A CURSE UPON THE NATION:
IDEAS ABOUT RACE, FREEDOM, AND EXTERMINATION IN ANTEBELLUM AMERICA

by

KAY LEWIS

A Dissertation submitted to the

Graduate School-New Brunswick

Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey

in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Graduate Program in History

written under the direction of

Deborah Gray White

and approved by

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

New Brunswick, New Jersey

May, 2011

ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION

A Curse Upon the Nation:
Ideas about Race, Freedom, and Extermination
in Antebellum America

By KAY LEWIS

Dissertation Director:
Deborah Gray White

This dissertation argues that ideas about black and white extermination in a war between the races influenced the development of slavery and precluded the acceptance of black freedom in America. Beyond the instrumentality of violence that we know was part of the master slave relationship, this study examines what impels white ideas in the eighteenth and nineteenth century that emancipation would ultimately lead to a race war. It attempts to demonstrate how ideas of extermination became part of the brutal legacy of racial control that sustained the institution of slavery and violence in the post-Civil War South. “A Curse Upon the Nation” traces the progression of these beliefs from the colonial period to the post Reconstruction era and how they traveled from Europe, Africa, and then to America, revealing that ideas about extermination became inextricably tied to race and freedom, making survival an important form of resistance for blacks in America.

Dedication

For my mother,

Addie Christine Wright.

Table of Contents

Introduction

In the spring of 1918, when Mary Turner made what the mob considered "unwise remarks" about the lynching of her husband who she claimed was innocent of any wrongdoing, "the people took exceptions to her remarks as well as her attitude."[1] The mob, out for vengeance for what they called the "personal outrages and violence, especially against helpless women and children," were not to be deterred in sending the message that no one in the black community could seek legal or extra legal justice and live. They took Mary from her house on a Sunday afternoon and strung her up by her ankles a few yards from Folsom's Bridge in Lowndes County, Georgia. They poured gasoline on her clothes and then set her on fire. After burning the clothes off her body, Mary, who was eight months pregnant at the time, was cut with "a sharp instrument….her stomach being entirely opened." Miraculously, her eight-month-old infant was still alive and it fell out of Mary's womb onto the ground. The baby made "two cries" but then was "crushed by the heel of a member of the mob." The formerly

[1] Atlanta Journal, May 20, 1918

pregnant woman was "riddled with bullets from high-powered rifles until it was no longer possible to recognize it as the body of a human being." Mary was not even allowed the dignity of being buried by her own kin folk, but rather she and her infant child were buried by the mob "ten feet from the tree" with a whiskey bottle and a cigar stub marking the atrocity of this particularly brutal execution.[2]

The horrific violence against black men, women and children in the post emancipation South had a long and complicated history in America. As the philosopher and theologian Howard Thurman argued, white southerners knew that they had the upper hand politically, socially, and economically. Without law enforcement on their side, African Americans "knew that they could not fight back effectively, they could not protect themselves, and that…they could not expect protection from their persecutors." From personal experience African Americans understood that "any slight conflict…would bring down upon the head of the defenseless the full weight of naked physical violence," something that Mary deliberately chose to take on when she called for justice in the murder of her husband.[3] Racialized violence was a salient part of everyday life in the African American community in the Jim Crow south, but it also had roots in the historical legacy of slavery.

---

[2]Walter White, "Memorandum for Governor Dorsey From Walter F. White Submitted in person July 10, 1918" Papers of the NAACP, Group 1. Series C, Box 353, Library of Congress, Washington D. C. Over five hundred African Americans left the area after this lynching and that of eleven others. Hampton Smith, who had a reputation of being particularly violent towards his workers, was shot in his home. His wife, who was also pregnant was probably unintentionally injured, but both baby and mother survived as her injuries were reportedly not serious. Governor Dorsey, defending the mob's actions claimed that the "unspeakable outrages…committed by members of your race," were responsible for the lynching. Yet he knew that the perpetrator, Sidney Johnson, acknowledged that he had acted alone in the crime of murdering the white farmer Hampton Smith because Smith had physically abused him a few days earlier. Johnson's entire family, his mother, father, and all other relatives were put in jail for protection "owing to the increased feeling among the people." Atlanta Journal, May 20, 1918.

[3] Howard Thurman, The Luminous Darkness (Richmond, Indiana: Friends United, 1999) p. 48.

Intuitively we know that this sort of violence did not begin as a post-emancipation South phenomenon: the South that saw the rise of the Ku Klux Klan and the venomous race riots where whites set upon blacks, and where occasionally blacks armed themselves in self-defense. It had a pre-history that extends back to the initial decades of English colonization and the development of slavery in America. This dissertation argues that during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries white ideas about black freedom and equality leading to a war of black or white extermination shaped and nurtured racial violence. In tracing the evolution of exterminatory warfare in America, I show how and why this particular strategy of war emerged and how it became raced. The history of these ideas, in part, helps explain the ferocity of the violence that black women like Mary Turner experienced during Reconstruction and in the Jim Crow era. It exposes the probability that white southerners did not develop a new emotional state after the Civil War, but were rather perpetuating an inherited set of ideas about black bodies.

The foundation for race based violence in America emanated from a type of warfare used for centuries by Europeans and Africans. What we today call total warfare, which military historian John Grenier calls "unlimited war" or "*petite guerre*," is a strategy where one side attempts to destroy their enemies' will to fight by "killing and intimidating enemy noncombatant's populations," namely women, children and old people.[4] Scholars identified this type of warfare in the nineteenth century, but Americans, white and black, historically used the term "extermination" to describe the total warfare that they envisioned. Thus to be clear, total warfare, unlimited war, and wars of extermination or extirpation, all signify the same action in the seventeenth through the

[4] John Grenier, The First Way of War: American War Making on the Frontier (Cambridge: Cambridge Up, 2005) pp. 1-17, and Chapter 1.

nineteenth centuries.[5] In looking at the antebellum period broadly defined, which is the primary focus of this dissertation—the institution of enslavement was always poised to disintegrate into total warfare, a war that Anglo-Americans were determined that blacks would lose. Overtime most African Americans deliberately sought strategies of nonviolence to win their freedom from enslavement and oppression. Anglo-Americans however, continued throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries to believe in the potential necessity of black extermination if a race war should ensue, making total warfare an essential tool for racial control and for maintaining the institution of enslavement.

The psychological cost of slavery is unveiled in the way that Africans and whites dealt with the idea of racialized codes of war.[6] Racial extermination was, for the most part, used by masters to make the enslaved "stand in fear."[7] Yet, whites also had a deeply rooted anxiety about the cataclysmic nature of slavery. This created "a condition of tension" between blacks and whites, between master and slave, which perpetuated the idea that exterminatory violence was necessary for liberation, self-defense and racial control.[8] Nevertheless, the phenomenological experience for those threatened by a race war and extermination differed for blacks and whites. For African Americans, enslaved and free, the potential for one-sided violence was always present and "deeply terrifying," especially as Thurman argued, when experience and rumor has taught you "you do not

---

[5]I will be using these terms interchangeably throughout the manuscript. Carl von Clausewitz's classic work On War published in 1832 was the first to discuss the use of unlimited war as a military concept.
[6] In 1996, Nell Irvin Painter wrote a seminal essay "Soul Murder and Slavery: Toward a Fully Loaded Cost Accounting," in which she challenged scholars to look at the psychological costs of slavery, the broader "set of ideals" that slavery gave rise to. Nell Irvin Painter, "Soul Murder and Slavery: Toward a Fully Loaded Cost Accounting," Southern History Across the Color Line (Chapel Hill: UNC P, 2002). p. 6.
[7]Exslave, "Kicked Around Like a Mule" Unwritten History of Slavery: Autobiographical Accounts of Negro Ex-Slaves (Nashville, Fisk University, 1968) p. 49. Former slave notes that "we had to stand in fear of them, we had no protection."
[8] Thurman, Luminous pp. 25-26.

count."[9] Thus, the social and psychological costs of these ideas were different for those in the oppressed group than for those of the dominant and therefore the teleological underpinnings of this rhetoric are paramount to this study.

I have found that the analysis of exterminatory ideas enriches the study of slavery. It forces us to reevaluate the conditions in which slaves and free blacks expressed agency. An examination of black thought and culture reveals these ideas in the "common wind," which Julius Sherrard Scott defines as the tradition of oral communication that Africans retained in America. Black people enslaved and free, were well aware of what they were up against as they shaped residual communities within American society.[10] Yet, my research indicates that the enslaved valued life and consciously saw it as their communal obligation to help keep the black race alive. And although some slaves transgressed the boundaries of white supremacy by attempting to foment insurrections, for most African Americans survival was their form of resistance. At the same time, the difficulty of coping with this potentially traumatic form of violence that went beyond the whippings, the rape, the separation of families, is also apparent, revealing the psychological cost of slavery not accounted for in economic terms.

A few secondary works briefly allude to the rhetoric of a war between the races, but they do not analyze it, nor trace it back to Africa or Europe as this project does. George Frederickson in *The Black Image in the White Mind* refers to what he calls the "racial prognostication" that early colonists like Thomas Jefferson espoused about the

---

[9] Howard Thurman, Jesus and the Disinherited (Boston: Beacon, 1996) p. 37-39.
[10] Julius Sherrard Scott, The Common Wind: Currents of Afro-American Communication in the Era of the Haitian Revolution Dissertation, University Microfilms International 1986.

dangers of black freedom.[11] From Frederickson's perspective, the belief in the possibility of a race war emerged from slave owners' understanding that slaves, just like white men, would always try to free themselves by killing off their captors. Robert Abzug wrote on this subject as well, only he views the subject narrowly through the lens of William Garrison's fears about slave rebellions resulting in the extermination of either race.[12] Like Frederickson, Abzug does not historicize the idea of extermination from the African American perspective in any way nor does he suggest how it shaped their understanding of the political and social world in which they lived, or how it influenced the institution of slavery and the business of the Atlantic slave trade. It is as if the rhetoric of a race war emerged in the public sphere with Garrison and the abolitionists' calls for immediate emancipation. In his *Crucible of Race,* Joel Williamson discusses these ideas in an attempt to explain white behavior in the post Reconstruction South.[13] Leon Litwack also exegetes these ideas with some detail in his *Trouble in Mind*, but his focus also centers on the post-Civil War and Reconstruction era.[14] Historian Gregory J. W. Urwin in his examination of Civil War atrocities connects the extermination of African American soldiers with the inherited ideas of racial prejudice generated during slavery in his *Black Flag Over Dixie*, but he fails to historicize it beyond its application against black soldiers.[15] Williamson, Litwack and Urwin, argue, as I do, that prophesies of a race war

---

[11] George M. Frederickson, The Black Image in the White Mind: The Debate on Afro-American Character and Destiny, 1817-1914. (Middletown: Wesleyan UP, 1971) pp. 4-24.
[12] Robert H. Abzug, "The Influence of Garrisonian Abolitionists' Fears of Slave Violence on the Antislavery Argument, 1829-40," The Journal of Negro History Vol. 55, No. 1. (Jan., 1970), pp. 15-26.
[13] Joel Williamson, The Crucible of Race: Black-White Relations in the American South Since Emancipation (New York: Oxford Up, 1984) pp. 183, 199, 214.
[14] Leon Litwack, Trouble in Mind: Black Southerners in the Age of Jim Crow (New York: Vintage, 1998) pp. 202-216.
[15] Gregory J. W. Urwin, "We *Cannot* Treat Negroes…as Prisoners of War" Racial Atrocities and Reprisals in Civil War Arkansas'" Black Flag Over Dixie: Racial Atrocities and Reprisals in the Civil War Gregory J. W. Urwin ed. (Carbondale: Southern Illinois Up, 2004) pp.140, 146.

continued into the twentieth century. But I show how the ideas of total warfare, the potential killing of women, children and old people, began much earlier. I argue that in the early years of the republic and the nineteenth century, the ideas of a race war were part of everyday life and who would win was always contested terrain and uncertain. Through the extensive use of archival resources, I conclude that African Americans viewed the possibility of racial extermination as a serious threat in the antebellum era and throughout the nineteenth century. Slave owners had the freedom to identify the terms of engagement in a servile war, but they did not and should not continue to have a monopoly on the emotional, cognitive, and spiritual meaning that such a conflict engendered.

Thus, this study mandates a reexamination of some of the existing premises in the historiography of slavery. A closer look at the language of extermination found in the personal letters, newspapers, pamphlets, travel narratives, and creative expressions of slave owning men and women as well as slave narratives, Congressional records, and abolitionist tracts troubles the existing scholarship on the everyday lives of the enslaved and makes what we know about slavery appear incomplete. This dissertation demonstrates that something much bigger was at stake for African Americans, and that the threat of racial extermination needs to be added to the list of reasons why slaves did not rebel more frequently especially in the latter part of the antebellum era. And, since the language of extermination was part of the cultural and political currency that slaveholders used to sustain slavery and uphold white supremacy, we must readjust our

notion of paternalism and question whether slavery ever was or ever could have been a paternalistic system at all.[16]

This dissertation is structured in three parts. The first part, chapters one and two, explores the ideological origins of exterminatory wars in America. In chapter one, I am particularly interested in how the early English colonists used the same total warfare strategies that they used against the Irish in Europe in dealing with aboriginal Americans first to take away their land and then as a tool for enslavement. In chapter two, I demonstrate how African slaves transported ideas of total warfare across the Atlantic, making white colonists fear their enslaved population. As John Locke predicted, West Africans who were compelled by force to become the slaves of Europeans, were always a threat to European colonists.[17] Thus, the subsequent exponential increase in the numbers of African laborers in America heightened white fear of the enslaved whom they perceived to be dangerous adversaries.

Part two, which is comprised of chapters three and four, looks at the continuity of African warfare practices and white fears of their own destruction in a servile war. It also

---

[16]Kenneth Stamp and Stanley Elkins did not perhaps take on the racial assumptions of U. B. Phillips and others, but they did concur that slave masters had absolute power over the slaves. And for Elkins the American system of slavery was so illiberally raced that slaves could not resist the systematic oppression they experienced, causing the evolution of the "Sambo" slave personality type. Writing from the perspective of the master class, evidence of slave agency was conspicuously absent in these works. Although Eugene Genovese approached the idea of absolute power from a broader, more nuanced perspective that included cultural analysis as well as political, he too argued that slaves constructed space within the system of oppression, making slavery one of "reciprocity" between slave and master. What this dissertation demonstrates is that slaves were not viewed as helpless victims in the long story of America's economic ascendancy, and that they were far from apolitical as Genovese suggests.
See: Kenneth M. Stampp, The Peculiar Institution: Slavery in the Ante-bellum South (New York: Knopf, 1956); Stanley Elkins, Slavery: A Problem in American Institutional and Intellectual Life (Chicago: Un. of Chicago P, 1959); Eugene D. Genovese, Roll, Jordon, Roll: The World the Slaves Made (New York: Vintage, 1976).

[17] John Locke wrote in his Two Treaties of Government, which was heavily read by English colonists in America, that slavery, because of the natural desire for freedom, was "nothing else, but the State of War continued, between lawful Conqueror, and Captive." (1698; Cambridge: Cambridge Up, 1960) pp. 296-297, 302.

traces how black Americans responded to the threats of removal and to the floated ideas about their extermination in the aftermath of Nat Turner's rebellion. In chapter three, I trace the continuity of white fears of slave insurrections in the British West Indies and Denmark Vesey's attempted insurrection in South Carolina in 1822. Chapter four looks at Nat Turner's insurrection for what it signified to black people, and how they remembered the escalation of racialized violence that ensued after Turner's revolt. The enslaved had experienced brutal and torturous reprisals before, but the retribution had never been so broad and widespread.

And finally, part three, which includes chapters five and six, interrogates two instances where southern elites discussed the possibility of extermination following a war between the races in the antebellum era, demonstrating that these ideas, girded by the military force of the entire nation, remained fundamental to southern proslavery ideology. In Chapter five, the Virginia Debates mark the point at which southerners proclaim that slaves were no longer a threat to white mastery, despite the fact that the trope of interracial warfare blocked the passage of gradual emancipation legislation. In chapter six, I argue that the debates over reopening the African slave trade reveal that ideas about a war between the races continued to be discussed, and were of concern to the slave owning community. I also argue that African American leaders attempted to exacerbate white fears by claiming that greater numbers of Africans would actually help the enslaved acquire freedom.

This dissertation ends with an epilogue in which I conclude that fears of a race war and black extermination are central to the historical narrative of what African Americans faced during the Civil War and throughout the nineteenth century. Indeed, it

helps make sense of the vast numbers of black men, women, and children murdered during the Civil War and the post-Civil War years, suggesting that these ideas, developed over the centuries, remained pervasive in America.

The development of the United States into a powerful nation occurred not only because of the courage of the early pioneers and the political brilliance of the Founding Fathers but also through acts of incredible violence towards those enslaved. The manifestation of exterminatory warfare and violent conquest depicted throughout this dissertation had roots in Europe and Africa that spread across the Atlantic world. As slavery became intrinsic to the American way of life, so too did ideas that blacks and whites could never live peaceably together as equals. Southerners remained determined that the enslaved could never be free without it ending in a massacre of the black race, and they intentionally followed through on their convictions during the Civil War and post Civil War era. Thus, the potential for a race war between blacks and whites shaped the human cost of slavery—and freedom—in ways that have been previously unexamined. A Curse Upon the Nation: Ideas About Race, Freedom, and Extermination in Antebellum America addresses this important historical silence.

PART ONE

CHAPTER ONE

"NITS MAKE LICE": GENOCIDAL VIOLENCE IN COLONIAL AMERICA

In ancient times, it was not uncommon for enemy combatants to either exterminate their foes or enslave them. Thus, when Europeans first settled in the New World, they came with an inherited set of ideas about how to subdue those whom they would soon declare to be savages. Eventually, fears of Native American revenge and wars for slaves created a "them or us" mentality, and those people, men, women and children, killed in what British colonialists viewed as just wars were seen as mere collateral damage. Yet, in many cases, colonists believed that divine providence dictated that any conflict with those deemed uncivilized would have to result in their complete decimation.[1] By doing so, they also hoped to keep others that might oppose British

[1] John Locke wrote in his Two Treaties of Government, which was heavily read by English colonists in America, that it was "reasonable and just I should have a right to destroy that which threatens me with Destruction. For by the Fundamental Law of Nature, Man being to be preserved, as much as possible, when all cannot be preserv'd, the safety of the Innocent is to be preferred," leaving room for the possibility that women and children in a violent confrontation might not be protected. Locke defined slavery as a particularly contentious state where "he who would get me into his Power without consent, would use me as he pleased, when he had got me there, and destroy me too when he had a fancy to it: for no body can desire to *have me in his Absolute Power*, unless it be to compel me by force to that which is against the Right of my Freedom, *i.e.* make me a Slave. To be free from such force is the only security of my Preservation, who would take away that *Freedom*, which is the Fence to it,…thereby puts himself into a

imperialism in check—to make those perceived to be in the way of progress—"stand in fear."[2]

This chapter explores how deep and pervasive violence was in colonial America, and it unveils, from a foundational perspective, the fact that violence was used as a tool to sustain the institution of enslavement and conquest. Native Americans faced uniquely fashioned ideas about warfare that were fundamentally sustained by greed, which also facilitated the emergence of not a few struggling colonies in the New World. Although much has been written about slavery and about proslavery and antislavery thought, we have yet to examine seriously how Native American slavery and the growth of America into a powerful republican nation was sustained by exhibitions of brute force—which not only destroyed people's lives, their bodies, but also their souls. The emphases here on southern states like Virginia and particularly South Carolina correlates with the fact that Native American and eventually African populations were very large within these regions and therefore best demonstrate what impelled the potent and multifaceted performances of violence that ensued against men, women, and even children in the early years. That is not to say that violence was not a component of northern colonization as well. As will be shown, this was far from the case.

State of War with me." Slavery, because of the natural desire for freedom, Locke argued, was "nothing else, but the State of War continued, between lawful Conqueror, and Captive." (1698; Cambridge: Cambridge Up, 1960) pp. 296-297, 302. Increase Mather preached in a sermon in 1710 that "there are Just Wars which the Lord Himself calls men to engage in….God has put a principle of self preservation into his Creatures. And in some cases men may be called to ingage in an Offensive War. This may be Lawful when their Liberties, Properties and Possessions are invaded." Mather goes on to use the example of the Israelite's war against the Ammonites to show how "Battles fought with the Enemies of God" should be waged: "therefore the Children of Israel fought against them and slew them with a great Slaughter: This was just." See Increase Mather, A Discourse concerning the Grace of Courage, where in The Nature, Beneficials, and Necessities of that Virtue for all Christians, is described. Delivered in a Sermon Preached at Boston in New-England. June 5th. 1710. (Corn hill: Brick Shop, 1710) p. 39.

[2]Exslave, "Kicked Around Like a Mule" Unwritten History of Slavery: Autobiographical Accounts of Negro Ex-Slaves (Nashville, Fisk University, 1968) p. 49. Former slave notes that "we had to stand in fear of them, we had no protection."

Early European Warfare

There is consensus among historians that "total wars" or extermination wars reemerged in Western Europe before colonists came to America.[3] For the English, the first attempt to colonize the nation of Ireland occurred as much from the need to create new markets for merchant capitalists in the mid 16th century as it did from the intellectual fractures caused by the separation of European Christianity. The countless atrocities in Ireland stand as testimony to the nature of English warfare. The slaughtering of hundreds of "manne, woman and childe" in Munster, Ireland in 1569, for example, was rationalized by Thomas Churchyard, an English author and soldier of fortune in the sixteenth century, as the most expedient way to end conflict since "terrour…made short warres." For after "thei saw the heddes of their dedde fathers, brothers, children, kinsfolke, and freendes, lye on the ground before their faces" the people would be reformed and "universall peace, and subjection" would prevail.[4] Churchyard further explained that killing the women of Irish soldiers was particularly effective because it ultimately led to the starvation of the "menne of warre" who were incapable of taking

---

[3]Barbara Donagan, War in England, 1642-1649 (Oxford: Oxford Up, 2008) chapters one and two. Donagan argues that the atrocities committed across Europe during the Thirty Year War were prelude to the subsequent Irish massacres, contradicting previously held standards of British warfare that protected civilians. See also Wayne E. Lee, "Early American Ways of War: A New Reconnaissance, 1600-1815," The Historical Journal, Vol. 44, No. 1. (Mar., 2001), pp. 269-289; Alden T. Vaughan, "Expulsion of the Savages": English Policy and the Virginia Massacre of 1622," The William and Mary Quarterly, Third Series, Vol. 35, No. 1 (Jan., 1978), pp. 57-84; Gary B. Nash, "The Image of the Indian in the Southern Colonial Mind," The William and Mary Quarterly, Third Series, Vol. 29, No. 2 (Apr., 1972), pp. 198-230; Francis Jennings, The Invasion of America: Indians, Colonialism, and the Cant of Conquest (Chapel Hill: UNC, 1975); Nicholas P. Canny, "The Ideology of English Colonization: From Ireland to America," The William and Mary Quarterly, Third Series, Vol. 30, No. 4 (Oct, 1973), pp. 575-598.

[4] Thomas Churchyard, A General rehearsal of warres and joyned to the same some tragedies and epitaphs (London, 1579), QI-RI. Others who rationalized and practiced extermination as effective war tactics were Edward Barkley, Walter Devereux, the first Earl of Essex, Sir John Norris, and Sir Peter Carew. Also qtd. in Nicholas P. Canny, "The Ideology of English Colonization: From Ireland to America," The William and Mary Quarterly, Third Series, Vol. 30, No. 4 (Oct., 1973), pp. 577-582.

care of "their Creates…their victualles, and other necessaries."[5] Churchyard was no doubt referencing the brutal policies of Sir Humphrey Gilbert who was known for piling the slaughtered heads of men, women and children along the pathway to his tent after a battle. In 1566, Gilbert placed the entire village of Munster, Ireland under martial law and despite their surrender to his will, ordered their decapitation to set an example of what other Irish people might expect if they resisted British imperialism. [6]

The brutality of the wars in Ireland in the 1560s and 1570s were justified by claims that those fighting against colonization were barbarians and savages, and therefore culturally inferior to the English. Ideas of Irish barbarity and paganism signaled the justification for the usurpation of martial law, since the Irish remained outside the realm of European standards of civilization.[7] The English Privy Council did not stand in the way of the perceived duty of England to civilize barbarian people, as Rome had the ancient Brits, for Ireland was a nation of "rebellious people" who "nothing but feare and force can teach dutie and obedience."[8] Irish subjects remained loyal to Catholicism, despite the establishment of the Protestant Church of England, which fueled further ideas that they could not or would not assimilate. To the sixteenth and seventeenth century English, this meant that the Irish should face either isolation or extermination until they respected political authority and accepted their predetermined destiny to imitate English culture and custom.

---

[5] Churchyard, Ibid.
[6] Sir Humphrey Gilbert was an English adventurer, soldier and member of Parliament during the reign of Queen Elizabeth I. Paul E.J. Hammer, Elizabeth's Wars: Wars and Government and Society in Tudor England, 1544-1604 (New York: Palgrave, 2003) pp. 77, 109; David Quinn, The Voyages and Colonizing Enterprises of Sir Humphrey Gilbert, Vol. I (London: Hakluyt Society, 1940) pp. 188-194.
[7] Canny, "The Ideology," pp. 585-6. Donagan, War in England, pp. 196-197, 202-204.
[8] Canny, "The Ideology," pp. 588-590, 593.

By the seventeenth century, genocidal warfare reached new heights as the English sought intentionally to achieve high casualties through military strategy. Historical accounts of the Irish rebellion against colonization and religious oppression in 1641 assert that from the beginning the English Parliament pressed for a war of extermination. By 1644, the Parliaments of England and Scotland, who were engaged in civil war, passed ordinances that "no quarter be given to any Irishmen" who came to the aid of the English King.[9] Although there was brutality on both sides, the subsequent slaughter of Irish people is well documented: where "in one day eighty women and children in Scotland were flung over a high bridge into the water, solely because they were the wives and children of Irish soldiers," and where the people from several villages were deliberately trapped by fire in an enclave and "all burnt or killed—men, women, and children."[10] British ferocity was particularly memorable in the massacres of Drogheda and Wexford where under the severe discipline and leadership of Oliver Cromwell at least 3000, "some women and children …were put to the sword on September 11 and 12, 1649." Cromwell would later claim, "I wish that all honest hearts may give the glory of this to God alone to whom indeed the praise of this mercy belongs."[11] John Nalson, an English clergyman and historian, was told by a relative who served as Captain in the English army that, "no manner of Compassion or Discrimination was shewed either to Age or Sex, but that the little Children were promiscuously sufferers with the Gulley, and that if any who had some grains of Compassion reprehended the Soldiers for this unchristian inhumanity, they would scofflingly reply, Why? Nits will be Lice, and so

---

[9] Donagan, War in, p. 206.
[10] William Edward Hartpole Lecky, A History of Ireland in the Eighteenth Century Vo. 1 (London: Elibron, 2006) pp. 82-82, 86-87
[11] Lecky, pp. 102-3.

would dispatch them." And it is at this point that the saying, "nits make lice," which was constantly employed to justify the murder of Irish children, became part of English vernacular.[12] The extermination of children was the ultimate solution, for it thwarted the possibility of revenge and made space for the progressive development of the superior race. The antecedent of these war tactics began nearly a century earlier, but the English policies that sanctified the final conquest of Ireland in 1652, that legitimized possession by force and colonization as God's will, would continue to be employed in the subsequent conquest of America.[13]

American Conceptions of War and Conquest

When the first settlers came to America, they anticipated, in aggressive fashion, that there would be trouble in the region. Historian Patrick M. Malone states that, "the transmission of concepts of total warfare from Europe to America" was evident as early as 1637, but I would argue that it began much earlier.[14] So that England could compete with Spain in the exploration and exploitation of new lands for trade and settlement, Queen Elizabeth I commissioned Sir Humphrey Gilbert, who had been extremely vicious in his suppression of Irish resistance, to appropriate "remote and barbarous lands."[15]

The theories of natural rights that prevailed during the English Reformation were conspicuously absent from the rhetoric concerning colonization of the new world, and

---

[12] John Nalson, An Impartial Collection of the Great Affairs of State, From the Beginning of the Scotch Rebellion In the Year 1683 to the Murther of King Charles I Vol. II, (London: His Majesty's Special Command, 1683) intro. vii.

[13] Lecky, A History, p. 104. After the war, Lecky states that "Slave-dealers were let loose upon the land, and many hundreds of destitute or vagrant boys and young women were torn away from their country, shipped to Barbadoes, and sold for terms of years to the planters."

[14] Patrick M. Malone, The Skulking Way of War: Technology and Tactics Among the New England Indians (Lanham: Madison, 1991) p.75.

[15] Alan Brinkley, A Survey: American History Vol. I: to 1877, Twelfth Edition, (Boston: McGraw-Hill, 2007) p. 27. Canny, "the Ideology," pp. 595-597. Jennings, p. 45.

what emerges is what Francis Jennings called the "Conquest myth." The New World as "virgin land" was claimed by Europeans to be settled by savages who were "demons" and "beasts in the shape of men," whom they therefore refused to recognize as fully human.[16] Savagery and barbarianism placed all those outside of European culture as outside of God's law and therefore his protection from extermination. The designation of aboriginal and African people as savages profoundly loosened the boundaries of just warfare since savages were "irrational," and uncivilized, Jennings argued, who committed senseless acts of "perpetual violence" rather than the "rational" organized violence that the English claimed defined European wars.[17] These differences—much like race—would be used to justify not only conquest but also enslavement and extermination, and many English settlers who had gained their military experience in Ireland had the confidence and formula for how they would induce the "lesser breeds" to cooperate.[18]

The clergy in the seventeenth century were also central to shaping and affirming American conceptions of war. As historian John Morgan Dederer puts it, ministers "refined contemporary and ancient just war theory to fit conditions facing their flocks, tossing in considerable practical military wisdom for good measure."[19] In the effort to encourage immigration to Jamestown in 1609, which was an under funded project

---

[16] Francis Jennings, The Invasion of America: Indians, Colonialism, and the Cant of Conquest (Chapel Hill: UNC p, 1975) pp. 15, 45. Gary B. Nash, "The Image of the Indian in the Southern Colonial Mind," The William and Mary Quarterly, Third Series, vol. 29, No. 2 (Apr., 1972), pp. 198-205. Canny, "The Ideology," pp. 586-588.

[17] Jennings, Invasion, p. 146.

[18] Sir Richard Grenville and Sir Walter Raleigh are two other examples of military leaders who came to America and used the same brutal tactics that they used in Ireland against Native Americans. See Jennings, pp. 5, 163-168. Qtd. in Nash, " The Image," pp. 203-204, 206. Nash notes that most of the New World explorers had also been involved in the English invasions in Ireland. See: also Adam J. Hirsch, "The Collision of Military Cultures in Seventeenth-Century New England," The Journal of American History, Vol. 74, No. 4 (Mar., 1988), pp. 1188.

[19] John Dederer argues that the notions of conquest and self-preservation were whole-heartedly employed by the English, first in Ireland and then in America to rationalize how they might have to kill men, women, and children like the Hebrews did in the bible. John Morgan Dederer, War in America to 1775 Before Yankee Doodle (New York: NYU p, 1990) pp. 176, 179.

struggling to recruit settlers, King James ordered church ministers to use their pulpit to encourage a colonizing spirit among the English to Christianize North America. One of the first ministers to do so was Reverend William Symmonds who preached that a missionary impulse should guide colonization, and that like "Worthy Joshuah and most worthy David" England, as the country of God's chosen people, had a moral mandate to expand so that its "dominion should be from sea to sea."[20] For Symmonds, the mission of colonizing Jamestown was not to make war on inferior countries as some suggested, but rather "the planting of a peaceable Colony in a waste country where people do live but like Deer in herds."[21] In another sermon, Reverend Robert Johnson argued that the intent was not to remove the "savages…Our intrusion into their possessions shall tend to their great good and in no way to their hurt, unless" —and here is the conundrum that aboriginal people faced— "as unbridled beastes, they procure it to themselves."[22] Johnson also affirmed that, "our intrusion into their possessions shall tend to their great good, like had been done when invading Ireland."[23] Reverend Robert Gray, however, rather bluntly outlined the theocratic justifications and militant intentions for English settlement by claiming that they had always been "more warlike" than other nations like France and that "we may justly say, as the children of Israel say here to Joshua, we are a great people." Joshua, "a faithfull and godly Prince," responsible for Israel's holy conquest and annihilation of the idolaters settled on the land of Canaan, seemed to Gray emblematic of the mission that English adventurers faced in Virginia.[24] Their task was to

---

[20] William Symmonds, "Virginia : A Sermon Preached at White Church." (1609) Early English Books On Line pp. 2-4.
[21] Symmonds, "Virginia," pp. 4-5.
[22] Robert Johnson, "Nova Brittannia offering most excellent fruites by Planting in Virginia: exciting all such as be well affected to further the same." (1609) Early English Books On Line p. 9
[23] Johnson, "Nova Brittania," p. 9 - 10.
[24] Robert Gray, "Good Speed to Virginia" (1609) Early English Books On Line pp. 5-6. See: Joshua 6:21.

"bring the barbarous and savage people to the civll and Christian kinde of government, under which they may learne how to liev holily, justly, and soberly in this world, and to apprehend the meanes to save their soules in the world to come, rather then to destroy them, or utterly roote them out." If that did not work, however, Gray made clear that "we are warranted by this direction of Ioshua, to destroy wilfull and convicted Idolaters, rather then to let them liev, if by no other meanes they can be reclaimed."[25]

The mission to propagandize settlement in Virginia was effective, and the English arrived in the Americas with a "crusading mentality."[26] God had given them as superior people the right to conquer those without religion and without civilization. Through these culturally driven beliefs and religious interpretations, the English believed themselves to be like the Israelites and they believed that God, as written in the Old Testament, was a "man of warre."[27] If aboriginal Americans caused trouble and resisted European settlement through violent means, God directed them as he did the Hebrews to "save alive nothing that breatheth."[28]

The fact that there was no central authority governing and shaping policy in the early colonies enabled the colonists to shape, among other things, the ways in which warfare was waged and how English expansion was rationalized. Wars fought in colonial America, however, were distinctive for their brutality. They were more violent and terroristic in nature than wars in Europe, and they "were waged with a macabre intensity

---

[25] Gray, "Good Speed," p. 9.
[26] Jennings, Invasion of America p. 5.
[27] Dederer, War in, pp. 21-22, 32, 176. Old Testament usage is prolific in Cromwell's Soldier's Bible. It was reprinted and given to Union soldiers during the Civil War. (1643; London: Elliot Stock, 1895). See Donagan, War in, pp. 20-21. Donagan argues that the ideas of "just war against ungodly foe" were common among soldiers and civilians by the 1620s and 1630s in England.
[28] Dederer, p. 175. From Deuteronomy 20:10-11.

not seen in Europe for generations after the seventeenth century."[29] In military historian John E. Ferling's opinion, "The American environment altered the nature of European warfare….war became a life and death struggle, not just for soldiers in the field but for the civilian population who often found themselves living in a war zone."[30] The English saw Native Americans as dangerous foes, "who seemed to possess some strange form of animal cunning, who treated prisoners cruelly, and who would not fight in expected ways."[31] These differences in military culture had a profound impact in shaping future English attempts to decimate and remove entire aboriginal populations, and ultimately led to Europeans giving up on Christianizing Native Americans and their hope that Indians would acculturate to western ways. Indeed, according to Virginia Governor Edmund Andros in 1697, "no endeavors to convert the Indians to Christianity have ever been heard of."[32] In looking at the early history of Jamestown, Virginia, we find the first of many examples of how colonists quickly shifted to the "total war" tactics used in Europe.[33]

War and Subjugation in Virginia

When the first successful settlement developed in Jamestown, Virginia in 1607, the ideas of colonization had replaced the Virginia Company of London's original intent

---

[29] John E. Ferling, A Wilderness of Miseries: War and Warriors in Early America (Westport: Greenwood p, 1980) pp. 21-22.
[30] Ferling, A Wilderness, p. 28.
[31] Patrick M. Malone, The Skulking Way of War: Technology and Tactics Among the New England Indians p. 75.
[32] Helen C. Roundtree, Pocahontas's People: The Powhatan Indians of Virginia through Four Centuries (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1990) p. 136.
[33] Malone, The Skulking, 75-78. Colonial Maryland is the only exception to this in that they did not suffer from Native American attacks, nor did Quakers in Pennsylvania and West New Jersey suffer from altercations until non-Quaker settlers moved into the region. See Roy Harvey Pearce, The Savages of America: A Study of the Indian and the Idea of Civilization (Baltimore: John Hopkins P, 1965) pp. 16-17, 35-38; Nash, "The Image of the Indian" pp. 220-221.

of only trading with indigenous peoples and exploring for minerals to export.[34] The subsequent European invasion of the region created a hostile environment, which resulted in a rise in Native American military organization.[35] Ultimately, Native Americans in Virginia were almost entirely extinguished from the region either through wars of extermination or enslavement, whereupon they faced the erasure of their aboriginal ethnicity as unfree laborers. By legislating that Native Americans and Africans, slave and free were legally the same as racial others, white colonists effectively continued their project of wiping out the aboriginal community in Virginia.

An example of the Powhatan Empire's early exposure to European conquest in Virginia can be found in the narrative of George Percy, a wealthy nobleman from England. In *Trewe Relacyon,* Percy stated that he and his men followed the orders of Governor Baron De La Warre to attack the Paspahegh and Chickahominy people in 1610 for revenge. They killed men, women and children with great brutality, and they captured the Queen and her children in the process. Interestingly, Percy seemed resistant to his fellow officers insistence that they kill their captives, but finally acquiesced under great pressure and allowed them to kill the children by throwing them "overboard and shoteinge owtt their Braynes in the water. Yett for all this Crewellty the Sowldiers weare nott well pleased and I had mutche to doe To save the queens lyfe for thatt Tyme." Upon reaching shore, De La Warre, who had served as a military man in Ireland, seemed displeased that the Queen had been left alive and thought it best to "Burne her." Percy,

[34] Nash, "The Image," pp. 208-209, 217.
[35] Roundtree, Pocahonta's, p. 10.

who claimed to be sickened already by the amount of "Blood shedd that day," then agreed to "geve her a quicker dispatche" by either shooting her or by the sword.[36]

European pressures for land and the development of tobacco as an export crop ultimately led to the 1622 massacre of one third of the colonists by the Pamunkey tribe. The English were infuriated that "under the bloudy and barbarous hands of the perfidious and inhumane people, contrary to all lawes of God and men, of Nature and Nations, three hundred forty seven men, women, and children, most by their owne weapons; and not being content with taking away life alone, they fell after againe upon the dead, making as well as they could, a fresh murder, defacing, dragging, and mangling the dead carkasses into many pieces, and carrying some parts away in derision, with base and brutish triumph."[37] Many English leaders admitted that this incident occurred because of the underhanded way they had dealt with Native American people and because of the murder of a revered and important leader by the name of Nemattanow or "Jack the Feather" of the Powhatan Confederacy. The 1622 massacre shocked the Jamestown colony. And eventually, helped lead to the bankruptcy of the Virginia Company of London, as public confidence waned in response to rumors of the continued conditions of near starvation and devastating diseases.[38]

The subsequent retaliation for the attack, however, was not only considered justifiable, but also a blessing as Native people in the region were viewed as an

---

[36] George Percy, George Percy's "Trewe Relacyon" (1625). The London Company changed their policy and began to encourage the overthrow and extermination of chiefs and priests in order to facilitate the complete subjugation of the Native Americans to King James and English religion. See: Vaughn, "Expulsion," pp. 65-66.

[37] Susan Myra Kingsbury ed., The Records of the State of Virginia Company of London Vol. 3 (Washington: 1933) p. 551.

[38] Nash, pp. 217-218. John Smith, "Smith's Generall Historie, Book IV" in Narratives of Early Virginia 1606-1625. Lyon Gardiner Tyler, ed. (New York: Scribner, 1907) p. 357. Alden T. Vaughan, "Expulsion of the Savages": English Policy and the Virginia Massacre of 1622" The William and Mary Quarterly, Third Series, vol. 35, No. 1 (Jan., 1978) p. 80.

obstruction and nuisance to white settlement. As Edward Waterhouse put it in his report on the event: "our hands which before were tied wit gentlenesse and faire vsage, are now set at liberty by the treacherous violence of the Sausages, not vntying the Knot, but cutting it: So that we, who hitherto haue had possession of no more ground then their waste, and our purchase at a valuable consideration to their owne contentment, gained; may now by right of Warre, and law of Nations, inuade the Country, and destroy them who sought to destroy vs."[39] John Smith, however, disagreed. He believed that despite the belief of many that "now we have just cause to destroy them by all meanes possible," for the good of the settlement it would have been better to avoid the burden of having to subjugate them. Yet Smith admitted that it would be easier to "civilize them by conquest then faire meanes; for the one may be made at once, but their civilizing will require a long time and much industry," which was too much trouble, he seemed to indicate, for a young settlement growing so rapidly.[40] In retaliation, armed forces were sent out to destroy all Indians residing in the areas of the James and York rivers, and two years later it was customary for colonists to attack Indians settlements every November, March and July with the hope of "rooting them out for being longer a people upon the face of the Earth."[41]

Through oral tradition, Uncle Moble Hobson's father, who he admits did not "see it" happen, transmitted the story of how Native American people along the York and

---

[39] Susan Myra Kingsbury ed., The Records of the State of Virginia Company of London Vol. 3 (Washington: 1933) pp. 556-557.
[40] John Smith, "Smith's History of Virginia" in Narratives of Early Virginia 1606-1625 Lyon Gardiner Tyler, ed. (New York: Scribner, 1907) p. 364.
[41] Kingsbury, Records, "A Letter to the Governor and the Council in Virginia" October 7, 1622, p. 683; Vaugn, "Expulsion" pp. 77, 81.

Poquoson Rivers were eliminated after "de white man come."[42] Hobson, a former slave of mixed descent relayed that his father told him "Dis whut de white man do…Well, dey cross de Potomac an' dey has to fight de injuns an' dey cross de York an' fit some more tell de kilt all de Injuns or run en' way. When de cross de Poquoson dey fine de Injuns ain't aimin' tuh fight but dey kilt de men an' tek de injun women fo'de wives. Coursen dey warn't no marryin' dem at dat time." There is no way to know for sure the exact time frame of Hobson's story, but the Poquoson River was named after an Algonquin group of Native Americans affiliated with the Powhatan Confederacy who had inhabited the area before its colonization by the English. The Algonquins, who were supposedly hostile to the English, would certainly have had good reason to be antagonistic as the colonists apparently opened their land for English settlement in 1628. Poquoson became part of York County in 1642-43, and this is when the name of the Charles River was changed to the York River. It is conceivable that what Hobson relays is the removal of the Poquoson inhabitants through the retaliatory campaigns of war mentioned above, ending with what appears to be unrelenting English aggression.

At face value, the assertion that the atrocity committed by the Pamunkey tribe forced the English to retaliate appears justified, except that historians concur that Native peoples did not practice exterminatory warfare traditionally. After contact with Europeans, however, Native Americans learned quickly that it was in their best interest to operate in what would become the "American way," borrowing the techniques of massive slaughter that they themselves frequently experienced during English attacks.[43] Although

---

[42] The Story of "Uncle" Moble Hobson," Slave Narratives: A Folk History of Slavery in the United States, from interviews with former slaves. Ohio, Virginia, Tennessee Narratives. Vol. 18. (St. Clair Shores: Scholarly P, 1976) pp. 31-33.
[43] See Jennings, p. 168; Hirsch, p. 1210; Malone, p.80.

according to William Strachey, Powhatan exterminated the Chesapeake Indians and many of the Piankatanks by 1608 because of a divine prophecy, the fact that he did so does not negate the fact that it was viewed as wrong and against their cultural traditions.[44] Strachey supports this by further noting that "they seldom make warrs for lands or goods, but for women and children, and principally for revenge…the weroances [officers or commanders], women or children, they put not to death, but keep them captives. They have a method in warre."[45] The Native American approach to warfare common to all woodland nations, the "Law of Innocence," did not allow for the killing of noncombatants, of women, children and old people. Europeans were not responding to savagery, they were creating an environment in which it thrived and Native American people learned to come to terms with it.

Despite the fact that collectively Native Americans in Virginia were substantially weakened by the persistent aggression of Europeans and the threat of Native Americans from bordering regions, Europeans continued to harness white fear to rationalize conquest and the extermination of aboriginal people in the region. In 1666, the English government ordered the militia to exterminate the Doeg, Nanzemond, Portobacco, and Patawomeck Native Americans residing in Rappachannock County because of their apparent harassment of a few settlers in the upper portions of that county. This was done, according to Governor, Sir William Berkeley, "for revenge" and he ordered that "for the prevention of future mifcheifs that the towns of Monzation, Nanzimond and Port

---

[44] William Strachey, The Historie of Travell into Virginia Britania 2d, ser., vol. 103, eds. Louis B. Wright and Virginia Freund. (1612; Cambridge: The Hakluyt Society) pp. 68-69, 44; Roundtree, pp. 10-12, 25-27.
[45] William Strachey, The Historie of Travaile into Virginia Britannia; Expressing the Cosmographie and Commodities of the Country, Together with the Manners and Customes of the People (London: Hakluyt Society: 1849) pp. 101, 107. Also qtd. in The Indians of the Southeastern United States Smithsonian Institution Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin 137. (United States Government Printing Office: Washington, 1946). pp. 687-688.

Tobacco with the whole nation of the Doegs and Potamacks[Patawomecks] be forthwith prsecuted with war to their utter deftruction if possible and that their women and children and their goods …be disposed of."[46] This action followed a 1655 law that made it legal to kill Native Americans if it was perceived that they were up to "mischief."[47] It is impossible to know the outcome of British efforts, but there is evidence that what ever was left of the Patawomeck tribe abandoned their homeland, and there is no further mention of the Patawomecks in the extant historical documents of English colonial history.[48] Some Nanzemond, however, appear to still be in Virginia in the late 1670s.[49] And enough of the Doeg Indians apparently survived to continue their aggressive resistance against white settlement on their lands.[50]

Although much has been written about Nathaniel Bacon's rebellion in 1676, the call for racial extermination as a tool to resolve the problems of continued contestations between Native Americans and Europeans over land is of seminal importance. In this first of civil actions against English imperial power, Bacon led a coalition of disgruntled white yeoman farmers against the colonial Royal Governor of Virginia, William Berkeley, which tightened pressures on an already diminished Native American population. Bacon and William Byrd charged that Berkley was not efficiently concerned with protecting the

---

[46] H. R. MclLwaine, ed. Minutes of the Council and General Court of Colonial Virginia 1622-1632, 1670-1676. 2nd edition, Richmond, Virginia State Library, 1979 [1924] pp. 488-489.
[47] Rountree, Pocahontas's, pp. 93, 103, 127, 129.
[48] Roundtree, Pocahontas's, p. 95. Stephen R. Potter, "Early English Effects on Virginia Algonquian Exchange and Tribute in the Tidewater Potomac," Powatan's Mantle: Indians in the Colonial Southeast Gregory A. Waselkov, Peter H. Wood, and Tom Hatley, eds. (Lincoln: University of Nebraska p, 2006) p. 231.
[49] Martha W. Mccartney, "Cockacoeske, Queen of Pamunkey: Diplomat and Suzeraine," Powatan's Mantle: Indians in the Colonial Southeast Gregory A. Waselkov, Peter H. Wood, and Tom Hatley, eds. (Lincoln: University of Nebraska p, 2006) p. 249.
[50] Kathleen M. Brown, Goodwives, Nasty Wenches, and Anxious Patriarchs: Gender, Race, and Power in Colonial Virginia (Chapel Hill: UNC p, 1996) p. 159.

Virginia frontier homelands from Doeg and the Susquehanna attacks because of his trade monopoly with Native Americans in the region.[51]

At the center of this conflict though was whether it was appropriate for the colonists to be at "war with all Indians which come not in with their armies, and give Hostages for their fidelity and to ayd against all others."[52] If what was left, if all 2,900 of the Powhatan population did not comply, the burgeoning English population of over 30,000 threatened that "we will spare none."[53] Native Americans would have to completely surrender themselves to British rule or else face certain destruction. The Doeg and the Susquehanna raids, which resulted in the death of Bacon's overseer perhaps made the issue a personal one for Bacon, but for most of the English citizens siding with Bacon it was the "law of nature" which required that "wee defend ourselves before they oppose us,…take their usual advantage…and soe destroy us."[54] For the eighty slaves and twenty servants who also participated, perhaps promises of freedom encouraged their involvement.[55] Nevertheless, the "common cry" that there was no distinction between "Friend or Foe Soe they be Indians" fostered what historian Kathleen Brown calls a "new ethic of racist violence" which pushed all Native Americans outside of the protection of English law.[56]

Bacon and his army of three hundred were able to only moderately make good on their promises of "killing those that will destroy us," but what the records do reveal is

---

[51]Kathleen M. Brown, Goodwives, Nasty Wenches, and Anxious Patriarchs: Gender, Race, and Power in Colonial Virginia (Chapel Hill: UNC p, 1996) pp. 159-160.
[52] John Berry and Francis Moryson, "Narrative of Bacon's Rebellion," The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography. Vol. IV. October, 1896. No. 2, p. 126.
[53] Roundtree, Pocahontas's, p. 96 ; Berry and Moryson, "Narrative," p. 126.
[54] Berry and Moryson, "Narrative," pp. 124, 126.
[55] Brown, Goodwives, Nasty Wenches, pp. 164, 168.
[56] Berry and Moryson, "Narrative," pp. 126, 136; Brown, Goodwives, p. 161.

that his army did kill men, women and possibly children.[57] In one altercation, Bacon and his rebels were successful after stumbling upon the Pamunkey Indians, who "did not at all oppose, but fled, being followed by Bacon and his Forces killing and taking them Prisoners." The Queen of Pamunkey, Cockacoeske, fled with a ten year old boy for her life, fearful of returning to her village because "Shee happened to meet with a deade Indian woman lying in the way being one of her own nation; which struck such terror in the Queene that fearing their cruelty by that gastly example shee went on her first intended way into wild woodes where shee was lost amd missing from her people for ffourteen dayes." [58] There is no way of knowing who the woman was, but an old Indian woman who was the Queen's nurse was killed earlier after Bacon ordered "his soldiers to knock her in the head, which they did, and they left her dead on the way."[59] Perhaps this was the woman left "on the way" that the Queen ran into while making her escape. A woman who had remained loyal to her by not guiding Bacon and his rebels to the Queen's encampment; traipsing them around for over a day until at last they discovered her intention to mislead them. In another incident, a "half starved" Native American woman apparently met a similar fate, as did a handful of men and an equal number of women who were attempting to flee from their encampment. Bacon managed to come away with 45 captives, which he proudly held as plunder.[60] Despite the rebels limited success in locating the Native American camps, the Pamunkey population was seriously decimated after Bacon's Rebellion.[61] Ironically, Bacon believed that it was the Pamunkey's committed friendship with the English that made them the greatest threat:

---

[57] Berry and Moryson, "Narrative," pp. 126, 138.
[58] Berry and Moryson, "Narrative," p. 140.
[59] Berry and Moryson, "Narrative," p. 138.
[60] Berry and Moryson, "Narrative," pp. 138, 140.
[61] Brown, Goodwives, p. 168.

"being acquainted and knowing both the manners, customs, and nature of our People, and the Strength, Situation and advantages of the country and so capable of doing hurt and damage to the English."[62]

Bacon was the standard-bearer for all the English hopes "of destroying the Heathen," which continued even after the rebellion was put down. One petition from the Isle of Wight County requested that the subsequent commissioners sent by the King continue Bacon's efforts of "war with the Indians that we may have done with them."[63] In Nansemond County, the petitioners also advocated that "all Indians ought to be killed."[64] Another petition from Rappahannock argued that it seemed to them that those colonists residing in the east "think it none of their duty to assist us in destroying the blood thirsty Indians, but would willingly leave us to fight the battles of the Republique…"[65] In their view, this was not only a border issue; it was a problem that everyone within the province of Virginia wanted addressed—the removal of Native Americans who were "all of a colour."[66]

After 1676, and through the perseverance of Nathaniel Bacon and his war against the Native Americans, aboriginal communities were subjected to the terror of settler's escalated efforts to exact revenge. Deprived of their protected status as aboriginal people, Native Americans in Virginia faced the ever-increasing options of death or enslavement, leaving voluntary exile as their only alternative. A series of laws were passed where the liberties of Native Americans were seriously altered. Specifically, now Indians engaged in war were to be made slaves if captured. Enslavement made war profitable for

---

[62] Berry and Moryson, "Narrative," p. 136.
[63] Brown, Goodwives, p. 169.
[64] Brown, Goodwives, p. 425, ftn. 86.
[65] Brown, Goodwives, p. 170.
[66] Berry and Moryson, "Narrative," p. 126.

Jamestown and incentivised those soldier citizens who might have previously been reluctant to join in initiatives like Bacon's Rebellion.[67] By 1682, any Indian traveling or living in Virginia could be legally enslaved.[68]

Anglo constructions of racial difference that did not distinguish between aboriginal slaves and African slaves also diminished the Native American community and their claims to the land. The importation of Africans into Virginia increased rapidly in the 1680s and 1690s and this led to greater efforts to create racial distinctions between unfree and free laborers. The unrelenting growth of mixed, racially vague colonists threatened social stability and the prescribed notions of racial difference despite the 1662 legislation which made it unlawful for any Christian to have sexual relations with a "negro." Statutes already fixed in place that the subsequent children born from these unions would follow the "condition of the mother" required greater clarity. So when Virginia lawmakers revisited this issue in 1691, they made the punishment for interracial marriage banishment. This was the first time that Virginia legislators used the word "white" and they specifically identified that the undesirable partners were "Negroes, mulattoes, and Indians." Rountree argues that this was done to put "all non-whites in 'their place,'" and to prevent the mulatto population from continuing to grow, which it did anyway in exponential fashion from 1690 to the 1720s.[69] After 1785, all mulattoes were considered to be mixed with African blood and any Native Americans who were found to have "become one fourth mixed with the negro race" were by law "treated as

---

[67] Rountree, Pocahontas's, pp. 97-100.
[68] James H. Merrell, The Indians' New World: Catawbas and Their Neighbors from European Contact Through the Era of Removal (New York: W.W. Norton, 1991) p. 36.
[69] Roundtree, Pocahonta's, pp. 141-142. Kathleen M. Brown, Good Wives, Nasty Wenches, and Anxious Patriarchs (Chapel Hill: UNC p, 1996) pp. 132-136, 197-198.

free negroes or mulattoes."[70] Moreover, slave owners and traders made no distinctions between African slaves and Native American slaves. Both groups were sent out into the fields, lived in the same quarters, were employed in trades and as domestics, they were renamed by their masters, wore the same type of coarse clothing—sometimes were without shoes, and generally suffered the legal and extralegal debasement of domination.[71] By making all Native Americans who did not voluntarily remove themselves, or those unable to become "pseudo white"[72] indistinguishable within the categories of negro or slave, white Virginians used race and bondage to further usurp aboriginal possession of the land. Those Native Americans who were, by the turn of the nineteenth century, considered un-civilizable and who were considered as Africans by law were then stripped of their title to any land in the American south, as they were affected as no longer aboriginal people.[73]

Indeed, a 1705 statute sought to close any legal distinction between Africans and Native American slaves in Virginia. It specifically allowed that "all servants imported and brought into this country, by sea or land, who were not Christians in their native country…shall be slaves." It further dictated that "all Negroes, mulatto, and Indian slaves within this dominion shall be held to be real estate," and was later clarified by the court so that executors of an estate could treat "Negroes…as no otherwise than Horses or

---

[70] Jack D. Forbes, Africans and Native Americans: The Language of Race and the Evolution of Red-Black People (Urbana: University of Illinois p, 1993) pp. 195-196.
[71] Wright, The Only Land They Knew pp. 154, 160, 169, 253.
[72] I use this term perhaps differently than Roundtree uses it. Rather, it seems to fit the continued loosening of the definition of mulatto: where laws that initially identified someone being mulatto as having no more than one eighth African blood changed to define someone with no more than one fourth African blood by 1785. Too much racial mixing had already occurred by the Revolutionary era, Roundree argues, to sustain through law the one drop rule that whites rhetorically held up as defining non-white persons. See: Roundtree, pp. 167, 179-180, 183.
[73] Theda Perdue, Mixed Blood Indians: Racial Construction in the Early South (Athens: Un. of Georgia p, 2003) p. 83.

Cattle."[74] The statute also allowed that the killing of a slave who resisted enslavement was no longer a felony. It became illegal, however, for any Negro, mulatto, or Indian, whether enslaved or free to fight or strike "any Christian, not being negro, mulatto or Indian." The enslaved could no longer carry arms, or own cattle, or leave home without permission. Slaves also faced the possibility of "dismembering" as a means of controlling those that would runaway by "terrifying others from the like practices."[75] The fact that the English engaged in and subsequently defeated Native Americans in wars, and because of the legal definition of many Native Americans as non-whites, they as a people were never beyond the reach of enslavement or white fears of a war between the races.

In *Notes from Virginia,* Thomas Jefferson in 1789 canonized the idea that a state of war always existed between master and slave. [76] Echoing the fears of other early colonists, like Colonel William Byrd and James Madison, Jefferson's ultimate belief in the "extermination of the one race or the other" reflected the view that large numbers of an enslaved population represented a dangerous threat to those who were their masters and whites generally.[77] Jefferson, however, did not make the distinction between those slaves who were of aboriginal descent, African descent, and those who were of a racially mixed heritage. By 1789, Native Americans who were racially mixed or enslaved had certainly become part of that group that Jefferson and other white colonists found an

---

[74] A. Leon Higginbotham, In the Matter of Color: Race and the American Legal Process (New York: Oxford Up, 1978) pp. 52-53.
[75] Ibid, pp. 55-57.
[76] Thomas Jefferson, Notes on the State of Virginia William Peden, ed. (Chapel Hill: UNC p, 1982).
[77] Colonel William Byrd, one of the largest slave owners in Virginia, wrote to Georgian Earl of Edgemont in 1736 about the "public danger" that so many slaves represented and wondered what would happen if "there should arise a Man … exasperated by a desperate fortune" who would "… kindle a Servile War. Such a man might be dreadfully mischievous before any opposition could be formed against him. Even James Madison agreed that blacks who were freedmen "would soon be at war with the whites if too near." See: Elizabeth Donnan, Documents Illustrative of the History of the Slave Trade to America Vol. IV. (Washington D.C: Carnegie Institute, 1935) p. 132; See: Qtd. in Winthrop Jordon, White Over Black: American Attitudes Toward the Negro, 1550-1812 (Chapel Hill: UNC P, 1968) p. 552.

incompatible element of the American republic. And for Jefferson, chattel slavery and racialized ideas of who could be civilized required that certain people "be removed beyond the reach of mixture." [78]

Defined by colonists as uncivilized heathens who were an obstruction to white settlement, the clarion call for the destruction of all Native Americans in the region did not go unheeded. English concerns about living amongst slaves did not exclude Native Americans who as racial outcasts found themselves outside the boundaries of colonial law by 1705. And by the 1820's Native Americans in Virginia were completely pushed off most of their tribal lands and into the black community because of white anxiety, which saw black and Native Americans as fundamentally the same, legally and racially.[79] That is, both groups were considered antagonistic and resistant to white supremacy. This was certainly true of the Native Americans in New England.

New England Ideas of Just Warfare

Puritans in the northeast, like Virginians, came with ideas about total war and conquest that they used to eliminate northern Native Americans who they believed were God's enemies. They took the principles outlined by seventeenth century ministers for

---

[78] Jefferson, Notes, pp. 61, 96, 138, 143, 163. For Jefferson, when cohabitation occurred between whites and Native Americans, their offspring remained racially white. Blacks, however, who were "a distinct race" produced inferior people. Jefferson does acknowledge that many Native Americans were racially mixed with the "negro." He also claimed that the custom practiced long ago of enslaving Native Americans was "inhuman." On the "scale of beings," Jefferson placed Native Americans above Africans, but only those who were not mixed with Africans. When Jefferson wrote *Notes*, he portrayed Native Americans in the romantic terms of the day as the superior "noble savage," although as historian Rhys Isaac points out this was easy enough for him to do as few Native Americans remained near Monticello or in Virginia generally. See: Rhys Isaac, "The First Monticello," in Jefferson's Legacies Peter Onuf, ed., (Charlottesville, University of Virginia p, 1993) pp. 98-99.

[79] Roundtree, Pocahontas's, pp. 105, 180; Brown, Goodwives, p. 180-181. After Nat Turner's rebellion in 1831, white paranoia extended to the Gingaskins, many of who were forced to sell their tribal homes. Eventually, they merged with the sympathetic black community nearby. Roundtree, Pocahontas's, pp. 183-184.

the colonization and proselytizing of native people to heart. The chronicled animosity between Europeans and Native Americans in the south, well established by 1620, influenced the first Puritan settler's views of Native Americans. Eventually the Puritans turned a few aggressive actions into a mandate to fulfill God's glory by waging wars of extermination. Thereafter, a substantial number of the already decimated Native American populations in New England suffered enslavement and removal to other British colonies in the south and the West Indies.

Although Puritan Americans believed themselves to be like the Hebrews who fought wars for self-preservation, their wars often turned into wars of conquest.[80] As God's new chosen people, Puritans believed themselves justified in their decisions about what constituted legitimate land tenure and their divine right to Indian lands in Massachusetts.[81] When Puritan Separatists left England in the pursuit of religious freedom, they dreamed of reestablishing pure Protestantism in the virgin land of North America. They wanted to create a theologically driven civil society based upon the Old Testament; one they believed existed in the sacred time. The pandemics that decimated the once populous regions of Massachusetts and Connecticut made, what looked like to Puritans, large swaths of land available for settlement. And as had occurred in Virginia, Anglo appropriations of aboriginal land created the environment in which the Native people sporadically attacked white settlers. [82] Eventually the increased pressure over land tenure created the catalyst for the first Anglo-Indian war in Connecticut.

---

[80] Dederer, War in America, p. 176.
[81] Pearce, The Savages, pp. 20-21.
[82] Ward Churchill, A Little Matter of Genocide (San Francisco: City Lights, 1997). For Wards discussion on the use of biological warfare to decrease Native American communities historically. see pp. 138, 148-156.

There are many historical accounts of the Pequot War; that make evident that it did not differ much from other Anglo Indian wars in terms of what precipitated the conflict.[83] The struggle to push back against English encroachment, as the English pushed forward illegally to take over the lands of indigenous people, was the reason war generally occurred and the incident in 1637 was no exception. What is unique, however, is the fact that the leaders of this effort, Major John Mason, Captain John Underhill, and Lieutenant Philip Vincent wrote detailed eyewitness accounts about the incident.

These accounts reveal that, according to John Mason, the Pequots were a "warlike people" who were angry that the English had built Fort Saybrook in the Indian territory of what is now known as Connecticut. They attempted to agitate the English by constantly attacking individual settlers, and killing their livestock in the hopes that they would force them to leave the region. Having already signed away the rights to the Connecticut River valley, the Pequots were determined that English settlement would not expand to the mouth of the Connecticut River permanently.[84] From 1634 to 1637, the three tribes living in the area, the Narragansetts, the Mohegans, and the Pequots, managed to kill thirty-two colonists and to frustrate the militiamen residing in Fort Saybrook, "keeping almost a constant siege." This led Mason to conclude that a just war could be waged, and that "it pleased God so to stir up the Hearts of all Men in general," the idea being that the Pequot had brought the "necessity…to engage in an offensive and

---

[83]See Francis Jennings' seminal work on the Pequot War in Invasion of America: Indians, Colonialism, and the Cant of Conquest (Chapel Hill, UNC p, 1975) pp. 187-281.

