Town* (Jacana Media, 2012).; Boucher, M and Penn, N. *Britain at the Cape, 1795 to 1803*. (Brenthurst, 1992.).; Lester, L., *Imperial Networks: Creating Identities in Nineteenth-Century South Africa and Britain* (Routledge, 2005).

[2] Van Niekerk, *The First British Occupation of the Cape of Good Hope and Two Prize Cases on Joint Capture in the High Court of Admiralty*, pp.155, 157.

[3] Ibid, pp.157, 169, 182.

[4] Ibid, pp.164, 168, 169.

[5] Potgieter and Grundlingh, *ADMIRAL Elphinstone and the Conquest and Defence of the Cape of Good Hope, 1795-96*, pp.39, 40, 42, 43.

[6] Ibid, pp.43-44.

[7] Bredekamp, *The Battle of Muizenberg (1795): The Moravian Missionaries and the Telling of Corps Pandouren History*, pp.39-40.

understand the Khoisan Moravian ethos, in order to shed more light on early colonial South African history, but does not look beyond this Khoisan participation in the British efforts to secure the Cape.[8] Potgieter looks at the British maritime defence of the Cape during the occupation. [9] He argues that maritime forces and various maritime military strategies were important to concurrently project military power toward the shore, secure colonial territory, and protect seaborne shipping routes and communications against global enemies.[10] By mainly focusing on the Cape VOC government and British Navy, Potgieter illustrated, but did not delve into, an interrelation between land and sea. This included the particular maritime spatial scope that stations like the Cape occupied, which had to be secured to protect maritime based interests.[11]

Consequently, in these studies different participants are acknowledged to be contributing to British military efforts to secure the Cape. The EEIC was identified to have played a key role in promoting and providing tangible support for the British invasion, particularly in terms of intelligence, transport and provisioning. In spite of the visibility and recognition of EEIC involvement, the Company's position, intention and participation in the British effort to secure the Cape is not investigated further in this particular literature. In this way, this chapter seeks to examine the ways, motivations and extent to which the EEIC was involved in this British effort to secure the Cape.

The Cape of Good Hope: A Brief History of the Colony until the c. 1780s

At the end of the fifteenth-century, commercial interest in monopolising the maritime spice trade route drove Portuguese merchants to sail through the South Atlantic, around the Cape, and into the Indian Ocean.[12] Portuguese transoceanic commercial ventures initiated and formalised the transoceanic link between these Indian Ocean and Atlantic political and commercial worlds. They trail blazed the way for other transoceanic European merchants to follow them.[13] Once the connection between the Atlantic and Indian Ocean had been established, European merchants travelling between these oceans stopped over at the Cape. At the Cape they restocked with food and water provisions (traded from the indigenous Khoisan), repaired their ships, and refreshed and restored their health.[14] From then on, this

[8] Ibid, p.39.
[9] Potgieter, *Maritime Defence of the Cape of Good Hope, 1779-1803*, pp.283-284, 285, 306-307.
[10] Ibid.
[11] Ibid, pp.285, 286, 292, 294, 298.
[12] Pearson, *The Indian Ocean*, pp.83, 121, 122
[13] Freund, *The Making of Contemporary Africa: The Development of African Society since 1800*, pp.42, 43.
[14] Keay, *The Honourable Company: A History of the East India Company*, p.10.

refreshment service to replenish voyaging labour and repair damaged ships served as a main function of the Cape station for many years.

The notion of 'social reproduction' is a central notion in Silvia Federici's work. In her work, she explains that "the reproduction of human beings is the foundation of every economic and political system."[15] The economic and political system that was being constituted and established transnationally by European imperial polities in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries was increasingly a capitalist system.[16] In a system of capital relations, labour-power is exploited to produce value, in the form of financial profit, from the expansion and movement of monetary (waged) based human social relations. From this, Federici states that, the social production and reproduction of labour-power is the most essential component to the expansion and perpetuation of this capitalist system, that imperial Britain was pursuing at this time.[17] For this to happen, the social reproduction and production of the labour-force (or human capital) is necessary to be able to exploit and benefit from that labour-force's labour-power.[18] In this way, maintaining and sustaining the labour-force is a vital project to expand and constitute the capitalist system. As such, the continued provision and supply of food, medical aid and water to replenish, and reproduce this labour-force is paramount to that objective.[19] It is within this context that the Cape should be viewed as a crucial and strategically located maritime station, that minimised the loss of labour and material forces while ships travelled between oceans.

In spite of an initial EEIC led British attempt in the early seventeenth-century, it was the Dutch VOC which was the first European organisation to establish a permanent operating base at the Cape, in 1652.[20] Ulrich explains that as much as ninety-three percent of VOC ships travelling from the Netherlands to the Indian Ocean stayed over at this base to replenish health and provisions, and repair ships, for an extended period of time, before continuing on their commissioned journeys between oceans.[21] This secured many VOC, and other European, fleets voyaging between oceans, which over time increasingly integrated the Cape

[15] Federici, *Revolution at Point Zero :Housework, Reproduction, and Feminist Struggle*, p.1.
[16] Federici, *Revolution at Point Zero :Housework, Reproduction, and Feminist Struggle*, p.94; Federici,S., *Caliban and the Witch* (New York: Autonomedia, 2004), p.113.
[17] Federici, *Caliban and the Witch*, p.7.
[18] Federici, *Revolution at Point Zero :Housework, Reproduction, and Feminist Struggle*, pp.4, 32.
[19] Ibid, pp.7, 33, 55.
[20] Thornton, *A Cultural History of the Atlantic World, 1250-1820*, p.77.
[21] Ulrich, *Counter Power and Colonial Rule in the Eighteenth-Century Cape of Good Hope: Belongings and Protest of the Labouring Poor*, p.75.

firmly into the transnational world and maritime networks of the Dutch VOC.[22] This also demonstrates that the Cape was pivotal in the movement of maritime labour, commodities and material forces over long distances between places.

This maritime operational base developed into a permanent colonial settlement. VOC officials hoped that by encouraging some Europeans to settle and farm there (mainly Company servants, who were released from their contracts), the colony would become self-sufficient in providing agricultural and pastoral provisions to voyaging ships, and stationed military troops.[23] Subsequently, on establishing themselves at the Cape, these settlers had ambivalent, often antagonistic, relationships with the indigenous Khoisan people living there. [24] Bill Freund explains that these settlers began trading in sheep and cattle with the Khoisan until they had their own pastoral stock, and then initiated their own grazing movements into the interior. [25] Freund argues that this increasing "[p]astoral competition led to quarrels over trade and raids for stock, bloodshed and colonial expansion."[26]

Consequential of these hostilities and competition, much of the settler agricultural and pastoral production required more labour than expected. Here, the VOC servants and settler farmers relied on forced labourers (notably slaves and prisoners) from the Indian Ocean. Richard Allen explains that the VOC transported thousands of Indian and Southeast Asian slaves to the Cape to constitute their settlement and developing colonial society.[27] This shows that the labour conditions at the Cape were harsh and the attrition of the labour-force was high, and indicates that the labour-force under the VOC was perpetually replenished in order to continue sustaining its settler-colonial society - to provide the needed provisions and material to travelling ships and crews. As such, the integration of greater transoceanic imperial and commercial transportation, and forced-labour networks were significant to securing and establishing Cape colonial society. Consequently, this illustrates the Cape colony to have been historically dependent on European maritime trade and activity to sustain and maintain itself.

[22] Ibid, pp.74, 75.
[23] Freund, *The Making of Contemporary Africa: The Development of African Society since 1800*, pp.55.
[24] Ibid.
[25] Ibid.
[26] Ibid.
[27] Allen,R. B., "Slaves, Convicts, Abolitionism and the Global Origins of the Post-Emancipation Indentured Labor System". *Slavery & Abolition,* 35: 2, (2014), p.331.

The Cape Colony and Global Uncertainty, c.1780s: EEIC Role in Early Discussions of the Cape

From 1775 to 1783, the thirteen British colonies in North America revolted against the control of imperial Britain over them. During this American revolutionary war for their independence, these thirteen colonies allied themselves to imperial France.[28] This enemy alliance and the resulting loss of these American colonies led British Crown government politicians to pay more attention to EEIC commercial interests and dominion in the East Indies. At this time, the EEIC was expanding its Asian interests from its territorial base of Bengal, particularly with an eye toward increasing its China trade.[29] As noted previously, Samkin highlights that the Cape occupied a pivotal maritime position on the Company's transoceanic shipping and transport route that regulated safe access to East Indies interests and investments. An enemy's occupation of this key place was perceived to endanger Company interests.[30] This ensured that the EEIC maintained a prolonged, attentive interest in the affairs at the Cape to reduce risks and uncertainty to itself, which provided significant motive for it to direct British Crown, and broader British imperial, attention toward keeping the Cape secure for mutual benefit.

According to Christopher Bayly the American Revolution instigated a period of significant political, economic and ideological changes that heralded a "New Order of the Ages".[31] In this particular period, Bayly explains that French Jacobin radicals instigated a revolution between1789 to 1799, to emancipate themselves in Europe from monarchic and aristocratic tyranny. However, their emancipatory pursuit reverberated beyond Europe and was seized by Black slaves in Saint Domingue (now Haiti) to stage their own revolt between 1791 to 1804, against their French slave masters.[32] In this context of global revolution and political and economic contestation and uncertainty, Bayly argues that an acceleration of European imperial global expansion took place during, and resulted from, these contestations: white

[28] Samkin, *Trader Sailor Spy: The Case of John Pringle and the Transfer of Accounting Technology to the Cape of Good Hope*, p.9.
[29] Bowen, *British Conceptions of Global Empire, 1756–83*, p.19; Bayly, *The Birth of the Modern World, 1780-1914 :Global Connections and Comparisons*, p.94.
[30] Samkin, *Trader Sailor Spy: The Case of John Pringle and the Transfer of Accounting Technology to the Cape of Good Hope*, p.10.
[31] Bayly, *The Birth of the Modern World, 1780-1914 :Global Connections and Comparisons*, p.86.
[32] Ibid, p.86-87.

settlers moved into the North American hinterland, Europeans took hold of Egypt, and European power expanded in India, Southeast Asia, and Southern Africa.[33]

In light of these global wars and revolutions, settler expansion, and general uncertainty, Geber explains that by 1781 the Cape was highly regarded by many Atlantic maritime sovereignties as significant to protecting their own global interests and positions. The VOC, like the EEIC, had a Charter that extended from the Cape to the Straits of Magellan.[34] The boundaries of the Charter show that the Cape was specifically identified as an important commercial entry point into the Indian Ocean trading world, and indicates the Cape as pivotal to the pursuit and retention of transnational European commercial and political power, and investment.[35] For instance, according to Geber, the EEIC Directors in London, at the time, described the Cape as "the Gibraltar of India."[36] Gibraltar was a strategically located place that connected the Mediterranean Sea to the Atlantic Ocean. It was used by the British to militarily secure and control seaborne trade that had to pass through its straits and was effectively used to impose British maritime political power in Southern and Mediterranean Europe.[37] This shows the Cape and its waters as important to the security and control of the EEIC's own Indian Ocean commercial and political interests. John McAleer highlights this in his work and affirms the Company view that described the Cape as "a place of consequence and resource, and of such importance to the preservation and welfare of India".[38] This *Gibraltar* metaphor also illustrates Company servants' perception of security as conjointly maritime, commercial and military in character, and the Cape to be significant to the reproduction of the Company. Subsequently, this locates and centres the Cape itself within a greater transnational frame of European political and commercial intrigue, activity and affairs.

In accordance with this importance, transoceanic Company interest in the Cape became perceptible when the EEIC *Government Select Committee of Madras* unsuccessfully sent an agent, Richard Lewin, to the Cape to gather intelligence on the designs and movements of

[33] Ibid, p.88.
[34] Ulrich, *Counter Power and Colonial Rule in the Eighteenth-Century Cape of Good Hope: Belongings and Protest of the Labouring Poor*, p.64.
[35] Geber, *The English East India Company at the Cape and the Cape of Good Hope Factory Records 1773–1836*, p.2.
[36] Ibid.
[37] Rodger, *The Command of the Ocean: A Naval History of Britain, 1649-1815*, pp.20, 71, 135.
[38] McAleer, *'The Key to India': Troop Movements, Southern Africa, and Britain's Indian Ocean World, 1795–1820*, p.297.

Company enemies at the end of 1780.[39] But, soon after arriving, Lewin was detained by the VOC Cape government and was only sent back to England in 1783.[40] At this time, the Company's London Directors had plans to set up an operating base at the Cape, but lost out to the French who had taken the initiative before them (and occupied the Cape from 1781 to 1783) to support the VOC during the Anglo-Dutch war between 1781 and 1784. The London Directors thoughts had echoed those of servants in the Company's Madras Presidency, who also viewed enemy and rival presence at the Cape as a detrimental transoceanic threat to EEIC Indian Ocean-orientated trade and political interests.[41]

By 1785, the Company had explored other Southern African alternatives to the Cape, such as the possibility of setting up a refreshment post at St. Francis Bay (located on South Africa's southeast coast). EEIC Lieutenant Henry Pemberton described the benefits of this after his fleet had anchored in this Bay for ship repairs, while returning to Europe on the Indiaman *Pigot*. Pemberton surveyed St. Francis Bay and sent a proposal to the Directorate that described establishing a Company supply station there, as an alternative to the VOC controlled Cape.[42] Pemberton argued that the principle connection of Great Britain, then, centred in the great extensive and opulent country of India, and that having a port in Southeast Africa would be most beneficial to the British nation, in general, and to the EEIC in particular; notably as a port to the leeward track of their ships returning from India, which would afford refreshment and restoration of health to the broken constitution of EEIC soldiers.[43] Once again the importance of reproduction is highlighted to crucially maintain, sustain and transport Company military labourers and provide repair to EEIC ships - so that the Company's greater Indian Ocean network could be militarily secured. Furthermore, Pemberton explained that this station would allow the Company to maintain a force of soldiers in reserve until their military service was needed to keep Company India secure. [44]

He asserted that St. Francis Bay would be a port to be protected and supplied, and act as security to EEIC interests in the event that the British Empire went to war with the Dutch

[39] Samkin, *Trader Sailor Spy: The Case of John Pringle and the Transfer of Accounting Technology to the Cape of Good Hope*, p.10.
[40] Ibid.
[41] Ibid, pp.9-10.
[42] Letter from Lieutenant Henry Pemberton, Krom Bay, 2 May 1785, British Library, digital microfilm [hereafter, BL], Indian Office Records [hereafter IOR], Cape Factory G/9/1. pp.24, 25.
[43] Ibid. p.26.
[44] Ibid. p.27.

Republic.[45] As such, he explicated this would allow the Company to mitigate against the human risks and dangers of landing its fleets at St. Augustin (a port at Madagascar) in the event of such hostility. Pemberton concluded that:

> When reflecting on the intimate connection of Great Britain, both political and commercial, now with India, and that from the [English] Channel to the coasts of Malabar and Coromandel. The English don't possess a single port capable of affording shelter and protection or refreshment to their ships (St. Helena, incapable of supporting itself). When we make this reflection, it is presumed that the possession of a port of this [South African] coast will be considered as an object of National importance.[46]

The correspondences of the EEIC Directors and Pemberton in the 1780s demonstrated that discussions about the Cape and Southern Africa were underway years before the first British occupation. They indicated that the EEIC was very much involved with designs, and keenly interested, to secure a base in Southern Africa within its own maritime networks, more than a decade before the first occupation. The EEIC, through its Directors and servant Pemberton, on separate occasions explicitly articulated that the Cape represented a key component of trade and military security to the Company and against its enemies, which was explained to be crucial to securing the greater British Empire, itself. It is also interesting to note that, the content in Pemberton's correspondence starts to map the British zone of maritime control, with Madagascar viewed as a contour that was situated on the edge of this British maritime zone.[47],

However, under the advice of the Crown Board of Control's president, Henry Dundas, the EEIC did not choose to pursue alternatives to the Cape. By then, the British Crown was allied to the Dutch Republic and Dundas desired a collaboration between the two allies' East India Companies.[48] But, changing circumstances: prospects of war on the European continent, French threats to EEIC ships in the Indian Ocean, and St. Helena's limited capacity to sustain

[45] Ibid.
[46] Ibid.
[47] Ibid.
[48] Geber, *The English East India Company at the Cape and the Cape of Good Hope Factory Records 1773–1836*, p.2.

its own settlers and passing Company ships, led the Company Directors to instigate and motivate the Crown government to successfully negotiate with the Dutch in 1793. [49]

The Dutch Republic, which was at war with Jacobin France, during the French revolutionary war at this time, approved British diplomatic overtures to convoy VOC ships, and supply provisions and naval protection to the Cape for mutual interest. According to Samkin:

> [s]ecuring access to the Cape of good Hope for re-victualling, repair and refitting purposes, was therefore a priority. Furthermore, British control would ensure that the Cape would no longer be a source of provisions for Mauritius and Bourbon. [50]

Here, the Mascarene Islands are shown to be partly dependent on the Cape to reliably sustain and maintain themselves.[51] In this manner, the reproduction of these French island colonial settlements is displayed to be threats and risks to Company and Crown interests. To protect against these threats was to disrupt the supply, and therefore, social reproduction of these enemy Indian Ocean islands.

Reducing Risk (1793 to 1795)

In 1793, global war broke out between France and imperial Britain. The outbreak of this global war provoked imperial Britain to actively seek ways to protect and promote its interests against this global Jacobin enemy. The EEIC emerged as a chief constituency within the British imperial polity that motivated action to secure the Cape and constitute control of the Cape's maritime zone. In collaboration with the British Crown government and navy, the Company moved to secure mutual commercial, political and military interests.

For instance, in a letter, 2 February 1793, Lord Grenville relayed instructions to Lord Auckland, from Whitehall:

> I transmit to your Excellency copies of some Papers which have been received from the Secret Committee of the Court of Directors of the East India Company, in order that you may communicate confidentially, and without delay, with the Dutch Ministers on this subject, which you will readily conceive to be the highest importance to the interests of our East India Company. It is highly probable that

[49] Ibid.
[50] Samkin, *Trader Sailor Spy: The Case of John Pringle and the Transfer of Accounting Technology to the Cape of Good Hope*, p.11.
[51] Geber, *The English East India Company at the Cape and the Cape of Good Hope Factory Records 1773–1836*, p.2.

> means might be found at no very remote period to send a number of troops to the Cape from St. Helena, where they might be replaced by recruits going out from hence. But it would be necessary that the fullest concert should be established on this point which may be of the utmost consequence to the interests of both countries.[52]

In a despatch, 12 March 1793, Lord Auckland reported to Lord Grenville, from The Hague:

> Your Lordship will recollect that on the breaking out of the war I transmitted to the States General a translation of your Instruction to me respecting the measures to be taken for the security of the Cape of Good Hope, and for the mutual protection to be given by the two countries to the trading vessels from the East Indies. The Dutch East India Directors have not given an answer as to the first of these Points.[53]

This indicates that securing the Cape to protect Company ships was an important British imperial objective, and aligning with the Dutch Republic at the beginning of their global war with France was an important step towards this goal.[54] While negotiations were taking place with the Dutch Republic, the EEIC Secret Committee and Crown Board of Control looked to neutralise French threats in the Indian Ocean; the invasion of Mauritius was considered, as it was perceived as the threat that posed the most identifiable danger to British imperial political and commercial interests in that space.[55] In consequence of these agreements with the Dutch Republic, and the threat posed by a French Mauritius, the EEIC needed to appoint a resident agent at the Cape. The Company's agent had to manage and organise the required personnel and provisions from and for both St. Helena and the Cape.[56] The Company's Secret Committee chose, and then deployed, another agent, John Pringle (also assigned as Crown Commissary-General).[57]

---

[52] Letter from Lord Grenville to Lord Auckland, Whitehall, 2 February 1793 in GM Theal, Records of the Cape Colony (Government Printer, Cape Town, 1897) [Hereafter RCC], Volume I, p. 1.
[53] Letter from Lord Auckland to Lord Grenville, Hague, 22 September 1793 in RCC, Vol I, p. 2.
[54] Letter from Lord Auckland to Lord Grenville, Hague, 29 March 1793 in RCC, Vol I, p. 8.
[55] Samkin, *Trader Sailor Spy: The Case of John Pringle and the Transfer of Accounting Technology to the Cape of Good Hope*, p.14.
[56] Geber, *The East India Company and Southern Africa: A Guide to the Archives of the East India Company and the Board of Control, 1600-1858*, pp.86-87; Samkin, *Trader Sailor Spy: The Case of John Pringle and the Transfer of Accounting Technology to the Cape of Good Hope*, p.15.
[57] Geber, *The East India Company and Southern Africa: A Guide to the Archives of the East India Company and the Board of Control, 1600-1858*, pp.86-87.

