Siege Mentalities

Objects in Motion, British Imperial Expansion, and the Pacific Turn

J. M. Mancini

Focusing on the period between George Anson’s circumnavigation in the 1740s and the joint British seizure of the Spanish cities of Manila and Havana in 1762, this article argues that the taking and making of objects in motion provided an important point of intersection between the British prosecution of empire in the Atlantic and in the Pacific in the eighteenth century. It has two central aims: first, to highlight the interconnectedness of the Atlantic to wider global contexts and, second, to emphasize the key role of military conflict and other processes beyond commerce in the generation and circulation of objects.

Anson, the celebrated navigator, was First Lord of the Admiralty—a position in which he disappointed everybody. (Francis Parkman, Montcalm and Wolfe, 1884)

Nor shou’d the naval daring sons of Spain,
Unnotic’d, in the warlike list remain;
Who dar’d with Britain’s matchless Tars t’engage;
Faced gallant Pocock’s war! and brav’d fierce Keppel’s rage!

(George Cockings, “War: An Heroic Poem,” printed by Samuel Adams, 1762)

Trade is not the only method for transferring surplus. (Philippe Beaujard, “The Indian Ocean in Eurasian and African World-Systems before the Sixteenth Century,” 2005)

In November of 1765, Dawsonne Drake was in big trouble. For three years, he had been deputy governor of British-occupied Manila, after a siege of the city undertaken by his employer, the East India Company, in concert with Britain’s naval and ground forces and precipitated by Spain’s disastrous decision to join its ally France in the Seven Years’ War. At first, things had gone well for Drake. The city fell rapidly, and the acting Spanish governor, the Mexican-born Archbishop Manuel Antonio Roxo del Rio Vera, readily agreed to a $4 million capitulation.1 But then Drake’s fortunes declined. Despite the very British promises the Company made to its would-be subjects—religious toleration and certain exemptions from taxation—the people of Luzon did not welcome their new invaders with open arms.2 Rather, as Drake and his Council lamented, “the minds of the Natives of

1 Diary and Consultations of Dawsonne Drake Esquire &ca., Council of Manila, October 3, 6, and 10, 1762, British Library IOR/H/76 (hereafter cited as BL-DD). On capitulation, see “Proposals made to their Excellencies His Britannick Majestys Commander in Chief by Sea and Land, by His Excellency the Archbishop Captain General of the Phillipine Islands” and “Conditions on which the City of Manila shall be preserved from Plunder,” both October 6, 1762, BL-DD.

2 “General Draper … published Manifesto’s [sic] declaring the Indians that shall pay Obedience to His Britannick Majesty to be exempted from all Taxes and Personal Services imposed by the Spanish Government,” undated entry, BL-DD; see also November 3, 1762, BL-DD.
these Islands [were] alienated from us ... through the means of the Augustine Friars and other disaffected Persons”—most notably the Spanish lieutenant governor, Don Simón de Anda y Salazar. Indeed, only two months after the surrender of Manila, the situation in its hinterland was so unstable that Drake was forced to propose to his naval counterpart, Admiral Samuel Cornish, an “Expedition to Boulacan” (Bulacan) “to destroy Senr. Anda’s Influence in the Country.” Cornish’s response was curt: declining Drake’s request, he declared that he “consider’d the Conquest compleat.” Thus, Drake faced a second, perhaps even graver problem: the final disintegration of his relationship with his military allies, which even during the planning stages of the siege had been fractious due to disagreement over how to divide the much-anticipated “Booty or Plunder, Ships, Vessells, Goods, Merchandize, Treasure, and other things” that the expedition promised to yield. Things were to grow even worse. By the time his adventure ended, Drake was politically ruined, having been demoted, replaced with the Scottish hydrographer Alexander Dalrymple, and brought before an inquiry in which a host of accusers aired grievances against him. Owing to the Company’s decision to withhold payment of his expenses, Drake also faced financial disaster. Perhaps under the circumstances, it is not surprising that Drake, who made it to Canton from Angkor Wat to East Timor, “sacred” declining Drake’s [ship of safety] was not just his sister but Lady Pocock; “Mr. McKie” was probably John Michie, Lady Pocock’s husband’s executor; and this favored sister’s husband was not just Drake’s brother-in-law but Sir George Pocock—the admiral after whom Drake’s ship of safety was named. Knight of the Bath as well as admiral, Pocock was prominent, successful, and rich; in contrast to the luckless Drake, as naval commander of the combined British expedition against Havana that had been undertaken concurrently with the Manila siege (Pocock also fought in India during the same war), he had made his departure from the Seven Years’ War victorious and with the certain promise of £22,697 in booty. As such, Pocock was undoubtedly the best-placed contact to whom Drake could appeal personally for help. This Drake did, directing numerous entreaties to his “dear Brother” and continuing to send objects to the Pococks long after returning to India. Luckily for Drake, Pocock and Michie