[84] Captain John Mason, "Brief History of the Pequot War: Especially of the memorable Taking of their Fort at Mistick in Connecticut in 1637." (Boston, Kneeland and Green, 1736) in History of the Pequot War: The Contemporary Accounts of Mason, Underhill, Vincent and Gardener Reprinted from the Massachusetts Historical Society, (Cleveland: Helman-Taylor, 1897) p. 16, 18; Hirsch, p. 1197.

defensive War" on themselves.[85] Mason took ninety militiamen and recruited five hundred Narragansett Indians, who according to Mason were enemies of the Pequot, and traveled across Rhode Island in order to surprise them at their two forts.[86] By the time they arrived in Connecticut, it was too late to attack both forts that day so they made the decision to attack the closest one first. With Captain Underhill leading half of the men, they entered the fort at both sides with the intention "to destroy them by the Sword." They did not see many warriors and the ones they did see fled from them and hid. So Captain Mason then decided, "We must Burn them" and immediately set the entire village ablaze. Captain Mason set fire to the west entrance while Captain John Underhill set fire to the south, which consumed everything within a half hour. They then set about blocking the two exits to the Fort so that none could escape the flames, and those that did "perished by the Sword."[87] Captain Underhill noted that other Europeans questioned, "why you should be so furious? Should not Christians have more mercy and compassion? But [Underhill said] I would refer you to David's war…sometimes the scripture declareth women and children must perish with the parents…We had sufficient light from the word of God for our proceedings."[88]

The English continued to pursue and destroy as many Pequot as they could find in what Francis Jennings described as "one long atrocity." Six to Seven hundred Pequot died in what the English called the "Mistick Fight." In Mason's view, "it was the Lord's

---

[85] Mason, "Brief History," pp. 18-19. The idea that the Pequot were bent on destroying the English is questionable when considering the total number of deaths by year: 1643- seven; 1635- three; 1636- thirteen; 1637- nine.
[86] Mason, "Brief History," pp. 25-26.
[87] Mason, "Brief History," p. 29.
[88]Captain John Underhill, Newes From America; or, A New and Experimentall Discoverie of New England (London, 1638) pp. 80-81.

Doings, and it is marvelous in our Eyes!"[89] The final act being that the "Pequots were then bound by Covenant, That none should inhabit their native Country, nor should any of them be called Pequots any more" causing the erasure of their bodies and their culture to be forever subsumed into the "Moheags and Narragansetts."[90] "Blessed be the Lord God of Israel" Mason proclaimed who "was pleased to smite our Enemies… [who would] give us their Land for an Inheritance."[91] By 1660, Lieutenant Lion Gardner observed that only "remnants of the Pequot" lived in a town called Groton where approximately forty Pequots lived on the useless land reserved for them, and where most of them, mixed with Negro and white blood, were even "more vicious and not so decent."[92] The Narragansetts Indians that fought behind the English in the Pequot war were appalled by what had occurred and came to Underhill afterwards to commend them on their victory "but cried Mach it, mach it; that is, It is naught, it is naught, because it is too furious, and slays too many men." From the Narragansetts point of view, there was no honor in a war waged in this way.[93]

Lieutenant Gardener, reaffirming English ideas of total war, remembered that the Pequot queried him and his men before the Mystic battle whether "we did use to kill women and children." They wanted to know whether extermination was part of traditional English warfare or if it was unique to war with Native people in North America, whereupon Gardener declared that "they should see that hereafter." The Pequot then asserted after some thought that they too "can kill them as mosquetoes, and we will

---

[89] Mason, "Brief History," pp. 31, 35.
[90] Jennings, Invasion, p. 226. Mason, "Brief History," pp. 36-40.
[91] Mason, "Brief History," p. 44.
[92] Captain Leif Lion Gardener, "Leif Lion Gardener his relation of the Pequot Warres" in History of the Pequot War (Cleveland: The Helman-Taylor Co., 1897) p. 119. Captain Lion Garnener was the engineer hired to construct the fort at Saybrook, Conn. Later he would command that fort after Mason conquered the Pequots.
[93] Underhill, "Newes" p. 84.

go to Connectecott and kill men, women, and children."[94] They never got the chance. According to the General Court of Massachusetts, the "right of conquest" and "revenge of innocent blood of the English" justified the wars against the Pequot, which enabled settlers in the Massachusetts Bay and Connecticut region to fulfill a war policy of annihilation against them.[95]

The fact that there was clear intent by the English to massacre the people within the Mystic River Pequot village demonstrates that a preexisting template for war was in place, challenging Alan Hirsch's assertions that this military culture was only prevalent during "actual warfare," that it occurred in the moment of passion.[96] Extermination was implemented and commonplace in America and was used by European Americans across the country as a strategy in the removal of indigenous people who stood in the way of "civilized progress."[97] The American way of warfare was no longer defensive; it became *the* way to clear the frontier of "barbarian savages," to make way for the civilized yeoman farmer and the triumph of America's manifest destiny.

The replication of the strategies used in the Pequot War continued well into the eighteenth and nineteenth century not only in New England and Virginia, but also in emerging colonies like New York, Tennessee, North and South Carolina, Louisiana, Florida, Ohio, and Pennsylvania.[98] This was certainly true in King Phillips War in Massachusetts, where as Increase Mather pointed out, "many men, women and children

---

[94] Captain Gardener, "Leif Lion Gardener his relation" p. 132.
[95] Charles Orr, introduction, History of the Pequot War (Cleveland: The Helman-Taylor Co., 1897) p. x-xiii.
[96] Hirsch, "The Collision," p. 1211.
[97] Pearce, The Savages, p. 49.
[98] The number of incidents are enormous, but a few good examples of total warfare used against Native Americans are: the Great Swamp Massacre of 1675, the Gnadenhuetten Massacre of 1782, the Horseshoe Bend Massacre of the Red Sticks in 1814, the Bad Axe River Massacre in 1833, the Bear River Massacre in 1863, and the Sand Creek Massacre in 1864.

were burned in their *wigwams*" and "Barbikew'd."[99] In fairness, both sides incurred astounding casualties. Several thousand English settlers lost their lives during King Phillips pan-Indian effort to prevent the entire colonization of his land. The best estimates suggest that three to six thousand Native Americans were killed.[100] Significant numbers of the Native Americans who eventually surrendered suffered subsequent enslavement; and their sale to the West Indian plantation market, much to Increase Mather's pleasure, facilitated the near extinction of aboriginal people in New England.[101]

The New England English propagandized that the Native American should be condemned for his way of waging war. Yet, one must wonder at the dissemblance here. For when Duke Holland, who as a member of the Wyandot tribe living near Detroit at the onset of the Revolutionary War questioned a British order to kill "all the rebels" even the women and children, believing surely "it was meant that they should kill men only," he was told, "no, no…kill all; nits breed lice." Holland, however, rejected this idea. He recognized, no doubt, that this practice had negatively affected his own people. Thus, honoring his own cultural traditions and the law of innocence, he decided not to join the British military against the American Patriots, nor did the sixteen tribes under him.[102]

After the Pequot War and King Phillips War, many Native Americans were sold into slavery. Warfare practices encapsulated in New England codes of law were used as early as 1641 to affirm that bond slavery was lawful if the persons were "Captives taken

---

[99]Captain John Underhill was hired in 1643-1644 as an English mercenary by the Dutch to conduct a similar campaign in the New Amsterdam region against the Raritan, Wappinger, and Mohawk nations where he and his men used the exact same tactics of fire and entrapment that they employed in the Pequot War. See Ward Churchill, A Little Matter of Genocide (San Francisco: City Lights, 1997) p.198. Increase Mather, A Brief History of the War (Boston: 1676) See December 18. Slotnick, Regeneration, p. 162.
[100] See Jill Lepore's seminal work, The Name of War: King Philip's War and the Origins of American Identity (NY: Vantage, 1998).
[101] Gary Nash, Red, White and Black (Englewood: Prentice Hall, 1974) p. 126. Ward, p. 177.
[102] Reverend John Heckewelder, History, Manners, and Customs of the Indian Nations (1818; Philadelphia: the Historical Society, 1876) pp. 337-338.

in just warres."[103] The crime of instigating warfare against the Puritan colonists, for example, led to the decision that any Indians indulging in "hostile practices" should be removed "either to serve or be shipped out and exchanged for Negroes."[104] This same rational was used in Virginia to justify Native American (and African) enslavement; but the collision of these ideas, just wars and the enslavement of Native Americans, was most pervasive in the Carolina region.

Carolinian Conquest and Native American Slaves

From the very beginning, English colonists incited wars with and between Native Americans to justify their enslavement in South Carolina. The traders in Native American slaves, however, followed a market driven approach that was not only uniquely gendered, but also attentive to age. As greater numbers of colonists settled the region, and as Native American's resisted the loss of their women and children and land, Native Americans became an enemy that needed not only subjugation, nor just enslavement, but complete decimation or removal.

When King Charles II issued land grants to eight of his loyal supporters after his Restoration to the throne in 1663, he did so not only to reward those loyal to him who had political power but also to monopolize the wealth that the eastern part of America had to offer. After the removal of the Dutch from the Mid-Atlantic region and the establishment of charters for New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Delaware, Carolina became the southern most region of settlement. White colonists, Charles II

---

[103] The Body of Liberties Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society, third Series, vol. viii., 1843. # 91. Leon Higginbotham, In the Matter of Color: Race and the American Legal Process. The Colonial Period (New York: Oxford Up, 1978) pp. 61-62.
[104] Ibid. also in Winthrop Jordon, White Over Black p. 69.

believed, would provide a buffer against the possibilities of Spanish and later French invasion, allowing the English to establish control of and trade with the powerful Creek, Cherokee, Chickasaw, and Choctow nations.[105]

The Lord Proprietors successfully established the first colony of Charlestown in 1670 by designing a generous land distribution system that enabled the territory to flourish. [106] The eighty acres offered to any adult male that was willing to settle in Carolina helped the region to develop rapidly and eventually the Proprietors raised the offer of land to 150 acres. Settlers were also encouraged to bring black slaves, and this would entitle their owners to an additional 150 acres of land. These incentives were effective in bringing settlers from other colonies and the West Indies, particularly Virginia and Barbados.[107] Eventually, after the settlers seized control of the colony from the Lord Proprietors in 1719, King Charles II separated the region into North and South Carolina in 1729.

Many of the early colonists in South Carolina sought to take over the Indian slave trade from Virginia, and they did so by instigating tribal warfare among the southern Indians in order that they might purchase captured slaves. Native Americanist J. Leitch

---

[105] Kenneth Wiggins Porter, "Negroes on the Southern Frontier, 1670-1763" The Journal of Negro History, Vol. 33, No. 1 (Jan., 1948), p. 54. Gary B. Nash, Red, Black, and White: The Peoples of Early America (Englewoods Cliff: Prentice-Hall, 1974) p. 114.

[106] A large number of the early settlers were from Barbados in the first decades, many of whom predominantly settled in the southern Carolina region. Many of the Barbadians resided in Charleston or northwest of Charleston along the Goose Creek where they developed plantations with the help of the African slaves they brought with them. They quickly established a profitable relationship with the colony of Barbados to whom Carolina supplied beef, lumber, food, and slaves. Although the development of commodities for trade were central to the mandate articulated in the Fundamental Constitution for Carolina, the market for Native American slaves soon created the real incentive for settlement in the region. In fact, because the Lord Proprietors were absentee landowners, the settlers chose to ignore much of what the Constitution dictated: specifically that Native Americans could not be enslaved or killed. Wright, The Only Land, pp. 136, 115-116; Nash, Red, Black, p. 115.

[107] Gary B. Nash, Red, Black, and White: The Peoples of Early America (Englewoods Cliff: Prentice-Hall, 1974) pp. 114-115; Peter H. Wood, Black Majority: Negroes in Colonial South Carolina From 1670 through the Stono Rebellion (New York: W. W. Norton, 1974) pp. 16, 19-20.

Wright notes that although slavery existed among southern Native Americans, it took on a "new" dimension after western contact, as did the Native American enslavement of prisoners of war.[108] Carolina's founding occurred just as the interest in selling slaves in Virginia and the northern colonies, the West Indies, Central and South America, and Africa intensified. The region quickly surpassed the other colonies in the exportation of Native American slaves for use in other British territories and in response to the high demand for slaves in the West Indies.[109] Historian Alan Gallay notes that prior to 1715 exports of slaves exceeded imports in South Carolina.[110] And, according to plantation owner Robert Southwell, Carolina was particularly dependant on slave labor due to the difficulty of obtaining white labor, especially Irish labor, as the Irish feared returning to or becoming entrapped in labor agreements with the English that might echo their experience as slaves in the West Indies after the massacres of Drogheda and Wexford.[111]

Eventually, as the population along the coast diminished, and as the demand for labor on the islands and in South Carolina increased, the colonists pushed farther into the interior, encouraged Native Americans to fight each other, and betrayed previous alliances in order to find additional natives for sale on the frontier. Thousands of Native Americans who still resided along the coast and the interior of the Carolina region at the beginning of the 18th century faced the danger of enslavement. Many had already died of

---

[108] J. Leitch Wright Jr., The Only Land They Knew: The Tragic Story of the American Indians in the Old South (New York: Free p, 1981) pp. 126-127, 138, 140.

[109] England founded the sugar colonies of Bermuda in 1612, Barbados in 1627, and Jamaica in 1655, which were distinguished for their intensive labor demands and high mortality rates for the enslaved.

[110] Alan Gallay, The Indian Slave Trade: The Rise of the English Empire in the American South, 1670-1717 (New Haven: Yale up, 2002) p. 299.

[111]" Robert Southwell to Lord Ashley," qtd. found in Wood, Black Majority, letter found in Collections V, 153 South Carolina Historical Society. (See page 17 ft..note 30 of this document regarding importation after Drogheda and Wexford massacres.) Sir Harry H. Johnston states that, "all through the second half of the seventeenth century there were of course many English, Irish, and Welsh indentured apprentices (practically slaves) and political prisoners who were sold as slaves by the British government and were worse treated than the negroes." The Negro in the New World (Plymouth: W. Brendon, 1910) p. 213, n1.

diseases, which John Archdale believed was a sign that "the Hand of God was eminently seen in thinning…the Barbarous Indians Nations" whose sole purpose [God's] was "to make room for the English."[112] Over time, as the English in Carolina were more active in the sale of slaves than any other colony, the southern Native Americans, the Westos, Savannahs, Apalachees, Lower and Upper Creeks, Yamasees, Tuscaroras, and others also became deeply invested in the traffic, much like the West African nations across the Atlantic, where they exchanged slaves for guns, powder, knives, hatchets, and rum.[113]

It is reasonable to conclude, despite the limited sources, that in the first two centuries of English contact many thousands of southern Indians became slaves. The exact numbers are not calculable because there are few extant records of their sale or export to the West Indies in the early colonial period. Gallay estimates that between 30,000 to 50,000 southern Native Americans were sold in the British slave trade from 1670 to 1715.[114] Yet, what we know for sure is that within fifty years of settlement, from 1663 to 1715, 50 percent of the southern aboriginal population had disappeared due either to death, exportation or enslavement.[115] Historian Gary Nash asserts that South Carolina was singular in its "naked exploitation of the indigenous people." Dr. Francis Le Jau, a missionary for the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel (SPG) in South Carolina, observed however that the intention of the English was more problematic than

---

[112] John Archdale, "A Description of that Fertile and Pleasant Province of Carolina" Narratives of Early Carolina 1650-1708 Alexander S. Salley ed. (NY: Charles Scribner's, 1911) p. 285.
[113] Peter Wood, Black Majority, p. 39; Wright, The Only, p. 137. Wright notes that the exponential increase of aboriginal participation in the enslavement of their own people matches what was occurring in Africa.
[114] Gallay, The Indian Slave Trade, p. 299.
[115] Wright, The Only, pp. 147-148; Nash, Red, Black p. 153.

exploitation by admitting that "we think to destroy the whole nation, that is kill the Men and make the women and children slaves, this is the way of our Warrs upon the like."[116]

Native Americanist Ward Churchill suggests that the enslavement of predominantly women and children in Carolina was to have the same effect as extermination, on the assumption that enslaved Native American women would not have any pure aboriginal children raised within their own community, whereby racial and cultural extinction would occur over time.[117] The demographics for South Carolina's Native Americans at first glance signify that Churchill may be right. Between the years of 1703 and 1708, Native American slaves were the fastest growing sector of the South Carolinian population.[118] Significantly, for this period though, the number of women enslaved was high while the number of Native American children enslaved was low. It is difficult to explain why there were 150 Native American female slaves in 1703 and only 100 Native American children; and why the number of female Native American slaves in 1708 had risen to 600, while the recorded number of aboriginal children is merely 300. It is highly unlikely that only half of the native women would have only had one child when taken as slaves. Another example in 1709 reflects a similar disparity, especially when compared to the populations of whites and blacks. Note that there were 1360 free white men and 900 free white women residing in Charleston in 1709, and 1700 free white children. For black slaves, there were 1800 male slaves, 1100 females and 1200 children. Compare these numbers with the Native American population: 500 male slaves, 600

---

[116] Nash, Red, White p. 151; Dr. Francis Le Jau, The Carolina Chronicle of Dr. Francis Le Jau 1706-1717 Frank J. Klingberg ed. (Berkley: Un. of California P, 1956) pp. 122-123.
[117] Ward Churchill, A Little Matter of Genocide: Holocaust and Denial in the Americas 1492 to the Present (San Francisco: City Lights, 1997) p. 200-201.
[118] In 1703, there were 350 Native American slaves, while in 1708 there were 1,400. See Table I Wood, Black, p. 144 for comparison of white where the population declines by 6% and black slaves increase by 20% in the same five year period.

female slaves and again, only 300 Native American children. In the non Native American ethnic categories, the female to child ratio reflects a larger number of children than women. In the case of free white women, the number is nearly double.[119]

A possible explanation for the demographics is that it might represent early Anglo ideas about race. For a law eventually passed in South Carolina in 1719 required that "all such slaves as are not entirely Indian shall be accounted as negroe."[120] Thus, slave children who had African mothers or fathers, for example, would not have been viewed as Native Americans.

The ex-slave Susan Hamilton of South Carolina had an understanding similar to Churchill of how Native Americans and Africans became a racially mixed community. "De white race is so brazen. Dey come here an' run de Indians frum dere own lan', but dey couldn't make dem slaves 'cause dey wouldn't stan' for it….den dey gone to Africa an' bring dere black brother an' sister. Dey say 'mong themselves, "we gwine mix dem up en make ourselves king. Dats de only way we'll git even with de Indians."[121] Hamilton seems to suggest that racial mixture was the way whites sought to conquer Native American peoples, similar to Ward Churchill's views that securing only Native American women and children in enslavement was intended to lead to their cultural and racial extermination. The former slave also appears to have an informed understanding of how Native Americans experienced enslavement. For, according to Gallay, those Native

---

[119] Elizabeth Donnan, "Governor and Council of South Carolina to the Board of Trade, 1709" Documents Illustrative of the History of the Slave Trade to America Vol. IV, (Washington D.C.: Carnegie, 1935) p. 256. From early on the age of adulthood appears to begin at 15 years old for slave traders. See: Donnan, Vol. IV, p. 57. "William Fitzhugh to Mr. Jackson, 1683."
[120] Wood, Black Majority, p. 99n.
[121] Interview with Mrs. Susan Hamilton, Slave Narratives Part II Vol. I, (St. Clair Shores: Scholarly Press, 1976) p. 235.

Americans sent out of South Carolina as slaves were known to be "troublemakers and instigators."[122]

The low percentage of Native American children held in captivity also correlates with the fact that on the frontier infants and very young children were seen as a nuisance to traders and others involved in the market for slaves procured through wars. Indeed, the numbers above align with the estimate made by Paul Lovejoy that between 1701 and 1809, children accounted for 22.7 percent of the transatlantic slave trade and those involved in the Native American slave trade would have responded accordingly to the similarly low demands for aboriginal children.[123] Slaves who were children had little value and were "generally perceived to be a liability" up until the late nineteenth century.[124] From Lovejoy's analysis above and from the evidence below, it is not difficult to extrapolate that Native American slave babies and very young children were even more in jeopardy than were adults as casualties of war and in the commerce of human trafficking.

There is evidence that suggests that the killing of children was widespread. Reverend John Heckwelder, the renowned eighteenth century Indian historian, related that a man he knew well during an excursion against Native Americans in Detroit took the baby of a captive woman and "taking it by the legs dashed its head against a tree, so

---

[122] Gallay, The Indian Slave Trade, pp. 257-258, 301-302. Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Connecticut, and Rhode Island all pass laws restricting importation of Native American slaves from South Carolina after the Yamasee and Tuscarora Wars.

[123] Paul Lovejoy, "The Children of Slavery –The Transatlantic Phase," Slavery and Abolition Vol. 27, No. 2, August 2006, p. 200. See Elizabeth Donnan for countless examples of traders requesting that children be around 10 years old. They appear very concerned about age because slaves that were too young or too old were not profitable, Documents Illustrative of the History of the Slave Trade to America. Vol. 2, (Washington D.C: Carnegie Institution, 1931) pp. 159, 244, 250, 289, 292, 327. In hard times, children were particularly hard to sell as Henry Laurens notes in 1756, that "the children too young by 3 or 4 years. None will now tempt Our People to open their purse Strings but very prime young folks." Ibid. vol. 4, pp. 360. See also pp. 57, 451, 456, 586 for other South Carolinian's concerns over the age of slaves being at least pubescent.

[124] Lovejoy, "The Children," pp. 197, 213.

that the brains flew out all around." Mary Jemison, a white woman held in captivity by the Shawnee and later adopted by the Seneca, relayed in her narrative that a man by the name of Ebenezer Allen, a Tory whose "cruelty was not exceeded by any of his Indian comrades," took an infant "and holding it by its legs, dashed its head against the jamb, and…after he had killed the child, he opened the fire and buried it under the coals and embers." Additionally, in the narrative of Tom Quick, an icon of American folklore, he "dashed out" the brains of a Native American infant to avenge the death of his father, because Quick "thought it good policy to destroy the serpent while it was in embryo…[that] nits make lice!" In the massacre of Gnadenhutten, under the leadership of Colonel David Williamson of the Pennsylvania militia, thirty-four Delaware and Mohican Indian children, along with twenty-two women and forty men were killed by striking a mallet upon their heads. Heckewelder argued that these actions went unaccounted for because "it was no uncommon saying among many of the men of whom juries in the frontier countries were commonly composed, that no man should be put to death for killing an Indian; for it was the same thing as killing a wild beast."[125]

We find these beliefs supported in another example. The former governor of South Carolina, Barbadian James Moore, and fifty other men led a coalition of Creeks, Yamasees and Apalachicolas out to northwest Florida in 1704. Moore confiscated 4000 Native American women and children to be sold as slaves for sale but only 300 men from the Apalachee province. Although Moore vacillated on the number of Native Americans

---

[125] Rev. John Heckewelder, History, Manners, and Customs of The Indian Nations Who Once Inhabited Pennsylvania and the Neighboring States (Philadelphia: Historical Society of Pennsylvania, 1876) pp. 339, 337; James E. Seaver, a Narrative of the Life of Mrs. Mary Jameson June Namias ed. (Norman: University of Oklahoma P, 1992) pp. 117-118; James E. Quinlan, Tom Quick, the Indian Slayer (Monticello, NY: De Voe & Quinlan, 1851; rpt. Morristown: Digital Antiquaria, 2004) pp. 31, 33; David Zeisberger's Diary, March 8, 1782 pp. 80-81, 85; True History of the Massacre of Ninety-six Christian Indians, at Gnadenhuetten, Ohio, (New Philadelphia, Ohio: Gnadenhuetten Monument Society, 1843) pp. 10-11.

that he actually took captive out of a population of seven thousand, in an effort to authenticate that these Native Americans were taken in "just wars," he claimed in his letter to the Lord Proprietors in 1704, "I did not make slave, or put to death one man, woman or child but were taken in the fight, or in the Fort I took by storm."[126] In his attempt to verify that what he did was legal, Moore admits that he did indeed kill children.[127] Wright calls Moore's raid the "greatest slave raid ever to occur in the South or in the United States."[128] Many were shipped out to the West Indies and others were sent to British colonies in the north. Ultimately, for those Apalachee who were taken from their homeland their "extinction as a people was a short one."[129]

Bishop Diaz Vara Calderon, however, estimated that within the Apalachee, Apalachicola, Guale, and Timucua Florida provinces, Native American families on average consisted of five members, two parents and three children in 1675.[130] If the reported population of Apalachee in 1704 was seven thousand, then using Bishop Calderon's estimates of indigenous family structure, approximately 1400 would have been men, 1400 women, and 4200 would have been children. The numerical imbalance of female to male taken away as slaves could only mean that as was customary most of

---

[126]John H. Hann, Apalachee: The Land between the Rivers (Gainesville: University of Florida p, 1988), See chapter 12, and Appendix 12, p. 395; Qtd. in Alan Gallay, The Indian Slave Trade: The Rise of the English Empire in the American South, 1670-1717 (New Haven: Yale up, 2002) p. 147-148. Gallay estimates that the number of captives was somewhere between two to four thousand, with the larger number probably being more likely. Wright, The Only, p. 149; William R. Snell, "Indian Slavery in Colonial South Carolina, 1671-1795," (Ph.D. Dissertation., University of Alabama, 1972) p. 96.

[127] In 1663, South Carolina officials instituted laws that only Native Americans captured in a just war could be transported out of the colony as a means of controlling the colonial elites and to "satisfy their Indian captors and to prevent them from being slaughtered." Although Gallay states that the proprietors were unaware that Native Americans generally incorporated the women and children of their enemies into their communities, the work of Strachey seems to suggest that they did know, at least in Virginia. This claim of ignorance seems similar to the one used to rationalize the commerce in African slaves. See Gallay, Indian Slave Trade, pp. 64-65.

[128] Wright, The Only Land, p. 141.

[129] Hann, Apalachee, pp. 264-265.

[130] Hann, Apalachee, pp. 166-167, 171.

the males were eliminated. Historian John Hann notes that generally men were put to death; but women and children faced enslavement unless they were sick, injured or old, which if it prevented "their keeping pace with their captors" might result in their death.[131]

Yet, some Apalachee women and children might have been killed merely out of convenience. An example of this took place along the Gulf coast. South Carolinian traders organized a force of as many as six hundred, the majority Native American, to attack the Mobilien and Tome Natives in the Mobile region of French Louisiana in 1709. They managed to capture twenty six to twenty-eight women and children, but eventually lost fourteen captives. The Native American men under siege went after the traders in the attempt to rescue their families. The South Carolinian traders then killed the rest of the women and children in their possession "in order to be more free to protect themselves."[132]

The subsequent absence of any record of large numbers of Native American children as slaves in Charleston in 1704 or any significant change in the Native American slave demographics for children might be explained by several factors. It seems that if the majority or even half of the 4000 Native Americans taken away by Moore as slaves were children, they would no doubt have found the long and hazardous trek from Florida back to South Carolina difficult. Some of them might have been sold to other colonies, but as stated before, there is no evidence that a substantive market existed for those who were

---

[131] Hann, Apalachee, p. 277. Carl J. Ekeberg states that the Native Americans in Illinois country were observed by the French to indulge in the same practices of killing men and old people considered "useless as slaves" by smashing their heads. The chronicler, Andre Penicaut, notes in 1711 that the Illinois Indians "are in no way so inhumane toward their prisoners as other Indians. If they capture young children they [unlike other Indians] raise them in their own villages." If the Illinois Indians are so humane by allowing children to live, then one must conclude that what Penicaut is suggesting is that other Native Americans put them to death by smashing their heads like they do other "useless slaves." See Carl J. Ekeberg, Stealing Indian Women: Native Slavery in the Illinois Country (Urbana: University of Illinois p, 2010) p. 12-13.

[132] Allan Gallay, The Indian Slave Trade, p. 289.

very young. On the other hand, some might have died on route to the slave market in Charlestown. Yet, the most likely explanation is that many were killed during Moore's ensuing conquest for slaves.[133] One thing is certain: something happened to the children from the Apalachee province and more research, which is beyond the scope of this project, needs to be done on this topic. Indeed, the low numbers of Native American children taken as slaves should be viewed suspiciously as a singular indicator of the English intent to rid themselves of Native American people in the Carolina region and the level of brutality expressed in the comodification of Native American people.

The accounts above of slave babies suffering from a distinctly violent death are indicative of how vulnerable babies and young children of slave mothers were in a time when violence was unmitigated by law or custom, and Native Americans especially shared the traumatic experiences of the potential loss of their infant children to white violence. [134] If you add the possibility that aboriginal infants and very young children

---

[133] Hann, Apalachee, pp. 277-278.

[134] The idea that infants were disposable because, as Wilma King argues, they were "worthless" while young as "productive laborers" to white slave owners is evident in the accounts of many former slaves who witnessed similar behavior expressed towards black babies. One ex-slave recounted that his uncle from Virginia told him of how "they used to take a child out and sling it up against a tree and sling its brains out." An anonymous slave from Culleoka, Tennesee castigated similar behavior of one slave master she knew by saying: "I never saw as many dead babies in my life as I did on his farm….I actually saw old man F. walk through the field and, seeing a baby crying, take his stick and knock its brains out and call for the foreman to come and haul off the nasty, black rat….This is one reason I believe in a hell." Another slave from Mississippi said that "Slavery is one of the greatest curses that ever was….killing babies—I have seen one with its brains dashed out against a red oak tree. Tired of carrying it, its mother being in the gang, and troubled with it, as any man would be, they put it out of the way." Indeed, the pervasiveness of the violence directed toward enslaved babies is clear by ex-slave Angie Boyce from Indiana who was told by her mother that when she was a baby, she and her mother were put in jail as runaways even though they were free. An Irish woman "threatened to bash its [Angie's] brains out against the wall if it did not stop crying." Angie's mother Margaret stayed up all night to keep the woman from carrying out her threat to kill her. Although it might be tempting to believe that perhaps this was a singular view and not how the trade in slaves operated because as one former slave put it "white folks crazy 'bout their nigger babies 'cause that's where they got their profit," it appears that this was not entirely true. Ex- slave Parthena Rollins recalled that a young mother of a baby was up for sale and because the trader did not want the child he would not buy the woman. So the owner "took her away, took the baby from her, and beat it to death right before the mother's eyes, then brought the girl back for sale without the baby, and she was bought immediately." Fannie Berry of Virginia recalled that when women with young babies were sold off and "as soon as dey got on de train

were slaughtered out of convenience as well, then the southern Native American's rationale for war against the colonists would have been based on more than just unfair practices and ill-usage by over aggressive traders, it would have been for communal preservation.

The importance of these anecdotes, how English brutality manifested itself in the killing of innocents and their market driven desire for slaves, is that it led directly to the outbreak of the Tuscarora and Yamasee War. A number of historians argue that it was the protection of their women and children from slavery that led the Yamasee and Tuscarora to wage war against the colonists—which ultimately ended the market for Native American slaves in the Southeast. Ramsey stresses that although white women were not protected by law from male violence in European cultures, "casual violence" against women went against the grain of southern indigenous societies that were largely

---

dis ol'new master had train stopped an made dem poor gal mothers take babies off and laid dem precious things on de groun' and left dem behind to live or die." L. M. Mills recounts that he knew of a woman in Glasgow, Missouri who along with her two month old baby was sold away from her husband. When she was unable to keep herself from crying about being separated from her husband, Mills said the slave driver "snatched her little baby from her an threw it into a pen full of hogs. That sounds like a strange story, but I saw it." These kinds of incidents did not just occur with slave babies in the south. James Lindsay Smith recalled that during the New York riot in 1863 "A sweet babe was brained while holding up his little arms, and smiling upon his murders. Many little children were killed in this manner." Frederick Douglass also recalled that during that same "bloody uprising" in New York the mob "spared neither age nor sex; it hanged negroes simply because they were negroes, it murdered women in their homes, and …it dashed out the brains of young children against the lamp posts." See: Wilma King, "Mad Enough to Kill: Enslaved Women, Murder, and Southern Courts," The Journal of African American History pp. 47, 52.; "Massa's Slave Son," Unwritten History of Slavery (Washington DC: Microcard, 1968) p. 38; Autobiography VI, "Slavery was hell without fires," god struck me dead: Religious Conversion Experiences and Autobiographies of Ex-slaves Clifton H. Johnson, ed. (Philadelphia: Pilgrim, 1969) p. 161; Mr._._., The Refugee: Or a North-Side View of Slavery (1856; New York: Negro Up,1968) pp. 283-284**;** Mrs. Angie Boyce, Works Administration Project, Indiana Narratives, District 4, Johnson County; "Nigger Ain't Scared of White Folks Now," Unwritten History, p. 56; Mrs. Parthena Rollins, Indiana Slave Narratives from the Federal Writers' Project of the W.P.A., 1936-1938 Indiana Narratives, Volume V, District #6 Marion County; Mrs Fannie Berry, Weevils in the Wheat p. 33; John W. Blassingame, ed., "L. M. Mill's Story," Slave Testimony: Two Centuries of Letters, Speeches, Interviews, and Autobiographies (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State UP, 1977) p. 504; James Lindsay Smith, Autobiography of James L. Smith p. 43; Frederick Douglass, The Life and Times of Frederick Douglass: In his Own Words (1881; New York: Kennsington, 1983) p. 361.

matrilineal.[135] Indeed, historian Theda Perdue's research indicates that southern Native Americans never hit their women and children and that their culture was based more on the principles of communalism than Anglo culture at that time.[136] The brutal treatment of their women and the killing of their children, combined with the realization that no tribe was safe from enslavement, forced southern aboriginal people to mount a Pan-Indian effort to rid themselves of the ever-encroaching settlers who sought to build a commercial empire without regard for any of the formal agreements that previously existed between them.

The first initiative, the Tuscarora War, began in 1711 and ended in 1713 with either the death or enslavement of the majority of Tuscarora remaining in the Carolina region. Over 5000 Tuscarora had dominated the North Carolina tidewater region in selling captives of weaker nations into slavery; but eventually those same nations began to strike back, and Europeans took advantage of this opportunity by capturing the besieged Tuscarora and selling them as slaves. The fear of enslavement and greater numbers of new German and Swiss settlers in New Bern, North Carolina, which brought

---

[135] Ian K. Steele, Warpaths: Invasions of North America (New York: Oxford Up, 1994), p. 165; Wright, The Only p. 122. William L. Ramsey, "Something Cloudy in Their Looks": The Origins of the Yamasee War Reconsidered" The Journal of American History Vol. 90, Issue 1, pp. 44, 49-50. Alan Gallay argues this as well, but he also asserts that, among other reasons, it was the push for the Yamasee's land that was superior for rice agriculture that propelled the colonists (especially the traders) to decide to get rid of them. See Gallay, The Indian Slave Trade, pp.255, 265-266, 330-331, and for extensive treatment on the Indian slave traders, see chapter 9; See Lawrence Stone's The Family, Sex, and Marriage In England 1500-1800 (New York: Harper & Row, 1977) Stone denotes that "casual violence" against women and children was not uncommon in England. The subordination of women by church and law was to create the "ideal woman" who was submissive in the Elizabethan era. The fact that clergy in England and America were compelled by the Crown to read to their congregations the Homily on Marriage regularly, which counseled that men should *not* beat their wives as was their right indicates its pervasiveness. The 16th and 17th century, Stone argues were marked by an "obsession with flogging…to suppress any form of dissent, deviation, or disobedience. Stone calls it the "great age of the whip." pp. 95, 99, 196-198, 212, 217; See also Frances E. Dolan, Marriage and Violence: The Early Modern Legacy; (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Up, 2008); Elizabeth A. Foyster, Marital Violence: An English Family History 1660-1875. (Cambridge: Cambridge Up, 2005).

[136] Perdue, Mixed Blood Indians p. 26. In Deborah Gray White's groundbreaking work, we find that African Americans also functioned by necessity as egalitarian communities during slavery. See Aren't I a Woman: Female Slaves in the Plantation South (New York: W. W. Norton, 1985).

with it epidemiological stresses, fostered the first altercation where 120 English and Swiss colonists lost their lives. For two years, an intensive Anglo-Indian War occurred with several Indian nations fighting on the side of the British with the expectation that they would profit in guns and plunder, and perhaps finally defeat an enemy that had preyed on their people for far too long.

Much as it had been in some West African communities concerned with protecting themselves from becoming enslaved, even Tuscarora women were engaged in combat, but their gender did not protect them in this war from annihilation. According to John Barnwell, an Assembly member from Colleton County and leader of the army raised by South Carolina to put down the Tuscarora, "the enemy were so desperate, the very women shooting Arrows, yet they did not yield until most of them were put to the sword." Afterwards, the fact that so many women had been slaughtered annoyed the men in Barnwell's army because this meant they obtained fewer slaves for sale in South Carolina.[137] The casualties and losses were high for the English and the Tuscarora, yet the demand for slaves in the Americas and the West Indies drove the war to its predetermined conclusion, which was that four hundred Native Americans were killed and a thousand Tuscarora and their allies were sold into slavery.[138]

The Native American slave trade was at its peak when the Yamasee organized an attack on first Port Royal, then Charleston, and then other South Carolina frontier settlements just two years later in 1715. Six percent of the white population, approximately 400 settlers died in the Yamasee War. A far greater number, however, of the Pan-Indian alliance of Lower Creeks, Guales, Apalachees, Savannahs, Cherokees

---

[137] Gallay, The Indian Slave Trade, pp. 261, 267, 270.
[138] Wright, The Only, pp. 117-119, 143-144.

(who actually changed sides and fought with the British), and others were decimated with help and supplies from North Carolina, Virginia, New England and Britain. Afterwards many tribes became extinct as they migrated entirely out of the Carolina region into the Ohio and Mississippi Valley, to Pennsylvania or southward to Georgia, or were killed, or sold into slavery and shipped to the Caribbean.[139] Le Jau foretold the inevitable when he stated that although "peace will be try'd first with the Cherikees at least," the Indians he understood "must be all cut off Strange and Cruel Necessity!"[140] By 1730, the trade in Native American slaves from South Carolina had diminished significantly, and the Pan-Indian alliance was destroyed. The calculated decision to rid themselves of all people in the colony viewed as Native Americans by law meant that British settlers could now focus on acquiring complete control over their African slaves.

English colonists came to America with a thorough understanding of how to use the tactics of total warfare after their conquest of the Irish in Europe. This type of warfare was then used to get rid of and then enslave the Native American populations in the southeast and New England. The authority to do so was sanctified, the English believed, by Holy Scripture and by evolving definitions of race, which sustained already established theories of incompatibility between those who were white and those considered to be savages. Yet, colonists remained fearful of being treated barbarously—like they had treated Native Americans and how southern Native Americans quickly learned to treat them. Thus, the template for how to deal with "unruly savages," used first on the Irish and then Native Americans, remained fundamental to the colonists' strategies

---

[139] Wright, The Only, pp. 112-124, 144; Ward, A Little Matter, pp. 200-201. Steele, Warpaths, pp. 165-167.
[140] Le Jau, Chronicle, p. 157.

for survival in a new world. Early European efforts to make their African slaves cowl in fear, however, were often not successful, which made, as Locke foresaw, living on the frontier a perpetual “state of war.” Indeed, many West African slaves had their own notable history of using total warfare that they carried with them across the ocean during the Atlantic slave trade, causing white fear of yet another enemy who needed subjugation.

CHAPTER TWO

"A STATE OF WAR CONTINUED": WHITE FEAR, BLACK WARRIORS

As John Locke predicted, West Africans who were compelled by force to become the slaves of Europeans, who understood that the "rights of freedom" pertained to them as much as any other man, were always a threat to European colonists.[1] Indeed, some West Africans came from a culture where total warfare reigned, at which point women, children, and old people might fall outside the protection of the laws of war. The brutality exhibited by British colonists noted in the previous chapter was matched by the brutality that facilitated the African slave trade, and white colonists knew by what means the people they brought across the ocean became slaves. Thus, European dependence on African labor and the exponential increase in importations heightened white fear of a dangerous enemy that they perceived had the potential to fight back ferociously—where Africans might dismantle the entire system and even possibly become *their* masters.

This chapter looks at how the institution of African slavery in America emerged as a "state of war continued" between the English colonists and those who became their slaves. African slaves in America, however, were not acquired through direct

[1] John Locke, Two Treatise of Government, (1698; Cambridge: Cambridge Up, 1960) p. 297.

confrontations between "a lawful Conqueror and a Captive," but rather were purchased through the African slave trade. [2] Subsequently, as third parties to West African warfare, the arbitrary power that Europeans held over those enslaved was never consensual.[3] By closely examining South Carolina, one can see that the colonists had the power to kill and maim their slaves at any time; but as the evidence reveals, slave masters knew that their dominance was never absolute. Whites, fearing the cataclysmic nature of African slavery, thus perpetuated the notion that bloodshed might be necessary in self-defense and in the control of a very large and highly militarized servile population.[4]

The reason that English colonists were so fearful of slave insurrections and ultimately black mastery had much to do with the fact that they knew that many West Africans had been warriors in their own countries. Ferreting out what white slave owners understood about their slaves' military past with greater specificity is therefore crucial to understanding what drove European obsessions about the possibility of a servile war between them and their African slaves.

---

[2] Ibid. p. 302-303. Although Locke attempts to qualify the way in which slavery could be lawful, according to Christian standards of war in Europe at the time, prisoners of war could not be made slaves. See also Hugo Grotius' The Rights of War and Peace, specifically Book 3, chapter 7.

[3] See Sylvaine A. Diouf, ed. Fighting the Slave Trade: West African Strategies (Athens: Ohio University p, 2003) for countless examples of African rejection of their deportation as slaves, and hence, according to one slave trader, the need for "chains, leg irons, handcuffs and strong houses…for the preservation of the order, and as recourse against dangerous consequences of this traffic." pp. x, xi, xvi, 125, 129, and ch. 8; And according to the observations of slave ship surgeon, Alexander Falconbridge: "Africans…have a strong sense of attachment to their native country, together with a just sense of the value of liberty." Narrative of Two Voyages in the River Sierra Leone during the years 1791, 1792, 1793, with Alexander Falconbridge: an Account of the Slave Trade on the Coast of Africa. Ed. Christopher Fyfe. (Liverpool: Liverpool UP, 2000). pp. 216, 214.

[4] See Ismail Rashids, "A Devotion to the Idea of Liberty at Any Price: Rebellion and Antislavery in the Upper Guinea Coast in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries." Fighting the Slave Trade, (chapter 9), for compelling evidence that slave resistance actually began in Africa.

How African Wars Supplied South Carolina with Slaves

Many of the Africans who became slaves in South Carolina were highly trained in war, having survived a vibrant military culture that developed over the centuries. The lure of European trade among West African nation states encouraged a militaristic transformation, which many Europeans believed the demand for slaves inspired. The rise in warfare within West Africa, however, fostered a military culture that focused as much on avoiding becoming the victim of the slave trade as it functioned in meeting the needs of European traders. At the height of slavery, West African wars resulted in the loser becoming a captive who was either sold, sacrificed, or retained within the conquering nation. Paul Lovejoy describes the period from 1600 to 1800 in African history as the age of "war-lord-ism."[5] Indeed, at the very same moment that the colonists fostered wars for slaves among Native Americans, Africans were responding to the same lure for profits and power in Africa. It is because of this fact and the increased violence that the trade gave rise to that the Africans sold into slavery in South Carolina were well trained in offensive and defensive warfare. Slaves in South Carolina came from the West Coast of Africa—Sierre Leone, Bight of Biafra, the Congo, Angola, Senegambia, Bight of Benin, the Gold Coast regions—with a distinguished military milieu that planters paid attention to.

Almost one eighth of the slaves who came to South Carolina were from the Windward/Ivory Coast and Sierra Leone/Liberian region, and most of them were obtained through wars.[6] Prisoners of war were not always male soldiers, however,

---

[5] Paul E. Lovejoy, Transformations in Slavery: A History of Slavery in Africa, Second Edition, (Cambridge: Cambridge Up, 2000) p. 70.
[6] Michael Gomez, Exchanging Our Country Mark: The Transformation of African Identities in the Colonial and Antebellum South, (Chapel Hill: UNC p, 1998) pp. 64-65, 75-76, 91.

because in West African wars (and as the trade in slaves became central to the economies of various nations in Africa) everyone, including women and children, were considered enemy combatants.[7] A fellow slave in South Carolina recounted to Charles Ball that:

> …we were alarmed one morning, just at break of day, by the horrible uproar caused by mingled shouts of men and blows given with heavy sticks upon large wooden drums. The village was surrounded by enemies, who attacked us with clubs, long wooden spears, and bows and arrows. After fighting for more than an hour, those who were not fortunate enough to run away, were made prisoners. It was not the object of our enemies to kill; they wished to take us alive, and sell us as slaves.[8]

The intent of the invaders is important as clearly it indicates that men and potentially women and children would have been part of those retained as prisoners. Although it is not possible to determine the region in which this event occurred, the people who captured the narrator were those "my protectors were at war with…a nation whose religion was different from ours."[9]

The English explorer Joseph Corry recalled a chief by the name of Smart who commanded an extensive area of the Windward Coast (Ivory Coast) region and "in one of his wars with his opposite neighbors and rivals," he began his attack "during the night to some of their towns, surprising them before they had arisen from sleep." Corry corroborates that the element of surprise became an African tactic of war and that preying upon innocent peoples by marauding armies became commonplace.[10] African people

---

[7] Melville J. Herskovits, Myth of the Negro Past, (Boston: Beacon p, 1990) p. 108.
[8] Charles Ball, Slavery in the United States: A Narrative of the Life and Adventures of Charles Ball (1837; New York: Negro Up, 1969) p. 183.
[9] Ibid.
[10] According to John Thornton, African societies engaged in many types of war strategies, and total warfare, which they called "eating the country," was one of them. For West Africans, however, this type of warfare was expensive and violent, and since the value added to any African community was in people and not in land, the accumulation of captives who could become slaves was generally the primary goal. Robert S. Smith argues that this was often possible because wars among West African nations often entailed the protocol of informing the enemy ahead of time, which not only gave the opposing side time to prepare for battle, but also time to remove their women and children from harm. Smith states that in polygamous societies female captives were important to African nations because there was always a shortage of women

were well aware of the danger that the slave trade created for all nations, and this matrix of violence and enslavement forced some African leaders to develop sophisticated strategies to circumvent the capture of their people. This is evident in Corry's description of "Morrey Samba's town."

> one of the most regular built towns I have observed in Africa….The town is surrounded by a mud wall, and at the entrance, and upon each angle of the oblong square which encloses it, there are towers erected for the purposes of defence. The wall, with the towers, completely obscures the buildings which form the town, and serve as a guard against any depredations of enemies, while it shelters the inhabitants from the effects of their arrows or musquetry.[11]

African historian Martin A. Klein and others argue that the engineering of "walled and fortified villages" was *the* most effective military strategy that Africans used to protect themselves against enslavement.[12]

This Windward Coast structure is strikingly similar to the one that South Carolinian Colonel John Barnwell depicts in his journal. Barnwell was "General" of the first militia regiment to fight against the Tuscarora and a plantation owner at Port Royal highly active in the Native American slave trade in South Carolina. Leading five hundred men to defeat the Tuscarora in 1712, Barnwell pursued his enemy to a "strong fort" where:

> I imeadiately viewed the Fort with a prospective glass and found it strong as well by situation on the river's bank as Workmanship, having a large Earthen Trench thrown up against the puncheons with 2 teer of port holes; the lower teer they could stop at pleasure with plugs, & large limbs of trees lay confused about it to make the approach intricate, and all about much with large reeds & canes to run into people's legs. The Earthen work

---

in these types of communities. Although Smith and Thornton argue that most civilians would remove themselves from the area of battle, there is evidence that there was, in some cases, a change that occurred over time in how wars were waged. See: John K. Thornton, Warfare in Atlantic Africa 1500-1800 (London: UCL p, 1999) pp. 150, 133, 16; Robert S. Smith, Warfare and Diplomacy in Pre-colonial West Africa (Madison: University of Wisconsin p, 1989) p. 35. Smith's assessment seems to rely heavily on chapter 23 of Mungo Park's Travels in the Interior Districts of Africa (1799); Herskovits, Myth, p. 108.

[11] Joseph Corry, Observations upon the windward coast of Africa (London: W. Bulmer and Co, 1807) (eBook, www.gutenberg.net) pp. 33-34.

[12] Martin A. Klein, "Defensive Strategies: Wasula, Masina, and the Slave Trade," Fighting the Slave Trade, pp. 62-63.

> was so high that it signified nothing to burn the puncheons, & it had 4 round [45] Bastions or Flankers; *the enemy says it was a runaway negro taught then to fortify thus, named Harry, whom Dove Williamson sold into Virginia for roguery & since fled to the Tuscaruros.*[13]

It is possible that Harry was a soldier from the Sierra Leone region familiar with the ways of war, but if not, and most important to this project, he clearly transported African indigenous practices in a way that was helpful to those Native Americans who were fighting against enslavement. European Carolinians no doubt benefited from these skills as well.

Although South Carolina planters were not keen on purchasing many slaves from the Bight of Biafra (or Bight of Benin), they too brought knowledge of the "arts of war" that English colonists would have been aware of.[14] The testimony of Olaudah Equiano informs us of the predatory nature of wars in this region, and how enslavement was the motivation for much of the aggression between states. Yet, Equiano points out, the war-lords had a lot at stake because "If he prevails and takes prisoners, he gratifies his avarice by selling them; but if his party be vanquished, and he falls into the hands of the enemy,

---

[13] John Barnwell, "The Journal of John Barnwell," The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography, vol. VI, no. 1 (July 1898) p. 43. See Le Jau, p. 103, ftnt. 135.(emphasis added)

[14] Donnan, Documents Illustrative, Vol. 4, pp. 316-317, 351, 319. Henry Laurens, one of the largest slave traders in South Carolina, was particularly adamant about the difficulty that his company had in trying to sell "bite Slaves which not in ten of our People will touch when others can be had on Moderate terms." Yet, when the market demand for slaves was high, as Lauren's indicates was the case in May 1755, even "ordinary Calabar men" sold well. Michael Gomez makes this point as well with respect to levels of various ethnicities in the colonies. Exchanging, p. 107; Also see Donnan, Documents Illustrative, Vol. 4, pp. 310, 314, 411-413, 453-454, 504, 521-522, for examples of the number of ships that just list their cargo of slaves as "Africans." See also Donnan, "Slave Trade into South Carolina" p. 823, ft. note 92, for evidence citing that "the average price of Eboe negroes in Charleston in 1771 as L40" which indicates that Igbo were indeed part of the Charleston market. Nevertheless, the largest populations of Igbo were in Virginia, Maryland and Louisiana. While the Dahomeans and Yoruba from the Bight of Benin were largely sold in Louisiana. Gomez, Exchanging, 149-153.

he is put to death; for, as he has been known to foment their quarrels, it is thought dangerous to let him survive."[15]

As was custom, Equiano was trained as a youth in the "art of war: my daily exercise was shooting and throwing javelins." Interestingly, Igbo women were given military training as well, as Equiano states, "all are taught to use these weapons; even our women are warriors, and march boldly out to fight along with the men. Our whole district is a kind of militia." The constant drilling with "fire-arms, bows and arrows, broad edged swords, and javelins" might seem unusual except these communities were living under the constant threat of slave trade induced conflict.[16]

Equiano recalls one day witnessing a battle between his people, the Igbo, who were suddenly attacked: "There were many women as well as men, on both sides; among others my mother was there, and armed with a broad sword. After fighting for a considerable time with great fury, when many had been killed, our people obtained the victory." Although the purpose was to obtain slaves, many people were killed in the process, men and women, and Equiano notes, "those prisoners which were not sold or redeemed we kept as slaves." [17]

Yoruba ex-slave Joseph Wright, however, had a more troubling memory of the violence that slavery encouraged when his town of Ake in Nigeria was under siege:

> The enemies satisfied themselves with little children, little girls, young men, and young women; and so they did not care about the aged and old people. They killed them without

---

[15] Olaudah Equiano, The Interesting Life of Olaudah Equiano, or Gustavus Vassa, The African. Written By Himself. In The Classic Slave Narratives ed. Henry Louis Gates Jr. (New York: Mentor, 1987) p. 18.
[16] Olaudah Equiano, The Interesting Life, pp. 18, 25.
[17] Olaudah Equiano, The Interesting Life, pp. 19; G. I. Jones notes that although Igbo women fighting in wars might seem unusual there seems to be evidence that in the 18th century Igbo women were encouraged to "fight along side their husbands in defense of their homeland" due to the diminishing population of able bodied men. See: Africa Remembered: Narratives by West Africans from the Era of the Slave Trade: Narratives by West Africans from the Era of the Slave Trade Philip D. Curtin, ed. (Madison: University of Wisconsin p, 1967) p. 66.

> mercy. Father knew not son, and the son knew not the father. Pity had departed from the face of mothers. Abundant heaps of dead bodies were in the streets, and there were none to bury them. Suckling babies were crying at the point of death, and there were none to pick them up.[18]

As it was with Native American slaves, certain limitations were placed upon those captives that were either too young or too old**.** Thus, very young children would have been a nuisance to African traders and others involved in procuring slaves through wars.[19]

James Arnold, a ships surgeon on board the African slaver *Ruby*, also affirmed that the barbarous treatment of slave babies in this region was fueled by the demand for slaves. For when the ship banked at the Island of Bimbe (located off the coast of present day Cameroon) "a woman was brought out to us to be sold. As she had a child in her arms, the captain refused to take her and she was taken back to shore; but the next morning she was brought out again, this time without the child which had been killed the night before by the black trader in order to accommodate a sale of the mother."[20] African babies were disposable to African traders, just as they were for European traders.[21] Very young African children apparently had little value in the slave market and were

---

[18] Joseph Wright, The Narrative of Joseph Wright in Africa Remembered ed. Philip D. Curtin (1839; Madison: Un. of Wisconsin P, 1967) p. 326; Martin R. Delaney observed during his trip to Africa that old people of both genders were put to death when Africans were warring for slaves in southwest Nigeria among the Yoruba people even in 1859. Martin R. Delany, "Report of the Niger Valley Exploring Party," Martin R. Delany: A Documentary Reader Robert S. Levine, ed. (Chapel Hill: UNC p, 2003) pp. 339-340.

[19] Lovejoy states that the killing of infants was not uncommon, and that very few slave ships carried infants or pregnant women across the Atlantic if they could help it. The ex-slave Charles Ball supports Lovejoy's argument in his narrative, where a South Carolinian slave from Africa recounted to Ball that when they were placed on the ships "the men who fastened the irons on these mothers, took the children out of their hands, and threw them over the side of the ship, into the water. When this was done two of the women leaped overboard after the children---the third was already confined by a chain to another and could not get into the water, but in struggling to disengage herself she broke her arm, and died a few days after." Paul Lovejoy, "The Children of Slavery –The Transatlantic Phase," Slavery and Abolition Vol. 27, No. 2, August 2006, pp. 205-206; Charles Ball, Slavery in the United States: A Narrative of the Life and Adventures of Charles Ball (1837; New York: Negro UP, 1969) p. 185.

[20] John Ashley Hall, in Lambert, ed. House of Commons Sessional Papers, vol. 72, Minutes & c., 1790, p. 558; George Francis Dow, Slave Ships and Slaving "Testimony of James Arnold" (Mineola: Dover, 2002) p. 173.

[21] See chapter one, "Nits Make Lice" of this manuscript.

"perceived to be a liability" up until the late nineteenth century. [22] Indeed, purveyors of slaves made it plain that they did not want any slaves beyond the age of forty and under the age of ten. [23] This business model then would have actually helped facilitate the continuity of African warfare practices, as many of the slaves that arrived in South Carolina and the colonies would have already received or been exposed to military training in their youth.

One of the largest groups of Africans deported to South Carolina with military skills came from West Central Africa, the Congo-Angola-Mozambique region. [24] Using psychological methods of terror and rejecting any kinship loyalty among the general population, Imbangala warriors from the southern part of the Kongo facilitated the enslavement of large numbers of Africans from West Central Africa. Although the Imbangala enlarged their army with captured slaves, only uncircumcised boys, those not

---

[22]According to Lovejoy, between the years 1663 and 1700, only 12.2 % of the trade was composed of children. Yet, from 1701 to 1809, the number of children sold in the transatlantic slave trade would increase to 22.7 percent. Lovejoy, "The Children," pp. 197, 200, 213. See Elizabeth Donnan for countless examples of traders requesting that children be around 10 years old., Documents Illustrative of the History of the Slave Trade to America. Vol. 2, (Washington D.C: Carnegie Institution, 1931) pp. 159, 244, 250, 289, 292, 327. In hard times, children were particularly hard to sell as Henry Laurens notes in 1756, that "the children too young by 3 or 4 years. None will now tempt Our People to open their purse Strings but very prime young folks." Ibid. vol. 4, pp. 360. See also Donnan, Documents, vol 4. pp. 57, 451, 456, 586 for other South Carolinian's concerns over the age of slaves being at least pubescent.

[23] Elizabeth Donnan, "Contract between the South Sea company and the Royal African Company," (1713) Documents Illustrative of the History of the Slave Trade to America vol. 2, (Washington D.C: Carnegie Institution, 1931) p. 159. And : vol. 4, pp. 323-324, 326, 357, 351.

[24] Imbangala warriors fought wars that fed the slave routes crisscrossing the region. They traveled from Kasanje and Matamba, two small yet essential interior states that relied on violence to maintain their monopoly exporting and importing slaves: to the Zambezi valley, which supplied slaves from the east and west coasts of Africa: to Madagascar, which by the late eighteenth century supplied not only most of the slaves for the French sugar islands but also the southern regions of North America. Although a relatively small number of slave ship manifests list Madagascar as the provenance of the slaves on board in South Carolina, planters valued slaves from this region because of their knowledge about rice cultivation. In 1803 and 1807, South Carolina lists large shipments of Africans from the Congo, and in 1803, one ship arrived directly from Mozambique. Hugh Thomas, The Slave Trade: The Story of the Atlantic Slave Trade: 1440-1870 (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1997) p. 399; Donnan, Documents, pp. 504, 522; Lovejoy, Transformations, pp. 76-80.

already defined as part of the opposing sides' warrior class, received military training.[25] They sold the rest as slaves, took whatever women they chose as wives, and killed the rest of the captives. Their rationale for doing so was probably based on the fact that by the eighteenth century, historian John Thornton argues, lengthy civil wars would have produced a number of slaves who had military training, who were organized and efficient in the use of guns. And as Equiano argued, this was not a population to leave behind as they might entice others to rebel.[26]

Still, slaves from the West Central Africa and Madagascar region were known to be captives who had military experience in their own country. According to a slave from the Congo region by the name of Adam, "his country name Sarri…his father, *Scindia Quante*, was a chief or captain under the king, and a great warrior, and had taken many people, whom he sold as slaves."[27] Martin R. Delany's paternal grandfather was a "pure Golah [Angolan]" who had been "a chieftain, captured with his family in war, sold to the slavers, and brought to America. He fled at one time from Virginia, where he was enslaved." He was caught and brought back from Canada to the United States where "the fallen old chief afterwards is said to have lost; his life in an encounter with some

---

[25] For many nations in Africa, the ritual of circumcision defined warrior status within the community, where the boy (or girl) was initiated into manhood (or womanhood). Jeff Marck, "Aspects of Male Circumcision in Subequatorial African Culture History," Health Transition Review, Supplement to Vol. 7, 1997 pp. 337, 346-347. Bryan Edwards, a historian, leading member of the colonial assembly in Jamaica, and English politician wrote in his well respected The History, Civil and Commercial, of the British Colonies in the West Indies, that based on his interviews with his slaves, that although the Muslim slaves were circumcised, many slaves from other nations were as well, "which are more likely to be ancient Ethnic rites; for many countries of Africa admit circumcision, and yet know not, or acknowledge not Mahometism; but are either Christians…or Gentiles." Vol. II (Dublin: Luke White, 1793) pp. 57, 68, 71. Edwards two volumes were considered great works, marking the beginning point of the canon of British Caribbean history.

[26] John K. Thornton, "African Dimensions of the Stono Rebellion," American Historical Review 96 (1991) p. 1103.

[27] Edwards, History, p. 97.

slaveholder, who attempted to chastise him into submission."[28] A Maryland petition for freedom in 1796 by a descendant of "negro Mary," an African from Madagascar, sheds light on the nature of warfare and the politics of slave trading in that region. The court's decision took to consideration that the people "of Madagascar make war upon each other for slaves and plunder; and they carry on the slave trade with Europeans."[29] The story of the formerly enslaved Aunt Ciller validates this assessment by the court. Aunt Ciller knew that her father was a king "from the Island of Madagascar" who was brought to South Carolina after the Revolution in 1783 from Virginia by Captain James Sims. And, that "Her Daddy was taken prisoner in battle by another king, and instead of being beheaded, as was their custom, the king sold him and his family to a "white-slave-trade-ship."'[30]

In the Senegambia region, the slaves that Carolinian traders prized because of their expertise in rice cultivation were also warriors, as the peasantry who performed agricultural labor also received military training. Historian Michael Gomez states that as "warrior-cultivators," the Bambara, in particular had a reputation for being skilled military men who captured huge numbers of captives in reoccurring wars for export from the Goree and Gambia Rivers.[31] Apparently, many Europeans often named all slaves whom they considered soldiers "Bambara," which is the ethnic identification given to people from the Greater Senegambian region. The true ethnic identity of the Senegambian people who ended up across the Atlantic, however, is "Bamana" (with their

---

[28] Martin R. Delany, Frank Rollin's Biography of Martin R. Delany (1868; New York: Arno, 1969) pp. 15-16.
[29] Herskovits, The Myth, pp. 47-48.
[30] "Aunt Ciller," Federal Writers Project (South Carolina) Unpublished Ex-Slave Narratives at South Caroliniana Library 36 Mss Project 1885-1.
[31] Gomez, Exchanging, pp.46-52.

"warrior-cultivator culture" intact), and Bamana were known to have a rebellious nature.[32] Thus, many Senegambians, like Sierra Leonians and West Central Africans, whose deportment to South Carolina in large numbers caused the heightened fear among whites of their African slaves, did not shed their experiences from their native countries during the middle passage overseas, but rather, retained a warrior/military culture that had been formulated within their own nation.[33]

An account of the military culture of African slaves imported into South Carolina would be incomplete without mentioning the Gold Coast states (present day Ghana) and the state of Dahomey (present day Benin), which provide perhaps the most extreme examples of the violence and total warfare employed in the acquisition of slaves.[34] Although they would rank as a favorite of South Carolina traders, only small numbers of slaves procured from the militarily powerful Gold Coast states of Bono and Denkirya were sold to Europeans prior to the eighteenth century. This was because, according to Samuel Brun, a Swiss surgeon on three Dutch voyages to West Africa, the victors of wars in that region "cut off all their enemies' heads, be they young or old, female or male: indeed they do not spare babies in their mother's wombs, just so that they bring home many heads and be considered mighty warriors." On another occasion, Brun noted that after he and his men supported the King of Sabou [Asebu] and his army where "Our people occupied the paths in time, so that no-one could escape. The three hundred Blacks then pounced quickly on the confident little mob and in two hours obtained three hundred

---

[32]According to the research of Gwendolyn Midlo Hall, Bambara is inaccurate. "Bambara" is of Muslim African derivation and it means "barbarian" in Arabic, which is an ethnic slur. Gwendolyn Midlo Hall, Slavery and African Ethnicities in the Americas: Restoring the Links (Chapel Hill: UNC p, 2005) pp. 96-98; Hall, Africans in Colonial Louisiana p. 112.
[33] Gomez, Exchanging, p. 54.
[34] I define total warfare as the killing of non-combatants, specifically women, children, and old people.

human heads, the majority of which were of women and children; for the Blacks say it is better to strangle women and children than men, because then they will not reproduce quickly; and the children, if they came of age, would seek revenge."[35] Here we see another example of how West African war tactics paralleled the brutal theories of English warfare, that since "nits make lice," women and children *must be killed* as a means of eliminating future confrontations.