Geber explains that Pringle had previously served as a writer for the Company's Bombay civil service, from 1789 to 1793.[58] At the time of his appointment the Company had a twelve-year career path for servants that went from writer, factor, junior merchant and then senior merchant.[59] But, Samkin explains that Pringle did not follow this path and returned to England due to ill-health in 1793. Shortly after his return he was appointed the Company's agent at the Cape by the Secret Committee.[60] It is believed that he was chosen due to his fluency in French, knowledge of Dutch and his patronage connection within Henry Dundas' political and social network.[61]

A critical examination by Samkin and Geber on this appointment indicates that Pringle was directed to gather military intelligence on enemy, particularly on French, transoceanic movements and threats to the EEIC.[62] He was supposed to do this while managing the necessary food and material provisions that were to be sent to and from St. Helena at the Cape.[63] Pringle is reported to have arrived at the Cape on 16 February 1794.[64] At the Cape, however, VOC Governor Abraham Sluysken refused to acknowledge his presence in his appointed public office as the EEIC's official commercial agent. Samkin explains that this gave Pringle the opportunity and time to focus his attention on gathering the required military and political intelligence for the Secret Committee, whereby he focused on information relating to the state of affairs, the morale of people, and the state of provisions at the Cape.[65] This shows Pringle as the key man on the ground at the Cape. He provided both intelligence and recommendations. Intelligence is displayed to be a key part of the Company's notion in providing and promoting security to itself. For example, Samkin identified this in a letter of Pringle's to the Secret Committee on 20 April 1794:

> [Mauritius] are in daily apprehension of being attacked by us; as they have done us so much Injury, that it is impossible we should not resent it, but that as they have been

[58] Geber, *The English East India Company at the Cape and the Cape of Good Hope Factory Records 1773–1836*, p.3; Samkin, *Trader Sailor Spy: The Case of John Pringle and the Transfer of Accounting Technology to the Cape of Good Hope*, p.13.
[59] Ibid.
[60] Ibid.
[61] Ibid, p.14.
[62] Geber, *The English East India Company at the Cape and the Cape of Good Hope Factory Records 1773–1836*, p.2; Samkin, *Trader Sailor Spy: The Case of John Pringle and the Transfer of Accounting Technology to the Cape of Good Hope*, p.14 .
[63] Ibid.
[64] Samkin, *Trader Sailor Spy: The Case of John Pringle and the Transfer of Accounting Technology to the Cape of Good Hope*, p.15.
[65] Ibid, p.16.

> enriched by the way, they are determined to make a vigorous resistance – For this purpose they are constructing several new works, particularly on each side of the harbour […] The number of armed men on the Island, including Blacks may amount to 8000: Provisions are very scarce, Bread one livre plb & only 6 ozs allowed to each person pday […] There is a Gentleman resident here [Cape] (the Chev de Pelagrom) under the title of Imperial Consul, which station he held at Mauritius previous to War, whom I have every reason to suspect of being of a Warm Friend to the French, & of being very active in transmitting them both Intelligence, & even Provisions when an opportunity could be found…[66]

As shown by Samkin, the intelligence provided by Pringle significantly informed the EEIC and Crown decision to delay executing their military plans against Mauritius.[67]

This appointment and correspondence allows us to identify the multiple components of how Cape security was viewed. Importantly, it shows the salient role that the EEIC played in providing intelligence to regulate threats within particular maritime spaces. As such, the supply and access of intelligence and information from the Cape were important aspects of this notion of security. It determined the degree to which the Company and Crown perceived and imagined the safety and type of plans required to pursue or not pursue actions of security in dangerous and threatening maritime waters.

The importance of social reproduction, or this disruption of the social reproduction of political and military enemies, is also highlighted. In this case, the Cape was located in a transoceanic zone that could militarily protect against enemy Mauritius, by stopping their supply of food and material provisions, while simultaneously promoting the supply of food and material provisions to the Company at St. Helena. Both of these were important contours and strategic locations within this context and defined the limit of the Cape's maritime sphere of influence. Both islands were reliant on the Cape, while concurrently posing dangers to those operating in Cape waters. The reliance on Cape food and material provisions by settlements at St. Helena and Mauritius and by European East India companies demonstrated the Cape to be crucial to the sustenance and maintenance of human settlers living on these islands, and those people working and travelling on transoceanic travelling ships. This displays colonial settlements and maritime workers to be vital to promoting and constituting

[66] Ibid, p.17.
[67] Ibid, p.18.

the global political and economic system that was pursued by European imperial polities to maintain and expand their own power. To this effect, the Cape is a significant place of social reproduction for those island settlements linked to its maritime zone.[68]

An important feature of Federici's notion of reproduction is 'food security'. This is the capacity to have and control reliable access to food (and water) sources, and sites of production that are able provide regular subsistence to labouring humans to perform commercial, civil and military services.[69] Reproduction was not only a function of the Cape, but also an important aspect of Pringle's understanding and interpretation of "security". Thus, as a seaborne Empire, the food security, and the protection and perpetuation of its global labour-force was paramount to continued global British imperial prosperity. This made the concept of reproduction a vital component to the Company's long interest, and pursuit of commercial and imperial security at the Cape and its waters. Furthermore, this notion greatly informed Company motivation to instigate joint Crown military action plans to take the Cape to keep it secure.

A Plan of Military Action, 1795

With the constant threat of French action against their interests, Company servants pushed the Crown to act. The Company played a significant part in motivating for, and directing, British plans to invade the Cape. EEIC Director, Sir Francis Baring, appealed to the Right Honourable Henry Dundas (Secretary State for the Department of War at the time) that an attempt to secure the Cape would benefit both the Crown and Company. He asserted that a joint operation would protect and promote mutual trade and imperial interests in the East Indies. The EEIC Director explained that:

> […] The importance of the Cape in [his] opinion comprised under two heads – as a place refreshment for our ships on their return from India, as St. Helena is unequal to the supply, and we should be much distrust for a substitute in the Cape is lost. Secondly, whoever is Master of the Cape will be able to protect, or annoy, our ships out and home, serving at the same time as an effectual check upon Mauritius, &c. […][70]

[68] Federici, *Revolution at Point Zero :Housework, Reproduction, and Feminist Struggle*, p.1.
[69] Ibid, pp.100, 106, 112.
[70] Letter from Sir Francis Baring to Right Honourable Henry Dundas, Devonshire Square, 4 January 1795 in RCC, Vol I, p. 17.

This suggests that there had been a sustained dialogue between the Company and Crown in London since the outbreak of war with France. Moreover, in their correspondences, EEIC servants promoted and framed securing the Cape, and Cape's security, as a mutual concern of, and benefit to, both entities. The emphasis on the Cape as a refreshment station reiterates that the sustenance and maintenance (reproduction) of the transoceanic moving labour-force, and material investment in these ships, organised and managed through the EEIC, was perceived as of great importance to both British imperial organisations.

Drawing on its transnational intelligence network, the EEIC provided urgent military intelligence to the British Crown, so that it would mobilise its military, and provided advice on how to act to secure the Cape. For instance, EEIC Director Baring expounded to Secretary Dundas that the Dutch Republic, who had been occupying the Cape, was unable to adequately defend the Cape against their French enemy.[71] It was explained that the Dutch Republic was endangering the security of the Cape because they were using required military resources and investments to sustain its failing VOC, at the expense of keeping the Cape secured.[72] Baring further revealed that Company intelligence, no doubt from their Cape agent Pringle, indicated that the Dutch Cape VOC government was experiencing hostility from its own colonial inhabitants.[73] It was explained that this VOC government had been "tyrannical & oppressive" in its administration of the Cape colony, and that those same inhabitants were "ripe for revolt" and greatly favoured the French enemy to take possession of the colony.[74]

Baring reiterated that the potential consequences of these threats demanded urgent action. He confidently suggested a that a joint military operation, between the EEIC and Crown, be organised so that they could take and occupy the Cape. To achieve this, the Director explained that this mission would proceed under the public guise of securing their "West Indian" interests in the Caribbean.[75] This is important, as the Haitian Revolution, 1791 to 1804, was taking place in the Caribbean at that time. This revolution was closely associated with the French Revolution, with its Jacobin ideology being prominent in instigating the Saint Domingue slave revolt. The self-liberating slaves of Saint Domingue, the wealthiest French

[71] Ibid.
[72] Ibid.
[73] Ibid.
[74] Letter from Sir Francis Baring to Right Honourable Henry Dundas, Devonshire Square, 4 January 1795 in RCC, Vol I, p. 17.; Letter from Sir Francis Baring to Right Honourable Henry Dundas, Devonshire Square, 12 January 1795 in RCC, Vol I, p. 22.
[75] Letter from Sir Francis Baring to Right Honourable Henry Dundas, Devonshire Square, 12 January 1795 in RCC, Vol I, p. 19.

Caribbean colony, successfully revolted on the island against universal slavery and colonialism to establish Haiti.[76] Lady Anne Barnard, in 1799, fearfully described the liberation of these 'black slaves' as a calamitous, and greatly threatening all white Europeans all over the world.[77] It was this fearful state of mind that the EEIC sought to capitalise on.

The EEIC played an active part in the preparation of the invasion and was willing to provide material support. Baring recommended to Dundas that he entrust the true intention of the Cape mission, under sealed orders, only to his chosen military officers commanding the expedition, that were worthy of his confidence.[78] Baring highlighted the *Deptford, Kent, Northumberland, E. Cornwallis, W. Hastings, Osterly, Gen. Coote* and *E. Howe* as the Company ships going the West Indies.[79] Describing:

> These ships will take 400 troops each except the last which take 450 & the number will not be too many for so short a voyage; but it may be prudent to reduce the number in proportion to the extent of the voyage, allotting about 300 to a ship of about 800 Tons and 450 or more to a ship of about 1200 Tons, the exact number however may be determined hereafter, observing that the Company are accustomed to send only 220 or thereabouts for the whole voyage to India in ships of 800 tons, & the mortality is so small, that they are often landed without loss of a man. In other respects, the practice of the Company is well calculated to preserve the health as well as the lives of the soldiers during the voyage.[80]

It is important to note the emphasis that the Company is placing on the preservation of the military labour-force being transported to the Cape. This implies that the military cost of losing or diminishing that labour-force would be detrimental to mutual interests. This shows the importance that both Company and Crown consciously ascribed to protecting their labour-forces and ships, as those travelling labour-forces and ships were vital to pursing, reproducing and constituting mutual imperial and commercial landed and maritime global objectives. Without this transoceanic labour-force the prosperity of successful military

[76] Thornton, *A Cultural History of the Atlantic World, 1250-1820*, pp.464, 471, 487; Nesbitt,N., *Universal Emancipation :The Haitian Revolution and the Radical Enlightenment* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2008), pp.17, 18, 196..
[77] Barnard, Lenta and Le Cordeur, *The Cape Diaries of Lady Anne Barnard, 1799-1800*, 24 August 1799.
[78] Letter from Sir Francis Baring to Right Honourable Henry Dundas, Devonshire Square, 12 January 1795 in RCC, Vol I, p. 19.
[79] Ibid.
[80] Ibid, pp. 19-20.

enterprise was threatened. Thus, the EEIC vitally assisted with the reproduction of the mission effort by protecting and supplying troops and transport.

Baring continued by stating that these ships would not be ready for the West Indies until the end of February, but at that time, other Company ships: the *Minerva, Hillsborough, Triton, Hy. Dundas, E. of Abergavenny, Glutton, Royal Charlotte* and *Warley,* would be ready to go.[81] Baring reassured Dundas that the Company had six more ships available at the end of March, and another squadron of less than fourteen ships if need be by the end of April.[82] Baring declared that this presented three distinct time periods to consider for the mission, and this, according to Baring, gave Dundas the opportunity to wait on the result of the negotiations with France to make a decision.[83] But, Baring advised that each departure period needed a notice of four to five weeks, so that correct and adequate preparations for the ships could be made.[84] Baring explained that they had to take financial insurance intimations against the ship owners, from whose ships they were tendering, to ensure the availability of the transport services when the moment came to use the chosen ships.[85] Furthermore, he expected that the basis of their plan was to surprise the Cape and not lay siege to it, which he noted would need more extensive planning to sustain the mission's reproduction.[86] Baring pointed out that if the attack was unsuccessful, the Company's ships would be unable to return to Europe or the West Indies. As such, an alternate arrangement had to be planned to dispose of the transported troops in the event of such a possibility.[87] Consequently, he affirmed that due to the uncertainty and precariousness of future events, the Island of St. Helena should be supplied with large stock of provisions of every kind without delay.[88] This highlights St. Helena as a key Company asset to sustain and maintain global military projects, and that its continued reproduction was crucial to the greater security of imperial Britain. But, St. Helena could not sustain itself, and depended on other settlements and stations within the British maritime network, places like the Cape, to do so. To this effect, the Cape was needed to secure the reproduction of the greater British maritime network.

[81] Ibid, p. 20.
[82] Ibid.
[83] Ibid.
[84] Ibid, p. 22.
[85] Ibid, pp. 20-21
[86] Letter from Sir Francis Baring to Right Honourable Henry Dundas, Devonshire Square, 12 January 1795 in RCC, Vol I, p. 21.
[87] Ibid.
[88] Ibid.

Threats were not only external. In the event that they successfully took the Cape, Baring succinctly stated that they would have to protect their occupation against colonial inhabitants who were tempted to work against them. [89] He advised Dundas that colonial laws and customs be preserved, and that freedom of trade would be limited internally to protect against all intercourse with the French Mascarenes during the war.[90]

The regulation of external Cape colonial trade is also shown to be significant. Cape trade was perceived to support hostile French enterprises in Cape waters. The Mascarenes are highlighted as an important contour within this Cape maritime zone. Regulating trade in this zone is accordingly crucial to securing this zone. Baring unequivocally stated that:

> the privileges & interest of the English East India Company will be completely guarded; for as their trade to & from India alone is unlimited, & that they are permitted to trade or communicate with G. Britain as a Colony only; the monopoly of the English East India Company which relates to the supply of the home consumption, is effectively protected. [91]

While the Cape was seen as pivotal, Baring affirmed that it would be disadvantageous to colonise the Cape entirely. Instead, he proposed that the British should possess the colony under the administration of the previous Dutch laws of governance.[92] This was because the Crown and Company's plans at this point were mainly maritime-orientated: to secure the Company monopoly over the homeward bound supply of East Indies trade at the Cape, and an occupation was deemed adequate to protect these interests.[93]

This perspective was affirmed by British naval commanders who agreed with the Company on the significant military potential that the Cape station would provide them, particularly in their global war against France. For example, this affirmation was justified by British naval Captain John Blankett, who illustrated that the Cape was a key maritime medium for European Atlantic and Indian Ocean commercial interests. Blankett explained that should the French take the Cape, the effectiveness of their own transoceanic imperial and commercial interests would be in danger. He added that the potential expansion of those same interests within Africa, and the larger world, would be similarly under threat if they did not secure the

[89] Ibid, p. 22.
[90] Ibid.
[91] Ibid, p. 23.
[92] Ibid, p. 19.
[93] Ibid, p. 23.

Cape.[94] In this way, for the Royal Navy, the protection of EEIC transoceanic trade was essential to promoting greater British imperial and commercial interests. This indicates that the Royal's Navy shared the view of the EEIC that securing Company trade was crucial for imperial Britain, in general.

On 19 January 1795, the Dutch Republic in Europe was defeated by France. William V (deposed Prince of Orange of this Dutch Republic) desired for British to secure Dutch forts and settlements, on his behalf.[95] However, the Company intelligence had already identified that he had no real authority, and advised that if those in command of the British secret mission did choose to evoke the Prince's name to their advantage, then they had to do so knowing that the Prince's name would most likely carry little weight in negotiating the surrender of the Cape.[96] This shows the importance of EEIC intelligence, which allowed Company servants to counsel British military commanders on military strategy.

With the fall of the Dutch Republic, the British armed forces followed the advised mission plan, logistics and timetable that had been provided by the EEIC and made swift preparations for the secret enterprise to secure the Cape – following the recommendation to execute the plan of action in the February and March period. [97] The military detailed the goals of the mission, and possible situations that they might face on their arrival at the Cape: getting the goodwill of the colonists and dealing with the colonial Jacobin threat, administering the colonial revenue, finding out the monetary allowance for commanding the colony, securing the Dutch mercenary soldiers under British pay, and the identification and examination of maritime military threats presented in the surrounding Table, False and Saldanha Bays.[98]

As preparations became finalised, ships were made ready to leave for their assigned destinations: EEIC St. Helena and Portuguese controlled St. Salvador (on the coast of Brazil). Those ships under the command of Admiral Keith Elphinstone and Commodore John Blankett were to rendezvous and regroup at St. Helena before making their approach to the

[94] Letter from Captain John Blankett to Mr. Evan Nepean, Mortimer Street, 25 January 1795 in RCC, Vol I, p. 23.
[95] Order from Lord Grenville to the Duke of York and Albany, Downing Street, 1 February 1795 in RCC, Vol I, p. 27.
[96] Letter from Sir Francis Baring to Right Honourable Henry Dundas, Devonshire Square, 12 January 1795 in RCC, Vol I, p. 22.
[97] Memorandum drawn up by Captain John Blankett, Portsmouth, 9 February 1795 in RCC, Vol I, pp. 29-30.; Memorandum drawn up by Major-General James Craig, Portsmouth, 22 February 1795 in RCC, Vol I, p. 32.
[98] Memorandum drawn up by Captain John Blankett, Portsmouth, 9 February 1795 in RCC, Vol I, pp. 29-30.; Memorandum drawn up by Major-General James Craig, Portsmouth, 22 February 1795 in RCC, Vol I, p. 32; Letter from Admiral Elphinstone to Right Honourable Henry Dundas, London, 14 March 1795 in RCC, Vol I, pp. 35-36.

Cape.[99] Here, Company settlement of St. Helena is shown to be a significant British military asset in the mission. The vanguard - St. Helena squadron - would then be joined by a second squadron, under Major-General Alured Clarke. The secondary force, under the guise and impression of going to the West Indies, was to rendezvous at St. Salvador, which was under the protection of their Portuguese ally. This secondary force simultaneously protected the outbound fleet of Company ships that been designated to transport military soldiers to the Cape.[100] This second squadron was instructed to launch from St. Salvador.[101] As a contingency, the St. Salvador force was given two instructions for their mission: If their force at the Cape arrived and conditions were favourable, they had to reinforce the Cape military effort. If unfavourable, the force was instructed to attack and take possession, and leave the Cape for the EEIC Madras presidency before the seasonal monsoon ended. This was to ensure that the greater mutual interests of the Company and Crown would remain secure, and also reduce the cost of the potential failure in taking the Cape.[102] EEIC information and time-space logistical expertise are shown to be important, and the effective transoceanic movements and distribution of deployed troops was displayed to be vital to securing the greater British maritime network.

With these preparations, the contours of the constructed maritime zone of British imperialism become more defined, although to be fully constituted once the Cape was occupied. It is significant to note that this maritime zone included the South Atlantic: St Helena and St. Salvador. Furthermore, St. Helena was an EEIC asset is this space that was crucially used by both Crown and Company. Thus, both Company and Crown jointly constituted the British maritime zone that they operated in.

A number of difficulties and upsets were experienced. Pringle, by March 1795, was running low on finances and still had yet to be officially recognised by the Cape Dutch Governor. This made his position at the Cape increasingly precarious, which eventually forced him to leave the Cape for St. Helena.[103] Pringle arrived at St. Helena in April 1795, and immediately

[99] Letter from Commodore Blankett to Right Honourable Henry Dundas, Spithead, 26 February 1795 in RCC, Vol I, pp. 34-35.; Letter from Commodore Blankett to Right Honourable Henry Dundas, St. Helena, 28 February 1795 in RCC, Vol I, p. 35.
[100] Letter from the Horse Guards to Major-General Alured Clarke, Horse Guards, 4 May 1795 in RCC, Vol I, p. 38.
[101] Letter from Admiral Elphinstone to Right Honourable Henry Dundas, London, 14 March 1795 in RCC, Vol I, pp. 35-37.
[102] Letter from Horse Guards to Major-General Clarke, Horse Guards, 4 May 1795 in RCC, Vol I, pp. 38.
[103] Samkin, *Trader Sailor Spy: The Case of John Pringle and the Transfer of Accounting Technology to the Cape of Good Hope*, pp.18-19.

involved himself with the EEIC island government's plans to take the Cape. But, upon learning of Elphinstone's vanguard force already travelling to the Cape, these St. Helena plans were shelved.[104] As a consequence of this, Pringle was no longer on the ground at the Cape when the vanguard force arrived. That would hinder the vanguard force's access to military intelligence on Cape colonial affairs in order to better inform their position and engagement with the Dutch Cape settlement. Lack of reliable military intelligence increased the uncertainty and insecurity of the mission.

