

# Anglo-Dutch Trade with the Baltic and White Sea: 1671–1780<sup>1)</sup>

Toshiaki TAMAKI

## I. Structural Changes

### Aim of This Study

In European economic history, the Baltic area, including Russia, has generally been known as an area providing Western Europe with primary products. This is why Immanuel Wallerstein considered this area as periphery or semi-periphery exploited by ‘the core.’<sup>2)</sup> The Baltic in the early modern era traded mainly with The Netherlands and England; providing England with naval stores – flax, hemp, pitch, tar, timber, and iron etc. – for ‘the Commercial Revolution.’<sup>3)</sup> With the expansion of the British Empire, Britain’s (England’s) balance of trade with the Baltic became more and more unfavorable.<sup>4)</sup>

On the other hand, Baltic trade was called ‘mother of trade’ (moedernegotie) for the Dutch, and had a great impact on the Dutch economy. Violet Barbour, for example, insists that in 1666, three-fourths of the capital in Amsterdam was invested in this trade. One of the reasons why The Netherlands experienced its ‘Golden Age’ is attributed to this trade.<sup>5)</sup> The most important commodity for Dutch Baltic trade was grain – especially rye and wheat. It is often said that the changing pattern of grain prices in the Baltic corresponded with that of Dutch economy.<sup>6)</sup> Even at the end of the 18<sup>th</sup> century, trade with the Baltic was very important for The Netherlands,<sup>7)</sup> and the longevity of the affluence of the Dutch economy was closely connected with the trade.

---

1) I presented a paper at the seminar “Maritime Morning” held in Jyvaskyla University (March 25, 2004), which was based on my Japanese article “Igirisu to Oranda no Hakkai Barutokai Boueki, 1670–1780” in Katsumi Fukasawa (ed.), *Kokusai Shogyo*, Kyoto, 2002, pp. 289–316. This article is a revised version of the paper presented to the above seminar. I want to express my special gratitude to Katsumi Fukasawa, Ismo Malinen, and especially Jari Ojala, who was a chairman of the seminar.

2) I. Wallerstein, *The Modern World System*, 3 Vols., (New York, 1974, 1980, 1989).

3) R. Davis, “English Foreign Trade, 1660–1700”, *Economic History Review*, 2nd ser., Vol. 7, (1954), pp. 150–166; Id., “English Foreign Trade, 1700–1774”, *Economic History Review*, 2nd ser., Vol. 15, (1962), pp. 285–303.

4) T. Tamaki, “Igirisu no Barutokai boueki (English Baltic Trade), 1731–1780”, *Shakai-Keizaishigaku (Socio-Economic History)*, Vol. 69, (1998), pp. 99–100.

5) V. Barbour, *Capitalism in Amsterdam in the Seventeenth Century*, (Toronto, 1963), p. 27.

6) K. Glamann, “European Trade 1500–1750”, in C. Cipolla (ed.), *The Fontana Economic History of Europe*, II, (Glasgow, 1972), p. 42.

7) M. van Tielhof, *The ‘Mother of all Trades’: The Baltic Grain Trade in Amsterdam from the Late 16<sup>th</sup> to the Early 19<sup>th</sup> Century*, (Leiden, 2002), p. 322.

Nevertheless, there have not been many studies on trade with the Baltic, both in The Netherlands and Britain. This may be partly due to the fact that in these countries, there were no influential trading companies participating in the Baltic trade; though the Eastland Company was established in Britain in 1579,<sup>8)</sup> its power was not very strong and indeed it became functionless in 1706.<sup>9)</sup> In The Netherlands, too, the Dutch did not have big trading companies like the (VOC) or the West India Company (WIC) in their Baltic trade. Small companies engaged in this trade and specialized in grain or timber etc.<sup>10)</sup> It is not easy, therefore, to clearly ascertain how the Baltic trade in Britain and The Netherlands functioned based just on the activities of merchants. Many case studies of merchants are needed to have an idea of the Baltic trade of both countries. In this article I will focus mainly on trade statistics, especially *Sound Toll Tables*.<sup>11)</sup>

### From 'Grain Stage' to 'Raw Material Stage'

An eminent Polish economic historian Maria Bogucka wrote, 'The 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> centuries are often called the era of Baltic trade.'<sup>12)</sup> This is especially because grain and naval stores exported from the Baltic were essential for the development of European economies. According to Bogucka, grain was the most important trade commodity from the mid-16<sup>th</sup> to the mid-17<sup>th</sup> centuries.<sup>13)</sup>

Increasing population had caused a shortage of foodstuffs in Europe, and the granary of Europe in this age was in the Baltic, especially Poland, which exported large amounts of grain from Danzig to Amsterdam; which in turn re-exported grain to other European cities. The importance of the Danzig -Amsterdam axis from the mid-16<sup>th</sup> to the mid-17<sup>th</sup> centuries cannot be dismissed. Until the mid-16<sup>th</sup> century, The Netherlands had imported grain from nearby areas such as Flanders, France or German Bight.<sup>14)</sup> From the mid-16<sup>th</sup> century, however, the amount of grain The Netherlands imported from the Baltic sharply increased. The relationship between the rise of Amsterdam and its import of grain from the Baltic was very strong.