By the mid seventeenth century, Stephanie Smallwood argues, it was no longer necessary to exterminate captives of Gold Coast wars because of the surging demand for slaves by European nations. This Atlantic commerce also gave Gold Coast Africans access to guns and thus the military power to wage aggressive wars against their neighbors.[36] The casualties of war numbered well over 375,000 people from 1700 to 1750 and that number would double by the end of the century.[37] Gold Coast slaves were highly valued by South Carolinians for their tenacity at work and physical superiority to other slaves. Yet, slave owners also viewed them as "ferocious if angered, unmindful of danger, unwilling to forgive, but loyal if their devotion could be captured."[38]

Although few slaves in South Carolina came from Dahomey, every state in West Africa would have been aware of the most powerful slave-raiding nation in the region. Dahomey was aggressively militaristic, innovative in its intentional inclusion of women

---

[35] Samuel Brun, "Samuel Brun's Voyages of 1611-20," in German Sources for West African History 1599-1699 trans. Adam Jones (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag GmbH, 1983) pp. 93-94. See also clergyman Wilhelm Johann Muller's description. ibid. p. 198.
[36] Stephanie E. Smallwood, Saltwater Slavery: A Middle Passage from Africa to American Diaspora (Cambridge: Harvard UP, 2007) pp. 20-24. See also John Thornton, Warfare in Atlantic Africa 1500-1800 (London: UCL p, 1999) for a different assessment of early Akan warfare as not "genocide." pp. 132-133.
[37] Lovejoy, Transformations, p. 84.
[38] Gomez, Exchanging, p. 107.

as warriors, and through constant warring achieved great wealth.[39] It was a nation much feared and fear was part of the military strategy that Dahomeans used; their policy of extermination, King Kpengla explained, "makes my enemies fear me."

Dahomians used brutal "demonstration[s] of power" to illustrate their greatness in all military endeavors.[40] For example, despite the fact that the King of the Whydah nation (along the coast of the Bight of Benin) had already surrendered, the Dahomean army continued to kill five thousand Whydah soldiers, and then held ten to eleven thousand more as captives for sale in the slave trade. Generally, after campaigns they would strip the dead and cut off their heads as trophies of war.[41] Additional evidence of this method of warfare appears in the narrative of Captain Thomas Phipps, who recounts that he saw "nine or ten bags full of men, women, and childrens heads at a time brought to the king's town, when the soldiers return'd from ravaging."[42] King Adandozan, who would later be deposed in 1818, supposedly wrote a letter to England which was published in *The New Yorker Weekly Magazine* in 1792 where he challenged Europeans to not sit in judgment of how slaves were procured for the Atlantic market in Dahomey;

> God made war for all the world; and every kingdom, large or small, has practiced it,…Did Weebaigah [a former King] sell slaves? No; his prisoners were all killed to a man.…Was he to let them remain in this country to cut the throats of his subjects?…the

---

[39]Dahomey's oligarchic rule expanded geographically over the centuries to include once powerful nations like the Aja states of Allada and Whydah (Benin) by the early eighteenth century. Walter Rodney, How Europe Underdeveloped Africa, (Washington D.C.: Howard Up, 1982), pp. 120-121.

[40] Walter Rodney, How Europe, p. 120; Robin Law, "Dahomey and the Slave Trade: Reflections on the Historiography of the Rise of Dahomey," The Journal of African History, Vol. 27, No. 2, Special Issue in Honour of J. D. Fage, (1986), pp. 250-251, 266; Edna G. Bay, Wives of the Leopard: Gender, Politics, and Culture in the Kingdom of Dahomey (Charlottesville: Un. of Virginia P, 1998) p. 141-142; Law, "Human Sacrifice," p. 74.

[41] Bay, Wives, p. 58.

[42] Thomas Phillips, A Journal of a Voyage Made in the Hannibal of London, Ann. 1693, 1694, From England to Cape Monseradoe in Africa; And thence along the Coast of Guiney to Whidaw, the Island of St. Thomas, and so forward to Barbadoes. in A Collection of Voyages and Travels vol.VI, ed. Awnsham and John Churchill (London, 1746) p. 220.

> Dahoman name would have long ago been extinguished, instead of becoming as it is at this day, the terror of surrounding nations.[43]

Part of the political strategy that facilitated the control of their expansive empire was that Dahomey offered protection to anyone within their borders, so that only Africans outside of the Dahomey nation were eligible for enslavement. To be sure, Dahomeans were known throughout West Africa for their callous extermination of enemy combatants and their ruthlessness in capturing slaves, but they were also known among Europeans as the "Black Spartans" in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.[44]

Thus, West African slaves brought with them an understanding of warfare that was based on ideas of conquest as well as resistance to the internecine conflict between slave raiding nations. Europeans knew about these warrior traditions generally, and they knew that many of those whom they enslaved retained predatory military skills honed in various parts of West Africa. For South Carolinians, this was a significant problem; an undeniable factor in their participation in the African slave trade and as suppliers of the South Carolina market for slaves.

South Carolinian Knowledge of the Transatlantic Trade in African Slaves

South Carolina colonists were very attentive to the slave trade in Africa because many of them were not only slave owners, but also slave merchants and ship proprietors involved in the very lucrative and global business of slave trading. The volatility of the slave market, however, made them aware of and concerned about the nature of insurrections that frequently took place off the coast of Africa and across the British

---

[43] Othello, "What the Negro was Thinking During the Eighteenth Century: Essay on Negro Slavery," The Journal of Negro History, Vol. 1, No. 1. (Jan., 1916), p. 67.
[44] Rodney, How Europe, p. 120.

colonies. They also feared that the enslaved might threaten the security of South Carolina because of their military experiences in Africa, and hence the colonists viewed them as dangerous adversaries who were poised to oppose their condition of bondage, and who given the right opportunity, might successfully win in a fight for their freedom.

Although African slaves were very expensive in the seventeenth century, slaves made up one forth to one third of the population in the first decades of English settlement in South Carolina, and three out of four were men. Many of the first British citizens who migrated from Barbados brought their slaves with them.[45] Planters from other British colonies in the West Indies, Jamaica, Antigua, and St. Kitts, also settled with slaves, but the largest numbers of settlers were from Barbados.[46] Eventually, South Carolina had the largest number of Africans held by any colony, which was four times greater than the number held in Virginia.[47] The Native American slave trade had almost entirely dissipated by 1730, and the news of high prices and high demand drew large numbers of ships directly to the port of Charleston with Africans for sale.[48]

As historian Daniel C. Littlefield and others have shown, colonial Americans involved in the slave trade were attentive to the provenance of Africans brought to South Carolina. South Carolinians differed from the other colonies in that they became more

---

[45]By 1671, half of the settlers in South Carolina were from Barbados. Men like Sir John Yeamans, Thomas Drayton, Robert Daniel, Arthur Middleton, Stephen Fox, Richard Quintyne, Christopher Portman, and John Ladson all emigrated with slaves from Barbados by 1679. They were given huge tracts of land in Carolina, whereupon these powerful men effectively planted the Barbadian model of colonial development in South Carolina, especially the plantation system. See: Warren Alleyne and Henry Fraser, The Barbados–Carolina Connection (London: Macmillan, 1988) pp. 1-31; Richard S. Dunn, "The Barbados Census of 1680: Profile of the Richest colony in English America," William and Mary Quarterly 3rd Series, vol. 26, No. 1 (Jan, 1969) pp. 28-29.

[46] Elizabeth Donnan, Documents Illustrative of the History of the Slave Trade to America Vol. IV (Washington D.C.: Carnegie Institute, 1935) pp. 241, 243.

[47] Wood, Majority, pp. 16, 25-26, 45, 49, 100, 105.

[48] Elizabeth Donnan, "The Slave Trade in South Carolina Before the Revolution," The American Historical Review, Vol. 33, No. 4 (Jul., 1928), pp. 823-827. Four of the Lord Proprietors, the Earl of Shaftesbury, Earl of Craven, Sir George Carteret, and Sir John Colleton were members of the Royal African company.

sophisticated in their knowledge over time and as the numbers of participants in the trade increased.[49] Advertisements submitted by slave traders in the *South Carolina Gazette* ran compelling bylines like: "This day arrived from the Windward Coast of Africa…a choice Parcel of young healthy slaves" or "Twenty four new Gold Coast Negroes" or "Whidah is esteemed to be the finest Country in Africa and Slaves from thence" or "243 Mozambique Slaves…the character of the Slaves from the East Coast of Africa is now so well known that it is unnecessary to mention the decided preference they have over all other negroes."[50]

Many slave merchants and plantation owners in South Carolina were from some of the wealthiest families in England, and they were as concerned about developing and maintaining potentially profitable partnerships in the resale of their human cargo as they were about the safety and prosperity of the colony.[51] Several of these business relationships flourished because many slave merchants operating out of Bristol, London, and Liverpool (the latter the largest of the slave ports in England) had also lived in the Carolina colony for many years and therefore understood the needs of the planters.[52] The Governor, Robert Johnson, appointed a council to assist him in 1731 consisting of some of the most respectable men involved in slave trafficking in the colony.[53] Men like Joseph Wragg, who as a Londoner and a leading slave dealer owned a company in Charleston.[54]

---

[49] Daniel C. Littlefield, Rice and Slaves: Ethnicity and the Slave Trade in Colonial South Carolina (Champaign: Un. of Illinois P, 1991) pp. 31-32, 8-55, 117. Donnan, "The Slave Trade"; Margaret Washington Creel, "A Peculiar People "; Slave Religion and Community-Culture Among the Gullahs (New York: NYU p, 1988) pp. 30-36; Gomez, Making, pp. 40, 106, 241.
[50] South Carolina Gazette, June 12, 1749; February 19, 26, 1754; July 30, 1772; July 12, 1804.
[51] Donnan, "Slave Trade into South Carolina" pp. 816-817, 811-812.
[52] David Richardson, Suzanne Schwarz, and Anthony Tibbles, eds. Liverpool and Transatlantic Slavery (Liverpool: Liverpool Up, 2007) pp. 14-15.
[53] Alexander Hewatt, An Historical Account of the Rise and Progress of the Colonies of South Carolina and Georgia, vol. 2. (London: A. Donaldson, 1779) pp. 4-6.
[54] Donnan, Documents, vol. 4, pp. 243, 296-297.

Or James Crokett, who returned to London in 1739, yet remained a Carolina merchant, retaining a business relationship with slave trader Henry Laurens. And Henry Laurens had consistent and extensive correspondence with slave trading companies and ship owners all over the West Indies, in Liverpool, London, and Bristol.

Laurens and other South Carolinians formed strong partnerships with other merchants across the Atlantic for the procurement of slaves once direct trade between Africa and South Carolina commenced in 1699.[55] John Guerard, the fourth largest slave trader in South Carolina, was partners with the English ships captain and merchant, William Jolliffe. Gabriel Manigault, an import and export agent and the owner of several ships, had extensive trade ties with West Indian merchant firms, like Lytcott and Company of Barbados and Henry Bonnum of Antigua.[56] Indeed, at times even the sitting Governor was involved as John and Nicholas Trott of London authorized "Governor Blake and others in Carolina" to collect the slaves and other items of trade brought by their partner Captain William Rhett, commander and co-owner of the ship *Providence*.[57]

Therefore, men in England as well as South Carolina paid attention to the frequency of shipboard insurrections and wars in the various regions of Africa out of concern for their own business ventures.[58] Melville Herskovits argued that the evidence of the number of insurrections aboard slave ships year after year proves that slaves were resisting captivity from the first year that the slave trade began. Moreover, the implementation and necessity of insurrection insurance indicates how tenuous the

---

[55] Donnan, Documents, vol. 4, pp. 315-449.
[56] R. C. Nash, "Trade and Business in Eighteenth Century South Carolina: The Career of John Guerard, Merchant and Planter," South Carolina Historical Magazine 1995 Vol. 95, pp. 8, 14, 16, 20, 27; Maurice A. Crouse, " Gabriel Manigault: Charleston Merchant," South Carolina Historical Magazine Vol. 68 (1967) pp. 221-223, 225. Although Crouse states that Manigault had an "aversion" to the slave trade, he still made eleven voyages and personally owned several hundred slaves.
[57] Thomas Hugh, Slave Trade, pp. 202-205, 209.
[58] See: Darold Wax, "Negro Resistance to the Early American Slave Trade," JNH 51 (1): pp. 1-15.

business of enslavement was and how essential risk assessment was for those involved in the speculative business of trading in human cargo.[59] As Robert Norris, the captain of five slave ships with trading interests in Carolina stated: "So far are the Whites from being accessary to these wars, as has been unjustly alleged; it is notorious, that the Europeans trading there, deprecate a war as the greatest inconvenience that can happen to them: trade is entirely suspended during its continuance; and the term of their voyages is thereby protracted much beyond the usual time. Hence arises an inevitable increase of expence, and an additional risk of sickness and mortality."[60] Norris might have added the risk of insurrection, since European slave ships who remained along the coast of Africa were at greater risk of experiencing the resistance of their captives. Economic historian, David Richardson, argues that since about half of all shipboard insurrections occurred when the vessels were still off the coast of Africa, many ship revolts may have occurred before the slavers were even fully loaded with slaves.[61] Such information increasingly shaped the business of purchasing slaves in the eighteenth century, alerting Europeans of the challenges they faced, and slave merchants made it their business to know what was going on wherever slaves were available for purchase.

Indeed, South Carolina traders and merchants could ill afford not to be watchful of what transpired along the slave coasts of Africa and in the Caribbean islands as news of an insurrection or war among nations could significantly affect their bottom line. Consequently, reports of slave uprisings on the islands of Jamaica, Barbados, Bermuda,

---

[59] Herskovitz, The Myth, pp. 88-89.
[60] Robert Norris, Memoirs of the Reign of Bossa Ahadee, King of Dahomy, An Inland Country of Guiney. To Which are added, The Author's Journey to Abomey, The Capital: And Short Account of the African Slave Trade. (London: Lowndes, 1789) p. 174. Electronic Edition. Documenting the American South.
[61] David Richardson, "Shipboard Revolts, African Authority, and the Transatlantic Slave Trade," Fighting the Slave Trade, p. 203.

Antigua, St. Croix, St. Kitts, St. Thomas, and St. Johns, and aboard ships laden with Africans for sale circulated around the colonies and in the *South Carolina Gazette.*[62] In 1729, a slave ship bound for South Carolina from the "Coast of Guinea" had "not got 10 Leagues on her Way, before the Negroes rose and making themselves Masters of the Gunpowder and Fire Arms, the Captain and Ships Crew took to their Long Boat, and got shore near Cape Coast Castle. The Negroes run the Ship on Shore within a few Leagues of the said Castle, and made their Escape."[63] According to another report in the *Gazette*, it was believed that the "negro traders" had instigated the uprising aboard a "sloop from Guinea" where "A considerable Number of Negroes came off afterwards in Canoes, and endeavored to get on board, but were beat off…About the same time the Slaves on board a Guinea-man belonging to Bristol, rose and destroyed the whole Crew, cutting off the Captains Head, Legs, and Arms."[64] Slaves rose on slave merchant Samuel Wraggs ship, the *Mary*, where it was: "drove ashore, plundered, and destroy'd in the River Gambia, by the Natives…The Slaves rose, in the most barbarous Manner murdered the Ship's Crew, and obliged the said Captain and the Mate, Mr. David Donahew, to confine themselves in the cabin for 27 Days."[65]

The *Gazette* printed other reports about African militancy and the destruction of slave ships destined for the port of Charleston. For example, the ships *Polly* and *Mercury* were both lost on the Coast of Africa with a cargo of slaves who "attacked…and

---

[62]For some examples see South-Carolina Gazette Oct 4 1732, "Newport, Rhode Island;" Aug 31-Sept 7 1734; Jan 11, 1733-34, "Extract of a Letter from Antigua dated Jan 11, 1734;" Dec. 4, 1736, "Antigua, Oct. 24;" Great Newes from Barbadoes, or A True and faithful account of the grand conspiracy of the Negroes against the English and happy discovery of the same with the number of those that were burned alive, beheaded, and other wise executed for their horrid crimes.." (London: L. Curtis, 1676); U. B. Phillips, Plantation and Frontier 1649-1863 Vol. 2, (New York: Burt Franklin, 1969) pp. 100, 117; Donnan, Documents, Vol. 4, p.274,Vol. 2, p. 528.
[63] Donnan, Vol. 4, p. 274.
[64] South-Carolina Gazette Sat Dec 2 to Sat Dec 9, 1732 "Newport Octob. 25"
[65] South-Carolina Gazette, Oct. 24, 1743. Donnan, Vol. 4, p. 296, ftn.6.

desperately wounded" the Captain, who "rather than fall into the Hands of such merciless Wretches, when about 80 Negroes had boarded his Vessel, discharged a Pistol into his Magazine, and blew her up; himself and every Soul on Board perished." Another ship, the *Perfect*, also bound for South Carolina, was "also cut off by the Negroes in the River Gambia and every Man on board murdered; and the Vessel lost."[66] Henry Laurens noted that he had a "fine Sloop nearly cut off some time ago with only 22 Negroes on board from the West Indies." And Laurens instructed his business partners, James Penman and William Makdougall of St. Augustine Florida, to "Remember to charge your Captain and others to be upon their guard constantly without discovering to the Negroes that they are so."[67]

Uprisings upon slave ships and in the West Indian colonies drew universal consternation, but they also made whites fear for their own safety in South Carolina.[68] Robert Pringle, a prominent Carolina slave trader wrote to his colleague Francis Guichard in St. Kitts that he heard "of your being alarm'd for fear of an insurrection of the Negroes but hope their wicked Designs will prove abortive" in the attempted insurrection there in 1739.[69] Commissary Von Reck commented after meeting on board his ship with his "Excellency Robert Johnson Esq; and Mr. Oglethorpe," the former the sitting Governor of South Carolina and the latter the founder of the colony of Georgia, that the slaves in Charleston were treated as if they "they were a Part of the Brute Creation." According to Von Reck, this created an environment where Africans "Being thus used, lays amongst them a Foundation of Discontent; and they are generally thought to watch an Opportunity

---

[66] Donnan, vol. 4, p. 374.
[67] Donnan, vol. 4, p. 418.
[68] Peter Woods, Black Majority, pp. 220-225.
[69] Qtd. in Woods, Black Majority, p. 222.

of revolting against their Masters, as they have lately done in the Island of St. John and of St. Thomas…and it is the Apprehension of these and other Inconveniences, that has induced the Honorable Trustees for Georgia, to prohibit the Importation and Use of Negroes within their Colony." Aboard the same ship the Reverend Mr. Bolziv noted in his journal in 1734 that "A credible Man told us, that about two Months ago, in the two Islands of St. Thomas and St. John, belonging to the *Swedes and Danes*, the Black Slaves had killed all the White People; the former being more numerous than the latter."[70]

The *South Carolina Gazette's* extensive coverage of Jamaica's troubles signifies the anxiety that slaveholders had concerning the possible replication of these disastrous events of resistance in their own colony.[71] Indeed, William Byrd, speaking on behalf of many of the colonists in the Americas, argued that if Parliament would not consider ending "making merchandize of Our Fellow Creatures. At least the farther Importation of them in Our Colonys should be prohibited lest they prove as troublesome and dangerous everywhere, as they have been lately in Jamaica, where besides a vast expence of Mony, they have cost the lives of many of his Majesty's Subjects. We have mountains in Virginia too, to which they may retire as safely, and do as much mischief as they do in Jamaica."[72]

Although other South Carolina slave owners opined, "this Province cannot be well…managed and brought into use, without the labor and services of negroes and other slaves," what emerged in the beginning of the eighteenth century was a racial paranoia

---

[70] "An Extract of the Journals of Mr. Commissary Von Reck, who conducted the First Transport of Saltzburgers to Georgia: And of the Reverend Mr. Bolzius, One of their Ministers. Giving an Account of their Voyage to, and happy Settlement in that Province." (1733-4) Forces Collection of Historical Tracts Vol. 4, No. 5, (Washington: Wm. Q. Force, 1846) pp. 9, 18.
[71] South Carolina Gazette, Nov. 1, 1734, May 18, 1734, Jan. 18, 1735, July 12, Sept. 20, Oct. 11, 1735, July 28, 1739.
[72] Donnan, "Colonel William Byrd to the Earl of Egmont, 1736," Vol. 4, p. 132.

about the numbers of oppressed people in their midst and the possibility of negro mastery.[73] White South Carolinians were presciently aware of the danger that African slaves represented to their community. The Governor of South Carolina, John Gibbes, who had lived in the region for 48 years, told the assembly in 1711 that he had observed that the "large increase" in Africans were "beginning to exhibit a malicious disposition." He then urged them to consider increasing the white population of the colony for their own defense. [74] Yet, despite the fact that English settlers were becoming fearful of their growing slave population, they continued to view their dependency on Africans as a necessity.[75]

These fears had not always existed, however. Initially, blacks played a fundamental role in the defense of the colony against any opposition to English settlement. In the early years, African, mulattoe, and Indian slaves were required to serve in the militia "toward the defence and preservation of this Province, in case of actual invasion" as colonists viewed "a great number of them" to be "trusty slaves."[76] Indeed, blacks served willingly in all capacities, as soldiers, drummers, messengers, and

---

[73]David J. McCord, ed. "Acts Relating to Slaves," The Statutes at Large of South Carolina Vol. 7 (Columbia: A. S. Johnston, 1840) See Act of 1712, 1722 and 1735.pp. 352, 371, 385. See also Winthrop D. Jordon, White Over Black: American Attitudes Toward the Negro 1550-1812 (Chapel Hill: UNC p, 1968), for discussion on fears of negro mastery. pp. 114-115. And Peter Wood over struggle for racial control, Black Majority, pp. 236-237.

[74]Donnan, Documents, Vol. 4, p. 257 *****[must find original doc. Rivers whom she cites does not have these words in quotes. find Thomas Cooper, Statutes of Carolina, vol. 2, pp. 646-649]. Their sense of dependency increased because of all their troubles with Native Americans, who clergyman Francis Le Jau said now had "something Cloudy in their looks" —the look of "discontent"— which eventually led to aboriginal Americans rebelling against their enslavement. The Yamasee War began while Gibbes was in office.; Le Jau, "Le Jau to the Secretary, February 20, 1712," Chronicles, p. 109. Also in Wood, Black, p. 143.

[75] Donnan, Documents, Vol. 4, p. 256.

[76] McCord, "An Act For Raising and Enlisting Such Slaves as Shall Be Thought Serviceable to This Province in Times of Alarm" Statutes At Large of South Carolina, no. 237, p. 347-348. This was also true in Virginia as blacks were free to carry arms and were enlisted in the militia even as late as 1738, although at that point they were required to "appear without arms." See: T. H. Breene and Stephen Innes, "Myne Owne Ground": Race and Freedom on Virginia's Eastern Shore (New York: Oxford UP, 1980) pp. 8, 26-27. So did blacks in Louisiana under the French for the first time in 1729. See Roland C. McConnell, Negro Troops of Antebellum Louisiana: A History of the Battalion of Free Men of Color (Baton Rouge: Louisian State UP, 1968) pp. 2-7.

translators. They served not only in confrontations with indigenous people like the powerful Creeks, Cherokee, Chickasaw and Choctaw, but also in other conflicts with European nations like Spain, and after 1699, France. Whites did not attempt to restrict the military service of slaves until 1712, around the time South Carolina gained a black majority, and after a notable rise in slave conspiracies in South Carolina and other colonies.[77]

Historian Kenneth Porter argues that Africans were more than willing to fight against southern Native Americans because they knew that aboriginal people were paid by the English colonists to capture runaway slaves who attempted to reach Spanish territory. At some point, however, the African and Indian communities must have ascertained that the European strategies of divide and conquer merely worked to strengthen European dominance in the region. The Goose Creek minister, Richard Ludlam, unequivocally stated it was the policy in South Carolina "for our present security to make the Indians and negroes a check upon each other lest by their vastly superior numbers we should be crushed by one or the other."[78] Still, Native American and Africans were not entirely at odds with each other even in the early colonial era in South Carolina.[79]

---

[77]Wood, Black Majority, 125-128. Porter, "Negroes on the Frontier" pp. 54-56; Herbert Aptheker, American Negro Slave Revolts (New York: International p, 2008) p. 171-173. For example, a group of slaves led by a slave named Sebastian terrorized the South Carolina community for several months in 1711. Another plot was uncovered in South Carolina in 1713. And most alarming was the 1712 slave conspiracy in New York where twenty five to thirty slaves burned a building and killed nine men before it was suppressed.

[78] Klinberg, Appraisal, "Richard Ludlam to David Humphreys, St James, Goose Creek, South Carolina. March 22, 1725, p. 47; S.P.G. MSS (L.C. Trans), A19 pp. 62-63.

[79]Porter argues that the collaboration between southeastern Indians and blacks that would later develop out of common cause and Spanish instigation would not surface until well after the Yamassee War. Porter, "Negroes," pp. 56, 58.

For example, there is no doubt that black militiamen were instrumental in both the Tuscarora and Yamassee Wars,[80] but as scholar Alan Gallay points out there were also significant collaborations among Africans and Native Americans who worked against South Carolina colonists in this period as informants and as soldiers.[81] Africans used their condition of enslavement as well as their employment in the Indian trade, where they learned Native American languages and customs, to create possibilities for their own liberation.[82] A white Indian trader by the name of Richard Smith was told that three runaway blacks had plotted with the Keowee people in 1751 telling them "that the white People was coming up to destroy them all." After the plot was discovered some other slaves came to an elderly Keowee warrior and "told him that there was in all Plantations many Negroes more than white People, and that for the Sake of liberty they would join them" if they decided to go to war with the English.[83] African slaves clearly understood European tactics of war, *and* the power of their numerical supremacy in the region.

Colonists were afraid, according to Lieutenant-Governor William Bull, "that their negroes may…become their enemies, if not their masters" and that they would be "unable to withstand or prevent" slaves taking over the region after a successful insurrection.[84] Sir Alexander Cuming chronicled that whites in South Carolina were constantly "in danger

---

[80] James Glen Papers, 25 May 1738, South Caroliniana Library.; McCord, "An Act For Raising and Enlisting Such Slaves as Shall Be Thought Serviceable to This Province in Times of Alarm" Statutes At Large of South Carolina, no. 237, pp. 347-348; Wood, Black Majority, pp.125-128. Porter, "Negroes on the Frontier" pp. 54-56.

[81] Gallay, The Indian Slave Trade, p. 347.

[82] Colonel George Chicken and other colonial leaders were rightly concerned that if slaves continued to be used in the trade they would "talk good English as well as Cherokee Language and I am Afraid too often tell falsities to the Indians which they are very apt to believe, the [Africans] being so much among the English." Gallay, The Indian Slave Trade, p. 348.

[83] Gallay, The Indian Slave Trade, pp 348-349.

[84] Qtd. in Wood, Black Majority, "Lt. Governor Bull to Duke Newcastle" (1739) p. 312. See also Winthrop Jordon, White Over Black, for discussion on fears of negro mastery. pp. 114-115. And see Wood, over struggle for racial control, Black, pp. 233-237.

of the Blacks Rising up against them."[85] Indeed, the Stono Rebellion, an event where a group of slaves killed twenty-five whites while attempting to escape to St. Augustine, Florida in September 1739, traumatized white colonists. As historian, Peter Wood notes, by "having their fears of open violence realized…their response was desperate and effective."[86] And no doubt out of frustration that earlier policies put in place had been ineffective in keeping their African population from rising against them, the Assembly asserted after the Stono Rebellion in 1739 that the slaves were an "intestine Enemy, the most dreadful of Enemies."[87]

The increased demand for African labor over the years only amplified the conditions that heightened white fear. The perceived restlessness of the slaves and the importations of even larger numbers of Africans created the possibility of 57,000 "intestine black enemies" insurrecting a real threat in 1760, and the Council reportedly only had 6000 white men ready for warfare.[88] Although whites exaggerated the disparity in numbers, they accurately captured the fear of insurrection. And matters only get worse in the following decades. In 1769, according to the Lieutenant-Governor William Bull, there were 80,000 Africans to 45,000 whites living in South Carolina because of the nearly doubled number of slaves purchased.[89] Between the years 1733 and 1785, there were 67,769 Africans imported into South Carolina as slaves, the majority of them from Angola, the Congo, the Gold Coast, and Gambia.[90] And, in anticipation of the end of the slave trade in 1808, 40,000 more Africans were purchased in Charleston from 1804 to

---

[85] Wood, Black Majority, p. 220.
[86] Wood, Black Majority, pp. 308, 323.
[87] Wood, Black Majority, p. 321.
[88] Porter, "Negroes on the Southern Frontier" p. 69; M.S. Journals of the Common House of Assembly, XXXIII, p. 59, and Charles Town Gazette, Jan. 17, 1761.
[89] Aptheker, American Negro Slave Revolts p. 198. Donnan, Documents vol. 4, p. 415
[90] Melville J. Herskovits, The Myth of the Negro Past (Boston: Beacon P, 1941) p. 48.

1807.[91] Ironically, the merchants in Bristol, England who were deeply invested as buyers and sellers in the trade, acknowledged that South Carolinian fears of those enslaved needed redress, and that because "South Carolina is overstock'd with blacks, in proportion to the number of white people…it must be allow'd that three independent companies…be serviceable to awe and terrify the slaves." They also, however, criticized South Carolinians for not "making proper laws and regulations to restrain the rich planters from keeping dangerous numbers of negroes," rather than expecting "the mother country" to pay for "a standing force to keep them in obedience."[92]

What white colonists feared most was their total annihilation in internecine warfare. For if those enslaved had "an opportunity of knowing their own strength and superiority in point of number," stated missionary John Wikhead, the colonists felt certain that Africans would insurrect in order "to recover their liberty tho' it were the slaughter and destruction of the whole colony."[93] Another South Carolinian had similar concerns in 1720 that "ye whole province was lately in danger of being massacred by their own slaves."[94] A letter published in the *Boston Weekly* in 1730 articulated the continuity of white fears when it reported that there was a plot in Charleston where the slaves were to "rise to destroy us" and if not for the fact that it was discovered "we [would] had been all in blood."[95] Moreover, colonist John Brickell stated that because Africans were "a People of very harsh and stubborn Disposition…if the severest Laws were not strictly put in [execution] against these People, they would overcome the

---

[91]Gomez, Exchanging, p. 23; W. Roberts Higgins, "Charleston: Terminous and Entrepot of the Colonial Trade," in The African Diaspora: Interpretive Essays ed. Martin L. Kilson and Robert I. Rotberg (Cambridge, Mass, 1976) p. 118.
[92] Donnan, vol. 4, p. 297.
[93] Washington, A Peculiar People p. 74. find: SPGLL reel 6 "Missionary John Wikhead to SPG" (1715).
[94] Wood, Black, p. 220. find: letter Aug. 30, 1720, BPRO Trans., VIII, 99-100.
[95] Wood, Black, p. 299.

Christians….as hath been too well experienced in Virginia and other Places, where they have rebelled and destroyed many Families."[96] According to an official British account of the colony in 1775, "massacres and insurrections were words in the mouth of every child."[97]

Nor were the colonists, who envisioned their African slaves as dangerous adversaries, complacent or dismissive about their familiarity with the ways of warfare. William Byrd of Virginia wrote that he was "sensible of many bad consequences of multiplying these Ethiopians amongst us." For those enslaved, as "descendants of Ham, [who were] fit to bear Arms…might with more advantage kindle a Servile War…and tinge our Rivers as wide as they are with blood."[98] The colonists in South Carolina, like Byrd in Virginia, also believed that Africans were accustomed to waging war, as the "Negroes that most commonly rebel, are those brought from Guinea, who have been inured to War and Hardship all their lives."[99] And, although not viewed ominously by this slaveholder, the continuity of African warrior culture is also evident in the example of General William Moulton who was greeted in 1782 by shouts of joy upon his return to his plantation in Charleston by "the old Africans joined in a war-song in their own language."[100] Peter Wood notes that many ads for runaway slaves in the *South Carolina Gazette* pictured them with a lance after 1750, but South Carolina colonists also depicted Africans with cutlasses and spears in their advertisements of slaves for sale in the

---

[96] John Brickell, The Natural History of North-Carolina with an Account of the Trade, Manners, and Customs of the Christian and Indian Inhabitants. (Dublin: James Carson, 1737) pp. 272-3.
[97] John R. Alden, "John Stuart Accuses William Bull," The William and Mary Quarterly, (July 1945) pp. 318-319. Quote found in document entitled "Annecdote March 76"
[98] Elizabeth Donnan, Documents Illustrative of the History of the Slave Trade to America Vol. IV. (Washington D.C: Carnegie Institute, 1935) pp. 131-132.
[99] Brickell, The Natural History, . p.274. The term Guinea was commonly used to describe all Africans.
[100] Epstein, "African Music," p. 81. Cited in Society for the Preservation of Spirituals, The Carolina Low-Country (New York, 1931) p. 94.

1760s.[101] English colonists in South Carolina had an acute understanding that the environment of master and slave, of domination and subjugation, was laden with the potential of danger and violence. And, that clearly the methods of African warfare that facilitated the abundance of slaves for purchase in America did not fade away upon arrival to a new land.

European Understanding of African Methods of War

Indeed, Europeans had a long and studied history of being concerned about the military heritage of those enslaved. In the early eighteenth century, the English Parliament sought to determine whether African slaves were lawful captives or whether Europeans were responsible for instigating military confrontations for slaves. Ultimately, the debates about whether slaves were gotten from just wars or predatory wars only furthered a universal awareness of African military prowess in colonial America. Moreover, while these discussions provide evidence that whites had a healthy fear of African soldiers, they also reveal that they had respect for them.

According to abolitionist Thomas Clarkson, in the early years only those individuals directly involved in the market knew a lot about the African slave trade.[102] An outline for an investigation into the state of the slave trade by the Royal African Company, however, was reported out of committee on February 23, 1720. It proposed that Africans brought before their agents for sale should be asked questions and the agents were to "make as strict an Enquiry as possible to find out what Sort of Country

---

[101] Wood, Black, p. 256. See: South Carolina Gazette, April 26, 1760, July 24, 1769.
[102] Thomas Clarkson, The History of the Rise, Progress And Accomplishment of the Abolition of the African Slave Trade By the British Parliament (1839; Kessinger Publishing) pp. 45, 48. See Christopher Leslie Brown's Moral Capital: Foundations of British Abolitionism for a comprehensive overview of the origins of English antislavery and abolitionism. (Chapel Hill: UNC p, 2006).

they came from….What form of Government they have? and in what manner Justice is exercised?" They wanted them to find out if Africans were "guided by written Laws, or Customs, or Absolutely by the Will of their Prince?" The most important information that the committee sought was, "how many fighting Men their Armys generally Speaking Consist of? Their manner of making slaves? Whether they become so by any other misfortune than that of being taken Prisoners in War time? And whether they have any other method of Trading for them than this of bringing them down to the Coast of Africa to Sell to the Europeans?" The RAC committee wanted "These Examinations to be very Carefully made and Sent over constantly with their Journals, for the Perusal and Information of the Royal African Compa."[103]

The fundamental purpose of recording this information was to ensure the continuity of the slave trade, yet these reports, held up as evidence that European culture was far different from the savagery exhibited by Africans, popularized ideas about African warfare. The proslavery proposition that evolved was that African captives sold into slavery would have otherwise lost their lives. The English also argued that slavery operated as a safety valve for the barbarianism practiced by African people, overlooking their own brutal suppression of the Irish in Europe and of Native Americans.

Although many of the reports claimed that Africans were brutal savages in warfare, which justified in their minds why slaves taken from that region were lawful captives, what is most apparent in many of the accounts is their respect for the military capacity of the West African nations, their warrior chiefs and armies.[104] For example, Captain William Snelgrave recounts of his travels in 1727 and 1734 that the Dahomey

---

[103] Donnan, Documents, Vol. 2, pp. 254-255.
[104] Law, "Dahomey and the Slave Trade," p. 250-251; See Rodney, How Europe, p. 121.

military "made, according to their barbarous Custom, a terrible Carnage of the People; and to the complete Destruction of the country, set all the Towns and Villages on fire."[105] It is worth noting that despite the harsh description, Snelgrave respected the King of Dahomey. He described him before this battle as "being a restless ambitious Prince." At other times, he called him a "great Man." Snelgrave also wrote admiringly about the King's army who were "marching in a much more regular Order than I had ever seen before, even amongst the *Gold Coast Negroes*; who were always esteemed amongst the *Europeans* that used the Coast of Guinea, the best Soldiers of all the Blacks."[106] Not only were Dahomean soldiers impressive but apparently they surpassed the pristine reputation of the military men along the Gold coast.

The warrior ability of Africans from the Gold Coast region were even recognized by the eighteenth century proslavery historian, Bryan Edwards, who had the highest regard for the "Koromantyns" who were "heroic and martial." For Edwards, "the circumstances which distinguish the Koromantyn, or Gold coast, Negroes, from all others, are firmness both of body and mind; a ferociousness of disposition; but withal, activity, courage, and a stubbornness, or what an ancient Roman would have deemed an elevation, of soul, which prompts them to enterprises of difficulty and danger; and enables them to meet death, in the most horrible shape, with fortitude or indifference." He goes on to say, "even the children brought from the Gold Coast manifest an evident superiority" in their aptitude for becoming warriors.[107]

---

[105] Captain William Snelgrave, A New Account of Some Parts of Guinea and The Slave-Trade (1731; London: Frank Cass, 1971) p. 152.
[106] Snelgrave, pp. 97, 77.
[107] Byran Edwards, The History, Civil and Commercial, of the British West Indies, in Two Volumes, (Dublin: Luke White, 1793) pp. 59, 64-65, 80.

Europeans also commented positively on West African military practices from other regions. John Hippisley, another English author on the slave trade in Senegambia and Angola noted that in Africa by 1764 "the wars are infinitely less bloody than ours. Scarce any of the prisoners taken in battle are put to death, but are almost all sold, and brought to some part of the coast."[108] From Hippisley's perspective, and as a pro-slave trade advocate, almost all the slaves that come from the Senegambia and Angola region were prisoners taken in war and many of them were soldiers.[109]

Mungo Park, the famous explorer, disagreed with Hippisley that African wars were less bloody although he used the example of the Bamana in the Senegambia region to discuss all of Africa. He corroborated, however, that "every free man is accustomed to arms and fond of military achievements, where the youth, who has practiced the bow and spear from his infancy, longs for nothing so much as an opportunity to display his valour." Park also observed that there were two kinds of wars. The one in which war is previously declared, where the aggressor will "call out" his opponent, reminded him of the European method. The end result however, was that victors gain captives of war whom they carry off, although "the weakest know their own situation, and seek safety in flight." Noting the other "exterminating system" in the African trade, Park assessed that "such of the prisoners as through age or infirmity, are unable to endure fatigue, or are found unfit for sale, are considered as useless, and I have no doubt are frequently put to death."[110]

---

[108] John Hippisley, "On Populousness of Africa: An Eighteenth-Century Text," Population and Development Review, Vol. 24, No. 3, (Sep., 1998), pp. 605-606.
[109] John Hippisley, "On Populousness of Africa: An Eighteenth-Century Text," Population and Development Review, Vol. 24, No. 3, (Sep., 1998), pp. 605-606.
[110] Mungo Park, Travels in the Interior Districts of Africa (1799) pp. 283-284.

English explorer, Joseph Corry, observed during his travels in Africa in 1803 that men in the Senegambia region "proved themselves skilful and expert marksmen." Corry also found that the chief, Morrey Bunda, "displayed in his plans of fortifications, considerable ingenuity, considering the circumstances he had to provide against, and the predatory nature of African wars, which are uniformly to surprise the inhabitants of a village or town while asleep, or in any other unguarded state."[111] Corry did not think, however, that African wars were less violent or that Africans were better off in their own country as "wars are carried on with the most sanguinary violence: their prisoners, by the customs of the country, are consigned to massacre, slavery, and sacrifice." Yet, Corry admitted that slaves were "unhappy creatures.[112]

Many European Americans would have read about a courageous group of West African warriors who with total unanimity rejected their condition of enslavement as an outcome of war. An article printed in *The New York Magazine* in April 1796 recounts an attempted insurrection on Goree Island, the center of the West African Slave trade where:

> five hundred captives abhorring slavery more than any of their neighbors, after making themselves acquainted with the situation of the island and the fort, laid a plan for revolting…the conspirators were to rush suddenly upon the guard-house, which is at the entrance of the fort, seize upon the soldiers arms, and kill the ten or twelve centinels, who would have been unprepared for such an attack. During this business, another third were to enter the fort, where the muskets, powder, and ammunition are kept, while the remainder were to disperse themselves in the village, and massacre all the white men and others, whom they should meet. [113]

When asked the next morning by the commandant of the Island if what he had heard was correct, "the two chiefs, without showing any signs of fear or terror, and without offering any excuse for their conduct replied boldly, that they intended to have put to death all the

---

[111] Joseph Corry, Observations upon the Windward Coast of Africa (London: W. Bulmer and Co, 1807) (eBook, www.gutenberg.net) pp. 33-34.
[112] Corry, Observations, pp. 18, 47, 71.
[113] "Account of a Plot formed by the Negroes of Goree, to destroy all the white People on the Island," The New York Magazine, or Literary Repository (1790-1797) Apr 1796; APS Online pg. 207.

white men on the island, not through any hatred that they bore to them, but that no obstacles might oppose their flight, and prevent them from joining their young king, adding that they were all ashamed not to have died for him in the field of battle, with their arms in their hands; and that since their design had miscarried, they preferred death to slavery," after which the rest of the slaves cried out "it is true, it is true."[114]

The published accounts of the lives of West African nationals, read by members of the RAC, the "Ten Percenters," the Privy Council, members of Parliament, plantation owners, and even those who had no interest in Africans as commodities, provided fodder for a growing anti-slave trade movement as early as 1735.[115] Yet, not only religious groups and individuals in England protested the slave trade, but also those living in America who specifically condemned African warfare.[116] Over time, the Enlightenment philosophy of natural rights and the Great Awakening in America, which began in the 1740s, made necessary a clear rationale for participation in the African slave trade.[117]

Anthony Benezet, a Huguenot and notable American abolitionist living in Philadelphia, argued that Europeans had, much like they did among Native Americans, instigated the wars among African tribes, who through "hard usage" and because of burgeoning slave populations "will always be a "just cause of Terror: In *Jamaica*, and *South Carolina."* This created the warlike environment that whites took advantage of in

---

[114] "Account of a Plot formed by the Negroes of Goree, to destroy all the white People on the Island," The New York Magazine, or Literary Repository (1790-1797) Apr 1796; APS Online pg. 207.

[115] Sir Anthony Ashley Cooper, the Earl of Craven, Sir George Carteret, Peter Colleton were all involved in the Royal African Company after their initial venture, the Company of Royal Adventurers to Africa, organized by the Duke of York in 1660 failed. Woods, Black Majority p. 15. Prior to 1699, the Royal African Company (RAC) attempted to monopolize the African trade while serving as an information center or school for those learning the business of African slave trading. English independent traders, merchants, and ship captains, nicknamed the "Ten Percenters," eventually forced the end of the RCA's control of the trade which allowed for the global economy in African slaves to blossom. Thomas Hugh, Slave Trade, pp.205, 209.

[116] Clarkson, The History, p. 48

[117] H. Shelton Smith, In His Image, But…:Racism in Southern Religion, 1780-1910 (Durham: Duke Up, 1972) p. 12.

order to justify their commerce in humans as lawful captives taken in a just war, which did not save their lives as some argued. Benezet also believed, however, that Africans were not as savage as Native Americans although he noted that there are "some people of a more savage Disposition than others, yet certain it is, that the natural Disposition of the Generality of the Negroes is widely different from the roving Disposition of our Indians."[118] Benezet's imperial impulse to conquer the New World clearly informed his perceptions of indigenous people who seemed obstructionist in this endeavor. Africans, on the other hand, served a valuable purpose to the colonies.

American religious leaders were at the forefront in broadcasting the way in which African slaves were participants as well as products of warfare. Evangelist George Whitefield wrote an open letter in 1739 to all white citizens of Maryland, Virginia, and North and South Carolina asking them if "it be lawful for Christians to buy slaves, and thereby encourage the nations from whence they are brought to be at perpetual war with each other."[119] The Quaker communities in Pennsylvania and New Jersey issued their position on the slave trade in 1754, asking, "How then can we, who have been concerned to publish the Gospel of universal love and peace among mankind, be so inconsistent with ourselves, as to purchase such as are *prisoners of war*, and thereby encourage, this anti-Christian practice; and more especially as many of these poor creatures are stolen away,…What dreadful scenes of murder and cruelty those barbarous ravages must occasion in these unhappy people's country are too obvious to mention"(emphasis added). Eventually those Quakers residing in Virginia, North and South Carolina,

---

[118] Anthony Benezet, A Short Account Of that Part of Africa, Inhabited by the Negroes (1762; Bedford: Applewood Books) pp. 8-10, 23, 45, 72-73, 79.
[119] Alan Gallay, Ed. Voices of the Old South: Eyewitness Accounts, 1528-1861 (Athens: Un. of Georgia p, 1994) p. 149. Whitefield would change his position about the slave trade as early as 1751 and became a slave owner himself. Smith, In His Image, p. 13.

Maryland and New York petitioned their own legislatures on this subject.[120] Alexander Hewatt, pastor of the Scotch Presbyterian Church in Charleston, argued that although "in war the conquerors were supposed to have a right to the life of their captives, insomuch that they might kill, torture or enslave them, as they thought proper," he challenged the European community's willingness "to vindicate the conqueror's right to murder or *enslave a disarmed army.*"[121] By the end of the 1780s, public pressure forced the King of England to command that the Privy Council establish another special committee "to take into their consideration the present state of the African Trade, particularly as far as [it] related to the practice and manner of purchasing or obtaining slaves on the coast of Africa."[122] During the thirteen months in which the committee met, they printed and distributed 26,526 reports, written accounts of the Parliamentary debates, and over 51,432 pamphlets or books on the issue of the African slave trade.[123]

Reports that supported the position that the slave trade positively served humanity or espoused the "double argument of the humanity and holiness of the trade," even as they acknowledged that the extermination of war captives was common, were touted by "all the higher circles." Indeed, these were the reports that "the planters and merchants did not fail to avail themselves. They boasted that they would soon do away all the idle tales which had been invented against them."[124] The Liverpool merchants and others invested in the continuation of the slave trade specifically used Dahomey and their method of warfare as evidence that the trade was actually a blessing. Certainly as Robin

---

[120] Clarkson, History, pp. 86-88.
[121] Alexander Hewatt, An Historical Account of the Rise and Progress of the Colonies of South Carolina and Georgia, vol. 2. (London: A. Donaldson, 1779) p. 38. Hewatt was pastor from 1763 to 1775; Smith, In His Image, p. 18.(emphasis added)
[122] Clarkson, The History, p. 224.
[123] Clarkson, The History, p. 265.
[124] Clarkson, The History, pp. 228-229.

Law argues, Dahomeans became the poster nation for why the slave trade ultimately served a positive good. And the ruthlessness and barbarity of African warfare was used extensively as a proslavery argument even after the slave trade became illegal in 1807.[125] Of particular value was the issue of captives being taken and killed as human sacrifice, which Law states did exist in Africa, continuing well into the nineteenth century.[126]

Although slave traders who testified acknowledged that these practices were not common among all African nations, they continued to trade with anyone who had slaves for sale. According to English abolitionist Thomas Clarkson, "they all confessed that such slaves, as the White traders refused to buy, were put to death; and yet these traders, knowing that this would be the case, had the barbarity uniformly to reject those whom it did not suit them to purchase...but left them to their hard fate."[127] This market driven outcome was supported by the fact that African leaders made conscious decisions about how to retain their involvement in the global market for slaves. Writing about "the Cries of the poor Women and Children" who were beheaded as part of the ritual sacrificing of their enemies, Snelgrave stated that he asked a Dahomean military man: "Why so many old Men were sacrificed in particular? He [the African colonel] answered, "It was best to

---

[125]Robin Law, "Human Sacrifice in Pre-colonial West Africa," African Affairs Vol. 84. No. 334 (Jan., 1985) pp. 53-55.

[126] Ibid, pp. 53-54, 63, 73, 68-70. Law makes a compelling argument for why human sacrificing or the killing of war captives actually increased after the closing of the slave trade. The Asante were also known to have sacrificed between 1,400 to 1,500 people at the burial of their royal princes in 1797, and at least 3000 people, 2000 of which were said to be captives of war, were sacrificed by an Asante king at the funeral held for his mother in 1809. Extant first hand accounts in 1817 and 1820 confirm that human sacrifice practices continued to be performed by the Asante, generally resulting in huge numbers of victims. Just like the Dahomey, the Asante believed that human sacrifice would ensure military success and performed these rituals in annual celebrations. Indeed Dahomey and Asante were not the only nations to practice human sacrifice especially in the early years, and there were some other types of sacrifice that were practiced where captives of war were not used. For the purposes of this chapter, though I have dealt only with those nations that used war captives in this way as a way to explain the frequent references by Europeans of Africans killing their captives. Certainly this does not completely explain all of the carnage that existed in African wars but this was the almost exclusive focus of the English in their justification of slavery.

[127] Clarkson, The History, p. 230.

put them to death; for being grown wise by their Age and long Experience, if they were preserved, they would be ever plotting against their Masters, and so disturb the country; for they never would be easy under Slavery, having been the chief Men in their own Land. Moreover, if they should be spared, no *European* would buy them, on account of their Age."[128] The model of interdependent trade that evolved from the seventeenth through the nineteenth century between Europe and Africa was sustained by mutual consent.[129] The European demand for slaves did influence who lived or died as a result of war, but as has been shown, not entirely.

The European markets for slaves facilitated the exponential increase in the business of enslavement in Africa, but slaves taken in wars, who had a wealth of life experience behind them, would continue to be part of the military outcomes between African nations despite legislation ending the trade in England and America.[130] Additionally, an important aspect of African culture that Europeans talked extensively about was the volatility of military life, and despite their fears, their respect for African military abilities. They knew that Africans rejected enslavement and that given the opportunity they would fight to free themselves. As the Reverend Hewatt told his fellow South Carolinians, "all men must confess, that those Africans, whom the powers of Europe have conspired to enslave, are by nature equally free and independent, equally susceptible of pain and pleasure, equally averse from bondage and misery, as Europeans themselves."[131]

---

[128] Snelgrave, A New Account, pp. 46-47
[129] Darold Wax, "Negro Resistance," pp. 2-3.
[130] Law, "Human Sacrifice," pp. 66, 69, 73-77. Law notes that the practice of human sacrifice actually increased (as did wars to obtain them) in the nineteenth century, well after the abolition of the slave trade. And he suggests that one of the reasons for this may have been because of a "glut" on market of African slaves which made them cheaper and more available for sale to be sacrificed.
[131] Hewatt, An Historical Account, pp. 38-39.

Controlling African Labor: A State of War Continued

Thus, slavery was always "a state of war continued" because the supremacy of white power, at least in the colonists' mind, always remained insecure.[132] The consequential violence directed toward Africans in America was not driven by the desire for land and conquest, but by the need for labor, which the Atlantic slave trade facilitated. Africans brought to South Carolina as slaves were essential to the development of the region, but they were always perceived to be dangerous resources of labor that if not carefully controlled would topple the colonial regime. Yet, slave owners and the English colonial economy remained deeply invested in African slave labor. And, having already experimented with Native American slavery, South Carolinians believed that only extreme violence and judicially sanctioned performances of torture could keep their slaves at bay, making fear and the possibility of death a central feature of white mastery.

Despite the service that African slaves played in helping secure the colony, eventually colonists were fearful of "negroes and other slaves brought unto the people of this Province" because now whites claimed, they were of "barbarous, wild, [and] savage natures." Unlike earlier times, these conditions of which Africans were "naturally prone and inclined" made it necessary for the people of the South Carolina to enact legislation to "restrain the disorders, rapines and inhumanity" of those enslaved in order to secure the "safety and security of the people of this Province and their estates."[133]

The problem that the early settlers faced was that many African laborers simply ran away into the frontier, jeopardizing the stability of the region and making the deployment of heinous measures for colonial control necessary. The Lord Proprietors at

---

[132] John Locke, Two Treatise, p. 302.
[133]"Acts Relating to the Slaves," Statutes At Large, p 352.

first attempted to legislate a solution to the problem in 1690 by establishing the amount of bounty (40 shillings) that anyone returning a runaway slave would receive and that the punishment of "moderate whipping" was to be expected of plantation owners. When in 1712, the laws changed and slaves became chattel or slaves for life as did their children, it is clear that the problem of Africans running away not only continued but also became more pervasive.

The laws enacted to address the problem of flight are indicative of the level of violence that the early colonists were willing to use upon those they feared would disrupt the system of chattel slavery. Note that for the first offense, the penalty was the same as before, only it was now to be a severe public whipping. For the second offense, the slave was to be branded with an R. For the third offense, the slave was to be severely whipped again and have one of his ears cut off. For the fourth offense, however, the slave, if he was a male, was to be castrated, and if the slave was female, she was to be severely whipped, branded on her left cheek with the letter R, and her left ear was to be cut off. Finally, for the fifth offense, the slave would either be put to death or have one of his Achilles tendons severed. Not only would a runaway suffer, but also any Negro or slave who was found to have aided or encouraged the slave to runaway, whereupon this person would "suffer the pains of death" upon conviction.[134]

Some religious leaders in England (and only Le Jau in South Carolina) publicly rejected the South Carolinian law in place for over twenty-five years requiring the castration of slaves as punishment for running away. They cited it as "an Abomination" especially if done outside the law, in the spirit of revenge, or "if he aimeth by it at his

---

[134]"Acts Relating to the Slaves," The Statutes at Large of South Carolina Vol. 7, (Columbia, S.C.: A. S. Johnston, 1840) pp. 352, 343, 357, 359-360.

Slaves death." The Baptist Association in South Molton, in Devon, England, however, later reversed its position to conclude that "We apprehend, the Master, Acting according to the Law of your Province, in gelding his Slave, hath not committed any Crime, to give any Offence to Any Member to break Communion with him in the Church; because we finde by Scripture, that 'tis lawfull to buy them…And if lawfull to buy them 'tis lawful to keep them in order, and under government; and for Self preservation, punish them to prevent farther Mischief that may Ensue by their running away and [?] rebelling against their Masters."[135] The use of the word *gelding*, which is the term used for the castration of horses or mules in order to make them physiologically non-aggressive and docile, is important for what it signifies. The attitude of the master that slaves could be manipulated and controlled like animals is well documented in historian Mia Bay's work, *The White Image in the Black Mind: African-American Ideas about White People,*[136] but the colonial castrations of runaway slaves seems to be suggestive of early experiments in social engineering. It is also indicative of the difficulty slave owners had in getting Africans to submit to their will. In reality, Anglo Americans could only fantasize that they could make the enslaved perform like animals, dependant docile slave creatures living only to serve as their laborers. For, despite the brutal way they sought to control the runaway slave population in South Carolina, Africans continued to resist enslavement during the colonial era.

---

[135] See "Le Jau to the Secretary," February 20, 1712, Carolina Chronicles, p. 108; William G. McLoughlin and Winthrop D. Jordon, eds. "Baptist Face the Barbarities of Slavery in 1710," The Journal of Southern History, Vol. 29, NO, 4 (Nov., 1963) pp. 497, 501.

[136] Mia Bay, The White Image in the Black Mind: African-American Ideas about White People, 1830-1925 (New York: Oxford UP, 2000). Using WPA interviews extensively, Bay amply teases out that slaves recognized that white people viewed them as animals, and this perspective of dehumanization informs the slave's day-to-day existence within a system that claimed to be paternalistic.

Some runaway Africans, taking advantage of the Tuscarora and Yamasee uprisings and colonial distraction with their "open" enemies in South Carolina, forged their own pathways to freedom by plotting insurrections, but with brutal ramifications. Early recorded accounts of insurrectionary impulses in South Carolina indicate that aggressive resistance began in 1711, where "several Negroes run away from their masters, and keep out, armed, and robbing and plundering houses and plantations, putting the inhabitants of this Province in great fear and terror."[137] Similar to how Native Americans were treated when they rejected British imperial policy, African slaves involved in a plot in Charleston in 1720 were brutally crushed: almost one hundred slaves were burned and hanged for attempting to "destroy all the white People in the country." A letter sent to King George in 1721 relayed that ""black slaves…were very near succeeding in a new revolution, which would probably have been attended by the utter extirpation of all your Majesty's subjects."[138]

Thus, in order to gain even greater racial control over an ever-increasing number of Africans, over ninety percent of whom came directly from West Africa, South Carolinian colonists imposed even stricter regulations upon the population in the region.[139] Specifically, the colonists sought to secure the institution of chattel slavery

---

[137] Edwin C. Holland, A Refutation of the Calumnies Circulated Against the southern and Western States, Respecting the Institution and Existence of Slavery Among Them (Charleston: A. E. Miller, 1822) pp. 63-65.

[138] Wright, The Only Land, p. 275. Aptheker, American Negro, p. 175-176.

[139] Gregory O'Malley, "Beyond the Middle Passage: Slave Migration from the Caribbean to North America, 1619-1807," The William and Mary Quarterly Vol. 66, Issue 1, pp. 3-5; See: John Hope Franklin, From Slavery to Freedom: A History of African Americans (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1994) pp. 69-70; Lorenzo Greene, The Negro in Colonial New England 1620-1776 (NYC: Columbia University p, 1942) pp. 35-37; Darold D. Wax, "Preferences for slaves in Colonial America," JNH, vol. 58, p. 374. O'Malley, Franklin, Green, and Wax argue that most South Carolinian slave owners and traders preferred unseasoned slaves as they were concerned that they might be getting recalcitrant slaves from the Caribbean. See Statutes, p.352

through laws that curtailed slave mobility; with new regulations against gun usage by slaves; and the prohibition against the ownership or playing of drums by slaves.

By the 1720s, African slaves comprised 65 percent of the total population of South Carolina, and in an effort to alleviate already existing tensions; regulations over slave mobility were put in place. The colonists believed that racialized laws that affirmed white mastery would curtail "any disorders Insurrections or Tumultuous Designs formed and carried on by any Negroes or other slaves."[140] White male patrols were responsible for keeping the province safe from slave rebellion, and legislation regulating what that entailed became more extensive over time. For example, in 1722, slaves were no longer allowed to be involved in "keeping and breeding horses, whereby they convey intelligences from one part of the country [and] carry on their secret plots and contrivances for insurrections and rebellions."[141] After the Stono Rebellion in 1739, the largest successful slave uprising to occur in colonial North America, South Carolinians sought to control the movement of slaves throughout the province. They wanted to know at all times where their slaves were and what they were doing. Thus, male slaves were not allowed to travel in numbers "exceeding seven in number…in any high road in this Province, without some white person with them." Not only were they no longer able to travel in groups, but generally the legislative council saw that it was "absolutely necessary to the safety of this Province, that all due care be taken to restrain the wanderings and meetings of negroes and other slaves, at all times…especially on Saturday nights, Sundays."[142]

---

[140] Ibid. Statutes p. 371.
[141] Ibid. Statutes, p.382. Wood, Majority, p.273.
[142] Statutes, p. 413 "Act of 1740"

Nevertheless, despite the regulations of the 1740s, slaves continued to move about the province, threatening the security of the white community and the institution of African bondage. According to one colonist who chose to remain anonymous: "The *stranger* had once an opportunity of seeing a Country-Dance, Rout, or Cabal of *Negroes*, within 5 miles distance of this town, on a Saturday night." Upon this occasion the enslaved formed "private committees" where they talked "in too low a voice, and with so much caution, as to not be overheard by the others." The European interloper observed, "members of this *secret council*, had much the appearance of Doctors, in deep and solemn consultation upon life or *death*; which indeed might have been the scope of their meditations at that time." Moreover, slaves who were outlaws as fugitives and other slaves came freely to this event well equipped to make their escape if necessary: "Not less than 12 fugitive slaves joined this respectable company…8 of whom were mounted on good horses…—The *Stranger* is informed, that such assemblies *have been* very common, and that the company has sometimes amounted to 200 persons." The cautious secrecy of these discussions should make it clear to everyone, the letter writer argued, that "Whenever or wherever such nocturnal rendezvouses are made, may it not be concluded, that their deliberations are never intended for the advantage of the white people?"[143] Chastising the region's leaders in 1772 for not enforcing the slave laws of 1740, the "Stranger" feared that blacks plotted insurrections and the death of their white masters at these "meetings." Yet, what this anonymous report also signifies is how the enslaved continued to contest their condition of bondage and to exert considerable control over their own lives—despite white efforts to curtail black freedom.

---

[143] Wood, Black, Appendix D, pp. 342-343. From: South Carolina Gazette Sept. 17, 1772. "Stranger."

The termination of the slave's usage of firearms, a change from earlier colonial times, is indicative of how preoccupied the colonists were over the threat of their slave population rising in rebellion. Since the enslaved were now forbidden to carry or use firearms, patrols were instructed to "search for guns, pistols, swords, cutlaces, lances, and other offensive weapons in negro houses." And the legislation required that "every master or head of any family" also "keep all his guns and other arms…locked up" or else face serious penalties. Yet, in a letter written even before the Stono Rebellion in 1730, the Reverend John Fulton of the Christ Church parish noted the all consuming fear of white South Carolinians of their slaves "who make insurrections sometimes [so] that the people are forced to come to Church with guns loaded."[144] The Stono Rebellion only further motivated the heightened surveillance of the enslaved population. In 1740, all white men were now required to "bear arms" at all times, even on Sundays, and the prevailing custom of "firing guns in the night time" was thereafter prohibited in the Carolina province.[145] Despite these laws, however, in 1787, a South Carolina Governor's message complained to the legislature that there were armed slaves "too numerous to be quelled by patrols" who were causing much trouble for the colonists in the region of St. Peter' parish.[146]

The prohibition against Africans playing drums in 1740 provides further evidence of white fears that their slave population could rise in violent confrontation. Now black people could no longer be found "using or keeping of drums, horns or other loud

---

[144] Statutes, pp. 372-373; Klingberg, An Appraisal, p. 76.
[145] Statutes, pp. 417-418, 412.
[146] (March, 1787 letters from militia commanders in St. Peter's Parish, South Carolina). Michael Mullin, "British Caribbean and the North American Slaves in the Era of War and Revolution," in The Southern Experience in the American Revolution eds. Jeffrey J. Crow and Larry E. Tise (Chapel Hill: UNC p, 1978) p. 241; Quarles, Negro in the American Revolution p. 174.

instruments, which may call together or give sign or notice to one another of their wicked designs and purposes."[147] Drums had long been associated with African rebellion in the European mind. The first laws established against drum usage occurred in Barbados. Sir Hans Sloane noted in 1689 that the slaves "formerly on their Festivals were allowed the use of trumpets…and Drums…But making use of these in their Wars at home in Africa, it was thought too much inciting them to Rebellion, and so they were prohibited."[148] South Carolina waited a full forty years before enacting laws against drums based on their potential use for wars of insurrection. Yet, in 1775, when colonists were fearful of British inspired slave insurrections during the Revolutionary War, Charleston was reportedly filled with "the daily and nightly sounds of Drums and Fifes." Again, it appears that the legislation enacted did not exert complete control over the slave population in South Carolina nor did it quell white fears. The concerns that the South Carolina colonists had about their slave population had been established long ago, and the fear of "domestic enemies…to be found in Negro houses" was now *the* motivating factor for all their concerns and the, albeit somewhat ineffective, legislation.[149]

Indeed, the challenges of controlling an ever-growing African population in South Carolina were well known, and for many it required that slaves be abused nearly to death. Colonist John Brickell's observations support this in his claims to have "frequently seen them [slaves] whipt to that degree, that large pieces of their skin have been hanging down their backs." Yet, despite the brutality, Brickell stated he had "never observed one of them shed a Tear, which plainly shews them to be a People of very harsh and stubborn

---

[147] Statutes p. 410.
[148] Dena J. Epstein, "African Music in British and French America," The Music Quarterly Vol. 59, No. 1 (Jan., 1973) p. 78.
[149] Wood, Black, pp. 276-277.

Dispositions."[150] According to Benjamin Martyn, a Georgian who used South Carolina to demonstrate the problems of slavery, the first thing that white settlers had to do on the frontier where the population of Africans grossly out numbered them was to "secure herself [South Carolina] against them." Martyn believed that all slaves were "secret enemies…ready to join with her open ones upon the first occasion."[151] Johann Martin Bolzius, a German settler also writing about the Carolina region, argued that the ratio of whites to black slaves was a "dangerous disorder" that could lead to rebellion. Any African that fomented rebellion, however, would find themselves "punished in a very harsh and nearly inhuman way (which is not the way of the English), for example, slowly roasted at the fire." We know, however, that this was indeed the English way during the Pequot War; and that similar brutal retaliation occurred during the aftermath of the 1712 and 1742 New York insurrection attempts.[152] Bolzius, like the colonists in South Carolina, believed that harshness was necessary, for if Africans "gain the upper hand in a rebellion they give no mercy, but treat the whites very cruelly." After all, he acknowledged, "eternal slavery to them as to all people is an unbearable yoke, and very harsh treatment as regards food and work exasperates them greatly. New Negroes therefore must be treated very carefully, for they frequently take their own lives out of desperation, with the hope of resurrection in their homeland, and of rejoining their

---

[150] John Brickell, M. D., The Natural History, p. 272.