Arriving at the Cape to Conquer and Occupy

As previously discussed, this mission to take control of the Cape has been investigated by Thean Potgieter and Albert Grundlingh.[105] They focus on Admiral Keith Elphinstone's (the Commander of this mission) role in this conquest. In spite of the great EEIC presence in their narrative, these authors do not critically highlight the importance of the Company's crucial military and supportive contribution and involvement in the success of this British military enterprise

In June 1795, the St. Helena British military forces arrived at the Cape. They informed the VOC government that the Dutch Republic in Holland had fallen to France. As such, they informed this VOC government that they had arrived to act to secure the Cape against their mutual enemy, which was explained to be in Dutch interests. The British commanders Keith Elphinstone and James Craig, proclaimed that they intended to take control with or without the VOC's Governor Sluysken's consent.[106] However, the VOC Governor informed these British commanders that he had to make an effort to understand the current situation in Europe, and stalled on allowing the British to take immediate possession of the settlement.[107] Colonel Robert Gordon, a Dutch ally gained from Pringle's time at the Cape, feared that the British presence might destabilise the internal state of the colony by prompting French sympathisers to take action. He affirmed France and its revolutionary Jacobin principles as a common enemy to both British and Dutch interests, and reassured Elphinstone that he would rather serve Britain than a French Dutch Republic.[108]

---

[104] Ibid, pp.19-20.
[105] Potgieter and Grundlingh, *Admiral Elphinstone and the Conquest and Defence of the Cape of Good Hope, 1795-96*, pp.39, 40, 42, 43.
[106] Letter from Admiral Elphinstone and Major-General Craig to Governor Sluysken, Cape Town, 13 June 1795 in RCC, Vol I, p.41.
[107] Letter from Governor Sluysken to Admiral Elphinstone, Cape Town, 13 June 1795 in RCC, Vol I, p.43.
[108] Letter from Colonel Robert Gordon to Admiral Elphinstone, Cape Town, 14 June 1795 in RCC, Vol I, p.45.

At that moment, commander Craig received an intelligence communication from a Lieutenant-Colonel Mackenzie at Cape Town that concerned Sluysken and the government Council opinion on receiving the British commanders letter:

> […] they sat till a late hour, it is composed of six members who are European Africans who regulate every thing in the most despotick manner and have monopolised all the public Offices, they are held in great abhorrence by the people in general who are I think ready to serve under any other Masters the Governor has a *decided Vote* in Council, that is he alone can adopt any measures, and has of late used his Authority he assured us to-day that all were unanimous in the Council but of this Captain Hardy will explain I rather think they are not likely suddenly, to coincide with our wishes, I am endeavouring to get every information as to their Forces, posts, provisions, population &c. and have been much indebted to the good Offices of two English Officers of the East India Company Service who are here […][109]

Intelligence from Company soldiers, staying in Cape Town, informed the British commander's view that the Cape was poorly governed, and that the colonial inhabitants desired anyone but the current VOC to administrate the colony. These inhabitants feared losing their monetary means of trade should the British take possession of the Cape.[110] A British soldier explained that Sluysken, although not committing to any action, was pleased to see the British, but did not want them to land and destabilise an already volatile situation.[111] This displays the importance of accessible intelligence, as it gave these British commanders insight and confidence to formulate and implement a plan of action. Company soldiers in this instance, are shown to be supplying needed intelligence to promote a successful plan of action. To this effect, the commanders identified Camps Bay and Muizenberg beach as possible entry and staging points to take the Cape. But, they believed that to be successful they would need additional naval and army reinforcements, and monetary finance from St. Helena and Clarkes St. Salvador Company transported force.[112]

[109] Letter from Lieutenant-Colonel Mackenzie to Major-General Craig, Cape Town, June 1795 in RCC, Vol I, pp.46-47.
[110] Letter from Lieutenant-Colonel Mackenzie to Major-General Craig, Cape Town, June 1795 in RCC, Vol I, pp.46-47.; Letter from Major-General Craig to Right Honourable Henry Dundas, Cape Town, 3 July 1795 in RCC, Vol I, pp.100-101;
[111] Letter from Captain Hardy Narrative, Cape Town, 13 to 15 June 1795 in RCC, Vol I, pp. 48-49.
[112] Letter from Major-General Craig to Right Honourable Henry Dundas, Cape Town, 16 June 1795 in RCC, Vol I, pp. 52-55.; Letter from admiral Elphinstone to Governor Brooke, Simon's Bay, 17 June 1795 in RCC, Vol I, p. 63.

Intelligence from Cape Town informed the British commanders' belief that the Dutch Governor was untrustworthy and was inclined to ally with France if the opportunity presented itself. As such, the British commanders moved to address the colonial inhabitants and sway them to their side. To do so, they proclaimed that they would put the Cape colony under British protection until the war in Europe was settled and the Dutch Republic was restored.[113] Yet, in spite the British commander's intention to pacify the increasingly unfavourable situation, their proclamation only resulted in more antagonism from the inhabitants against the British presence. The Burgher council rejected all British declarations and overtures. While the Governor continued to delay on his decision. [114]

The delays proved detrimental to the waiting British force: colonial inhabitants no longer provided provisions to the British force and abandoned the healthcare of sick British soldiers at the hospital – leaving them to die. [115] The latter incident particularly aggrieved Admiral Elphinstone, as this put British military labour-force and, therefore, also the mission in grave danger.[116] This attention to the healthcare of sick British soldiers is significant as it shows that the social reproduction of the British military force was crucial to the British notion of security.

However, the EEIC had committed a great deal of its resources to get troops to the Cape and assist with the reproduction of the military. An effort in which Pringle was actively involved. At the end of June, agent Pringle arrived at the Cape. He had invaluable, intimate knowledge of the Cape settlement from his previous stay, and he provided tactical and material advantage to the British commanders waiting at the Cape. On Pringle's immediate arrival, he was required to call upon the needed food provision, soldier reinforcement and finances from St. Helena to relieve the unfavourable situation. Pringle implored St. Helena that if the fleet did not get the required provisions, the vanguard force would be in a distressing situation.[117] It would appear that the British military commanders were dependent on Pringle's authority,

[113] Proclamation from Major-General Dundas, Cape Town, 18 June 1795 in RCC, Vol I, p. 64.
[114] Letter from Admiral Elphinstone to Governor Sluysken, Cape Town, 21 June 1795 in RCC, Vol I, pp. 69-70.; Letter from Governor Sluysken and Council of Policy to Admiral Elphinstone, Cape Town, 21 June 1795 in RCC, Vol I, pp. 71-72.; Letter from Burgher Council to Admiral Elphinstone and Major-General Craig, Cape Town, 25 June 1795 in RCC, Vol I, p. 76.; Letter from Admiral Elphinstone and Major-General Craig to Right Honourable Henry Dundas, Cape Town, 27 June 1795 in RCC, Vol I, p. 80.
[115] Ibid.
[116] Letter from Admiral Elphinstone to Governor Sluysken, Cape Town, 21 June 1795 in RCC, Vol I, p.71.
[117] Letter from John Pringle to Governor Brooke, Simon's Bay, 27 June 1795 in RCC, Vol I, pp. 85-86.; Letter from John Pringle to EEIC Secret Committee, Simon's Bay, 27 June 1795, BL: IOR G/9/1., pp. 33-35.

management and coordination of EEIC controlled resources in order to sustain the military mission.

Later in October, Pringle reported that St. Helena Governor, Robert Brook, sent the *Arniston* and *Orpheus*, back, to the British assault force with £5000. This money had been consigned for the use of the expedition. Pringle explained that this had been done to pay for the EEIC troop detachments sent from St. Helena to support the mission.[118] This shows EEIC St. Helena as a key asset to sustain and maintain the British military effort to secure the Cape.

Pringle proceeded to stay at the designated resident's house in Cape Town. From the resident's house he relayed detailed information. This included describing that many of the colonial inhabitants held Jacobin dispositions and delusions of independence and were unfavourably disposed toward the potential British occupation. This concerned the British commanders.[119] Their anxiety increased when VOC military and militia (of indigenous inhabitants) mobilised near Cape Town, and its immediate surroundings, such as Muizenberg beach. These movements fuelled the suspicions of British commanders that the VOC Governor was their main opponent, and that his government was untrustworthy and inclined toward the French, and hostile to the British presence.[120]

These fears appeared to be justified when the British intercepted a Dutch maritime communication that informed VOC Cape government of a Dutch and French alliance in Europe. This communication directed the VOC Cape government to protect all VOC property at the Cape under the new French directed governance.[121] This led Elphinstone to embargo all Dutch ships in and entering Cape ports to stop any action against British forces.[122] This embargo illustrates that controlling maritime information, intelligence and ship movements into, at and out of Cape bays and ports were crucial to taking control of the Cape.

In the context of increasing volatile shore, and potential maritime hostility against them, the British commanders believed that they had tried everything in their power to peacefully

[118] Letter from John Pringle to the EEIC Secret Committee, IOR G/9/6, 14 October 1795, p.8.
[119] Letter from John Pringle to Governor Brooke, Simon's Bay, 27 June 1795 in RCC, Vol I, pp. 85-86.; Letter from Admiral Elphinstone to Right Honourable Henry Dundas, Cape Town, 17 June 1795 in RCC, Vol I, pp. 60-62
[120] Letter from Admiral Elphinstone to Right Honourable Henry Dundas, Cape Town, 3 July 1795 in RCC, Vol I, pp. 102, 105.
[121] Letter from Admiral Elphinstone to Right Honourable Henry Dundas, Cape Town, 28 June 1795 in RCC, Vol I, pp. 86-89.
[122] Proclamation from Admiral Elphinstone to Captains and Commanders of Dutch ships in Simon's Bay, Cape Town, 28 June 1795 in RCC, Vol I, p. 90.; Letter from Admiral Elphinstone to Governor Sluysken and Council of Policy, Cape Town, 30 June 1795 in RCC, Vol I, pp. 97-98.; Letter from Admiral Elphinstone to Right Honourable Henry Dundas, Cape Town, 3 July 1795 in RCC, Vol I, pp. 102, 105.

secure the Cape, and that the only course of action left was to proceed in using force. By July 1795, the British commanders had assessed their urgent situation and affirmed their need for reinforcements from EEIC St. Helena and the secondary force, waiting at St. Salvador, to do so.[123] This urgency was felt by Major-General Clarke and by EEIC ship captains at St. Salvador, who were anxious to join the other British commanders at the Cape.[124] The British Cape vanguard commanders used July as a preparation period to consolidate their own force in preparation for an attack on the settlement.[125]

The British Assault to Take the Cape, August 1795

On 7 August 1795, after they had secured Simon's Town, the British began their assault on Muizenberg beach, the "Thermopylae of the Cape Peninsula".[126] The British force, however, was unable to make territorial progress and were forced to dig in and hold their position at Muizenberg beach. At this time, British commanders, again, addressed the colonial inhabitants, and stated that their reinforcements were coming and they would prefer to avoid unnecessary bloodshed when they took possession of the Cape. This announcement went unheeded by the VOC government and the armed inhabitants that had been rallied.[127]

Soon after, on 9 August, the EEIC Indiaman *Arniston* arrived from St. Helena with 400 additional Company troops, £10000,and military equipment, to relieve and reinforce this British vanguard force.[128] Elphinstone used this opportunity to send communications with the EEIC *Arniston* ship, and Danish ship *Prince of Gustenburg*, to the EEIC Madras and Bengal Presidencies.[129] This was to update them on the Cape mission, and request provision and reinforcement for themselves.[130] As the assault persevered on Muizenberg beach, Major-General Clarke arrived on 3 September with the second British force from St. Salvador. This

[123] Letter from Major-General Craig to Right Honourable Henry Dundas, Cape Town, 3 July 1795 in RCC, Vol I, p. 99.
[124] Letter from Major-General Clarke to Right Honourable Henry Dundas, St. Salvador, 26 July 1795 in RCC, Vol I, p. 112.
[125] Theal,G. M., *Records of the Cape Colony from February 1793 to [April 1831], Volume 1: Copied for the Cape Government, from the Manuscript Documents in the Public Record Office, London* (London: Printed for the Government of the Cape Colony, 1897), pp.86, 92, 97, 99, 100, 102, 111, 112.
[126] Potgieter and Grundlingh, *Admiral Elphinstone and the Conquest and Defence of the Cape of Good Hope, 1795-96*, pp.48.
[127] Letter from Admiral Elphinstone to Right Honourable Henry Dundas, Cape Town, 18 August 1795 in RCC, Vol I, p. 113.; Address to Inhabitants of the colony of the Cape, Cape town, August 1795 in RCC, Vol I, pp. 117-118.
[128] General return of assistance forwarded by the *Arniston* to the disposal of Admiral Elphinstone, Cape Town, 1795 in RCC, Vol I, p. 111.; Potgieter and Grundlingh, *Admiral Elphinstone and the Conquest and Defence of the Cape of Good Hope, 1795-96*, p.51.
[129] Summary of the proceedings of the squadron under Admiral Elphinstone, Cape Town, 17 June – 14 September 1795 in RCC, Vol I, p. 123.
[130] Ibid.

force arrived with a fleet of EEIC ships: *Northumberland*, *Prince William Henry*, *Exeter*, *Worcester*, *Osterley*, *Kent*, *Brunswick*, *Bombay Castle*, *Earl Cornwallis*, *Earl Howe*, *Deptford*, *General Coote*, *Warren Hastings*, and the armed transport *Prince of Wales*, which arrived on 9 September.[131]

The arrival of these auxiliary forces and reinforcements allowed the British to successfully invade and take Muizenberg beach, and then swiftly advance toward Cape Town. The British advancement forced the VOC government into a truce and negotiation. For the British, the negotiation was handled by Major-General Clarke.[132] During the truce, the VOC government realised that their military situation against the British force was untenable, which led to the capitulation of the VOC government, and victory for the British. The British formally took possession of the Cape on the 16 September 1795.[133] The success of this operation caused Henry Dundas to describe the Cape as an "essential establishment under the dominion of Great Britain", as this Cape expedition was vital to the strategic prevention of threats to British India.[134]

In this British assault on Muizenberg beach, the timely arrival of EEIC military, and financial reinforcement are seen to have played a pivotal role in strengthening the British force's position on the beach. Relieving the British commanders stress and anxiety over their military and financial insecurity, boosting the British commanders' confidence in the success of the mission, and maintaining momentum of the assault against the Cape VOC government. The Company's ships, in the first case of the *Arniston*, provided invaluable lines of communication and supply from allied bases of operation – EEIC St. Helena and EEIC British India Presidencies - to the Cape British occupational force. The arrival of the second force under Clarke, with the fleet of EEIC vessels under his command, gave the British the increased force they needed to overwhelm the VOC's armed forces. In these cases, EEIC

[131] Summary of the proceedings of the squadron under Admiral Elphinstone, Cape Town, 17 June – 14 September 1795 in RCC, Vol I, p. 125.; Potgieter and Grundlingh, *Admiral Elphinstone and the Conquest and Defence of the Cape of Good Hope, 1795-96*, 51.
[132] Summary of the proceedings of the squadron under Admiral Elphinstone, Cape Town, 17 June – 14 September 1795 in RCC, Vol I, p. 125.; Letter from Governor Sluysken to Major-General Clarke, Cape Town, 14 September 1795 in RCC, Vol I, p. 126; Letter from Major-General Clarke to Governor Sluysken, Cape Town, 14 September 1795 in RCC, Vol I, p. 127.
[133] Summary of the proceedings of the squadron under Admiral Elphinstone, Cape Town, 17 June – 14 September 1795 in RCC, Vol I, p. 125.; Letter from Governor Sluysken to Major-General Clarke, Cape Town, 14 September 1795 in RCC, Vol I, p. 126; Letter from Major-General Clarke to Governor Sluysken, Cape Town, 14 September 1795 in RCC, Vol I, p. 127.; Potgieter and Grundlingh, *Admiral Elphinstone and the Conquest and Defence of the Cape of Good Hope, 1795-96*, p.51.
[134] Potgieter and Grundlingh, *Admiral Elphinstone and the Conquest and Defence of the Cape of Good Hope, 1795-96*, p.53.

ships, soldiers and finance proved critical in assisting and replenishing British military labour and material forces to successfully occupy the Cape. It could be said that without EEIC support, the British mission would not have been successful.

While the British force had made its territorial advances, the British commanders were similarly weary of French threats in the British maritime zone, which now included the Cape. They discussed a plan to attack Madagascar to disrupt enemy supply and provision to Mauritius, and entertained the possibility of using the Cape, instead of St. Helena, as a transnational troop depot to strengthen other British colonial garrisons after taking it.[135] The commanders relied on the EEIC and its St. Helena government for supply of both (provision and troops), in order to sustain their intended military operation. The British Navy planned ahead to combat these enemy threats from Madagascar. This included stopping colonial merchants in the Cape from trading with all foreign ships, such as suspected smugglers, who might aid their enemies in India and the French Indian Ocean islands.[136]

The British commanders praised the sailors and soldiers who persevered in the fight to take the Cape. Admiral Elphinstone and Major-Generals Clarke and Craig commended the seamen of the EEIC for volunteering in the assault and stated that the EEIC at their disposal were useful in naval manoeuvres that led to the success of their military operation.[137] This praise of EEIC seamen is of particular importance, as it is described to be active and important to British forces in the assault. It is also interesting that the British commanders chose to single out for praise the efforts from these EEIC seamen, as though they were a separate "people". This recognition and deference displayed by the British commanders highlights and traces the Company as a powerful entity in the political dynamics of the British imperial state. This reinforces the argument that not only did the EEIC play a vital part in the British forces successful mission to secure the Cape, but it also acted an essential role in instructing and overseeing the imperial military and political direction of the British imperial state to take the Cape. Additionally, these commanders remarked that their success would make the Cape the

[135] Letter from Admiral Elphinstone to Evan Nepean, Cape Town, 4 July 1795 in RCC, Vol I, pp. 106-107.; Letter from Admiral Elphinstone to Right Honourable Henry Dundas, Cape Town, 4 July 1795 in RCC, Vol I, p. 108.
[136] Letter from Admiral Elphinstone to Right Honourable Henry Dundas, Cape Town, 12 September 1795 in RCC, Vol I, p. 119.
[137] Letter from Commodore Blankett to Admiral Elphinstone, Cape Town, 19 September 1795 in RCC, Vol I, p. 135.; Letter from Major-General Craig to Admiral Elphinstone, Cape Town, 20 September 1795 in RCC, Vol I, p. 147.; Letter from Admiral Elphinstone to Right Honourable Henry Dundas, Cape Town, 21 September 1795 in RCC, Vol I, p. 157.; Letter from Major-General Craig to Right Honourable Henry Dundas, Cape Town, 12 September 1795 in RCC, Vol I, p. 148.

overarching common rendezvous base for British ships intending to protect British Indian interests.[138]

Conclusion

In this chapter, I have drawn attention to the territorial location of the Cape – situated as a strategic point of entry for Europeans into the Indian Ocean, and a place that was passed by hundreds of vessels travelling between Europe and the East Indies. I have also highlighted that the Cape was important to European maritime powers because it secured the healthcare and repair of their transoceanic moving labour and material forces that were needed to expand, and constitute imperial, and commercial goals in the Indian Ocean. As a refreshment station it reduced the risk of labour and material loss. Hence, the Cape occupied a pivotal position on the Company's transoceanic shipping and transport route. In this historical context, the EEIC had a long interest in the security of the Cape. These interests became urgent in the 1770s and 1780s, a time of global hostility and uncertainty. The risk and uncertainty toward its own commercial and political interests made the EEIC attentive toward affairs and activity that endangered the security of those interests at the Cape. Through EEIC agent, John Pringle, in this turbulent period, it was revealed that Federici's notion of social reproduction[139] was important to promoting and protecting EEIC security interests. I argued that this notion was significant in Company motivation to instigate joint Company-Crown military action to take control of the Cape and keep it secure.

Subsequently, in this chapter I highlighted interconnected themes: the notion of security. To the EEIC, and British Empire, this notion was maritime, commercial, political and military orientated that was framed by the protection of labour and material reproduction, and the access and distribution of intelligence. These aspects of this security notion were framed around securing the Cape to promote broader British imperial (Company and Crown) assets. In the unfolding of these events it was revealed a construction of particular maritime zone, that included Cape waters. To the British, this maritime zone encompassed the Brazilian coast and St. Helena in the Atlantic Ocean, to the Indian Ocean Islands of Madagascar, Mauritius and Reunion, and from 1795 the Cape became even more central to the constitution of this zone.

[138] Ibid.

[139] The activities and work of maintaining and sustaining labour and material forces.

I showed that the EEIC was a main instigator of the invasion to occupy the Cape. This was to protect its transoceanic shipping and labour forces and reduce security risks in this maritime zone to them. The Company did this by providing intelligence that informed military and diplomatic advice. The motivation, in collaboration with the British Crown, was to protect and promote mutual imperial and commercial interests against their mutual global enemy, France. As such, to achieve this, securing the Cape to protect Company ships and trade was an important objective. From this we can see that the mission to conquer the Cape was shown to be a joint operation between the EEIC and British Crown government. Thus, in this operation, EEIC intelligence, organisational, transport, finance, labour and settlement resources were shown to be necessary to reproduce the labour and material forces that were crucial to promote and consolidate the success of the mission.