However, according to Bogucka the situation transformed in the 17<sup>th</sup> century, and from the latter half of that century such raw materials as flax, hemp, pitch, tar, timber and iron began to be more important than grain as Baltic exports. The declining importance of grain was concomitant with the end of a greatly increasing population for Europe. Bogucka called the era after the second half of the 18<sup>th</sup> century 'the raw material stage' in Baltic trade.<sup>15)</sup> Admittedly, it is impossible to decide with

8) M. Sellers, *The Acts and Ordinances of the Eastland Company*, (London, 1906).

9) R. W. K. Hinton, *The Eastland Trade and the Common Weal in the Seventeenth Century*, (Cambridge, 1959), p. 160.

10) M. van Tielhof, "De handel op de Oostzee: Een unieke momentopname van het bedrijfsleven", in M. Damen, M. Kelblusek en van der Vlis (eds.), *Duizend Jaar Holland* (Hilversum, 1999), pp. 261-271.

11) N. E. Bang and K. Korst (eds.), *Tabeller over Skibsfart og Varetransport gennem Øresund 1497-1783*, 7 Vols., (Copenhagen & Leipzig, 1906-1953).

12) M. Bogucka, "The Role of Baltic Trade in European Development from the XVIth to the XVIIth Centuries", *Journal of European Economic History*, Vol. 9, (1980), p. 5.

13) *Ibid.*, p. 10.

14) M. van Tielhof, *De Hollandse Graanhandel, 1470-1570: Koren op de Amsterdamse molen*, (The Hague, 1995).

15) Bogucka, *op.cit.*, p.11.

any real certainty which is the more important, of the primary products - grain or raw materials; but the trend is very clear. Owing to grain exports from England and the declining prices of grain, which began in the latter half of 17<sup>th</sup> century, raw materials became more and more important during the second half of the 17<sup>th</sup> and into the 18<sup>th</sup> century. In ‘the grain stage’, the economic center of the Baltic was in Poland, but after that it moved to Sweden and then to Russia.

In this article, I refer mainly to the Anglo-Dutch Baltic trade, but in respect to the trade with Russia, mention must be made about Archangel, where the Dutch merchants vigorously traded.<sup>16)</sup> In the 3rd section, I will discuss not only the Baltic but also the White Sea trade. The main purpose here is to describe the Anglo-Dutch Trade with the Baltic and White Sea areas, with special reference to Russia. Russia is chosen for three reasons. First, after the Great Northern War (1700–21), the major Baltic ports changed from Swedish to Russian territory. Second, an interesting difference in the activities of the Anglo-Dutch Merchants’ can be discerned in their Russian trading. Third, in the 18<sup>th</sup> century, three domestic commercial zones were formed in Russia by the activities of the Anglo-Dutch Merchants.

## II. Ships and Commodities

### Ports and the Numbers of Ships

Table 1 shows the number of ships (laden) passing through the Sound. By presenting the changing pattern of English and Dutch ships, I can demonstrate the characteristics of both countries’ trade with the Baltic.

The high ratio of Dutch ships is easily noticed, but then tends to decline. In the period from 1497 to 1657, the proportion of Dutch ships in the total was more than 59%. The table reveals that from 1661 to 1720,<sup>17)</sup> it declined to 41.3% and from 1721 to 1780, it fell to 31.2%. The decreasing number from 1710 to 1720 can be attributed to The Great Northern War. In 1771–80, the number of English ships was 11,398 and that of Dutch ships 15,485, and so the difference in number becomes smaller. Moreover, according to Johansen, during the period from 1784 to 1795, the number of English ships was actually 39,344, while that of Dutch ships just 16,810.<sup>18)</sup> Considering that his figures include not only English but also Scottish ships, the decline of The Netherlands in Baltic trade cannot be doubted. Furthermore, Taihei Yamamoto contends that in 1845, the number of ships passing through the Sound from the Baltic was 8,618.<sup>19)</sup> This figure is much larger than in an average 18<sup>th</sup> century year, with the number of English ships 1,820 and that of Dutch only 423. In the

16) Cf. H. Kellenbenz, “The Economic Significance of the Archangel Route (from the late 16th to the late 18th century)”, *Journal of European Economic History*, Vol. 2, (1973), pp. 541–581.

17) T. Tamaki, “England’s Trade with the Baltic (1661–1730): A Quantitative Approach”, *KSU Economic and Business Review*, No.27, (2000), p. 22.

18) H. C. Johansen, *Shipping and Trade between the Baltic Area and Western Europe 1784–95*, (Odense, 1983), p. 18.

19) T. Yamamoto, “Baltic Grain Exports in 1845: Decline of the Dutch Baltic Grain Trade in the 19<sup>th</sup> Century”, Unpublished paper.