[151] Benjamin Martyn, "An Impartial Inquiry in to the State and Utility of the Province of Georgia," in Voices of the Old South: Eyewitness Accounts, 1528-1861. ed. Alan Gallay, (Athens: Un.Of Georgia p, 1994) pp. 82.

[152] John Martin Bolzius, "Reliable Answer to Some Submitted Questions Concerning the Land Carolina in Which Answer, However, Regard Is Also Paid at the Same Time to the condition of the Colony of Georgia," in Voices of the Old South: Eyewitness Accounts, 1528-1861. ed. Alan Gallay, (Athens: Un. of Georgia p, 1994) p. 234; In the 1712 revolt of the slaves in New York, twenty Africans were hanged and three were burned at the stake. In the 1741 affair that may or may not have been a conspiracy among the slaves to insurrect, thirteen men were burned at the stake, seventeen were hanged, and eighty-four were sent to die an early death enslaved in the West Indies. See Jill Lepore's New York Burning for an excellent overview/interpretation of this event. (New York: Knopf, 2005) pp. 58, xii.

people."[153] Both men were aware of the underlying problem. For Martyn also noted that the antagonistic relationship between the black and white population was sustained by the fact that Africans were "fond of liberty just like white men, and he will struggle for it, when he knows his own strength, when he sees this is equal, at least very little inferior to his master's."[154]

The conundrum that faced those who severely needed labor to sustain their plantation economy and who needed to control a burgeoning population of non-white people was a serious one. As Peter Wood argues, free and enslaved Africans who had skills were welcomed in those early years because "workers who were merely submissive and obedient would have been a useless luxury," which, these new colonists could ill afford when so many of them had limited to no skills in agriculture or animal husbandry.[155] Nor were the colonists wrong in their perceptions that the slaves were restless, for as Wood argued, the intensity of the plantation system led to an increase in slavery's brutality, which ultimately led to greater animosity and black rebellion.[156]

---

[153] Bolzius, "Reliable Answers to Some Submitted Questions," pp. 233, 256.

[154] Benjamin Martyn, "An Impartial Inquiry in to the State and Utility of the Province of Georgia," in Voices of the Old South: Eyewitness Accounts, 1528-1861. ed. Alan Gallay, (Athens: Un. of Georgia p, 1994) p. 83.

[155] African slaves were valuable because they brought with them skills in agriculture, animal husbandry, in working with metal, wood, masonry, as interpreters or "linksters" on the frontier, and in military service. Wood, Majority, pp. 26, 44, 105; Porter, "Negroes" p. 72.

[156] Wood, Majority, pp. 152-153, 158. The rise in imports of Africans also correlates with a decline in the natural increase of female slaves, which suggests that as slavery became more essential to the South Carolina economy, conditions of servitude worsened. Similar to those slaveholders involved in the West Indian sugar plantation system, the life expectancy of their slaves became less important to plantation owners in Carolina, as they viewed the bodies of black labor as expendable. See:William Dusinberre, Them Dark Days: Slavery in the American Rice Swamp (Athens: University of Georgia p, 2000), and the Diary of Frances Anne Kemble, Journal of a Residence on a Georgian Plantation (BiblioBazaar, 2006). As well as Jennifer Morgan's Laboring Women: Reproduction and Gender in New World Slavery (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania p, 2004), and Sharla Fetts, Working Cures: Healing, Health, and Power on Southern Slave Plantations (Chapel Hill: UNC p, 2002) for the abusive nature of plantation labor and how it interfered with female fertility, pregnancy, and the survival of women, children, and men.

Informed about their slaves' artfulness at war, South Carolinians grappled with what Africans made clear, that they would if they could fight for their freedom: the question was always whether colonists or Africans would win.[157] Perceptions of this possibility changed over time depending on what was happening not only on the ground in South Carolina but also around the Diaspora. The colonist's general lack of military training was very different from the experiences of many of their African slaves, and eventually the knowledge of this generated threats of unrestrained violence upon Africans within the English colonies.

In truth, unlike with Native Americans, the colonists believed that they could not completely rid themselves of their African slaves because they needed them. In a debate over the importation of Africans in 1785, General Charles Pinckney asked, "was it not well understood, that no planter could cultivate his land without slaves?" Moreover, Pinckney argued, "this country was not capable of being cultivated by white men; as appeared on the attempt made by Georgia" and that "Negroes were to this country what raw materials were to another country." Pinckney argued that the "strength of this country" during the American Revolution, which "once saved this city [Charleston] in the war," was due to "the number of bastions hastily thrown up, a service performed entirely by the negroe pioneers."[158]

Ralph Izard, however, a planter and the first senator of South Carolina, was not convinced that slaves would always remain invaluable. Izard imagined in a 1794 letter to

---

[157] James Glen stated while governor in 1738, that "the people…are still undisciplined and Ignorant of Every Military Art, except the Bare use of Fire Arms…[and] it is hardly possible for them to be Instructed in Military Discipline, which is inconsistent with a Domestic or Country Life." James Glen Papers, 25 May 1738 "To the Right Honorable The Lord Commissioner for Trade and Plantations" pp. 15-16. South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina.

[158] Donnan, Documents Illustrated, Vol. 4, p. 482-483.

Mathius Hutchinson what would happen if "the same horrid Trajedies among our Negroes, which have been so fatally exhibited in the French Islands" in the Haitian revolution were to occur in America. Hutchinson predicted that the "Proprietors of Negroes should themselves be the instruments of destroying that species of property" rather than see their slave population freed in South Carolina or in any other American colony.[159] Slave owners nevertheless made a calculated choice to perpetuate the institution of African bondage in America, and they used violence and the threat of death to sustain it.

Thus, white fears of African slaves' capacity to overwhelm them in any confrontation were not fantasies. Europeans understood what enslavement represented to Africans—that, as losers, they had been taken and removed from their own countries in the aftermath of warfare. This knowledge also heightened the colonists' fears that just as Africans were able to subjugate other Africans to their will, so might they be able to turn the tables on their white masters. Yet, Europeans were poised to defend themselves and their insatiable demand for slaves in the New World. For, although the lure of extraordinary profits generally protected the African slave population in South Carolina, total warfare was never completely off the table if those who were enslaved attempted to free themselves by force. White Americans knew that they had placed an enemy in their midst: an enemy procured to satisfy the ever-rising demand for African slaves, who continued to resist chattel slavery—who intended to effect total warfare against a previously unknown adversary, white slave holders.

---

[159] "Letter to Mathius Hutchinson from Ralph Izard," 20 Nov 1794, Ralph Izard Papers South Carolinian Library, University of South Carolina. Ralph Izard's father was a prominent Goose Creek man from England and his maternal grandfather, Robert Johnson, was the provincial governor of South Carolina.

PART TWO

CHAPTER THREE

"THE PAST IS NEVER DEAD": THE CONTINUITY OF AFRICAN AND EUROPEAN WARFARE PRACTICES

Despite British efforts to control them, Africans who survived the middle passage were aggressive in their resistance to enslavement in the West Indies and American colonies. The continuity of African warfare practices and white fears of their destruction in a servile war shaped plantation owner theories that only the severest and most traumatizing reprisals would keep the slaves from getting the upper hand and dismantling the entire system. Yet despite brutal retaliation, blacks continued to rebel in the British colonies, making white mastery over the enslaved seem elusive. For European settlers knew that for Africans, as well as for themselves, "the past is never dead. It's not even past."[1]

In this chapter, the continuity of slave insurrections in the British West Indies and Denmark Vesey's attempted insurrection in South Carolina in 1822 demonstrates that African and European ideas of being at war with one another were ubiquitous. Slave holders kept track of insurrections in other parts of the "New World." They knew that

[1] This famous quote comes from William Faulkner's Requiem for a Nun (New York: Random House, 1951) p. 92.

enslaved Africans used military tactics with the same aims, the same ideas of "nits make lice" that whites had used, for example, against the Irish and Native Americans. European slave owners, unsettled by their quintessentially African "prisoners of war," who were set upon destroying a system that kept them and their people enslaved, always responded with unrestrained violence.[2] Whites took solace, however, that although they lived with fear and constant dread of a servile war, they were confident that they would be victorious, even if it meant the annihilation of the entire black population.

The Dangers of Black Resistance and White Reprisals

The fact that African slaves continued to utilize their military training can be found in the closely read reports about slave insurrections which reverberated all over North America. These incidents, of which Carolinians and other colonists were well informed, served as sober reminders to slave owners that many Africans remained well trained in the arts of war. To paraphrase Melville Herskovits, white fear of their enslaved black population was as much a part of the legacy of America as slavery was.[3] Europeans shared the "circular fallacy" that somehow it was the enslaved African's fault that they feared their slaves, not the condition of servitude.[4] Indeed, the brutality that defined the institution of bondage fostered aggressive resistance to enslavement and this in turn fostered brutal retaliation. From slave trader Robert Norris' perspective, slaves brought the misery on themselves and because of this "are subject to correction, as a punishment

---

[2] Elihu Embree, The Emancipator (Sept 30 1820.) p. 85.
[3] Herskovits, Myth, p. 99.
[4] Circular fallacy is a term used by Francis Jennings to describe the thought processes that Europeans used against Native Americans to justify their imperialism and the myths of savagery that I adapt to describe the condition of enslavement. See The Invasion of America: Indians, Colonialism, and the Cant of Conquest (Chapel Hill, UNC p, 1975) p. 31.

for his own vices, and for the instruction of others."[5] The notion of correction, however, oversimplifies the conditions in which slavery existed. It was to the colonists a serious contest of wills, played out repeatedly across the West Indies with deadly and unpredictable consequences.

African tactics of warfare were very visible in the insurrections of those enslaved in the British colonies, generating the severity of white reprisals. Barbados, South Carolina's early trading partner, offers an excellent example of how despite the fact that slaves in Barbados were tortured, worked to death, starved, whipped, and occasionally killed by whites who threw them into boiling vats of sugar, Afro Barbadians continuously rebelled for over a century. A combined effort in 1649 of white servants and slaves, who were, "so haughty in their resolutions, and so incorrigible" in their intention to "revenge themselves" or else die trying, led to the execution of eighteen of the leaders. Noted to be a well thought out plan, their intention was to seize "their Masters, and cut all their throats, and by that means, to make themselves not only freemen, but Masters of the Iland."[6] The slave rebellion of 1675 had similar intentions, but according to Governor John Adkins, slaves from all over the island were organized with "a damnable design…to destroy them [whites] all." Governor Adkins admitted that he found the rebellion "far

---

[5]Robert Norris, Memoirs of the Reign of Bossa Ahadee, King of Dahomy, An Inland Country of Guiney. To Which are Added, The Author's Journey to Abomey, The Capital: And Short Account of the African Slave Trade. (London: Lowndes, 1789) pp. 175-176. Electronic Edition. Documenting the American South.

[6] Richard Ligon, A true and exact history of the island of Barbados illustrated with a map of the island as also the principall trees and plants there, set forth in their due proportions and shapes, drawne out by their severall and respective scales: together with the ingenio that makes sugar, with the plots of the severall houses, roomes, and other places that are used in the whole processe of sugar-making… (1657) pp. 45-46. (Although Eric Williams recounts this event as an all black affair (194), based on Ligon's account it seems as if Servants and negro slaves are involved. Need to further confirm this.) Eric Williams states that non-conformists or enemies to Oliver Cromwell in the seventeenth century were sent away to the colonies as white laborers. Especially "the few lives saved in the Drogheda massacre were reserved by him to be sent to Barbados, and thereafter it became his fixed policy to 'barbadoes' his opponents." See: From Columbus to Castro: The History of the Caribbean (New York: Vintage, 1970) pp. 100-101

more dangerous than was at first thought, for it had spread over most of the plantations, especially amongst the Cormantin negroes, who are much the greater number from any one country, and are a warlike and robust people."[7] Accounts were published and distributed to all the English colonies, as many of the first settlers in South Carolina were from Barbados, and there was great comfort found in the reports that the "numbers of those that were burned alive, beheaded, and other wise executed for their horrid crime" eliminated further threats.[8] Of the seventeen who were found guilty, six were burned alive and eleven were beheaded, where after the headless bodies were "dragged through the streets" and then "publicly burned." Twenty-five more slaves were executed, five committed suicide, and seventy were either deported or returned to their masters "after a savage flogging."[9] Still another insurrection plot uncovered in Barbados in 1692 where the "slaves entered into a well concerted plan for exterminating the white inhabitants" led the South Carolina House of Assembly to propose a bill that year which "inhibited the Importation of such slaves as have been conserned in any plott in Barbados."[10]

---

[7]Calendar of State Papers, Colonial Series, America and West Indies 1675-1676 Noel Sainsbury, ed. (London: John Menzies, 1893) p. 291; Also quoted in David Eltis, The Rise of African Slavery in the Americas (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2000) p. 243.

[8]By 1671, half of the settlers in South Carolina were from Barbados. Men like Sir John Yeamans, Thomas Drayton, Robert Daniel, Arthur Middleton, Stephen Fox, Richard Quintyne, Christopher Portman, and John Ladson all emigrated with slaves from Barbados by 1679. Six Barbadians became governor of South Carolina between 1670 to 1730, Sir John Yeamans, James Colleton, Robert Gibbes Arthur Middleton, Robert Daniel, and Henry Middleton. Richard S. Dunn, "The Barbados Census of 1680: Profile of the Richest colony in English America," William and Mary Quarterly 3rd Series, vol. 26, No. 1 (Jan, 1969) pp. 4-30; Great Newes from the Barbadoes, or A True and faithful account of the grand conspiracy of the Negroes against the English and happy discovery of the same: with the number of those that were burned alive, beheaded, and otherwise executed for their horrid crimes; with a short description of that Plantation (London: L. Curtis, 1676).

[9] Michael Craton, Testing the Chains, pp.109-110.

[10] John Poyers, The History of Barbados, (1808) p. 155; Journal of the Commons House of Assembly of South Carolina 1692, p. 15.

Jamaican slaves also suffered hard usage under British colonialism, which resulted in their being "very troublesome" in their aggressive resistance to enslavement.[11] A Jamaican plantation owner wrote news, which circulated in the *South Carolina Gazette* in 1734, that "Our rebellious Negroes are to[o] numerous that they attack us everywhere, and are not afraid of our greatest Force… About ten Days ago they attacked near 100 men, most Soldiers,…most of our people fled; we can get no body to stand before them."[12] What concerned Jamaican slave owners the most was that, "We are at present more apprehensive of a *Civil War* than a Foreign War, and it is feared, if some effectual Means are not taken to reduce them [the slaves] they may in a Little Time render themselves stronger than the Force that can be sent against them….The Number of Negroes on this Island are computed to be about Eighty Thousand, and the Whites not Nine Thousand, which strikes them all with a general consternation."[13]

The Maroons, runaway slaves living in the hills of Jamaica, successfully fought against the British until they signed a treaty in 1739. The formerly truant African slaves and their offspring were given freedom in perpetuity and semi-autonomous governing of the maroon towns of Twelawny, St. James, St. Elizabeth, and St. George located within the interior regions of the colony.[14] The *South Carolina Gazette's* extensive coverage of the remarkable and troubling story of the negotiated truce in Jamaica signifies the studied

---

[11] Extract of a Letter from a Gentleman in Jamaica, to his Friend in London." Kingston in Jamaica, Feb. 25, 1734. South-Carolina Gazette Aug 31 – Sept 7 1734.
[12] "Boston, March 15 [1734]" South-Carolina Gazette May 11 to May 18 1734.
[13] "Extract of a Letter from a Gentleman in Jamaica, to his Friend in London." Kingston in Jamaica, Feb. 25, 1734. South-Carolina Gazette Aug 31 – Sept 7 1734. (emphasis added)
[14] Martha Warren Beckwith, Black Roadways: A Study of Jamaican Folk Life (New York: Negro Up, 1969) pp. 190-191. Martha Beckwith notes that writers of the eighteenth century also reported respectfully of the Maroons of Jamaica having "superior strength, symmetry, and intelligence…as distinct from the shorter, yellower, and more Negroid blacks from the lower Congo," whose social customs in marriage and labor responsibilities as well the political hierarchy of chiefdoms were retained from Africa.

concern that slaveholders had about the replication of this disastrous turn of events in their own colony.[15]

The British treaty with the Jamaican maroon population did not resolve, however, the colonist's fears of the rest of their African slaves rebelling. These fears were realized in 1760 when a slave by the name of Tacky, "a Koromantyn Negro…who had been a chief in Guiney," led other enslaved Africans "carrying death and desolation" in their attempt to exterminate many of the residents in St. Mary's parish. "In one morning they murdered between thirty and forty Whites, not sparing even infants at the breast, before their progress was stopped." This "very formidable insurrection of the Koromantyn or Gold Coast Negroes…spread through almost every other district of the island." [16] In one district, a "Koromantyn yell of war" could be heard, and "a Wooden Sword adorn'd with Parrott's Feathers (being a Signal of War, in Some Part of guinea [Africa]" was discovered. In all, the plan was that "fire was to have been Sett to ye Townes in many Places at once, and all the Whites who Come to help Extinguish them, were to be Murder'd in ye Confusion."[17] Although "an old Koromantyn Negro, the chief instigator and oracle of the insurgents…administered the Fetish or solemn oath to the conspirators, and furnished them with a magical preparation which was to render them invulnerable," Tacky was eventually caught and decapitated. Very few of the rebels willingly surrendered and many instead committed suicide. The British militia "frequently came to places in the woods where seven or eight were found tied up with whites to the boughs of

---

[15] South Carolina Gazette, Nov. 1, 1732, May 18, 1734, Jan. 18, July 12, Sept. 20, Oct. 11, 1735, July 28, 1739.
[16]Bryan Edwards, The History, Civil and Commercial, of the British West Indies, in Two Volumes, Vol. II, (Dublin: Luke White, 1793) pp. 59-61, 87-88.
[17] Thomas Thistlewood's Journal, 1748-1786 June 7, 1760, Lincolnshire County Archives Monson MSS 31.

trees, and previous to these self-murders, they had generally massacred the women and children" who had joined the rebel cause as cooks and porters.[18] In the end, the enslaved killed sixty whites during the rebellion—but that number seems miniscule in comparison to the three to four hundred slaves who were killed or committed suicide, the one hundred slaves who were executed, and the five hundred slaves who were transported out of Jamaica in response to their suspected resistance to enslavement.[19]

Events in Antigua reported in the *South Carolina Gazette* also aroused similar fears among South Carolinians about the militancy of their slave population. A report to the Governor of Antigua, William Mathew, published by the *Gazette* in 1737 almost in its entirety, outlined an attempted insurrection that was led mostly by Africans from the Gold Coast (Coromantees) and by Creole slaves. A man named Court was the leader of the African contingent, and according to the report given to Governor Mathew, he was "of a considerable family in his own country, brought here at ten years of age." After growing up in Antigua, Court assumed the "title of King." The other leader Tomboy, who was a creole, along with Hercules, Jack, Scipio, Ned, Fortune, and Toney, made up the other half of the "negro conspiracy." The plan of the insurrectionists was that "three or four parties of 300—400 slaves were to enter the town and put the whites to the sword; forts and shipping in the harbour were to be seized," whereby "a new government was to be established when the whites were extirpated."[20] According to Billy Johnson, a free

---

[18] Bryan Edwards, The History, Civil and Commercial, of the British West Indies, in Two Volumes, Vol II, (Dublin: Luke White, 1793) pp. 59-61, 87-88; Edward Long, History of Jamaica II, pp. 461-462; Michael Craton, Testing the Chains:Resistance to Slavery in the British West Indies (Ithaca: Cornell up, 1982) pp. 129 133, 136-137.
[19] Craton, Testing the Chains, p. 138.
[20] Antigua, 30 December 1736, "Report to Governor Mathew of an enquiry into the negro conspiracy," 'America and West Indies: January 1737' Calender of State Papers Colonial, America and West Indies: 1737, volume 43 (1963), p. 20iii. URL: http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=72897. For a

black, this would be done because "it would be better if we had the country to ourselves."[21] In order to consolidate support for the effort to free themselves oaths were taken; a person would drink "a health in liquor with grave-dirt and sometimes cock's blood infused, and sometimes the person swearing laid his hand on live cocks. The general tenor of the oath was to kill the whites." Additionally, a "military dance" was done during the day:

> of which whites and negroes not in the secret would be spectators yet ignorant of the meaning. It is the custom of Africa when a coromantee king has resolved on war to give public notice that the ikem-dance will be performed….the people forming a semicircle about him. The king then begins the dance…When several have danced, the king dances again with his general and swears an oath to behave as a brave prince should or forfeit his life. If he is answered by three huzzas from those present it signifies a belief that the king will observe his oath. [22]

In the opinion of a confessant, "Tomboy was the greatest of generals." Not all the Gold Coast slaves supported the initiative, however, as "Some of the coromantees, knowing that a war was intended, tried to stop the dance being performed," perhaps indicating their fear of white reprisals. It is also however an indication of the significance of an Akan ritual which remained culturally intact despite their removal from their African homeland.[23] This evidence supports what historian John Thornton has argued with respect to Angolan and Congolese people: that "military dancing was a part of the African culture of war….as much a part of military preparation as drill was in Europe."[24]

---

similar reporting in South Carolina, see South-Carolina Gazette December 4, 1736 "Antigua, Oct. 24": "Charles-town" January 29 to February 5 1737.

[21] St. Christophers, May 1737, 11-15, "Governor William Mathew to Alured Popple," 'America and the West Indies: May 1737, 11-15', Calender of State Papers Colonial, America and West Indies: 1737, volume 43 (1963), p. 287. URL: http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=72897

[22] Antigua, 30 December 1736, "Report to Governor Mathew of an enquiry into the negro conspiracy," 'America and West Indies: January 1737' Calender of State Papers Colonial, America and West Indies: 1737, volume 43 (1963), p. 20iii. URL: http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=72897

[23] Ibid. Michael Craton cites the war dancing as an Akan ritual. Testing, p. 123.

[24] Thornton, "African Dimensions," p.1112.

Indeed, it seems that not only Angolan and Congolese Africans performed military dances, but also Africans from many other ethnic groups as well.

Because of the British discovery of their plot, eighty-eight slaves were put to death. Five were broken on the wheel, six were starved to death on gibbets, and seventy-seven were burned alive. Another forty-four slaves were sold away from the island of Antigua. Although no slave women were deported or executed, Judge Valentine Morris believed that African females had a role to play in the rebellion and that they were complicit because he sensed "by their Insolent behavior and Expressions [they] had the utter Extirpation of the Whites as much at heart, as the Men, and would undoubtedly have done as much Mischief by Butchering all the Women and Children."[25]

The continuity of African methods of war and white reprisals can be found outside of the British colonies as well. Evidence given after an attempted insurrection on the Dutch island of St. Croix in 1759 indicated that the oath-taking practices performed in Antigua were pervasive throughout the Diaspora. One informant told the judge, Engelbret Hesselberg, that when making the oath to fulfill their plot "French and Davis cut themselves in the finger in his presence, mixed the blood with earth and water, and drank it with the assurance that they would not confess to the conspiracy no matter what pain they were subjected to." A black woman taken up in an attempt to gather evidence about her husband William's involvement indicated that "the most binding oath that a Negro could take, was when he took earth from a dead Negro's grave, mixed it with water and drank it."[26] This conspiracy in St. Croix resembles others within the British colonies in

---

[25] Cited in Croton, Testing the Chains, n. 18 p. 359; Minutes of the Antiguan Council January 31, 1737, Colonial Office 9/10.

[26] Waldemar Westergaard, ed. "Account of the Negro Rebellion on St. Croix, Danish West Indies, 1759" Journal of Negro History, Vol. 11, No. 1 (Jan., 1926) p. 57. Further evidence of this can be found in Byran

that after "setting the plantations on fire" the Africans planned on "killing or burning all whites who collected to put out the fires."[27] One does not have to wonder if the explicit details of the punishment that those accused received was similar as well. The husband of the "negress" above was:

> Wm. Davis, free negro, convicted by [testimony of] witnesses, and confessed. He cut his own throat. His dead body was dragged through the streets by a horse, by one leg; thereafter hanged on a gallows by a leg, and finally taken down and burned at the stake.
>
> Franch, (or French) free negro, convicted by [testimony of] witnesses, but confessed nothing himself. He was broken on the wheel with an iron crowbar, laid alive on the wheel, where he survived 12 hours. The head was then set on a stake, and the hand fastened on the gallows.
>
> Will, belonging to Soren Bagge, is convicted by [testimony of] witnesses, but made no confession. Was burned alive, lived in the fire 14 minutes.[28]

These three examples demonstrate the high level of commitment that the decision to rebel required of those enslaved, as they clearly understood the expected and tortuous outcome of failure. The torturing of dead bodies is also indicative of the level of violence that Europeans exerted in revenge against the enslaved, and of their determination to deter any future efforts at liberation in the British West Indies or in colonies like South Carolina.

Internecine Warfare in South Carolina

White South Carolinians, well aware of the troubles that the colonies in the

---

Edward's interviews of his "Koramantyn" slaves in Jamaica, "their mode of administering an oath of secrecy or purgation.—Human blood, and earth taken from the grave of some near relation, are mixed with water, and given to the party to be sworn." History, p. 67.

[27] Westergaard, ed. "Account," p. 56.

[28] Westergaard, ed. "Account," pp. 58-59. Westergaard suggested that since all Europeans were plagued with these "serious disorders" someone "competent" should compile "the negro codes of the French, English, and Dutch islands…to produce in that way a permanent law."

West Indies had in controlling their slave populations, had similar problems of their own. Historian Margaret Washington Creel argues that the eighteenth century was a difficult time for slave owners in South Carolina.[29] South Carolinians had huge populations of salt water Africans that, historian Michael Gomez argues, had significant influence over the second, and possibly third generations of country born or creolized African Americans as late as the end of the eighteenth century and the early decades of the nineteenth century.[30] The anxiety that this engendered in the hearts and minds of slave owners in America, who had to know that Africans had the capacity to organize and fight for their freedom as effectively as Europeans, remained an important factor in how the institution developed.

There are accounts of insurrectionary impulses in South Carolina that indicate that aggressive resistance began even before the 1730's. A plot in 1720 in the Goose Creek region demonstrated how quickly the enslaved assimilated their cultural differences, which facilitated the organization of their deadly mission to "destroy all the white people."[31] In 1730, well-armed slaves involved in plotting their insurrection intended to meet for "a great Dance" and then descend upon Charleston to "Rise and destroy" all the whites. [32] The "Chief of them, with some others" were stopped before they could execute their rebellion, but the ritual of dance and the assignment of leadership titles demonstrates

---

[29] Margaret Washington Creel, "A Peculiar People"; Slave Religion and Community-Culture Among the Gullahs (New York: NYU p, 1988 p. 117.

[30] Gomez, Exchanging, p. 194-195. Gomez argues that it is not until the 1830s that perhaps the large numbers (over 82%) of American born Africans influence the acculturation process, where the memory of an earlier antecedent of African culture and society might have had less prominence in the everyday lives of those enslaved. This also can be evaluated through the lens of class, as those who were farther away from bondage would perhaps had different experiences from those still trapped/immersed in life on the plantation. See also Gomez, Exchange, pp. 22-23 for demographic breakdown.

[31]MS, Public Records of South Carolina, VII, pp. 24-27; Aptheker, American Negro, p. 175; Porter, "Negroes," p. 63.

[32] Woods, Black Majority, p. 299; Margaret Washington Creel, "A Peculiar People"; Slave Religion and Community-Culture Among the Gullahs (New York: NYU p, 1988) p. 114.

how African military culture remained in tact even across the Atlantic and throughout the American Diaspora.

The Stono rebellion in 1739 provides perhaps the best early evidence of how enslaved Africans in South Carolina continued to use the military skills they brought with them which whites had learned to fear. South Carolina planters had the same concerns as Jamaican plantation owners about the numerical imbalance of slaves to whites in their own province, and this made them feel vulnerable. Indeed, a man by the name of "Mercator" published a letter to the editor of the *South-Carolina Gazette* in 1737, two years before the Stono rebellion occurred, warning that "When it is considered that for the four years last past we have had imported 10,447 Negroes…I believe most People will agree with me….if some Method is not speedily taken to prevent this large importation of Negroes, it will…be of the most fatal consequences to this Province in many Respects to obvious to all thinking Men."[33]

Despite the admonishment, the Stono plot began with twenty African men, many of them Angolans, breaking into a store where they acquired ammunition. Historian John Thornton notes that these men would have been familiar with the use of arms as either slaves in South Carolina or Africans soldiers from the Kongo region that was plagued by continuous intercontinental wars for power and control of the slave trade.[34] With Jemmy as their leader, approximately fifty rebels set about killing everyone living within the houses they passed on their way to freedom. They killed men, women and children for nearly ten miles, in all over twenty whites, with the exception of one man, an innkeeper

[33] "Charleston March 26," South Carolina Gazette March 26 to April 2, 1737.
[34] Thornton, "African Dimensions," p. 1103.

who had shown kindness to his slaves.[35] Finally they stopped in a field where they began "dancing, Singing, and beating Drums to draw more Negroes to [join] them." Using the customs of African warfare to unite those willing and those fearful of reprisals to battle, these enslaved men demonstrated remarkable confidence in their ability to successfully reach their destination of St. Augustine, Florida.[36] It has been suggested that because the South Carolina region was suffering from a smallpox epidemic and a potential confrontation with Spain, whites appeared distracted enough for the conspirators to assess that freedom was obtainable; and they held onto these beliefs even after an equally large band of white militia suppressed their effort.[37] According to an account of the Stono rebellion passed down orally for nearly two centuries by the great-great-grandson of Cato: "Commander Cato speak for de crowd. He say: 'We don't lak slavery. We start to jine de Spanish in Florida. We surrender but we not whipped yet, and we' is not converted.' De other 43 say: 'Amen'….He die but he die for doin' de right, as he see it."[38]

Historian Peter Wood notes that roughly one third of the insurgent slaves remained at large after the initial confrontation on the field, and that it was fully one week later before the bulk of them were captured and punished. Many were "put to the most cruel Death." It took another three years before the authorities found and killed one of the ring-leaders. In all about sixty African slaves lost their lives in the aftermath, "some shot, some hang'd, and some Gibbeted alive."[39]

---

[35] Wood, Black Majority, pp. 314-316.
[36] Thornton, "African" p. 1102. Spain is offering freedom to all slaves that can reach Spanish territory.
[37] Wood, Black, pp. 313-314.
[38] George Cato, Federal Writers Project (SC) Unpublished Ex-Slave Narratives at South Caroliniana Library 36 Mss project #1655.
[39] Boston Weekly News-Letter, Nov. 8, 1739; Otd. In Wood, Black, p. 318.

This however did not quell the possibility of another insurrection; in 1740 between 150 and 200 slaves planned to escape bondage after they seized Charleston. Repeating the model of the Stono rebels, this group intended to take weapons from a local storehouse in order to supply everyone with arms. One slave, Peter, told of their plot, however, and through entrapment, fifty bonds people, ten each day, were hanged to deter the others from the crime of attempting to insurrect.[40] "So many Enemys to the Government" led the South Carolina legislature to put a duty on newly imported slaves in 1740 and to impose a hiatus on the importation of African slaves for three years.[41] Additionally, the legislature enacted stringent laws constraining gun use, black mobility, and the playing of drums with the hopes that this would protect white colonists from future African attempts at freedom.

As blacks continued to foment insurrections, so did the determination of white colonists to suppress them. In 1816, Governor Williams ordered Major-General Youngblood to use the militia under his command to "either capture or destroy the whole body" of Maroons living in the swamps near the Combahee and Ashepoo rivers whose "forces now became alarming, not less from its numbers than from its arms and ammunition with which it was supplied."[42]

What seems clear in all of these early insurrection attempts is that the enslaved were engaged in wars with white colonists for their own liberation. In each rebellion, slaves either claimed to be, or were attempting to engage in an armed struggle against those whites they believed were *their* enemies, as the progenitors of racialized chattel slavery, a distinct form of bondage that African people clearly rejected. Eventually, the

---

[40] Wood, Black, pp. 318-322.
[41] Porter, "Negroes," p. 67.
[42] Herbert Aptheker, American Negro Slave Revolts (New York: International, 1993) pp. 258-259.

one model of warfare that all slaves and slave owners looked to was the successful insurrection in Santo Domingo at the end of the eighteenth century.

There can be no question that the revolution in Santo Domingo was inspiring to enslaved populations throughout the African Diaspora and a horrific nightmare for white slave owners in not only South Carolina but also throughout the North American mainland. Beginning with Mackandal's failure, a Guinea African who attempted to unify the slaves in destroying the entire white population of Santo Domingo, and the high priest Boukman's near successful war with the whites of Le Cap, the mission of those enslaved was to achieve black liberation. Out of the 30,000 whites who lived in the colony in 1789, approximately 20,000 either lost their lives or escaped the island. Freedom did not come without cost, however, as over 166,000 out of 500,000 African slavesalso lost their lives in the struggle.[43]

Many French refugees fled to the mainland with their slaves and this made many South Carolinian colonists fearful of insurrections in their own communities. They expressed strong concerns about "Frenchmen" escaping from Santo Domingo who might "come to this country, who would fraternize with our Democratic Clubs, introduce the same horrid Trajedies among our Negroes, which have been so fatally exhibited in the French Islands." Plantation owner Ralph Izard feared that because of the importation of slaves from this region, "the foundation of more serious troubles has been laid in South

---

[43] C.L.R. James, The Black Jacobins: Toussaint L'Ouverture and the San Domingo Revolution (NY: Vintage, 1989) pp.22-23, 85-59, 241-242; See also: Laurent Dubois, A Colony of Citizens: Revolution and Slave Emancipation in the French Caribbean, 1787-1804 (Chapel Hill: UNC p, 2004). Dubois places people of color, slave and free, at the center of his narrative, and he argues that black people were responsible for creating and sustaining the new social order of freedom for all people, regardless of color or caste, that evolved out of this colonial war for Haitian independence.

Carolina."[44] For South Carolinian Mary Pinckney, the arrival of whites from Santo Domingo with their slaves was indeed unsettling and "has given us a great deal of concern—We dread the future, and are fearful that our feelings for the unfortunate inhabitants of the Wretched island of St. Domingo may be our own destruction."[45]

The seeming inevitability of slave rebellions, culled from nearly two centuries of Africans attempting to fight their way to freedom, plagued the minds of white colonists in South Carolina well into the nineteenth century. Certainly Denmark Vesey's insurrection attempt in 1822 only further affirmed two things: that despite the brutal exhibitions of power, whites still had trouble controlling their slaves, and that the possibility of future incidents of aggressive resistance would continue to hover over the anomalous institution of chattel slavery in the American south.

Denmark Vesey's War

The endurance of African military culture, black resistance, and white trepidations about a servile war is apparent in Denmark Vesey's insurrection attempt in 1822. As Michael Craton wrote so eloquently, "the pull of 'Mother Africa' remained strong even after the umbilical cord was cut," and this was most evident in the attempted insurrection of Vesey and his followers.[46] While the plot of Denmark Vesey's insurrection is well known, specific aspects of the trial transcript describe African ideas of warfare that are critical to our understanding of this military legacy. There is no way to ascertain whether

---

[44] Ralph Izard Papers 1742-1804 letter "Ralph Izard to Mathius Hutchinson" 20 Nov 1794.
[45] Manigault Family Papers 1750-1900 Folder 20, letter "Mary Pinckney to Mrs. Manigault" 5 Feb 1798.
[46] Craton " Proto-Peasant," p. 100. One of the ways African cultural mores may have remained relevant to American slaves is the continuation of the African slave trade up through the Civil War.

all of the facts left as record of the event are true,[47] as the courtroom was closed to outside spectators which the prosecuting attorneys Lionel H. Kennedy and Thomas Parker argued had precedence in the insurrection trials in Antigua in 1736 and the "Negro plot" of 1741 in New York.[48] Yet, the countless references by witnesses who testified to Vesey's intention to build large armies and to acquire weaponry for the soldiers of these armies suggests that this evidence should be given a second look for what it reveals about how blacks synthesized traditional African practices of warfare. Moreover, despite rhetoric to the contrary, Europeans and Africans remained well aware of and believed in the concept of "nits make lice" as a tactic of war.[49]

Not unlike their West Indian predecessors, black South Carolinians worked at developing an army that replicated the forces in Santo Domingo. Monday Gell confessed that he was "shown paper about the battle that Boyer had in San Domingue"[50] and Rolla was told by Vesey that "we must unite together as the Santo Domingo people did."[51] Jack

---

[47] My analysis does not rely on any of the contested evidence that Michael P. Johnson interrogates in his article, "Denmark Vesey and His Co-Conspirators." But, because no African American that I know of contested the trial or accusations waged against Vesey in the antebellum era, I am convinced that people like David Walker, Reverend Morris Brown, Richard Allen, T. Hamilton, and Robert Vesey, Denmark Vesey's son, who eventually rebuilt Charleston's African Methodist Episcopal Church in 1865, would have spoken out against the murder of dozens of black people for absolutely no reason what so ever: which would have been the case if one believes that Vesey's insurrection plot was fabricated. Especially since these black men either lived in South Carolina around or during the time of the incident, they would have, at some point, spoken out. Indeed, what one observes instead is the black community's continuous reverence for what Vesey attempted to do throughout the antebellum era. Moreover, the black community writ large would have had nothing to gain by pretending that an insurrection was planned when one was not, but they would have gained much antislavery sympathy *against* southern white slave holders who slaughtered or sent into exile 131 innocent blacks.

[48] Lionel H. Kennedy, and Thomas Parker, An Official Report of the Trials of Sundry Negroes Charged with an Attempt to Raise an Insurrection in the State of South Carolina. (Charleston, 1822) reprinted as The Trial Record of Denmark Vesey, edited by John Killens (Boston: Beacon Press, 1970) p. 4.

[49] See Michael Craton's work, Testing the Chains and Edward Pearson's introduction to, Designs Against Charleston: The Trial Record of the Denmark Vesey Slave Conspiracy of 1822 (Chapel Hill: UNC p, 1999) on the continuity of African cultural mores and the influence of Haiti in Denmark Vesey's insurrection plan.

[50] Trial Record, p. 68. Jean Pierre Boyer, a free mulatto who had fought with Toussaint L'ouverture in the early years, was the president of Haiti from 1818 to 1843.

[51] Trial Record, p. 46.

Purcell said Vesey was constantly reading to him newspaper articles on Santo Domingo,[52] and that Vesey sent letters to President Boyer asking for his assistance which were delivered to a steward on a ship whose brother was a general in Haiti.[53] The South Carolina insurgents used the revolution in Haiti as a model to outline how they needed to organize, and continuous references to Santo Domingo as the touchstone for what was to follow made it infinitely easier for Vesey and his leaders to articulate how a successful war would be waged.

Of particular interest is the idea of Africa as a liberator. Much like the Native American populations in the Southeast who turned inward as they began to see how destructive the slave trade was to their communities, black South Carolinians looked to their native land for assistance in freeing themselves. Bacchus, the slave of Benjamin Hammet, along with Charles Drayton consulted with an African named "old daddy" who was "marked on both sides of his face" about their plans to bring the "Country Negroes" down and that "he must be in readiness" to "receive them" at the onset of the revolt.[54] Vesey asked to see an elderly Guinea slave named Peter who agreed to join their effort.[55] Although there is no way to know what transpired, the fact that these consultations were mentioned suggests that "old daddy" and Peter may have retained essential experiences and war time strategies from Africa that Vesey valued.

Vesey and his followers attempted to encourage participation by stating that the countries of Santo Domingo and Africa were intimately involved in their struggle against

---

[52] Trial Record, p. 88.
[53] Trial Record, p. 117.
[54] "Confession of Bacchus Hammet, the Slave of Mr. Hammet (ca. 12 July)" in Pearson, Design, Appendix, p. 328; In Trial Record, authors either observed or thought to add for effect that "old daddy" had marks on his face signifying him as having been part of the warrior class. p. 110.
[55] Trial Record, p. 117. Pearson, Design, pp. 238-239.

enslavement. Rolla told a witness that "a large army from Santo Domingo and Africa were coming to help us."[56] Another rebel warrior believed that once they "raised an army" and began the insurrection, soldiers from Africa and Santo Domingo "would come over and cut up the white people."[57] These examples suggest that the perception of kinship between Africans sold into slavery and Africans who facilitated the purveyance of slaves to the Americas remained. More deeply, perhaps these affirmations of solidarity indicate a psychic need for Africa, as a symbol of possibilities. Whereby Africa, as a body of nations, would metamorphosize and no longer support the expatriation and enslavement of its own people.

Other slaves had the more pragmatic view that the war they talked about "against the whites" was to be waged by them alone.[58] Thus, they would need to be "making arms for the black people" so that they could achieve their goal of "slaying the whites."[59] Some of the weaponry was to come from "some Frenchmen, blacks very skillful in making swords and spears, such as they used in Africa."[60] Another witness said that a slave by the name of Tom Russell who was a blacksmith "was making arms for the black people."[61] Smart Anderson testified that he observed that "spear's were brought into Monday's shop,"[62] and Peirault, one of Vesey's main recruiters, admitted that he, a slave named Dean, and Vesey "met purposely to make a collection of spears," weapons used by African soldiers in the past.[63] The organizers planned to obtain guns for their entire

---

[56] Trial Record, p. 43.
[57] Trial Record, pp. 42, 45.
[58] Trial Record, pp. 45, 47.
[59] Trial Record, p. 41.
[60] Trial Record, p. 95.
[61] Trial Record, p. 79.
[62] Trial Record, p. 82.
[63] Trial Record, p. 120.

army once the insurrection began by seizing "the Powder Magazine and the Arsenal on the Neck."[64]

It was said that Vesey and his team of leaders had been working for four years to organize massive numbers of men.[65] Denmark Vesey, Governor Bennett's slaves Rolla and Ned, Jack (Purcell), Peter (Poyas), Gullah Jack (Pritchard) and Monday (Gell) kept lists of all who agreed to join the effort. They recruited from as far away as Columbia and as close to Charleston as Goose Creek and Dorchester, where purportedly 6,600 slaves signed on to insurrect against their masters, and where they divided their "regular army" across ethnic and regional lines. Monday Gell, an Igbo was in charge of the "The Ebo Company."[66] Then there was "the Gullah Company" led by Jack Pritchard.[67] "The French Band," was composed of slaves who spoke French and who "had been ready a long time,"[68] and finally the "countryborn" or American-born (versus "salt-water" or African born) slaves who were not trusted by many members.[69] Joe, the slave of Mr. Jore, stated that he "did not know how to trust countryborns."[70] While Jack Pritchard boasted that he had no trouble with the countryborn joining because they all believed "he was a doctor" and were perhaps therefore afraid of his using magic "charms" of conjure on them. Jack, leader of the Gullah company, was "their general" in the war, and as part of his leadership strategy he gave all his men charms of crab claws to put in their mouths and

---

[64] Trial Record, p. 44.
[65] Trial Record, p. 53.
[66] Trial Record, p. 66.
[67] Trial Record, p. 78.
[68] Trial Record, pp. 66, 83.
[69] Trial Record, p. 76.
[70] Trial Record, p. 84.

"parched corn and ground nuts" to eat prior to battle so that they would not "then be wounded."[71]

During the recruitment process, men took oaths much like the one used by African slaves in Antigua and St. Croix. All members were required to swear oaths of secrecy by standing and raising their right hand. Vesey, a salt-water African, asserted this was necessary so that they would "not tell if we are found out, and if they kill us we will not tell on anyone."[72] Gullah Jack had his men eat a halfway roasted fowl "as evidence of union."[73] These oaths were to demonstrate serious commitment, and as the authors of the *Trial Record* noted, "not one of the leaders betrayed their associates; the companies of Vesey, Peter, Ned, Rolla, and Gullah Jack have escaped detection and punishment; with the exception of a few of Gullah Jack's band, who were discovered in consequence of one of his men, betraying those companions he knew, together with his leader."[74] Yet, the court grudgingly observed that Jack was to them a "savage who indeed had been caught but not tamed."[75]

The importance of secrecy had a long history in West African communities, especially among the Igbo in the Bight of Biafra region, the Ashanti/ Fante of the Gold Coast, the Yoruba and Dahomean of the Bight of Benin, and the mandatory participation in the (male) Poro and (female) Sande societies in the Sierre Leone and Liberia regions. The function of Secret Societies in Africa as political and social organizations, and importantly, as arbiters of justice, assisted the collective organizing of African slaves in South Carolina; and the amazing resilience of those leaders implicated in Vesey's

---

[71] Trial Record pp. 76-77, 85.
[72] Trial Record, p. 110.
[73] Trial Record, p. 120.
[74] Trial Record, p. 17.
[75] Trial Record, pp. 31-32.

insurrection attempt exemplifies how powerful cultural continuity can be despite the oppressiveness of bondage. As Gomez points out "some order and sense had to be fashioned out of New World disorder. To achieve this, the African antecedent was drawn upon, and in the process the African-based community began to see itself in heretofore unimagined ways."[76] Secrecy was the cornerstone of all insurrectionary attempts, and the continuation of military rituals practiced in Africa and the New World were reflected in the valuations given to honor and death.

Although Monday Gell testified in his confession that he was opposed to the idea, he avowed that everyone else was on board with Vesey's plan "in the murder of all."[77] Their mission would have been familiar to those who knew what happened to Native Americans in, for example, the Pequot War: to "set the town on fire in different places and as the whites come out we will slay them."[78] It has been argued that Vesey found the ideas for his plan in the Old Testament and the record indicates that passages from the Bible were used frequently in the meetings of the leaders to affirm that slavery was a sinful and immoral institution.[79] In Vesey's view, fighting for their freedom as outlined by the Israelites was part of God's plan for black people, and Rolla recounted that this meant, "that all should be cut off, both men, women, and children."[80] Although some members confessed resistance at "killing ministers, women, and children," Vesey argued that "it was not safe to keep one alive, but to destroy them totally…the Lord has

---

[76] Herkowitz, The Myth, p. 82; Washington, Peculiar, pp.2, 46, 51, 59, 181; Gomez, Exchanging, pp. 94-102, 167. Gomez states that the continuity of the secret societies is found in the attraction of blacks to European Masonry and religious organizations: the latter clearly functioning outside of the structure of secrecy.
[77] Trial Record, p. 71.
[78] Trial Record, p. 52.
[79] Trial Record, pp. 45, 85, 96.
[80] Trial Record, p. 46.

commanded it."[81] This evidence of Vesey's intent was repeated in another confessant's testimony that was given to the same "Reverend Hall." Much like the English had done for centuries, Vesey seemed to use the idea that God commanded extermination as articulated in the scripture of Joshua to justify his actions.[82] Or, perhaps Vesey used Joshua and the Old Testament text to confound white theological interpretations, turning the tables on the spiritual hierarchy (and certainly who might be classified as heathen) established by the planter class. Perhaps as the "new Israelites," Vesey and his followers were waging war against a people he believed were outside of God's covenant—challenging the notion that white slaveholders were Christians.[83]

Moreover, Vesey's affirmation that it was not enough to just kill white men because "what was the use of killing the louse and leaving the nit" flayed slave owners with their own rationale for killing children in Ireland and indigenous children in America.[84] This rhetoric signifies a certain awareness of and attention to European methods of warfare that white South Carolinians no doubt would have preferred to remain invisible. In short, Vesey boldly determined that "if you kill the lice you must kill the nits" because in his view whites were the ones who were barbarians, who kept black people enslaved against their will.[85] Yet, the killing of women and children was also part

---

[81] Trial Record, pp. 46, 58.
[82] Joshua 6:20
[83] S[tephen] elliot to William Elliot (Beaufort), 22 July 1822 in Appendix 3, Edward A. Pearson, Designs against Charleston (Chapel Hill: UNC p, 1999) p. 334.
[84] Trial Record, p. 90."Testimony of Smart"
[85] Pearson, Designs, "Confession of John,"Appendix 3, p. 337. There is a history of African slaves rejecting the Christianity of their white masters, and the leaders of Vesey's insurrection attempt who traveled around the country preaching the "pure and unsophisticated doctrines of the Gospel which they said whites only garbled to suit their own purposes," apparently did also. Albert J. Raboteau has already canonically documented these ideas with many examples of the underlying sentiment. See: Albert J. Raboteau, Slave Religion: The "Invisible Institution" in the Antebellum South (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2004) ch. 6. Margaret Washington argues that outside of Charleston, slaves in the rural areas learned what they knew about Christianity from other blacks and therefore these sentiments may be consistent with those of other slaves across space and time. Washington Creel, Peculiar, p. 147.

of African traditions of war evidenced during the Atlantic slave trade. And so, although Vesey may have been using European terminology to convince countryborn and salt-water slaves of the wisdom of his methods, his plan was consistent with the type of total warfare practiced in both Africa and America.

Certainly Vesey's usage of Old Testament scripture would have proved a valuable tool in winning the support of the over 1,848 black members of the Charleston African Methodist Episcopal Church.[86] Church leaders like Vesey, Peter, Ned Bennett, and Charles Shubrick would have used church gatherings as an opportunity to instruct other members about the revolutionary ideas contained within the scripture and the fundamentals of warfare.[87] Indeed, according to T. Hamilton, a black American living in Charleston at the time he calls "The Reign of Terror," Vesey and Peter Poyas were successful because they were revered by the black community as religious martyrs for their "patriotic bravery" in leading the "determined revolutionary spirit of the slaves." Hamilton states that the insurrection was instigated by the enactment of repressive legislation that restricted the rights of free people of color and the criminalization of future manumissions of slaves, closing an important avenue for freedom and black prosperity.[88]

Vesey and his followers may have rationalized his war against enslavement as part of God's commandments, but at the core of his strategy was the certain knowledge

---

[86] H. Shelton Smith, In His Image…Racism in Southern Religion, 1780-1910. (Durham: Duke UP, 1972) p. 54. This is membership reported in May, 1818.
[87] Trial Record, p. 53.
[88] T. Hamilton, The Late Contemplated Insurrection in Charleston, S. C. with the Execution of 36 of the Patriots: Death of William Irving, The Provoked Husband: and Joe Devaul, For Reusing to be the slave of Mr. Roach: with the Capture of the American Slaver Trading Between The Seat of Govt. and New Orleans: together with an account of the Capture of the Spanish Schooner Amistad (Jan. 1850) pp. 3, 5, 8-9. See: Acts Relating to the Slaves, (1820) p. 459 Which states, "That no slave shall hereafter be emancipated but by act of Legislature."

that if they proceeded in implementing their plans and were unsuccessful, retaliation would be severe, that "we should all have been destroyed."[89] They knew that success would only occur if they were able to escape from South Carolina and the American continent, which was the final stage of their plan.

For sure, concerns over retribution would have been pervasive. Although a convicted slave by the name of John was instructed by Monday Gell that "the *Northern Brothers* would assist them" in their insurrection, Gell also told them that "if they failed 'twould be no disgrace."[90] Amherst Lining, a slave acquitted of all charges against him, stated that although he was not involved in the insurrection attempt he was concerned that "in the confusion, he would be in danger of losing his life whether he was engaged in it or not."[91] Another witness expressed concerns over retribution, which focused on the responses of "the whites in the back country, Virginia, [who] when they hear the news will turn to and kill you all."[92] William, a slave belonging to John Paul, made a concerted effort to protect the women out of fear that the justices were considering whether women should be charged as he begged, "you won't take up Sarah, for no woman knows anything about it."[93] Thomas Wentworth Higginson, with an eye towards this possibility, concluded in his analysis of the event that in the Vesey conspiracy "they took no women into counsel,—not from any distrust apparently, but in order that their children might not

---

[89] Trial Record, p. 58.
[90] Pearson, Design, Appendix 3, p. 337. Henry Ravenel Papers, SCHS
[91] Trial Record, p. 54.
[92] Trial Record, p. 50.
[93] Trial Record, p. 86. The Court justices were aware that at least three black women, if not all of the women, knew about the rebellion and did not try to stop it. A slave by the name of Edwin stated that "I have heard everybody, even the women say, …that they wondered why Denmark and Monday Gell were not taken up." Sally testified against a slave named Jesse that he had told her that "all the white people would be killed." Another slave by the name of Prudence said that she was "told a fort night ago about the plan." Then one of "Colonel Cross' wenches said Morris Brown knew all about it. Trial Record, pp. 65, 56, 80, 95.

be left uncared-for in case of defeat and destruction."[94] Yet, we know that in the Dahomian and Igbo nations, women did serve in the military, engage in warfare, and were also taken as captives of war.[95]

Thus, the threat of a large-scale violent confrontation between blacks and whites was a real consideration. Hence, the dark prediction that Virginia whites would come and "kill you all," and their subsequent careful protection of black women and children, evidences an awareness of that reality. The fact that enslaved and free blacks attempted to rebel anyway only affirms their determination to be free, and that slaves and whites were locked in a never-ending contest of wills that ultimately made them fearful of each other.

Indeed, the white community was traumatized by the fact that some witnesses testified, probably in exaggeration, that an army of nine thousand was ready to commence warring against the whites of South Carolina on Sunday, July 16, 1822.[96] The subsequent trial lasted for five and one-half weeks, long enough for South Carolina officials to charge one hundred and thirty-one blacks. One white child described the executions as "a sight to strike terror in the heart of every slave."[97] This youth's observations were not off the mark, as Justice William Johnson wrote to Thomas Jefferson in his disdain for the courts proceedings, "you know the best way in the world to make them tractable is to frighten them to death."[98] Yet, all references to the affair within the white community were silenced out of fear that "something further of the same nature" might come to pass. No day of prayer, no day of public thanksgiving was deemed

---

[94] Thomas Wentworth Higginson, Black Rebellion p. 244.
[95] Rodney, How Europe, p. 121. Bay, Wives of the Leopard, p. 121, Equano, The Life, p. 18-19. As Deborah Gray White has pointed out, slave women did assist on board slave ship insurrections, so it is plausible that they might have been involved in insurrectionary efforts that occurred on land as well. See: Deborah Gray White, Aren't I a Woman pp. 63-64.
[96] Aptheker, American Slave Revolt, p. 272.
[97] Washington, Peculiar, p. 163.
[98] Pearson, Designs, p. 351.

appropriate despite the Reverend Richard Furman's assertions that "Divine Interposition has been conspicuous; and our obligations to be thankful are unspeakably great."[99] Anna Johnson believed "our own God has saved us from horrors equal if not superior to the scenes acted in St. Domingo." Indeed, she claimed, "there is a look of horror on every countenance." [100] Mary L. Beach wrote that she "heard it remarked by several that all confidence in them [the enslaved] now is forever at an end!"[101]

Yet at the same time, many South Carolinians recognized in private that Vesey's plot was "a good plot—an excellent plot."[102] They said that his "plan denoted a fine military tact and admirable combination," and that the leaders "met their fate with the heroic fortitude of Martyrs."[103] While others said that Vesey and his men "were *true* warriors—Not a single Woman knew a word of their plan."[104] Indeed, the owner of several of the insurgents and the governor of South Carolina, Thomas Bennett, defined Vesey's insurrection attempt in the lexicon of American Revolutionary action in remarks to John C. Calhoun: "It ought to excite no astonishment with those who boast of freedom themselves, if they should occasionally hear of plots and desertions among those who are held in perpetual bondage. Human beings, who once breathed the air of freedom on their own mountains and in their own valleys, but who have been kidnapped by white men and dragged into endless slavery, cannot be expected to be contented with their situation.

---

[99] Richard Furman, Rev. Dr.Richard Furman's Exposition of the Views of the Baptists, Relative to the Coloured Population of the United States, in A Communication To the Governor of South-Carolina (Charleston: A.E. Miller, 1823) p. 4.
[100] Pearson, Designs, p. 332.
[101] Pearson, Designs, "Mary L. Beach to Elizabeth L. Gilchrist (Germantown, Pennsylvania), 5 July 1822" Appendix 3, p. 324.
[102] Pearson, Designs, "Anna Johnson (Charleston) to Elizabeth Haywood (Charleston) 18 July 1822" p. 333.
[103] Pearson, Designs, "Martha Proctor Richardson (Savannah) to Dr. James Screven (Liverpool), 6 July 1822" Appendix 3, p. 325.
[104] Pearson, Designs, "Martha Proctor Richardson (Savannah) to Dr. James Screven (Liverpool), 7 August 1822" Appendix 3, p. 341; Arnold-Screven Papers, SHC. (emphasis added)

White men, too, would engender plots and escape from their imprisonment were they situated as are these miserable children of Africa."[105]

Edwin Holland noted that there had been a pattern. The attempted insurrection in 1816 in Camden, South Carolina was motivated by just such "wild and frantic ideas of the rights of man, and the *misconceived injunctions and examples of Holy writ."* [106] Yet, clearly Holland believed that Vesey's organization was different: it represented a political movement, a radical challenge to established authority, a racialized opposition to the existing order. He revealed that the recent insurrection attempt was more than just rowdy heathens trying to start trouble: "Let it never be forgotten," that "our Negroes are truly the *Jacobins* of the country; that they are the *anarchists* and the *domestic enemy;* the *common enemy of civilized society*, and the barbarians who would, IF THEY COULD, become the DESTROYERS *of our race."*[107]

Still, Holland clung to the idea that if a war did commence black people would lose, evidencing that both blacks and whites had similar ideas—which created a volatile atmosphere in the south that was no doubt thick with fear:

> The struggle, it is true, might be a bloody and awful one; but it would be limited to a very short period. A few hours would decide the conflict and the *utter extermination* of the black race would be the inevitable consequence. In such an event, it would be difficult to discriminate. The innocent, as well as the guilty; would alike fall a sacrifice to the vengeance of violate humanity.[108]

Perhaps Holland felt confident about his threats against rebellious blacks because he was familiar with the federally sanctioned action against Native Americans that had recently been played out in the Battle of Horse Shoe Bend, commonly called the Red Sticks

---

[105] Pearson, Designs, "Thomas Bennett to John Calhoun, 30 July 1822" Appendix 3, p. 340. Papers of John C. Calhoun, 7:227.
[106] Edwin C. Holland, A Refutation of the Calumnies Circulated Against the Southern and Western States, Respecting the Institution and Existence of Slavery Among Them (Charleston: A. E. Miller, 1822) p. 76.
[107] Holland, A Refutation, p. 86.
[108] Holland, A Refutation, pp. 65-66.

massacre, led by Andrew Jackson in 1814. This was a nationally celebrated event where nine hundred Creek Indians were killed, the largest death toll of any Anglo-Indian war.[109] Or, perhaps Holland was really speaking to an audience of whites who viewed Vesey's actions as a warning that one day God would "raise up a Toussaint, or a Spartacus, or an African Tecumseh to demand by what authority we hold them in subjection;" to let them know, from the South's perspective, how disastrous that would be.[110]

Despite these warnings, white fear of the African slaves in their midst remained as indelible in 1822 as it had been in the colonial era. Slaves were now executed for things that they had previously only been whipped for.[111] There were calls for strengthening and the further development of the military in South Carolina, and a special guard of 150 men was established to protect Charleston. Robert J. Turnbull went ahead and organized a voluntary militia outside the purview of government regulation in 1823 for the protection of that city as well.[112] The South Carolina legislature required that any free black sailors, cooks, or stewards employed on board ships be kept in jail until the ships departure; male slaves were no longer able to hire out their time; free black males over the age of fifteen had to have a guardian; free blacks not living in the state for more than five years had to pay fifty dollars per year in order to remain in South Carolina; and no slave could be brought in from the West Indies, Mexico, South America, or north of Washington D.C.[113]

Harkening back to earlier Euro-American accomplishments in war, the members of the Charleston court told ten convicted conspirators that the "plot so wild and

---

[109] Adam Rothman, Slave Country: American Expansion and the Origins of the Deep South (Cambridge: Harvard Up, 2005) p. 135.
[110] Whitemarsh B. Seabrook, A concise view of the critical situation and future prospects of the slave-holding states ((1825) p. 4.
[111] Washington, Peculiar, p. 165.
[112] Aptheker, Slave Revolt, pp. 274-275, ftn. 31; John Hope Franklin, The Militant South 1800-1861 (Urbana: University of Illinois p, 2002) p. 77.
[113] "Acts Relating to the Slaves, (1822)" pp. 461, 462, 464.

diabolical…. would have probably resulted in the destruction and extermination of *your race."*[114] The past was not dead. Slavery was just, and the racialized privilege of redemptive warfare belonged to white Americans who would respond to the "great law of nature" which was "self preservation."[115] For whites knew that blacks understood total warfare from every perspective: how it was used against Native Americans to take away their land, how it was used by European Americans to sustain their power, how Old Testament Israelites used it to ensure that their nation would remain free, and how Africans used it, first to enslave their own people, and then as a strategy for liberation in America.

Africans brought across the Atlantic strategies of warfare that were used in procuring slaves for sale, which the enslaved then used in their efforts to free themselves. British colonists, having fashioned their own templates of war, were determined to thwart any insurrectionary attempts with a callous ruthlessness intended to make the enslaved dread white retaliation. Yet Europeans knew from experience that many Africans carried their African military heritage unambiguously across the Atlantic Diaspora. Thus, the institution of enslavement was always pregnant with the possibilities of an internecine war. Although Vesey's rebellion, and all the other insurrections mentioned above (with the exception of the Haitian Revolution) were not successful, they do reveal what both sides believed was at stake, what they believed was required in effectively fighting for or in the obstruction of black freedom. The potential of total warfare would continue to be

---

[114] Court members were William Drayton, Nathaniel Heyward, J. R. Pringle, Jas. Legare, Robert J. Turnbull, Henry Deas, and of course Thomas Parker and Lionel H. Kennedy the authorized authors of the *Report*. Trial Record, pp. 11, 138.

[115] Edwin C. Holland, A Refutation of the Calumnies circulated Against the Southern and Western States, Respecting the Institution and Existence of Slavery Among Them (Charleston: A.E. Miller, 1822) p. 62

part of the slave owning/slave resisting lexicon well into the antebellum era. Never did it waver in its intended ferocity and prophesy of doom for the slave, or in its appeal as a strategy of liberation amongst blacks. That is until 1831, when in response to the aftermath of Nat Turner's insurrection in Virginia, a fundamental transformation occurred.

CHAPTER FOUR

"THE ABRIDGMENT OF HOPE" AFTER NAT TURNER

Although, traditionally, Nat Turner's insurrection in 1831 has been viewed as a momentous event for white Virginians, it was equally traumatic and certainly more transformative for the black community in the slave holding South. Laws set in place to curtail servile insurrections did not stop the enslaved from continuing to attempt to free themselves. And Nat Turner's rebellion, in his attempt to do what insurrectionists had done elsewhere, was such a moment. In response whites living in the South, which had become much more militarized than in the colonial era, allowed unchecked retaliation to ensue. The vigilante violence experienced by the black community enslaved and free, was meant to send a message to those living in the North and the South. This was that any future attempts to dismantle a system of labor that white southerners had grown to depend on, would be suppressed with an overwhelming use of force. Indeed, the large numbers of volunteers, militia men, artillery companies, assistance from neighboring

states and troops provided by the federal government, as well as the two warships ready to engage at a moments notice, signified that Virginia was ready for all out war.[1]

This chapter looks at Nat Turner's insurrection for what it signified to black people, as individuals and as a community, and how they remembered the escalation in racialized violence that ensued after Turner's revolt. It argues that the subsequent show of military force used by whites proves that ideas of total warfare were not ideological abstractions. That indeed this was the moment that whites always feared, and they did what they warned they would do in response. The heightened threats of racial extermination and interminable retaliation after Turner's war against slavery drastically affected the black community's outlook of procuring freedom through violence. The enslaved had experienced brutal and torturous reprisals before, but the retribution had never been this broad and widespread. Moreover, Turner's insurrection made plain how a war between the races would play out for both sides; not only for innocent African American men, women, and children, enslaved and free, but also for whites in the South and the North.

General Nat Turner[2]

About 70 miles from Richmond, a man by the name of Nat Turner attended a barbeque where he arranged with six other men, Henry Porter, Hark (or Hercules) Travis, Sam and Will Francis, Nelson Williams, and Jack Reese to take back what they knew

---

[1] John Hope Franklin, The Militant South 1800-1861 (Urbana: Un. of Illinois p, 2002) p. 78; The American Beacon announced on August 30, 1831, "The war is over." See: Henry Irving Tragle, The Southampton Slave Revolt of 1831: A Compilation of Source Material (Amherst: Univerisity of Massachusetts p, 1971) p. 55.