4 Drake and Council to Cornish, December 16, 1762, BL-PPP.

5 Cornish to Drake, December 18, 1762, BL-PPP. For prize negotiations, see East India Company proposed “Articles of Agreement Indented made and concluded in Fort St. George,” [July 1762]; Cornish and William Draper to George Pigot, July 28, 1762; Cornish to Pigot, July 28, 1762; Draper to [Pigot], [July 29, 1762]; Pigot and Council to Cornish and Draper, July 30, 1762; Cornish and Draper to Pigot and Council, July 31, 1762; Pigot and Council to Cornish and Draper, July 31, 1762; Cornish and Draper to Pigot and Council, July 31, 1762, all in BL-PPP.

6 President and Council of Fort St. George, “Observations upon the Accusers of Mr. Drake from the Enquiry into his Conduct,” [1767], Henry E. Huntington Library, San Marino, CA (hereafter cited as HEH), PO 1026.

7 Stephen De Visme to G. Pocock, December 8, 1765, HEH PO 1031; John Burrow to G. Pocock, December 7, 1765, HEH PO 1030.

8 Dawsonne Drake to Dear Sister [Lady Pocock], November 25, 1765, HEH PO 1029.

9 General figures on booty are in César García del Pino, Toma de La Habana por los ingleses y sus antecedentes (Havana: Editorial de Ciencias Sociales, 2002), 194; for individual payouts, see [Sir] G[eorge] Pocock, May 23, 1765, HEH PO 1004 (receipt for £2,000); Pocock, July 16, 1764, HEH PO 1009 (receipt for £10,261 15 3); Pocock, September 2, 1766, HEH PO 1023 (receipt for £10,000); Pocock, April 22, 1772, HEH PO 1066 (receipt for £5,121 6 3).

10 See Drake to Pocock, January 20, 1767, HEH PO 1024; Drake to Pocock, “Papers contained in the Packet,” [ca. 1768], HEH PO 1038; Drake to Pocock, June 28/December 17, 1769, HEH PO 1053; Drake to Pocock, July 20, 1771, HEH PO 1016; for objects, see Drake to Pocock, August 15, 1768 (“four pieces of Long Cloth”), HEH; Drake to Pocock, February 28, 1772, HEH PO 1021.
took his side; at long last, he was able to regain his pay, if not the position he desired in the Company.11

Twinned Sieges, Objects in Motion, Magnified Networks

Drake’s woeful adventure provides a glimpse into the complex roles that objects in motion could play in the lives of individuals who participated in Britain’s eighteenth-century Asian turn. But what might a consideration of Drake’s story tell us about the more familiar spheres that are the main destination of this volume—North America, the Caribbean, and the “Atlantic world”? First, and most generally, Drake’s multifaceted entanglement in the twinned sieges of Manila and Havana calls attention to an important fact: that incipient British militarization in the Pacific was directly connected to events in the Caribbean. But a more detailed exploration of the particulars of Drake’s misadventure also invites two more specific observations to be considered below. The first is that processes surrounding the placement of objects in motion played significant, multifaceted, and consequential roles in both expeditions—and thus themselves provided an important point of intersection between the British prosecution of empire in the Atlantic and the Pacific. The second is that the intimate, often object-inflected human connections that linked figures like Drake and Pocock also joined Asian and Atlantic spheres in important ways.

As the bickering over “Booty and Plunder” suggests, the siege of Manila began as it ended for Drake: with the idea of putting objects in motion. This was no idle argument, either. The capitulation, in early October, rendered the subsequent British seizure of Spanish objects outside of that agreement illegal. Nonetheless, this prevented neither Cornish’s capture, on October 30, of the Santíssima Trinidad and all its cargo (including $30,000 worth of possessions belonging to Pedro Calderón Henríquez, a Spanish oidor, or magistrate, returning home after twenty-five years) nor widespread looting within the city itself. As Calderón Henríquez—himself no stranger to the harder side of empire, having earlier played a crucial role in the “Pacification” of the Manila hinterland—described it, “the Place [was] plundered with the utmost rigour for more than forty Hours.”12 Drake himself participated eagerly. As Nicholas Cushner recounts, a Captain Thomas Backhouse later reported that Drake “took all the furnishings from the Spanish governor’s palace and chapel and packed them in crates which he neatly marked, ‘Rice for Governor Drake.’”13 Objects possibly put in motion during this episode include a Sino-Philippine altar frontal with the arms of Fernando Valdés y Tamon (governor of the Philippines from 1729 to 1739), one of only a few such Catholic liturgical textiles from Asia in British collections, and two maps also associated with Valdés y Tamon that became part of the personal collection of George III (fig. 1).14 Moreover, Drake failed to stop even later instances of looting, notably the November 3, 1762, raid on the church and convent of San Agustín in which, as Pedro Galende estimates, the British seized 200,000 pesos in objects and 92,000 pesos in cash—and even “sold at public auction” the church building itself (fig. 2), along with “jewels, church vestments, paintings, engravings, bells, infirmary furniture, medicines, two church organs, books and incunabula from the library.”15 Thus, British looting targeted not only objects whose value was primarily monetary or aesthetic but also “information objects” that might facilitate imperial expansion, such as a 1707 codex of transcriptions of royal Spanish decrees relating to the trade between Acapulco and the Philippines.16 Many of these ended up in Dalrymple’s hands, and some eventually made their way to North America, including a codex, which, now at Indiana University, still mutely pleads that it “Belongs to the sideboard outside the Wall, Drawer no. 4” of San Agustín (fig. 3).