**Table 1** The Number of English and Dutch ships (laden; total of eastbound and westbound ships)

years	English ships	Dutch ships	Total of all ships
1661-70	1,126	11,708	22,434
1671-80	4,205	10,071	23,625
1681-90	4,328	17,122	36,179
1691-1700	2,430	10,659	33,014
1701-10	1,269	7,277	25,478
1711-20	3,034	7,906	15,948
1721-30	4,902	12,097	30,192
1731-40	5,779	13,760	35,653
1741-50	4,792	11,447	34,645
1751-60	6,346	13,386	43,094
1761-70	7,959	13,601	51,878
1771-80	11,398	15,485	62,827

[Source] *Sound Toll Tables*.

era discussed in this article, English ships had become more and more numerous, while the number of Dutch ones decreased. Nevertheless, the total number of Dutch ships was still greater than that of English ones.

Beside English and Dutch ships, the number of Swedish ships was also large. Swedish ships, however, were mainly used for coastal trade, and so their size, their carrying capacity, was relatively small compared with the English and Dutch ships.

As regards the White Sea trade, namely the trade with Archangel, the proportion of Dutch ships was high, and was always 50 to 60% of the total number of ships arriving at and departing from this port.<sup>20)</sup> In 1740, for example, the total number of ships making use of Archangel was 115, and the number of Dutch ships was 60. In 1750, the total was 51 and Dutch ships 34. The share of Dutch ships was always more than 60%.<sup>21)</sup> For Archangel, at least, the major trading partner was the Dutch.<sup>22)</sup>

Next, we turn attention to the major ports in the Baltic and their features. The Baltic Sea is not so large, and the area is much smaller than that of the Mediterranean. However, if we include its hinterlands, the commercial area of the Baltic was quite large. The major ports discussed in this article are, Danzig, Königsberg, Riga, Stockholm (the Swedish ports in the Baltic), and St. Petersburg.

Danzig was a city representative of Poland and from it much grain was shipped to The Netherlands, especially Amsterdam. Its hinterland extended to all of the Polish territory centered on the Vistula. Königsberg was a port city in Prussia, with its hinterland seeming to have reached

20) J. Newman, "Russian Foreign Trade, 1680-1780", (unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, University of Edinburgh, 1985), p. 33.

21) *Ibid.*, pp. 242-243.

22) J. W. Veluwenkamp, *Archangel: Nederlandse Ondernemers in Rusland 1550-1785*, (Amsterdam, 2000), p. 180; cf. J. V. Knoppers, *Dutch Trade with Russia from the Time of Peter I to Alexander I: A Quantitative Study in Eighteenth Century Shipping*, 3 Vols, (Montréal, 1976).

throughout Prussia. Riga was the largest city in Livonia. After the occupation of Gustav II Adolf in 1621, the trading volume of this city rapidly expanded.<sup>23)</sup> In 1721 when the Nystad treaty was concluded, it changed from Swedish to Russian territory. Elizabeth Harder-Gersdorf wrote, ‘until 1782, Livonia belonged to a region different from “Russia” in tariffs.’<sup>24)</sup> Riga’s hinterland extended from White Russia to Lithuania,<sup>25)</sup> and German immigrants traded vigorously in this city. As for Sweden we do not know the ports exactly because in *Sound Toll Tables*, only the name ‘Sweden’ is written and there is no means to know about the ports arriving at and departing from. Though, in Sweden there were two major ports - Stockholm and Göteborg – but as the latter is situated along the North Sea we can regard ‘Sweden’ in *Sound Toll Tables* as the area in the Baltic centered on Stockholm. Its hinterland was eastern part of Sweden and some part of Finland. St. Petersburg (Nyen was its Swedish name) was established in 1703. Peter the Great made it the capital of Russia in 1713. This city appeared in *Sound Toll Tables* first in 1712. Its hinterland extended to a vast area including the Ural Mountains. The hinterland of Archangel, which faces the White Sea, was centered on North Dovina and seems to have expanded to at least Moscow, even in winter by using sledges.

### Changing Number of Ships: Exports

Let us investigate the changing patterns of ships from England and The Netherlands to these ports.

The numbers of ships departing from The Netherlands to Danzig through the Sound overwhelmed other countries during the period from 1671 to 1680. In the long term, however, the proportion tended to decline. During the twenty years from 1761 to 1780, the number of ships departing from England became ever more numerous.

For Königsberg too, the ratio of ships from The Netherlands was very high. During the period from 1721 to 1740, the number of ships is in double figures, but the difference begins to shrink.

For Riga, we find the same tendency; probably from the influence of the Great Northern War, the number of ships from both England and The Netherlands greatly declined during the period from 1701 to 1720. However, ship numbers from The Netherlands stagnated, while those from England tended to increase except for the period 1761–70. Nevertheless, the number of Dutch ships was greater until the period from 1771 to 1780.

Contrarily, for the Swedish ports, during the period from 1671 to 1690, the number of ships from England is greater, but after this period, that the numbers from The Netherlands become greater. In this context, we need to keep in mind that from 1661 to 1721, when the Great Northern War was over, Swedish ships were not imposed Sound toll. Dutch merchants, thus, used many Swedish ships in order to expand their volume of trade.