[2] Newspapers editors asserted that Nat Turner was known as a "General" or "Captain." See Richmond Enquirer, August 30, 1831.

belonged to them in the first place, their freedom. And, on August 21, 1831, these seven men put into action what they had been planning for months, and what Nat Turner had been dreaming about for years. In the beginning, all went according to plan. Between sixty to eighty blacks joined Nat's army as it passed from one house to the next, beginning in the Cross Keys region of Southampton, Virginia. They gathered ammunition, guns, and money as they went along. At each house they enlarged the army of slaves, who now masterless, but not leaderless, readily followed orders to divide themselves into groups so that they could achieve quickly their goal of "killing all the white people."[3] They managed to remain united for over 48 hours, killing 61 whites.[4]

Nat Turner's insurrection caused a frenzy of excitement among the citizens of Virginia. Every white person, male and female, was concerned with where Nat's army planned to strike next. They wanted to know whether Nat had communicated with other slave and free communities outside of Southampton, and how many insurgents (as they called them) there actually were.[5] Ex-slave Ella Williams, who lived in St. Petersburg, Virginia, reported that her mistress "come drivin' up in de carriage jus' screamin' to beat de ban'. "De niggers is riz," she yelled. "De niggers is resurrected, an' dey's killen all de white folks. "Marsa Charlie come runnin' out wid his gun an' he say, "where is dey?" Den she say, "Down in Southampton County." An he say, "Aw I thought dey was in dis

---

[3] Henry Irving Tragle, The Southampton Slave Revolt of 1831: A Compilation of Source Material (Amherst: Un. of Massachusetts P, 1971) pp. 189, 196, 204, 214.
[4] Thomas Wentworth Higginson, Travellers and Outlaws: Episodes in American History (Boston: Lee and Shepard, 1889) 282-288; Herbert Aptheker, Nat Turner's Rebellion (New York: Humanities, 1966) pp. 44-50. The number of whites killed varies from 57 to 61, 61 was the number used by Governor John Floyd.
[5] The Richmond Enquirer August 30, 1831, September 30, 1831.

county," and he took his gun back in de house cause Southampton County musta been hundreds miles fum us."[6]

There were rumors that large numbers of slaves were planning to participate in Turner's rebellion. Some reports stated that there might be as many as one hundred to one hundred and fifty slaves riding on horseback, while other reports speculated that the number was eight hundred, with two to three white men as leaders. The United States troops and the militia from Norfolk, Nansemond, and Princess Anne Counties were all told to search the entire Dismal Swamp region. It was believed that between two to three thousand fugitive slaves were there amongst the colonies of maroons who were accustomed to waging the kind of guerilla warfare that Nat intended and who were organizing in preparation to join him in his revolution.[7]

North Carolina, whose border was less than 15 miles from The Cross Keys, was particularly concerned that the "banditti" were heading for their state to join those enslaved already organized to insurrect.[8] Soon, a story circulated throughout the nation that two thousand slaves had killed all of the white residents and overtaken Raleigh.[9] This did not happen, but there was supposedly an insurrection plot that included the counties of Duplin, Sampson, Wayne, New Hanover and Lenoir. The twenty-four men who were in the process of organizing it were discovered only because a free black man told the

---

[6] Ella Williams, Weevils in the Wheat: Interviews with Virginia Ex-Slaves eds. Charles L. Perdue, Jr., Thomas E. Barden, Robert K. Phillips. (Charlottesville: Un. of Virginia P, 1976) pp. 313-314.
[7] The Richmond Enquirer August 30, 1831; Higginson, Travellers and Outlaws, pp. 294-296.
[8] The Richmond Enquirer August 30, 1831.
[9] See page 167 of this chapter for details about the Rhode Island race riot that was started because of this rumor.

authorities of their plan. In South Carolina and Georgia, similar types of rumors generated similar hysterical responses.[10]

The Root and Consequences of Servile War

Nat Turner's organized insurrection in 1831 had huge ramifications for enslaved and free African Americans. His war against the institution of slavery was much like other insurrectionary attempts in that the simple objective was freedom from enslavement. Yet, no other servile insurrection on American soil generated as much fear and retaliatory violence as did Turner's. The reason, simply put, was that he successfully implemented his battle plan against slave owners, enacting total warfare against a significant number of men and their families, half of whom were women and children, challenging white manhood at its core. Yet, the numbers of black people that lost their lives due to the white rage that ensued—the men, women, and children who were also killed—curiously remain unknown.

The Nat Turner insurrection was, much as it was for Denmark Vesey and those waging insurrections in the West Indies, motivated by visions of liberation. Turner waged his war against what he believed was an ungodly institution, against those who believed in the rightness of his oppression. As Turner purportedly confessed, he knew "by the signs in the heavens…I should arise and prepare myself and slay my enemies with their own weapons."[11] The abuse and suffering that marked chattel bondage enabled those who were enslaved to believe that they were right to attempt to fight for their freedom.

---

[10] The Richmond Enquirer September 4, 1831; See Herbert Aptheker, American Negro Slave Revolts, pp. 309-312 for evidence of white paranoia in Georgia, Tennessee, Alabama, and South Carolina after Turner's insurrection.
[11] Tragle, "Confessions," Southampton Slave Revolt, p. 310.

Speaking perhaps a universal perspective of those enslaved throughout the south, J. H. Banks argued that if a slaveholder "takes my liberty, he endangers his own. This is the law of consequences ordained by God, and firmly incorporated into his moral system."[12]

And since slavery, as ex-slave William Thompson put it, was "cousin to hell," the boundaries protecting women and children, much like it was in Denmark Vesey's insurrection, were intentionally erased as a strategy of war.[13] The nephew of Hark Travis related that Nat believed he had received a message from God, telling "him to start the fust war with forty men." To Turner this meant that none of the enemy, even children, should remain alive:

> When he got to his mistress' house he commence to grab him missus' baby and he took hit up, slung hit back and fo'h three times. Said hit was so hard fer him to kill dis baby 'cause hit had bin so playful setting on his knee and dat chile sho did love him. So third sling he went quick 'bout hit—killing [the] baby at dis rap.[14]

For Turner and his men, slaying all the whites in their path regardless of age or gender was a tactic of war that would serve a particular objective. According to the *Richmond Enquirer*, when Turner was examined by the magistrates after his capture, "He said that

---

[12] J. W. C. Pennington, A Narrative of Events of the Life of J. H. Banks, an Escaped Slave, from the Cotton State, Alabama, in America. (Liverpool: M. Rourke, 1861) Electronic Edition. Documenting the American South: http://doc.south.unc.edu, p. 18.

[13] Benjamin Drew, A North-side View of Slavery. The Refugee: of the Narratives of Fugitive Slaves in Canada. Related By Themselves with An Account of the History and Condition of the Colored Population of Upper Canada. (New York: Negro Up, 1968) p. 136.

[14] Allen Crawford, Weevils in the Wheat ed. Charles Perdue et. al., pp. 75-76. Crawford's account is interesting not only for its reference to slinging babies as a way of killing them, but also because the Confessions narrative written after Nat Turner's capture is silent on who or how the baby was killed. It in fact states that Nat Turner forgot that the infant was even there but then sent back Henry and Will and they "killed it." The story told by Turner even at first glance seems rather implausible as he stated that they had "gone some distance" before he ordered them to return at the onset of their very dangerous mission to begin an insurrection. William Drewry's account, The Southampton Insurrection, however, states that after Nat left, he remembered that "nits make lice. Nat sent Henry [Travis] and Will [Reeves] back to take it by its heels and dash its brains out against the bricks of the fireplace." Whether Nat Turner or Henry Porter and Will Francis did the deed, it seems that all three accounts are consistent that the baby was murdered. It is interesting that even in 1900 the phrase "nits makes lice" is still used by Drewry; and in 1937 the idea of swinging a baby's head against the wall is still remembered by ex-slaves as a form of execution. See Chapter One of this dissertation "Nits Makes Lice." See William Sidney Drewry, The Southampton Insurrection, (1900; Murfreesboro: Johnson, 1968) p. 36.

indiscriminate massacre was not their intention after they obtained foothold, and was resorted to in the first instance to strike terror and alarm. Women and children would afterwards have been spared, and men too who ceased to resist."[15]

Turner was not the only one with designs to free those enslaved. Not that Turner's leadership was in doubt; as the former Virginian slave James L. Smith identified Nat Turner as the "captain" in a war "to free his race." Yet, he distinguished Turner as "*one* of the slaves who had quite a large army," indicating that perhaps there were others who shared Turner's aspirations.[16] And Turner's goal, according to one of William Brodnax's slaves, was to reach the free states where they would galvanize other blacks to return to the south to liberate the rest of "their brethren."[17]

It must have seemed to those enslaved in 1831 that Turner's strategy was their only hope. An insurrection was the only way to liberate the entire black community from callous political policies that sustained the economic interests of the elite few and the social interests of the masses.[18] Enslaved Hardy Edwards, who initially thought that the British had massacred the whites, said that it "ought to have been done long ago—that the negroes had been punished long enough."[19] As convicted slave Ben indicated, Nat Turner's insurrection was an attempt to destroy an institution, to destabilize it, in the

---

[15]The Richmond Enquire, 8 November 1831. rpt. in Tragle, The Southampton Slave Revolt, p. 137

[16] James L. Smith, Autobiography of James L. Smith, Including, Also, Reminiscences of Slave Life, Recollections of the War, Education of Freedmen, Causes of the Exodus, Etc. (Norwich: Press of the Bulletin, 1881) p. 15. electronic edition: http://doc.south.unc.edu

[17]"News From the Insurgents," The American Beacon, Norfolk, Virginia, 29 August 1831; Also Tragle, Southampton Slave Revolt, p. 49. Of course, this testimony must be taken with a bit of skepticism yet evidence that I present in the next chapter from a northern black suggesting similar sorts of plans makes it plausible that this might have been their intention.

[18]Historian Claude Clegg argues that whites saw, "blackness as a troubling counternarrative" which disrupted their vision of America as a "neo-European preserve" which would have precluded ideas of immediate emancipation. Claude A. Clegg, The Price of Liberty: African Americans and the Making of Liberia (Chapel Hill: UNC P, 2004) p. 21.

[19]Tragle, Southampton Slave Revolt, p. 202; [Southampton County Minutebook, 1830-35, p. 72-131, Virginia State Library; Qtd. In Freehling, 9.] Freehling gives a different version of this by making it several witnesses instead of one.

hopes of creating something new. After hearing that the negroes were "killing the white people," Ben said to another slave by the name of Sam, "did not I tell you there would be war?"[20]

Although the insurrection appears to have only involved slaves from Southampton, the court proceeded to call witnesses from other nearby counties to ascertain if any slaves outside the province seemed to know about Nat's plan. The Court found credible the testimony of a sixteen-year-old girl who stated that she had heard the plans for insurrection discussed among her master's slaves and those of a nearby neighbor almost 18 months before the massacre occurred. The court convicted as many as nine people on her unsupported testimony.[21] Nat Turner, however, remained at large.

By August 28th the United States troops and militia from various counties had arrived and restored order, whereupon, a North Carolinian newspaper reporter stated "the white people commenced the destruction of the negroes."[22] The *Richmond Enquirer* foreshadowed that assessment by stating, "these wretches will rue the day on which they broke loose upon the neighboring population, is most certain. A terrible retribution will fall upon their heads---Dearly will they pay for their madness and their misdeeds."[23] Susan Selden of Norfolk described the state of affairs in Virginia this way: "nothing to be heard but the firing of arms…and nothing to be seen but uniforms & warlike looking men."[24] On September 27th, John Hampton Pleasant, the senior editor of the *Constitutional Whig*, noted that "the people are naturally enough, wound up to a high

---

[20] Tragle, Southampton Slave Revolt, p. 223.
[21] The Richmond Enquirer September 30, 1831 "The Southampton Tragedy, Jerusalem, September 21, 1831."
[22] Higginson, Travellers and Outlaws, p. 297.
[23] The Richmond Enquirer August 26, 1831.
[24] Susan Selden, "Spreading Terror and Devastation Wherever They Have Been: A Norfolk Woman's Account of the Southampton Slave Insurrection" Deborah Shea, ed. The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography, Vol. 95, No. 1(Jan., 1987), p. 72.

pitch of rage,…it is to be feared that a spirit of vindictive ferocity has been excited, which may be productive of farther outrage, and prove discreditable to the country. Since Monday, the insurgent negroes have committed no aggression, but have been dodging about the local swamps, in parties of three and four. They are hunted by the local militia with great implacability, and must all eventually be slain or made captive."[25] The commanding officer, F. M. Boykin felt it necessary to publish a letter assuring the residents that it was safe for them to come home, lamenting the sorrow that they felt. Included in this letter, however, is a reprimand:

> It is with the most painful sensation, that the Commanding Officer has to [illegible] upon the conduct of any citizen:…that any necessity should be supposed to have existed, to justify a single act of atrocity….But he feels himself bound to declare, hereby announces to the troops and the citizens, that no excuse will be allowed for any similar acts of violence.[26]

But, the violence against black people did not cease. The unrestrained bloodshed that the Southern black community experienced after Turner's insurrection exemplifies how ideas of total warfare became a reality, that the verbalized threats of extermination were neither abstractions nor mere bluster. Moreover, it shows how destructive the ideas of self-defense and retaliatory violence can be when the power to define it as such lies with the State. Robert S. Parker observed, while traveling with the Murfreesboro Company, the Governor Guards and other vigilante forces, that the "negroes are taken in …and executed everyday."[27] Ex-slave Allen Crawford related that when the U.S. soldiers met at the Cross Keys they built "log fires…and every one that was Nat's man was taken

---

[25] Tragle, The Southampton Slave Revolt, pp. 52-53.
[26] Richmond Enquirer "Headquarters, Jerusalem, August 28, 1831," September 6, 1831
[27] Robert S. Parker to Rebecca Manney, August 29, 1831 in John Kimberly papers, Southern Historical Collection, UNC, Chapel Hill. qtd. in Merton L. Dillon's Slavery Attacked: Southern Slaves and Their Allies 1619-1865 (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State up, 1990) p. 157. (Not sure if this is the Robert Parker that was the attorney who lived in Clare Hall in Halifax, Virginia and died in London in 1856)

bodily by two men who catch you and hol yer bare feet to dis blazing fire 'til you tole all you know'd 'bout dis killing," even if you "don't know nothing."[28] On September 24th, S. B. Ebbons wrote that he met a man on a stage coach who had witnessed blacks who were taken prisoner being tortured and being generally treated in a "barbarious manner. Their noses and ears cut off, the flesh of their cheeks cut out, their jaws broken asunder and then set up as a mark to shoot at!!! If a black was found out of doors, after dark, without a pass, he would be immediately shot down."[29] The *Constitutional Whig* reported on September 3rd that they also had evidence that there had been a "slaughter of many blacks, without misconduct, and under circumstances of great barbarity." They had apparently interviewed one man who admitted killing between ten to fifteen people in retaliation for the massacre of whites. Although the *Whig* felt, "compelled to offer an apology for the people of Southampton, while we deeply deplore that human nature urged them to such extremities. Let the fact not be doubted by those whom it most concerns, that another such insurrection will be the signal for the extermination of the whole black population in the quarter of the state where it occurs."[30] In their final analysis of the Southampton insurrection, the *Whig* noted that the lessons from this event should not be forgotten; that whites need to be ever vigilant and secure in their position of power and that blacks need to understand that: "20 armed men would put to route the whole negro population, and we *repeat* our persuasion, that another insurrection will be followed by putting *the whole race to the sword*."[31]

---

[28] Allen Crawford, Weevils in the Wheat, p. 76.
[29] The Liberator October 1, 1831 "Savage Barbarity!." rpt. In Henry Irving Tragle, The Southampton Slave Revolt: A Compilation of Sources (Amherst: U of Mass. P, 1971) p. 115.
[30] The Constitutional Whig September 3, 1831. rpt. in Tragle, Southampton Slave Revolt, p. 69.
[31] The Constitutional Whig September 3, 1831. rpt in Tragle, Southampton Slave Revolt, p. 71. (emphasis added)

These words were no idle threat; as white former resident, Mr. Robinson confirmed that "there [was] not a Virginian,…whose mind would revolt at any cruelty, however atrocious, of which the blacks might be the object." According to Robinson, a country doctor stated that he "assumed that the blacks were not men, and that they ought all to be exterminated. 'They had declared war first,' he said, 'let them be hunted like wild beasts.'" Moreover, the idea that all slave owners valued the lives of their slaves[32] is perhaps troubled by one woman, "a pious Methodist," who said "she would willingly cast her own slaves into the street, there to be shot, provided others, who had slaves, would agree to do the same." Ultimately, even though Robinson helped put down the insurrection in Southampton, he was run out of town after being severely whipped for merely stating that "blacks, as men, were entitled to their freedom, and *ought* to be emancipated."[33]

Northerners and their newspapers also expressed their concerns over the plight of black people after Turner's efforts to destroy the institution. Newspapers like the *Liberator* reprinted countless articles that affirmed that the violence experienced by blacks in the aftermath of Turner's rebellion was "of a more savage and blood-thirsty character, than any which have occurred in this country since its early conflicts with the savages, with the single exception of Gen. Jackson's barborous massacre of the Indians,

---

[32] I am in dialogue with Eugene Genovese's Roll, Jordon Roll (New York: Vintage, 1976, pp. 5, 317) here and his notion that white paternalism "implicitly recognized the slaves' humanity" or that it undermined "solidarity among the oppressed by linking them as individuals to their oppressors;" as well as the more recent work of Patrick Wolff which argues that slaves were a valued commodity who "were carefully—albeit not kindly—preserved." See: "Land, Labor, and Difference," American Historical Review, Vol. 106, No.3. (Jun., 2001), p. 896.

[33] Tragle, Southampton Slave Revolt, pp. 106-107.

after he had gotten them into his power, at the Horse Shoe Bend."[34] Northern ideas about black people being at serious risk fostered the belief that southerners were poised to "give over a whole race of two million of human beings to butchery and destruction."[35] It was therefore, as former Virginian Robinson believed, "necessary for the people of the non-slaveholding states to interfere and save our country from the disgrace of adding to the horrors of slavery the crime of destroying hundreds upon thousands of those who are only guilty of conspiring, as did the founders of our republic, to obtain their freedom."[36]

Black Fear and the Abridgement of Hope

We have yet to come to terms with the legacy of Nat Turner.[37] Was he a rogue killer, a revolutionary, a mass murderer, or a martyr for his people? Slave owners had the freedom to identify the terms of engagement—that Turner was waging a servile war—but we should not allow slave owner interpretations to continue to have a monopoly on the emotional, cognitive, and spiritual meaning that such a conflict engendered. As the philosopher and theologian Howard Thurman asserted, white people knew that they had the upper hand politically, socially, and economically and the law of the land on their side.[38] And, as Thurman argued, one-sided violence is "deeply terrifying" especially

---

[34] Liberator, Boston, Massachusetts, 17 September 1831; Tragle, The Worcester Spy Worchester, Massachusetts, September 1831 p. 84. Also known as the Red Sticks Massacre, where 900 Creek Indians were killed in 1814 by forces led by Andrew Jackson. See Adam Rothman's Slave Country, p. 135.
[35] Ibid.
[36] Tragle, "Daring Outrage of Virginia Slavites," Southampton Slave Revolt, p. 114; The Sentinel New York, New York. Reprinted in the Liberator, Boston, Massachusetts, 1 October 1831.
[37] See Scot French's The Rebellious Slave: Nat Turner in America Memory (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 2004) for an excellent overview. Also see David Brion Davis' Inhuman Bondage: The Rise and Fall of Slavery in the New World (Oxford: Oxford Up, 2006) for his questioning of whether it is appropriate to defend "indiscriminate killing of people who are "part of" an oppressive system" as it echoes the rationale/psychology used to justify other acts of crimes against humanity like "the genocide of Jews, Armenians, Tutsis, or Sudanese blacks." p. 210.
[38] Howard Thurman, The Luminous Darkness (Richmond, Indiana: Friends United, 1999) p. 48.

when experience and rumor has taught that "you do not count."[39] The "active fear" of the slave, who now believed that nothing stood in the way of their annihilation,[40] makes it essential to understand how white threats of racial extermination after Turner's insurrection figured into the thoughts of the enslaved who no doubt overheard myriad conversations on the topic. The sources affirm that black people knew what they were up against: Nat Turner's insurrection put everyone, men, women, and children, at risk and the cost to the entire black community was untenable.

Indeed, the aftermath of Turner's insurrection had a profound effect upon all African Americans. The old ex-slave, Charity Bowery, testified that during the time of the "old Prophet Nat," black people could not even express religious sentiment out loud for fear that "low whites would fall upon any slaves they heard praying, or singing a hymn…kill[ing] them before their masters or mistresses could get to them." Religious expression apparently reminded them of Turner's divine visions of freedom. In her interview with Lydia Maria Childs, Charity lamented that, "The brightest and the best was killed in Nat's time. The whites always suspect such ones."[41]

This harassment of the black community extended well beyond the region of Southampton County and Virginia. Former slave Harriet Jacobs stated that the Turner insurrection threw her town of Edentown, North Carolina into utter chaos. According to Jacobs, poor whites in the community took advantage of the situation to exercise unrestrained violence against the community of color:

---

[39] Howard Thurman, Jesus and the Disinherited (Boston: Beacon, 1996) pp. 37-39.
[40] Thurman, Luminous, p.25-26.
[41] Charity Bowery, interview by Lydia Maria Childs. The Liberty Bell. By Friends of Freedom (1839-1858); Jan. 1, 1839 (Boston: American Anti-Slavery Society, 1839-1858) p. 42. Also found in John Blassingame, ed. Slave Testimony: Two Centuries of Letters, Speeches, Interviews, and Autobiographies (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State UP, 1977) p. 267. Also in Higginson, Travellers and Outlaws, pp. 301-302.

> Those who never witnessed such scenes can hardly believe what I know was inflicted at this time on innocent men, women, and children, against whom there was not the slightest ground for suspicion. Colored people and slaves who lived in remote parts of the town suffered in an especial manner. In some cases the searchers scattered powder and shot among their clothes, and then sent other parties to find them, and bring them forward as proof that they were plotting insurrection. Every where men, women, and children were whipped till the blood stood in puddles at their feet.[42]

Affirming Charity's experiences, Jacobs, as did other former slaves, remembered that it was the slaveholding class who ultimately served as protector for many blacks as they became concerned that they were losing too much of their slave population.[43] Mrs. Coleman Freeman, a free black woman also from North Carolina, remembered, "The white people that had no slaves would have killed the colored, but their masters put them in jail to protect them from the white people," and as a way, whites believed, to protect "themselves of being killed."[44] In Norfolk, Virginia ex-slave George Teamoh noted that a white woman helped to protect the people of color in his community. Still, he recalled the anguish he experienced: "the persecutions of 1832, when colored people of this State were slaughtered as sheep for the shambles, had brought me into serious doubt as to the existance of an omnipresent, as well as an all creating Being, still with a lingering hope mingled with despair, and a mind, floating as it were into empty space, I hoped on, in the midst of hopelessness."[45]

To be sure, Nat Turner's insurrection had profound implications for black people everywhere. Even as far away as Philadelphia, "the intense interest depicted in the face of my mother and her colored neighbors; the guarded whisperings, the denunciation of

---

[42] Harriet Jacobs, Incidents in the Life of a Slave Girl (New York: Oxford UP, 1988) pp. 97-98.
[43] Jacobs, Incidents, p. 102.
[44] Mrs. Coleman Freeman, A North-Side View of Slavery. The Refugee: Or the Narratives of Fugitive Slaves in Canada. Related By Themselves Benjamin Drew, ed. (1856; New York: Negro Up, 1968) p. 332.
[45] F. N. Boney, Richard L. Hume, and Rafia Zafar eds. God Made Man, Man Made the Slave: The Autobiography of George Teamoh (Macon: Mercer Up, 1990) pp. 69, 71.

slavery" led to intense disappointment, black Abolitionist Mifflin Gibbs recalled, and "the hope defeated of a successful revolution affected my juvenile mind and stamped my soul with hatred to slavery."[46] Yet, the intentional exclusion of any account of Nat Turner's rebellion also seems clear in some of the slave narratives written during the antebellum era.

Of course, the silence around Nat Turner speaks volumes. For example, the Rev. Noah Davis was born into slavery in Madison County, Virginia and he served as a house servant in Fredericksburg. In his detailed account of the months proceeding, during, and after the Turner rebellion, Davis never once mentions the chaos that plagued the black and white community in Fredericksburg at the time. His frequent references to reading and carrying the "New Testament" versus the Bible seems deliberate, suggesting an attempt to disassociate himself perhaps from any knowledge of Old Testament theology or wars for liberation. Davis' reference to the date of September 19, 1831, a time where violence against the black community was most virulent, as the point in which he became "baptized, in company with some twenty others" seems important for what it potentially says about his state of mind. Perhaps the fact that Davis made no mention of Turner, the insurrection, or the intense retribution that blacks as well as the black church faced indicates that despite Davis' attempts to obfuscate his anxiety about what happened, it had serious meaning for him even many years later.[47]

---

[46] Mifflin Winstar Gibbs, Shadow and Light: An Autobiography with Reminiscences of the Last and Present Century (Washington, D.C.: 1902) Project Gutenberg eBook www.gutenberg.org p. 21. Mifflin Gibbs was the first African American elected as a municipal judge in the United States. He was also a very successful businessman.

[47] Rev. Noah Davis, "A Narrative of the Life of Rev. Noah Davis, a Colored Man," Don't Carry Me Back! Narratives of Former Virginia Slaves Maurice Duke, ed. (Dietz P, 1995) p. 154.

This seems plausible, as the timing of Davis' religious conversion experience in 1831 was similar to that of Henry Box Brown in Richmond. Brown stated that he did not know why whites suddenly began to whip, hang and "cut down with swords" any slaves in the streets after dark. His master explained that the sudden intensity in violence was because some "slaves had plotted to kill their owners." Brown recalled that, "About this time, I began to grow alarmed respecting my future welfare,…I thought perhaps the day of judgment was not far distant and I must prepare for that dreaded event." After "praying for about three months," Brown asked his master if he could join the Baptist church, which he got permission to do. [48] Unlike Davis, Brown does relate how horrible the post-Turner retribution was for the black community but even he limits the traumatic experience to only a few pages of his narrative.

Bethany Veney's narrative is another example of how the memory of Nat Turner stands conspicuously absent from the memoir of a slave growing up in Virginia. Bethany would have been a young adult at the time of Nat Turner's rebellion and yet she makes no mention of it.[49] It is possible that in the western part of Virginia where she was enslaved there was not as much anxiety and violence directed towards the black community at the time. Yet, this seems odd. The evidence indicates that whites in the west were just as vested in asserting control and were as full of fear of their black population as those slaveholders living in the tidewater and eastern regions.[50] Indeed, the Governor of Virginia, John Floyd claimed that he got requests for arms from everywhere,

---

[48] Henry Box Brown, Narrative of Henry Box Brown, Who Escaped From Slavery Enclosed in a Box 3 Feet Long and 2 Wide. (Boston: Brown and Stearns, 1849) p. 40.

[49] Bethany Veney, The Narrative of Bethany Veney, A Slave Woman. (Worcester, Mass., 1889) *Documenting the American South* http://docsouth.unc.edu/fpn/veney/veney.html Veney was 74 years old at the time of the publication of her narrative, which means that she would have been seventeen at the time of Turner's rebellion.

[50] See chapter five regarding the Virginia Debates transcripts which indicate how central free blacks were in their discussions.

as "the alarm of the country is great in the counties between this and the Blue Ridge Mountains. I am daily sending them a portion of arms though I know there is no danger as the slaves were never more humble and subdued."[51]

Yet, Veney did reveal what it was like for free blacks living in Virginia. She observed when she was hired as a cook for blacks working on "the pike" which was under construction in the 1830's that, "the negroes were a rude set, as might be expected; for at that time they were the one class despised by everybody. They were despised by the master-class, because they could not subject them to their will quite in the same way as if they were slaves, and despised by the slave-class, because envied as possessing a nominal freedom, which they were denied."[52] Free blacks were particularly targeted by slaveholders after Turner's rebellion because they believed that blacks not in bondage unsettled those still enslaved, making white mastery insecure. Moreover, much of the discourse among elected officials after Turner's insurrection centered on how to get rid of and terrorize the free black population into leaving the state of Virginia.[53] Although Veney does not mention the Turner insurrection, she does give evidence of the climate of heightened animosity that existed at the time.

The silence surrounding the Turner insurrection suggests that the aftermath of that event affected many African Americans deeply. For how curious is it that the preponderance of WPA slave narratives from either Virginia or throughout the South do not mention Nat Turner at all or claim to never have heard of him or any insurrection

---

[51] John Floyd, "Diary of John Floyd," The John P. Branch Historical Papers of Randolph-Macon College Charles H. Ambler, ed. Vol. V, June, 1918, Nos. 1 and 2, p. 156.
[52]"The pike" was probably the Columbia turnpike, which ran from east to west across Virginia. Bethany Veney, The Narrative of Bethany Veney, A Slave Woman. (Worcester, Mass., 1889) pp. 31-32. *Documenting the American South* http://docsouth.unc.edu/fpn/veney/veney.html
[53] See chapter five of this manuscript for more on the experiences of free blacks after Nat Turner's rebellion.

attempts? In many of the WPA narratives of Virginia slaves, and those from other southern states, the interviewers list of questions apparently included whether the ex-slave had ever heard of Nat Turner.[54] Too often, the answer was that they did not "remember anything about the Nat Turner Rebellion, and never heard anything about it."[55] Some ex-slaves deliberately deflected the question by stating something like, "I don't know nobody in that rebellion"[56] or that "we never had any slave up-risings in our neighborhood."[57] One woman claimed that she "never knowed about uprisings till the Ku Klux sprung up."[58] Out of all the published extant copies of Virginia WPA narratives only four interviewees mention Nat Turner by name, and all of these accounts were given to interviewers of color.[59] It is probable that some black people in the South may not have known about Nat Turner's plans, or that an insurrection took place on August 21, 1831. It is highly doubtful, however, that they did not know about or experience, in some form or other, the retaliation fed by white paranoia that occurred afterwards.

Nevertheless, there was not complete silence during the antebellum era about the retribution experienced after Nat Turner's rebellion. Harriet Jacobs stands out as an exception to this claim as do Box Brown, Charity Bowery, and a few others. In a letter to Jacobs, Lydia Maria Childs told her to add more detail to her chapter on Nat Turner.[60] Jacobs, who was born a slave in Edenton, North Carolina around 1813, complied by

---

[54] Weevils, See p. 375, Appendix 6, question # 281.
[55] Frances Andrews, Newberry, South Carolina. Slave Narratives from the Federal Writers' Project, 1936-1938. http://memory.loc.gov/cgi-bin/query/P?mesn:14:./temp/~ammen_K7FT::
[56] Liney Chambers, Brinkley, Arkansas. Slave Narratives from the Federal Writers' Project, 1936-1938. http://memory.loc.gov/cgi-bin/ampage?co11Id=mesn&fileName=022/mesn022.db7recNu...
[57] Frances Andrews, Newberry, South Carolina. Slave Narratives from the Federal Writers' Project, 1936-1938. http://memory.loc.gov/cgi-bin/query/P?mesn:14:./temp/~ammen_K7FT::
[58] Maria Sutton Clemments, DeValls Bluff, Arkansas. Slave Narratives from the Federal Writers' Project, 1936-1938. http://memory.loc.gov/cgi-bin/ampage?co11Id=mesn&fileName=022/mesn022.db&recNu...
[59] See introduction, Weevils in the Wheat: Interviews with Virginia Ex-Slaves.
[60] Jean Fagin Yellin, ed. "letter Lydia Maria Childs to Harriet Jacobs," Incidents in the Life of a Slave Girl Written by Herself by Harriet Jacobs (Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1987) p. 244.

detailing how violent the aftermath of Nat Turner's rebellion was for her and the rest of the enslaved and free black community. She noted that in town "towards evening the turbulence increased. The soldiers, stimulated by drink, committed still greater cruelties. Shrieks and shouts continually rent the air." And although "the wrath of the slaveholders was somewhat appeased by the capture of Nat Turner," for two months black folks, particularly those "that lived out of the city; …[suffered] the most shocking outrages …committed with perfect impunity. Every day for a fortnight, if I looked out, I saw horsemen with some poor panting negro tied to their saddles, and compelled by the lash to keep up with their speed."[61] Jacobs also noted that during this time black women were victims of rape by roving bands of white men who at night "went wherever they chose among the colored people, acting out their brutal will. Many women hid themselves in woods and swamps, to keep out of their way. If any of the husbands or fathers told of these outrages, they were tied up to the public whipping post, and cruelly scourged for telling lies about white men."[62] Everyone was alarmed and lived in fear of the violence inflicted upon the black community Jacobs recounts, "the consternation was universal."[63]

Moses Grandy, would have been forty-eight years old during what he called "the time, called the time of the Insurrection…when the whites said the colored people were going to rise, and shot, hanged, and otherwise destroyed many of them" in Norfolk, Virginia. Grandy stated that although he did not suffer personally "The soldiers were seizing all the blacks they could find….I could see the jail, full of colored people, and

---

[61] Jacobs, Incidents, pp. 102-103.
[62] Jacobs, Incidents, p. 99.
[63] Ibid.

even the whipping post, at which they were constantly enduring the lash."[64] This slave narrative also depicts how dangerous religious expression was, and Grandy, who never says Nat Turner's name, stated that:

> after the insurrection which I spoke of before, they were forbidden to meet even for worship. Often they are flogged if they are found singing or praying at home. They may go to the places of worship used by whites; but they like their own meetings better. My wife's brother Issac was a colored preacher. A number of slaves went privately into a wood to hold meetings; when they were found out, they were flogged, and each was forced to tell who was there. Three were shot, two of whom were killed and the other was badly wounded. For preaching to them, Isaac was flogged, and his back pickled; when it was nearly well, he was flogged and pickled again, and so on for some months; then his back was suffered to get well and he was sold.[65]

Grandy goes on to say how slaves lived in constant fear, and affirming Bethany Veney's assessment, stated that "free negroes are liable to great cruelties. They have their dwellings entered, their bedding and furniture destroyed, and themselves, their wives and children beaten….There is nothing which a white man may not do against a black one, if he only takes care that no other white man can give evidence against him."[66]

As a free person of color, Mrs. Coleman Freeman, made the decision to leave North Carolina after Nat Turner's insurrection because of the violent aggression directed towards her and her family. Freeman stated when: "they came into my mother's, and threatened us—they searched for guns and ammunition; that was the first time I was ever silenced by a white man. One of them put his pistol to my breast, and said, 'If you open your head, I'll kill you in a minute!' I had told my mother to hush, as she was inquiring what their conduct meant. We were as ignorant of the rebellion as they had been. Then I

---

[64] Moses Grandy, Narrative of the Life of Moses Grandy, Late a Slave in the United States of America Hard Press, 1844) p. 15.
[65] Grandy, Narrative, p. 19.
[66] Grandy, Narrative, p. 20.

made up my mind not to remain in that country. We had to stay a while to sell our crops: but I would not go to church there any more."[67]

While enslaved in a small community in eastern Virginia, Fields Cook wrote that he "was a boy about the time of nat Turners [sic] insurrection who had better never been born than to have left such a curse upon *his* nation I say that he had better never been born." [68] By intertwining the extreme, yet divinely ordained suffering of Job from the Bible with the aftermath of Turner's insurrection, Cook, a preacher, medical practitioner, and candidate for Congress in 1869, places that ordeal within the larger context of the struggle between good and evil—between slaves and slaveholders. In Job, slavery is wrong and in the end, God promises those who are faithful that he has the capacity to humble those with great physical power when he decides to.[69]

It is also important to note that Cook marked the Turner rebellion as transformative for the black community, as the curse that black people experienced after Turner's open battle for liberation. To be sure, for Cook, the curse upon "his nation" was the curse of white persecution and chattel slavery; and it does not seem that he means that God cursed blacks as a people or that he believed that what Turner did was sinful. And although Turner might have regretted the destruction of other people of color, Cook

---

[67] Mrs. Coleman Freeman, North-side View of Slavery, p. 332.
[68] Fields Cook, Fields Observations: The Slave Narrative of a Nineteenth Century Virginian in The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography ed. Mary Jo Jackson Bratton, [1980] p. 93; See The Book of Job, Authorized King James Version of the Holy Bible chapter 3:1-19. In reference to slavery, Job envisioned that in his quest to end his life he would find in heaven, in God's place, "there the wicked cease from troubling; and there the weary be at rest. There the prisoners rest together; they hear not the voice of the oppressor. The small and great are there; and the servant is free from his master. Wherefore is light given to him that is in misery, and life unto the bitter in soul." and chapters. 3:21-24, 27.
[69] Cook, Fields Observations, p. 92.

suggests that Turner's divinely ordained mission dictated that the suffering of the African American community would serve a higher purpose.[70]

In Cook's account African Americans were continuously engaged in life and death struggles which enveloped their lives after Turner's insurrection. As a teenager, when Cook was put into the fields for the first time, he stated, "I had to comply with the old saying work little pig or die."[71] Cook also described how frightened many Afro Virginians were: "who could not sleep at nights for the guns and swords being stuck in our windows and doors to know who was here and what their business was and if they had a pass port and so forth and at that time a colored person was not to be seen with a book in his hand:..many a poor fellow burned his books for fear."[72] Cook beleived "we poor colored people" were undeserving of the subsequent white violence.

Clearly many of the enslaved did know about Turner's actions and many no doubt revered him for what he attempted to do. Fortunately, there is evidence that Turner's legacy remained part of and was sustained by oral tradition—that Turner was indeed a folk hero. Especially to George H. Burks, a lawyer in Indiana who wrote a lecture in 1890 proclaiming that Turner was a martyr who was "hanged and murdered because he dared to speak in behalf of liberty and for no other cause was he murdered." In this aspect—Burks argued in support of Fields Cook's analysis—Turner laid the groundwork for John Brown, the Civil War and the efforts of Abraham Lincoln, and because of this:

---

[70] Fields Cook, Fields Observations: The Slave Narrative of a Nineteenth Century Virginian in The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography ed. Mary Jo Jackson Bratton, [1980] p. 93; See The Book of Job, Authorized King James Version of the Holy Bible chapter 3:1-19. Allen Crawford stated that when Henry Travis' mother hit Turner in her grief and asked him "why did you take my son away," Turner's response was that Travis "was as willing to go as I was." All those who believed in the cause, Turner seemed to suggest, did not regret losing their lives.
[71] Cook, Fields Observations, p. 80.
[72] Cook, Fields Observations, p. 93.

"Nat Turner's object was successful." Finally, Burks concluded, "Nat Turner is not dead. He lives in the hearts of those who love freedom and liberty."[73]

The idea of Turner's legacy living on seems to be true as ex-slave Daniel Goddard indicated that "the Nat Turner insurrection in Virginia and the Vesey uprising in Charleston was discussed often, in my presence, by my parents and friends." Goddard, who was an infant during the Civil War, told that not only himself but most other slaves knew about Nat Turner and other international acts of resistance: "I learned that revolts of slaves in Martinique, Antigua, Santiago, Caracas and Tortugua, was known all over the South. Slaves were about as well aware of what was going on, as their masters were. However the masters made it harder for their slaves for a while."[74]

Harriet Jacobs was also inspired by the memory of Nat Turner. When Jacobs finally determined that she had to make her escape from slavery and the sexual advances of her young mistress' obsessed father, Dr. James Norcom, she went to the grave site of her parents: "As I passed the wreck of the old meeting house, where before Nat Turner's time, the slaves had been allowed to meet for worship, I seemed to hear my father's voice come from it, bidding me not to tarry till I reached freedom or the grave. I rushed on with renovated hopes."[75] It seems significant that for Jacobs, her father's instructions came from a godly place whose memory was tied to the revolutionary Turner.

Although only a few former slaves in the Virginia WPA narratives were willing to admit any knowledge of Turner's insurrection, some ex-slaves living outside of Virginia

---

[73] Geo. H. Burks, Future: containing great lecturers on the future of the colored race, Nat Turner's insur[r]ection, the new insur[r]ection (New Albany, Ind: Will A. Dudley, 1890) pp. 11-12 African American Perspectives: Pamphlets from the Daniel A.P. Murray Collection, 1818-1907.
[74] Daniel Goddard, (Columbia, South Carolina) Slave Narratives:… South Carolina Narratives Part 2 , vol. 1 (St. Clair Shores: Scholarly p, 1976) p. 150.
[75] Jacobs, Incidents, pp. 138-139.

did recall being told about Nat Turner. Indeed, the WPA narratives of ex-slave Anna Washington from Clarendon, Arkansas and slaves from other communities illuminate how the oral tradition of storytelling may have helped to sustained Turner's memory across the south. Washington, whose mother and father were slaves in Virginia, claimed that "I heard my pa talk about Nat Turner. He got up a rebellion of black folk back in Virginia. I heard my pa sit and tell about him."[76] Emma Turner, from Pine Bluff Arkansas, whose mother was born in Virginia, says she "heard her talk of the Nat Turner Rebellion but I never did see him."[77] Reverend Frank T. Boone, a free black born in Nansemond County, Virginia who was also living in Arkansas at the time of his interview, stated that "I have heard the 'Nat Turner Rebellion' spoken of,…I think the old people called it the 'Nat Turner War.'"[78] Thanks to the active participation of Virginia in the internal slave trade, stories about Nat Turner and his rebellion traveled across the deep south and these memories were passed on to future generations as examples of how black people had indeed contested their condition of servitude and oppression. Furthermore, Cornelia Carney informs us that Turner became part of the slave vernacular—a particular way of being that they clearly valued and named as culturally relevant to their own formulations of resistance and similar to the trickster in *Uncle Remus' Tales*, Brer Rabbit:

> Niggers was too smart fo' white folks to git ketched. White folks was sharp too, but not sharp enough to git by ole Nat. Nat? I don't know who he was. Ole folks used to say it all

---

[76] Anna Washington, (Clarendon, Arkansas) Born in Slavery: Slave Narratives from the Federal Writers' Project, 1936-1938

[77] Emma Turner, (Pine Bluff, Arkansas) Born in Slavery: Slave Narratives from the Federal Writers' Project, 1936-1938.

[78] Rev. Frank T. Boone, (Little Rock Arkansas) Born in Slavery: Slave Narratives from the Federal Writers' Project, 1936-1938.

> de time. De meanin' I git is dat de niggers could always out-smart de white folks. What you git fum it?[79]

These transmissions of black history might have additionally served as lessons to the black community. It would remind them of the scope of white retaliation when blacks waged servile wars against their oppressors: as a cautionary tale of the potential ramifications of black/white conflict in America and as rationale for supporting certain strategies of uplift over others. In examination of the number of those enslaved convicted or even accused of attempting insurrection throughout the south from 1832 up to the Civil War,[80] the number is extremely small compared to the nearly 4 million African Americans living in America by 1860. In fact, using Herbert Aptheker's careful study of slave insurrections, I have examined twenty-five insurrections or conspiracies to rebel against the institution between 1835 and 1860 in the entire south.[81] Nine of the attempted revolts could be defined as large in scale. Several of the reported insurrections or conspiracies were not attempts to engage in warfare at all. In six events, all in the1850s, the enslaved were attempting to run away en masse to some place where they could be free. Of the twenty-five attempts by blacks to rebel in the twenty-five years after Turner, only one incident was recorded for Clarksburg, Virginia in 1859, where it was reported that arms were found among the slaves in the Western part of Virginia.[82] Therefore, the vast majority of slaves did not attempt to insurrect, particularly after Nat Turner's

---

[79] Cornelia Carney, Weevils in the Wheat, p.67. See: Joel Chandler Harris, The Complete Tales of Uncle Remus (Boston: Houghton Mufflin, 1955) pp.679-725.

[80] Herbert Aptheker calculated that there were 250 revolts and conspiracies for the entire history of slavery in the United States. Herbert Aptheker, American Negro Slave Revolts p. 162.

[81] Aptheker defines slave rebellion and conspiracy as ten or more slaves who have freedom as their main objective. I have counted only those where the plot was detailed or specific, where there were recorded reprisals against the accused, and where the plot was confirmed by court conviction or execution of the said guilty parties in order to weed out those that might merely have been white hysteria or delusions about servile unrest. See: Aptheker, Slave Revolts, pp. 328-333, 338, 341-343, 346-347, 351, 353-357.

[82] Aptheker, Slave Revolts, p. 351. Ten slaves were arrested, but there is no further evidence of what happened to them after being arrested. Liberator, July 29, 1859.

rebellion, and the question that few historians have approached from the slave's perspective is why.

Former slave Lunsford Lane lets us know that in Virginia, they as slaves were "aware of our utter powerlessness" in stopping the "wrongs endured by themselves or friends." They also knew that "any attempt at resistance would bring certain and immediate destruction." Affirming that the memories of the aftermath of Nat Turner's rebellion remained indelible, Lane recalled that "we had seen the attempt fail, and we were not anxious to put our necks in the halter." Lane noted that for whites, ideas of commoditization aligned with the "calamity" of racial annihilation and the discernment of what had happened after Nat Turner seemed to figure prominently within this slave's psyche.[83] Slave owners made it clear that black people were mere chattel who could be worked to death, or for attempting an insurrection, killed.

Black men and women, slave and free, did not need any more examples of white retaliation to let them know that, ultimately, they did not matter. As a female ex-slave put it, "You know white folks would just as soon as kill you as not, and you had to do what they said," if you wanted to stay alive.[84] Mom Ryer Emmanuel was given a similar accounting of slavery by her mother: "I say, 'Ma, if dey been try to beat me, I would a jump up en bite dem.' She say, 'You would get double portion den.' Just on account of dat, ain' many of dem slavery people knockin bout here now neither, I tell you. Dat first

---

[83] Rev. William G. Hawkins, Lundsford Lane; or, Another Helper From North Carolina (Boston: Crosby and Nichols, 1864) p. 83.
[84] Clifton H. Johnson, ed. god struck me dead: Religious Conversion Experiences and Autobiographies of Ex-slaves (Philadelphia: Pilgrim, 1969) p. 134.

hide dey had, white folks just took it off dem. I would rather been dead, I say…'Ma, yunnah couldn' do nothing?' She say, 'No, white people had us in slavery time.'"[85]

Indeed, reliving the memory of "cruelties occasioned by this [Nat Turner's] insurrection," former Virginia slave Henry Box Brown confirmed that slaves made a calculated choice not to insurrect:

> It is strange that more insurrections do not take place among the slaves; but their masters have impressed upon their minds so forcibly the fact, that the United States Government is pledged to put them down, in case they should attempt any such movement, that they have no heart to contend against such fearful odds; and yet the slaveholder lives in constant dread of such an event….the fierce yells of an infuriated slave population, rushing to vengeance.
>
> There is no doubt but this would be the case, if it were not for the Northern people, who are ready, as I have been often told, to shoot us down, if we attempt to rise and obtain our freedom. I believe that if the slaves could do as they wish, they would throw off their heavy yoke immediately, by rising against their masters, but ten millions of Northern people stand with their feet on their necks, and how can they arise?[86]

In other words, Nat Turner's insurrection exposed for both sides how the antebellum ideas of a race war and extermination would perhaps play out, not only in the southern mind but also among those living in the north. [87]

---

[85] Mom Ryer Emmanuel, (Marion, South Carolina) Slave Narratives: South Carolina part II Vol. 1 (St. Clair Shores, Michigan: scholarly P, 1976) p. 25.

[86] Henry Box Brown, Narrative of Henry Box Brown, Who Escaped From Slavery Enclosed in a Box 3 Feet Long and 2 Wide. (Boston: Brown and Stearns, 1849) pp. 38-39.

[87] The hopelessness of the enslaved trying to acquire freedom forcibly was made even clearer in the Great Slave revolt of December 1831 led by Samuel Sharpe in Jamaica: which demonstrated that even peaceful attempts at obtaining freedom end in the massacre of men, women, and children. Sharpe, a devout Baptist, believed that the king of England intended to end slavery in Jamaica, and he conceived of a plan that seems to have been later replicated by black Abolitionist Henry Highland Garnet. All blacks had to do was unite under Sharpe's plan of passive resistance: "He thought that if they all 'sat down,' and refused to go to work again in the capacity of slaves after Christmas, carefully abstaining from offering violence to any person, it would be a very difficult thing for the masters to force such an immense body of people to work against their will." Fighting was only to occur if the slaveholders compelled them to work. Sharpe clearly chose nonviolence as a strategy for liberation. Perhaps he heard what had happened after Turner's rebellion, or perhaps he understood in historical terms the human cost of servile insurrections. For once he lost control of his people and they began to burn the plantations Sharpe predicted that "now the 'buckras' would shoot and murder the people without mercy, and have an apology for doing so." Just as it was in America, many religious Jamaican slaves were implicated in the movement and "dreadful was the retaliation inflicted upon the misguided negroes." At least 207 slaves were killed in the rebellion and another 312 were executed after trial in the Slave Courts at Montego Bay. In all, 519 slaves lost their lives as compared to 14 whites.

We do not know the number of black people that lost their lives in the aftermath of Nat Turner's insurrection. Although the Auditor's Office lists only 19 slaves executed (and 21 slaves deported) from August 21, thru December 31, 1831 for the entire state of Virginia, this number cannot be an accurate accounting of the total loss of life.[88] Estimates of over one hundred have been suggested,[89] and based on observations of blacks who lived during the 1830s, in "one day 120 Negroes were killed."[90] These numbers only take into account the region of Southampton. The real number, which would include blacks from all the southern states, was undoubtedly much higher.

After Turner's insurrection, blacks in the north came under siege as well. To be sure, anti-black sentiment expressed in race riots predated the Nat Turner rebellion, but the number of incidents increased exponentially, from 20 incidents between 1820 and 1829, to over 115 incidents between 1830 and 1839.[91] In Providence, Rhode Island, a riot broke out in September, 1831 where a mob of between 700 to 800 whites, most of them sailors, destroyed nearly all the homes of the black community in response to rumors that blacks had insurrected in North Carolina and had taken over the city of Wilmington.[92] Frederick Douglass noted that in St. Michaels, Maryland that a mob threatened him and other blacks for establishing a Sabbath school in 1833, and "one of this pious crew told

---

Henry Bleby, Death Struggles of Slavery: Being A Narrative of Facts and Incidents, Which Occurred in a British Colony, During the Two Years Immediately Preceding Negro Emancipation (London: Hamilton, Adams, 1853) p. 113-114; Mary Reckford, "The Jamaica Slave Rebellion of 1831" Past and Present, No. 40 (Jul., 1968), p. 120. See Henry Highland Garnet's 1843 "Address to the Slaves of the United States" where he tells the slaves to first reason with the slave owners and then "forever cease to toil for the heartless tyrants…If they then commence the work of death, they, and not you, will be responsible for the consequences." Walker's Appeal and Garnet's Address to the Slaves of the United States of America (Salem, New Hampshire: Ayer, 1994) p. 94.

[88] Tragle, Southampton, Document 10, "Statement of Amount Paid by Public Treasury," p. 445.

[89] Aptheker, American Negro, p. 301.

[90] John W. Cromwell, "The Aftermath of Nat Turner's Insurrection," The Journal of Negro History, Vol. 5, No. 2. (Apr., 1920) p. 212.

[91] Hine, Hine, and Harrold, The African-American Odyssey p. 215.

[92] "Insurrection in North Carolina," Providence Journal Sept 21, 1831; "Another Riot," Rhode Island American & Gazette Sept 27, 1831.

me, that as for my part, I wanted to be another Nat Turner: and if I did not look out, I should get as many balls into me, as Nat Turner did in to him."[93] These sorts of threats appear commonplace as Douglass also claimed that "The feeling was very bitter toward all colored people in Baltimore, about this time, (1836,) and they—free and slave—suffered all manner of insult and wrong." He recalled that when he was working on the docks in Baltimore as a ship's carpenter, the white carpenters began to "talk contemptuously and maliciously of 'the niggers;' saying, that 'they would take the country,' that 'they ought to be killed.'"[94]

In Philadelphia, some white men determined that the black population within that city was dangerous, and that northern free blacks must have collaborated with Turner in planning his insurrection. A proposal was put forth seeking to have the state government expel not only any newly arriving black settlers but also the existing free black population. James Forten and other leaders of the black community tried to defend themselves against the accusations that they had aided Turner in his rebellion, but the tide of emotion was such that despite their counter arguments against any activity of the sort, white Philadelphians were focused on getting rid of a people they viewed as dangerous. When the *Julius Pringle*, an ACS ship hired to transport newly freed blacks from North Carolina to Liberia, stopped in Philadelphia for some repairs in 1832, an armed mob quickly gathered to repel any attempts to unload the cargo of blacks as it was rumored

---

[93] Frederick Douglass, My Bondage and My Freedom (1855; New York: Dover, 1969) p. 200. In Douglass' first narrative, he says that they said that "they all ought to be killed." See: Frederick Douglass, Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass, An American Slave Written by Himself (1845; New York: Dell, 1997) p. 92.

[94] Douglass, My Bondage, pp. 311-312.

that they were part of Nat's army. The ship was forced to quickly leave port and make her repairs further down the coast at Chester.[95]

In 1833 and 1834, anti-black riots broke out in New York City, Philadelphia, Danville, Kentucky, Nashville, Tennessee, and New Haven, Connecticut, affirming that the northern white community was just as opposed to the idea of black freedom as the south. Black people in the north and south experienced the escalation in racial violence that occurred across America. Making Nat Turner's war against slavery a pivotal moment for the black community and the nation long after the dust had settled in Southampton, Virginia.

Nat Turner's insurrection represented an organized attempt to dismantle a system that had become even more oppressive over time—where violence and the possibility of death remained as fundamental tools for sustaining white mastery. In the aftermath of the insurrection, black people experienced unspeakable persecution, which for many remained either too painful or too dangerous to fully articulate for posterity. And yet, the abridgement of hope articulated above, and the curtailment in the belief in a Haitian model of liberation working in America, did not mean that black Americans lost sense of, nor the need to be free. It suggests rather that the slave and free community came to see that a Haitian styled revolution was unachievable, that as a strategy, it would never result in freedom. For whites clearly sent a message that black people, slave and free understood: whites would win any war of liberation that blacks might wage, even if it meant death to the entire black community. These ideas were grounded in historical

---

[95] Julie Winch, A Gentleman of Color (Oxford: Oxford Up, 2002) pp. 284-288. See "To the Honorable the Senate and House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania" Herbert Aptheker, ed., A Documentary History of the Negro People in the United States (New York: Citadel, 1951) p. 126.

precedence. Indeed, they were rearticulated in didactic fashion by the Virginia legislative body in 1832 in their attempt to assure the public that no other incident like Nat Turner's war of liberation would ever occur again.

PART THREE

CHAPTER FIVE

"IN THE HANDS OF THE MASTER": THE VIRGINIA DEBATES

When Alexis de Tocqueville surveyed the southern states of America in 1832, he observed a pervasive sense of "conflict between the white and the black inhabitants of the Southern States of the Union." He noted that this "danger…however remote it may be, is inevitable" and that it "perpetually haunts the imagination of the Americans." Tocqueville discerned that in the North, people talked incessantly about the possibility of a violent struggle, but for those in the "Southern States the subject is not discussed." While it may be true that southerners did not discuss with him what he called the "tacit forebodings of the South," they did discuss quite openly and in great detail the possibility of "open strife" with each other during that year's Virginia Debates.[1] Southern elites discussed the issue of extermination and a war between the races at two seminal moments in the antebellum era: the Virginia legislative debates of 1832 and the debates over the reopening of the slave trade in the 1850s. This chapter interrogates the first moment when

[1] Alexis de Tocqueville, Democracy in America Vol. I and II, Trans. Henry Reeve, (New York: Bantam, 2000) pp. 433-434.

Virginia's legislative body grappled with these ideas after Nat Turner's insurrection in 1831.

As a formative event in southern history, the Virginia Debates mark the point where the trope of interracial warfare obfuscated even gradual emancipation legislation and where ideas over the racial composition of America, frontier justice, and the indefinite rights to property were debated and then formalized. Despite Governor John Floyd's requests, Virginia legislators, who claimed that the debates were a "feast for the soul," used the potential of total warfare to justify why slaves should remain in bondage and to restrict the freedoms of free blacks.[2] What emerged in January and February of 1832 as a solution to "this damning curse of slavery" was the triangulation of the idea that black people had three choices in America: remain enslaved, be colonized, or die in a war between the races.[3] Although southerners asserted that the enslaved were no longer a threat to white mastery, Turner's rebellion heightened white fears of black people as the

---

[2] Philip A. Bolling, The Speeches of Philip A. Bolling, (Of Buckingham) In the House of Delegates of Virginia on the Policy of the State in Relation to Her Colored Population: Delivered on the 11th and 25th of January, 1832. (Richmond: Thomas W. White, 1832) p. 6.

[3] Ibid. Bolling, p. 14. Some historians, like James C. Ballagh, viewed the Virginia debates as the last free discussion to end slavery. Ballagh claimed that the antislavery movement created a backlash, which pushed southern men to protect their honor and the institution. In his view, the only thing that kept the debates from realizing success was that they could not agree on the method to achieve abolition. While others, like Alison Freehling, take the opposite view that the debate to end slavery continued among reform-minded legislators, and that Virginia reformers saw the debates as only the beginning of their struggle for abolition. The research of Hebert Aptheker and William W. Freehling, however, demonstrate convincingly that not only was the "back lash thesis" which blamed antislavery activists overblown, but that absolutely nothing came out of the debates to warrant such nostalgia. As William Freehling argues what Virginians were really after was a "new vocabulary, new thought, new action to consolidate slavery" not to end it. He concludes by saying, "a better title would be the "Virginia Deportation Debate." See Joseph C. Roberts classic study Road to Monticello: A Study of the Virginia Slavery Debate of 1832 (Durham: Duke Up, 1941); Also Charles H. Ambler, Sectionalism in Virginia from 1776 to 1861 (New York: Russell and Russell, 1964) pp.196-198; See James Curtis Ballagh, History of Slavery in Virginia (Baltimore: John Hopkins University p, 1902) pp. 127-139; See Alison Goodyear Freehling, Drift Toward Dissolution: The Virginia Slavery Debate of 1831-1832, (Baton Rouge: Louisiana Up, 1982) pp. xi-xvi, 228; See Herbert Aptheker, American Negro Slave Revolts (New York: International, 1983) p. 316; William W. Freehling, The Road to Disunion: Secessionist at Bay 1776-1854 (New York: Oxford Up, 1990) pp. 190-195. What most historians seem not to emphasize is the fact that all those who supported ending slavery in Virginia did so in the belief that it would transform society; but this transformation would completely exclude blacks from citizenship or even living in the state as free people.

enemy, whether slave or free, and complete abolition without removal was never under consideration in Virginia.

Governor John Floyd's Case for the Necessity of Removal

Governor John Floyd pressured Virginia Congressmen to enact legislation for the colonization of free blacks and slaves who would be gradually emancipated because he feared that antislavery ideas circulating within and outside the state would bring about another servile war. Included with his annual message were incendiary documents that supported his belief that all blacks living in Virginia were a threat to the white community. In one instance, Floyd blamed antislavery outsiders for Nat Turner's insurrection. On the other hand, he accused free blacks in Virginia of conspiring with the enslaved. Ultimately it was the persistence of widespread white fear of Virginia's black population that made Floyd determine that he must get the Assembly to finally legislate the gradual abolition of slavery.[4]

Thus anti-black sentiments resonated in Governor Floyd's annual message to the legislature in December 5, 1831. He wrote at length about the necessity for a revision of state laws to ensure the subordinate status of African Americans in Virginia. He specifically asked for the allocation of funds for the removal of free blacks since they encouraged and abetted insurrections, and "seek to excite a servile war; a war, which exhausts itself in the massacre of unoffending women and children on the one side, and on the other, in sacrifice of all who have borne part in the savage undertaking."[5]

---

[4] John Floyd, "Diary of John Floyd" The John P. Branch Historical Papers of Randolph-Macon College Charles H. Ambler, ed. (Richmond: Richmond p, 1918) pp. 166, 168.
[5] Journal of the House of Delegates, &c. Monday, December 5, 1831, Virginia Historical Society.

Governor Floyd believed that many whites, as adherents to the Second Great Awakening, were responsible for Turner's rebellion by their encouragement of egalitarian ideas and their dissemination of religious instruction to blacks.[6] According to Floyd, northern preachers and laymen used Christianity to teach slaves that they had a right to be as free as whites, and this helped motivate Turner to plan an insurrection. Floyd was convinced that "every black preacher in the whole country east of the Blue Ridge" knew about Nat's plans, and religious whites had allowed that to happen.[7] Although Floyd allowed that it might have been unintentional, southern women were also responsible for the revolt, for some, in their benevolence had taught "negroes to read and write" as an act of piousness. Governor Floyd was also concerned with the activities of non-religious types, "Yankee peddlers and traders" who taught slaves that they were equal and therefore encouraged insubordination.[8] In reality, beginning in the eighteenth century black people themselves insisted that literacy be part of their conversion to Christianity and their spiritual education. Over time blacks became more independent religiously and Virginia became a breeding ground for black leadership.[9]

It was literacy, Floyd suspected, that enabled black preachers to read to their congregations the inflammatory pamphlets of "Walker, Garrison, and Knapp of Boston."

---

[6] Second Great Awakening was an evangelical movement that reemerged at the beginning of the 19th century. Men and women, black and white, rich and poor, all participated together in huge religious revivals. The egalitarianism that defined the First and Second Great Awakening movement disrupted the social order of the south as it embraced Christianized African slaves as equals before God.
[7] Tragle, John Floyd, "Letters Pertaining to the Revolt," p. 276.
[8] Tragle, "John Floyd to J. C Harris," pp. 275-276.
[9] Charles F. Irons, The Origins of Proslavery Christianity: White and Black Evangelicals in Colonial and Antebellum Virginia (Chapel Hill: UNC P, 2008) pp. 41, 49-57, 93. White evangelicals probably had little to do with Turner's actions, but rather provided the model for how religion and slavery could coexist. Whites could enjoy fellowship with blacks, as Evangelical churches were thoroughly integrated by 1792, without offering freedom and without the guilt. They could be the loudest advocates for those enslaved while rationalizing that it was not in their power to determine the law on such things. As historian Charles Irons argues, white evangelicals crafted the Old Testament model of slavery into ideas of paternalism. Thus, in the antebellum era, church discipline was used as a way of controlling black people as a group.