Chapter 5

Keeping the Cape Secure: Constituting the Administration and Maritime Zone

Introduction

In this chapter, I examine the role of the EEIC in the British administration of the Cape. At the beginning of the British occupation, the Cape was declared a Crown colony, however, it was made explicit that the EEIC Chartered authority and jurisdiction would be protected and not interfered with. This made the Cape colony under the British, a Crown government colony within the Chartered jurisdiction and authority of the EEIC.[1]

The colonial administration experienced a number of changes in leadership between 1795 and 1803. For the first months of the occupation, the Cape was ruled by British commanding officers - Admiral Keith Elphinstone, Generals Alured Clarke and Henry Craig - until the colony was perceived to be stable. In November 1795, Craig was appointed Commandant of the Cape and placed in charge of all civil and military matters. He was replaced by a civilian, Lord George Earl McCartney, in May 1797 until the end of 1798. But McCartney was forced to step down due to ill health. After this, Major-General Francis Dundas (the Cape's appointed Lieutenant Governor) briefly served as the Acting Governor of the colony until the end of 1799. Sir George Yonge, installed as the new civilian Governor, did not serve long and, as will be discussed in greater detail, was dismissed under a cloud in 1801. Finally, Dundas, once again, served as Acting Governor until the occupation ended in 1803.

It is interesting to note that, while the administration was served by six Crown governors during the occupation, the EEIC was considerably more stable during the same time; represented by John Pringle throughout, who already had some experience of the Cape. As will be noted, this continuity strengthened Pringle's position. Pringle was not simply a Company man and, perhaps demonstrating the close linkages between Company and Crown at the Cape, was also appointed Commissary-General to the Crown in 1795 - this made him chief representative in charge of provisioning the Cape Crown army.[2]

---

[1] Address from the British Officers to the inhabitants of the Cape colony, Cape Town, 22 September 1795 in RCC, Vol I, p. 153; Letter from Admiral Elphinstone to Right Honourable Henry Dundas, Table Bay, 10 October 1795 in RCC, Vol I, p. 185; Letter from Agent John Pringle to EEIC Secretary William Ramsay, Cape Town, 27 March 1800 in RCC, Vol III, pp. 83-85.

[2] Samkin, *Trader Sailor Spy: The Case of John Pringle and the Transfer of Accounting Technology to the Cape of Good Hope*, p.21.

The additional aims of this chapter are to explore the uniquely configured administrative arrangement instituted by the British at the Cape, and highlight ways in which maritime, political, trade, reproduction, intelligence and regulatory features of the security were realised to keep the British Cape secure. I argue that the Company, through Pringle, played a key role in providing support and resources to and had considerable influence on the manner in which the British colonial administration was able to govern the Cape colony.

Subsequently, the British Cape was a Crown colony within the Company's Chartered jurisdiction and authority, and in this, the Cape is shown to be integrated and influenced by the transnational and transoceanic configured British imperial maritime network. The main argument is that in order to protect and promote mutual Company and Crown interests, the EEIC Directorate offered support from this transoceanic network. This support effected the way that the Cape was governed, and made the EEIC, through Pringle, an active, involved and influential presence in the administration of the colony.

Accordingly, this Chapter explores the EEIC's part in securing the Cape, through examining a number of overlapping concerns: defence against external maritime threats and the constitution and maintenance of the British maritime zone, trade and local commodity consumption, integration of the Cape in British transnational networks, reproduction of the colony and food security, and mitigating against internal colonial threats to the colony's security.

Significance of the British Occupation

The first British Cape occupation falls into a 'transition period'. Some scholars deem it an important period that transitioned to state-directed imperialism and the establishment of the modern colonial state.[3] Despite the period's perceptible consequence, there has only been significant examination of the Crown aspects of British colonial administration, with not much attention given to Company involvement. Furthermore, this study, which broadly looks at the relationship between corporate entities and the colonial state, suggests that even though there was a separation between commercial entities and the colonial state during the first British occupation, companies such as the EEIC continued to be involved in and influence administration.

[3] Ulrich, *Counter Power and Colonial Rule in the Eighteenth-Century Cape of Good Hope: Belongings and Protest of the Labouring Poor*, pp.53, 195.

After the British Occupation (1795 to 1803), the Cape was handed back to the Dutch Batavian Republic (1803 to 1806), and occupied again by the British in 1806, and officially ceded to the British in 1814. It is at this time, under the rhetoric of free trade and labour, that the state expanded into new areas of life and modernised the state bureaucracy.[4]

Nigel Worden, Elizabeth van Heyningen and Vivian Bickford-Smith briefly look at this particular period. They describe a heavy Company presence and involvement in the Cape British administration and society, but do not critically engage or detail this Crown-Company relationship.[5] Wayne Dooling explores the making of the Cape colonial elite, but glosses over the subject in the first British occupation. He mainly highlights that British imperialism operated through local collaborators to gain dominance in a colony.[6] Timothy Keegan questions and explains that the origin and foundations of the racism that informed the Apartheid state can be neatly traced back to the early colonial Cape. He examines British influences on these developments from the time of the American and French revolutions.[7] Keegan frames British motivation through political and commercial power that was driven by emerging capitalist economic relations, and considers early and later British socio-political influences on state development.[8] But, the first British occupation is only briefly touched upon and not critically examined.[9] David Johnson looks at the way in which the Cape Colony was imagined as a political community by various Portuguese, French, British and American writers from 1500s to the 1830s.[10] He examines debates around Northern hemispheric conceptions and exportations of nationhood to European colonies, and political debates on the manner in which the post-Apartheid experience informed the reading of South Africa's colonial past.[11] In reference to the Cape, maritime activity and trade are described, but not elaborated on as important facets to the continued European interaction there.[12] Johnson highlights the importance of Britain occupying and then colonising the Cape from 1795 to 1910. He explains that over this period the British model of nationalism became hegemonic

[4] Ibid.
[5] Worden,N., Van Heyningen,E. and Bickford-Smith,V., *Cape Town :The Making of a City : An Illustrated Social History* (Cape Town: David Phillip, 1998), pp.96-99.
[6] Dooling,W., "The Making of a Colonial Elite: Property, Family and Landed Stability in the Cape Colony, c.1750-1834". *Journal of Southern African Studies,* 31: 1, pp.151, 154.
[7] Keegan,T. J., *Colonial South Africa and the Origins of the Racial Order* (Cape Town: D. Philip, 1996), pp.14, 15, 37.
[8] Ibid, p.37.
[9] Ibid, pp.42, 47.
[10] Johnson, D., *Imagining the Cape Colony: History, Literature, and the South African Nation* (Edinburgh University Press, 2011), pp. 1, 7.
[11] Ibid, p.3.
[12] Ibid, pp. 11, 16, 17, 41.

in South Africa and was the model against which all others reacted.[13] When examining the first occupation period, Johnson's attention is toward the land and focuses on the Boer rebellions, and the degree to which these rebellions have influenced the construction of Afrikaner national identity. In this analysis, the VOC is prominent in his narrative, while the EEIC is not.[14] Nigel Worden engages with the social history of the Cape during the Dutch colonial period over the eighteenth-century to better understand the social identity of those who lived there. But does critically stretch his study into the British first occupation.[15] The study strongly interrogates the VOC presence, and does not look at the EEIC's presence there or its relationship to the Cape and VOC.[16] By focusing on the Cape's port settlement interactions, it is argued that the Cape was shaped by wider forces beyond its geographical confines, and explains that the Cape had extensive maritime activity that connected it to the wider contexts of the Atlantic and Indian Oceans. It is stressed that the Cape was, in this way, entangled in complex connections with Europe, Asia and Africa. This highlights the importance of the Cape's maritime dimension.[17] Maurice Boucher and Nigel Penn account and chronicle the British first occupation at the Cape from various British Cape government officials' perspectives. But, their study is more of a description than a critical analysis of the period.[18] The period is noted to be both turbulent and critical to founding Britain's colonial rule and influence in South Africa. The Cape is explained to be essential to Britain's India transoceanic sea route, whereby controlling the Cape was highlighted to be paramount to British naval strategy and trade successes. Yet, in spite of recognising the importance of this maritime dimension, this aspect of the of the British occupation is not deeply examined.[19] In their study, the EEIC is highly visible and its presence and involvement strongly acknowledged. However, despite its recognition and visibility, the study does not delve into the meaning of this presence or critically look at the relationships and influences that the Company had during this period.[20] Alan Lester examines the discourses and practices of British colonialism. His study focuses on the colonization of the Xhosa at the Cape colony in the nineteenth-century where he links the British colonial projects across, and within,

[13] Ibid, pp. 3-77.
[14] Ibid, pp. 117, 136-137.
[15] Worden, N., *Cape Town between East and West: Social Identities in a Dutch Colonial Town* (Jacana Media, 2012), pp. ix-x, xi-xii.
[16] Ibid, pp. 126-135.
[17] Ibid, pp. xxi-xxii, 84-87.
[18] Boucher, M and Penn, N., *Britain at the Cape, 1795 to 1803* (Brenthurst, 1992), pp. 5, 11.
[19] Ibid, p. 14.
[20] Ibid, pp. 17, 20, 67, 69, 79-80, 88, 183-187, 227.

transnational European networks, and explains that interconnected British colonial discourses developed by building on one another.[21] In this link, Lester argues that the British government structures that sought to control the Xhosa resulted through their transnational connections with other colonial projects in the transnational imperial network.[22] In this study, he briefly covers late eighteenth-century South Africa to provide context to the colonial and indigenous interactions and conflicts. Lester touches on the 1790s but does not examine or describe the first British occupation and is more cognizant of British presence and influence from the British second occupation onwards.[23] His study is more landed and does not actively engage in the Cape's maritime dimension, in spite of explaining the importance of the transnational connections. Additionally, Lester gives greater recognition and impact to the VOC, rather than the EEIC in the contextualisation of his analysis.[24]

Organising the Administration: Military Imperative

From the 16 September to 15 November 1795, the British took charge of the colonial administration of the Cape. This period of British administration was distinctly military, and the British commanders, Elphinstone, Clarke and Craig, took joint command.[25] Pringle asserted that at the beginning there was much hurry and confusion, and that all exertions were being made to bring the Cape colony into a perfect state of order.[26] The commanders assessed the situation, evaluating the military threats to newly occupied British Cape. This included taking stock of the labour, material, provision and trade resources at the Cape settlement, which were perceived to be important to the broader security of the Cape.[27]

Pringle played an important part in providing information on these resources, which informed the commanders' action and decisions. For instance, as displayed by Clarke:

> This part of the [Cape] Country having little or no Wood in it, Mr. Pringle the Commissary tells me it will be hardly possible to procure as much as it is requisite to be delivered to the Troops for the necessary use of Cooking; and, if to be had at all, not without very great difficulty and expense – I therefore beg leave to suggest

[21] Lester, A., *Imperial Networks: Creating Identities in Nineteenth-Century South Africa and Britain* (Routledge, 2005)., pp. Preface, 5.
[22] Ibid, pp. 5, 176.
[23] Ibid, pp. 10, 12, 14-15, 16.
[24] Ibid, p. 9.
[25] Proclamation by the British Commanders Major-General Clarke, Admiral Elphinstone and Major-General Craig, Cape Town, 19 September 1795 in RCC, Vol I, pp.140-141.
[26] Letter from John Pringle to EEIC Secret Committee, 14 October 1795, BL: IOR G/9/6. p. 8.
[27] Ibid.

> whether it may not be proper to send out some Coals for this purpose on Trial, as well as for the use of the Forges, by an early opportunity.[28]

This excerpt indicates that the British commanders relied on Pringle's intelligence and knowledge of the Cape colony to evaluate the available supplies and materials needed to keep the Cape secure. For the commanders, this was so that they could organise the transoceanic movement and supply of needed materials and provisions to maintain, sustain, repair and replenish the British armed labour and material force stationed at the Cape. This also displays the military's reliance on imported maritime labour and materials to preserve their capacity to uphold and pursue a sustained military effort. In this instance, Pringle appears to be working closely with Clarke, and this suggests that Pringle served as an important and trusted advisor to the commanders, as the information that Pringle provided is indicated to shape governance decisions and action.

Clarke and Elphinstone, after evaluating the aggressive military way in which the British took control of the Cape, thought that it would be best for both of them to remain at the Cape for a further six-week period. This was so that they could "employ that Time in regulating the Affairs of this Place [the Cape] in the best manner" they could.[29] This importantly concerned the Cape's maritime dimension, as the Cape relied a great deal on its maritime trade, which was central to the prosperity of its economy, and stability of its colonial affairs.[30]

In this way, maritime trade and economy was a long-running and important feature of Cape colonial affairs, and accordingly, represented a significant space that had to be regulated to promote British security of the Cape, which included Company trading interests. Cape Town and Simon's Town ports were the central maritime trading places at the Cape, and consequently, key sites of this intended regulation. Here, the EEIC is key, and Elphinstone was adamant in protecting the EEIC's Charter at the Cape.[31] Thus, regulation included the banning of neutral ships from trading from the Cape.[32] There was also an important military dimension to regulation. Cape commanders feared that those same ships would go on to

[28] Letter from Major-General Clarke to Right Honourable Henry Dundas, Cape Town, 24 September 1795 in RCC, Vol I, pp. 163-164.
[29] Ibid, p. 164.
[30] Memorandum on the Condition of the Colony by Kersteins, Cape Town, No date 1795 in RCC, Vol I, p. 174.
[31] Letter from Admiral Elphinstone to Right Honourable Henry Dundas, Cape Town, 10 October 1795 in RCC, Vol I, pp. 186-187.
[32] Letter from Admiral Elphinstone to Right Honourable Henry Dundas, Cape Town, 12 September 1795 in RCC, Vol I, p. 119.

supply grain provision to their French enemy at Mauritius, and take commissions to capture British vessels, such as EEIC *Indiamen*.[33]

On Admiral Elphinstone's departure, 15 November 1795, he gave Commodore Blankett instructions.[34] These show that the constitution of a maritime zone under British authority that now included the Cape. Instructions included the disruption and interception of enemy trade and also of enemy ships provisioning off Madagascar and the French Mascarene Isles, and areas near there. The transoceanic security of the British Empire and the Cape depended on the protection of this military and trade maritime zone.[35] This identified Mauritius and Madagascar as significant threats to the British Cape within its maritime zone.

In line with EEIC Director Baring's designs, maritime security was highly prioritised from the beginning of the occupation. Soon after securing Table Bay, the British Navy of the Cape sought to ensure that the Atlantic and Indian Ocean coasts of the colony were safeguarded, and the broader security of British maritime zone maintained.[36] To achieve this, the Cape naval squadron was deployed to undertake regular patrols. These patrols were sent to the coasts of South America, and the waters of Madagascar and the French Isles (Mauritius and Reunion) to gather intelligence, and disrupt and intercept enemy trade.[37] Furthermore, the Cape squadron performed convoy protection duty for EEIC ships and fleets that were travelling through Cape waters.[38]

This purposeful convoy protection of EEIC ships by the Royal Navy at the Cape demonstrates that the Cape maritime zone to be particularly necessary for the military purpose of ensuring that European transoceanic trade and shipping was protected.[39] Subsequently, this also made this zone important for the protection and distribution of reproductive labour and material resources shipped from the Cape and through its waters. For instance, the Cape was seen as a key granary that supported the sustenance to other European

[33] Letter from Admiral Elphinstone to Right Honourable Henry Dundas, Cape Town, 10 October 1795 in RCC, Vol I, p. 185.
[34] Letter from John Pringle to EEIC Court of Directors, 23 December 1795, BL: IOR G/9/6. p. 12.
[35] Instructions to Commodore Blankett from Admiral Elphinstone, Cape Town, 12 November 1795 in RCC, Vol I, pp. 225-227.
[36] Ibid, Vol I, p. 228.
[37] Instructions Commodore Blankett by Admiral Elphinstone, Cape Town, 12 November 1795 in RCC, Vol I, p. 228; Letter from John Pringle to Governor Brooke, Cape Town, 7 July 1795, BL: IOR, G/9/1. p.45.
[38] Letter from Rear-Admiral Thomas Pringle to Evan Nepean, Cape Town, 28 April 1796 in RCC, Vol I, p. 375.
[39] Instructions to Commodore Blankett from Admiral Elphinstone, Cape Town, 12 November 1795 in RCC, Vol I, pp. 225-227.

maritime colonies networked within its waters, such as St. Helena and Mauritius.[40] This shows that access to the Cape's reproduction resources was crucial to European maritime powers. Thus, to further secure against French enemy powers, a policy of embargo would later be implemented by the British administration on Cape ports in particularly hostile and uncertain periods of military insecurity during the occupation. This policy was instituted to control the flow of harmful information, humans and material into and out of the colony that might aid British global enemies. In this manner, the constitution of this Cape maritime zone by the British was an important security measure.[41]

Regulating the movement of people out of the colony became an important security measure for the British commanders. For instance, the VOC government had used German mercenary troops to augment their Cape military force. The EEIC Director had advised Henry Dundas that these German troops had been "very much tinged with Jacobin principle" and could be influenced to revolt.[42] In light of this advice, steps were taken to move these potential threats out of the colony. These VOC German mercenary soldiers had been allowed to enlist in the EEIC military service and were then sent on to serve the Company's armed forces away from the colony.[43] This organised movement of 225 German soldiers by the British administration worked to simultaneously secure the Cape, and boost the Company's military force in India and St. Helena, keeping both British Cape and Indian interests secure.[44] To achieve this, agent Pringle was directed by Elphinstone to organise the required finances to transport these men out of the colony to both the EEIC Bengal Presidency and St. Helena.[45] Here, Company resources and networks play an important part in regulating the movement of people out of the Cape, particularly in and out of the maritime zone to keep the greater EEIC and Crown interests secure.[46] Much like with Clarke, this case shows that Pringle worked closely with Elphinstone. Pringle is highlighted to have close and effective working relationships with the commanders governing the British administration of the Cape.

[40] Letter from John Pringle to William Ramsay, 15 September 1798, BL: IOR G/9/6. p. 124.
[41] Ibid.
[42] Letter from Sir Francis Baring to Right Honourable Henry Dundas, Devonshire Square, 12 January 1795 in RCC, Vol I, p. 22.
[43] Letter from Admiral Elphinstone to Right Honourable Henry Dundas, Cape Town, 10 October 1795 in RCC, Vol I, p. 186.
[44] Letter from John Pringle to EEIC Secret Committee, 14 October 1795, BL: IOR G/9/6. p. 9.
[45] Letter from Admiral Elphinstone to Right Honourable Henry Dundas, Cape Town, 10 October 1795 in RCC, Vol I, p. 186.
[46] Letter from John Pringle to EEIC Court of Directors, 23 December 1795, BL: IOR G/9/6. p. 12.

In the evaluation of the Cape's landed military security, we find that the British commanders desired to have a bigger military force stationed at the Cape. To them, a bigger military labour-force was essential to keep the Cape both protected against maritime threat and keep the colonial society under their control. This was because the commanders were wary of the inhabitants, although were not presently hostile, but were considered to be favourably inclined to assisting French or Dutch military endeavours against the British, should the opportunity arise.[47]

This desire to have a bigger military force affirmed the importance of the regulation of maritime activity and that the regulation of colonial society was also central to imperial notions of security. In light of this, the commanders moved to secure the colonial forces internal affairs. They did this by re-instituting the Cape Town Burgher Senate, a council of colonial settlers that managed the Cape civil societal needs and grievances.[48] This Burgher Senate explained to the British commanders that the deterioration of the interior colony districts was detrimental to the security of the whole country. In this stead, the British administration started working to gain the cooperation and coordination of the Landdrosts (officials with local jurisdiction in the colonial districts) to administer the Stellenbosch, Swellendam and Graaff Reinet colonial districts.[49]

Graaff Reinet, in particular, was identified as a threat (and would prove a continuous threat), as this district was recognised as a site of "Jacobine Mania" that would incite rebellion in colony.[50] It was thought that the Jacobin inclination toward self-governance and independence evoked distrust against the British occupiers, and was a strong cause of colonial inhabitant hostility and antagonisms with the indigenous Xhosas and Khoisan, who lived nearby to the European settlers.[51] To regulate and manage this unfavourable sentiment, the commanders moved to reassure the colonial inhabitants that the British administration was working towards the welfare of the colony. [52]

[47] Letter from Major-General Clarke to Right Honourable Henry Dundas, Cape Town, 24 September 1795 in RCC, Vol I, p. 163.
[48] Appointment by Major-General Clarke and Admiral Elphinstone, Cape Town, 30 September 1795 in RCC, Vol I, pp. 175-176.
[49] Letter from Burghers of Graaff Reinet to Major-General Craig, Graaff Reinet, 29 October 1795 in RCC, Vol I, pp. 208-209.
[50] Memorandum on the Condition of the Colony by Kersteins, Cape Town, No date 1795 in RCC, Vol I, p. 168.; Letter from John Pringle to EEIC Secret Committee, 16 April 1796, BL: IOR G/9/6. p. 14.
[51] Letter from Major-General Clarke to Right Honourable Henry Dundas, Cape Town, 22 September 1795 in RCC, Vol I, p. 154-156.
[52] Ibid.

Additionally, the British commanders affirmed their idea of security to involve getting more troops to augment the Cape garrison, which was viewed to need no less than 3000 troops.[53] The supplementary troops were perceived to create a more secure environment and allow for a better regulated society. The British believed that this would be able to promote the welfare of the Cape inhabitants themselves, and serve British occupation interests.[54] As such, the Company, as a significant transporter of troops and official maritime trader, was vital to these British commanders' military objectives of constituting and reproducing this regulatory security.