23) T. Tamaki, “The Swedish Trade in the Age of Greatness, 1611–1720”, *Balto-Scandia*, Vol.6, (1996), p. 38.

24) E. Harder-Gersdorff, “The Baltic Provinces - ‘Bridges’ or ‘Barrier’ to Russian Engagement in Western Trade?: A Study of ‘Russia at Reval’ during the Reign of Catherine II”, *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas*, 45, (1997), pp.561–576.

25) Id., “Riga im Rahmen der Handelsmetropolen und und Zahlungsströme des Ost-Westverkehrs am Ende des 18. Jahrhunderts”, *Zeitschrift für Ostmitteleuropa-Forschung*, 44, (1995), p. 524.

**Table 2** The number of laden ships from England and The Netherlands to major ports in the Baltic

destinations Departure ports years	Danzig		Königsberg		Riga		Sweden		St. Petersburg	
	England	The Netherlands	England	The Netherlands	England	The Netherlands	England	The Netherlands	England	The Netherlands
1671-80	323	926	118	421	125	357	423	355	—	—
1681-90	395	1273	142	393	166	576	442	428	—	—
1691-1700	270	984	117	481	99	480	307	455	—	—
1701-10	165	428	143	424	54	284	249	421	1	0
1711-20	209	428	132	414	41	259	206	477	103	68
1721-30	266	863	87	328	121	459	400	615	284	266
1731-40	292	678	83	259	125	417	271	555	311	238
1741-50	292	461	94	225	126	239	358	377	317	252
1751-60	386	479	147	206	200	273	284	311	477	344
1761-70	473	340	227	201	184	246	194	255	548	281
1771-80	407	261	236	283	298	395	189	253	809	500

[Source] *Sound Toll Tables*.

For St. Petersburg, the number of English ships is greater. This is, as will be seen later, due to the fact that The Netherlands placed its trading center at Archangel, and therefore did not pay as much attention as England did on trade with St. Petersburg.

### Imports

Table 3 shows the total number of ships passing through the Sound and the number of ships leaving for England and The Netherlands. For Danzig, ships departing from the port fundamentally leave for The Netherlands, except for the period from 1711 to 1720. Also, the proportion of ships for The Netherlands had been more than 50% until 1750. From the mid-16<sup>th</sup> to mid-17<sup>th</sup> centuries, much grain had been shipped from Danzig to Amsterdam, so that at least during this era, the relationships between these two cities were so correlated. This trend applied also in the 18<sup>th</sup> century. Königsberg too has a high ratio of ships for The Netherlands, especially up to 1760. Riga also sent more ships to The Netherlands than to England. The difference, however, tended to disappear later, though the proportion of Dutch ships was still very high in the total number of ships from Riga.

On the other hand, the trend at the Swedish ports was in the contrary direction. Except for the period from 1711 to 1720, the number of ships for England was larger than that for The Netherlands. The ratio of the number of ships for England and The Netherlands was small in the total number of ships departing from Swedish ports. This is due to the fact that there were many ships departing from Swedish territory in the Baltic to the North Sea coast through the Sound. That is, Baltic trade was partly a domestic trade for Sweden.

Small ships departed from the eastern part for the western part of Sweden via the Sound. Lastly, for St. Petersburg, which was similar to Sweden, the number of English ships overwhelmed that of The Netherlands. Moreover the ratio of the ships for England is larger than that found from the Swedish ports. This trend was very remarkable after the period from 1731 to 1740.

**Table 3** Total number of laden ships passing the Sound and ships leaving for England or The Netherlands

Departure Ports	Danzig			Königsberg		
	England	The Netherlands	Total	England	The Netherlands	Total
1671–80	298	1,719	2,817	404	1,049	1,812
1681–90	411	2,876	4,399	291	1,265	1,996
1691–1700	279	1,906	2,899	160	1,310	2,048
1701–10	194	1,149	1,828	310	1,068	1,812
1711–20	263	1,088	2,027	236	860	1,446
1721–30	636	2,292	4,269	286	1,196	1,949
1731–40	636	2,026	3,288	165	1,382	1,961
1741–50	676	1,813	3,551	188	1,144	1,917
1751–60	1,038	2,673	5,623	249	1,372	2,163
1761–70	1,129	2,244	6,132	525	1,777	3,330
1771–80	1,000	1,276	3,858	715	1,536	3,313

  

Departure Ports	Riga			Sweden			St. Petersburg		
	England	The Netherlands	Total	England	The Netherlands	Total	England	The Netherlands	Total of all ships
1671–80	382	949	1,792	831	645	2,305	—	—	—
1681–90	673	1,630	2,984	990	818	2,955	—	—	—
1691–1700	542	1,578	2,582	790	775	2,854	—	—	—
1701–10	146	512	841	734	707	2,362	1	0	1
1711–20	150	692	911	637	712	1,616	140	69	255
1721–30	550	1,370	2,231	876	834	2,816	494	350	1,071
1731–40	695	1,749	2,859	923	759	3,495	826	479	1,467
1741–50	968	1,457	3,045	909	830	3,170	1,008	459	1,710
1751–60	1,133	1,407	3,670	885	709	3,621	1,483	446	2,444
1761–70	1,091	1,855	4,130	954	611	4,249	1,752	351	2,890
1771–80	1,217	2,321	5,297	1,018	628	5,286	2,463	539	4,711

[source] *Sound Toll Tables*.