Havana did not experience the sort of pillage Manila did, but both legal and extralegal forms of

11 Drake wrote, “It is with infinite pleasure I acquaint you my Manilla Accounts are at last settled & paid to my utmost satisfaction, & tho’ I cannot flatter my self the Directors will restore me to the Service again, as Mr Michie & Yourself have so often been disappointed in your applications in my behalf, still I must do them the justice to say they have behav’d ... beyond almost what I could have expected from them” (Drake to Pocock, October 16, 1772, HEH PO 1068).

12 “Traslado authentico de las Diligencias evaquadas para la Pacificacion de algunos Pueblos,” 1745, Lilly Library Philippine Manuscripts (hereafter LLPM) Lot 524, Ms. 21534 (4); Pedro Calderón Henríquez to Drake and Council, [likely December 13, 1762], BL-PPP.


16 “Indice de las copias de Cedulas Reales ... tocantes a las Naos,” LLPM Ms. 21534 (2).
“surplus transfer” also figured prominently in that campaign. As Pocock’s booty suggests, the capitulation yielded a vast reward to the siege’s prosecutors, including the leader of the ground forces, 3rd Earl of Albemarle George Keppel, who acquired the same sum as Pocock. Moreover, Pocock and Albemarle both worked to acquire cash or objects outside the capitulation. Pocock used his experience with the law of prize to keep the proceeds from ships “taken before the Surrender of the Havanna.” Albemarle added rather ominously that “I hope I shall not have motives to deviate from my Inclinations by any mistake of your side.” This emphasis on the transfer of objects and cash had long-term consequences, and not just for Spaniards. The extreme hardship of the campaign, exacerbated by the almost immediate return of Cuba to Spain via the Treaty of Paris, set the stage for widespread British military unrest that, in the words of Peter Way, “erupted from Newfoundland to Florida after the war unfolded.” As Way argues, the mutiny’s origins lay in pay, conditions, and the sense that traditional rights had been revoked. But it was also fueled by the perception among Havana veterans that “the blood of britons … was lavish’d to agrandize individuals”—Pocock, Albemarle, and the other high-ranking officers who shared the bulk of the booty.

17 "Reasons why the Produce of the Vessels and Goods … in … Havana … is not divided," [1763], HEH PO 987; Pocock won a decision stating that “the Spanish ships in the Harbour were to be delivered without Restriction” (GB Court of Appeal for Prizes Decree, July 16, 1765, HEH PO 1005); Michie et al., “Sales of Sundry Prize Vessels,” March 7, 1772, HEH PO 1063.

18 Albemarle [George Keppel] to Bishop of Havana, October 19, 1762, HEH PO 942.

19 Peter Way, “Rebellion of the Regulars; Working Soldiers and the Mutiny of 1763–1764.” William and Mary Quarterly 57, no. 4
Further consideration of another element of Drake’s story, his personal relationship to Pocock, is also warranted in Atlantic and global contexts. After all, British imperial actors in the Atlantic often had close connections to others engaged in related actions in the region and in other places of interest to Britain, connections often inflected by objects in motion. Pocock’s second-in-command in Havana, for instance, was Albemarle’s younger brother, Augustus, Viscount Keppel (the two Keppels were the sons of William Anne Keppel, 2nd Earl of Albemarle, after whom Albemarle County is named), who gained £25,000 from the siege. While frequently familial, persistent personal relationships connecting British imperial actors could also originate in other ways—such as the shared experience of a particular campaign. Keppel’s early career, for example, included service under Commodore,

---

Further consideration of another element of Drake’s story, his personal relationship to Pocock, is also warranted in Atlantic and global contexts. After all, British imperial actors in the Atlantic often had close connections to others engaged in related actions in the region and in other places of interest to Britain, connections often inflected by objects in motion. Pocock’s second-in-command in Havana, for instance, was Albemarle’s younger brother, Augustus, Viscount Keppel (the two Keppels were the sons of William Anne Keppel, 2nd Earl of Albemarle, after whom Albemarle County is named), who gained £25,000 from the siege. While frequently familial, persistent personal relationships connecting British imperial actors could also originate in other ways—such as the shared experience of a particular campaign. Keppel’s early career, for example, included service under Commodore,

---

and later admiral, George Anson, on a round-the-world voyage that brought him into close association with his fellow officers, including Anson.