While making efforts to boost the Cape military labour-force to maintain security, the commanders moved to placate inhabitants through other means. To do so, they proclaimed that there would be internal free trade and open public markets within the colony.[55] But, the British commanders only opened up the colony's coastal trade (whaling and fishing) to the inhabitants, but under controlled conditions that included needing Company regulated trade licences and working under the threat of colonial government instituted embargos. Such measures noticeably ensured that the EEIC Charter was not interfered with.[56]

The Cape Embedded in the British Transoceanic Network

By the time Major-General Craig was appointed as Commandant, the Cape was already being integrated within the larger British imperial maritime network. This is demonstrated in a letter from the Crown War Office to Major-General Craig, 22 January 1796, that directed the supply of Cape grain to Britain:

> SIR, - Enclosed I transmit to you the copy of an order of the Court of Directors to Mr Pringle, their Agent at the Cape of Good Hope, directing him to ship on board the Vessels therein named as much Wheat as he can procure, to be brought to England with as little delay as possible. As the purchase of Grain is undertaken by the East India Company, not so much with a view to any commercial benefit, as from a laudable motive of seconding, as far as may be in their power, the exertions making

[53] Van Niekerk, *The First British Occupation of the Cape of Good Hope and Two Prize Cases on Joint Capture in the High Court of Admiralty*, p.170.
[54] Letter from Major-General Clarke to Right Honourable Henry Dundas, Cape Town, 9 October 1795 in RCC, Vol I, p. 182.
[55] Proclamation by Major-General Clarke, Admiral Elphinstone and Major-General Craig, Cape Town, October 1795 in RCC, Vol I, pp. 179-181.
[56] Proclamation by Major-General Clarke, Admiral Elphinstone and Major-General Craig, Cape Town, October 1795 in RCC, Vol I, pp. 179-181.; Letter from Admiral Elphinstone to Right Honourable Henry Dundas, Cape Town, 10 October 1795 in RCC, Vol I, p. 187.

> by Parliament to diminish the high price of Grain, resulting from the uncommon and distressing scarcity which prevails in this Country and in the greatest part of Europe; I feel it a duty incumbent upon me to desire that you will take every step in your power to enable Mr Pringle to meet the anxious wish of the Court of Directors in effecting this object, and give him every assistance that he may require for procuring and shipping the expected supplies, which from your situation, you may be able to afford, without violence to private property or material injury to the Interests of the Colony itself.[57]

This communication shows the British Crown government commanding the Commandant to work closely with EEIC agent Pringle, in order to manage the resources of, and for, the British transoceanic Empire. Here, the Cape colonial government is shown to officially promote and support EEIC activity and affairs at the Cape to protect broader British European imperial interests.

Pringle's instructions display the EEIC Cape office to have separate and defined authority to the Crown colonial government. Pringle, distinctly described under Company authority, was drawn into matters concerning the governance of the colony in order for him to realise his instructions to procure the desired grain supply. In addition, these instructions highlight that the Cape being used to feed and economically secure imperial Britain. Company ships were to be sent to the Cape to officially transport the procured wheat to Britain. (It is interesting to note that these ships would be subsequently delayed at the Cape and that their labour-force on those ships would be used in the successful protection of the Cape against the Dutch in Saldanha Bay, 1796, to keep the British Cape secure.)[58]

It also significant to note that this communication demonstrates that the British governance of Cape colonial society was administrated in a transnational manner and illustrates that the Cape was integrated within the transnational British imperial maritime network. Additionally, the urgent desire for Cape grain indicates that the British Cape was not marginal to British imperial thinking and peripheral to its transnationally organised activity. The instruction to procure grain also affirms the governance of the Cape to be configured in a unique manner based on the close working relationship between the British War Office and EEIC Court of Directors, which is replicated in the relationship between the Cape Company agent and Cape

[57] Letter from the War Office to Major-General Craig, Horse Guards, 22 January 1796 in RCC, Vol I, p. 319.
[58] Letter from John Pringle to EEIC Secret Committee, 7 July 1796, BL: IOR G/9/6, p.22; Letter from John Pringle to EEIC Secret Committee, 20 August 1796, BL: IOR G/9/6. pp.34-36.

Governor. [59] Such collaboration was undertaken for the benefit of both Crown and Company.[60]

Partly due to the lack of sufficient understanding of Cape farming and weather patterns and party due to the urgent need of supply across the British Empire, especially in times of war, the shipping of the Cape grain stores proved to be a vital error, undermining the reproductive function of the Cape. Poor harvests and the lack of food reserves ensured that throughout the British occupation, the Cape experienced a dire grain scarcity and an enduring grain food crisis within the colony. The Cape administration perpetually had to institute measures and a commission to regulate the consumption, supply and redistribution of grain foods within the colony, and had to import grain to keep the colonial population and Cape military secure. The EEIC can be identified as a key contributing factor to this food crisis in the colony, influencing the British governance of the Cape colonial society to secure itself.[61] However, the EEIC, was involved in attempting to manage the problem, and Pringle was included in the colonial commission charged to manage and organise the implementation of the grain regulations.

EEIC and Security

Intelligence from Europe indicated that joint Dutch and French naval fleets were heading to the Indian Ocean.[62] Concern over this united effort would be increased by French and Dutch ship surveillance near Brazil and Tenerife (one of the Canary Islands off the coast of West Africa). Pringle reported that if such a force potentially united at Mauritius, then the British Cape would be greatly threatened.[63] The looming possibility of such a danger prompted much advanced naval and army preparation from the Cape administration.[64] It is important to recognise that many of the troops brought in to augment the Cape military against this attack were transported on outward and homeward bound EEIC fleets.[65] Pringle explained that the

[59] Address from the British Officers to the inhabitants of the Cape colony, Cape Town, 22 September 1795 in RCC, Vol I, p. 153.
[60] Address from the British Officers to the inhabitants of the Cape colony, Cape Town, 22 September 1795 in RCC, Vol I, p. 153; Letter from Admiral Elphinstone to Right Honourable Henry Dundas, Table Bay, 10 October 1795 in RCC, Vol I, p. 185.
[61] Minutes of Special and Supreme Commission appointed by the Governor for regulating consumption of colony grain, and for supply provision during present scarcity, Cape Town, 27 February 1801 to 27 January 1802 in RCC, Vol IV, pp. 149-215.
[62] Letter from the War Office to Major-General Craig, Horse Guards, 14 February 1796 in RCC, Vol I, p. 326.
[63] Letter from John Pringle to Governor Brooke, St. Helena, 7 July 1796, BL: IOR, G/9/1. p. 47.
[64] Letter from Admiral Elphinstone to Evan Nepean, Simon's Bay, 30 July 1796 in RCC, Vol I, p. 326.
[65] Letter from John Pringle to Governor Brooke, St. Helena, 7 July 1796, BL: IOR, G/9/1. p. 47; Letter from Major-General Craig to Right Honourable Henry Dundas, Cape Town, 30 July 1796 in RCC, Vol I, p. 415.

unexpected appearance of the Dutch enemy force (and the possibility of it being joined by 'disaffected inhabitants of the colony) prompted the 'most vigorous' British military defence of the Cape. [66] The well-prepared British administration forced the surrender of the Dutch squadron that landed in Saldanha Bay, 6 to 17 August 1796 (Saldanha Bay is directly north of Table Bay). Thus, Saldanha Bay was also incorporated in the Atlantic section of the British maritime zone to bolster the security of the Cape.[67]

The EEIC played a significant role in this effort to ensure that that the Cape military had the necessary troops and food provision to enforce and sustain this security.[68] Pringle had to land and manage all troops from the Company's *Indiamen* that had been laying over in False Bay, waiting for their naval convoys. According to Pringle, Craig then marched a total of 3000 troops to Saldanha Bay. Additionally, the EEIC supplied the necessary food to maintain the security effort. [69] Pringle explained that is was 'absolutely necessary', to land bread provisions at Saldanha Bay to subsist these troops, and only Company provisions were available to be given. Half of these provisions were then supplied for that military purpose with the knowledge that the Company Committee would approve of Pringle's assistance to the enterprise of a 'mightily national object', and one that so closely concerned EEIC interests – protecting Company ships.[70]

This event at Saldanha Bay demonstrates that the EEIC played an important part in the security of the Cape. The Company's transoceanic shipping network provided communication mediums to exchange military intelligence. EEIC fleets moving between oceans transported troops and food provision. When trading or laying over at the Cape to restore their health and repair ships, those on EEIC ships could be rallied to participate in military action, while EEIC ships supplied sailors and soldiers with much needed provisions. Agent Pringle was essential in the coordination, organisation and management of these Company human and material resources to the security benefit of the Company and the British colonial administration.

As Commissary-General to the Crown government, Pringle not only acquired the food and material provisions from the colony for military, but also was involved in the maintenance of

[66] Letter from Major-General Craig to Right Honourable Henry Dundas, Saldanha Bay, 19 August 1796 in RCC, Vol I, p. 433.
[67] Ibid.
[68] Letter from John Pringle to EEIC Secret Committee, 20 August 1796, BL: IOR G/9/6. pp.34-36.
[69] Ibid.
[70] Ibid.

Cape settlement public infrastructure, and other colonial government administrative duties.[71] This put him in a position to organise and manage Crown government resources in the British administration of the Cape. In this capacity Pringle is shown to be vital for the Crown government to coordinate, organise, manage and sustain Crown labour and materials toward constituting security at the Cape.

Furthermore, external maritime and colonial threats were not necessarily distinct. For instance, ongoing colonial inhabitant problems in Graaff Reinet came to a head in 1799. This resulted in a revolt against the British that led to wider confrontations with Khoisan rebels and Xhosa warbands over the course of 1799.[72] To subdue the rebellion and war in the district, the British setup an operating base in Algoa Bay. This base proved invaluable in defending against a French frigate that landed in the Bay, thought to aid the Graaff Reinet rebels. This incident confirmed the British need to protect and constitute a broader maritime zone that included the EEIC.[73]

1796 Order-in-Council: Constituting the British Cape Administrative Convention

At the end of Commandant Craig's tenure of governance, George Macartney arrived to take his position as Cape Governor on 5 May 1795. Prior to this appointment, Macartney had served as envoy extraordinary to the Empress of Russia in 1764, chief secretary of Ireland in 1769, Governor of Grenada in 1775, EEIC Governor of Madras in 1780, and ambassador extraordinary to the Emperor of China in 1792. This displayed his experience with both Company and Crown expectations and affairs.[74] Governor Macartney was commissioned and instructed by the War Office. But, his powers were framed through the December 1796 Order-in-Council that was instituted on the Cape colony. This Act originated from a proposal designed by Company Directors to regulate trade to, and from, the Cape.[75] This Order-in-Council officially guided the way in which the administration could govern the Cape

[71] Geber, *The East India Company and Southern Africa: A Guide to the Archives of the East India Company and the Board of Control, 1600-1858*, p.134.; Statement of Expenditure at Cape in Salaries and other Expenses as Issued by Warrants on Receiver-General of Major-General Craig, Cape Town, from 1 October 1795 to 31 March 1796 in RCC, Vol I, p. 350; Letter from Major-General Craig to Right Honourable Henry Dundas, Cape Town, 28 April 1796 in RCC, Vol I, p. 372.

[72] Proclamation by Major-General Dundas, Cape Town, 17 February 1799 in RCC, Vol II, p. 358.

[73] Letter from Major-General Dundas to Captain George Losack, Cape Town, 21 September 1799 in RCC, Vol II, p. 494; Letter from Lieutenant Fothergill to Captain Gooch, Algoa Bay, 21 September 1799 in RCC, Vol II, pp. 495-496.

[74]Theal, *Records of the Cape Colony from February 1793 to [April 1831], Volume 5: Copied for the Cape Government, from the Manuscript Documents in the Public Record Office, London*, pp.24-25.

[75] Geber, *The English East India Company at the Cape and the Cape of Good Hope Factory Records 1773–1836*, p.57.

settlement and defined the limits of the authority that could be exercised over trade and commerce. It also served to entrench the unique Company and Crown government administrative configuration at the Cape. This Act stated that:

> […] It shall be lawful, until further Order, for all Ships and vessels belonging to His Majesty's subjects, as well as Ships and Vessels belonging to the Subjects of any other Country or State with Amity with His Majesty, to enter into the Ports of said Settlement, […]. And it is His Majesty's Pleasure, that no goods, Wares, or Merchandize, the Growth, Produce or Manufacture of the Countries to the Eastward of the Cape of Good Hope, be imported into the said Settlement, or the Territories or Dependencies thereof, except by the United Company of Merchants trading to the East Indies; and that no such so Goods, Wares or Merchandize, be permitted to be exported thence, except for Sea Store only, or by the United Company of Merchants of England trading to the East Indies, or by their license. […][76]

In this exert of the Act, maritime activity that is related to trade at the Cape, and the provisioning of the colony was placed within the exclusive authority and jurisdiction of the EEIC. As a consequence, this Order-in-Council further enforced and strengthened the Company's Charter at the Cape. It did this by protecting and promoting the Company's East Indies monopoly trading privileges, this included its supply and redistribution of the import of East Indies commodities into Europe and the British Atlantic. In the previous section, the deployment of Cape naval convoys and patrols can be seen as the Crown taking an active part in the protection of EEIC trade.[77]

This Order gave the EEIC authority to control and regulate the trading and civil society provisioning of, and protected access to, the Cape settlement and its transoceanic maritime network. In the issuing of trading licenses, the EEIC could regulate who would have maritime access to the Cape, and its Charter limited the consumption of Cape colonial societal goods to Company East Indies produce, which could only be officially obtained through the Company.

For instance, at the end of July 1796, Pringle explained to the EEIC Secret Committee that after prohibiting foreign ships from trading at the Cape, a shortage of necessary commodities

[76] Order in Council signed by Steph Cottrell, Court of St. James, 28 December 1796 in RCC, Vol II, pp. 1-3.
[77] Letter from Rear-Admiral Thomas Pringle to Evan Nepean, Cape Town, 28 April 1796 in RCC, Vol I, p. 375; Instructions Commodore Blankett by Admiral Elphinstone, Cape Town, 12 November 1795 in RCC, Vol I, p. 228; Letter from John Pringle to Governor Brooke, Cape Town, 7 July 1795, BL: IOR, G/9/1. p. 45.

had arisen in the colony.[78] Pringle described this situation to animate increased concern and trepidation amongst the colonial inhabitants. Pringle advised his superiors for an annual layover of Company China ships, at the Cape, to supply the desired commodities of tea, cloth and China ware, in order to mollify inhabitants.[79] These desired China goods arrived at the Cape, much to the relief of the colonial inhabitants at the end of November 1797.[80] This example illustrates the EEIC as the official trade medium through which members of Cape society could satisfy their consumption needs. It also shows that Company activity had a perceptible effect on Cape inhabitant affection and disposition.

Significantly, by not securing the Cape's maritime zone to protect EEIC ships, the Cape administration's colonial food and material needs, and that reproduction, were endangered. This in turn threatened the desired military and civil order needed to keep the Cape secure. As such, the importance of this Order-in-Council codification demonstrates that securing the Company's commercial interests at the Cape as a high priority for the British Cape administration: as a subject of governance and object to protect and promote Cape civil and military security. This made Pringle's advice and expertise on EEIC related activity and affairs at the Cape highly consequential to the administration and security of the Cape. Increasing his influence in directing the governance of Cape colonial society to those effects. For instance, food insecurity was cited as a main grievance by mutineers in the 1797 October Cape naval mutiny.

On 13 October 1797, Admiral Thomas Pringle reported to Evan Nepean that:

> […] on the seventh instant a General Mutiny broke out on board of the Ships of the Squadron named in the Margin [*HMS Tremendous, Trusty, Imperieuse, Braave, Rattlesnake, Chichester, Star, Euphrosyne*] (the others being at sea). Their conduct was nearly the same with that which is reported to have lately taken place in His Majesty's Fleet in England, and I fancy was instigated by it, the information of which had been brought about a month ago […][81]

An EEIC ship had been identified to have carried news from England about the Nore and Spithead mutinies to the Cape, and this was believed to have incited the October Cape

[78] Letter from John Pringle to EEIC Secret Committee, Cape Town, 30 July 1796, BL: IOR, G/9/6. p. 29.
[79] Ibid.
[80] Letter from John Pringle to EEIC Secret Committee, Cape Town, 30 November 1797, BL: IOR, G/9/6. p. 94.
[81] Letter from Rear-Admiral Thomas Pringle to Evan Nepean, Cape Town, 13 October 1797 in RCC, Vol II, p.161

mutiny.[82] The interplay of transnational British sailor protest experience provoked an already simmering disaffection instigated by the Cape colonial grain crisis, that resulted in this October mutiny. Food insecurity was articulated as one of the primary grievances by the fleet mutineers. They specifically highlighted the poor quality of food provision, particularly grain-based food, that they were receiving was not acceptable. It was implied that the mutineers believed that such food resources were going to EEIC ships at the expense of themselves.[83]

On 11 October, the Admiral Thomas Pringle proclaimed that general tranquillity had been restored by an agreement to court martial the concerned and offending naval officers. He then affirmed that all the mutineers had returned to duty and promised to give them a general amnesty.[84] The Admiral's promise of general amnesty to the mutineers indicates that he could not afford to dispose the mutineers, and that those mutineers were crucial to the continued functioning of the Royal Navy at the Cape. This suggests that the resolution of the mutiny, without losing sailors, was necessary to secure the Cape.

Additionally, this demonstrates that food insecurity proved significant to the British administration to reproduce the necessary naval labour that was needed to maintain and promote that security. The mutiny also illustrates that the Cape food insecurity was important to influencing the affections and dispositions of people at the Cape. This mutiny incapacitated the Cape administration's ability to provide and maintain its military security.[85] Here, the EEIC interdependently was a subject of and vital object to reproduce British Cape security and highlights a material effect of EEIC trade exclusiveness on the effective administration of the Cape.

Shipping

Governor Macartney retired in November 1798 for health reasons, and Lieutenant-General Dundas served as Acting Governor for approximately a year. He too worked closely with

[82] John Pringle to EEIC Secret Committee, Cape Town, 24 October 1797, BL: IOR G/9/6, pp. 88-89; Letter from Governor Macartney to Right Honourable Henry Dundas, Cape Town 13 October 1797 in RCC, Vol II, p.186.
[83] Enclosed C Letter from HMS Tremendous to HMS Rattlesnake, Cape Town, 7 October 1797 in RCC, Vol II, p.163; Enclosed D Letter - HMS Tremendous Grievances in Muting, Cape Town, 7 October 1797 in RCC, Vol II, p.164; Enclosed F to L Letters of Grievances from HMS Trusty, Imperiuse, Braave, Chichester, Rattlesnake, Star, and Suffolk, Cape Town, 7 October 1797 in RCC, Vol II, pp.170-77.
[84] Letter from Rear-Admiral Thomas Pringle to Evan Nepean, Cape Town, 13 October 1796 in RCC, Vol II, p.185.
[85] Ibid. pp.161-186.

Pringle.[86] Unlike Macartney, who had extensive management experience and knowledge through long service for the Company East Indies establishment,[87] Dundas was comparatively inexperienced and had to rely on Pringle for advice on Company matters.[88]

Macartney's instructions and commission directly ordered him to protect EEIC interests:

> […] or any other Act or Acts of Parliament now in force relating to our Colonies and Plantations or any other Act or Acts of Parliament Law Custom or Usage to the contrary in any wise notwithstanding Provided nothing in the said Act contained should in any manner be construed to infringe the Rights Privileges and Advantages belonging to the [EEIC] of England trading to the East Indies […][89]

In Macartney's official instructions, the British Cape government is under the supreme administrative authority of Crown London, with the Cape colony firmly placed in the Company's East Indies jurisdiction and responsibility. Specifically, the Cape colonial government was accountable to the London Crown government, but was dependent on the support of the EEIC's East Indies governments in order to sustain and maintain (reproduce) important governing functions: the supply of civil and military articles, goods and material provisions to effectively manage the Cape settlement. From this we can see that the configuration of the British administration was organised within the greater British transnational Empire - based on the transoceanic collaboration between the EEIC British Indian and British Crown London metropole, Atlantic and Indian Ocean governments.