From Table 3 it can be seen that what was most important was the sudden increase in the number of ships from St. Petersburg to England through the Sound.

### Exports of Goods

English and Dutch exports consisted of domestic commodities and re-exported goods. The former was mainly cloth and the latter colonial goods - spices, pepper, indigo, sugar, tobacco, and rice etc. In this article I focus on cloth and colonial goods.

England's export of cloth was mainly shipped to Danzig, and then to St. Petersburg. During the period from 1671 to 1680, England's export of cloth to Danzig amounted to 8,200 pieces (yearly average), and its export to Königsberg was 9,600 pieces (yearly average); but during the period from 1771 to 1780, England's annual export of cloth amounted to 7,740 pieces and 7,710 pieces to those cities, respectively; while its export of cloth to Russia reached 25,500 pieces (yearly average). According to British trade statistics, Custom 3, the sum of British exports to Russia was £26,477 in

1731 and £103,286 in 1751.<sup>26)</sup> This will be the result from the rise of exports to St. Petersburg.

In the beginning, The Netherlands, too, exported cloth and colonial goods, mainly to Danzig. During the period from 1671 to 1680, the annual exports of The Netherlands to Danzig were 13,900 pieces in cloth and 1,199,000 pounds in colonial goods. In the same era, The Netherlands' average exports of both commodities to the Baltic were 25,100 pieces and 2,032,400 pounds respectively during the same decade. The share of Danzig was 55% in cloth and 59% in colonial goods. The annual export of cloth from The Netherlands to Danzig declined to 770 pieces in the period of 1771 to 1780, while in the same period the annual export from The Netherlands to St. Petersburg amounted to 12,000 pieces. The total export of cloth to the Baltic was 17,000 pieces in these years, and therefore, the share of the trade to St. Petersburg was 73% of the Dutch trade to the Baltic as a whole. In the same decade, The Netherlands exports of colonial goods to the Baltic reached 5,036,500 pounds (yearly average) and the share to St. Petersburg was 23%.

Lastly, we compare English and Dutch exports. In the period from 1671 to 1680, English annual cloth exports to the Baltic were 16,300 pieces and annual Dutch exports were 25,200. In the period from 1741 to 1750, England exported 36,000 pieces and The Netherlands 32,300. In the 16<sup>th</sup> century, the number of cloth pieces exported to the Baltic was larger in England than in The Netherlands. This fact was reversed by the 1620s, because The Netherlands exported lighter and cheaper new draperies to the Baltic, especially to Poland. This trend was again re-reversed by 1740s; however, the reasons for this are uncertain.

English exports of colonial goods to the Baltic were 7,335,000 pounds (yearly average) in the period from 1771 to 1780, and Dutch exports were 5,040,000 (yearly average). This difference was caused by England's superior position in the Atlantic trade.

The facts above demonstrate a tendency that in (re-)exports to the Baltic, England had more influence than The Netherlands.

### Features of Imports

The kinds of imports going into the Baltic were more various than those goods being exported. Major imports were flax, hemp, linen, ash, timber, iron, pitch, tar, grain, etc. England imported much pitch and tar from the New World and much timber from Norway;<sup>27)</sup> therefore, I refer here to flax, hemp, linen and iron.

We next pay attention to the flow of commodities. England imported linen mainly from Danzig. From the first half of the 17<sup>th</sup> century, the volume of linen imported from Danzig to England began to increase, and in the period from 1671 to 1680, it amounted to 21,900 pieces (yearly average) and reached 81,800 pieces in the period from 1731 to 1740. However, the import from St. Petersburg to England also started to rise, and overtook Danzig. In the period from 1771 to 1780, English annual import of linen from Danzig was 64,600 pieces, while that from St. Petersburg was 157,600 pieces.

---

26) P. R. O. Custom 3/51, 71.

27) Cf. H. S. K. Kent, *War and Trade in the Northern Seas: Anglo-Scandinavian Economic Relations in the Mid-eighteenth Century*, (London & New York, 1973); S.-E. Åström, "The Anglo-Norwegian Timber Trade in the Eighteenth Century", *Economic History Review*, 2nd ser., Vol. 13, (1955), pp. 62-74.



On the other hand, The Netherlands also imported much linen from Danzig. In the period from 1741 to 1750 it imported an annual quantity from Danzig of 22,000 pieces of linen and from St. Petersburg 6,100. During the period from 1771 to 1780, The Netherlands annually imported 24,400 pieces from Danzig and 35,500 from St. Petersburg. Compared to England, though, the number of imported pieces was smaller for The Netherlands.