Indeed, these relationships were important enough to be commemorated in a 1747 gold medal by the Italian-born medallist and die engraver Thomas Pingo. Notable for its careful draftsmanship and its explicit appeal to the poses, iconography, and composition of Roman imperial coins, the medal’s obverse, in the form of a portrait bust of Anson with his own hair, in profile, receiving a crown of laurels from the figure of Winged Victory, marked Anson’s victory against the French at Finisterre (fig. 4). The reverse, however, presented Anson neither as a solitary figure nor as one limited to the Atlantic, venerating his relationship to the officers via the repeated motif of laurel wreaths—symbol of both victory and immortality. These encircle the officers’ names as well as a central image framed by a beaded boundary, containing the word CIRCUMNAVIGATION and a second Victoria, this one atop a monstrous winged creature above a tiny globe (fig. 5).

The earth-spanning, object-inflected relationships that linked Anson to Keppel, Keppel to Albemarle,
Albemarle to Pocock, and Pocock to Drake—and the complex travels that underpinned such relationships—suggest a series of interrelated observations that are of methodological interest to the analysis of the eighteenth-century Atlantic. The first is that, in the eighteenth century, the movement of Britons increasingly took place within a context in which they and their objects moved not only in the Atlantic world but also within, between, and across the worlds of the Indian or Pacific Oceans. The second is that the movement of these individual Britons and their objects was, in an important sense, magnified by the fact that Britons who moved were also likely to have close personal ties to other Britons who also moved—including Britons who moved in worlds beyond their own. The development of magnified networks of moving Britons thus resulted in an increased intensity and complexity in the movement of objects, in the production of objects created to represent both motion and relationships forged in motion, and perhaps even in the roles that objects in motion served within empire itself.

Anson’s Objects

I have suggested here that Keppel’s relationship to Anson was typical of other relationships in the expanding worlds of the eighteenth-century British empire in important respects: in, for example, its linking of the Atlantic to other global spheres and in its commemoration in the form of moveable objects. But this relationship, and all relationships involving Anson, were more than merely typical, for two reasons. The first is that Anson, as eventual First Lord of the Admiralty, was one of the most powerful agents of British naval policy in the eighteenth century—was, indeed, the prime mover behind the Havana and Manila sieges. The second is that Anson’s rise to power from the 1740s to the 1760s was itself intertwined at all points with the creation, exchange, seizure, theft, reproduction, alteration, and destruction of moveable and moving objects. For these reasons, this article will now turn to Anson’s actions and objects.

Anson’s rise, and the complex personal and imperial relations with objects that were to emerge from it, began with the circumnavigation commemorated by Pingo. Significantly, this voyage was itself predicated on a sense of the real and potential interconnections between the Atlantic and the Pacific worlds—and in particular on an understanding of the southwestern Caribbean not as the edge of the Atlantic but as a hinge between the two great oceans and their worlds. This understanding can be seen in the explanation of the purpose of the voyage, presented in the hugely successful account of the expedition published under the purported authorship of Anson’s chaplain, Richard Walter, as A Voyage Round the World. As Walter wrote, Anson’s initial purpose in going to the Pacific had been “to touch in the neighbourhood of Panama, and to ... get some correspondence over land with ... Admiral Vernon,” who famously had already captured Portobelo and who was expected also to seize Cartagena de Indias. This pincer action was meant to allow Britain to take “even Panama itself; which would have given to the British Nation the possession of all that Isthmus, whereby we should have been in effect masters of all the treasures of Peru, and should have had in our hands an equivalent for any demands ... we might have ... made on either of the branches of the House of Bourbon.”

This scheme to control the hinge between the oceans came to nothing. Despite the striking of medals depicting Cartagena’s Don Blas de Lezo y Olavarrieta on bent knee, handing his sword to Vernon, Vernon actually lost the battle along with 18,000 men, and Anson quickly abandoned any notion of permanently seizing American territory (fig. 6). Nonetheless, Anson’s vision of the Caribbean as the gateway to the Pacific persisted, and he, Keppel, and the rest of his men avidly set their sights on other Pacific objects: notably, the prize and plunder to be obtained by temporarily taking Spanish towns and by seizing Spanish ships. In an action in which Keppel was “shot in his jocky cap” and nearly killed, for example, Anson’s men took the Peruvian town of Paita for its “dollars and church plate” and its “broad-cloaths, silks, cambrics, velvets, &c.” Pausing only briefly to hoist “an English flag ... on the flag-staff of the fort” and to offer to the town’s governor a last-minute chance to ransom the goods they could not carry with them, Anson’s men burned the settlement to the ground and returned to the Centurion for an on-the-spot prize auction. Anson then made his way to Acapulco in search of the Manila galleon, crossed the Pacific, and ultimately captured, off Cape Espiritu Santo in the Philippines, the eastbound Nuestra Señora de Covadonga with its cargo of “1,313,843