Black church leaders then circulated these "incendiary publications" which inspired the "fanatical preacher" Nat Turner.[10] Indeed, the writings of David Walker had fostered intense concern among whites when the Virginia House of Delegates was informed in January of 1830 that thirty copies of *Walker's Appeal* had been intercepted on route to Thomas Lewis, a free black living in Richmond. They confiscated a letter Walker sent to Lewis instructing him to disseminate the pamphlets "to those who can pay for them, -- and if there are any who, Cannot pay for a Book Give them Books for nothing."[11] The legislature discussed the letter and the content of Walker's message behind closed doors, but other than the recovery of all but ten of the pamphlets, surprisingly nothing was done to counteract his invocation.[12] It was not until after Turner's rebellion that Floyd became convinced that "the plans as published by those Northern presses were adopted and acted upon by them."[13] The writings of Walker would have been particularly disconcerting , who stated, "We must and shall be free I say, in spite of you….And wo, wo will be to you if we have to obtain our freedom by fighting."[14]

Floyd, having carefully preserved Walker's *Appeal* in his papers, no doubt read the message of revolution, and his prediction that although things did not start out that way, the evolution of the system of slavery had predetermined that things would end

---

[10] Tragle, "Floyd to Harris", p. 275. Richmond Enquirer, August 30, 1831.
[11] David Walker, "Letter to Thomas Lewis," Virginia: Governor's Office. House of Delegates Executive Communications, 1830. (Box 14, folder 61) Accession 36912. State Records Collection, The Library of Virginia. (Richmond, Va 23219)
[12] Freehling, Drift, p. 82.
[13]Tragle, "Floyd to Harris", p. 276.
[14] David Walker, Walker's Appeal, Walker's Appeal, In Four Articles, Together With A Preamble, To The Colored Citizens Of The World, But In Particular, And Very Expressly To Those Of The United States Of America. (Boston: For the Author, 1829) p. 69.

violently.[15] As "God will show the whites what we are yet. I say, from the beginning, I do not think that we were natural enemies to each other. But the whites have made us so wretched, by subjecting us to slavery, and having murdered so many millions of us in order to make us work for them….that there can be nothing in our hearts but death alone for them." [16] Walker, in speaking to the black community, and particularly the enslaved community, told them to "read the history particularly of Hayti, and see how they were butchered by the whites, and do you take warning."[17]

In Walker's view, frontier justice and the law of self-preservation applied to blacks as well. He instructed the enslaved to freely use the principles outlined by whites for controlling populations of people: "if you commence, make sure work—do not trifle, for they will not trifle with you—they want us for their slaves, and think nothing of murdering us in order to subject us to that wretched condition—therefore, if there is an *attempt* made by us, kill or be killed…and believe this, that it is no more harm for you to kill a man, who is trying to kill you, than it is for you to take a drink of water when thirsty."[18] In prophesy, Walker told them that "the person God shall give you, give him your support and let him go his length, and behold him in the salvation of your God. God will indeed, deliver you through him from your deplorable and wretched condition…I charge you this day before my God to lay no obstacle in his way, but let him go."[19]

Floyd was particularly angry with the editor of the *Liberator,* William Lloyd Garrison, who he believed wrote "with the express intention of inciting the slaves and

---

[15] There exists a complete copy of the second edition of David Walker's Appeal in Floyd's executive papers. See: Virginia: Governor's Office. House of Delegates Executive Communications, 1830. (Box 14, folder 61) Accession 36912. State Records Collection, The Library of Virginia. (Richmond, Va 23219).
[16] David Walker, Walker's Appeal, p. 61.
[17] Walker, Walker's Appeal, p. 21.
[18] Walker, Walker's Appeal, p. 27-28.
[19] Walker, Walker's Appeal, p. 21.

free negroes in this and other States to rebellion and to murder the men, women and children of those states."[20] Worried about the barrage of antislavery material written by Walker, Garrison, and his co-editor Knapp, the Virginia legislature banned whites from teaching blacks to read and write, and forbad blacks to gather for educational purposes on April 7, 1831, only five months before the Turner insurrection.[21] In the aftermath of Turner's insurrection, Floyd warned that if the invasion into their "ultra states rights" by men from other states did not cease, repercussions would be severe, for "the law of nature will not permit men to have their families butchered before their eyes by their slaves and not seek by force to punish those who plan and encourage them to perpetrate these deeds."[22]

Floyd's opinions about the negative impact of northern antislavery influences on slaves like Nat Turner was supported by information he acquired about black abolitionists from someone traveling through Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. In his letter to the Governor, a man by the name of John Patton quoted for several pages the minutes from the first annual black abolitionist convention held in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania from June 6th through the 11th in 1831. Although Patton was only allowed to look at the convention minutes briefly, he was able to identify in his letter the number of black participants from the ten participating states. He specifically noted that white participants like Garrison, Benjamin Lundy, and Arthur Tappan were in attendance. Patton argued that although the convention's "great object… is not distinctly stated—but so "shadowed forth" as to make its darkness visible," he felt sure that this meeting was against the interests of the

---

[20]John Floyd, "Diary of John Floyd," The John P. Branch Historical Papers of Randolph-Macon College Charles H. Ambler, ed. (Richmond: Richmond p, 1918) p. 157.
[21] Freehling, Drift, p. 83.
[22] John Floyd, "Diary of John Floyd," The John P. Branch Historical Papers of Randolph-Macon College Charles H. Ambler, ed. (Richmond: Richmond p, 1918) p. 158.

southern states. The convention of free blacks resolved, of which one delegate from Virginia notably participated, that the Constitution sustained their rights to full citizenship and they mandated the reiteration of this information at every gathering. Particularly the Fourth of July was to be set aside for fasting and prayer, in order to affirm the idea that one day the "almighty God" would "intervene on our behalf—that the shackles of slavery may be broken—and our sacred rights obtained." Patton wanted the Governor to share this information with the Legislators who he knew were presently in session discussing the issue of gradual emancipation and slavery.[23]

Floyd no doubt believed that the information he received about black abolitionists confirmed they were conspiring to disrupt slavery in the south. Patton attested to the fact that "it had been for sometime known in Virginia that there had been during the last summer a convention of the Free negroes of the United States, by delegates –who assembled at Philadelphia. But so far as I am informed, the character and the objects of that assembly have not been known in our state." The idea that a group of free blacks were asserting the right of all blacks to be free "throughout the United States" clearly concerned Virginians; and evidence linking two free blacks from Fredericksburg as elected officers of the convention did nothing to calm fears about future trouble. For one of these men was supposedly "the same individual to whom—a seditious and insurrectionary letter which was picked up in the market place at Fredericksburg—during the last summer or fall was directed."[24]

---

[23] Virginia. Governor's Office. John Floyd Executive Papers, 1830-1834. Accession 42665. Box 324. John Patton letter to the Governor, "Convention of Free Negroes in Philadelphia," 23 Jan 1832 State Records Collection, The Library of Virginia. (Richmond, Va 23219)
[24] Ibid.

Particularly worrisome to Floyd would have been a letter written by a former Virginian slave living in Boston who claimed that the enslaved population would continue to rebel and kill whites even after Nat Turner was apprehended and executed. A black man by the name of Nero sent a letter to Southampton County, Virginia, which was then forwarded to Governor Floyd in the fall of 1831 claiming that there would soon be another insurrection between masters and slaves. This letter, merely addressed "sir," foretold of a vast conspiracy of northern blacks leading southern slaves "to avenge the wrongs and abuses the Slaves have received in the United States." According to Nero, they had "no expectation of conquering the whites of the South States," their purpose was purely "revenge for the indignities and abuses received."[25] They would then make their escape as the "Non-Slaveholding States…and Haiti offers an asylum for those who survive the approaching carnage." Nero taunted Floyd with the assurance that they had established accomplices from the free states who were willing to support those who were "willing to hazard their lives in defence of our common rights."[26] The members of this secret organization purportedly "pledged ourselves in a goblet made of the skull of a slaveholder." Moreover, the writer of this letter did not believe slaveholders threats of "exterminating the black population" for "you are to inert to do without them." Nero taunted them to go ahead: "We defy you; do your best—we ask no favors – spare neither age nor sex, for we assure you that we shall not – that you shall destroy every vestage of a slave is what we desire." [27]

---

[25] "After Nat Turner: A Letter from the North," The Journal of Negro History , Vol. 55, No.2 (Apr., 1970), pp. 145-146.
[26] "After Nat Turner: A Letter from the North," The Journal of Negro History , Vol. 55, No.2 (Apr., 1970), p.147.
[27] "After Nat Turner: A Letter from the North," The Journal of Negro History , Vol. 55, No.2 (Apr., 1970), p. 148.

On the intended apocryphal "day of carnage" where there would be a "promiscuous slaughter of [white] women and children," Nero claimed they had recruited men: "that can perform deeds of death and destruction that would have made a Cortes or Pizarro relent, a Red Jacket sympathize, or a Tecumseh weep. Would to Heaven, we could enlist the Indians of Georgia in our common cause – and we are not without hopes that we shall."[28] The possibility of enlisting Native Americans in the liberation of the slaves would have hit a nerve, for southerners like Governor Floyd were well aware of the fighting potential of another perceived enemy yet to be subdued. Moreover, to Floyd, Nero's letter affirmed that slave unrest was generated by outside influences. Especially since Nero implicated many northern African Americans when he claimed, "there are people in Boston, N. York, Philadelphia and Hartford who know more of the circumstances of the late insurrection than any Slave holder in Virginia or North Carolina."[29]

Nero, dismissive of the ultimate results of this secret group's actions, nevertheless laid out in clear terms what had become the line in the sand that many African Americans would not cross when he claimed: "we prefer to see every person of colour headless, and their "heads on poles" if you please than to see them servants to a debauched and effe/min/ate race of whites. O my blood boils when I think of the indignities we have suffered, and I long for the scene of retribution; and at that day let there be no more whining about cruelty and above all let there be no sympathy expressed for the "poor

---

[28] "After Nat Turner: A Letter from the North," The Journal of Negro History , Vol. 55, No.2 (Apr., 1970), p. 147.
[29] "After Nat Turner: A Letter from the North," The Journal of Negro History , Vol. 55, No.2 (Apr., 1970), p. 148.

deluded blacks" who may fall in your battle."[30] Although Nero claimed that members of his group represented the slave and free populations, "three hundred thousand men" who asserted that death was desirable over slavery, the evidence left by those formerly enslaved and free suggests otherwise.[31] Of course, what Nero described did not occur, nor does there appear to be any indication, as shown in the previous chapter, that the enslaved were intent on dying for the cause of revenge and retribution. And perhaps, as noted earlier, northern blacks had their hands full fending off anti-black sentiment and race riots in their own communities.

Finally, it was white fear and the continued demand for arms from across the state that made Floyd fixate on the gradual abolition of slavery. Floyd wrote in his diary "the alarm of the country is great in the counties between this [Southampton] and the Blue Ridge Mountains. I am daily sending them a portion of arms though I know there is no danger as the slaves were never more humble and subdued."[32] What the Governor ultimately hoped for was that after viewing the gathered evidence he presented of how antislavery fanaticism had infiltrated their state, the Virginia legislators would vote gradual emancipation into law. Floyd envisioned, in due time, that all blacks would be removed from the state. His goal was to "drive from this state all free negroes and to substitute the surplus revenue in our Treasury annually for slaves, to work for a time upon our Rail Roads etc etc and these sent out of the country…as the first step to emancipation."[33] He did not think that slavery was immoral, but rather that slave labor

---

[30] "After Nat Turner: A Letter from the North," The Journal of Negro History , Vol. 55, No.2 (Apr., 1970), pp. 147-148.
[31] "After Nat Turner: A Letter from the North," The Journal of Negro History , Vol. 55, No.2 (Apr., 1970), p. 145.
[32] Floyd, "Diary of John Floyd," The John P. Branch Historical Papers, pp. 156, 166,168.
[33] Tragle, "John Floyd to J. C. Harris" p. 276.

was an impediment to the growth and economic development of Virginia.[34] Moreover, his conceptualization of Virginia as a free "white" society was not new; it followed traditional theoretical visions that began to coalesce in the days of the early republic, which Thomas Jefferson and others helped to crystallize.[35] Floyd never announced publicly his support for gradual emancipation, however, but rather championed it privately in his diary and to those in the Assembly who were in his inner circle.[36]

The Dangers of Emancipation and Servile War

For white Virginians, Nat Turner's revolt was so significant that it initiated a profusion of petitions to end slavery through gradual emancipation as well as calls for greater restrictions on the lives of slaves and free blacks. The speaker of the House of Delegates established a special committee to review the gradual emancipation petitions, many asking for the "removal of a race irreconcilably antagonistic to ours."[37] Thereafter, a serious discussion occurred within the House over what legislative action Virginia should take. Should she follow the path of the Northern states and abolish slavery

---

[34] Tragle, intro to Floyd diary, p. 249, "John Floyd to J. C. Harris," p. 276.

[35]The writings of Thomas Jefferson reflect the negrophobic ideas about emancipation that would have influenced Floyd and the other members of the legislature. Jefferson's highly valued *Notes on the State of Virginia* also foreshadowed the scientific racial theories that emerged in the last half of the 19th century. Linking his rationale for gradual emancipation to an analysis of black mental and physical inferiority: Jefferson argued that "the difference is fixed in nature." In Jefferson's mind, differences in color and intellectual ability were a complete obstacle to the emancipation of black slaves and these differences would require that if they were emancipated they "be removed beyond the reach of mixture." This had to occur so as not to pollute the purity of the Anglo- Saxon origins of the American people. Jefferson was not concerned about the loss of slave labor since after their removal a concerted plan to recruit from around the world an "equal number of white inhabitants…to migrate hither" would be put in effect. He answered his critics who asked why black slaves could not remain here in America with the assertion that black and whites could never live peacefully together. James Madison also believed that blacks who were freedmen "would soon be at war with the whites if too near." See: Thomas Jefferson, Notes on the State of Virginia William Peden, ed. (Chapel Hill: UNC p, 1982) pp. 138, 143, 163; Qtd. in Winthrop Jordon, White Over Black: American Attitudes Toward the Negro, 1550-1812 (Chapel Hill: UNC p, 1968) p. 552.

[36] Tragle, "Floyd Diary" pp. 261, 262.

[37] Alison Goodyear Freehling, Drift Toward Dissolution: The Virginia Slavery Debate of 1831-1832 (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State UP, 1982) p. 127; Virginia Legislative Petitions, Loudon County, 1831, Virginia State Library, Richmond.

gradually or should she remain a part of an economic system that had made many men wealthy and therefore powerful? Many legislators agreed with Governor Floyd and the petitioners that gradual emancipation was necessary: but they also believed that the large populations of blacks in Virginia were dangerous, making a war between the races inevitable. Others, while rejecting emancipation because it infringed on their rights to their property, saw gradual emancipation as *especially* dangerous, as they feared it would only inspire the desire for immediate emancipation among the rest of the enslaved and thus another servile war, and ultimately black extermination. Slave owners claimed that "the very breath" of those enslaved "is in the hands of the master," yet at the same time, all agreed that the "feeling of security [was] gone forever, destroyed."[38]

Immediately after Floyd's message was delivered to the House of Delegates, the Speaker of the House, William O. Goode of Mecklenburg, selected a committee to consider proposals relating to "insurrectionary movements" which was then taken up by the Congressional delegates in what would become known as the Virginia Debates.[39] Of the thirteen members appointed to the Select Committee on the Coloured Population, the conservatives, who were from the eastern quarter of Virginia, constituted 76 percent of the voting strength, and Goode appointed William Henry Brodnax of Dinwiddie as Chair of the Special Committee.[40] Although the division amongst the legislators appears wide, those who genuinely feared the potential for slave rebellion and those who feared losing

---

[38] Bollings, The Speeches of Philip A. Bolling, pp. 3-4.
[39] Freehling, Drift, p. 125.
[40] The rest of the committee members were Messrs. Fisher, Cobb, Wood of Abermarle, Roane, Moore, Newton, Campbell of Brooke, Smith of Frederick, Gholson, Brown, Stillman, and Anderson of Nottoway. (add first names) Journal of the House of Delegates Monday, December 5, 1831, Virginia Historical Society.

their property were united about the danger that slavery posed to the white community."[41] Where they differed was in what the solution to that danger would be: colonization, enslavement, or extermination.[42]

Petitions that requested that slaves be immediately emancipated *post-nati*, and then colonized so as to restore their rights, and most importantly, to secure the "peace, prosperity, and happiness" of white Virginians, provoked fierce debates between factions.[43] Goode, as well as Charles S. Carter of the Northern Tidewater region, asserted that the duties of the Special Committee did not extend to discussing the issue of emancipation and they should focus only on the issue of free blacks and their removal.[44] Chairman Brodnax, who was a moderate and a colonizationist, disagreed, and stated that slavery was part of the larger question that they as legislators needed to address since the job of the committee was to respond to the community at large who now lived in constant fear that another insurrection might occur at any time. After much discussion, the debate over slavery began in earnest among members of the entire House.[45]

Committee and House Delegate members who supported gradual emancipation argued that slavery had an ill effect on the population of the states where it existed, and that slavery was a dangerous institution that needed to be eliminated from the state of Virginia. House member Moore argued that slavery was responsible for the decline in

---

[41] Bollings, The Speeches of Philip A. Bolling, p.3; Charles Jas. Faulkner, The Speech of Charles Jas. Faulkner, (Of Berkeley,) In the House of Delegates of Virginia, On the Policy of the State With Respect to Her Slave Population. Delivered on January 20, 1832. (Richmond: Thomas W. White, 1832) p. 21; John A. Chandler, The Speech of John A. Chandler, (Of Norfolk County,) In the House of Delegates of Virginia, On the Policy of the State With Respect to Her Slave Population. Delivered January 17, 1832. (Richmond: Thomas W. White, 1832) p.7.

[42] James M'Dowell, Jr., The Speech of James M'Dowell, Jr. (Of Rockbridge,) In the House of Delegates of Virginia, On the Policy of the State With Respect to Her Slave Population. Delivered January 21, 1832. (Richmond: Thomas W. White, 1832) pp. 5, 12.

[43] Post-nati literally means "those born after." Post-nati emancipation disallowed slaveholder claims on the children of slaves or any person born after the date of emancipation.

[44] Freehling, Drift, p. 126. Tragle, "Floyd Diary," p. 263.

[45] Tragle, "Floyd Diary" p. 263.

population growth in Virginia among whites, while the black population steadily increased. In order to check this gain, Moore stated, there must be an "immense emigration" of blacks "from it" through gradual abolition for "the time has come, when emigration [to Virginia] must be confined almost exclusively to the white population." [46]

For many delegates what really made slavery a threat to Virginia society was the "overflowing black population" which would only lead to violence and war between the races.[47] Those members in the western section of Virginia who advocated gradual abolition did not want any of the excessive black population currently residing in the eastern part of Virginia to be sold or forced into the region of what would become the state of West Virginia.[48] They feared that if slavery did spread throughout Virginia it would "become more unmanageable—we do not wish it to extend beyond the convenient reach of legislative remedy—we do not wish it to overspread that part of your State… rendering its eradication, in any other mode than that of the sword, utterly and forever hopeless."[49]

Even legislators who opposed emancipation had some questions about the future safety of the institution because they believed the growing population of African Americans would inevitably lead to their annihilation. Conservative Congressman Powell of Spottsylvania believed that something had to be done to address the evil of slavery. For him, reiterating the concerns of gradual abolitionists, it was an issue of "self-preservation" and the fact that the slaves, in his calculations, would outnumber the whites

---

[46] Constitutional Whig January 17, 1832.
[47] William H. Brodnax, The Speech of William H. Brodnax, (Of Dinwiddie,) In the House of Delegates of Virginia, On the Policy of the State With Respect to Her Slave Population. Delivered January 19, 1832. (Richmond: Thomas W. White, 1832) pp. 39, 26.
[48] Charles Faulkner, The Speech of Charles Faulkner, pp. 8-9.
[49] James M'Dowell, The Speech of James M'Dowell, p. 31.

ten to one. Indeed, Powell believed that the struggle for freedom manifested in Southampton would become:

> a common occurrence, and the historic muse of Virginia, be fated to weep, often to weep over similar catastrophes. Sir, whatever the results of the convulsive struggles may be, whether they eventuate in the attainment of their object, by this ill fated people, or whether, as to me their seems little doubt, they result in their utter extermination, at the point of the bayonet; in either event, their history will be written in characters of blood.[50]

Virginia legislators were not the only ones worried that the large numbers of African slaves in America might lead to a race war. The increase in the black population in North America due to the expansion of slavery further south troubled many whites across the nation. From 1790 to 1830, the number of enslaved within the nation grew by 188 percent. The number of slaves increased from 697,624 to 2,009,043 while the white population increased 232 percent, from 3,172,006 to 10,537,378. Of particular concern was the fact that during this same period, the number of freed African Americans rose by 437 percent from 59,557 to 319,599. Although nationally the number of white Americans increased by a substantial number in forty years, for a country that viewed itself as Anglo European in origin and culture, the increasing numbers of black people was problematic. In Virginia, where the white population increased by only 57 percent, compared to the 60 percent increase of those enslaved and the whopping 268 percent increase of free blacks from 1790 to 1830, the sheer numbers deepened Anglo-American fears of servile insurrections, or worse yet, a war of extermination between the races.[51]

---

[50] Constitutional Whig January 20, 1832.

[51] U.S. Department of Commerce, Table 6. "Negro Population, Slave and Free at each Census by Division," Bureau of the Census, *Negro Population*, 1790-1915 (Wash, D.C.. 1918) p. 45, 57. See chapter two of this dissertation for early accounts of concerns about the numerical imbalance of African slaves to white Europeans. In Virginia, the slave population went from 292,627 to 469,757; the white population went from 442,117 to 694,300; the free black population went from 12,866 to 47,348. Virginians and white Americans generally had concerns about the increased sophistication and organization of the liberation attempts made by those enslaved, as well as the antislavery activity of free blacks in the nineteenth century.

Thus, at the center of the issue facing the Assembly about whether to maintain blacks in slavery or emancipate them was the question of just how dangerous were the slaves to the white community and the plausibility of a servile war. Gradual abolitionist Samuel M'D. Moore of Rockbridge reflected: "What must be the ultimate consequences of retaining them among us. To my mind, the answer to this enquiry must be both obvious and appalling. It is, sir, that the time will come, and at no distant day, when we shall be involved in all the horrors of a servile war, which will not end until both sides have suffered much; until the land shall every where be red with blood and until the slaves or the whites are totally exterminated." Moore had no doubts that the enslaved would continue to fight for their freedom nor what type of warfare would be waged: "from what we know of human nature generally, and from what we hear of the spirit manifested by both parties in the late Southampton rebellion, it is very evident that such a war must be one of extermination, happen when it will."[52] Many Virginian legislators feared that "a Nat Turner might be in every family, that the same bloody deed could be acted over at any time and in any place, that the materials for it [slaves] were spread through the land and always ready for a like explosion."[53] It was because they considered blacks as an "alien element in …our civil society" that Virginians held the "suspicion" that slaves were "extremely fanatical, and therefore always dangerous," a view that was "eternally attached to the slave himself."[54]

They were dangerous, Congressman James M'Dowell argued, because slaves by nature loved freedom, because they were men who understood the world around them: "Take the slave in his general relation to ourselves, and you cannot regard him otherwise

---

[52] Constitutional Whig January 17, 1832.
[53] James M'Dowell, Speech of James M'Dowell, p. 29.
[54] Ibid. (M'Dowell) p. 4. 29; Bollings, Speeches, p. 4.

than as man,—having the capacities and resentments of man, both indeed repressed but both existing." In M'Dowell's view, "the love of liberty come to us with life…you may…debase and crush him [the slave] as a rational being…and the idea that he was born free will survive it all." Indeed, the "idea [expressed during the debate] that the slave…can be so attached to his master and his servitude as to be indifferent to freedom…is wholly unnatural." [55]

The idea that "a death struggle must come between the two classes in which one or the other will be extinguished forever" was something Congressman Henry Berry of Jefferson agreed was inevitable. In Berry's view, however, Virginians had nothing to worry about because he felt confident that "we have the power to crush any such effort [insurrection] at a blow. I know that any such effort on their [the slaves] part, at this day, will end in the annihilation of all concerned in it; and I believe our greatest security now, is in their knowledge of these things---in their knowledge of their own weakness."[56] The problem, Berry stated in agreement with M'Dowell, was that no matter how many laws were enacted and no matter how ignorant whites attempt to keep the slaves, ideas of freedom were all around them.[57]

A few plans for the emancipation of the slave were brought forward despite Eastern Conservatives attempts to block all discussion of the subject. When Charles James Faulkner asked that the special committee present a resolution of gradual emancipation to the House, he knew it would have little effect on his own livelihood. Faulkner, who was from a northwestern county bordering Maryland, was the owner of

---

[55] M'Dowell, Speeches, pp. 18-20.
[56] Daniel Goodloe, The Southern Platform: or, Manual of Southern Sentiment on the Subject of Slavery (Boston: John P. Jewett, 1858) p. 47.
[57] Ibid. p. 48

one slave. The gradual emancipation proposal that Faulkner suggested to the committee was that slave owners would have the rights to compensation for their existing slaves, but they would forfeit the potential for future profits from their slave's increase. Easterners immediately tabled the proposal.[58]

Thomas Jefferson Randolph, the grandson of Thomas Jefferson, offered a counter proposal to Charles Faulkner's for gradual emancipation *post-nati,* and recommended that Congress look to Virginia voters to decide if they supported his plan. Randolph was not concerned, however, that his plan for emancipation did not mean freedom for blacks in Virginia. In Randolph's plan, the state would mandate that slaves born after 1840 would be free, whereupon after the males turned 21 and the females 18, they would work for the Commonwealth of Virginia to pay their passage to Africa or some other place outside of the United States. Slave owners would receive compensation for their existing slaves from the state or they could sell them in the Deep South slave markets, thus forfeiting the part of their property rights contained in the potential for their slaves to reproduce and increase naturally. All slaves born before 1840 who remained in Virginia would remain enslaved for twenty-eight years from the time in which the legislature passed the act emancipating them. Colonization would cost the taxpayer nothing as the slaves would work off their own passage over the course of their remaining time in bondage. Those slaveholders who chose to sell their property out of state could of course keep the entire profits made from their sale, which solved the problem posed by those looking for or needing full compensation for their slaves.[59] The introduction of this proposal inspired a serious and eventually heated debate over property rights. Members

---

[58] Constitutional Whig, January 7, 1832.
[59] Goodloe, The Southern Platform p. 48.

of the Assembly were especially concerned that Randolph insisted that any legislative act for emancipation be put before their constituents for approval.[60]

Most legislators rejected Randolph's proposal of gradual emancipation because they viewed it as an invasion upon their lawful rights to their private property. They believed that Randolph's proposal was unconstitutional and that any emancipation plan had to overcome the difficult question of how the State could legislate over their exclusive right to use or dispose of their slaves.[61] Since the state of Virginia had no authority to exercise eminent domain in the expropriation of slaves without just compensation or the consent of the planter class, allowing the people of Virginia to vote on a plan for gradual emancipation was unconstitutional. Post-Nati emancipation directly challenged the conservative planters Lockean notions of absolute rights to their property ensured by the Fifth Amendment of the Constitution. Moreover, Congressman Bruce argued, the increase of the slaves as property had always been "recognized by the civil law, and runs through all our statutes, from the earliest period of our colonial existence."[62] This right to "children born of slaves" had been defined by common law, and if the children of female slaves after 1840 became the property of the state, "it must be at once acknowledged, that they are either persons or property, for there is no third class to which they can be assigned; not being property, then, they must be persons."[63] They would not be persons, however, Bruce stated, because now the *state would own* what plantation owners called their property as defined by the Constitution, as well as

---

[60] Brodnax, The Speech of, p. 17.
[61] As defined by Black's Law Dictionary, 5th ed. (St. Paul: West Publishing, 1979) p. 1095.
[62] Constitutional Whig January 19, 1832.
[63] Ibid.

their increase until they could be removed to a foreign country. The Randolph proposal was therefore egregious and oppressive, Bruce declared.[64]

At the heart of their argument on property rights was Virginia's deep investment in the internal African slave trade.[65] As early as the seventeenth century, Virginia was the dominant provider of slaves to the other southern states. By the 1830's, and after the closing of the African slave trade in 1807, the demand for more slaves in the Deep South solidified the commoditization of black people for Virginian slave owners and the merchant class. The improvements in infrastructure, the building of railroads and canals and the usage of slaves for these works and in factories, revived even greater interest in slaves within eastern Virginia. The high demand for male slaves who were a scarce resource, according to one planter, made the prices for a single slave jump 25%: from $400 to $500 by 1832. By 1837, the price had risen to $1,100 for a prime field hand. If the prices of slaves continued to rise, as they did, and there was a shortage of the preferred male slaves from ages 12 to 18, as there was, then it is no wonder that slaveholders were over anxious to protect what appeared to them a flourishing market.[66]

Other Congressman, however, noted that the species of property that legislators claimed in slaves was troubled by how "came slaves into this country," since they were not acquired, as John Locke defined, by "a lawful Conqueror and a Captive."[67] Slaves in America were acquired "by strategies of war, and the strong arm of the conqueror: they

---

[64] Ibid.
[65] See: Walter Johnson's seminal work Soul By Soul: Life Inside the Antebellum Slave Market (Cambridge: Harvard Up, 1999) for how the internal trade in African American slaves operated in America.
[66] Charles Henry Ambler, Sectionalism in Virginia From 1776 to 1861 (New York: Russell and Russell, 1964) pp. 186-188; Herbert Aptheker, American Negro Slave Revolts (New York: International, 1993) p. 321.
[67] John A. Chandler, , The Speech of John A. Chandler, (Of Norfolk County,) In the House of Delegates of Virginia, On the Policy of the State With Respect to Her Slave Population. Delivered January 17, 1832. (Richmond: Thomas W. White, 1832) p.8. See chapter 2, "A State of War Continued" of this manuscript

were vanquished in battle, sold by the victorious party to the slave-trade who brought them to our shores." John Chandler challenged the method by which "ancient authors" claimed one could become a slave by asking "If warriors had no absolute right to the person of his captive, may there not be SOME DOUBT whether the Virginia planter has an unqualified one…The truth is, that our ancestors had no title to this property in the first place."[68]

Not able to come to any consensus on the issue of property rights, gradual emancipation legislation was also resisted because some members believed it would actually inspire revolution amongst the slaves. Speaker of the House, William Goode wanted to make the Legislatures position on the subject of emancipation clear to the press and the community as quickly as possible, and therefore he argued that the question of emancipation should be eliminated from consideration.[69] The state had no money to compensate slave owners, nor did the state have money to pay for their removal, so why waste time talking about something that could not happen? Goode was particularly concerned with the fact that open discussion might encourage slaves to assert their rights to be free and therefore further endanger whites: "They would naturally reason, if a few desperadoes in Southampton, by a few murders, produced such a sensation and such a disposition, what may not be achieved by numbers and combination?"[70] Slaves, Goode warned were not as they had been portrayed, an "ignorant herd of Africans" who had no interest in the outcome of this discussion. They were an "active, intelligent class, watching and weighing every movement of the Legislature with perfect knowledge of its

---

[68] John A. Chandler, , The Speech of John A. Chandler, (Of Norfolk County,) In the House of Delegates of Virginia, On the Policy of the State With Respect to Her Slave Population. Delivered January 17, 1832. (Richmond: Thomas W. White, 1832) p.8.
[69] The Richmond Constitutional Whig January 11, 1832.
[70] Constitutional Whig January 17, 1832.

bearing and effect."[71] If the Committee continued this discussion, Goode asserted, it would be a signal to the slaves that Nat Turner's actions had inspired Congress to enact laws to emancipate them, and it would strengthen their courage that by creating havoc and "fear" they could advance their own freedom.[72]

Many legislators agreed that the discussions they were conducting could have dangerous ramifications, but they predicted a disastrous outcome for the black community:

> If *one insurrection* has been sufficient to secure the liberty of *succeeding* generations, might it not be inferred that *another* would achieve the freedom of the present? I know, Sir, that such an inference would be delusive. I know that the result of any insurrection in Virginia for centuries to come, must be, the extermination of its perpetrators; and often repented, the total destruction and annihilation of the slave population.[73]

The gradual emancipation scheme would precipitate a race war and because of the envisioned outcome, it would financially ruin the majority of the slave holding class, Gholson argued, and "uncalculated millions" would be lost.[74]

Outlining a scope of retribution, which was not theoretical, but rather reflected what had already been and continued to be enacted against African Americans after Turner's insurrection, most legislators agreed with Thomas Marshall. For Marshall argued that "no plan of general insurrection could be carried into successful operation" because of the scope of retaliation, and because of the "dread of punishment prompt, awful, and universal; involving alike the innocent and guilty in its sweeping and sanguinary course." Marshall had to admit, however, that the possibility of a servile insurrection was unsettling for "all men are affected by dangers which are unseen, but

---

[71] Richmond Inquirer, January 19, 1832.
[72] Richmond Inquirer, January 19, 1832.
[73] Speech of James H. Gholson, Constitutional Whig January 26, 1832.
[74] Ibid.

known to exist." Indeed, the "minds of men are commonly most disturbed by dangers which do not appear."[75]

Brodnax, the General of the Dinwiddie county militia who helped put down the Turner insurrection, however, vowed that should blacks attempt "a few more Southamptons…whites with moral, intellectual, and scientific advantages would annihilate the whole race."[76] Blacks could never "exchange conditions with us." Moreover, Brodnax argued, the possibility of a "negro legislature" envisioned by Congressman Rives was ridiculous: that "so far from overwhelming the whites, conquering the country, overturning our political dynasty, and usurping the seats of legislation, *the very act of their imbodying, would be the immediate signal for their annihilation."* There was not "a human being in the region," Brodnax argued, who does not believe that "it will be the *blacks* themselves, and not the whites who must fall in such a struggle."[77]

In order to avoid such a cataclysmic event, Brodnax, an avid supporter of the American Colonization Society offered a compromise proposal that was essentially a replica of the ACS model. Brodnax proposed first the systematic colonization of Virginia's free blacks and then eventually her slaves through voluntary emancipation. Through the efforts of the ACS, a thirty-two cent tax levied on each white resident, and the annual revenue of $275,000 a year from the sale of public lands, approximately six thousand freed blacks could be relocated in Africa each year. The ACS had a long history in Virginia, and many believed that Brodnax's moderate proposal was the answer they

---

[75]Thomas Marshall, Speech of Thomas Marshall, (Of Fauquier) In the House of Delegates of Virginia, On the Policy of the State With Respect to Her Slave Population. Delivered January 14, 1832. (Richmond: Thomas W. White, 1832) pp. 8-9.
[76] Qtd. In Freehling, Drift, p. 142.
[77] Brodnax, Speech of William Brodnax, pp. 23-26

were looking for. It also refocused their attention toward Governor Floyd's previous assertions three weeks earlier of the necessity of removing free blacks.

Colonization as the Final Solution

The colonization proposals made by the Virginia legislature for the removal of black Virginians in 1832 reflected a long history of inherited ideas about the disposability of black bodies in America.[78] This portion of the debates reveal that coercion through vigilant violence was the method of enforcement that the legislature discussed and evidently executed through extralegal means. Colonization was the processes by which both the threat of premature death and removal to Liberia became reality for African Americans slave and free. The seriousness of their ideas is affirmed by free black Theodore Wright who remarked that "immediately after the insurrection in Virginia, under Nat Turner, we saw colonization spreading all over the land; and it was popular to say the people of color must be removed. The press came out against us, and we trembled….we despaired….that was a dark and gloomy period."[79]

Across the nation, many whites viewed colonization as *the* solution to the danger of blacks living in America and a war between the races, and they had done so for at least three decades.[80] Perhaps one of the most active champions of colonization in the

---

[78] I get this term from Kevin Bales' Disposable People: New Slavery in the Global Economy (Berkeley: University of California p, 1999).

[79] Theodore S. Wright, "Address of the Rev. Theodore S. Wright, Before the Convention of the New York State Anti-Slavery Society, On the Acceptance of the Annual Report, Held at Utica, Sept. 20." Colored American October 14, 1837.

[80] This turn to colonization echoed white responses to an earlier insurrection attempt in Virginia. On December 12, 1800, the Virginia House of Delegates met in secret to deliberate on whether, in response to the late attempt at insurrection by Gabriel Prosser, they should remove "such people of color as have been, or shall be, emancipated, or may hereafter become dangerous to the public safety." The Commercial Advertiser reported on October 13th that all the ensuing trials had been suspended because the numbers of people implicated in the insurrection they believed was so large that "should they all be found guilty and be

nineteenth century was the Presbyterian minister Robert Finley from Basking Ridge, New Jersey. Finley was largely responsible for the influential gathering of prominent men who responded to calls from across America for something to be done with what many believed was a dangerous population living in their midst. To address what liberal elites termed "the negro problem,"[81] the American Colonization Society (ACS) was founded in Washington on December 21, 1816.[82] Although others before him made similar statements regarding the colonization of free blacks, Finley's assumptions were widely

---

executed, [it] will nearly produce the annihilation of the blacks in this part of the country." Gabriel, a twenty four year old blacksmith living in Richmond on a plantation belonging to Thomas Prosser Henrico had organized a strategy that was so detailed and multi-dimensional that whites could scarcely believe that they had caught it in time. A Virginia newspaper assumed that "Toussaint Louverture in the French colony" was the model for slaves like Gabriel, acknowledging that the ideas represented by this revolution were ideas that continued to influence black people and their desires for freedom. Although whites discovered Gabriel's plan through the aid of other slaves, he managed to escape for a month before his capture and execution. It is at this point that the idea of colonizing free blacks and recalcitrant slaves developed into one beyond serious contemplation. In the same year, that Gabriel Prosser attempted to "to fight the White People for Freedom," the Virginia legislature met in secret to draft a proposal that the governor of Virginia, James Monroe, submitted to the President of the United States. In this proposal, they requested that President Thomas Jefferson begin negotiations with some other European powers who owned African colonies to allow Americans to send free or emancipated blacks to reside there. Jefferson began talks with the Sierra Leone Company, but nothing ever came of it. He then reached out to the government of Portugal, with no results, and he subsequently gave up. Not deterred from doing something about what they saw as the greatest threat to the institution of slavery, Virginia passed a law in 1805 forbidding emancipated slaves to remain in the state for longer than one year. In an 1816 legislative session, the subject of colonization was brought forward again by the Virginian General Assembly, where they formally vowed to continue to look for, "an asylum beyond the limits of the United States, for such persons of colour as had been or might be emancipated under the laws of this Commonwealth." They again offered another resolution, "that the executive be requested to correspond with the President of the United States, for the purpose of obtaining a territory on the coast of Africa, or some other place, not within any of the states or territorial governments of the United States." See: Helen Tunnicliff Catterall, Judicial Cases Concerning American Slavery and the Negro Vol. 1, (rpt. 1926; New York: Negro Up, 1968) p. 73; Appendix, Letters, II from M. C. in William Lloyd Garrison's Thoughts on African Colonization (rpt. 1832; New York: Arno, 1968) pp. 8-9; Virginia Argus (Richmond), October 3, 1800; Scott French, The Rebellious Slave, p. 292; Freehling, Drifting, p. 111; Joshua Coffin, An Account Of Some Of The Principal Slave Insurrections, Others, Which Have Occurred, Or Been Attempted, In the United Sates and Elsewhere, During The Last Two Centuries, With Various Remarks (New York: ASS, 1860) reprinted in Slave Insurrections: Selected Documents (Westport: Negro UP, 1970) pp. 28-29.

[81] See: Issac V. Brown, "Letter to Mr. John P. Mumford," Biography of the Rev. Robert Finley, D.D. of Basking Ridge, N. J. With an Account of His Agency as the Author of The American Colonization Society; also A Sketch of the Slave Trade; A View of Our National Policy and That of Great Britain Towards Liberia and Africa (Philadelphia: John W. Moore, 1857) pp. 81-83, 89-93, 97, 99; Richmond Recorder Sept. 22, 1802; Jordon, White over Black, p. 469; Henry Noble Sherwood, "The Formation of the American Colonization Society," The Journal of Negro History, Vol. 2, No. 3 (Jul., 11917), pp. 212- 213.

[82] Henry Noble Sherwood, "The Formation of the American Colonization Society," The Journal of Negro History, Vol. 2, No. 3 (Jul., 11917), pp. 212- 213.

accepted: "Everything connected with their condition, including their color, is against them; nor is there much prospect that their state can ever be greatly ameliorated."[83] The co-founders and signers of the ACS constitution in 1816 included many notable Virginians. One signer was congressional representative John Randolph of Roanoke Plantation in Charlotte County, Virginia. Randolph, a descendant of one of the oldest families in Virginia, was known as one of the greatest orators for the proslavery south. John Taylor, of Carolina County, Virginia, a political writer and politician in the United States House and Senate for many years also signed the ACS constitution. So did George Washington's nephew, Bushrod Washington of Westmoreland County, Virginia, who became the ACS' first president.

Contained in Finley's widely read pamphlet, *Thoughts on the Colonization of Free Blacks,* were ideas of racial strife that the ACS founding members used to formulate their initiative to rid the country of its black population.[84] In this document, Finley laid out why blacks and whites needed to be separated and why it was best that blacks be removed from the American continent. His reasoning was simple. First, the presence of black people demoralized whites and made them lazy.[85] Second, racism among whites was "too deep rooted to be eradicated." Third, blacks felt and acted, and therefore remained inferior in their own minds even when free because they were reminded of their past servitude while they lived amongst their former masters.[86] Slavery would never end, Finley believed, as long as so many whites believed it "to be unsafe to encourage the idea

---

[83] Issac V. Brown, "Letter to Mr. John P. Mumford," Biography of the Rev. Robert Finley, D.D. of Basking Ridge, N. J. With an Account of His Agency as the Author of The American Colonization Society; also A Sketch of the Slave Trade; A View of Our National Policy and That of Great Britain Towards Liberia and Africa (Philadelphia: John W. Moore, 1857) p. 99.
[84] Rev. Issac Van Brown, Memoir of the Rev. Robert Finley, D.D. Late Pastor of the Presbyterian Congregation (New Brunswick: Terhune and Letson, 1819) pp. 81-83.
[85] Brown, Memoir of Finley, p. 89.
[86] Brown, Memoir of Finley, p. 91.

of emancipation" and colonization provided the answer for those who wearily searched for how to put an end to "all this [slavery]." [87]

Finley's pamphlet also made clear that the resettlement of enslaved and free blacks within the United States territory was a bad idea because of his certainty that it would lead to a war between the races. Finley saw in "an independent settlement of people who were once our slaves" that "there might be cause of dread, lest they should occasionally combine with our Indian neighbors, or with European nations who have settlements adjacent to our own, and we should have them for our enemies." [88] Moreover, the close proximity of a free colony of blacks would encourage slaves to run away and "escape to a land where their own race was sovereign and independent." Word would spread about the free territory and would make those that remained in slavery "uneasy in their servitude." If, however blacks were removed to Africa, Finley argued, "we should have nothing to fear from their becoming our enemies. Removed far from our sight, our contempt of them, produced by their situation, and by long habit confirmed, would gradually die away." [89]

Finley was also concerned that blacks be removed so that racial amalgamation would not occur, which would inspire ideas and the demand for social equality, and thus conflict between the races. "It can scarcely be doubted that slavery has an injurious effect on the morals and habits of a country where it exists," Finley argued. "Could they be removed to some situation where they might live alone, society would be saved many a pang which now is felt, and must in course of time be much more sensibly felt from the

---

[87] Brown, Memoir of Finley, p. 90.
[88] Brown, Memoir of Finley, pp. 92-93.
[89] Brown, Memoir of Finley, p. 93.

intermixture of the different colours."[90] Many Anglo-Americans envisioned that if blacks were emancipated and not removed the inevitable intermixing of the races would lead to a race war and the extermination of African Americans.[91] Thus, the logic ran, thwarting the possibility of racial amalgamation and the growth of a multiracial America was an act of benevolence central to the issue of and the necessity for developing a plan for the removal of black people.[92]

---

[90] Brown, Memoir of Finley, Attributed to Elias Boudinot Caldwell, Esq. p. 90. The idea that racial amalgamation would lead to a war between the races is evident throughout the antebellum era beginning with, for example, the provocative sentiments of political pamphleteer and editor of the *Richmond Recorder* James Callender. As Thomas Jefferson's nemesis, Callender warned Jefferson that if he continued to have sexual relations with his slave Sally Hemings, he would be responsible for establishing a precedence that would normalize and make acceptable interracial sex. If that happened, if: "every white man in Virginia had done as much as Thomas Jefferson has done towards the utter destruction of its happiness….The country would be no longer habitable, till after a civil war, and a series of massacres. We all know with absolute certainty that the contest would end in the utter extirpation both of blacks and mulattoes. We know that the continent has as many white people, as could eat the whole race at a breakfast." See: Richmond Recorder Sept. 22, 1802, and Winthrop Jordon's White Over Black, p. 469. Fanny Wright would make one exceptional effort to promote interracial sex in her Utopian community Nashoba in Tennessee. Nevertheless, the rise of scientific racialism in Europe in the 1830' s spread to the United States by the 1840s and 1850s. American race scientist like Samuel George Morton, Josiah Mott, and Louis Agassiz produced studies that were concerned with proving that apparent differences in people were biological and that African Americans were actually a different species. By the Civil War, racial purity became a moral imperative, as amalgamation would ultimately lead to the extinction of the white race. David Goodman Croly coined the word miscegenation in 1863 to describe the intermarrying of blacks and whites in a pamphlet he wrote anonymously entitled Miscegenation: The Theory of the Blending of the Races, Applied to the American White Man and Negro to stoke white fear of what the Emancipation Proclamation would mean to northern communities. In satire, Croly contended that blacks could not be "driven out of the country or exterminated" as providence had placed blacks among whites so that "there should be no impediment to the absorption of the one race in the other."(p. 64) Written to incite racial hatred and resistance to the emancipation of the enslaved, Croly's pamphlet created intense debate among northerners, where the extermination of the black race was raised as a solution to an inevitable war between the races. For overview on Croly's effectiveness see: Sidney Kaplan's "The Miscegenation Issue in the Election of 1864," JNH, Vol. 34, No. 3. (July, 1949), pp. 274-343. For other examples of these ideas see: New York Times, Jan. 4, 1860, Oct. 7, Oct. 16, 1862, ; London Morning Herald, Nov. 1, 1864; New-York Daybook 1864; New York Freeman's Journal & Catholic Register, April 16, 1864.

[91]From the African American perspective, it was the members of the ACS who "resorted to every artifice to effect their purposes, by exciting in the minds of the white community, the fears of insurrection and amalgamation." See: Howard Holman Bell, Minutes of the Proceedings of the National Negro "Convention 1830-1864 "Minutes of the Fourth Annual Convention, For the Improvement of the Free People of Color, In the United States, (1834)" (New York: Arno, 1969) pp.4 -5, 7.

[92]Brown and many other colonizationist rationalized that even if it meant death, destruction and hardship for blacks in the early years of settlement in Africa, it which would be nothing out of the ordinary as the ancestors of white Americans had also suffered in the beginning: "How many were destroyed! Sometimes whole settlements cut off by disease and hunger—by the treachery and cruelty of the savages: yet were they not discouraged." Brown, Memoir of Finley, p. 97.

When committee chair Brodnax proposed colonization, he shared the ACS' views of the necessity of their removal and the impossibility of blacks ever gaining full citizenship in America: even though the Virginia legislature recognized that the enslaved were no longer African, "that this [America] is their home—their birth-place."[93] Nevertheless, Brodnax argued that in Virginia they would remain a "distinct and degraded caste" and would never be truly free. The "middle ground" of colonization was a more productive position than either that of the conservatives or the abolitionists. Brodnax believed, that under Randolph's proposal, plantation owners would be inclined to sell their slaves rather than liberate them.[94] Under Brodnax's plan (which took up the assumptions that Thomas Jefferson laid out in 1787),[95] white labor would become available to replace black labor so "that the vacuum produced by the withdrawal of portions of our colored population, would soon be filled again by emigrants of our own color, from other quarters of the world."[96] Yet, Brodnax also knew that the colony of Liberia was too underdeveloped to accommodate the 6000 slaves annually that he suggested would relieve Virginia of her entire population of free blacks in ten years.[97]

---

[93] John Thompson Brown, The Speech of John Thompson Brown, In the House of Delegates of Virginia, On the Policy of the State With Respect to Her Slave Population. Delivered January 18, 1832. (Richmond: Thomas W. White, 1832)
[94] Brodnax, The Speech of William Brodnax, p. 7.
[95] Thomas Jefferson, Notes on the State of Virginia p. 138. Jefferson proposed that after removing blacks through colonization they were "to send vessels at the same time to other parts of the world for an equal number of white inhabitants."
[96] Brodnax, Speeches of William Brodnax, pp. 30.
[97] Brodnax, Speeches, pp. 29, 36, 38, 43. Brodnax's objectives, however, went beyond what the ACS outlined. As a southern businessman looking for new markets, Brodnax envisioned that colonization would facilitate white control over West Africa. This could be achieved by writing into the bill the acquisition of additional territory in Africa "for the reception of any future increased numbers of immigrants, selections could be made…with little expense, to give us control of the whole southwest coast of Africa." In doing so, "we should hold the commercial key to the whole south and west coasts, and as far east as the Bight of Biafra, and control as we pleased, the trade of the Gambia, the Senegal, and even of the Niger—Ivory Coast and the Gold Coast," any of which would supply "a place to carry our black population."

Other committee and House Delegate members, who supported colonization, echoed the sentiments of Finley in his fears of interracial sex. Congressman Moore argued that since the slaves were incapable of being virtuous and moral in their condition, the "demoralizing influence of the indiscriminate intercourse of the sexes among our slave population" corrupts the entire society of Virginia. The dangers and "dissolute habits of a large number of our citizens, especially of the very poorest class, is too notorious to be denied, and the cause [slaves] of it is too obvious to be disputed."[98] For Moore and other legislators who supported gradual emancipation, this dangerous disruption of racial boundaries between especially poor whites and blacks made it an imperative that blacks when freed be removed from the state of Virginia.[99]

Southern abolitionist Charles Faulkner, however, challenged Brodnax's colonization plan because it "deals too much in contradictions, and seeks too fancifully to reconcile impossibilities," and because it would not resolve the issue of ensuring who would win in a war between the races.[100] Many in Congress, Faulkner stated, believe that "something must be done," and if something was not done, "concede that one race or the other must be exterminated." Note that "the gentleman from Campbell, (Mr. Rives)," Faulkner posited, believes that "the throats of all the white people will be cut—No, says the gentleman from Dinwiddie [Brodnax]—'The whites cannot be conquered—the throats of the *blacks* will be cut.'" If this was the case, Faulkner declared, the "supreme law of society" demanded more than Mr. Brodnax's plan of postponement to halt the

---

[98] Constitutional Whig January 17, 1832.
[99] By 1832, white urban wage laborers, small farmers, and the merchant class population begin to challenge white elites on issues such as taxation and political representation, and access to land. Working class whites viewed African Americans, however, as a competition that they were determined to marginalize and exclude from all the trades in the south.
[100] Faulkner, Speeches, p. 13; Constitutional Whig January 24, 1832.

growth of slavery and its "further march to the west."[101] It demanded that they "relieve the country of their [slaves] presence as promptly and efficiently as...our resources will permit. We stand in a relation towards them, not as absolute masters, but of fiduciaries." Indeed, "if this immense negro population were now in arms—gathering into black and formidable masses of attack—would that man be listened to, who spoke of property?…I think I am then borne out…that we should be justified *now* in removing this class of our population." For if extermination was to be the result of an ensuing race war, Faulkner asked, what would the colonization of first free blacks, and then afterwards the gradually emancipated slaves do to prevent it?[102]

Archibald Bryce Jr., who was also for gradual emancipation, suggested that they look to the Brodnax proposition of colonization as a "first step" towards the rectification of the dangerous possibility of a servile war. Bryce believed the question of removing slaves would have to wait until there was more public consensus about it, while the colonization of free blacks would demonstrate to the world that Virginia intended to end slavery. When the state was able to tackle the challenge of removing so large a population of undesirable inhabitants, some legislative body in the future would do so.[103] This proposal was so similar to that of Brodnax's that they were combined to form the Brodnax-Bryce compromise. This legislation opened the discussion on emancipation anew, only this time the discourse became angry and heated. Abolitionists like Mr. Marshall of Fauquier also called for the immediate abolition of slavery and asserted that slaves would no longer be dangerous if they were removed.[104] Still, the Brodnax-Bryce

---

[101] Ibid. Faulkner, Speeches, pp. 14, 16; Constitutional Whig January 24, 1832.
[102] Faulkner, Speeches, pp. 18, 16, 10.
[103] Freehling, Drift, pp. 148-149.
[104] Constitutional Whig January 23, 1832.

proposal passed narrowly, and was attached to the Committee report, which stated that emancipation was possible through colonization and that although the issue of slavery was unresolved, it remained open for legislation.[105]

Ultimately, colonization conflated two of the possible outcomes discussed over the course of the debates: removal and death. When the Committee met again on February 7, 1832, their agenda was to "discuss the bill for the removal of Free persons of Colour from this Commonwealth," and the means by which that could occur.[106] Which blacks were willing to go to Liberia, who was manumitting their slaves for the purpose of removal, and whether free blacks could be made to leave Virginia by compulsory means, were all questions that remained unanswered. For Brodnax, who continued as Chair, the pressing question was whether the "legislature would or would not adopt a coercive plan" to remove free blacks because "no gentleman, who forms a component of this committee…can believe that the free negroes of Virginia are, in truth, willing to be removed from the United States." Furthermore, Brodnax asked "who has not observed the proceedings of the great meeting of free negroes last summer in Baltimore, and that they are not only utterly opposed to emigration themselves, but are making exertions to dissuade all others of the same class, throughout our country?"[107] More than likely because compulsion was something that the ACS had always categorically denied was part of their philosophy, and because of the suspicions of the black community,[108]

---

[105] Freehling, Drift, pp. 164-165.
[106] Richmond Enquirer February 7, 1832.
[107] Brodnax, "Appendix" Speech of, p. 42.
[108] Blacks had contested the ACS's plan for colonization from the very beginning. After the ACS revealed their pro-colonization ideas through the *National Intelligencer* and in Philadelphia and New York newspapers, the black community in Philadelphia held a massive protest meeting. Over three thousand black people questioned the sincerity of the ACS and its clear agenda of noninterference with slavery, making the ownership in men all the more secure in the south. Moreover, they were concerned that compulsion might replace the purported voluntary recruitment of free blacks, and this concern was

Brodnax "wished the name of the Colonization Society might be forgotten until this legislation had got through its action on the question."[109]

Brodnax concluded that since *he* knew of no free blacks who were willing to go, "sooner or later the free negroes will be *forced* to leave the state."[110] Other members thought that they could use "moral" force, harnessed through severe laws that restricted their "existing privileges" and the will of the white community through Lynch clubs and similar types of organizations to "induce their removal." A few members thought that there were some blacks willing to go voluntarily and this would allow for the "responsibility of coercion to fall upon the shoulders of others." Mr. Brodnax did not agree, "depend on it, force must be resorted to in some way."[111] According to formerly enslaved Virginian, Moses Grandy, Brodnax was correct. As far as being sent to Liberia by the ACS, Grandy believed that free blacks did not want to go to Africa, "America is their home: if their forefathers lived in Africa, they themselves know nothing of that country." The problem, as Grandy saw it, was that "None but free coloured people are taken there: if they would take slaves, they might have plenty of colonists. *Slaves will go any where for freedom."* [112]

---

universal. James Forten and the other early black nationalists who had previously championed emigration remained silent and did not contest the majority of black Philadelphians unequivocal rejection of the ACS and its colonization plans. See: James Forten's letter to Paul Cuffee, Cuffee Papers, January 25, 1817; Garrison, Thoughts, William Loren Katz, introduction, viii-ix; Garrison, Thoughts, Philip Bell, "An Address to the citizens of New-York" pp. 16-17.

[109] Richmond Enquirer February 7, 1832. It is also possible that the committee sought to replicate the Maryland legislation that had already passed concerning the colonization of free blacks after Turner's insurrection, which dictated that if they needed more blacks to fulfill their budgeted quota, Marylanders would force blacks to resettle in Liberia. See Aptheker, American Negro, pp. 314-315. Find: Laws Made and Passed by the General Assembly of the State of Maryland…1831…1832, Annapolis, 1832, Chapters 281, 325, and Resolution No. 124.

[110] Brodnax, Speeches, "Appendix," p. 42 Richmond Enquirer, February 7, 1832.

[111] Ibid. Richmond Enquirer, February 7, 1832.

[112] Moses Grandy, Narrative of the Life of Moses Grandy, Late a Slave in the United States of America (1842; Boston, Hardpress) p. 24. (emphasis added)

Central to the argument for colonization was that there was nothing to protect the black community from violence and "adoption of a compulsory principle" because Virginia laws did not protect the rights of blacks. According to Mr. Brodnax, "Free negroes have many *legal* rights and privileges in Virginia, but no *constitutional* ones—they are not citizens, or members of the body politic."[113] Disregarding Brodnax's lengthy assertions on the morality of being "frank, and magnanimous, to…declare to all these people what it is you really intend in the first instance,"[114] the House *formally* rejected ideas of colonizing free blacks through coercion. They adopted instead John C. Campbell's plan for the voluntary colonization of free blacks and manumitted slaves. [115] Eventually, the Senate indefinitely postponed the House plan for colonization, as they could not agree as to who should finance the removal of blacks from Virginia.[116]

Yet the ACS, despite the inability of Virginians to legislate on the issue of colonization, still had the largest shipment of black emigrants ever assembled in 1832. And Virginia was the biggest exporter, apparently undeterred by Liberia's known inability to sustain so many new settlers. Although in previous shipments the number of free blacks departing for Africa through the ACS had been small in number, in 1832 the number of free blacks emigrating out of the South dwarfed the number of emancipated slaves.[117] This push for expatriation occurred despite the fact that mortality rates in Liberia were extremely high, reaching almost 50 percent from 1820 to 1843, and white

---

[113] Brodnax, "Appendix," Speeches, p. 44.
[114] Brodnax, "Appendix," Speeches, p. 42.
[115] Freehling, Drift, p. 182.
[116] Freehling, Drift, pp. 191-192.
[117] Clegg, The Price of Liberty, pp. 134-136. See: U.S. Congress. Senate Roll of Emigrants That have Been Sent to the Colony of Liberia 28th Congress, 2nd session 1844. rept. 150. and African Repository, "The Long Awaited Statistics," June 1844, pp.161-162.

and black Americans knew this.[118] And when Joseph Mechlin, the colonial agent in Monrovia, warned that malaria and the rainy season currently made preparation for large numbers of new settlers impossible, the ACS went forward anyway and commissioned three shipments of black immigrants after Turner's rebellion in 1831 and 1832. Out of almost 350 people, 291 were free African Americans who left Virginia aboard the *James Perkins* in December 1831, and another 171 blacks from Virginia left in May 1832 on the *Jupiter*. In July of that same year, 39 immigrants left from Virginia and Washington D.C., and 89 North Carolinians left for Liberia on the brig *American*.[119]

Ultimately, white Virginians cared little about whether blacks survived in African or not. According to Mechlin's carefully kept records, of the 1449 emigrants that came to Liberia between 1831 and 1833 looking for freedom from oppression, 21 percent of them died from malaria alone.[120] The spectacle of extralegal violence, murder, and harassment after the Southampton affair continued to generate candidates for immigration, and this, William Brodnax stated, allowed those who claimed to object to physical coercion to remain blameless.[121] According to Brodnax: "many of those [blacks] who have already been sent off, went with *their avowed consent*, but under the influence of a more decided compulsion…I will not express, in its full extent the idea I entertain of what has been done, or what enormities will be perpetrated to induce this class of persons to leave the state. Who does not know that when a free negro, by crime or otherwise, has rendered

---

[118] Claude A. Clegg, The Price of Liberty: African Americans and the Making of Liberia (Chapel Hill: UNC p, 2004) pp. 130-160. Out of 4,454 people sent to settle in Liberia from 1820, only 1,736 remained in 1843, 2198 of them had died and 608 managed to leave the colony. See Garrison, Thoughts, pp. 19, 26-30, 34, for black awareness of mortality in Africa.
[119] Clegg, The Price of Liberty, pp. 134-136. See: U.S. Congress. Senate Roll of Emigrants That have Been Sent to the Colony of Liberia 28th Congress, 2nd session 1844. rept. 150. and African Repository, "The Long Awaited Statistics," June 1844, pp.161-162.
[120] Clegg, The Price, p. 139.
[121] Brodnax, "Appendix," Speeches, p. 43.

himself obnoxious to the neighborhood, how easy it is for a party to visit him one night, take him from his bed and family, and apply to him the gentle admonition of a severe flagellation, to induce him to *consent* to go away…the gentleman from Southampton will put me right, that of the large cargo of emigrants lately transported from that county to Liberia, all of whom *professed* to be *willing* to go, most of them were rendered so, by such severe ministrations as those I have described."[122] As has been shown, violence against the black community was intense after Nat Turner's insurrection, and the shipload of free blacks coerced into leaving Southampton for Liberia were aboard the *James Perkins*, which was filled beyond legal capacity.[123]

Those blacks that continued to reside in Virginia after the Virginia Debates concluded experienced the severity of legislative action intended to protect the white community from any future servile wars.[124] Blacks, for example, were no longer able to preach at religious meetings or meet at night for such purposes unless in the company of their slave owner or mistress. Ex-slave James Lindsay Smith remembered that "when Nat Turner's insurrection broke out, the colored people were forbidden to hold meetings among themselves." These restrictions were put into place, Smith stated, so that blacks could not plot "some scheme to raise an insurrection among the people."[125] In the final analysis, the legislature did nothing to loosen the chains of bondage for those enslaved in Virginia. Rather, it seems that the rhetoric of the Virginia Debates functioned more as a

---

[122] Brodnax, "Appendix," Speeches, p. 43.
[123] Clegg, The Price of Liberty, pp. 134-135.
[124] The 1832 Police Bill altered the rights of free blacks to a trial by jury and instead they would share the same legal rights that slaves had. The Governor could now sell free blacks into slavery if convicted of a crime punishable by death. The legislature put restrictions on black trade and crafts men so that unless they were willing to immigrate to Liberia they could no longer practice their livelihood in Virginia. The Senate later suspended these restrictions, perhaps in order to maintain an exploitable labor force in the area.
[125]Lindsey remarked that slaves continued to hold meetings at their quarters in secret: "notwithstanding our difficulties, we used to steal away." James Lindsay Smith, Autobiography, p. 15.

rationale for the greater violence and oppression waged against all people of color, slave and free. Proslavery ideology was well served by these discussions, and one example of how this event was canonized in the antebellum era can be found in the writings of Thomas Dew.

Thomas Dew, a professor at the William and Mary College in Virginia, was asked by Governor Floyd to present what was described as a scholarly view of both sides of the issue.[126] Dew questioned whether: "two distinct races of people now living together as master and servant, [could] be ever separated" so that the latter would have "rights, to an equalization with the whites?"[127] With little ambivalence, Dew declared that they could not. Reaffirming the inevitable outcome of the debate, he stated that "every plan of emancipation and deportation which we can possibly conceive, is totally impractical."[128]

Dew revisited old ideas about war and slavery to explain why the institution was not only lawful but also necessary. He argued that slavery saved Africans from African extermination and made wars on the continent of Africa more mild. Dew took on African precepts of justice in arguing that as a "commutation of the punishment of death" slavery served a positive good.[129] Dismissing those who questioned slave owner rights to those held in bondage, Dew used the definition of just wars cited by Hugo Grotius, which allowed that "the law of nature permits prisoners of war to be killed, so the same law has introduced the right of making them slaves."[130] In the instance of Nat Turner, his actions were informed by "the passion of revenge," as this, Dew argued, was what savages do

---

[126] Floyd, "Diary of John Floyd," The John P. Branch Historical Papers, p. 92.
[127] Thomas R. Dew, Review of the Debate in the Virginia Legislature of 1831 and 1832. (1832; Westport: Negro UP, 1970) p. 5. Thomas Dew's writings on emancipation stemmed directly from the debates in the Virginia legislature.
[128] Dew, Review, p. 9
[129] Dew, Review, pp. 15, 19.
[130] Dew, Review, p. 18. Hugo Grotius, The Rights of War and Peace (1625) Chapters 1and 7.

unlike Europeans: "When polished nations have obtained the glory of victory, or have acquired an addition of territory, they may terminate a war with honor. But savages are not satisfied, until they extirpate the community which is the object of their hatred. They fight not to conquer, but destroy. The desire of vengeance is the first and almost the only principle, which a savage instills in the minds of his children."[131] The remedy for these savage wartime practices, Dew contended, was slavery. Slavery was the element that changed the "nature of the savage" as it facilitated the "taming of man" making blacks "fit for labor" and western civilization.[132] The slave "generally loves the master and his family," and because "blacks are as much civilized as they are in the United States," the white population had little to fear of another insurrection like Nat Turner's ever accomplishing "such fell deeds" as the wholesale "murder of men, women, and children."[133] Dew optimistically predicted that even in the next century, in 1929, and based on the latest census, whites would retain control of and power over the black race and be even "much more secure from plots and insurrections."[134]

Indeed, in Dew's opinion, the mistake that America had made with Native Americans was that they should have enslaved all of them to save them from extermination:

> a great number of Indians within the limits of the United States would have been saved, had we rigidly persevered in enslaving them, than by our present policy…. They have rapidly disappeared, as the pale faces have advanced. Their numbers have dwindled to insignificance….The President of the United States [Andrew Jackson] now tells you, that their removal further to the West is necessary …—to remove them is all we can now do for them….Our population will again, and at no distant day, press upon their borders—their game will be destroyed—intoxicating beverages will be furnished to them—they will engage in wars, and their total extermination will be the inevitable consequence. The *handwriting* has indeed appeared on the *wall*. The mysterious degree of Providence has

[131] Dew, Review, pp.11-12.
[132] Dew, Review, pp. 33, 29.
[133] Dew, Review, pp. 113-114.
[134] Dew, Review, p. 116.