As such, we see that Company trading ships and Indian Ocean trading settlements were crucial to the reproduction of British Cape security and governance. Company ships that travelled between oceans redistributed communications that coordinated the functioning and administration of the Cape settlement: supplying news, intelligence, consumables and materials, in addition to China ware and tea, like rice, corn, pepper, silk, gunpowder, muslin, coffee and iron, into and from the settlement. Subsequently, displaying the importance of the

[86] Letter from Major-General Craig to Right Honourable Henry Dundas, Cape Town, 14 January 1797 in RCC, Vol II, pp. 38-39; Letter from Agent Pringle to William Ramsay, Cape Town, 27 March 1800 in RCC, Vol III, pp. 83-85.
[87] Potgieter and Grundlingh, *Admiral Elphinstone and the Conquest and Defence of the Cape of Good H, 1795-96*, pp.2, 39, 40, 42, 43.
[88] Theal, *Records of the Cape Colony from February 1793 to [April 1831], Volume 5: Copied for the Cape Government, from the Manuscript Documents in the Public Record Office, London*, pp.1-2, 24-25.
[89] Instructions to Our Right Trusty and Right Well-beloved Cousin and Councillor George Earl of Macartney, B: Our Governor and Commander in Chief in and over the Settlement of the Cape of Good Hope in South Africa, Court of St. James, 30 December April 1796 in RCC, Vol II, pp. 3-19.

maritime constituency to secure the operating and functioning of the British Cape administration within the British imperial transnational network, and the securing of civil and military food, material and labour resources to secure and reproduce the network itself. Thus, EEIC ships are affirmed (particularly as the official trade medium) as important components of the colonial governance itself. These ships transported and redistributed the necessary food, commodities, and civil and military labour that was essential to the administration's continued reconstitution and reproduction.

This affirmation of the significance of Company ships is instructive and reflected by Samkin's tabulation of the quantity of EEIC ships laying over at the Cape, which he found in Geber's work.[90] He showed that 256 EEIC ships stopped at the Cape during the British occupation.

Table 1: EEIC stopping at Cape during the first British occupation

Year	1794	1795	1796	1797	1798	1799	1800	1801	1802	1803	**Total**
No. of EEIC Ships	11	31	68	67	52	29	13	29	15	9	256

Source: Samkin[91]

It is important to note that the great increase of Company ships from the inception, and then decrease in ships, mirrors the unfolding of the prolonged grain crisis experienced in the colony, from 1797 to the end of the occupation.[92] In February 1797, Pringle was asked by Commandant Craig to warn Company ships of the scarce supply of grain related food from

[90] Samkin, *Trader Sailor Spy: The Case of John Pringle and the Transfer of Accounting Technology to the Cape of Good Hope*, p.24.
[91] Ibid.
[92] Proclamation from Major-General Craig to Cape colony, Cape Town, 30 January 1797 in RCC, Vol II, pp. 48-49; Letter from Governor Macartney to Right Honourable Henry Dundas, Cape Town, 9 May 1797 in RCC, Vol II, pp.83-84; Barnard,A. L., Lenta,M. and Le Cordeur,B. A., *The Cape Diaries of Lady Anne Barnard, 1799-1800*, 18 March 1799.; Theal,G. M., *Records of the Cape Colony from February 1793 to [April 1831], Volume 4: Copied for the Cape Government, from the Manuscript Documents in the Public Record Office, London*, pp.141-215.; Letter from John Pringle to Governor Patton, Cape Town, 1 January 1803, BL: IOR, G/9/1. p. 168; Proclamation by Governor Yonge to Cape colonial inhabitants, Cape Town, 31 October 1800 in RCC, Vol III, p. 352; Proclamation by Governor Yonge to Cape colonial inhabitants, Cape Town, 24 January 1801 in RCC, Vol III, p.409; Letter from Governor Yonge to Right Honourable Henry Dundas, Cape Town, 18 February 1801 in RCC, Vol III, pp. 420-428; Letter from John Barlow to Lieutenant-General Dundas, Cape Town, 30 January 1802 in RCC, Vol IV, pp.142-148; Minutes of Special and Supreme Commission appointed by the Governor for regulating consumption of colony grain, and for supply provision during present scarcity, Cape Town, 27 February 1801 to 27 January 1802 in RCC, Vol IV, pp. 149-215.

the colony.[93] Food insecurity experienced in the colony was a probable reason for giving it back to the Batavian Republic, in favour of Ceylon, when negotiating the articles of peace with France and its allies, in 1802.

In addition, there appears to have been difficulties with the docking facilities. In a letter to the EEIC, Pringle explained that the inadequate cargo loading resources at the Cape significantly delayed the dispatch of many Company ships that stopped at the Cape. It is noted by Pringle that this was exasperated by the unscheduled docking and restoring of Cape naval ships, which had been instructed on the naval commanders' orders to happen at the same time as Company ship docking activity.[94] This is important, as it implies that EEIC ships and their crews, passengers and commodities stayed for extended periods of time at the Cape, while their refreshment and security was being attended to.

In spite of the noted decrease in Company ships after 1798, we do, however, see that overall a substantial number of Company ships stopped over at the Cape. This coupled with the assertion by Pringle that there were inadequate loading facilities, which caused perceptible long refreshment delays, implies the extended layover period of these ships. [95] It can be perceived that many EEIC commercial, civil and military labourers being transported between the British Atlantic and Indian Ocean settlements stayed at the Cape, and therefore featured prominently in Cape colonial society.

Revolt

In 1799, the eastern frontier of the colony erupted into war and rebellion. In this year, many disaffected Dutch settler farmers (referred to as Boers by the British) revolted against the Cape British government in the District of Graaff Reinet. It began when a resident being held in Cape British government custody at Graaff Reinet, Adriaan van Jaarsveld, was rescued by his Boer comrades and sympathisers, in January 1799. His rescue incited a rebellion in this frontier district against the British Cape administration.[96] Dutch farmer Khoisan servants then rebelled against their Boer masters' oppression toward them, and many of these Khoisan then

[93] Letter from Major-General Craig to Right Honourable Henry Dundas, Cape Town, 27 February 1797 in RCC, Vol II, pp. 61-63.
[94] Letter from John Pringle to EEIC Secret Committee, 7 July 1796, BL: IOR G/9/6, p.22.
[95] Ibid. pp. 22-23.
[96] Letter from Lieutenant Governor Dundas to Landdrost Faure of Stellenbosch, Cape Town, 16 February 1799 in RCC, Vol II, p.356; Disposition of Henry Oetel, Cape Town, 16 February 1799 in RCC, Vol II, p.355; Proclamation from Lieutenant Governor Dundas, Cape Town, 17 February 1799 in RCC, Vol II, p.358; Journal kept by Landdrost Bresler, Graaff Reinet, 17 January to 19 March 1799 in RCC, Vol II, pp.389-394.

united with Xhosa warbands that raided frontier Boer farms in the eastern districts of the colony. Not surprisingly, the unrest amongst Boers emanated from Graaff-Reinet.[97]

In a letter to the Company, Pringle raised a concern that the uprising would prevent farmers from interior districts travelling to Cape Town as usual, during that particular season. This disruption would affect all merchants in the settlement.[98] This illustrates that the unfolding disorder endangered Pringle's duty to supply the Cape army and navy with food provision, and therefore also jeopardised the security of the Cape.

Subsequently, the disrupted food supply could severely disrupt Pringle's duty as EEIC agent to refresh Company ships stopping at the Cape. Additionally, Pringle was responsible for organising finances, implied to be from the EEIC, to cover the expenses of the Cape colonial army operations[99], manage and deploy troops, and assist rallying the Stellenbosch district to military activity, in the subsequent defensive effort against the threatening rebellions and war.[100]

In order to quash the Boer revolt, the British colonial government executed two plans of action. A military operation base was established in Algoa Bay (on the Indian Ocean coast of South Africa) several hundred kilometres east of Cape Town. The base here allowed the British government to deploy its naval resources (transporting troops, food and materials) to secure the interior.[101] General Dundas also travelled in-land to oversee operations to end the rebellion and war in the isolated and disordered districts. According to Lady Anne Barnard (who was a prolific author and the wife of Andrew Barnard the Colonial Secretary of the Cape - The Barnard's arrived at the Cape in May 1797 with Governor Macartney and resided

[97]Proclamation by Governor Yonge to Cape Colony, Cape Town, 18 December 1799 in RCC, Vol III, p. 2; Letter from Major-General Dundas to Governor Yonge, Algoa Bay, 6 January 1800 in RCC, Vol III, pp. 15-16.
[98] Letter from John Pringle to EEIC Secretary William Huskisson, Cape Town, 6 April 1796 in RCC, Vol II, p. 420.
[99] Letter from Lieutenant-Governor Dundas to Adriansen Jr., Cape Town, 16 February 1799 in RCC, Vol II, p.357; Letter from Lieutenant-Governor Dundas to Landdrost Bresler of Graaff Reinet, Cape Town, 17 February 1799 in RCC, Vol II, p. 359; Letter from Major-General Dundas to Fort William Governor in Council, 18 February 1799 in RCC, Vol II, p. 362-363; Journal kept by Landdrost Besler, Graaff Reinet, 17 January to 19 March 1799 in RCC, Vol II, pp. 389-395.
[100] Letter from Major-General Dundas to Deputy-Secretary Ross, Swellendam, 12 and 13 August 1799 in RCC, Vol II, p. 465-466; Letter from Landdrost of Swellendam to Landdrost of Stellenbosch, Swellendam, 13 August 1799 in RCC, Vol II, p. 369; Letter from Major-General Dundas to Deputy-Secretary Ross, Swellendam, 15 August 1799 in RCC, Vol II, p. 470; Extracts from the diary of the Secretary's Office, Cape Town, 17 August 1799 in RCC, Vol II, p. 489.
[101] Proclamation by Governor Yonge to Cape Colony, Cape Town, 18 December 1799 in RCC, Vol III, p. 2; Letter from Major-General Dundas to Governor Yonge, Algoa Bay, 6 January 1800 in RCC, Vol III, pp. 15-16.

in the colony for five-years.[102]), General Dundas placed a great deal of trust in Pringle to supply the Algoa Base with their required grain provisions.[103]

On 22 September 1799, as the rebellion was still unfolding, a French enemy frigate appeared in Algoa Bay. It was surmised that this ship sought to provide aid to the rebelling Boers against the British. Once again, the connection between internal political threats and maritime threats from enemy ships is highlighted. But, British Cape naval ships: the HMS *Rattlesnake* and *Camel*, were stationed in Algoa Bay and were operating in support of the British base's colonial security. These British ships engaged with the enemy frigate, but only with the timely arrival and assistance of the HMS *Jupiter* were the British ships able drive this enemy frigate out of the Bay. It was only once the rebellion ended in the district of Graaff Reinet, by 6 January 1800, that the British government perceived an official end to the landed hostilities within the colony. [104]

After the resolution of these maritime and landed dangers, the Algoa Bay base was formally recognised as a military outpost, and naval ships were instructed to regularly patrol and supply this base. This bay was incorporated into the British imperial maritime zone and utilised to protect against both landed and maritime threats to British security.[105]

Once again, the EEIC played a crucial role in securing the Cape and ensuring the reproduction of military forces. Pringle, as an official expression of the Company, draws on Company finances and resources to assist the colonial government. The close working relationship between Acting Governor Dundas and Pringle also symbolises the collaboration between Company and Crown in the colonial administration of the Cape. However, the eastern districts of the colonial frontier would remain in turmoil with the 'Servants Rebellion', which consisted of a confederation of Khoisan rebels and colonial labour deserters. The British military was unable to gain the upper hand and quell this rebellion, which only dissipated once the British evacuated in 1803.[106]

---

[102] Barnard, Lenta and Le Cordeur, *The Cape Diaries of Lady Anne Barnard, 1799-1800*, ix, x, xi; Barnard and Lenta, *Paradise, the Castle and the Vineyard :Lady Anne Barnard's Cape Diaries*, p.10.
[103] Barnard, Lenta and Le Cordeur, *The Cape Diaries of Lady Anne Barnard, 1799-1800*, 23 August 1799.
[104] Proclamation by Governor Yonge to Cape Colony, Cape Town, 18 December 1799 in RCC, Vol III, p. 2; Letter from Major-General Dundas to Governor Yonge, Algoa Bay, 6 January 1800 in RCC, Vol III, pp. 15-16.
[105] Letter from Major-General Craig to Captain Losack, Cape Town, 21 September 1799 in RCC, Vol II, p. 494; Letter from Lieutenant Fothergill to Captain Gooch, Algoa Bay, 21 September 1799 in RCC, Vol II, p. 495; Letter from Major-General Dundas to Deputy-Secretary Ross, Gamtoos River, 21 September 1799 in RCC, Vol II, p.498; Letter from Captain Losack to Evan Nepean, Table Bay, 4 October 1799 in RCC, Vol II, p. 498.
[106] Newton-King,S., *Masters and Servants on the Cape Eastern Frontier, 1760 - 1803* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), pp.148, 149, 182.

Failure of Command and the EEIC

At the end of 1799, Acting Governor Dundas was replaced by Sir George Yonge as Cape Governor. Yonge had previously been the vice-treasurer of Ireland, a Lord commissioner of the Admiralty, one of the Secretaries of War, and a Master of the Mint, for the British Crown.[107] His term of office was quickly cut short as it was soon discovered that Yonge was both incompetent and corrupt. But, one of his key mistakes was that he failed to recognise Company privileges, and undermined Company and Crown agreements and collaboration at the Cape. This was illustrated by Lord Robert Hobart's (Henry Dundas' successor as British Secretary of State) instruction to Major-General Dundas on 7 April 1801:

> […] In order to obviate the difficulty and embarrassment which has been created by the Interference of the late Governor [Yonge] of the Cape upon this point, it becomes expedient that you [Major General Dundas] take immediate steps for replacing this matter upon the footing originally settled in the Correspondence between Mr. [Henry] Dundas and the Chairman of the [EEIC] Court of Directors, it being intended that all Articles of the above description imported according to the Indents transmitted to India and China for that purpose, by the Company's agent, and consigned to Him, should be permitted to be landed and sold at the Cape […][108]

Subsequently, Major-General Dundas was informed that under Yonge's governance of the colony, a variety of "vexations" and "abuses" had been perpetrated. General Dundas was instructed to investigate these contraventions. Included in the instructions was a list of the misconducts that Yonge had perpetrated. Significantly amongst those offences was that he had implemented a government direction against Commissary-General Pringle's opinion and in opposition to Pringle's objections on trade related matters that concerned: the import of captured prize goods, and illegally importing of slaves into the colony. This action was perceived to have side lined and discomforted Pringle from his Cape administrative responsibilities to the detriment of EEIC interests.[109]

For example, on the case of slave trading at the Cape, an application had been made to Pringle by Governor Yonge to ascertain if slaves were included in the EEIC's exclusive

---

[107] Theal, *Records of the Cape Colony from February 1793 to [April 1831], Volume 5: Copied for the Cape Government, from the Manuscript Documents in the Public Record Office, London*, p.62.

[108] Letter from Lord Hobart to Right Honourable Henry Dundas, Downing street, 7 April 1801 in RCC, Vol III, p.466.

[109] Letter from Governor Macartney to Right Honourable Henry Dundas, Cape Town, 2 May 1801 in RCC, Vol III, pp.484-487.

privileges of importing goods eastward of the Cape. Pringle had explained to his superiors that Governor Yonge had granted a Mr. Hogan permission to land slaves from Mozambique. Pringle explained that he responded to this application by explaining that no exception had been made in the 1796 Order-in-Council. [110] However, Pringle had been persuaded that the conceive on slaves as 'goods' had never occurred to the EEIC's Court of Directors. This questioning of Company jurisdiction on the import of slaves into the colony threw Pringle off balance, as it had never been questioned by previous Governors before. Pringle thought best to not contest Governor Yonge on this particular business until he received further information from his superiors in order to clarify this issue of contention. A clarification that led to Yonge's dismissal.[111]

Additionally, through Lady Anne Barnard, we understand that by promoting the topic of captured prize goods, Yonge's governance instigated and promoted antagonisms between the Cape EEIC office and the Royal Navy at the Cape by validating of both parties competing interests on the matter.[112] For example, The Royal Navy at the Cape became resentful to the ambivalent character of their deployment in securing EEIC interests - protecting their ships, but unable to profit from the security that they provided, to which Yonge sympathised. In reporting to his superiors on this development, Pringle explicated that such competition and antagonism between the Company and the Royal Navy was disadvantageous to the security of the Cape, and therefore the overall objective of their occupation.[113]

The 1801 commission of inquiry in Yonge's alleged misconduct concluded in 1802 that it was the duty of the Acting-Governor, Fiscal and Commissary-General to counter a meat price plot that had subverted government interests on the subject, and found that Yonge's conduct on the matter had been negligent.[114] It was perceived that the contract Yonge had tendered to Mr. William Duckitt to supply meat provisions to the Cape military had breached the instituted instruction against creating monopolies within the colony. Which had happened against Commissary-General Pringle's opinion and went in opposition to his objections on

[110] Letter from John Pringle to William Ramsay, Cape Town, 29 March 100, BL: IOR G/9/6, pp.186-187.
[111] Ibid.
[112] Barnard, Lenta and Le Cordeur, *The Cape Diaries of Lady Anne Barnard, 1799-1800*, December 1799; Letter from Vice-Admiral Curtis to Governor Yonge, Cape Town, 1 January 1800 in RCC, Vol III, p.9.
[113] Letter from John Pringle to William Ramsay, Cape Town, 29 March 1800, BL: IOR G/9/6, pp.186-187; Letter from John Pringle to William Ramsay, Cape Town, 27 March 1800 in RCC, Vol III, pp.83-85.
[114] Letter from Lord Hobart to Lieutenant-General Dundas, Downing Street, 2 May 1801 in RCC, Vol III, pp.484-485.

the subject. [115] In cognizance of these findings, food security and EEIC interests were crucial to directing the appropriate priority needed to govern and keep the Cape secure.[116]

Consequently, the dismissal of Governor Yonge demonstrates that previous Governors Macartney and Dundas had done well in observing the directives of the 1796 Order-in-Council. In addition, Pringle's advice on these matters was to be taken seriously by those governing the colony. The Crown was committed to protecting the privileges of the Company and benefited from Company support in return, which was affirmed in the dismissal of Yonge.

Social Hub

As already noted, the Cape was integrated into British imperial and Company maritime networks. Both Crown and Company ships stopped at the Cape; transporting commodities, news, official communication, and intelligence packets between different British trading and colonial settlements. In addition to sailors and soldiers, these ships also brought high-ranking officials and Company servants to the Cape, and the colony served as a social hub for these travelling British elites. Indeed, Nigel Worden notes that the "rhythms" of Cape settlement life were closely linked to the arrival of these home- and out-bound EEIC fleets.[117]

This is recognised and particularly noticeable through Lady Anne Barnard's accounts on British Cape government affairs, functions and broader settlement social society activity. At the Cape, she was the designated official British government hostess. Lady Anne Barnard entertained many of the European colonial inhabitants, and visitors who were passing through on their transoceanic voyagers.[118] During much of her stay, she and her husband, Andrew Barnard (colonial government secretary), lodged in the Castle (colonial government office headquarter). Here, she was party to many political, social and military affairs that informed the British Cape administration, and thus observed much of the social dynamics and politics that happened in this administration, between British civil and military personnel.[119]

[115] Letter from Brigadier General Vandeleur to Lieutenant-General Dundas, Cape Town, 16 March 1802 in RCC, Vol IV, pp.221-233.
[116] Ibid, pp.221-272.
[117] Barnard, Lenta and Le Cordeur, *The Cape Diaries of Lady Anne Barnard, 1799-1800*, 24 January 1799, 22 March 1799, 30 April 1799, 26 June 1799; Worden,N., Van Heyningen,E. and Bickford-Smith,V., *Cape Town :The Making of a City : An Illustrated Social History* (Cape Town: David Phillip, 1998), p.28.
[118] Barnard, Lenta and Le Cordeur, *The Cape Diaries of Lady Anne Barnard, 1799-1800*, pp.ix-xvii.
[119] Ibid.

In her diaries, Lady Anne Barnard describes the social impact that arriving and departing EEIC (particularly its servants from the East Indies) ships exerted in the Cape social space. For example, regarding the EEIC, Lady Anne Barnard notably socialised with Dr. Roxburgh (an EEIC botanist collecting samples at the Cape on 8 February), Captain Wardlaw (of the EEIC Navy), and Henry Wellesley (private secretary to Lord Mornington in October).[120] Additionally, the various communications brought on these Company ships from Britain and Company India, informed the Cape political and social society of the broader seaborne imperial context. In this manner, this Cape colonial worldview was significantly framed by the perceptions and reports of the transoceanic EEIC high-ranking employees and their maritime networks.

Worden explains that British officers and administrators that served the EEIC, passing through the Cape for health recuperation reasons, joined the higher social ranks of Cape settlement society. [121] This highlights the importance of the Cape as a refreshment station to secure the continued reproduction of the EEIC's transoceanic of high-ranking servants, who had a prescribed identity within British society. Worden notes that these Company servants were referred to as 'Indians', which highlighted EEIC servant affiliation distinctly from Crown government employees. Worden explicates that the first occupation British administrators were significantly reliant on these persons with 'Indian experience'.[122] Lady Anne Barnard describes their influence and effect on British Cape administration:

> […] so many Indian men of some ability residing [at the castle], so we have a Bengal levy every morning at breakfast the individuals of which are closeted and pour the riches of their knowledge and experience on [Governor Macartney] […][123]

This demonstrates that the Cape colonial government highly valued the advice and expertise of Company servants (other than Pringle), and it is implied that their knowledge and presence (particularly within the colonial office) significantly contributed to, and influenced, the way that the Cape colony was governed.