21 Walter, Anson’s Voyage, 198.
pieces of eight, and 35,682 oz. of virgin silver, besides some cochineal, and a few other commodities.\textsuperscript{22}

The taking of this treasure made Anson’s fame, as well as his fortune. Soon enough after Anson’s return to London that its engraver appears to have scratched in Anson’s name at the last minute, Thomas Bakewell published \textit{England’s Glory} (1744; Guildhall Library, City of London), depicting the procession through London of thirty-two wagonloads of silver. Samuel Scott painted multiples of Anson’s feats, including the \textit{Capture of the Nuestra Señora de Covadonga by HMS Centurion, 20 June 1743} (ca. 1743; National Maritime Museum, Greenwich, London). And, according to the records of the National Portrait Gallery, Anson himself became the subject of at least twenty-seven portrait oils and engravings. But painted or printed portraits and battle scenes represented only a fraction of the Anson objects produced, many at his own urging. In a notable addition to Pingo’s gold medal, Anson also transformed some of the \textit{Covadonga’s} vast coin into icon, commissioning the Huguenot silversmith Paul de Lamerie to make dozens of objects with the Anson arms, including an enormous charger in University of California, Los Angeles’s Fowler Museum.\textsuperscript{23}

Perhaps the most important Anson object was the \textit{Voyage Round the World}, which joined Walter’s text to forty-two engravings fashioned after drawings made during the voyage by Piercy Brett, the \textit{Centurion’s} third lieutenant and eventual captain. This work was a sensational success. Initially printed in folio via subscription in 1748, its original 350 subscribers included the Archbishop of Canterbury, a roster of aristocrats (including Albemarle and Keppel’s mother and father), and “Christopher Mole, Esq; for the Hon. the Directors of the East-India Company,” who ordered “31 books.”\textsuperscript{24} After this, it was quickly reprinted, in both quarto and cheaper octavo editions. By 1749, the \textit{Voyage Round the World} was in its fifth edition, and by 1767, its twelfth. It was translated into German, Dutch, and French, thus gaining an avid reader in Jean Jacques Rousseau. As Christopher Thacker notes, in his 1761 \textit{Julie, ou La nouvelle Héloïse}, Rousseau sent the character Saint-Preux around the world with a fictional Anson and, upon the character’s return to Julie’s garden, made him cry, “O Tinian! O Juan-Fernandez! Julie, the end of the world is at your door!” in a direct evocation of the two islands for which Brett made edenic views.\textsuperscript{25} Rousseau, furthermore, was one of many prominent writers to be influenced by this Anson object. Darwin brought it on the \textit{Beagle} and read it while on board; J. S. Mill wrote in his autobiography that “Anson’s Voyage” was one of “two books which [he] never wearied of reading.”\textsuperscript{26} It was included in Bohn’s Standard Library and the Everyman’s Library. And, more than 200 years after its publication, Anson’s \textit{Voyage Round the World} became the basis for not one but two novels by Patrick O’Brian.\textsuperscript{27}

Beyond its publication in numerous, varied editions and its generation of new literary works influenced by its text and images, the \textit{Voyage Round the World} also became multiplied, magnified, and mutated in other respects—in, for instance, the creation of new images modeled after Walter’s text. The looting and burning of Paita, for example, was originally presented both in the text and as

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{22} The usually omitted “List of Subscribers” is in the first edition of \textit{Voyage Round the World} (Getty Research Institute, Los Angeles).
\item \textsuperscript{23} Christopher Thacker, “O Tinian! O Juan-Fernandez!; Rousseau’s ‘Elysée’ and Anson’s Desert Islands,” \textit{Garden History} 5, no. 2 (Summer 1977): 41–47.
\item \textsuperscript{25} Patrick O’Brian, \textit{The Golden Ocean} (London: Hart-Davis, 1956), and \textit{The Unknown Shore} (London: Hart-Davis, 1959).
\end{itemize}
“The burning of the Town of Payta,” engraved by J. S. Müller after Brett’s drawing (fig. 7). This image is itself interesting and deceptively complex. Appearing at first glance as merely a conventionally exciting narrative depiction of naval victory—complete with sinking ships and billowing smoke—it is also a legible coastal profile, complete with textual references, depicting the settlement as it stretched from the large cross atop a high hill at the south end of town, past the parish church and convent of the Order of Mercy (the name of whose order Brett, or perhaps Müller, mistakenly rendered as “The Convent of Mercenarians”), to the hills at the north. Nonetheless, when Edward Cavendish Drake published an image of the raid in his later compendium, the New Universal Collection of Authentic and Entertaining Voyages and Travels, he did not turn to the Brett/Müller image but presented a new image, “Admiral Anson’s men in the dress of the Inhabitants of Payta” (fig. 8). This was based on a passage in the text describing the sailors’ “private pillage” of “the cloaths which the Spaniards in their flight had left behind them, and which, according to the custom of the country, were ... either embroidered or laced,” in which “our people eagerly seized these glittering habits, and put them on over their own dirty trowsers and jackets.” Indeed, the new image dwelled on the raid’s most sensational detail: that “those, who came latest into the fashion ... were obliged to take up with womens gowns and petticoats, which ... they made no scruple of ... blending with their own greasy dress.”