> gone forth against the red man—his destiny is fixed, and final destruction is his inevitable fate.[135]

Dew's linkage of the plight of the Native American with his assessment of the future of black people in America is telling. As he further concludes, "Slavery, we assert again, seems to be the only means that we know of, under Heaven, by which the ferocity of the savage can be conquered…by which, in fine, his nature can be changed."[136] Indeed, Dew's positing that African Americans and Native Americans were essentially savages incontrovertibly places both groups at risk for annihilation.[137] It also further validates the apprehensions that black people had about whites not using force to resettle them in Africa.[138] Laying out the historical model for how Americans dealt with those whose

---

[135] Dew, Review, pp. 32-33.
[136] Ibid. Dew, Review, p. 33.
[137] Comparisons between Native Americans and African Americans were salient to many black Americans in the antebellum era, as an important lens to the possibilities of what they too might experience as racialized others. William J. Wilson wrote an essay "What Shall We Do With the White People" published in the *Anglo-African Magazine* where he recounted: "They [white people] came to this country in small numbers and began upon a course of wrong-doing. The Aborigines were the first victims. They robbed them of their lands, plundered their wigwams, burned their villages and murdered their wives and children. Thus, they advanced, until now they have almost the entire possession of the continent….We find room enough for us [blacks] in this country….yet they would elbow us off what we possess….We want this country, say they, for ourselves alone." Austin Stewart recollected that he met up with an old Indian in making his escape to freedom who when "the kind-hearted old Indian repeated to me the story of his wrongs, it reminded me of the injustice practiced on myself, and the colored race generally….I have often wondered, when looking at the remnant of that once powerful race, whether the black man would become extinct and his race die out, as have the red men of the forest; whether they would wither in the presence of the enterprising Anglo-Saxon as have the natives of this country." Frederick Douglass stated that: "The negro is sometimes compared with the Indian, and it is predicted that, like the Indian, he will die out before the onward progress of the Anglo-Saxon Race. I have not the least apprehension at this point….with the negro. There is a vitality about him that seems alike invincible to hardship and cruelty. Work him, whip him, sell him, torment him, and he still lives, and clings to American civilization." See: "Ethiop" The Anglo-African Magazine, February 1860; Austin Steward, Twenty-two Years a Slave and Forty Years a Freeman (Rochester, NY: William Alling, 1857) p. 140; Frederick Douglass, "The Black Man's Future in the Southern States: An Address Delivered in Boston , Massachusetts, On 5 February 1862," The Frederick Douglass Papers ed. John W. Blassingame, Series One, vol. 3 1855-63, p. 507.
[138] Some members of the free black community marveled at how whites, who called themselves humanitarians, could not understand why blacks had little faith in the ACS proposition that they would have a choice to immigrate or not: " We hope that those who have so eloquently pleaded the cause of the Indian, will at least endeavor to preserve consistency in their conduct. They put no faith in Georgia, although she declares that the Indians shall not be removed but '*with their own consent.*' Can they blame us if we attach the same credit to the declaration that they mean to colonize us 'only with consent?' Blacks had seen what happened with the Native American community; how Anglo Americans had either reneged

warlike ability predisposed them to elimination, Dew's message was clear: that the freedom given to Native Americans was a disastrous mistake and if Virginia chose to emancipate her African American slaves it would ultimately lead to their extermination as well.

Anxiety about internecine warfare as well as the inability of white southerners to accept the existence of a large free black population shaped the dialectic over emancipation in the Virginia Debates in 1832. Colonization, as the only solution to getting rid of all the free blacks in the state, was complicated by the fact that black Virginians did not want to go to Africa. The issue of how to control a large population of slave and free blacks was resolved by ideas of force and violence, and by loud assertions of a potential war between the races. Yet, although many Virginia Congressmen claimed that any challenge to slavery would result in a war of extermination, one that they were determined that blacks would lose, they never intended for any such escalation to occur because a prolonged servile war would not have sustained slavery—it would have ended it. Unfortunately, the fear that permeated the white community was left with no redress, and the backlash, the vigilante violence that ensued after Nat Turner's rebellion described in the previous chapter, attempted to compensate for that. Indeed, the Virginia Debates functioned as a tool to let black Virginians know that their lives were in jeopardy as individuals and as a community. For as the committee Chair, William Brodnax stated, the "negroes know very well what is going on. Will they not see your debates?"[139] Thus,

---

on every agreement made or killed off the opposition to white encroachment and they had little faith that this would not happen to them. See: Garrison, Thoughts, Philip Bell, "An Address to the citizens of New-York" pp. 16-17.

[139] Brodnax, "Appendix," Speeches, p. 42.

despite Turner's war for black freedom nothing much changed for those enslaved in the south. Even more troublesome was the fact that instead of trending towards abandoning the institution as the Founding Fathers predicted, many slaveholders sought to expand it. Two decades later, the South debated whether to supply the expansion of slavery with newly imported African slaves by reviving the African slave trade.

CHAPTER SIX

"WOULD HAVE TO SEE THEIR BLOOD FLOW": REOPENING THE AFRICAN SLAVE TRADE

The quest to reopen the African slave trade caused vigorous debate among proslavery Southerners in the 1850s. Some politicians were concerned that a rally around the reestablishment of the trade would create sectional tensions, perhaps even disunion. The states on the border of the slave south argued that the effects of an increase in the slave population would negatively influence the price for goods and slaves. The need for more labor and the perceived erosion of political power, however, inspired several Southern men to call for the repeal of federal laws that prohibited them from purchasing slaves directly from Africa. Their argument was that since the nation upheld slavery morally, politically, and recognized it socially as a domestic institution, legislation restricting the African slave trade was improper. What was the difference, they asked, between buying slaves in America versus from Africa, Cuba or Brazil?

This chapter argues that despite the argument, many Southerners believed that the importation of slaves directly from Africa would result in black and white violence, and inevitably black or white extermination. Even though they remained unsure about their

American born slaves, Southerners nevertheless argued that new Africans would disrupt the institutional practices of paternalism and the Master-Sambo relationship that they claimed existed. What the discussions over reopening the foreign slave trade reveal is that the idea of a war between the races was very much in play in the decades before the Civil War. Indeed, these visions of violence remained central to proslavery ideology. On the other hand, African Americans, who were very aware of these debates, taunted Anglo Americans by encouraging white fear.[1]

Reopening the African Slave Trade in America: The Pro-slave Trade Perspective

Although some historians have rightly noted that the movement to reopen the African slave trade represented a distinctly different viewpoint from those in the early republic, they have failed to fully investigate why a transformation in the thinking of

---

[1] Other than Du Bois's work, there are several articles written from various perspectives on the reopening of the foreign slave trade. See: W. E. B. Du Bois, The Suppression of the African Slave Trade to the United States of America 1638-1870 (1896; Baton Rouge: Louisiana State p, 1969); Harvey Wish, "The Revival of the African Slave Trade in the United States, 1856-1860" The Mississippi Valley Historical Review, Vol. 27, No. 4. (Mar., 1941), pp. 569-588; Thomas P. Martin, "Conflicting Cotton Interests at Home and Abroad, 1848-1857" The Journal of Southern History, Vol. 7, No. 2. (May, 1941), pp. 173-194; Robert F. Durden, "J. D. B. De Bow: Convulsions of a Slavery Expansionist" The Journal of Southern History, Vol. 17, No. 4. (Nov., 1951), pp 441-461; Barton J. Berstein, "Southern Politics and Attempts to Reopen the African Slave Trade" The Journal of Negro History, Vol. 51, No. 1. (Jan., 1966), pp. 16-35. Gerald Horne interrogates the discussions to reopen the slave trade in the US more broadly in his The Deepest South: The United States, Brazil, and the African Slave Trade (New York: NYU p, 2007) especially pp. 83-170; Ronald Takaki, The Proslavery Crusade: The Agitation to Reopen the African Slave Trade (New York: The Free Press, 1971); Manisha Sinha, The Counterrevolution of Slavery: Politics and Ideology in Antebellum South Carolina (Chapel Hill: UNC p, 2000) pp.136, 129, 142, and chapter 5. Ronald Takaki's is the only monograph written exclusively about the subject of reopening the slave trade to date. Takaki, in his seminal work, claimed that the proslavery call for reopening the trade was complicated by the moral ambivalence that Southerners felt despite their rhetoric of state's rights and their assertions that slavery remained a vital institution. The work of revisionist Manisha Sinha, however, challenges some of Takaki's conclusions. Sinha contends that the movement "was not an extremist fantasy," nor were southerners consumed with guilt about slavery or the morality of the institution. In her view, the attempt by large agri-capitalists to reinstate the foreign slave trade "embodied a rejection of the Revolutionary Generation's compromise on slavery." Sinha devoted an entire chapter to the slave trade movement. What my research in this dissertation chapter makes clear is that Anglo American fears of the enslaved and newly imported African slaves must be added to the list of factors for why the foreign slave trade movement ultimately failed.

some southerners occurred.[2] Fundamentally, those who supported reopening the African slave trade understood that in reality, the slave trade had never really ended. Practically every European nation was searching for a cheap, exploitable, and disposable labor force, and the foreign African slave trade continued to fulfill that need throughout the antebellum era and beyond.[3] Southerners, well aware of the reemergence of an international trend that championed the exploitation of Africans and other peoples of color for their labor, believed that reopening the slave trade would be good for Africans and with proper oversight, good for the nation. The brutality and cruelty, and the substantive increase in African mortality from the illegal business of acquiring Africans for slaves encouraged southerners like Virginian George Fitzhugh to reason that: "If it be right to prohibit the slave trade, it must be wrong to increase it, and aggravate its cruelties;…worse, still,… to multiply its horrors."[4]

In light of the protracted participation and fantastic wealth made by nations around the world from the continued commerce in African slaves, southern men took seriously the viability of reopening the foreign slave trade in America.[5] Former Alabama

---

[2]Robert F. Durden, "J. D. B. De Bow: Convulsions," p. 457; Sinha, Counterrevolution, p. 142.

[3] By the 1850's, the evidence reveals that many nations participated in the trade in African slaves and that it was as resilient as ever. According to the consuls of Brazil, as many as 23,000 African slaves were imported in 1850. Several American slavers attempted to capitalize on the subsequent need for additional slaves in Brazil after an outbreak of cholera there in 1855. In Cuba, over 30,000 slaves were reported to have landed on the island in 1859. In a letter to the British ambassador in Washington, Lord John Russell reported that of the 170 slave trading expeditions fitted out from 1857 to 1860, 74 sailed from New York, 43 from other American ports, 40 were from Cuba, and the rest were from European ports. Even England discovered in 1860 that some of her own were considerably participating in the slave trade under the flag of France. As Eric Williams pointed out, "British capitalism destroyed West Indian slavery but continued to thrive on Brazilian, Cuban, and American Slavery." Whatever their nationality, the slave traders said openly "that money does all things." William Law Mathieson, Great Britain and The Slave Trade 1839-1865 (New York: Octagon: 1967) pp. 133, 135, 162, 165-166, 179; Eric Williams, Capitalism and Slavery, (Chapel Hill: UNC p, 1944) pp. 176-177.

[4] George Fitzhugh, "The Conservative Principle; Or, Social Evils and Their Remedies," De Bow's Review XXII, Issue 5, May 1857, p. 450.

[5] Trafficking in African slaves continued beyond 1807 because the penalties for participation in the trade were minor at best, while the profits which reached over 30%, made the foreign slave trade too lucrative for many American businessmen to ignore. In fact, profit was achieved even if only one out of every three

Congressman William Yancey argued that: "If it is right to raise slaves for sale, is it not right to import them?..If it is right to buy slaves in Virginia and carry them to New Orleans, why is it not right to buy them in Cuba, Brazil, or Africa and carry them there?...If it is not wrong to hold slaves, and to buy them and sell them, it is right in morals, and under the Constitution which guarantees the institution, that we should buy them in whatever place we may choose to select." Yancey concluded by questioning why anyone would want to pay 1500 dollars for a slave when they could purchase them for 600 dollars in Cuba or go to Africa and pay 60?[6]

Some Southerners felt sure that they had support for reopening the foreign slave trade in the north, because it would be especially good for those involved in the manufacturing and mercantile industries.[7] Men like Virginian George Fitzhugh

---

slave trading ventures were successful. Fines under the 1808 legislation could reach no higher than $20,000 or in the case of individuals caught purchasing slaves, $800 per slave. Prison time was 5 to 10 years maximum for individual merchant/financiers and 2-4 years for the Commanders of the ships. Ships were to be forfeited upon capture, but since the ships were often ruined from the outrageous conditions that slaves lived under during the voyage from Africa, they were sometimes of little to no value anyway. The problem, as W.E.B. Du Bois set out, was that all of the Acts established by Congress were essentially a dead letter. Not only was enforcement virtually non-existent, but also the open abrogation of international treaties with Britain and other countries effectively sent the signal that business could continue as usual. This activity was officially documented many times in letters and reports sent to Congress. Despite James Monroe's attempts that very same year to pay rewards to informants who could identify smugglers, to establish naval policing activities on the coast of West Africa, and to convert slave trading into an act of piracy in 1820—the allure of trafficking in slaves continued. Du Bois notes that there is some decline from 1825 to 1830, but then the trade was revived from 1840 to 1860. The fact that no one ever suffered the death penalty for participating in the illegal slave trade reveals in real terms not only the judicial attitudes but also the social and political predilections of the times. Even the Webster-Ashburton Treaty in 1842, which established an official African Squadron for the final suppression of the African slave trade, had little effect. The shift towards an international free market economy sustained slavery and labor exploitation, and laws without genuine leadership could not compete with the power of the demand for this form of transatlantic commerce. Thomas Fowell Buxton, The African Slave Trade and It's Remedy, (1839; London: Frank Cass, 1967) pp. 221-225; Mathieson, Great Britain and The Slave Trade, p. 5; See Public Statutes At Large of the United States of America Vol. II Act of March 2, 1807, Statute II, Chapter XXII; Hugh Thomas, The Slave Trade: The Story of the Atlantic Slave Trade: 1440-1870 (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1997) p. 614; Du Bois, The Suppression of the African Slave Trade, pp. 112, 114-123, 182-184.

[6] William Lowndes Yancey, "Late Southern Convention At Montgomery," De Bow's Review Vol. XXIV, Issue 6, June 1858, p. 585.

[7] Du Bois notes that the fitting out of slave ships was a thriving business in New York City in the 1850s. Even in 1808, New York was considered the premier port for the illicit trade and the cities of Portland and Boston participated in a major way as well. See Du Bois, pp. 178-179; Thomas, pp. 461-463.

understood that northerners also benefited from the cotton produced from slave labor in the south. Slaves provided the factors of production that drove the New England economy, which in turn supplied the markets of the world. The slave trade would benefit northern white laborers too. Recent reports about the conditions in Africa and Europe indicated that people were "starving for want of food, employment, and a market." The rising demand for products made from slave labor would increase production and reduce prices. Increased production would occur through the employment of white laborers, who would then benefit from cheaper manufactured goods. Fitzhugh goes on to say, "but were the slave trade renewed, there is no doubt that the North would on the whole reap much the larger share of advantages and profit. This trade would render the Union indissoluble."[8]

An age-old idea that continued to have currency among southerners for or against the trade was that slavery actually benefited African people as well. No one could dispute that in Africa, "slavery is the common condition of that country," Leonidas Spratt and others harangued, and "to the captive of the savage there are no alternatives but death or slavery." From his prospective, slavery and the reopening of the slave trade "saves to life and usefulness" the African from "the barbarities of savage warfare."[9] Edward Bryan stated that indeed the slave trade elevated the African—which justified whatever cruelties existed. Of course, cruelty "abounds in every human institution," but those opposed to the importation of new Africans, Bryans argued, should reflect on the fact that there was less cruelty in the slave trade before its legal abolition. Bryan believed the inhumanity of the

---

[8]George Fitzhugh, "The Conservative Principle; Or, Social Evils and Their Remedies," De Bow's Review XXII, Issue 5, May 1857, pp. 450, 456-457.
[9] Leonidas W. Spratt, "Report on the Slave Trade" De Bow's Review Vol. XXIV, Issue 6, June 1858, pp. 477-478.

middle passage could simply be alleviated with care. In any case, the harshness of the current trafficking in African slaves "should not condemn uses, they rather should be reformed by a good regulation of the uses."[10] George Fitzhugh's sophistry that Mr. Seward, the great northern abolitionist, and his cohorts should consider "whether this memorable, universal, and time-honored trade, be not an operation enjoined and demanded by the higher law," was an idea he shared with many of his fellow southerners.[11]

Bryan was making reference to the known fact that those involved in the illegal slave trade inflicted the most inhumane and barbarous cruelties upon their African captives. Slave traders, concerned with getting as many Africans on board ship as they possibly could, anticipated that roughly one third of their cargo would die as they crossed the Atlantic and another one third would die after arrival.[12] Unlike the days before abolition, where the mortality rate was approximately 14 percent, traders packed their ships with Africans, sometimes with as many as 750 in a vessel only 100 feet long. Captives would have to sleep in spoon like fashion and the ships reeked with the stench and filth of death and disease.[13] The slaves, who were mostly male and now in large part children between the ages of ten and fifteen arrived dazed and emaciated. They were dehydrated to the point where according to Dr. Jose E. Cliffe, an American citizen who

---

[10]Edward Bryan, Notice of the Rev. John B. Adgers's Article on the Slave Trade Published for the Author (Charleston: Steam Power Press of Walker, Evans, 1858), p. 24, 26.
[11] Fitzhugh, "The Conservative Principle," pp. 454, 456.
[12] William Law Mathieson, Great Britain and The Slave Trade 1839-1865 (New York: Octagon: 1967) p. 42; Frederick C. Drake; R.W. Schufeldt, "Secret History of the Slave Trade to Cuba Written By an American Naval Officer, Robert Wilson Schufeldt, 1861" The Journal of Negro History, Vol. 55, No. 3. (Jul., 1970), p. 225.
[13] W. W. Wright, "The Coolie Trade, or the Excomienda System of the Nineteenth Century" De Bow's Review XXVII, Issue 3, September 1859, p. 304; F. C. Drake, "Secret History," pp. 225, 226. Drake believes that contaminated water procured from the river Congo for the slaves to drink during the voyages was responsible in large part for much of the diseases on board ship.

participated in the African slave trade, they appeared to be mere skin and bone, with "eyes like boiled eye of a fish." Two other English women witnessed nearly the same atrocities on a captured slaver in Kingston, Jamaica.[14] When reaching deck to disembark "they all rushed, like maniacs for water, as if they grew rabid at the sight of it."[15] Another informant noted in 1829 that generally slaves were unable to stand up straight after being confined in a space that for adults averaged five feet, six inches long, sixteen inches across, and two feet high during the long voyage across the ocean. Children, it was believed withstood the tortuous journey better than adults, and traders especially favored boys between the ages of eight and twelve.[16] Their smaller stature enabled more bodies to be committed to the ever-diminishing space allowed.[17] Yet, these children, with their stomachs distended from starvation, suffered as much as adults, which the nearly 150 percent mortality rate—from seizure, to middle passage, to landing—indicates.[18]

---

[14] Mathieson, Great Britain and The Slave Trade, pp. 97- 99; See also Paul E. Lovejoy, Transformations in Slavery: A History of Slavery in Africa (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2000) p. 143; David Eltis and Stanley L. Engerman, "Fluctuations on sex and age ratios in the transatlantic slave trade, 1663-1864," Economic History Review, XLVI, 2 (1993), pp. 308-323.

[15] Mathieson, Great Britain and The Slave Trade, pp. 40-41, 43.

[16] Reverand Pascoe G. Hill noted that of the 447 slaves on board the recaptured Brazilian ship the "Progresso" in 1843, 213 were boys and none of the 189 men exceeded 20 years of age. See: Fifty Days on Board a Slave Vessel (Baltimore: Black Classic p, 1848) pp. 21-22.

[17] An Exposition of the African Slave Trade, From the Year 1840, to 1850, Inclusive. Prepared From Official Documents, And Published By Direction of the Representatives of the Religious Society of Friends, in Pennsylvania, New Jersey and Delaware (Philadelphia: J. Rakestraw, 1851) pp. 20, 154.

[18] Thomas Fowell Buxton, The African Slave Trade and It's Remedy, (1839; London: Frank Cass, 1967) pp. 73, 200; John Leighton Wilson, The Foreign Slave Trade. Can it Be Revived Without Violating the Most Sacred Principles of Honor, Humanity, and Religion? From the Southern Presbyterian Review, October, 1859 (Cornell University Library Digital Collection) p. 13. Wilson, a former Presbyterian minister, argued that in order to receive 100,000 African slaves for labor, you would need to start with 250,000. There were various calculations used for estimating the mortality rate, some estimates were 33%, others were 25%. What seems clear is that these smaller percentages only include one aspect of the enslavement process, partial accountings of the entire journey. Buxton, who much like Wilson included every phase of the process of getting slaves in Africa in his analysis, argued that for every ten slaves that survived to reach Cuba or Brazil, at least fourteen were destroyed. And if the victims of the Islamic slave trade were factored in, the mortality rate escalated to over 200%. Despite the variations in the calculations of mortality, which mirrors the extreme variations in the amount of profits made, everyone acknowledged that the death rates for slaves in the illicit trade were unbelievably high.

At times, the enslaved were deliberately killed during this illegal period of the transatlantic slave trade. It was not uncommon for slaves to be cast overboard if slavers thought that their lawbreaking activity had been detected. They sometimes threw away as many as five hundred at one time, whereupon, as a commander of a British cruiser observed, sharks, which Herman Melville called the "invariable outriders of all slave-ships" proceeded to eat the still "shackled negroes."[19] Many slaves were cast overboard by traders in order to avoid the ten-dollar import duty that the Brazilian government, for example, charged ships for entering and landing slaves at their ports if the Africans were believed to be too sick to survive reaching the "fattening pens."[20] At a slave depot called Gallineos, two thousand slaves were reportedly murdered because English cruisers blocked the ability of African traders to get them aboard the awaiting slave ships. Finding "it impossible to embark them" they "beheaded the whole number, placing their heads on poles stuck in the beach saying—"If you will not allow us to make profit of prisoners we take in war, we will kill all."[21]

Nor was it unusual for large numbers of Africans to die on recaptured vessels. According to the *Sierra Leone Report* issued in 1830, one sixth to one-half of all the captives on board slave ships taken by cruisers of any nation died before ever landing due to the additional five weeks that it took for them to reach Sierre Leone.[22] In these "floating pest-houses" the death toll skyrocketed. Over 13.4 percent or 6700 of 50,000

---

[19] Mathieson, Great Britain and The Slave Trade, p. 44; Herman Melville, Moby-Dick or the Whale (1851; New York: Oxford UP, 1981) p. 280.
[20]Buxton, The African Slave Trade, p. 202. There are several accounts that remark how common suicide was especially among male captives who seemed unable to tolerate the brutal conditions, and that many, and especially those women who were observed to be the most intelligent, became "lost in madness." Buxton, p. 189; Mathieson, pp. 41, 121; Thomas C. Hansard, Hansard's Parlimentary Debates vol. lxxvi, (London: T. C. Hansard, 1844) p. 930.
[21] "Slave Trade—Horrible massacre," Niles National Register May 1, 1847.
[22] Buxton, The African Slave Trade, p. 183.

African captives died on their way to Sierre Leone by 1830. In the case of the recaptured Portuguese vessel, the "Progresso," 39 percent of those on board ship died before landing in Cape Town, South Africa in 1843.[23] This led some observers to believe that from a "humane point of view" the recaptured African was "infinitely worse off than if permitted to pursue his original destination."[24] The statistics above, however do not take into account the starvation and often re-enslavement that recaptured Africans experienced once returning to their "homeland." Unfortunately, the recaptured slaves generally belonged to various tribes, who differed in language and custom, and with whom they might have been enemies. In American naval officer Robert Schufeldt's opinion, as benevolent as the intentions of the American Colonization Society might have been, landing the recaptured African in Liberia often meant either certain death or re-enslavement.[25] From the Reverand Pascoe G. Hills perspective, "the capture" of a slave ship was "an event far more disastrous to the slave than to the slave dealer" as it was an "unintentional aggravator of their miseries."[26]

Violence or what Thomas Buxton called the "whole sale murder" of Africans reached its highest level when the enslaved attempted insurrections. According to the deposition of one crewmember aboard the American vessel the "Kentucky," an attempted slave rebellion resulted in forty-six men and one woman, out of five hundred slaves, suffering the grossest mutilation. They were hung high in the air by their necks and then shot, after which "the legs of about a dozen were chopped off" to save the loss of the irons around their ankles. When some of "the feet fell on deck," great "sport" was made.

---

[23] Hill, Fifty Days, p. 50. Out of 447 total, 175 Africans died on board the "Progresso," and according to Hill, many of them were children.
[24] Mathieson, Great Britain and The Slave Trade, p. 44.
[25] Drake, Secret History pp. 228, 231.
[26] Hill, Fifty Days, pp. 54, 56.

The woman was shot and thrown over board still alive where she "was seen to struggle some time." After this, twenty more men and six women were severely flogged. All of the women died, and the men, suffering the rest of the passage, would "groan and sob with the most intense agony," the skin "where they were flogged, putrified."[27] Thus, the illegal continuation of the African slave trade facilitated the death of 100's of thousands of Africans, making a mockery of the much-celebrated laws to end the trade by the Revolutionary generation in 1807. For southerners, legalizing the African slave trade would save African lives and reduce the brutality that currently existed because it operated without formal regulation.

The revival of the slave trade, southerners argued, would also serve as an instrument for positive good by enabling the expansion of slavery and by protecting black Americans from a race war and extermination. Dr. Van Evne wrote in 1853 on what he described as "the mighty negro question, the "greatest question of modern times." He concluded that the expansion of slavery was essential to the survival of the southern way of life, and that the enslavement of Africans was "a normal or natural condition, and it must therefore always exist so long as the white and black races are in contact."[28] The Negro, as "a drug in the labor market" had always been a necessity until they had to compete with white immigrants. The superiority of white labor benefited the north and those regions where black labor was unprofitable, yet the south provided the necessary safety valve for blacks. The extension of slavery ensured the well-being of blacks because of the racial prejudice in "free" society.[29] If slavery was not able to expand, the

---

[27] Buxton, The African Slave Trade, p.202; An Exposition, pp. 63-64.
[28] Dr. Van Evne, "Slavery Extension," De Bow's Review Vol. XV, No. 1, (July 1853) p. 3.
[29] During the first half of the nineteenth century, Americans developed the belief that the divine purpose of the "superior" Anglo Saxon race was to foster civilization in America and throughout the world. The shift

pressures of survival would lead to whites destroying the black population where only limited opportunities for employment existed. The British writers and northerners who argued that slavery was an evil did not understand that freedom—because of "the physical necessities, the absolute overwhelming pressure of hunger"—would "impel them [blacks] to crime, robbery, insurrections, to violence and blood," which was "certain to end in [their] complete and total destruction. There can be, or there need be no doubt or uncertainty on this point….the cry of no more slave States, or no more extension of slavery is tantamount to no more room of the blacks, and *death to the negro."* Van Evne concluded that " the deluded fanatic, when…opposing slavery extension, is not only warring against the higher law, but doing all he can to exterminate the very race that he professes to labor for."[30] Leonidas Spratt affirmed these sentiments in his proposal for reopening the foreign slave trade at the Southern Convention at Vicksburg. He claimed that if the South failed in asserting her power and the socio-economic order of her section: "if we bend…to the requisitions of another people…with subjugation comes a war of races, hand to hand, that will not end while a remnant of the weaker race remains."[31]

Many southerners' believed that Britain's real intent was to *cause* a servile war in their relentless push to end the foreign slave trade. In their view, England's efforts to enforce the laws against slave trading were contorted by a larger vision to end slavery in America. Abolition was a "well-conceived scheme of self-aggrandizement" to create "the

---

to ethnology to explain and reaffirm African Americans as animalistic, dangerous and degraded, historicized slavery as a "necessary evil" and made the defense of the peculiar institution a cornerstone of national security. See Reginald Horsman, Race and Manifest Destiny: The Origins of American Racial Anglo-Saxionism (Cambridge: Harvard Up, 1981) pp. 9-25; Forrest G. Wood, Black Scare: the Racist Response to Emancipation and Reconstruction (Berkeley: University of California p, 1968) pp.1-18.

[30] Evne, "Slavery Extension," pp. 9-10, 13.

[31] Leonidas W. Spratt, "Speech of Mr. Spratt, of South Carolina," De Bow's Review Vol. XXVII, Issue 2, (August 1859) p. 213.

same failure in Brazil, Cuba and the US and the reduction in productive capacity" as currently existed in England. By creating a trade-equilibrium amongst competing nations, England would be able to regain their market share of the world's commercial trade that they held before emancipating their own slaves. Accordingly, Governor James H. Adams reasoned that England's secret intention was to, "to sow further dissensions between the Northern and Southern sections of the Union, with the hope of dissolving their compact under circumstances calculated to ensure a series of civil and servile wars."[32]

Southerners remained certain that if emancipation did occur, it would be a disaster leading to black annihilation. As blacks, Evne argued, would return to "savageism and negroism." The "abolition of slavery and the total extinction of the negro, is the same thing in fact."[33] Indeed, slaveholder James Henry Hammond had already formalized these ideas in 1845. Historicizing the mechanisms in place that ensured control over the African race, Hammond prognosticated: "let the story of our British ancestors and the aborigines of this country tell the sequel. Far more rapid…would be the catastrophe…the African race would be exterminated or reduced again to slavery."[34] An article in the Virginian *Staunton Vindicator* proffered that emancipation would be disastrous to African Americans because it would undermine the sociopolitical function of African's as labor:

> If African labor is evil, the North and the civilized world have extracted an immense and incalculable good out of it. This may be said not only of the whites, but of the blacks also. The cotton bales of the United States have kept England and America at peace for

---

[32] Report of the Special Committee of the House of Representatives, of South Carolina, On So Much of the Message of His Excellency Gov. Jas. H. Adams, As Relates to Slavery and the Slave Trade (Columbia S.C.: Steam Power P, 1857) pp. 7-8, 16.
[33] Evne, "Slavery Extension," pp. 4, 11.
[34] James H. Hammond, "Slavery in the Light of Political Science," Cotton is King, And Pro-Slavery Arguments: Comprising the Writings of Hammond, Harper, Christy, Stringfellow, Hodge, Bledsoe, and Cartwright, On this Important Subject ed. E. N. Elliot (Augusta: Pritchard, Abbott & Loomis, 1860) pp. 667-668.

> forty years and prevented the whites from mutual slaughter. Emancipation is not only the destruction of African labor, but the extermination of the Negroes themselves.[35]

The idea of freedom for black Americans was equally troubling to southerner W. W. Wright who argued that if Abolitionists incited an insurrection of African Americans, it would end in the "bloodshed and probable extermination" of those enslaved.[36] Slavery and the African slave trade stymied international as well as national aggression; but without the economic benefits derived from this form of labor, people of African descent would become valueless to the nation, and therefore inexorably dispensable.

Pro-slave trade advocates had clear ideas about how to maintain control over an enlarged slave population, however, and they dismissed concerns that reopening the slave trade would dangerously affect white people in the South. Southerners had no intention of allowing the black population in the South to increase disproportionately, nor did they believe those who argued that "our institutions will therefore languish, and a contest of some sort [would] spring up between that [Africans] and the white race."[37] Instead, Spratt envisioned that slaves would extend beyond the present boundaries of the South into, "the whole broad plain from the Mississippi to the Pacific. Nor even without this, do we see the reason to dread a density of population. Slaves can be as dense as freemen; the discipline will be greater; the order will be greater; the economy of resources will be greater."[38] Unlike the colonies of Britain and France, where absentee ownership of plantations still prevailed, African Americans lived alongside their masters, a situation that most Europeans and northern Americans eschewed. Spratt, like most southerners, however, believed that, "while so unequal, there is no reason why these races may not

---

[35] "The Results of African Labor in the New World," Staunton Vindicator Feb. 10, 1860, Vol. XVI, No. 6.
[36] Wright, "The Coolie Trade," pp. 318 - 320.
[37] "Southern Population—Its Destiny," De Bow's Review Vol. XIII, Issue 1, (July 1852) pp. 13, 18.
[38] Leonidas W. Spratt, "Report on the Slave Trade," De Bow's Review Vol. 24, Issue 6, (June 1858) p. 490.

come together…unless it can be inferred that the stronger was intended to exterminate the weaker, as it has crushed out the Indian on this continent."[39] Mississippian Henry Hughes, in taking up this question argued that: "the African slave trade can, by no possibility realize in the South an over powering disproportion of blacks to whites." Hughes also envisioned a racial hierarchy that would regulate the expansion of slavery:

> If the African slave trade shall be reopened, all Mexico, all Central and South America may be reckoned as wild land. Nor is that all; they may be esteemed not only uncultivated but unpeopled lands. For their population is either pure blood or mixed. But if mixed blood, extinction by degeneration or sagacious and benevolent extermination for the purity of races is a certainty and perhaps an ethnical duty. But if pure blood, they are either Caucasians, Africans, or Indians. As to Caucasians, there are virtually none. As to Africans, they will be elevated into slavery to prevent, amongst other atrocities, that of sexual amalgamation. And as to pure blooded Indians, they will not be civilized, and therefore must, directly or indirectly, be benignly slaughtered.[40]

In the debates about reopening the slave trade, some southerners ultimately counseled patience since "the whole civilized world was discussing the question" of how to exploit African labor in new ways.[41] According to Wright, who did not support reopening the African slave trade, Europeans made claims of African wage labor being superior to slave labor, but it often only escapes the responsibility and name of slavery.[42] Indeed, civilized nations, Wright observed, "are exterminating the human race,…in most cases literally kidnapping or purchasing those whom they transport as free. In the case of

---

[39] Rev. George B. Wheeler, intro. The Southern Confederacy and the African Slave Trade: The Correspondence Between Professor Cairnes, A. M. and George M'Henry, Esq. (Dublin: Mcglashan and Gill, 1863) pp. vi, xvii: Spratt, "Report on," p. 474.

[40] Henry Hughes, "Reopening of the Slave Trade: A Series by "St. Henry"' (From the *Southern Reveille*, 1857-58) Selected Writings of Henry Hughes: Antebellum Southerner, Slavocrat, Sociologist Stanford M. Lyman, ed. (Jackson: Un. Press of Mississippi, 1985) pp. 98-99. Hughes was the creator of a third American labor system (the other two being free and slave) called warranteeism: where labor was owed as the duty of an inferior race in a productive society, rather than owned. Ultimately it was slavery called something else.

[41] L. J. Gogerty, "Southern Convention at Knoxville," DeBow's Review Vol. XXIII, No. 3, (Sept, 1857) p. 318.

[42] W. W. Wright, "The Coolie Trade," p. 304, 318-320.

the African negro emigrants this is now universally acknowledged."[43] While the American South was able to increase their slave population ten to one, all the other nations around the world were "destroying the lives of negroes, Coolies, Chinese, and Portuguese with frightful rapidity."[44] Thus, at the Southern Convention in Montgomery, Alabama, Mr. Preston of Virginia proffered that perhaps it was impolitic for the South to create divisions among themselves when "England and France were endeavoring to establish systems of labor like our own, differing only in name? Let us rather wait."[45] Southerners knew that England was making apprentices out of Africans seized from slave ships and this was proof to some of them that the slave trade needed to be reopened and "renewed legally and actively."[46] According to Wright, England imported 14,784 immigrants from Africa between 1848 and 1855 to her colonies.[47] The accounts of Reverend Hill verify that it was Britain's "authorized practice to apprentice negroes brought to the Cape in prizes [recaptures slave ships], as servants or farm-labourers, for the term of six or seven years, according to their age."[48] In light of this, Roger Pryor argued the South should be strategic in taking up this question as "England with her coolies, and France with her apprentices…shows gradual amelioration in sentiment upon this subject. We should bide our time, and not, by this public action, give our institution

---

[43] Wright, "The Coolie Trade," pp. 316-317. See also Lovejoy, Transformations pp. 151-152. Lovejoy contends that the French and Portuguese were the greatest offenders of all the European nations trying to get around the legal barriers to slave trading by the using the label of contract laborers. Because these laborers left Africa as slaves, Lovejoy argues, they must be included in the number of slaves exported from Africa in the nineteenth century.
[44] Wright, "The Coolie Trade," p. 298.
[45] Mr. Preston, "Late Southern Convention at Montgomery," De Bow's Review Vol. XXIV, Issue 6, (June 1858) p. 596.
[46] Wright, "The Coolie Trade," p. 310; Fitzhugh, pp. 449, 451.
[47] Wright, "The Coolie Trade," p. 310. Fitzhugh, pp. 449, 451.
[48] Hill, Fifty Days, p. 51.

an irretrievable recoil…Allow things to go along smoothly."[49] From the African American perspective, southerners were right to feel confident, as in their view, "the proposition to reopen the African slave trade [was] daily growing in popularity in the South,"[50] while at the same time northern and southern "opposition …[was] becoming feebler every day."[51]

White Fear and the Law of Might

Opposition to the slave trade movement resonated not only with fears of a growing African and African American population, but also with the same anxiety about slave rebellions that had plagued them in the past. Slave owners argued that although they had complete mastery over their American slaves, newly imported Africans would resist enslavement and therefore disrupt the slave South, making violence again necessary. Some southerners believed that increasing the numbers of African slaves would make their states more susceptible to northern abolitionist interference. Nevertheless, whether advocating or arguing against the reopening of the foreign slave trade, many slave owners confidently concluded that they could control inferior people with superior force, or if compelled, they would get rid of them entirely. African American's were presciently aware of the seriousness of the debates over whether to reopen the foreign slave trade, no doubt because the ideas of a race war and black extermination permeated the discourse on both sides of the question. Black leaders also understood that many whites' feared a violent confrontation between the races in

---

[49] Roger Pryor, "Late Southern Convention at Montgomery," De Bow's Review Vol. XXIV, Issue 6, (June 1858) p. 582.
[50] "The Slave Trade," The National Era June 23, 1859
[51] "Great Changes Coming Over the South" The National Era March 24, 1859.

America. They used what Frederick Douglas claimed became part of a broader strategy for black liberation, namely scare tactics: "Now the next best thing, if we cannot make them love us, is to make them fear us."[52] Thus, to heighten white fear of servile unrest, many African Americans wrote and published predictions that violence would indeed ensue with the importation of more African slaves, as the greater numbers of people of African descent would facilitate a successful servile war. They also intentionally stoked white fears in the hopes of protecting Africans within Africa from becoming victims in an increased trade in African slaves.

Many southerners were against reopening the African slave trade because they feared American blacks and Africans slaves would wage a servile war against them. To bring in new Africans, "a teeming population of barbarians," Mr. Hilliard of Alabama believed, would make the south the slave-market of the world and this could only lead to cataclysmic events like those in St. Domingo.[53] Moreover, an enlarged population of African slaves, Roger Pryor argued, would make slave owners become cruel and "it would create a new grade of slavery and create in the slaves we already have a feeling of superiority that we should avoid."[54] The south would become overrun with savages "who have yet to learn that treachery and bloodshed are wrong" when directed toward their masters. Similarly, James Johnston Pettigrew stated that if the South were to, "reopen this floodgate of impurity…all that we have accomplished in a half century would be lost…and a new night would descend; the very ignorance by which they would be incapacitated for a grand scheme, would urge them to outrages…for an unknown tongue

---

[52] Frederick Douglass, The Frederick Douglass Papers Series One, Vol. 3 1855-63, John Blassingame, ed. (New Haven: Yale UP, 1985) p. 434.
[53] "Late Southern Convention at Montgomery," De Bows Review Vol. XXIV, Issue 6, (June 1858) p. 592.
[54] Ibid, p. 582.

would afford convenient means of concealment."[55] Slaveholders had not forgotten that African slaves came with a military past and they were not keen on perpetuating the cycle of bloodshed and fear that marked the colonial period.[56]

That was not to say that the domestic slave population was ignorant of their strength, Pettigrew argued, but that they had been educated to fear white power. The black slave saw in the white sheriff "not an individual man, not the leader of an armed posse, but the representative of the latent force of a whole society."[57] Walter Brookes and others agreed with Pettigrew that the present population of slaves had attained a certain level of education, "that spirit-of-obedience which rendered them so peculiarly fitted for a state of slavery." However, if the slave trade were to be reopened, Brookes argued, "the condition of the slaves would be put back two hundred years, and the condition of white men would be put back too. Every semblance of humanity would have to be blotted out from the statute-books, and the slaveholder…[would become] a bloody, brutal, and trembling tyrant." Brookes also believed that if the price of slaves were to become nominal as envisioned, planters would find it "profitable to work their slaves to death, because they could replace them by others."[58]

Some southerners opposed reopening the slave trade because they knew that it would not be easy to impress their brutal system of control upon Africans who were accustomed to personal freedom. The African, Pettigrew argued, "whose ancestors have delighted his youth with tales of war and resistance to control, [who] grow up with this

---

[55] J. J. Pettigrew, "Protest Against," pp. 292-295.
[56] See chapters two and three of this manuscript.
[57] J. J. Pettigrew, "Protest Against," pp. 294.
[58] "The Recent Southern Convention at Vicksburg," De Bow's Review Vol. XXVII, Issue 3, (Sept. 1859) p. 361.

sentiment strong in his breast," would not as easily accept white mastery.[59] Their presence would force the institution of slavery into a backward trend of "visible exhibitions of power" because Africans would never peaceably submit to the commands of their owners. Violence would become necessary; the African would have to "see his blood flow" before the South would be secure again from insurrection and a race war. From "a mere military point of view," Pettigrew argued, it would be a serious mistake to reopen the slave trade.[60]

Although slaveholders were largely concerned about the influence of African military traditions, they acknowledged that they remained fearful of American blacks as well. According to one columnist in the *Franklin Repository*, the real danger that "fire-eaters," or extremist proslavery politicians ignored, was the complete Africanization of the Southern states if the tables should be turned:

> Is it not astonishing that the simpletons who urge so strongly the propriety of repealing the laws of Congress which pronounce the Slave-trade piracy, cannot see that they are preparing for themselves the most horrible doom imaginable? The slave-holder of the South are now almost afraid to go to bed without a revolver under their pillows for fear their darkeys will rise in the night and inflict retaliatory vengeance upon their self constituted owners—their unfeeling task-masters. Then why do they insist upon increasing the danger? [61]

The article goes on to say that, "the only way that slavery is upheld now, or ever was, is by brute force—the law of might;" exposing that the utopic vision of peace and

---

[59] J. J. Pettigrew, "Protest Against," pp. 293-295. This notion of war-like Africans aligns with John Thornton's conclusions that high numbers of Africans captured and sold into slavery were trained soldiers. Thornton also argues that African slaves used their military background to help foment rebellions and slave revolts in America. See John K. Thornton, Warfare in Atlantic Africa, 1500-1800 (London: UCL p, 1999) pp. 139-147. See also chapter 2 of this dissertation, "A State of War Continued."
[60] Pettigrew, "Protest Against," pp. 298-299.
[61] "Becoming Africanized," Franklin Repository September 14, 1859. p. 4.

tranquility between master and slave, of patriarch and "Sambo" was never more than an illusion.[62]

Slave owning men understood that newly imported Africans could *become* a problem to the south, but clearly black Americans *remained* a problem to their security despite the rhetoric. Edmund Ruffin acknowledged that northern abolitionists, especially those like the martyred John Brown, had effectively reached the slave masses, causing discontent; and Ruffin admitted, "negro slaves probably would generally rebel, and free themselves and seize on their masters' property, if perfectly assured of success." Ruffin was adamant, however, that a successful insurrection could never happen again, and even if it were initially successful in execution, like Nat Turner's rebellion, it would be suppressed immediately. From "a military aspect," Ruffin said, "nothing could be more fruitless, feeble or contemptible than a negro insurrection, even with all the aid…by northern philanthropy. These general truths are recognized by every southerner. Yet, when an alarm of insurrection comes, with all the usual uncertainty, every head of a family at once thinks of the possibility of the near vicinity of the outbreak, and of all that are precious to him being the victims."[63] Southern men remained haunted by the possibilities of slave unrest. Validating what Thomas Jefferson reflected upon in 1787, they wondered "whether the slave may not as justifiably …slay one who would slay him?"[64]

Many southerners were not as confident as Ruffin: they remained fearful that by reopening the African slave trade they would only increase the ever-present potential of a

---

[62] Ibid.
[63] Edmund Ruffin, Anticipations of the Future: To Serve as Lessons for the Present Time (1860; Freeport, New York: Books for Libraries, 1972) pp. 238, 237, 385, 243, 76-77.
[64] Thomas Jefferson, Notes on the State of Virginia (1787; Chapel Hill: UNC P, 1982) p. 142.

slave rebellion and the possibility of white defeat.[65] Although the author of an article signed "A Florida Farmer" recognized that Africans "would produce dangerous discontent," he was also concerned that abolitionists would intentionally import large numbers of African slaves, train them to "render the slaves we have dissatisfied," and then send them down south to be sold. These same northerners would also aid the slaves in a "general insurrection and massacre. The white people would be butchered, as they were in St. Domingo."[66] Senator H. S. Foote of Tennessee agreed that the potential for northern involvement was problematic especially if a black republican won the next Presidential election and then, "we shall have enough to do to take care of what slaves we have, without importing a horde of wild Africans to corrupt them, and thereby add to our domestic troubles." Foote projected what would happen if new states admitted to the Union created a majority in Congress with enough votes to legislate against slavery: "will not ourselves and our children have sufficient trouble to manage the native population, without sending for thousands, and perhaps, millions, of Africans to add to our cares? If we repeal the laws, as asked for, the North will enjoy the exclusive benefit, while we shall have to bear its burdens…the proposition is too monstrous to be mentioned for a moment."[67]

The South's preoccupation with the possibility of servile war was based on real fears, but it also was supported by a pervasive acceptance of violence as a core social experience. Historian John Hope Franklin pointed out that in the 1850s, southerners vehemently denied that slavery was a military liability or a problem to the white

---

[65] James J. Pettigrew, "Protest Against the Slave-Trade Revival," De Bow's Review Vol. 25, Issue 3, (Sept. 1858) p. 305.
[66] A Florida Farmer, "Southern Prosperity," De Bows Review Vol. XXVII, Issue: 1, (July 1859) p. 38.
[67] "Southern Convention at Vicksburg," De Bow's Review Vol. XXVII, Issue: 2, (August 1859) p. 220.

community. By 1860, the South viewed itself as the "fountainhead of martial spirit" in America, perhaps in response to taunts from Abolitionists that slavery weakened them militarily and regionally.[68] Franklin further argued that, southerners believed in their ability to win any battle and they "were not being merely theatrical, although they had their moments of sheer acting." Ultimately, however, southerners knew that they still had not oppressed their current slave population completely, and subjugation was a synonym for what Franklin calls the "violence [that] was inextricably woven into the most fundamental aspects of life in the South and [which] constituted an important phase of the total experience of its people."[69]

Thus, the opposition's arguments that reopening the slave trade would jeopardize the "entire security and harmony" of the South was loudly and confidently proclaimed as absurd by many of its supporters by the end of the 1850's. Spratt claimed that the slaves that first came to America were not an "explosive mixture" and there were fewer whites then than there were now and far greater opportunities for disorder and plunder. Therefore: "we see no reason for believing the negroes would be more savage now than they were at the earlier period," but even if this were so, "there are securities of order here which exist in no other form of society." By that, Spratt meant that the slave owner was the conservator of his own power, giving him the authority to punish with out restraint. It was legally permissible for slave owners "to crush the germ of insurrection," making it impossible for slaves to successfully rise against their masters.[70] Even,

---

[68] John Hope Franklin, The Militant South 1800-1861 (Urbana: Un. Of Illinois P, 2002) pp. 7, 10, 91-92. Franklin argues that especially after the Mexican-American War; violence became a central part of southern culture. I argue throughout this manuscript, however, that violence was a central part of American culture from the very beginning, at least towards peoples of color.
[69] Franklin, pp. 12-13.
[70] Spratt, "Report On," pp. 488-499.

Pettigrew, who did not support reopening the trade, admitted that: "We Suck in rebellion or obedience with our mother's milk….Perhaps no nation on the globe is more highly tempered, restless, excitable and violent in resistance to illegitimate authority [those enslaved], than the inhabitants of these Southern States."[71] And, Henry Hughes argued: "even if the servile population should have the desire and knowledge for a rebellion, they would not have the ability. Ability to rebel is nothing more than war ability. Arms, ammunition, provisions and discipline are powers of war, and the negro race want and must want all these. But if they had the ability to rebel, their subjugation and entire extermination would be but a day's bloody toil..."[72]

The very idea of a bloody confrontation is what African Americans used in their attempts to hopefully unsettle and dismantle the proposition to reopen the African slave trade. African Americans knew that despite the rhetoric, many antebellum slave owners remained fearful of their slave population and that these fears significantly shaped their opposition to reopening the foreign slave trade. Of course, with the power of the federal government behind them, slave owners were prepared to act if necessary to protect their property and to defend their families. But black leaders did their best to convince white southerners that the importation of new African slaves was a dangerous idea.

African Americans were well aware that the illegal trade in foreign slaves continued in Africa and America with impunity. Black abolitionist John B. Russwurm reported from Liberia that although it was thought that the slave trade had ended in 1807, "nothing is more erroneous, as the trade was never carried on with more vessels nor with greater vigour than it has been for the last two years. Even now, [1830] as I am writing,

---

[71] Pettigrew, "Protest Against," p. 295.
[72] "A Quartette of Objections to African Labor Immigration," New Orleans Delta March 9, 1858.

slavers are within forty-four miles of the colony at Cape Mount."[73] Martin R. Delany wrote in 1849 that Cuba was the "great channel through which slaves are imported annually into the United States….Into this island are there annually imported more than fifty thousand slaves, expressly for the human market, and being contiguous to the United States, vessels from Baltimore, Washington city, Richmond, and other American slave-markets…sail to the isle of Cuba under the pretext of touching by Havana for trade." The traders then "purchase a full cargo of slaves, sail to New Orleans where they are sold out to the highest bidder, at the slave market there, from whence they are taken to all parts of the South."[74] An illiterate, yet highly intelligent fugitive slave named John Brown recalled that he was "quite sure" that even in 1855, "the slave trade [was] carried on between the Coast of Africa and the Slave States of the American Union." Brown knew of at least five hundred "Salt-backs" – or slaves directly from Africa, who lived on Zachariah Le Mar's Savannah plantation somewhere between the time of 1830 and 1834, and that "new ones were constantly brought in." These Africans, who lived in Georgia with Brown could not speak English that well – yet they were very much a visible part of his community. [75] Formerly enslaved Charley Barber stated that both his parents were from Africa where, "they was 'ticed on a ship, fetch 'cross de ocean to Virginny, fetch to Winnebora by a slave driver, and sold to my marster's father. Dat what they tell me.

---

[73] John B. Russwurm to [Edward Jones], 20 March 1830 The Black Abolitionist Papers vol. 3, p. 74

[74] Martin R. Delany, "Annexation of Cuba," The North Star 27 April 1849. Reprinted in Martin R. Delany: A Documentary Reader, ed. Robert S. Levine, (Chapel Hill: UNC p, 2003) pp. 161-162.

[75] John Brown, Slave Life in Georgia: A Narrative of the Life, Sufferings, and Escape of John Brown, A Fugitive Slave ed. F. N. Boney (1855; Savannah: Beehive, 1991) pp. 163-164. Zachariah Le Mar was related to Charles A. L. Lamar who attempted to challenge the constitutionality of the ban on the foreign slave trade by openly importing Africans into the Georgia in December 1858. Mr. McIntosh, the Collector of Customs in Brunswick, Georgia told the Secretary of Treasury in 1818 that "African and West Indian negroes are almost daily...introduced into Georgia for sale or settlement, or passing through it to territories of the United States for similar purposes." Du Bois, The Suppression of the African Slave Trade p. 114. Hugh Thomas, The Slave Trade: The Story of the Atlantic Slave Trade: 1440-1870 (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1997) p. 614.

When they was sailin' over, dere was five or six hundred others all together down under de first deck, of de ship, where they was locked in. They never did talk lak de other slaves, could just say a few words…It was 'ginst de law to bring them over here when they did, I learn since. But what is de law now and what was de law then, when bright shinny money was in sight?...Yes, sir, my pappy and mammy, was just smuggled in dis part of de world."[76] And ex-slave Paul Singleton recounted how the brutality and murder of African slaves by American slave traders became folkloric among African American's living along the Altamaha River in Darien, Georgia.

> Lots uh time he [his father] tell me annuddah story bout a slabe ship bout tuh be caught by revenoo boat. Duh slabe ship slip tru back ribbuh intuh creek. Deah wuz bout fifty slabes on bode. Duh slabe runnahs tie rocks roun duh slabes' necks and tro um ovuhbode tuh drown. Dey say yuh kin heah um moanin an groanin in duh creek ef yuf goes deah tuh-day.[77]

Thus in the decade between 1850 and 1860, many African Americans believed that if they did not respond aggressively to the call to reopen the African slave trade by stoking white fear, all would be lost and the enslaved would face interminable bondage.[78] The possibility of the United States increasing the slave population with newly imported African slaves was a serious step backward for blacks in America, and readers of the *Provincial Freeman,* the black newspaper in Canada, *Frederick Douglass' Paper,* the

---

[76] Charley Barber, (Winnaboro, S.C.), "Ex-Slave 81 years old," Slave Narratives—a folk history of slavery in the United States, from interviews with former slaves: South Carolina Narratives Part 1, Vol. 1, (St. Clair Shores: Scholarly p, 1976) p. 30. (Interviewer, W. W. Dixon).

[77] Paul Singleton, Savannah Unit Georgia Writers' Project Works Projects Administration, Drums and Shadows: Survival Studies Among the Georgia Coastal Negroes (Athens: University of Georgia p, 1940) p. 17

[78] Black Abolitionists consistently faced the possibility of racial violence in the 1850s without provocation. Aside from the legislation enacted, starting with the Fugitive Slave Law of 1850; the Kansas Nebraska Act in 1854; and finally the Dred Scott decision in 1857, which stated that black people were not citizens and therefore held no constitutional rights in America; northern black Abolitionists were well aware that public sentiment was against them. The emergence of ideological notions like the Manifest Destiny of the white race and the racial exclusion that it embodied, as well as laws that advocated the expatriation or reenslavement of free blacks in the south made life and true liberty seem bleak for everyone.

Liberator, and the *National Era*, noted that the idea was growing in popularity in the South. Initially African American leaders did not take the movement seriously. They believed that "the idea of reviving the slave trade,…[was] very silly…that …no candid mind will believe that it is seriously entertained in the South."[79] Yet, there was concern, as abolitionists noted at a meeting of the Western Anti-Slavery Society in Salem, Ohio in 1854, the "repeated avowals in leading Southern newspapers of a design to reopen the inhuman traffic." And they asked "every friend of freedom" to renew their efforts to persevere on behalf of the antislavery movement."[80] By 1857, the *Provincial Freeman* reported that should any "conflict of State and Federal authorities arise" over the importation of African slaves, from "Dahomey," "it cannot be doubted that it will be decided in favor of the South, and that the slave trade would be formally established under the principles of the Dred Scott decision."[81] Finally, in a call to action one anonymous source noted, "The myriads of our fellow-men in Africa, marked as future victims of a hellish trade, are voiceless. Who, then, standing up before this nation and the whole civilized world, shall protest, in the name of God, and in behalf of our common humanity, against the consummation of this astounding crime? Who, but we, the free colored inhabitants of these United States?"[82]

Determined to protect Africa from further European exploitation, many black leaders did their best to encourage whites to remain fearful of increasing the African population in America by predicting that blacks would win in an internecine war between the races. James McCune Smith, in a provocative essay has his fictional character Fly

---

[79] "Revival of the Slave Trade," Frederick Douglass' Paper August 18, 1854.
[80] Frederick Douglass' Paper September 15, 1854.
[81] " A New Dodge" Provincial Freeman August 22, 1857.
[82] "Anonymous," Anglo-African Magazine:1 September 1859, No. 9, Vol. 1, p. 310 (New York: Arno Press and the New York Times, 1968).

envision that if whites did reopen the African slave trade, the Congo war cry *Canga li* used during the Haitian revolution, which "transformed indifferent and heedless slaves into furious masses…must yet ring in the interior of Africa."[83] Fly further taunted southern slaveholders by stating that this resistance against enslavement as a result of reopening the slave trade would occur in America as well:

> I go in for extending the area of Slavery, for the renewal of the African slave-trade. Let them import a million a year; then in six years…these six millions of "children of the sun," restless under the lash, and uncontaminated, unenfeebled by American Christianity, may hear in their midst "Canga li," and the affrighted slave owners, not stopping to count their "people," will rush away North faster than they did from St. Domingo.[84]

In another article, an unknown author prophesized that reopening the African slave trade would force poor whites to leave the South out of fear that it would "precipitate the horrors of a negro insurrection" once states like South Carolina became "Africanized." It warned that "agitators of that measure" would be "wise to read the handwriting on the wall before it is too late."[85]

Although black abolitionist William Wilson believed that "this reopening of the African slave trade has…become a fixed fact," he was confident that it would ultimately bring "great numerical and physical strength…to Anglo-Africans from this source," and therefore the success of a servile war in securing black freedom. Wilson, who wrote under the pseudonym of "Ethiop," hoped to arouse white fear by further arguing that African Americans should not "wear sad faces at the prospect of this reopening of the slave-trade; but as load after load, and gang after gang, fresh turned loose, go clanking

---

[83] James McCune Smith, "The Critic at Chess," The Works of James McCune Smith: Black Intellectual and Abolitionist John Stauffer, ed. (Oxford: Oxford Up, 2006) pp. 110-111. Frederick Douglass' Paper, January 12, 1855.
[84] James McCune Smith, "The Critic at Chess," The Works of James McCune Smith: Black Intellectual and Abolitionist John Stauffer, ed. (Oxford: Oxford Up, 2006) pp. 110-111. Frederick Douglass' Paper, January 12, 1855.
[85] "South Carolina Becoming Africanized," The National Era August 18, 1859.

their chains through the land. Let us listen," as the increased numbers would facilitate black success in "a hand-to-hand struggle." And there would be no turning back, Ethiop taunted, "when the final day does come, as come it must…it may then be with the Anglo-African a question of numbers on this continent…it may be with him [the enslaved] …not merely the question of his liberty, but entire indemnity for the past, full security for the future, and the most perfect and fullest equality for all time to come." Despite slave owner claims that Africans were only "fit for slaves" Wilson reminded whites as well as African Americans that Africans had also "been shown fit for good soldiers in any hour of need."[86] In an editorial in 1860, black abolitionist Thomas Hamilton warned that although secession would mean that nothing stood in the way of southerners reopening the African slave trade, the result of South Carolina seceding from the Union and the "renewal of the African slave trade" was that an "insurrection of the slaves must follow." Because now the "slaves, knowing or believing that no Northern army will come down to interfere, will raise the arm of rebellion."[87] Black leaders may have in earnest seen advantages to an increased population of newly imported African slaves, but in reality, their biggest concern was that reopening the slave trade would mean that slavery was more secure than ever. Moreover, despite the arguments made for forceful resistance by some black leaders, most black abolitionists remained presciently aware of the danger of such actions. Nevertheless, African Americans used fear to taunt slave holders into rejecting reopening the African slave trade, hoping in the midst of hopelessness to render

---

[86] "Ethiop" Anglo-African Magazine:1 September 1859, No. 9, Vol. 1, pp. 284-286. (New York: Arno Press and the New York Times, 1968).

[87] "Editorial by Thomas Hamilton," The Black Abolitionist Papers vol. V. The United States, 1859-1865, C. Peter Ripley, ed. (Chapel Hill: UNC p, 1992) pp. 98-99.

the idea of greater numbers of African slaves—of black warriors—too frightening a proposition to ever make real.

Although the slave trade ended officially in the United States in 1807, most Americans knew that the trade in African slaves continued. And—that it was perpetrated in the most barbarous manner and with little regard for the lives nor the simple humanity of those Africans held as captives. Ultimately, the rally around the importation of African slave labor set the stage for future ideas about black labor and black disposability. Yet fears of a race war and black or white extermination if they brought in newly imported Africans also remained a concern to many slave owners. Southerners were certainly concerned about importing large numbers of Africans, but they were also anxious about the growing population of American blacks that, in their minds, threatened their self-induced sense of security. African Americans, well aware of the debate over whether to reopen the slave trade in America, did their best to stoke white fear. Although both African Americans and southerners used fear to influence the outcome of the debate, only one side espoused the kind of violence that specifically included extermination—to envision the possible necessity of killing men, as well as women and children. Despite their apprehensions that victory in such an event would not come without cost, pro-slave trade southerners continued to embrace their vision of maintaining black labor in bondage. Southerners continued to believe that blacks in freedom would create a race war and violence yet blacks in bondage would not. Giving evidence to the fact that the ideas about black freedom that supported the notion of the inevitability of total warfare

between blacks and whites were still relevant in the southern mind—only to come out in full relief during the Civil War and the post Civil War years.

EPILOGUE

"MAKING HELL FOR A COUNTRY": THE CIVIL WAR AND POST CIVIL WAR ERA

The Civil War, even in the beginning, was at its' heart about blacks in America and the institution of slavery, making the issue of a war between the races more relevant than ever before. As the first southern state to secede from the Union, two of South Carolina's reasons for withdrawing from the Federal Union stand out: because of hostility to the institution of slavery by non-slaveholding states, and because of the federal government's waning commitment to protecting the south from a servile war. These two significant causes of the Civil War, resting under the umbrella of States rights, centered on what had historically given substance to the ideas of race war and black or white extermination: namely the issue of slavery as well as the freedom of African Americans. This was true for the Union side as well. It was politically far more beneficial for the Union to dissemble about what caused the fracture between the states, rather than admit that everything the South claimed above was true. Many black Americans distrusted Abraham Lincoln's lack of commitment to the abolition of slavery and his proposals to colonize those enslaved once free. Yet Lincoln admitted to a group of African American

clergy: "But for your race among us there could not be a war…without the institution of slavery, and the colored race as a *basis*, the war would not have an existence."[1] Indeed, as Frederick Douglass pointed out, in the federal government, an "attempt is made to conceal…the real cause of the rebellion."[2] Unfortunately, the Lincoln administration's unwillingness to confront honestly the issue at hand, as well as the consistency of federal efforts for reunification with the southern states allowed for greater violence and uncontested assertions that with emancipation would come the extermination of African American people.

The ramifications of the outbreak of hostilities between the North and South were not lost on those enslaved in the South, however. They no doubt saw it as the opportunity *they* had been waiting for. Thousands of enslaved people fled to Union lines seeking protection in the very first months after the fall of Fort Sumter in 1861. Their active participation in their own liberation did not come without cost. Confederate soldiers deliberately sought to intimidate the noncombatant populations of the black community in their attempt to stem the flow of what Union soldiers termed contraband of war, a term used for property. Renewing a centuries old strategy, Confederate soldiers brutally killed many black soldiers under the policy of no quarter for negro soldiers, and they also killed women and children with equal fervor. This sort of violence did not end after the Civil War. The continued exhibitions of racially motivated and inchoate acts of brutality made many black Americans fearful that southerners did indeed intend to carry out what they had threatened to do for centuries. They had only to look around the nation and to the

---

[1] Roy P. Basler, editor, et. al. The Collected Works of Abraham Lincoln,, Vol. V, (New Brunswick: Rutgers Up, 1953) (emphasis added) pp. 370-375.
[2] Frederick Douglass, Douglass Papers, Series One, Vol. 3, 1855-63, p. 477, 484.

west, indeed to their own communities to determine that the threats were real, threats that greatly concerned the black community well into the next century.