England originally imported large quantities of flax and hemp from Riga. In the period from 1670 to 1680, England's annual imports of flax and hemp amounted to 9,700 shippounds and in the period from 1681 to 1690, it reached 23,000. During the decade from 1771 to 1780, the annual imports into England of flax and hemp from Riga was 24,900 pounds, and 109,000 pounds from St. Petersburg.

The Netherlands too imported flax and hemp, mainly from Riga, and its annual imports of these commodities were 13,500 shippounds in the period from 1671 to 1680. During the period from 1771 to 1780, its annual imports of flax and hemp from Riga were 16,600 shippounds, while from St. Petersburg it was 17,800 shippounds. In this respect, the rise of St. Petersburg is impressive. However, The Netherlands' imports from St. Petersburg were smaller than those from England.

In respect to iron, in the latter half of the 17<sup>th</sup> century Sweden was the center of iron exports in Europe. Its iron was known for its high quality and dominated the European market; and the country it exported iron most of all to was England (or Britain). From the 1760s, England imported iron mainly from Russia. During the period from 1771 to 1780, English annual imports of Swedish iron were 98,000 shippounds, and 169,000 shippounds from St. Petersburg. According to Custom 3, in 1751 British imports of iron from Sweden amounted to a sum of £180,646, and £ 55,948 from Russia was, but in 1771, from Sweden it was £146,555 and £268,116 from Russia.<sup>28)</sup> Russian iron was inferior to Swedish in quality, but was cheaper. The iron was carried from Ural Mountains to St. Petersburg via rivers and canals,<sup>29)</sup> and from there it was exported to Britain as bar iron. Kaplan contends that during the period from 1753 to 1783, more than 80% of the iron exported from St. Petersburg was carried by British ships.<sup>30)</sup>

The Netherlands, on the contrary, imported more iron from Sweden. In the period from 1741 to 1750, its annual imports from Sweden were 29,200 shippounds, but just 1,400 shippounds from St. Petersburg. During the period from 1771 to 1780, it was 21,300 shippounds from Sweden and 5,000 from St. Petersburg.

### **Characteristic of The Netherlands**

From the above analyses, imports and exports considered, the development of England was spectacular, especially in the import of iron from Russia. What then was the characteristic of The Netherlands?

Table 4 presents the exports of grain (rye and wheat) to The Netherlands from Danzig,

---

28) P. R. O. Custom 3/51,71.

29) A. Kahan, *The Plow, the Hammer, and the Knout: An Economic History of Eighteenth Century Russia*, (New York, 1985), p. 183

30) H. Kaplan, *Russian Overseas Commerce with Great Britain during the Reign of Catherine II*, (Philadelphia, 1995), p. 60.

**Table 4** Dutch imports of grain (rye and wheat) through the Sound (lasts)

Departure Ports	Danzig				Königsberg				Riga			
	rye		wheat		rye		wheat		rye		wheat	
	To The Netherlands	Total	To The Netherlands	Total	To The Netherlands	Total	To The Netherlands	Total	To The Netherlands	Total	To The Netherlands	Total
Years												
1671-80	118,389	146,223	66,123	74,101	49,894	56,749	17,207	18,158	17,454	23,203	583	626
1681-90	184,035	220,610	120,503	130,515	60,163	72,021	23,073	24,888	41,405	47,464	504	928
1691-1700	104,394	119,143	69,964	79,799	53,151	62,944	16,378	18,175	55,964	59,351	1,071	1,080
1701-10	96,207	100,622	46,597	49,606	40,532	44,839	13,973	14,681	3,809	3,911	0	62
1711-20	92,556	103,256	37,268	40,743	33,672	41,025	6,436	7,951	5,793	6,298	9	18
1721-30	150,940	192,968	76,691	88,603	35,286	46,548	6,782	8,611	1,888	2,823	1	8
1731-40	64,137	71,010	69,187	75,992	38,165	45,714	15,942	19,045	31,363	35,838	2,518	2,726
1741-50	64,413	78,241	50,655	54,440	17,420	27,786	7,674	11,194	8,280	11,498	1,023	1,043
1751-60	94,539	131,203	80,801	107,839	15,394	23,731	5,726	10,884	2,525	5,686	44	98
1761-70	93,470	143,053	67,809	98,605	40,245	74,358	15,087	23,756	24,414	48,949	832	1,618
1771-80	30,388	47,075	66,774	99,797	33,812	56,838	21,041	40,847	60,367	87,149	4,293	12,628

[source] *Sound Toll Tables*

Königsberg, and Riga. The three cities exported more than 75% of their grain through the Sound to The Netherlands (mainly Amsterdam). This fact shows that in the grain trade at least the English capabilities were inferior to those of The Netherlands.

It will represent the close relationship between the development of the Gutsherrschaft and the Dutch grain trade.<sup>31)</sup> Even by the latter half of the 16<sup>th</sup> century, the Dutch gained ascendancy in the Baltic grain trade. This trend continued at least to 1780. The formation of the Gutsherrschaft was only possible with the Dutch seaborne trade network.

In the beginning of this article, I referred to Wallerstein. In the period under discussion, the hegemonic state of the World Economy moved from The Netherlands to Britain. However, at least in the late 18<sup>th</sup> century, the Baltic was exploited not by the emerging hegemon Britain, but the old and past hegemonic state, The Netherlands.