[120] Barnard, Lenta and Le Cordeur, *The Cape Diaries of Lady Anne Barnard, 1799-1800*, 8 February 1799, 13 September 1799, October 1799.
[121] Worden, Van Heyningen and Bickford-Smith, *Cape Town :The Making of a City : An Illustrated Social History*, p.96.
[122] Ibid.
[123] Ibid.

These Company servants' description as 'Indians' affirm a conscious social and political separateness from British Crown personnel in the settlement. This projection of the EEIC as a distinct entity is visibly expressed at an imperial level, through Lady Anne Barnard's diary entry on 28 February 1799. [124] Lady Anne Barnard's brother had served in Company India, and on his return to England he had financial claims against the Company there. But, Lady Anne Barnard advised her visiting brother against bringing his claim against the Company to the British Crown government in London, because she believed that he would not win the case:

> Knowing the views that ministers will have of the business, the manner in which they will try to oppose justice herself should her Heavy weighed balance of right be in the social opposite to the late rules approved of them for the East India company to pursue, I let him in short hand comprehend *how* I thought this would be likely regarded at Home […][125]

Barnard shows that the EEIC has its own autonomous identity within Imperial Britain and was not merely an extension or department of the British Crown government. Here, the Company can be seen to have exerted significant social and political influence on the British Crown government to promote its own interests.[126]

Subsequently, this distinct and self-determining EEIC authority at the Cape is affirmed through her observations of agent Pringle. Unlike the other colonial personnel, Barnard does not venture any opinion on Pringle's EEIC agency occupation or on any of the Company's affairs and activities. She does not venture observations of what he was involved in, the manner in which he achieves his EEIC duties, or his position and inclination within the colonial administrative social and political space.[127] This suggests that that the EEIC Cape office was spatially separate to the colonial government office, displaying Cape Company and Crown affairs and responsibilities to be organised autonomously. But through Pringle's frequent interactions with Cape governors, those same affairs and responsibilities were being managed interdependently. In her mind, Barnard situates Pringle decisively as servant to the

[124] Barnard, Lenta and Le Cordeur, *The Cape Diaries of Lady Anne Barnard, 1799-1800*, 25 to 27 February 1799, 28 February 1799.
[125] Ibid.
[126] Barnard, Lenta and Le Cordeur, *The Cape Diaries of Lady Anne Barnard, 1799-1800*, 25 to 27 February 1799, 28 February 1799.
[127] Barnard, Lenta and Le Cordeur, *The Cape Diaries of Lady Anne Barnard, 1799-1800*, 3 March 1799, 1 May 1799, 2 May 1799, 9 May 1799, October 1799.

EEIC, and almost above, or separate to, the social and political dynamics happening within the British colonial government. EEIC official affairs and activity are not explicitly accounted in or governed under the British colonial administration in her diary.[128] But more pointedly, Pringle, with a few others, is described by Lady Anne Barnard as one the "Masculine grandees of the Cape". This indicates that within the Order-in-Council constituted administrative convention at the Cape, Pringle (and through him the EEIC and its interests) was highly regarded and suggestively, influential in the governance of Cape colonial society. In this light, the protection and promotion of Company interests at the Cape is demonstratedly of great importance to the Cape administration.[129]

Pringle's Position of Influence in the British Cape Administration

Food security remained a key concern for the Company. The anxiety that Pringle displays over this food insecurity problem (not having access to reliable quantities of needed food), suggests that this was a serious problem that endangered the British Cape security as a refreshment and trading station for Company ships.

This food insecurity (particularly concerning grain scarcity in the colony) at the Cape also had implications for sustaining and assisting joint Company and Crown military operations in the Indian Ocean against transnational French threats. On 16 May 1801, Pringle reported that he had received an official and urgent request for food and military assistance from the Marques Richard Wellesley in Company India against French aggressions from Egypt (Wellesley was the Governor-General (1798 to 1805) of the EEIC Presidency of Fort William, in Bengal).[130] The French, under Napoleon Bonaparte, were perceived by the British to be using Egypt to launch a campaign against the Company in India, most likely to advance the interests of their own East India trading Company.[131] Pringle acknowledged that he would do all he could to obey 'his lordship's commands; in particular to cooperate with Acting Governor General Dundas and Admiral Curtis to get the needed wheat provisions to requested military staging station at Mocha (a port city at the entrance, on the Middle-Eastern side of the Red Sea).[132] The intention was to provision the Governor-General's military forces operating against their French enemy in Egypt. [133]

[128] Ibid.
[129] Ibid.
[130] Letter from John Pringle to Marquis Wellesley, Cape Town, 16 May 1801, BL: IOR G/9/1, p.87-89.
[131] Letter from John Pringle to EEIC Secret Committee, 31 March 1798, BL: IOR G/9/1, pp.66-67.
[132] Letter from John Pringle to Marquis Wellesley, Cape Town, 16 May 1801, BL: IOR G/9/1, p.87-89.
[133] Ibid.

This transnational exchange highlights agent Pringle, Acting Governor Dundas and Admiral Curtis as the chief British Cape administrative points of colonial authority at the Cape. It can be surmised that these three persons: Cape Company agent, Crown colonial Governor and Crown naval commander, were the chief British personnel who collaborated, coordinated, managed and organised British Cape colonial resources to benefit the broader Empire. This is displayed to promote the security of British transnational interests and activities, whereby the Cape colonial administration was expected to contribute to global military campaigns.[134]

However, Pringle regretted that the desired wheat and flour provisions from the Cape colony could not actually be procured. He explained the Cape had been suffering a 'profuse' scarcity' of these articles. [135] Pringle informed the Governor-General that the Cape was also short of grain provisions and had been expecting rice from India to relieve the colony (at least until the next harvest) of their enduring food.[136] Pringle adamantly stated that the Cape's poor food situation could surely be perceived from the gazette, concerning this topic, that had been circulated to them.[137]

The circulation of such information indicates that there was an active distribution and redistribution of news and information between British trading and colonial settlements. It is suggested that these British settlements were intended to be informed of each other's affairs, which shows an active circulation of information in the British imperial maritime network to promote the military and civil security of each other.[138]

But, while the Cape administration had to regulate grain foods, Pringle affirmed that the Cape would be able to supply the Governor-General's Mocha military force with the requested meat provisions. Subsequently, Pringle cautioned the Governor-General that at that moment there were not enough ships at the Cape to transport and maintain the cattle that would be sent.[139] Pringle noted that any meat provision being shipped without a given price by the Crown had to be settled in Europe, showing the authority that the Cape administration adhered to was the EEIC and the Crown in London.[140] He explained to the Governor-General that he should not rely on the Cape to procure food provisions.[141] This displays EEIC-

[134] Ibid.
[135] Ibid.
[136] Ibid.
[137] Ibid.
[138] Ibid.
[139] Ibid.
[140] Ibid.
[141] Ibid.

orientated British India depending on the British Cape colony for their own food and military support to promote and sustain their own security. Yet, the limitations of the Cape's food and military resources restricted that assistance.

Pringle remarked that Company and Crown governments in Europe and India both perceived that the availability of material resources at the Cape were much greater than they actually were. [142] This significantly shows that the Cape was perceived to be crucial to the maintenance, sustenance and security of British imperial interests, and that it was not thought to be inconsequential to the effects of greater British transnational affairs.[143] Concerning this, Pringle related that it would be many years in the future until the Cape would be ready to equally supply the necessary surplus of food cultivated for its own inhabitants and the stationed British army and navy, and the broader British imperial network.[144] In reference to this poor supply of grain, he stated that the Cape had been unable to get any grain in advance to food secure the colony, and thought it would be fortunate that the Cape's own harvest provided the colony enough food security for themselves for next season.[145] Pringle confirmed that Admiral Curtis would answer the Governor-General's request for military reinforcements, but the Governor-General should be cognisant that the Cape's capability to assist was temporally and logistically influenced by, and dependent on, the seasonal movements of the Indian Ocean monsoon and surrounding seas currents.[146]

End of the Occupation: Evacuation of the British Cape

As part of the Treaty of Amiens, the Cape was restored to the Dutch Batavian Republic. It has been shown that during the occupation Pringle played a prominent part in organising colonial affairs toward greater British imperial and Company-orientated commercial benefit and highlighting an interdependence of imperial maritime and colonial landed activities. In this light, Pringle and the EEIC influenced the way the British Cape was governed. This was demonstrated prominently in the British evacuation of the Cape towards the end of 1802.

This British evacuation did not happen smoothly and had to be delayed. The delay forced the Cape British and Batavians to negotiate (1 January 1803) a suspension of restoration until the delay was resolved. This only happened when the British were officially able to evacuate on

[142] Ibid, p.88.
[143] Ibid, pp.87-89.
[144] Ibid.
[145] Ibid.
[146] Ibid

20 February 1803. During this extended period of evacuation, Pringle worked closely with Admiral Curtis and Acting Governor Dundas. In addition to depending on EEIC finance to fund British evacuation activity, the colonial government relied on, and negotiated with, Pringle to use Company ships to transport the remainder of British civil and military occupation personnel to their deployed stations. [147] As such, Pringle played a key role as the chief representative and personification of the EEIC's highest authority at the Cape. [148] In other words, he was the chief medium for the Crown and Company to secure their mutual interests at the Cape.

Subsequently, Pringle's importance is clearly demonstrated by his election as British agent of the Cape to assist with the evacuation.[149] Respected and trusted by the Crown, Pringle was included in the sensitive negotiations with the Batavian representatives during the emergency delay of the British evacuation and Batavian restoration of the Cape.[150] But, despite his significant involvement in the colonial governance, Pringle primarily served the EEIC to promote and protect their interests of the Company. He only left the colony in August 1803, months after the British had officially evacuated, so as to not disadvantage EEIC interests and avoid dishonouring the Company.[151]

At the end of the evacuation, General Dundas officially acknowledged the Company's contribution and involvement in the evacuation. In so doing, he recognised the distinctness of the EEIC, the significance of Company authority in the British imperial space and affirmed the particular collaborative arrangement that the Crown and Company developed at the Cape.[152]

---

[147] Letter from John Pringle to William Ramsay, 10 October 1802, BL: IOR G/9/1. pp. 150-151; Letter from John Pringle to William Ramsay, 10 October 1802, BL: IOR G/9/6. pp. 263-264; Disbursement Abstracts from John Pringle, 21 November 1802, BL: IOR G/9/1 p.157; Letter from Vice Admiral Curtis to Evan Nepean, Table Bay, 27 December 1802 in RCC, Vol IV, p. 469.

[148] Letter from Lieutenant-General Francis Dundas to John Pringle, 2 December 1802, BL: IOR G/9/1 pp. 159-160; Letter from John Pringle to William Ramsay, 25 December 1802, BL: IOR G/9/1 pp. 161-162; Letter from John Pringle to William Ramsay, 25 December 1802, BL: IOR G/9/6. pp. 266-267; Letter from John Pringle to Captain's Patton and Kirkpatrick, 31 December 1802, BL: IOR G/9/1. p.168.

[149] Appointment of a British Agent at the Cape by Lieutenant-General Dundas, and Instructions to the British Agent at the Cape of Good Hope, Cape Town, 19 February 1803 in RCC, Vol V, pp. 151–154; Proclamation by Lieutenant-General Dundas to Cape colonial inhabitants, Cape Town, 20 February 1803 in RCC, Vol V, p. 156.

[150] Letter from Lieutenant-General Dundas to Commissary-General De Mist, Cape Town, 31 December 1802 in RCC, Vol IV, p. 476.

[151] Letter from John Pringle to William Ramsay, 16 June 1803, BL: IOR G/9/6 pp. 282-283.

[152] Letter from Lieutenant-General Dundas to Lord Hobart, Lord Cape Town, 22 February 1803 in RCC, Vol V, p. 159; Letter from Lieutenant-General Dundas to John Pringle, 22 February 1803, BL: IOR G/9/1. pp. 185-186.

The Treaty of Amiens was meant to end the global war between Britain and France.[153] However, 1805 saw the war break out into the Napoleonic Wars. This instigated a more formal and united British coalition between the EEIC and Crown that defeated the Dutch, again, at the Cape in 1806. This victory marked the second, more permanent, British occupation.[154] Geber explains that this second occupation was based on the cooperation between the Crown Board of Trade and the EEIC – the Company again provisioning the Cape and regulating its trade to protect its monopoly privilege.[155] From 1810 to 1812, the Company opened the Cape to trade with New South Wales, Ceylon, and Indonesia. This began the formalisation of a united global British imperial maritime trading system and network, which was facilitated through the Cape.[156]

In 1807, Pringle would once again be appointed as the Company's agent at the Cape. [157] He was instructed to: maintain communications and control information between the south Asian Presidencies, factory at Canton, St. Helena and the agent at Rio de Janeiro, and to regularly report back to London, coordinate the provisioning of the Cape and St. Helena from China, India and Ceylon, regulate the re-export of Indian Ocean commodities, provide assistance, naval and military, to the south Asian Presidencies when they required it, and coordinate and cooperate with the new British colonial governance to defend the Company's monopoly privileges, which included acting against smuggling and illegal trade. [158] In both occupations, the Cape EEIC agent was under the direct authority of the London headquarters.[159]

In 1810, the Company cooperated successfully with the Royal Navy in blockading French Mauritius and Reunion from the Cape. Following this, in 1812, the British at the Cape then assisted Portugal to defeat Sakalava raiders and pirates that had been plundering the Mozambique Channel from Madagascar.[160] Anderson explains that the Crown then established their own colonies at Mauritius, Reunion and the Seychelles.[161] From 1815 to 1825, a network of convict transportation between these British Indian Ocean settlements, the

[153] Geber, *The English East India Company at the Cape and the Cape of Good Hope Factory Records 1773–1836*, p.3.
[154] Geber, *The East India Company and Southern Africa: A Guide to the Archives of the East India Company and the Board of Control, 1600-1858*, p.137.
[155] Ibid.
[156] Geber, *The English East India Company at the Cape and the Cape of Good Hope Factory Records 1773–1836*, p.4.
[157] Ibid, pp.4-5.
[158] Ibid.
[159] Ibid.
[160] Alpers, *East Africa and the Indian Ocean*, pp.139, 141.
[161] Anderson., *Subaltern Lives: Biographies of Colonialism in the Indian Ocean World, 1790-1920*, p.1.

Cape and British Australian colonies was created. Anderson shows that the Crown and Company administered settlements across oceans and coordinated amongst themselves to transport convicts for colonial labour - transporting persons in a maritime network between Australian, Caribbean, the Cape, South East Asia, Mauritius and other British Crown or Company settlements.[162]

In 1813, the British Parliament renewed a limited Charter to the EEIC. This Charter ended the Company's monopoly privilege on all trade east of the Cape, only retaining the Company's rights over tea and trade with China. This new 1813 Charter also expressed Crown sovereignty over British India. But, in practice the EEIC began acting as an administrative authority on behalf of a united Britain. It is interesting to note that this Charter gave British missionaries permission to spread and preach their religion which had been strongly discouraged by the EEIC before that.[163] Ewald shows that from 1814 legislation also increasingly limited lascar settlement in Britain and ensured that while a lascar remained in Britain they were the financial responsibility of the Company. By 1855, up to 12000 lascars were employed by British merchant ships.[164]

From 1813 onwards, the Company progressively transitioned from a self-determining corporate-polity to an extension of an integrated and united British imperial state. In this form, it executed the administrative and bureaucratic function of organising and managing British imperial interests in their Indian dominions.[165] This transition became more pronounced after its remaining monopoly privileges on the import and distribution of Qing tea were ended under the Government of India Act of 1833. Without its limited trading privileges (from 1813 and 1833), the EEIC's main occupation was to remain as the primary imperial governor and administrator over British India.[166] Finally, after the 1857 "great Indian mutiny", the EEIC and British Crown government formally merged into one organisation. The government assumed the decision-making authority over Company affairs

[162] Ibid, p.2.
[163] Robins, *The Corporation that Changed the World*, p.148.; Keay, *The Honourable Company: A History of the East India Company*, p.263.; Bowen, *The Business of Empire: The East India Company and Imperial Britain, 1756–1833*, p.253.
[164] Ewald, *Crossers of the Sea: Slaves, Freedmen, and Other Migrants in the Northwestern Indian Ocean*, p.76.
[165] Bowen, *The Business of Empire: The East India Company and Imperial Britain, 1756–1833*, pp.80, 253, 254, 255, 258.
[166] ibid, p.298.

and activity in British India. The EEIC formally came to an end in 1874, when it paid its last dividends.[167]

Conclusion

In this chapter I demonstrated that the British Cape administration was a uniquely configured imperial and colonial arrangement in which the EEIC played a key role, especially in the security of the Cape. In this position, the EEIC had significant influence in the manner in which the British colonial administration governed the Cape colony. The EEIC supported efforts of the British Cape administration to constitute the Cape's transoceanic imperial and colonial maritime zone; to keep the Cape and the greater British seaborne Empire secure from their global French and Dutch enemies. In both instances, agent Pringle was shown to be actively involved, playing a crucial role in key events to support the British maritime-orientated security of the Cape.

Pringle, as representative of the EEIC, also provided much in terms of advice, knowledge and expertise on Company expectations, and in so doing, impacted on the governance of the Cape. He developed close working relationships with the Cape British Governors and military commanders; particularly Commandant Craig and Lieutenant-General Dundas, who had little governing and Company related experience.

In this global administrative organisation of the Cape between Company and Crown Atlantic and Indian Ocean metropole governments, EEIC ships were demonstrated to be crucial to the reproduction of Cape administrative functions of governance and security. These ships transported and redistributed communication (intelligence and news), labour (military and civil) and provisions (food, commodity and materials) vital to reconstitute and reproduce the British Cape colonial administration over the course of the first occupation. All of these aspects informed British notion of security. In addition to attending to the urgent issue of food security and the dire implications that the lack of grain held for feeding crews, the military and inhabitants, the EEIC played a key part in protecting the British administration at the Cape from colonial landed threats and maritime imperial threats posed by France and her allies.

A significant number (256) of EEIC ships stopped at the Cape during the first occupation. Trade and refreshment delays extended ship layover periods at the Cape, and as observed

[167] Robins, *The Corporation that Changed the World*, pp.162-166.

through Lady Anne Barnard, this made EEIC transoceanic labour-force a distinct feature of Cape colonial society. The Cape was a transoceanic social hub for British elites, and Company servants were a notable, and indeed influential, part of colonial high society.

Although there must have been some tensions between Crown and Company, these entities collaborated for their mutual benefit. Threats posed to this relationship – as in the case of Governor Yonge – were swiftly dealt with. The Crown protected the EEIC privileges and was able to rely on the EEIC for material support in terms of transport of troops, provisions and financial assistance.

Most notably, throughout the occupation, the Cape was not peripheral nor marginal to British transnational activity. As for the British seaborne Empire, securing the Cape protected and promoted the essential transoceanic (mainly EEIC transported); military and civil labour forces, commercial investments, and material and food provisions, that were envisioned to be redistributed to maintain and sustain the greater transoceanic British imperial maritime network. In other words, keeping the Cape secure (as a military and refreshment station), protected and promoted a secured reproduction of the greater British seaborne Empire. Thus, the Company's maritime network was simultaneously required to maintain and sustain the Cape's own military and civil security, to protect and promote that greater security. In, the EEIC and agent Pringle proved significant in the organisation, management coordination and resourcing of the Cape colonial administration, intending to promote broader imperial and trade interests and protect against broader imperial and trade concerns.

Chapter 6

Conclusion

The Company was an extensive transoceanic and transnational organisation that had colonial settlements and trading stations across the Atlantic and Indian Oceans, which included an important agency at the Cape. At points in its history, it received over £150 million in annual profits and employed over 150 000 military, civil and trading servants that contributed to its commercial and military seaborne activities, and networks that lay the foundation for British imperial rule in the Indian Ocean. The aim of this thesis has been to investigate the relationship between the EEIC and the British colonial administration at the Cape during the first British occupation, 1795-1803, from a maritime perspective. This was explored in three main sections: *The Honourable EEIC*, *Securing the Cape: Company interest, plans and the mission to take it, c. 1780 to 1795* and *Keeping the Cape Secure: Constituting the Administration and Maritime Zone.*

The Honourable EEIC outlined the broader history of the Company by tracing its transoceanic historical trajectory from its inception, to the first British occupation of the Cape. This demonstrated the EEIC to be an autonomous maritime British polity that was commercially driven to prosper from its Indian Ocean trades, where it engaged in extensive political and military activity that involved collaborations and contestations to pursue financial profit and political influence for its servants and stockholders. Here, the Company formed beneficial relationships, such as with the British Crown and Mughal Empire, that included financial and military assistance, to promote its own security and continued prosperity. These pursuits and relationships established and ascended the EEIC's political, economic, legal and military power and position in the Indian Ocean. To achieve this, it structured itself to promote collective authority and prosperity that instilled its servants to be loyal to the Company, above all other allegiances. As a transoceanic organisation these administrative, trade and military servants perpetually travelled on its ships to and from assigned stations between Oceans. This situated and contextualised the importance of Company's significant presence at the Cape to secure its transported labour-force and trading goods, vital to itself.