More common was the making of new images and objects after Brett’s drawings or the Voyage Round the World’s images (fig. 9). Like Dawsonne Drake after him, Anson also stopped in Canton, acquiring an armorial porcelain plate (ca. 1743–47; British Museum) whose garlanded breadfruit tree decoration suggests that it was made after the same original as figure 9; Anson also commissioned a silk waistcoat, although apparently did not pay for it.

Moreover, Anson was only one instigator for such secondary objects. The royal cartographer Emanuel Bowen created “A new and accurate map of the world” (ca. 1744–48; National Library of Australia) that, after the “Voyage’s Chart, shewing the Track of the Centurion round the world,” inscribed Anson’s route; the map also contained an admonition “to observe, that Sr. Francis Drake was the first navigator who made the circuit of the globe: for tho’ Magellan was first in that design ... he was unfortunately killed [and] cannot properly be intitled a circumnavigator.” This particular form of multiplication and geographical reimagining continued in the next century, when Lane’s Improved Globe allowed observers to hold the world in their hands.

28 Walter, Anson’s Voyage, 184.
29 Letter from Canton merchant to Lord Anson, 1742, National Maritime Museum, Greenwich.
Fig. 8. "Admiral Anson's men in the dress of the Inhabitants of Payta." From Edward Cavendish Drake, New Universal Collection of Authentic and Entertaining Voyages and Travels (London: printed for J. Cooke, at Shakespear's Head, in Pater-Noster-Row, 1771), 137. (Getty Research Institute, Los Angeles, 93-B9774.)

Fig. 9. After Piercy Brett, "A View of the Watering Place at Tenian," 1748. Engraving. From Richard Walter, A Voyage Round the World in the Years MDCCXL, I, II, III, IV by George Anson, Esq. (London: Knapton, 1748), 310. (Getty Research Institute, Los Angeles, 95-B2328.)
to turn it on its poles, and to reenact Anson’s voyage from the Atlantic, to the Pacific, and back to the Atlantic again (figs. 10 and 11).

Insider Art; or, Take and Loot

The sheer proliferation of Anson objects brings us back to the Atlantic, and to North America, for another reason. That is its obvious similarity to the process, analyzed compellingly by Kathleen Wilson, whereby object-making, press saturation, and public celebration commemorated the feats of Anson’s rival and imagined collaborator in the bicoastal seizure of Spanish America, Admiral Edward Vernon. According to Wilson, the Vernon “agitation” was a watershed in Atlantic history. By bringing together “economic interests, expansionist aspirations and anti-government sentiment,” the Vernon agitation strengthened opposition to and ultimately contributed to the collapse of Walpole’s administration; moreover, Wilson argues, it laid “the groundwork for popular support for, and ministerial exploitation of, Britain’s greatest imperial effort in the eighteenth century, the Seven Years War.”

Thus, the parallel existence of the Anson “agitation”—of another episode that saw the creation and circulation of large numbers of objects venerating a British admiral active in the War of Jenkins’ Ear and that in turn encouraged imperial expansion in the Seven Years’ War—suggests that Wilson’s analysis fits not only a specific case but a broader pattern for the eighteenth-century Atlantic.

A comparison between the Vernon and Anson “agitations” is warranted not only because of the general similarities between the two episodes, however, but also because the significant differences between them complicate Wilson’s analysis of eighteenth-century British expansion and the role of objects within it. Consider the divergent aesthetic and social-political sensibilities operative within the two agitations. In concordance with Wilson’s analysis of the Vernon agitation as allied to popular politics, the objects of that agitation are fashioned mostly in a vernacular and naive style. For instance, the many anonymous Vernon medals commemorating his victory at Portobelo (and the premature Cartagena coins) were generally cast in a copper alloy and present a crudely drawn Vernon in contemporary dress and wig (fig. 12; and see fig. 6). This contrasts sharply with the careful design and neo-imperial iconography, as well as the material, of Pingo’s medal (cast in both gold and silver)—and with Pingo’s later role as a founding member of the Royal Academy (see figs. 4 and 5). If the Vernon objects were popular, vernacular, and linked to the opposition, the Anson objects might be described as “insider art” at the level of both design (the conscious appropriation of the ancient historical practice by those with power of crafting images for political ends) and institutional interconnection

sonal gain and by the nonpermanent seizure of territories for their cash, objects, provisions, or information. In this alternative, objects in motion served not only a memorial or even a persuasive purpose, but they were constitutive of the “imperial effort” itself. If Vernon’s method was take and hold, Anson’s was take and loot.