### III. Trade with Russia

#### Major Ports

In this section, having already covered the Baltic trade, I discuss trade with the White Sea. Archangel, a town facing the White sea, had been 'discovered' by the English during the reign of Elizabeth I. But by the 17<sup>th</sup> century, Dutch merchants were those trading most actively in this town; indeed they founded a colony that became a trading center with Russia. At the end of the 17<sup>th</sup> century, Dutch merchants in Archangel exported such goods as furs, tallow, caviar, flax, tar,

31) In this age, England exported much grain; therefore, the importance of grain exported from the Baltic declined; D. Ormrod, *English Grain Exports and the Structure of Agrarian Capitalism, 1700-1760*, (Hull, 1985).

potash, ash, hemp etc., and imported salt, brandy, linen and colonial goods.<sup>32)</sup>

Comparison of shipping volumes from Archangel and St. Petersburg to Amsterdam shows that during the period from 1720 to 1779 the total tons of shipping from Amsterdam to Archangel was 48,125 tons while in the same period, from Amsterdam to St. Petersburg it was 29,278 tons.<sup>33)</sup> The Dutch preferred Archangel to St. Petersburg, and the Dutch balance of trade was negative in its trade with Archangel. The balance was settled using bills of exchange.<sup>34)</sup>

In 1713, Peter I ordered that one half of exports from Archangel be exported from St. Petersburg. In 1718, he ordered that, of Russian exports, two-thirds be exported from St. Petersburg and one-third from Archangel. In 1727, however, Archangel was permitted to continue trading as before. The difference between the two cities lay in the level of internal tariffs. The level of Archangel was 7%, and on the other hand that of St. was 3%.<sup>35)</sup>

Besides St. Petersburg and Archangel, Riga was another very important trading center for Russia in the 18<sup>th</sup> century. After the end of the Great Northern War in 1721, Russian trade was carried out based on these three cities – Archangel, St. Petersburg and Riga. It is true that the exports of St. Petersburg to England increased enormously but, in spite of Peter's efforts, the city did not overwhelm the other two ports.

### British and Dutch Merchants

In St. Petersburg, most of the foreign merchants were commission agents, and they traded with Russian merchants, who actually did not live in St. Petersburg. They came to the city in May and June every year; then after completing their business, they went back to their hometowns. Foreign merchants sold goods on credit and the deadline for settlement was usually in twelve months. They bought goods with cash; often paying cash in advance with the commodities promised for the next summer.

In 1699, the Moscow Company was reestablished as the Russian Company. After the establishment of St. Petersburg, its trade, especially its exports, expanded rapidly. Anyone could join this company if they paid five pence.<sup>36)</sup> Peter I preferred British to Dutch merchants, and so permitted the British merchants to send commodities to Russia and sell there in the same way as the Russian merchants.<sup>37)</sup> This might have been because Dutch merchants had close commercial relations with Archangel, and so they hesitated to settle in St. Petersburg. On the other hand, English merchants did not have strong ties with Archangel,<sup>38)</sup> establishing factories in St. Petersburg and enormously increasing the volume of trade with this city.

32) Knoppers, *op.cit.*, Vol. 1, p. 220.

33) *Ibid.*, p. 241.

34) *Ibid.*, p. 225.

35) J. W. Veluwenkamp, "Dutch Merchants in St Petersburg in the Eighteenth Century", *Tijdschrift voor Scandinavistiek*, 16, (1995), p. 237.

36) A. Cross, *By the Banks of the Neva: Chapters from the Lives and Careers of the British in Eighteenth-Century*, (Cambridge, 1997), p. 45.

37) Veluwenkamp, "Dutch Merchants in St Petersburg", pp. 236–237.

38) *Ibid.*, p. 247.

The two important commercial treaties between Britain and Russia were concluded in 1734 and 1766, respectively. The former is considered as a commercial victory of Britain.<sup>39)</sup> By the latter treaty, the British were permitted to trade as the Russians did, and they could use their own currency (pound sterling) instead of the rijksdaler or leeuwendaaler (Dutch currency).<sup>40)</sup> In 1763 bills of exchange appeared in transactions between London and St. Petersburg; indicating that the British could remit through London instead of Amsterdam.<sup>41)</sup> Further, though British trade with Russia was in deficit, their receipts produced by freight and services seem to have given them a balance of payments surplus.<sup>42)</sup>

Many of the Dutch merchants in Archangel belonged to the Reformed Church; and in 1730 a new parish of about 238 people including 81 merchants, their families and servants was established.<sup>43)</sup> Dutch merchants in Archangel married merchants in The Netherlands,<sup>44)</sup> and Archangel provided them with social, economic, cultural and commercial foundations; something that they could not have in St. Petersburg. So, the Dutch persisted in trading with Archangel, setting up a long period for commercial relations. However, in St. Petersburg the Dutch merchants did not trade as actively as did the British.