In *Securing the Cape: Company interest, plans and the mission to take it, c. 1780 to 1795,* I argued that the Cape was strategically located on the shipping route between Atlantic and

Indian Oceans for European maritime powers. As a military and refreshment station the Cape reduced the risks of losing important transoceanic travelling labour and material forces needed to secure transnational imperial and trade interests. This ensured that the EEIC had a long self-interest in the security of the Cape, which I argued became urgent in the 1770s and 1780s - a period of global hostility and uncertainty that threatened the security of those Company interests that were protected and promoted from Cape. In consequence, motivating the Company to initiate joint diplomatic and military plans of action with the Crown to take and keep the Cape secure, and the sustained protection of Company ships and trade was a principal objective. I demonstrated that in this joint mission that successfully took the Cape, EEIC intelligence, organisational, transport, finance, labour and settlement resources were revealed to be critical to reproduce the labour and material forces crucial to the success of the mission. In doing so, and through EEIC Cape agent John Pringle, I highlighted interconnected themes: first, the notion of security which was informed by maritime, commercial, political and military features. These were framed by the protection of Federici's notion of labour and material force reproduction, and the access and distribution of intelligence and information. Second, the construction of a particular transoceanic maritime zone around Cape waters that incorporated the Brazilian Portuguese coast and St. Helena in the Atlantic Ocean, to the Indian Ocean Islands of Madagascar, and French Mauritius and Reunion.

Keeping the Cape Secure: Constituting the Administration and Maritime Zone examined the role of the EEIC in the administration of the Cape, which was a Crown colony in the Chartered jurisdiction of the Company. I showed that the British Cape administration was a uniquely configured imperial and colonial convention constituted to keep the Cape secure, and that the Cape was displayed to be integrated and effected by the transnational and transoceanic configured British imperial maritime network. Furthermore, as a primary object to, and subject of, the occupation's goal to secure the Cape, I argued, through Pringle, that the Company played a key role in providing support and resources. Here, it was shown that the EEIC had significant influence on the way that the British colonial administration governed the Cape colony. I demonstrated that EEIC's maritime network was concurrently required to maintain and sustain the Cape's own military and civil security, to protect and promote that greater security. In doing so, I highlighted ways in which the maritime-orientated political, trade, reproduction, intelligence and regulatory features of the security notion were realised to keep the British Cape secure.

Subsequently, by investigating the history of this relationship between the EEIC and the British colonial administration during the first occupation from a maritime perspective, this thesis hopes to contribute to debates that: challenge the triumphalist and monolith imperial and colonial histories, by illustrating the great insight and continued relevance of women's voices and participation in historical narratives, and centring the Cape within broader transoceanic and transnational historical narratives and networks. But, there are considerations that suggest limitations in this thesis that could provide opportunities for future research. In this thesis there is very little on indigenous Cape groups, particularly in relation to the EEIC, which could be attributed the maritime point of view of this study and Company's archival attention; its Cape agency mainly focused toward colonial and imperial transoceanic affairs and activities that effected the protection of Company ships and promotion of Company trade. Similarly, there is a small discussion on the EEIC and the slave trade at the Cape, but, a deeper investigation into this topic could yield interesting insights into the topic of forced labour at the Cape. Additionally, there is an emphasis on cooperation in this thesis. Yet, it was shown within this study that there were conflicts between the Company and Crown, for instance over docking and prizes during the occupation. These are three potential areas and questions of research that could be pursued and addressed by future historians to give further insight and knowledge into the effect and manner of the EEIC's presence to the broader Cape colony, and further understanding into its relationship to the British colonial administration, during this time. However, despite these limitations into this investigation, the gravity of the Company's presence at the Cape colony and its influence and effect on the British colonial administration should not be understated.

Accordingly, through the insights and highlights in this final chapter, I have sought to show that the EEIC, a key commercial player in the British Empire, was prominently involved and influential in its collaborative relationship with the Cape British administration. As a consequence, the Company's participation and presence, more generally, shaped British colonial governance at the Cape. Additionally, this relationship was uniquely configured and constituted to keep the Cape secured as a military and refreshment station for mutual Company and Crown imperial and trade interests, which, in turn, was intended to secure reproduction of the greater British seaborne Empire against their global rivals and enemies. Thus, demonstrating the EEIC, and its agent Pringle, to be significant and influential to the continued security and reproduction of the Cape administration and British seaborne Empire against broader British imperial concerns and threats during the first occupation.

Bibliography

Primary Sources:

The English East India Company Indian Office Records, Cape Factory G/9/1 and G/9/6: British Library, digital microfilm.

Published Primary Resources:

Barnard, A. L. and Lenta,M. *Paradise, the Castle and the Vineyard :Lady Anne Barnard's Cape Diaries*. Johannesburg: Wits University Press, 2006.

Barnard, A. L., Lenta,M., and Le Cordeur,B. A. *The Cape Diaries of Lady Anne Barnard, 1799-1800*. Cape Town: Van Riebeeck Society, 1999.

Barnard, A. L. and Melville,H. D. *The Letters of Lady Anne Barnard to Henry Dundas, from the Cape and Elsewhere, 1793-1803, Together with Her Journal of a Tour into the Interior, and Certain Other Letters*. Cape Town: Balkema, 1973.

Theal, G. M. *Records of the Cape Colony from February 1793 to [April 1831], Volume 1: Copied for the Cape Government, from the Manuscript Documents in the Public Record Office, London*. London: Printed for the Government of the Cape Colony, 1897a.

Theal, G. M. *Records of the Cape Colony from February 1793 to [April 1831], Volume 2: Copied for the Cape Government, from the Manuscript Documents in the Public Record Office, London*. London: Printed for the Government of the Cape Colony, 1897b.

Theal, G. M. *Records of the Cape Colony from February 1793 to [April 1831], Volume 3: Copied for the Cape Government, from the Manuscript Documents in the Public Record Office, London*. London: Printed for the Government of the Cape Colony, 1897c.

Theal, G. M. *Records of the Cape Colony from February 1793 to [April 1831], Volume 4: Copied for the Cape Government, from the Manuscript Documents in the Public Record Office, London*. London: Printed for the Government of the Cape Colony, 1897d.

Theal, G. M. *Records of the Cape Colony from February 1793 to [April 1831], Volume 5: Copied for the Cape Government, from the Manuscript Documents in the Public Record Office, London*. London: Printed for the Government of the Cape Colony, 1897e.

Secondary Sources:

Allen, R. B. "Slaves, Convicts, Abolitionism and the Global Origins of the Post-Emancipation Indentured Labor System". *Slavery & Abolition,* 35: 2, (2014), 328-348.

Alpers, E. A. *East Africa and the Indian Ocean*. Princeton, NJ: Markus Wiener Publishers, 2009.

Anderson, C., et al. *Mutiny and Maritime Radicalism in the Age of Revolution* Cambridge University Press, 2013.

Anderson, C. *Subaltern Lives: Biographies of Colonialism in the Indian Ocean World, 1790-1920*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.

Arkin, M. *John Company at the Cape :A History of the Agency Under Pringle (1794-1815) Based on a Study of the "Cape of Good Hope Factory Records"*. S.A.: 1960.

Armitage, D. *The Ideological Origins of the British Empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Baladouni, V. "The Accounting Records of the East India Company". *Accounting Historians Journal,* 8: 1, (1981), 67-69.

Basu, H. *Journeys and Dwellings*. Hyderabad: Orient Longman, 2008.

Bayly, C. A. *The Birth of the Modern World, 1780-1914 :Global Connections and Comparisons*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Pub., 2004.

Boone, C. *Merchant Capital and the Roots of State Power in Senegal, 1930-1985*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

Boucher, Maurice, and Nigel Penn. *Britain at the Cape, 1795 to 1803*. Brenthurst, 1992.

Bowen, H. V. 'Britain in the Indian Ocean Region and Beyond: Contours, Connections, and the Creation of a Global Maritime Empire', In *Britain's Oceanic Empire: Atlantic and Indian Ocean Worlds, c. 1550-1850,* edited by Bowen, H. V., Mancke,E. and Reid,J. G. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.

Bowen, H. V. "British Conceptions of Global Empire, 1756–83". *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History,* 26: 3, (1998), 1-27.

Bowen, H. V. *The Business of Empire: The East India Company and Imperial Britain, 1756–1833*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Bowen, H. V., Mancke, E., and Reid, J. G. 'Britain's Oceanic Empire: An Afterword', In *Britain's Oceanic Empire: Atlantic and Indian Ocean Worlds, c. 1550-1850,* edited by Bowen, H. V., Mancke, E. and Reid, J. G. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012a.

Bowen, H. V. *Britain's Oceanic Empire: Atlantic and Indian Ocean Worlds, c. 1550-1850*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012b.

Bowen, H. V. 'Introduction: Britain's Oceanic Empire', In *Britain's Oceanic Empire: Atlantic and Indian Ocean Worlds, c. 1550-1850*, edited by Bowen, H. V., Mancke, E. and Reid, J. G. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012c.

Bowen, H. V. ""so Alarming an Evil:" Smuggling, Pilfering and the English East India Company, 1750-1810.". *International Journal of Maritime History*, 14: 1, (2002), 1-31.

Bowen, H. V. "400 Years of the East India Company". *History Today*, 50: 7, (2000), 47-53.

Bredekamp, H. C. J. "The Battle of Muizenberg (1795): The Moravian Missionaries and the Telling of Corps Pandouren History". *Kronos: Journal of Cape History*, 22: 1, (1995), 36-53.

Buchan, P. B. "The East India Company 1749-1800: The Evolution of a Territorial Strategy and the Changing Role of the Directors". *Business and Economic History*, 23: 1, (1994), 52-61.

Chaudhuri, K. N. *The Trading World of Asia and the English East India Company: 1660-1760*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Condon, M. E. "The Administration of the Transport Service during the War Against Revolutionary France, 1793-1802." Doctoral, University of London, 1968.

Cooper, F. "Decolonizing Situations: The Rise, Fall, and Rise of Colonial Studies, 1951-2001". *French Politics, Culture & Society*, 20: 2, (2002), 47-76.

Cooper, F. and Stoler,A. L. *Tensions of Empire*. Berkeley: University of California Press Berkeley, 1997.

Davis, G. ‘EFF: Ramaphosa Can’t Be Friends with White Monopoly Capital’. Accessed 18 March 2018. http://ewn.co.za/2018/02/20/eff-ramaphosa-can-t-be-friends-with-white-monopoly-capital.

Day, J. F. "British Admiralty Control and Naval Power in the Indian Ocean (1793-1815)." Doctoral, University of Exeter, 2012.

Dening, G. *Mr Bligh's Bad Language: Passion, Power and Theater on the Bounty*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

Dooling, W. "The Making of a Colonial Elite: Property, Family and Landed Stability in the Cape Colony, c.1750-1834". *Journal of Southern African Studies*, 31: 1, (2005), 147.

Ewald, J. J. "Crossers of the Sea: Slaves, Freedmen, and Other Migrants in the Northwestern Indian Ocean, c. 1750-1914". *American Historical Review*, 105: 1, (2000), 69-91.

Farooqui, A. "Governance, Corporate Interest and Colonialism: The Case of the East India Company". *Social Scientist*, 35: 9/10, (2007), 44-51.

Fawcett, Charles. "The Striped Flag of the East India Company, and its Connexion with the American "Stars and Stripes"." Flags of the World. https://flagspot.net/flags/gb-eic2.html.

Featherstone, D. *Resistance, Space and Political Identities: The Making of Counter-Global Networks*. West Sussex: John Wiley & Sons, 2008.

Federici, S. *Caliban and the Witch*. New York: Autonomedia, 2004.

Federici, S. *Revolution at Point Zero :Housework, Reproduction, and Feminist Struggle*. Oakland, CA: PM Press, 2012.

Fisher, M. 'Diplomacy in India, 1526 - 1858', In *Britain's Oceanic Empire: Atlantic and Indian Ocean Worlds, c. 1550-1850*, edited by Bowen, H. V., Mancke,E. and Reid,J. G. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.

Freund, B. *The Making of Contemporary Africa: The Development of African Society since 1800*. London: Macmillan, 1984.

Galbraith, J. S. "The 'Turbulent Frontier' as a Factor in British Expansion". *Comparative Studies in Society and History,* 2: 2, (1960), 150-168.

Geber, J. L. "The East India Company and Southern Africa: A Guide to the Archives of the East India Company and the Board of Control, 1600-1858." Doctoral, University of London, 1998.

Geber, J. L. "The English East India Company at the Cape and the Cape of Good Hope Factory Records 1773–1836". *South African Archives Journal,* 36: (1994), 54-64.

Gilroy, P. *The Black Atlantic :Modernity and Double Consciousness*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press ;London, 1993.

Hejeebu, S. "Contract Enforcement in the English East India Company". *Journal of Economic History,* 65: 2, (2005), 496-523.

Hofmeyr, I. "The Complicating Sea: The Indian Ocean as Method". *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East,* 32: 3, (2012), 584-590.

Hornsby, S. 'Geographies of the British Atlantic World', In *Britain's Oceanic Empire: Atlantic and Indian Ocean Worlds, c. 1550-1850*, edited by Bowen, H. V., Mancke,E. and Reid,J. G. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.

Hyslop, J. "A British Strike in an African Port: The Mercantile Marine and Dominion Politics in Durban, 1925". *The Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History,* 43: 5, (2015), 882-902.

Hyslop, J. "Oceanic Mobility and Settler-Colonial Power: Policing the Global Maritime Labour Force in Durban Harbour c. 1890-1910.". *Journal of Transport History,* 36: 2, (2015), 248-267.

Johnson, D. *Imagining the Cape Colony: History, Literature, and the South African Nation*. Edinburgh University Press, 2011.

Keay, J. *The Honourable Company: A History of the East India Company*. London: Harper Collins, 1991.

Keegan, T. J. *Colonial South Africa and the Origins of the Racial Order*. Cape Town: D. Philip, 1996.

Kresse, K., et al. "Between Africa and India: Thinking Comparatively Across the Western Indian Ocean". *Ssoar,* (ZMO Working Papers 5): (2011).

Legassick, M. and Legassick, M. *The Politics of a South African Frontier :The Griqua, the Sotho-Tswana and the Missionaries, 1780-1840*. Basel: Basler Afrika Bibliographien, 2010.

Lester, A. *Imperial Networks: Creating Identities in Nineteenth-Century South Africa and Britain*. Routledge, 2005.

Linebaugh, P. and Rediker,M. *The Many-Headed Hydra: Sailors, Slaves, Commoners, and the Hidden History of the Revolutionary Atlantic*. Boston: Beacon Press, 2000.

Marshall, P. J. "British Society in India Under the East India Company". *Modern Asian Studies,* 31: 1, (1997), 89-108.

Mbeki, M. "Mugabe's Economic Inheritance". *Economic and Political Weekly,* 5: 32, (1980), 1343-1344.

McAleer, J. "'The Key to India': Troop Movements, Southern Africa, and Britain's Indian Ocean World, 1795–1820". *The International History Review,* 35: 2, (2013), 294-316.

McAleer, J. "Looking East: St Helena, the South Atlantic and Britain's Indian Ocean World". *Atlantic Studies,* 13: 1, (2016), 78-98.

McAleer, J. *Representing Africa: Landscape, Exploration and Empire in Southern Africa, 1780–1870* Manchester University Press, 2010.

Nesbitt, N. *Universal Emancipation :The Haitian Revolution and the Radical Enlightenment*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2008.

Newton-King, S. *Masters and Servants on the Cape Eastern Frontier, 1760 - 1803*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

O'Brien, P. "Mercantilism and Imperialism in the Rise and Decline of the Dutch and British Economies 1585-1815". *De Economist,* 148: 4, (2000), 469-501.

Ogborn, M. "Writing Travels: Power, Knowledge and Ritual on the English East India Company's Early Voyages". *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers,* 27: 2, (2002), 155-171.

Pearson, M. N. *The Indian Ocean*. London: Routledge, 2003.

Penn, N. *The Forgotten Frontier :Colonist and Khoisan on the Cape's Northern Frontier in the 18th Century*. Cape Town: Double Storey Books, 2005.

Philips, C. H. "The Secret Committee of the East India Company". *Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies,* 10: 2, (1940), 299-315.

Potgieter, T. "Maritime Defence of the Cape of Good Hope, 1779-1803". *Historia*, 48: 1, (2003), 283-308.

Potgieter, T and Grundlingh, A. "Admiral Elphinstone and the Conquest and Defence of the Cape of Good Hope, 1795-96". *Scientia Militaria: South African Journal of Military Studies, Vol 35, Iss 2 (2011)*, 35: 2, (2007).

Pratt, M. L. *Imperial Eyes :Travel Writing and Transculturation*. London; New York: Routledge, 2008.

Rediker, M. *Between the Devil and the Deep Blue Sea: Merchant Seamen, Pirates, and the Anglo-American Maritime World, 1700-1750*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

Reid, S. *Armies of the East India Company, 1750-1850*. Oxford: Osprey Publishing, 2009.

Robins, N. *The Corporation that Changed the World: How the East India Company Shaped the Modern Multinational*. London: Pluto Press, 2006.

Robins, N. "Loot: In Search of the East India Company, the world's First Transnational Corporation". *Environment and Urbanization,* 14: 1, (2002), 79-88.

Rodger, N. A. *The Command of the Ocean: A Naval History of Britain, 1649-1815*. London: Penguin Books, 2005.

Rogoziński, J. *Honor among Thieves: Captain Kidd, Henry Every, and the Pirate Democracy in the Indian Ocean*. Mechanicsburg: Stackpole Books, 2000.

Samkin, G. "Trader Sailor Spy: The Case of John Pringle and the Transfer of Accounting Technology to the Cape of Good Hope". *Accounting History,* 15: 4, (2010), 505-528.

Stern, P. J. 'Company, State, and Empire: Governance and Regulatory Frameworks in Asia', In *Britain's Oceanic Empire: Atlantic and Indian Ocean Worlds, c. 1550-1850*, edited by Bowen, H. V., Mancke,E. and Reid,J. G. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.

Stern, P. "Politics and Ideology in the Early East India Company-State: The Case of St Helena, 1673–1709". *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History,* 35: 1, (2007), 1-23.

Stern, P. J. "British Asia and British Atlantic: Comparisons and Connections". *William and Mary Quarterly*, 63: 4, (2006), 693-712.

Stoler, A. L. *Along the Archival Grain: Epistemic Anxieties and Colonial Common Sense*. Vancouver: Princeton University Press, 2010.

Subramanian, L. 'Commerce, Circulation, and Consumption: Indian Ocean Communities in Historical Perspective', In *Indian Ocean Studies: Cultural, Social, and Political Perspectives*, edited by Moorthy, S. and Ashraf,J. London: Routledge, 2010, 136-157.

Subramanian, L. *The Sovereign and the Pirate: Ordering Maritime Subjects in India's Western Littoral*. Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2016.

Sutherland, L. S. "The East India Company in Eighteenth-Century Politics". *Economic History Review,* 17: 1, (1947), 15-26.

Thornton, J. K. *A Cultural History of the Atlantic World, 1250-1820*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.

Travers, R. 'Constitutions, Contact Zones, and Imperial Ricochets: Sovereignty and Law in British Asia', In *Britain's Oceanic Empire: Atlantic and Indian Ocean Worlds, c. 1550-1850*, edited by Bowen, H. V., Mancke,E. and Reid,J. G. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.

Ulrich, N. "Counter Power and Colonial Rule in the Eighteenth-Century Cape of Good Hope: Belongings and Protest of the Labouring Poor." Doctoral, University of the Witwatersrand, 2011.

Van Niekerk, J. "The First British Occupation of the Cape of Good Hope and Two Prize Cases on Joint Capture in the High Court of Admiralty". *Fundamina: A Journal of Legal History,* 2005: 11, (2005), 155-182.

Vickers, D. "Beyond Jack Tar". *William and Mary Quarterly,* 50: 2, (1993), 418-424.

Vink, M. P. "Indian Ocean Studies and the 'new Thalassology'". *Journal of Global History,* 2: 1, (2007), 41-62.

Ward, K. *Networks of Empire: Forced Migration in the Dutch East India Company*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

Ward, K. and Bentley, J. "'Tavern of the Seas?'The Cape of Good Hope as an Oceanic Crossroads during the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries". *Seascapes: Maritime Histories, Littoral Cultures, and Transoceanic Exchanges,* (2007), 137-152.

'[WATCH LIVE] Gigaba Appears before State Capture Inquiry'. Accessed 18 March 2018. http://ewn.co.za/2018/03/13/watch-live-gigaba-appears-before-state-capture-inquiry.

Wigen, K., et al. "Oceans of History.". *American Historical Review,* 111: 3, (2006), 717-721.

Worden, N., Van Heyningen,E., and Bickford-Smith,V. *Cape Town :The Making of a City : An Illustrated Social History*. Cape Town: David Phillip, 1998.

Worden, N. *Cape Town between East and West: Social Identities in a Dutch Colonial Town*. Jacana Media, 2012.