By following Wilson’s method but acknowledging these differences, it becomes possible to chart an alternative trajectory for British imperial expansion from the War of Jenkins’ Ear to the Seven Years’ War that passes not through Vernon’s objects but through Anson’s. Space does not permit a complete charting, so it will be necessary to focus on only the most obvious Anson object to anticipate the siege of Manila: the Voyage Round the World, whose text openly articulated Anson’s regret that his superiors had revoked a plan for such a siege before the Centurion’s embarkation and whose text and images employed strategies such as compression and repetition to emphasize the link between Acapulco and the Philippines and, more specifically, to cast the Philippines as a narrative end point.

This highlighting of the Acapulco-Philippine link through narrative compression is apparent both in the text and in two images, “A Chart of the Pacific Ocean” (fig. 13) and “A View of 2 of the Ladrone Islands/ A Plan of the Harbour of Acapulco/ A Plan of the Bay of Manila.” Although titled a Voyage Round the World, the narrative essentially ends with the capture of the Covadonga off the Philippine coast and an extraordinarily antagonistic account of the Centurion’s ensuing visit to Canton. The voyage across the remaining half of the globe only merits a few paragraphs. “A Chart of the Pacific” presents much the same story. The image’s overall composition places the Philippines, half obscured by the frame, at the extreme western edge of the map and omits China altogether, even though during the “real” voyage Anson spent a considerable period in Macao before returning to the Philippines. Moreover, the annotation to the dotted east-west line at lower center detailing “Commodore Anson’s Track from Acapulco to Tenian and from thence to China” is immediately followed by a consecutive annotation for “The Track of Nostra Seigniora de Cabadonga from Acapulco to Guam & from there to the Philippine [sic] Islands, where she was taken by Commodore Anson in the Centurion the 30th of June, 1743” that guides the observer to read the meeting of Anson and the galleon off the Philippine coast as a point of conclusion.

R. W. Seale’s engraving after Brett’s “A View of 2 of the Ladrone Islands/ A Plan of the Harbour

Fig. 12. Obverse of medal commemorating Vernon’s capture of Portobelo (1739) and proposed attack on Havana (1741). Copper alloy; D. 1 1/2. (© National Maritime Museum, Greenwich, London.)

(e.g., the raising of subscriptions for the Voyage Round the World among the aristocracy and the East India Company or the making of objects such as Josiah Wedgwood’s jasperware portrait medallion marking Anson’s election to the Royal Society).51

Consider also the disparities between the imperial methods pursued by Vernon and Anson and the ways in which objects figured in those differences. In Wilson’s words, the scorn for prize-taking and its objects defined Vernon: he “represented the epitome of British … integrity and intrepidity in a mercenary and venal age,” was “hostile to the profiteering that riddled the royal navy,” and sought only to pursue the suprapersonal goal of territorial expansion—“a policy of ‘Take and Hold’ towards the Spanish empire in America.”52 Within this formulation, objects are important, contributing, by implication at least, to events as significant as the taking of New France. Nonetheless, their role is constrained to two processes: commemorating Vernon and inspiring others to pursue “Take and Hold” to its limit. But Anson’s method could not have been more different, marked as it was by the acceptance and even veneration of appropriating prize for per-

Fig. 13. "A Chart of the Pacific Ocean from the Equinoctial to the Latitude of 39½ d. No.," 1748. Engraving. From Richard Walter, A Voyage Round the World in the Years MDCCXL, I, II, III, IV by George Anson, Esq. (London: Knapton, 1748), 376. (Getty Research Institute, Los Angeles, 95-B2328.)
of Acapulco/ A Plan of the Bay of Manila” presents the Pacific in an even sharper shorthand, in the form of two adjacent city plans whose fully condensed narrative declares, “Here is Acapulco, here is Manila” (fig. 14). Indeed, this third version of the Pacific link even presented Acapulco on the left—the narrative or paginal “start”—rather than on the right, or hydrographic “east.” It did make one concession to the existence of anything between New Spain and the Philippines, in the form of a coastal profile of the islands of Anatahan and Serigan across the top of the overall image. Nonetheless, even this inclusion reinforces the image’s overall narrative. The overlay of a distinctly horizontal image above the two charts visually integrates them and encourages the eye to move across the picture plane, and the use of a coastal profile, a type of image whose very purpose is to guide sailors to their desired destinations, reinforces the underlying message of arrival. Moreover, this particular coastal profile, far from reminding viewers of the tedium or hazard of crossing the vast Pacific—of the fact that over 90 percent of Anson’s men died—instead calls to mind the saving presence within that space of the Mariana Islands, a Pacific Eden of “gentle descents and vallies ... as if laid out by art.”