Some Dutch merchants, who belonged to the Reformed Church, moved from Archangel to St. Petersburg in order to create better relationships with the czar. However, there were just 48 members in the parish of the Reformed Church in St. Petersburg, whereas there were 112 in Archangel.<sup>45)</sup>

### Three trading areas and their characteristics

The treaty of Nystadt, which ended the Great Northern War, enabled Russia to become the state with the greatest political power in the Baltic. Nevertheless, Russian commercial policy, which aimed to make St. Petersburg the center of Russian economy, did not succeed. From the point of view of relations with Western Europe, there emerged three commercial zones. The first is the White Sea region with its center at Archangel where the Dutch merchant principally traded. The second was the area in which British merchant dominated and its center was St. Petersburg.

---

39) D. K. Reading, *The Anglo-Russian Commercial Treaty of 1734* (New Heaven and London, 1938), p. 301; Cross, *op.cit.*, p. 47.

40) "Treaty of Commerce and Navigation Between Great Britain and Russia" in Lord Liverpool (ed.), *A Collection of Treaties between Great Britain and Other Powers*, Vol. 3, (London, 1785; re. New York, 1969), pp. 215-234.

41) P. Dehing and M. 't Hart, "Linking the Fortunes: Currency and Banking, 1500-1800" in M. 't Hart, J. Jonker and J. L. van Zanden (eds.), *A Financial History of the Netherlands*, (Cambridge, 1997), p. 59.

42) H. H. Kaplan, "Russia's Impact on the Industrial Revolution in Great Britain during the Second Half of the Eighteenth Century: The Significance of International Commerce", *Forschungen zur osteuropäischen Geschichte*, 29, (1981), p. 9.

43) J. Veluwenkamp, "Familienetwerken binnen Nederlandse koopliedengemeenschap van Archangel in de eerste helft van de achttiende eeuw", *Bijdragen en Mededelingen betreffende de Geschiedenis der Nederlanden*, Vol. 108, (1993), p. 658.

44) *Ibid.*, p. 660.

45) *Id.*, *Archangel*, p. 182.

The third was the Livonian region with its center at Riga. These commercial areas were related with each other, but fundamentally were autonomous commercial zones. The main exports from Riga were flax, hemp, grain (rye) and timber; this port town belonged not only to the Russian commercial zone but also to part of the Gutsherrschaft area from Poland to Livonia.

In the latter half of the 18<sup>th</sup> century, the situation changed. Even in 1783, exports from Archangel were 38.7% of the total of Russian exports.<sup>46)</sup> In this period, Dutch merchants as well as merchants from North Germany, for example Hamburg, were very active in Archangel.<sup>47)</sup>

The hinterlands of St. Petersburg were extended by the development of river and canal systems. Bar iron was carried from the Ural Mountains to the city, and iron exported from Russia supported the demand of Britain during the period from the 1760s to the 1790s (the beginning of Industrial Revolution).<sup>48)</sup> Russia became the European country from which Britain imported the most. Its trade deficit with Russia rose from £130,000 to £1,120,000 in 1771.<sup>49)</sup> Naval stores from St. Petersburg became essential commodities for the development of Britain's shipping industry, which then formed the basis for the formation of the British Empire.

From the end of the 18<sup>th</sup> century, the influence of Russian merchants became stronger in Riga,<sup>50)</sup> but it was in the 19<sup>th</sup> century that the port town of Riga was incorporated into the Russian national economy. The demand for flax and hemp exported from Riga was so high that the rapidly increasing exports from St. Petersburg did not give impact much upon Riga.<sup>51)</sup> Livonia could maintain an autonomous commercial zone for a long period because its hinterland was so extensive.

---

46) Kellenbenz, *op.cit.*, p. 581.

47) *Ibid.*, p. 197.

48) J. Harris, *The British Iron Industry*, (London, 1988), p. 50.

49) P. R. O. Custom 3/31, 71.

50) U. Handrack, *Der Handel der Stadt Riga im 18. Jahrhundert*, (Jena, 1932), pp. 37–45.

51) Harder-Gersdorf, "Riga im Rahmen der Handelsmetropolen", pp. 561–562.

## イギリスとオランダのバルト海・北海貿易（1671-1780年）

玉 木 俊 明

近代のバルト海地方（ロシアを含む）は、西欧への原材料の供給地域として機能した。西欧の対バルト海貿易においては、オランダの圧倒的優位が衰退し、イギリスが台頭したものの、なおオランダが優位を占めた。イギリスはサンクト・ペテルブルクからの輸入を大きく増やし、それが「帝国」の形成に役立った。オランダは、穀物輸入においては他を圧倒し、それがグーツヘルシャフトの形成に寄与した。

このような様相は、対ロシア貿易だけを取り上げると大きく異なる。18世紀のロシアでは、アルハンゲリスクを中心とし、オランダ商業が活躍する白海貿易圏、サンクト・ペテルブルクを中心とし、イギリス商人が活躍する貿易圏、リーガを中心とするリヴォニア地方の三貿易圏が成立した。この三つの貿易圏は、ある程度依存しあいながらも、基本的に自律的な商業圏として機能したのである。