As a final point, it is worth noting that this particular combination of hydrographic chart and narrative coastal profile had specific contemporary associations with “take and loot” in the Caribbean, having been used by Bowen (decades before his Anson world map) specifically to agitate for the taking of Havana in a 1740 map, “The Seat of War in the West Indies,” based in part on his single images for the Gentleman’s Magazine (fig. 15). Notably, this composite image presented a wealth of specific detail about the location of Havana’s religious institutions; one-third of the keyed sites are church related, including the “Great Church or Cathedral ... Jesuits Colledge; Dominicans; Franciscans; Augustinians; Other Monasterys; [and] Nunneries.” Bowen,

it may be assumed, did not include this material so that sailors could say their prayers while sacking His Catholick Majesty’s city or even just because his employers despised the Catholic religious orders as dangerous political rivals with at least as much evil intent toward England as Spain itself. More likely, Bowen, like the anonymous maker of a list deposited in the Cuban archives by Albemarle’s “great, great, great-grand[son]” characterizing Havana’s conventos and religious colleges by wealth (“Convento de Sn. Francisco … Poor/Convento de Sn. Agustín … Rich/Colegio de los Jesuitas … Very Rich/Convento de Betlem … Very Very Rich”), included this information because religious sites were among the richest, most highly concentrated, and least well-defended repositories of loot on the island.

Brett and Seale’s plan of Manila had none of this detail. Indeed, unlike Bowen’s precise charts or their own Acapulco plan, it bore only the sketchiest resemblance to the real city. Virtually the only


things that this Anson object did convey were that Manila was on a great bay and river and that its fort was near lots of churches—big churches, represented with big icons as big as the symbols for “safe harbour.” But then again, neither Anson nor Brett nor Keppel was sanctioned to go to Manila in the 1740s to obtain firsthand experience of its appearance or its objects. That task was left to the generation of 1762, when Anson called the shots.

Conclusion

In considering the complex relationship between objects in motion and the British “imperial effort” in the crucial middle third of the eighteenth century, it is necessary to chart a dual course through Anson’s objects, if only because Vernon’s objects do so little to illuminate the siege of Manila. As has been noted, Manila was taken but not held either militarily or diplomatically, reverting (with Havana) to Spanish rule with the peace. Manila’s citizens and institutions were subjected, moreover, to a massive object-taking that benefited individual Britons but not the state—indeed, the seizure of the galleon contributed to a legal dispute that caused Spain not to pay the official ransom dictated by the capitulation and that, as Nicholas Tracy suggests, festered until the twentieth century. And finally, and perhaps most obviously, Manila was anomalous in another respect, for while it was in the Spanish empire and was administered by New Spain, physically it was not “in America.”

But a consideration of “objects in motion” can also benefit understanding of imperial conflict in other spheres, both Atlantic and Pacific. From an Atlantic perspective, gaining an appreciation of “take and loot” as a constitutive, consequential process of empire is a necessary step toward understanding the composite character of eighteenth-century imperial conflict and toward gaining a full sense of the period’s “temporal heterogeneity.” This is necessary insofar as the most influential recent analyses tend to derive their analytical force from a near-exclusive emphasis on the power of competition over land to generate conflict—and thus present conflict in places like Havana and Manila as afterthoughts to the “real” processes of empire. In turn, a recognition of the persistence and consequentiality of “take and loot” might illuminate further instances of imperial conflict in Asia, particularly when it is recognized that the westward course of British looting from the Caribbean via Peru did not end in Manila. Rather, as James Hevia brilliantly analyzes in his account of the Arrow War and the suppression of the Boxer Rebellion, looting—including the theft of “information objects” and episodes in which Britons cross-dressed in the stolen garments of the Dowager Empress—played a constitutive role in the instantiation of semicolonial, nonterritorial rule in China.

Finally, if the analysis of “objects in motion” can further understanding of imperial conflict, then it is likely that a greater emphasis on political and military processes as contexts for the movement of objects will also have beneficial results. For—in contrast to recent work on India—it is arguable that scholarship on “objects in motion” in the British Atlantic and Pacific is dominated by the analysis of only one set of processes that set objects in motion: those associated with trade, consumer culture, and the like. But, as Philippe Beaujard observes, “trade is not the only method for transferring surplus.” Other processes, including the movement of objects along religious networks, “the imposition of tribute and taxes, [and] looting,” also put objects in motion and created “worlds.”

36 Nicholas Tracy, Manila Ransomed (Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 1995).
38 I am thinking of Fred Anderson’s otherwise magisterial Crucible of War: The Seven Years’ War and the Fate of Empire in British North America (New York: Knopf, 2000).