A Most Uncivilized War

Once the Civil War commenced, aside from both sides being consumed about who would ultimately win the war, white Americans became intensely engaged in discussions about what was to be done with the enslaved if they were freed, and whether there would be a race war ending in black extermination. The same triangulation of choices that emerged during the Virginia Debates for African Americans emerged during the Civil War: remain enslaved, be colonized, or face extermination. But now another option was included, which was slavery by another name. For African Americans freedom remained at the forefront of why they invested in the war by walking away from their masters and by their willingness to fight, and to die if necessary for their freedom. At the beginning of the war, former slave Henry Wright remembered, "all the slaves grew hopeful and glad of the prospect of being set free."[3] According to another former slave from Tennessee, "they just expected [their] freedom" to be the result of the Civil War.[4] Southerners responded to the emancipation of those enslaved and their subsequent service as soldiers, however, with atrocious acts of brutality that they not only rationalized as a tactic of war but also as a means of retaining control over what they still viewed as their servile population.

---

[3] "Henry Wright - Ex-Slave," Atlanta, Georgia, Born in Slavery: Slave Narratives from the Federal Writers' Project, 1936-1938. (Black interviewer- Edwin Driskell)
[4] Liney Chambers, Brinkley Arkansas, Born in Slavery: Slave Narratives from the Federal Writers' Project, 1936-1938.

According to Frederick Douglass, the first option discussed in the North and South by whites during the Civil War to resolve the "negro problem" was that slavery would remain a fixed institution in America. Only now the nation would "reduce the whole colored population to slavery."[5] This idea, however, lacked plausibility in the climate of the free labor discourse among whites that was so pervasive during the middle of the nineteenth century. As Douglass stated, it would have meant that "the slaveholder would then be the only really freeman of the country. All the rest would be either slaves, or be poor white trash" whose liberty would never be safe from a "class of tyrants."[6]

In the second and newest scenario of the future of newly freed blacks in America, southerners envisioned a labor system where they would "retain them as slaves in fact."[7] As Douglass saw it, they would be free in name only, they would be made "a degraded caste" by not "conferring equal rights" upon them.[8] This vision was particularly dangerous to the black community argued Douglass because "it would…lacerate and depress the spirit of the negro, and make *him a scourge and a curse to the country*. Do anything else with us, but plunge us not into this hopeless pit."[9]

Colonization continued to be seriously entertained as another possible solution to the "negro problem" during the Civil War, "a singularly pleasing dream" to white Americans. Douglass noted, however, that "even if we could consent to the folly of sending away the only efficient producers" in America, it would not occur as a result of the costliness of the present war.[10] Yet, for Suzie King Taylor, an enslaved woman from

---

[5] Frederick Douglass, "The Present and Future of the Colored Race in America: An Address Delivered in Brooklyn, New York, on 5 May 1863," The Frederick Douglass Papers, vol.3, p. 573.
[6] Ibid. Douglass, "The Present and Future," 5 May 1863," Douglass Papers, vol. 3, p. 573.
[7] Frederick Douglass, The Frederick Douglass Papers, vol.3, pp. 574-575.
[8] Frederick Douglass, The Frederick Douglass Papers, vol.3, pp. 574-575.
[9] Frederick Douglass, (emphasis added) The Frederick Douglass Papers, vol.3, p. 575.
[10] Frederick Douglass, The Frederick Douglass Papers, vol.3, p. 574.

Savannah, Georgia who ran behind Union lines, the first year of war "was a gloomy time for us all" because of this very issue. As contraband in a camp on St. Simons Island in Georgia, Taylor, her uncle, and seven siblings were told that "there was going to be a settlement of the war. Those who were on the Union side would remain free, and those in bondage were to work three days for their masters and three days for themselves…we [the contraband] were to be sent to Liberia." Taylor stated that when asked whether she would prefer to go back to Savannah or go to Liberia, she stated that she hoped to go back to Savannah "by all means." Nevertheless, Taylor remained concerned that she would be sent to Liberia: "We did not know when this would be, but were prepared in case this settlement should be reached. However, the Confederates would not agree to the arrangement, or else it was one of the many rumors flying about at the time."[11]

They were not merely rumors, as Abraham Lincoln made countless propositions to resettle contraband outside of the nation as part of his proposal for reunification with the South.[12] Lincoln vigorously asserted throughout the war and afterwards that it was necessary for the good of the nation to remove blacks from the American south, as Lincoln believed that the two races, blacks and whites, could never live together peaceably.[13] African Americans overwhelmingly rejected these assertions and Lincoln's position on colonization affected a serious level of concern as well as distrust of his

---

[11] Suzie King Taylor, Reminiscences of My Life in Camp ch. 3 in Black Writers and the American Civil War Richard A. Long, ed. (Secaucus: Blue and Gray p, 1988) p. 131.

[12] Abraham Lincoln, Proclamation 92 – Warning to Rebel Sympathizers July 25, 1862; Abraham Lincoln, Second Annual Message December 1, 1862.

[13]Ibid. Lincoln was a member of the Illinois Colonization Society even before he became President. See: Charles H. Wesley, "Lincoln's Plan for Colonizing the Emancipated Negroes." Journal of Negro History 4 (January 1919): 7-21. See also the groundbreaking work of Phillip W. Magness and Sebastian N. Page for evidence that despite the Emancipation Proclamation Lincoln continued to work with the British government for the resettlement of blacks in British Honduras (Belize) and British Guiana. Colonization after Emancipation: Lincoln and the Movement for Black Resettlement (Columbia: University of Missouri P, 2011).

administration.[14] These ideas also fueled the administration's reticence to enlist black regiments. In Alfred M. Green's opinion, "the longer the government shirks the responsibility of such a measure the longer time she gives the rebel government to tamper with the free colored people of the South, and prompt and prepare their slaves for shifting the horrors of Saint Domingo from the South to the North."[15] Bishop Daniel A. Payne after meeting with Lincoln and other black leaders wrote that to him there was a "crisis upon us" because "the opinions of the government are based upon the ideas, that white men and colored men cannot live together as equals in the same country; and that unless a voluntary and peaceable separation is effected *now*, the time must come when there will be a war of extermination between the races."[16] If the President as head of the federal government thought that blacks and whites could not live together where would support for the African American community's right to full citizenship come from once slavery was abolished?

The final solution of a race war, which clearly concerned Lincoln, was also Douglass' greatest concern. The *New York Times* noted that newspapers in border states like Maryland were prognosticating that "emancipation…would be no philanthropy to the negro: his fate was extermination."[17] Another article in the *Times* expressed concern that if emancipation was "carried into effect, the blacks remaining intermixed with the

---

[14]R. Basler, et. al. Collected Works, pp. 370-375; "Editorial by Philip A. Bell," 14 June 1862; "R.H.V. to Robert Hamilton," "Alfred M. Green to Robert Hamilton, "Black Abolitionist Papers, vol. V, pp. 143, 117-124: Former slave Maria Sutton claimed that she did "not taken sides wid neither one." Former slave, William Ward, claimed that he didn't know if "Sherman intended to keep him in slavery or free him."
[15] "Alfred M. Green to Robert Hamilton" October 1861, BAP, Vol. V, p. 123.
[16] Bishop Daniel A. Payne, "An Open Letter to the Colored People," Weekly Anglo African (1862); The Christian Recorder September 29, 1862. Also in William Wells Brown, The Black Man, His Antecedents, His Genius, and His Achievements pp. 208-209.
[17] "The Extermination of the Negro" New York Times October 16, 1862.

whites,…will induce a war of extermination."[18] Thus, "enfranchised blacks," that is, free blacks had to be moved "west of the Mississippi river; in the States of Arkansas, Louisiana (West) and Texas" while all the rebels would be "driven from the Slave states west of the Mississippi into those of the east of it." By gathering all the blacks in the nation into one region "it will place the blacks where their future deportation—in part or in whole—will be the most convenient," and prevent their extermination.[19] To do nothing would "cause an animosity on the part of the South…that five generations would not see obliterated, and which would be placed in the category of the deeds of Cawnpore," a particularly brutal altercation of internecine warfare that occurred between British and Indian rebels in 1857, ending in the slaughter of hundreds of women and children.[20] Commenting directly on these ideas, Douglass was emphatic about what many blacks continued to fear and what Americans talked incessantly about during the Civil War, which was that: "the white people of the country may trump up some cause of war against the colored people, and wage that terrible war of races which some men even now venture to predict, if not desire, and exterminate the black race entirely. They would spare neither age nor sex."[21] But Douglass was quick to denounce such prospects:

> But is there not some chosen curse, some secret thunder in the stores of heaven red with uncommon wrath to blast the men who harbor this bloody solution?....Such a war would indeed remove the colored race from the country. It would fill the land with violence and crime, and make the very name of America a stench in the nostrils of mankind. It would give you hell for a country.[22]

---

[18] "The War, the Proclamation, and the Slaves" The New York Times November 6, 1862.
[19] "The War, the Proclamation, and the Slaves" The New York Times November 6, 1862.
[20] "The War, the Proclamation, and the Slaves" The New York Times November 6, 1862. The massacre in Cawnpore, India was a major event the Indian rebellion in 1857. After an attack, and despite their surrender, Indian rebel forces killed many British soldiers. The Indian rebels also managed to subsequently capture and kill 120 British women and children, brutally hacking their bodies into pieces. When British Company forces discovered the atrocity, they in turn relentlessly killed Indian rebels as well as citizens in violent retaliation. See: Rudrangshu Mukherjee's Spectre of Violence (New Delhi: Penguin Books, 1998) for full treatment of this rebellion.
[21] Frederick Douglass, The Frederick Douglass Papers, vol.3, p. 574
[22] Frederick Douglass, The Frederick Douglass Papers, vol.3, p. 574

The prevailing threat of a war between the races did not deter slaves who emancipated themselves and African American soldiers, who knew that they faced serious danger. Some northern Democrats, according to free black George E. Stephens of Massachusetts, attempted to scare him from enlisting in the Fifty Fourth Massachusetts Regiment by sharing what they knew to be true: "Every one of them that the rebels catch will be hanged, or sent into the Indigo mines, or cut up into mincemeat, or quartered and pickled, or spitted…—what good is it going to do the colored people to go fight and lose their lives?"[23] Yet, Stephens called upon African American men to not be discouraged in enlisting in the Union army by such dire warnings or by their understandable skepticism about the sincerity of Lincoln's commitment to African Americans. Stephen's argued that these "copperheads" had no idea of how powerful the call from "Heaven, as with a voice of thunder, calls on you to arise from the dust, and smite with an avenging hand the obdurate, cruel, and relentless enemy and traitor,…whose life and sacred honor are pledged to wage an interminable war against your race."[24] When General Benjamin Butler asked some colored officers in New Orleans if they thought their men would fight they responded by saying "General, we come of a fighting race. Our fathers were brought here slaves because they were captured in war, and in hand to hand fights, too. We are willing to fight."[25] Within one day in August 1862, two thousand black men were ready to enlist in the "first regiment of colored troops ever mustered into the services of the

---

[23]"George E. Stephens to Robert Hamilton," The Black Abolitionist Papers, The United States, 1859-1865 Vol. 5, C. Peter Ripley, Editor, (Chapel Hill: UNC p, 1992) p. 199.
[24]"George E. Stephens to Robert Hamilton," The Black Abolitionist Papers, The United States, 1859-1865 Vol. 5, C. Peter Ripley, Editor, (Chapel Hill: UNC p, 1992) p. 199.
[25] Benjamin Butler, Autobiography and Personal Reminiscences of Major General Benjamin F. Butler (Boston: 1892) p. 493.

United States during the War of the Rebellion."[26] Yet, they too did not take their enlistment lightly or without calculation as indicated by their response to Butler's query as to why they had not already "struck a good blow somewhere for their freedom?" One man responded by asking the General: "If we colored men had risen to make war on our masters, would not it have been our duty to ourselves, they being our enemies, to kill the enemy wherever we could find them? And all the white men would have been our enemies to be killed? [General Butler answered] I don't know but what you are right,…I think that would be a logical necessity of insurrection." To which this former slave replied, "If the colored men had begun such a war as that, General, which general of the United States army should we have called on to help us fight our battles?"[To which Butler wrote] That was unanswerable."[27] What was clear to Butler, however, was that "in a very short time three regiments of infantry and two batteries of artillery were equipped, drilled, and ready for service. Better soldiers never shouldered a musket. They were intelligent, obedient, highly appreciative of their position, and fully maintained its dignity. They easily learned the school of the soldier."[28] This training would come in handy as African American men, formerly enslaved and free, faced considerable peril in fighting against the Confederates who viewed their participation as an act of servile war.

Indeed, southerners were emboldened during the Civil War to act upon the ideas of black extermination in their establishment of the policy of the black flag or no quarter on the battlefield. This policy did not acknowledge the surrender of black soldiers and the white officers that led them. It also allowed for the murder of newly freed slaves or contraband of war found among them. According to a letter addressed to Union officer,

---

[26] Ibid. Butler, Personal Reminiscences, p. 493.
[27] Ibid. Butler, Personal Reminiscences p. 492-493.
[28] Butler, Personal Reminiscences pp. 493-494.

Major General Samuel R. Curtis from the Confederate Major-General Thomas H. Homes, "ordinarily when civilized and Christian nations are belligerents no special settlements of any rules of warfare would seem requisite," but Lincoln arming the slaves had changed all that. Slaves with arms, in the southern mind, put white women and children at risk, and "it cannot in such a situation be expected that we will remain passive, quietly acquiescing in a war of extermination against us, without waging a similar war in return."[29] From the president of the Confederacy Jefferson Davis' perspective, Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation removed any possibility of a "reconstruction of the old Union. Rather it "has established a state of things which can lead to but one of three possible consequences—the extermination of the slaves, the exile of the whole white population from the Confederacy, or absolute and total separation of these states from the United States." Indeed, in Davis' opinion, which was republished in *Douglass' Monthly,* the slaves were "doomed to extermination."[30] Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation may have stoked white fear that a race war and servile insurrection were eminent, but there is no evidence of blacks harming white women and children during the Civil War. There is evidence, however, that southern whites ruthlessly murdered not only countless African American soldiers, but also black women and children.

The Confederacy used the Emancipation Proclamation to rationalize their military strategy of extermination, of brutally murdering black Americans across the south. Southerners hoped that total warfare would intimidate those enslaved and free from

---

[29] "Maj. General Samuel Curtis to Th. H. Holmes," October 11, 1862 The War of the Rebellion: A Compilation of the Official Records of the Union and Confederate Armies vol. 13, (Chapter XXV), pp.726-727.

[30] Jefferson Davis, "To the Senate and House of Representatives of the Confederate States" Journal of the Congress of the Confederate States of America, 1861-1865 [Volume 3] Wednesday, January 14, 1863; See: "Rebel View of the Proclamation," Douglass' Monthly March, 1863.

joining with or seeking protection from the Union army. For example, according to one escaped slave, several blacks were hung without trial under the suspicion that they were organizing the enslaved to insurrect. Proof of their intent was that copies of the published Emancipation Proclamation "were found in their possession." According to the report the knowledge "that such a proclamation has been made is well-known among all the negroes, and it produced the most startling effect. The terror of the whites is beyond description. Apprehensions of a re-enactment of the Nat Turner horrors are felt to an alarming extent." In response to the unfounded fears that blacks were set upon massacring whites and to repudiate the possibility of black freedom, "seventeen negroes were promptly taken out…and hung. It is said that the negroes of the different counties …are all engaged in the conspiracy for a general insurrection."[31] Allen Parker, a former slave who served with the United States Navy, heard a slave owner warn another slave that "if the south were successful they would kill all the negroes that ran away."[32] Although Allen and his friend Joe were not deterred by this prophecy, as they chose to believe that the south would not win, many runaway slaves were killed to send the same message of intimidation. The *Liberator* reported in 1863 that twenty unarmed negro teamsters were shot and killed because they were wagoneers for the Union forces. Eighteen black men and boys serving as cooks and cabin boys on the captured Union steamer *Harpeth Shoals* were "tied and taken to an open field…and deliberately shot down in cold blood."[33] Then there is the example of troops from Texas under Col. William Henry Parson murdering the refugees attached to the Federal supply train in

---

[31] "Reported Negro Plot in Virginia" The Christian Recorder October 25, 1862.
[32] Allen Parker, Recollections of Slavery Times by Allen Parker (Worcester, Mass: Chas. W. Burbank and Co., 1895) Chapter 8.
[33] "The Confederate Black Flag," "Rebels Shooting Negroes" The Liberator February 20, 1863, Vol. XXXIII, Issue 8.

northeastern Arkansas. According to a Wisconsin soldier, William DeLoss Love, "the rebels, now that resistance had ceased, took possession of the Camp, and with the most fiendish barbarity murdered many negroes, both men and women."[34] Similar actions against unarmed runaway slaves took place during the Battle of Marks Mills, Arkansas in April of 1864 where according to Lieutenant Pearson, rebel soldiers admitted to him that "they had killed eighty odd negroes men women & children."[35]

The most highly publicized example of rebel atrocities during the Civil War, however, took place at Fort Pillow in the western part of Tennessee. Fort Pillow, overlooking the Mississippi river sixty miles north of Memphis, had been nearly empty until the arrival of over six hundred troops, some traders, two hundred contraband, and the families of the soldiers. Two hundred and forty six of those soldiers were African Americans sent by General Stephen A. Hurlburt to secure the fort for trading purposes and to ensure that the Federal forces were free to navigate the Mississippi without obstruction. Unfortunately, the soldiers as well as their leaders were ill prepared for a Confederate siege upon the fort on April 12, 1864. Hurlburt would later claim that he never received the orders from General Sherman to abandon the fort in January of 1864.[36]

When the rumor spread like wildfire that Nathan Bedford Forrest was on his way to attack the fort, many women, children, and some sick negroes were put aboard a barge pulled by the gunboat the *New Era* to seek shelter at a place named Coal Creek. The over two hundred women and children who were at Fort Pillow as contraband of the war did

---

[34] William De Loss Love, Wisconsin in the War of the Rebellion (Chicago: Sheldon & Co, 1866) p. 557; Greg Urwin, Black Flag Over Dixie: Racial Atrocities and Reprisals in the Civil War (Carbondale: Southern Illinois Up, 2004) p. 25.
[35] Urwin, Black Flag, pp. 142-143.
[36]"Report," U. S. Congress. House, Joint Committee on the Conduct of the War, Fort Pillow Massacre (Washington D. C., May 5, 1864) p. 7

not make it onto the barge, however, and they ran helter-skelter into the brush along the river's edge, hiding in the massive tangle of driftwood.[37]

Once the battle commenced, Forrest, with over 1500 Confederate troops took illegal advantage of a cease-fire, and his men leaped over the fort's garrison wall in a solid mass crying "no quarter." The stunned Union troops recognizing that the battle was now over, threw down their weapons and made a mad dash down the steep and slippery side of the bluff all the while hearing the rebels yelling again and again "no quarter," and "kill the damned niggers; shoot them down!"[38] The Confederates had placed a regiment of cavalry to block off their escape, and all of the Union soldiers that could, either raised their arms in surrender or continued running toward the Mississippi river.[39]

Almost all of the Union troops, black or white, that had made it to the water's edge ended up dead or nearly so. According to Acting Master William Ferguson of the U.S. steamer *Silver Cloud*, there were "unmistakable evidences" that a "massacre" occurred. Bodies were left with gaping holes, some soldiers were "bayoneted through the eyes," some had their "skulls beaten through," other bodies were found with "hideous wounds as if their bowels had been ripped open with bowie-knives." With cold-blooded barbarity, the rebels continued to shoot and kill those who surrendered, as well as those who attempted to hide "behind logs and under the brush" for protection, showing how "persistent was the slaughter of our unfortunate troops."[40] Daniel Stamps certified that the next morning he saw "negroes who were wounded, and had survived the night, shot

---

[37] Andrew Ward, River Run Red: The Fort Pillow Massacre in the American Civil War (New York: Penguin, 2005) pp. 156-159.
[38] "Report of the Joint Select Committee of the Conduct of the War," House of Representatives, 38th Congress, 1st Session, Report No. 65. May 5, 1864, p. 4.
[39] War of Rebellion, Vol. 32, pt. 1, Series 4. testimony of Major Williams, testimony of Alexander Nayron,
[40] War of Rebellion, Vol. 32, pt. 1, Series 4. "Testimony of Jacob Wilson,(colored)" pp. 539-540; "Report of Acting Master William Ferguson, U. S. Navy, of the capture of Fort Pillow." pp. 571-572.

and killed as fast as they could be found."[41]

The evidence shows that black women and children were not exempt from slaughter as well. According to William J. Mays, "2 negro women and 3 little children' were murdered after a "rebel stepped up to them and said, 'yes, God damn you, you thought you were free, did you?' And shot them all. They all fell but 1 child, when he knocked it in the head with the breach of his gun. They then disappeared in the direction of the landing, following up the fugitives, firing at them wherever seen."[42] Two other formerly enslaved women were shot down and "their bodies were thrown into the river after the place was taken."[43] Surgeon Horace Wardner received a "young negro boy, probably sixteen years old, who was in the hospital there sick with fever, and unable to get away. The rebels entered the hospital, and with a saber hacked his head, no doubt with the intention of splitting it open…He was brought here insensible, and died yesterday."[44] Elias Falls testified that there were others, and that he was informed that the rebels killed "two women and two children" who were also sick in the hospital at Fort Pillow.[45] Another African American soldier, Thomas Adison testified that they shot two "little children not more than that high [holding his hand off about four feet from the floor,]" whose names he recalled as "Dave" and "Anderson."[46] Manuel Nichols, also witnessed a

---

[41] War of Rebellion, Vol. 32, pt. 1, Series 4. "Statement of Daniel Stamps, Company E, Thirteenth Tennessee Cavalry," p. 531.
[42] War of Rebellion, Vol. 32, pt. 1, Series 4, p. 525. "Statement of William J. Mays, Company B, Thirteenth Tennessee Cavalry."
[43]"Statement of James Lewis, private of company C, Sixth U.S. Heavy Artillery (colored)" War of Rebellion p. 537.
[44] "Testimony of Surgeon Horace Wardner," U. S. Congress. House, Joint Committee on the Conduct of the War, Fort Pillow Massacre (Washington D. C., May 5, 1864), p. 13.
[45] "Testimony of Elias Falls," U. S. Congress. House, Joint Committee on the Conduct of the War, Fort Pillow Massacre (Washington D. C., May 5, 1864) p. 15.
[46] "Testimony of Thomas Adison (colored) private, company C, 6th United States heavy artillery," U. S. Congress. House, Joint Committee on the Conduct of the War, Fort Pillow Massacre (Washington D. C., May 5, 1864) pp. 20-21.

"little boy belonging to company D" being "shot…down."[47] Three young boys who helped with the breastwork were also murdered, "lying in the water, with their heads out; they could not swim. They begged them as long as they could, but they shot them right in the forehead." Shaw was perturbed by the fact that from hardly ten feet away he could see that the "boys" were "not more than fifteen or sixteen years old. They were not soldiers."[48]

The rebels also set houses, the hospital, and the commissary located at the bottom of the bluff on fire, deliberately burning alive the many injured Union soldiers placed inside them. Anderson Ransom testified that he heard their "hallooing" screams, but they could not escape because the doors were "barred with one of those wide bolts."[49] Jacob Thompson stated that he also saw them nail "black sergeants to the logs and set the logs on fire….drove the nails right through their hands."[50]

Out of six hundred men, three to four hundred men lost their lives. The Confederates gathered up the remaining black troops as prisoners and made them "pull the artillery, whipping them at the same time in the most shameful manner" as if they were beast.[51] According to the Congressional report, "At least three hundred were

---

[47] "Testimony of Manuel Nichols (colored,) private, company B, 6th United States heavy artillery," U. S. Congress. House, Joint Committee on the Conduct of the War, Fort Pillow Massacre (Washington D. C., May 5, 1864) p. 21.
[48] "Testimony of George Shaw, (colored,) private, company B, 6th United States heavy artillery," U. S. Congress. House, Joint Committee on the Conduct of the War, Fort Pillow Massacre (Washington D. C., May 5, 1864). pp. 25-26.
[49] "Testimony of Ranson Anderson (colored,) Co. B, 6th United States heavy artillery," U. S. Congress. House, Joint Committee on the Conduct of the War, Fort Pillow Massacre (Washington D. C., May 5, 1864) pp. 31-32; "Testimony of Jacob Thompson (colored)," ibid. p. 30; "Testimony of William Ferguson," War of the Rebellion, p. 571.
[50] "Testimony of Jacob Thompson (colored)," U. S. Congress. House, Joint Committee on the Conduct of the War, Fort Pillow Massacre (Washington D. C., May 5, 1864) p. 30;
[51] "Statement of Frank Hogan, corporal Company A, Sixth U. S. Artillery," War of Rebellion, p. 536.

murdered in cold blood."[52] In the end, sixty-two black prisoners, most of them severely wounded, were all that was left of the two hundred and forty six combatants in Companies A through D of the 6th United States Colored Heavy Artillery (USCHA) division[53] and Company D of the 2nd United States Colored Light Artillery (USCLA) division. It is not possible to assess how many black women and children lost their lives, but clearly many were killed. The Confederacy praised Forrest for his actions calling it a "brilliant campaign…a campaign which has conferred upon its authors fame as enduring as the records of the struggle which they have so brilliantly illustrated."[54]

In commenting on Fort Pillow, African Americans noted that "We know that, when we enlisted, threats had been made, and we expected them to be fulfilled; and this butchery is not a new thing to us—we have had experiences before to-day. With slaveholders this is only *an act on a grander scale*…"[55] For many black soldiers, the cry "remember Fort Pillow" would be their rallying cry for the remainder of the war.[56] Reverend Henry McNeil Tuner, serving as Chaplain to the 1st U.S. Colored Troops recalled that at the Battle of Petersburg in Virginia, African American soldiers "and the rebels were both crying out – "Fort Pillow!" This seems to be the battle-cry on both sides…onward they went waxing stronger and mightier every time Fort Pillow was mentioned." When the rebels attempted to surrender "some few held up their hands and

---

[52]"Report," U. S. Congress. House, Joint Committee on the Conduct of the War, Fort Pillow Massacre (Washington D. C., May 5, 1864) p. 6.
[53] Andrew Ward, River Run Red: The Fort Pillow Massacre in the American Civil War (New York: Viking, 2005) p. 250, 464, ftn. 4.
[54]"From L. Polk to Major General Forest," "Joint Resolution," War of the Rebellion, Vol. 32, part 1, Series 1, p. 619.
[55] R. H. C., "Fort Pillow" The Christian Recorder April 30, 1864.
[56] Urwin, Black Flag, p. 145-146; Dudley Taylor Cornish, The Sable Arm: Negro Troops in the Union Army, 1861-1865 (New York: W.W. Norton, 1966)176-177; Alan Axelrod, The Horrid Pit: The Battle of the Crater, The Civil War's Cruelest Mission (New York: Carroll & Graf, 2007) pp. 177-178; John Cimprich, Fort Pillow, a Civil War Massacre and Public Memory (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State p, 2005) p. 104.

pleaded for mercy, but our boys…with few exceptions" killed them.[57] For Turner, while he understood why the black soldiers showed their adversaries no mercy, he still opposed behavior that he recognized was

> highly endorsed by an immense number of both white and colored people…that is the killing of all the rebel soldiers taken by our soldiers. True, the rebels have set the example, particularly in killing the colored soldiers; but it is a cruel one….Such a course of warfare is an outrage upon civilization and nominal Christianity. And in as much as it was *presumed* that *we* would carry out a brutal warfare, let us disappoint out malicious anticipators, by showing the world that higher sentiments not only prevail, but actually predominate.(emphasis added)[58]

It is important to point out, however, that indiscriminate acts of violence against people of color in the South during the Civil War were pervasive across America and not just in the South. James Lindsay Smith recalled that during the New York Draft riot in 1863 "A sweet babe was brained while holding up his little arms, and smiling upon his murders. Many little children were killed in this manner."[59] Frederick Douglass also recalled that during that same "bloody uprising" in New York the mob "spared neither age nor sex; it hanged negroes simply because they were negroes, it murdered women in their homes, and …it dashed out the brains of young children against the lamp posts."[60]

In the Detroit riot against the draft similar acts of brutality also occurred in 1863 against black men, women and children. An anonymous author noted that there was "but one thing the colored man knows, that the class of men of the same politics as those South are doing the mobbing North; so they are not only ready to suffer, but to die in the cause that promises over three millions of their race liberty. Whatever…the rage of the enemies of freedom may be!" Yet, for one eye witness by the name of Mr. Dale it was

---

[57] H. M. Turner, "A Very Important Letter From Chaplain Turner" The Christian Recorder, July 9, 1864.
[58] H. M. Turner, "A Very Important Letter From Chaplain Turner" The Christian Recorder, July 9, 1864.
[59] James Lindsay Smith, Autobiography of James L. Smith p. 43.
[60] Frederick Douglass, The Life and Times of Frederick Douglass: In his Own Words (1881; New York: Kennsington, 1983) p. 361.

"most revolting, to see innocent men, women and children, all without respect to age or sex, being pounded in the most brutal manner."[61] Reverend S. S. Hunting elaborated on what was perhaps the emerging spirit of African Americans as well as that of white Americans across the nation:

> the threat is made, that "if the course of things,"…viz.: the elevation of the negro in moral, intellectual and social endowments, "shall not be arrested," the recent riot "is but premonitory of an uprising which will leave no resting place for the negro in the States of the Northwest." Now, let it be distinctly understood, that the attempt to exterminate the negro will bring extermination to certain classes of their enemies….Let all beware how they countenance this prejudice against a race or give their sanction to it in the least. This negro hatred is what blinded the eyes of the nation, and threatens future calamity if it is not checked and overcome.[62]

Douglass noted that the "mobs at Detroit, Chicago, Cincinnati, and New York" were evidence of "the unconquerable aversion of the Irish towards the colored race…that the Irish people are among our bitterest persecutors." It was, "in one sense… strange passing strange, that they should be such." Douglass, quoting Daniel O'Connell, knew that the "history of Ireland might be traced like a wounded man through a crowd—by the blood. The Irishman has been persecuted for his religion about as vigorously as the black man has been for his color." Knowing this to be the case, Douglass was perturbed by the violence of Irishmen upon black Americans, stating that "there is something quite revolting in the idea of a people lately oppressed suddenly becoming oppressors, that the persecuted can so suddenly become the persecutors."[63]

Racialized and degendered warfare also occurred out west in 1864 in the Sand Creek Massacre in Colorado. According to United States Indian interpreter and special

---

[61] A Thrilling Narrative From the Lips of the Sufferers of the Late Detroit Riot, March 6, 1863, with the Hair breadth Escapes of Men, Women and Children, and Destruction of Colored Men's Property, Not Less Than $15,000. 24 p. Detroit, Mich. Published by the Author. 1863. http://docsouth.unc.edu/neh/detroit/detroit.xml .

[62] Ibid. A Thrilling Narrative

[63] Frederick Douglass, The Frederick Douglass Papers vol. 3, p. 581. Daniel O'Connell was an Irish political leader and activist in the early 19th century.

Indian agent, John S. Smith, one hundred families of Cheyennes and six or eight lodges of Arapahoes known to be "friendly Indians" were massacred on November 29, 1864 by United States troops under the leadership of Col. John M. Chivington.[64] Of the five hundred Native Americans, based on Smith's calculation of "five to a lodge," approximately two hundred and fifty were killed, more than half of the dead were women and children.[65] According to Smith women and children were slaughtered "indiscriminately" and "I saw the bodies of those lying there cut all to pieces, worse mutilated than any I ever saw before; the women cut all to pieces…scalped; their brains knocked out; children two or three months old; all ages lying there, from sucking infants up to warriors."[66] A soldier who protested the attack of Black Kettle's village to no avail and was still ashamed that he "was in it with my Co. Col. Chivington" acknowledged that what Smith testified to was true, that he saw "a squaw ripped open and a child taken from her, little children shot while begging for their lives."[67] The massacre lasted for six to eight hours. Years later, veteran, Dr. T. P. Bell recounted the events of that day, and when he was asked "But how about the children, doctor?" Bell "smiled grimly" and stated that he and the other soldiers were told just before the charge began "Boys,

---

[64] "Congressional Testimony of John S. Smith Washington, March 14, 1865," Joint Committee on the Conduct of the War, Massacre of Cheyenne Indians, 38th Congress, 2nd Session (Washington, 1865) pp. 4-12, 56-59, 101-108.

[65] Ibid (Smith testimony); "letter from Joe A. Cramer to Major [Edward Wanshaer Wynkoop]" Cramer wrote a letter to Edward W. Wynkoop asking that the "great Indian Massacre" be investigated. (December 19, 1864). "Sand Creek Massacre" United States Congress, Senate. Report of the Secretary of War, Sand Creek Massacre, Sen. Exec. Doc. No. 26, 39 Cong., 2 sess. (Washington, Government Printing Office, 1867) pp. 29-33.

[66] Ibid. John S. Smith testimony.

[67] "letter from Joe A. Cramer to Major"

remember that *nits make lice*." Bell went on to state that "we all seemed to feel the same way."[68]

Significantly, the *Liberator* aligned the Sand Creek massacre with the massacre of African Americans in the South by juxtaposing the paper's expose of "The Chivington Massacre" above the article the "Awful State of affairs in Alabama" describing the barbarous murder of men, women and children. [69] Only people of color experienced exterminatory warfare during the Civil War. Although over six hundred thousand soldiers white and black died in this war, the deliberate killing of non-combatants, namely women and children was unique to African Americans as well to the Native American communities. Concerned at the war's end that now many black men were armed as well as trained, Lincoln stated, "I fear a race war," ignoring the fact that there had already been a war between the races going on, a war of extermination that would continue to be waged against the black community.[70]

The Post Civil War Years

The resurgence, if you will, of race based acts of annihilation continued for many years, long after the Civil War ended. Whites in the North and the South continued to talk about black extermination and a war between the races as inevitable. Black people found themselves caught relatively unprotected in the subsequent undeclared war that the south waged against people of color residing within their communities. In an attempt to regain

---

[68] "The Story of the Sand Creek Massacre Retold by One Who Participate in the Bloody Work of That Eventful Day in Colorado's History," The Denver Evening Post, (Denver, CO) April 9, 1899; pg. 13; col A, (emphasis added).
[69] "The Chivington Massacre," "Awful State of Affairs in Alabama" Liberator August 25, 1865; vol. 35, Issue 34, pg. 135.
[70] Butler, Personal Reminiscences, p. 903

the supremacy of the white race, black people were treated like they were disposable and not essential to the South or the nation. These ideas fostered the continuation of exterminatory practices towards African American men, women, and children during Reconstruction, which lasted well into the twentieth century.

For most southerners it was the elevation of African Americans to an equal, or as many feared, superior status to whites that would cause a race war to ensue after the Civil War ended. In Georgian Eliza Frances Andrew's view, unless labor and race relations returned to as they were, "the fanatics who have caused the trouble" will "force the negro in their rash experiments to justify themselves for his emancipation" making direct confrontation inevitable. Eliza, who considered herself a moderate but now because of Sherman's "infamous march" had been "driven to the other extreme," believed that because of this pressure upon the southern people, "eventually the negro race will be either exterminated or reduced to some system of apprenticeship embodying the best features of slavery."[71] Mary Jones, the wife of the Rev. Dr. Charles Colcock Jones, also believed that circumstances in the South were dire for African Americans. In her religious prophesizing, Mary predicted that "with their emancipation must come extermination….I feel if ever we gain our independence there will be radical reforms in the system of slavery as it now exists. When once delivered from the interference of Northern abolitionism, we shall be free to make and enforce such rules and reformations as are just and right." In Mary's view, it was not just southerner's who despised African Americans, "In all my life I never heard such expressions of hatred and contempt as the Yankees heap upon our poor servants. One of them told me he did not know what God

[71] Eliza Frances Andrews, The War-Time Journal of a Georgia Girl, 1864-1865. http://docsouth.unc.edu/fpn/andrews/menu.html.

Almighty made Negroes for; all he wished was the power to blow their brains out."[72] These women were writing privately in their diaries, but they were also perhaps echoing public sentiment.

This sentiment was reported in several newspapers by the end of the Civil War; a "war between the whites and blacks of the South is probable." The idea "widely prevails throughout the South. It was an universally accepted axiom there, long before the rebellion, that emancipation would result in one of two things—either amalgamation or extermination."[73] Another paper noted that "already we hear from many quarters the prophecy that the whole black race in this country is doomed to extermination."[74] In Alabama, a newspaper reported that "some planters even boast that they could manure their lands with the dead carcasses of negroes." Commenting on the lack of federal intervention the article went on to say that "If negroes can be shot down daily in garrisoned towns where the authorities are unable to stop this state of thing, it is very reasonable to suppose that this brutal work is carried on more extensively where the blacks have no protection. This wholesale murdering of human being is, we fear, the practical working of the conspiracy to exterminate the colored race."[75] According to the *Milwaulkee Sentinel*, another southern press warned that although they had "a great solicitude for the welfare of the colored men…in the event of the negroes securing the elective franchise a war of races will ensue which will result in the extermination of the

---

[72] Entry of Mrs. Mary Jones in her Journal (Wednesday, January 11, 1865), The Children of Pride: Selected letters of the family of the Rev. Dr. Charles Colcock Jones from the years 1860-1868, with the addition of several previously unpublished letters. Robert Manson Myers, ed. (New Haven: Yale Up, 1984) p. 526.
[73] "The Government and the Freedmen." New York Times June 6, 1865, p.4.
[74] "The Policy of the President, In its Bearings Upon the Black Man." The Independent October 19, 1865:17,881; pg. 1.
[75] "North Carolina. The Scheme to Exterminate the Colored Race. From the Southern Christian Intelligencer of Aug. 5," New York Times August 22, 1865.

race."[76] It was this kind of talk that concerned C. Lester Edwards of New York in his letter to Governor Orr of South Carolina:

> when men talk so idly of a war of races which would end in the annihilation of the negro in the South,…they are using language far more dangerous…than they did when they declared that if Slavery or the Union were to perish the Union should be the victim…What then shall the South do to make the best of her position? She can neither get rid of these four millions of people nor exterminate them: both are impossibilities. The nineteenth century is not going to allow four million of people, who have committed no crime to be swept from the face of the earth.[77]

African Americans were not so confident, as they believed that southern whites were determined to show that they meant what they said, that they would exterminate African Americans in order to reaffirm white supremacy. According to Robert Hamilton, a black abolitionist and editor of the *Weekly Anglo African*, because African Americans had fought on the side of the Union "the scheme is now…to exterminate the negro."[78] He also noted that the "virus of negro hate" had always been conjoined with the "mania of eternal negro slavery." Southerners had not reconciled with the outcome of the Civil War and the subsequent destruction of the institution of slavery, and now the "rebel hates the negro because he has thrown off *his* yoke and become free," and because "he defeated the object and the aim of the rebellion." Indeed, Hamilton argued, the hatred was so severe, and "their jealousy of their former slaves is such that they would rather see everyone of them blotted out of existence, than to see them free." What concerned Hamilton was that "this feeling is shared by thousands at the South who have not been slaveholders. The shocking barbarities now suffered by the colored people at the South affords a solemn

---

[76] "Extermination of the Negroes" Milwaukee Daily Sentinel March 01, 1866; Issue 50: col B.
[77] "The South and the Union" New York Times November 6, 1866, p. 2. See: "The Future of the Negro" The Round Table NY: September 9, 23, 1865 for similar analysis of whether emancipation would lead to the extermination of the colored race in the south.
[78] Thomas Hamilton, "The Emancipation Proclamation Ignored, And A New Scheme of Southern Despotism Boldly Initiated" Weekly Anglo-African (New York, N.Y.) 3 September 1865. Found in The Black Abolitionist Papers Vol V, The United States, 1859-1865 Peter C. Ripley, ed. (Chapel Hill, UNC p, 1992) p. 360.

lesson for the Government." Hamilton called on Congress to not just take his word for it, to do something to protect blacks in the south from white vengeance: "We trust that Congress will ventilate when it meets, and let the country and the world know if there is a conspiracy to institute a massacre, or to reestablish slavery all hazards."[79]

The conspiracy to massacre African Americans of which Hamilton warned seemed to begin almost immediately after the Civil War. For example, there were reports from Clark County, Alabama in 1865 that: "Men are hanged for saying they are free, and tied hog-fashion, and thrown over in the river and drowned. Women are shut up in chicken-coops, and thrown in the river. All these things are done, and no person to protect them."[80] According to a teacher from the Northwest Freedman's Aid Commission in Mobile, Alabama "One hundred and thirty three dead bodies were counted in the woods, five bodies were seen floating in the river…Women and children killed, and then boxed up and thrown into the river."[81] One black man, who had his ears cut off by former rebel soldiers, was told by them "that five thousand of them had formed a clan to kill every negro that they could without detection; that if the negro was to be free, he should not live in this country; that the tariff that the government has established for wages was too small for a man to live on; therefore, in order to obtain more, the negroes must be banished, so that they could get higher wages."[82] According to Inspector General Col. Charles F. Johnson, in the Memphis Riot in Tennessee, the City Recorder, John C. Creighton, called for the "whole sale slaughter of blacks." In a speech he delivered on

---

[79] Thomas Hamilton, "The Emancipation Proclamation Ignored, And A New Scheme of Southern Despotism Boldly Initiated" Weekly Anglo-African (New York, N.Y.) 3 September 1865. Found in The Black Abolitionist Papers Vol V, The United States, 1859-1865 C. Peter Ripley, ed. (Chapel Hill, UNC p, 1992) pp. 360-364.
[80] "Awful State of Affairs in Alabama" Liberator, August 25, 1865.
[81] Ibid. (Liberator August 25, 1865)
[82] Ibid. (Liberator, August 25, 1865)

May 1st, 1866, Creighton urged the "crowd of police and citizens" to continue to "prepare and clean out every damned son of a bitch of a nigger out of town…"Boys, I want you to go ahead and kill every damned one of the nigger race and burn up the cradle."[83] The fact that a city official urged violence, gave the white crowd a license to kill: "during the night the Negroes were hunted down by police, firemen and other white citizens, shot, assaulted, robbed, and in many instances their houses searched under the pretense of hunting for concealed arms, plundered , and then set on fire, during which no resistance so far as we can learn was offered by the Negroes….All crimes imaginable were committed from simple larceny to rape and murder. Several women and children were shot in bed. One woman (Rachel Johnson) was shot and then thrown into the flames of a burning house and consumed."[84]

African Americans were not only well aware of the danger that freedom engendered, but also that the desire to drive the "whole negro race out the country" was at the heart of white violence against them during the post Civil War years.[85] Martin R. Delany, fearing that talk of colonization would fuel southern ideas of black extermination wrote a letter on July 21, 1866 to James Lynch, editor of the *Christian Recorder* entitled "Letter on President Warner of Liberia." In his letter, Delany chastised President Warner, the third African American president of Liberia, for his public comments suggesting the

---

[83] "Letter of Chas. F. Jackson to Maj. Genl. O. O. Howard, May 22, 1866," "Affidavit of William Davis, July 8, 1867," "Reports of Outrages, Riots and Murders, Jan. 15, 1866-Aug. 12, 1868" Records of the Assistant Commissioner for the State of Tennessee: Bureau of Refugees, Freedmen, and Abandoned Lands, 1865-1869 National Archives Microfilm Publication M999, roll 34.

[84] Letter of Chas. F. Jackson to Maj. Genl. O. O. Howard dated May 22, 1866, "Reports of Outrages, Riots and Murders, Jan. 15, 1866-Aug. 12, 1868" Records of the Assistant Commissioner for the State of Tennessee: Bureau of Refugees, Freedmen, and Abandoned Lands, 1865-1869 National Archives Microfilm Publication M999, roll 34. In the years between 1865 to 1868, over 1500 people were lynched across the south. data compiled from http://users.bestweb.net/~rg/lynching_century.htm

[85] Testimony Taken by The Joint Select Committee to Inquire into the Condition of Affairs in the Late Insurrectional States North Carolina. Vol. 2, (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1872) pp. 14, 49, 318.

removal of southern blacks from America. For Delany there was real danger in even discussing the idea: "Does President Warner know, that the commencement of such an act of national injustice is itself a barbarity that might lead to *extermination,* a much cheaper and by far easier method of ridding the nation of this people![86]"

Over time, as ideas about a race war continued to preclude absolute freedom in the South, Delany became concerned about the possibility of national support for a war between the races and black extermination. In a letter to Douglass in 1876, Delany reveals that his fears of extermination were real:

> the eye of the whole North and West being already turned in this direction, and their minds made up, and the first occasion of a murmur of a conflict of races, and the whole country will rise up and rush to arms with such force and power,…
> Extermination will be their theme. Their watch-word, "Every Negro in the grave!…When our race, shall only be remembered among the things of the past![87]

Delany's inclusion of the "West" should not be overlooked, as the U.S. military was now in the western part of America executing a doctrine of destruction and extermination on Native American people. The President, Ulysses S. Grant issued a sharp yet heartfelt warning to Native Americans in the West stating that they had only one choice in 1873, either allow themselves to be brought "under the benign influences of education and civilization" or else they would face a "war of extermination."[88]

Aside from federal policy and the Sand Creek Massacre mentioned earlier, Delany might have also been reflecting upon the Camp Grant Massacre in 1871. Out of the one hundred and twenty five Native Americans killed by a large party of white citizens, only eight were men. The camp, First Lieutenant Royal Whitman recalled, was found "burning

---

[86]Martin R. Delany, letter, Christian Recorder, 21 July 1866:1. Also in Levine, 465.
[87] Delany, "Trial and Conviction," 28 February 1876, rpt. in Adeleke, p. 227. Copy of letter as an unpublished pamphlet may be found in the Charleston Historical Society Library.
[88]"By the President of the United States. A Proclamation," Journal of the Senate of the United States of America, 1789-1873 Tuesday, March 4, 1873.

and the ground strewn with their mutilated women and children."[89] Instead of being the instigators of anti-American aggression or uncivilized members of society as Grant portrayed them, Whitman believed that Americans would "drive them into a hopeless war of extermination."[90] Moreover, the national outrage at Custer's death in his confrontation with the Sioux Indians on June 25, 1876 incited many Americans across the country to call for total warfare against Native Americans and for their complete extermination.[91] Delany seems to imply that black Americans might be next. Given the racial strife that existed in the South, his implications were certainly justified.

During Reconstruction, black men organized themselves across the south into trained military units to fight against rising white forces like the Ku Klux Klan. For many former slaves during the post war years, "things were mighty tough for us."[92] From 1865 to 1869, fifteen hundred African Americans were lynched in the South.[93] According to Richard Taylor, the son of President Zachary Taylor and the brother-in-law of Confederate President Jefferson Davis, after the assassination of President Lincoln and prior to 1869,

> The entire white race of the south devoted itself to the killing of negroes…Thousands upon thousands were slain…such was the ferocity of the slave-drivers, that unborn infants were ripped from their mothers wombs. Individual effort could not suffice the rage for slaughter,…Thus "Ku-Klux" originated, and covered the land with a network of crime….As crocodiles conceal their prey until it becomes savory and tender and ripe for

---

[89] "The Camp Grant Massacre: Lieut. Whitman's Report—A Fearful Tale—Women and Children Butchered." New York Times July 20, 1871, p.1.
[90] Ibid. (The Camp Grant Massacre: Lieut. Whitman's Report—A Fearful Tale—Women and Children Butchered." New York Times July 20, 1871, p.1.)
[91] Jeffrey Ostler, The Plain Sioux and U.S. Colonialism from Lewis and Clark to Wounded Knee (Cambridge: Cambridge Up, 2004) pp. 13, 15, 62.
[92] Jeptha (Doc) Choice, Texas Slave Narrative; Lewis Favor, Ex-Slave, Born in Slavery: Slave Narratives from the Federal Writers' Project, 1836-1938 p. 7
[93] data compiled from The Lynching Calendar: African Americans Who Died in Racial Violence in the US During 1865-1899. Also See: Lynching Century: 1865-1965 African Americans Who Died in Racial Violence in the United States Chronology: Dates of Death. http://users.bestweb.net/~rg/lynching_century.htm

> eating, so the Radicals kept these dark corpses to serve up to the public when important elections approached, or some especial villainy was to be enacted by the Congress.[94]

Many blacks, like those in Bennettsville, South Carolina, carried weapons with them at all times and patrolled the streets to prevent attacks from the Klan. The problem was most pervasive in counties where many blacks owned farms and where the populations were racially mixed. Thousands of blacks left their homes every night and took to the forest, as they feared for their lives once darkness fell.[95] Yet, according to the testimony of former slave Essic Harris, he went back into his house "because I could not leave my children there to be killed." Harris knew what the Klan was capable of, as the family of another black man named Anthony Davis had been nearly killed when "they whipped him and shot at his children." The children and their father survived but the Ku Klux Klan had "wounded them."[96] Congressman Richard Cain of South Carolina surrounded his house with armed men as he and his family lived under the constant threat of violence.[97] Republican officials attempted to calm the tension between blacks and whites by urging black militias to cease their defensive counter violence, but times had changed and black men were no longer willing to be victims at the hands of whites. According to former slave William Henry Rooks, the violence that groups like the KKK and others exhibited against the black community was "about equalization after the freedom."[98] Indeed, according to Eli

---

[94] Richard Taylor, Lieutenant-General in the Confederate Army, Destruction and Reconstruction: Personal Experiences of the Late War (1979; New York: Longmans, 1955) pp. 306-307.

[95] During his testimony, Essic Harris was asked: "Are the colored people very much frightened there?" Answer: "Oh yes, sir; they are scared badly." Question: "Do they all sleep in their houses?" Answer: "No sir, they say they don't." Testimony Taken by The Joint Select Committee to Inquire Into The Condition of the Affairs in the Late Insurrectionary States. North Carolina. Vol. 2 (Washington: Government Printing Office: 1872) p. 99.

[96] Testimony Taken by The Joint Select Committee to Inquire Into The Condition of the Affairs in the Late Insurrectionary States. North Carolina. Vol. 2 (Washington: Government Printing Office: 1872) pp. 94-95.

[97] Eric Foner, Reconstruction: America's Unfinished Revolution 1863-1877 (New York: Perennial Classics, 2002) p. 426.

[98] William Henry Rooks, (Arkansas) Born in Slavery: Slave Narratives from the Federal Writer's Project, 1936-1938.

Coleman, they were determined "not [to] let the negro exert his freedom." In this old slave's view "the white man he thought we ought to still work for them like we did during slavery time…It is still that way, son, to this day with some white people."[99] While recognizing the very legitimate reasons for the state of unrest existing in the south, for Delany the problem was that if "this great divergence and extraordinary estrangement….From whichever side it comes,… [is] not permanently checked, my race can have but one terminal destiny, political nonentity and race extermination."[100]

By the end of Reconstruction in 1877, many Republicans in Congress believed that the "Negro question" had been resolved with the passing of the 15th amendment and no longer wished to pursue national involvement in southern affairs. Northerners in both parties felt that, as was the case with newly arriving immigrants, it was up to blacks to create their own place in the American market place. Congress' laissez-faire approach to the freedmen hurt Reconstruction, giving space for the racial violence to continue.

Many Black leaders confirmed that the possibility of extermination or reenslavement remained a considerable threat to the black community for the rest of the century, especially after the Civil Rights cases brought to the Supreme Court in 1883 nullified the Civil Rights Act of 1875.[101] For example, Dr. Henry McNeal Turner, a bishop of the American Methodist Episcopal church and an emigrationist wrote in 1883, "That decision [the nullification] will either put the Negro back into national politics, where his status will be either fought over again, or drive him out of the country, or result in his

---

[99] Eli Coleman, Texas Slave Narratives.

[100] Martin R. Delany, "Delany for Hampton," letter to the editor, News and Courier, 26 Sept. 1876: 1. rpt. in Levine 453.

[101] The United States Supreme Court ruled that Congress did not have the constitutional authority to regulate acts of discrimination committed by individuals or organizations, and that the Civil Rights Act of 1875 was unconstitutional. Civil Rights Cases 109 U.S. 3 (1883)

extermination." Turner also referred to the period of time between 1873 and 1883 as "the reign of blood and slaughter."[102] T. Thomas Fortune, a journalist and editor of *New York Age* and *New York World*, wrote in 1884 that the Republican party had "betrayed its trust in permitting thousands of innocent men to be slaughtered without declaring the South in rebellion….No: it is time that the coloured voter learned to leave his powerless "protectors" and take care of himself." Fortune also made it clear that from his perspective, "A people in whom the love of Liberty is in-born cannot be enslaved, though they may be exterminated by superior force."[103] Frederick Douglass stated in 1886, "Sometimes I have feared that, in some wild paroxysm of rage, the white race, forgetful of the claims of humanity and the precepts of the Christian religion, will proceed to slaughter the Negro in wholesale, as some of that race have attempted to slaughter chinamen, and as it has been done in detail in some districts of the Southern States." Apprehensively optimistic, Douglass concluded, "the future of the Negro therefore is, that he will not be expatriated nor annihilated."[104] W. E. B. Du Bois reflected that it was only due to the efforts of those Americans that helped the freedmen to improve their condition through education that blacks were not "reenslaved or exterminated in an unequal and cowardly renewal of war."[105]

---

[102]Dr. Henry McNeal Turner, "The Barbarous Decision of the Supreme Court," Christian Recorder, 8 Nov. 1883. Letter to editor, Christian Recorder, 22 Feb. 1883. rpt. in Edwin S. Redkey, ed., Respect Black: The Writings and Speeches of Henry McNeal Turner, (New York: Arno Press, 1971) 62-63, 54.

[103]T. Thomas Fortune, "Political Independence of the Negro," Black and White: Land, and Labor and Politics in the South (1884) rpt. in Howard Brotz ed. African-American Social and Political Thought 1850-1920 (New Brunswick: Transaction, 1992) 337-343. Fortune was the son of Florida office holder Emanuel Fortune

[104] Frederick Douglass, "The Future of the Colored Race," May 1886. rpt. in Brotz, African-American Social, p. 309. Douglass was probably referring to the massacre of Chinese in Wyoming by white miners in 1885. The white miners in Duquoin, Ill., imitated these actions and warned African American men that they would be next if they did not abandon their claims and leave. See: "The bitter fruits of the Chinese massacre in Wyoming making their appearance with unpleasant rapidity" The Congregationalist October 8, 1885; Issue 41; col. B.

[105] W. E. B. Du Bois, Black Reconstruction in America 1860-1880 (1935; Free Press, 1962) p. 379.

Indeed, ideas about black extermination remained rife within the black and white community. And the two thousand African Americans that were lynched from 1890 to 1909 testifies to the fact that the threats of deadly violence were real.[106] In 1893, the former slave Reverend Peter Randolph wrote regarding the plight of his people in America: "Will extermination satisfy? No, it will add insult to injury…There is but one rule, and one only, that can solve the "Race Problem," and all difficult problems….It is called the Golden Rule: "Do unto others as you would have others do unto you." On this rests the joy or sorrow of America."[107] But as one white southerner put it, white supremacy remained more important than any ethical obligation to the nation, "before we submit we will kill every Negro in the south. This is not idle boasting or fire-eating, but the cold hard facts stated."[108] In reminiscing about the African American experience during the Civil War many years later, another former slave reflected that ideas about black extermination remained as salient as ever, "You all ain't seen no hard times, and if another war comes they are going to kill the nits and the old ones. So you all try to be happy. It is nice to live…"[109]

During the Civil War and post Civil War years, African Americas were well aware of what they were up against, for the ideas linking race and freedom with black extermination developed nearly two hundred year earlier did not just disappear. In the

---

[106] data compiled from The Lynching Calendar: African Americans Who Died in Racial Violence in the US During 1865-1899. Also See: Lynching Century: 1865-1965 African Americans Who Died in Racial Violence in the United States Chronology: Dates of Death; University of Missouri-Kansas City School of Law from Archives at Tuskegee Institute. http://users.bestweb.net/~rg/lynching_century.htm

[107] Reverend Peter Randolph, From Slave Cabin to the Pulpit. The Autobiography of Rev. Peter Randolph: the Southern Question Illustrated and Sketched of Slave Life (Boston: James H. Earle, 1893) http://docsouth.unc.edu/neh/randolph/randolph.xml p. 44.

[108]"Robert W. Winston, N.C., Oct. 2, 1919, to Moorfield Storey," Robert W. Winston Papers, North Carolina State Archives, as found in Leon F. Litwack's, Trouble in Mind: Black Southerners in the Age of Jim Crow (New York: Vintage, 1998) p. 207.

[109]Egypt, Unwritten History of Slavery p. 118.

case of African American soldiers, it was used unsuccessfully to intimidate black recruits from joining the war effort. A renewed sense of hope between blacks in the north and south, made it possible for them to endure the terrorism of undeclared total warfare. The subsequent murder of large numbers of black men, women and children, however, reveals the brutality experienced not only during the Civil War years but also the next half-century of freedom for blacks in America. Indeed, I believe it is because of their determination to survive that more massacres like those perpetrated upon Native Americans did not occur before and after the Civil War against blacks. And yet the massacre of innocent Native Americans demonstrates how these racialized tactics of war continued throughout the nineteenth century. If we are ever to reconcile our national memory with our national past then we must acknowledge what African Americans faced every day, slave and free. Namely, the supposed inevitability of a war between the races and black extermination, the resurgence of the old philosophy that "nits makes lice" and the degendered violence against black women and children that this philosophy gave rise to. Who the nation was willing to sacrifice and who the nation was willing to save was always informed by race and strategies of war used in the past to conquer, to colonize, to oppress—and African Americans navigated their way through this world they did not make during and after enslavement by ultimately making survival their form of resistance.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Manuscripts

Public Records Office, London, England

Sainsbury, Noel W, ed. Calendar of State Papers, Colonial Series, America and West Indies, 1675-1676; 1574-1674. London: John Menzies Press, 1893.

Calendar of State Papers, Colonial Series, America and West Indies: 1737, Volume 43 (1963).

Hansard, Thomas C, ed. Hansard's Parlimentary Debates Volume lxxvi, London: T. C. Hansard Press, 1844.

Lambert, Sheila, ed. House of Commons Sessional Papers of the Eighteenth Century, Report of the Lords of Trade on the Slave Trade, 1789. Volume 72, Minutes & c., 1790. Wilmington, DE: Scholarly Resources Inc., 1975.

Thomas Thistlewood's Journal, 1748-1786. June 7, 1760, Lincolnshire County Archives Monson MSS 31.

Minutes of the Antiguan Council January 31, 1737, Colonial Office 9/10.

Public Records of South Carolina.

McCord, David J. ed. The Statutes at Large of South Carolina "Acts Relating to the Slaves," Volume 7. Columbia, S.C: A. S. Johnson Press, 1840.

South Carolina Department of Archives and History

Lipscomb, Terry W, ed. Journal of the Commons House of Assembly of South Carolina 1692, October 6, 1757- January 24, 1761; Volume XXXIII.

South Caroliniana Library, Columbia, South Carolina

James Glen Family Papers.

Ralph Izard Papers.
Manigault Family Papers
Federal Writers Project (South Carolina) Unpublished Ex-Slave Narratives at South Caroliniana Library. 36 Manuscript Project, 1885-1.

South Carolina Historical Society

Henry Ravenel Papers

United States. Congress.

Joint Committee on the Conduct of the War, Massacre of Cheyenne Indians, 38th Congress, 2nd Session Washington, 1865.

Journal of the Congress of the Confederate States of America, 1861-1865 [Volume 3] Wednesday, January 14, 1863.

Journal of the Senate of the United States of America, 1789-1873.

Public Statutes At Large of the United States of America Vol. II Act of March 2, 1807, Statute II, Chapter XXII.

Records of the Assistant Commissioner for the State of Tennessee: Bureau of Refugees, Freedmen, and Abandoned Lands, 1865-1869 National Archives Microfilm Publication M999, roll 34.

United States Congress. House, Joint Committee on the Conduct of the War, Fort Pillow Massacre Washington D. C., May 5, 1864.

United States Congress, Senate. "Report of the Secretary of War, Sand Creek Massacre" Executive Document No. 26, 39th Congress, 2nd Session. Washington, Government Printing Office, 1867.

Testimony Taken by The Joint Select Committee to Inquire into the Condition of Affairs in the Late Insurrectional States North Carolina. Volume 2, Washington: Government Printing Office, 1872.

The War of the Rebellion: A Compilation of the Official Records of the Union and Confederate Armies Volume 13, (Chapter XXV); Volume 32, part 1, Series 4.

Virginia State Library

MclLwain, H. R, ed. Minutes of the Council and General Court of colonial Virginia 1622-1632, 1670-1676 with notes and excerpts from Original Council

and General Court Records into 1683 Now Lost. 2nd Edition, Richmond, Virginia State Library, 1979.

Virginia Legislative Petitions

The John P. Branch Historical Papers

Virginia Historical Society

Journal of the House of Delegates, &c. Monday, December 5, 1831

Printed Primary Sources

Ambler, Charles H. ed. "Diary of John Floyd." The John P. Branch Historical Papers of Randolph-Macon College. Vol. V, June, 1918, Nos. 1 and 2, Richmond: Richmond Press, 1918.

Andrews, Eliza Frances. The War-Time Journal of a Georgia Girl, 1864-1865. http://docsouth.unc.edu/fpn/andrews/menu.html.

Aptheker, Herbert, ed. A Documentary History of the Negro People in the United States. New York: Citadel Press, 1951.

Arkansas Slave Narratives from the Federal Writers' Project. 1936-1938.

Ball, Charles. Slavery in the United States: A Narrative of the Life and Adventures of Charles Ball. 1837; New York: Negro University Press, 1969.

Barnwell, John. "The Journal of John Barnwell." The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography vol. VI, no. 1 (July 1898).

Basler, Roy P. editor, et. al. The Collected Works of Abraham Lincoln. Vol. V, New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1953.

Bell, Howard Holman. Minutes of the Proceedings of the National Negro "Convention 1830-1864. New York: Arno Press, 1969.

Blassingame, John W. ed. Slave Testimony: Two Centuries of Letters, Speeches, Interviews, and Autobiographies. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1977.

_____. The Frederick Douglass Papers. Series One, Vol. 3, 1855-63 New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985.

Bleby, Henry. Death Struggles of Slavery: Being A Narrative of Facts and Incidents, Which Occurred in a British Colony, During the Two Years Immediately Preceding Negro Emancipation. London: Hamilton, Adams Press, 1853.

Boney, F. N. ed. Slave Life in Georgia: A Narrative of the Life, Sufferings, and Escape of John Brown, A Fugitive Slave. 1855; Savannah: Beehive Press, 1991.

Boney, F. N., Richard L. Hume, and Rafia Zafar, eds. God Made Man, Man Made the Slave: The Autobiography of George Teamoh. Macon: Mercer University Press, 1990.

Born in Slavery: Slave Narratives from the Federal Writers' Project. 1936-1938.

Bratton, Mary Jo Jackson, ed. "Fields [Cook] Observations: The Slave Narrative of a Nineteenth Century Virginian." The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography (1980): 79-93.

Brickell, John. The Natural History of North-Carolina with an Account of the Trade, Manners, and Customs of the Christian and Indian Inhabitants. Dublin: James Carson Press, 1737.

Brown, Rev. Issac Van. Memoir of the Rev. Robert Finley, D.D. Late Pastor of the Presbyterian Congregation. New Brunswick: Terhune and Letson Press, 1819.

Brown, Henry Box. Narrative of Henry Box Brown, Who Escaped From Slavery Enclosed in a Box 3 Feet Long and 2 Wide. Boston: Brown and Stearns, 1849.

Butler, Benjamin. Autobiography and Personal Reminiscences of Major General Benjamin F. Butler. Boston: 1892.

Burks, Geo. H. Future: containing great lecturers on the future of the colored race, Nat Turner's insur[r]ection, the new insur[r]ection. New Albany, Indiana: Will A. Dudley Press, 1890.

Catterall, Helen Tunnicliff. Judicial Cases Concerning American Slavery and the Negro. Vol. 1, 1926; New York: Negro University Press, 1968.

Coffin, Joshua. An Account Of Some Of The Principal Slave Insurrections, Others, Which Have Occurred, Or Been Attempted, In the United Sates and Elsewhere, During The Last Two Centuries, With Various Remarks. New York: ASS Press, 1860 reprinted in Slave Insurrections: Selected Documents. Westport: Negro University Press, 1970.

Croly, David Goodman. Miscegenation: The Theory of the Blending of the Races, Applied to the American White Man and Negro. New York: H. Dexter, Hamilton Press, 1864.

Dew, Thomas R. Review of the Debate in the Virginia Legislature of 1831 and 1832. 1832; Westport: Negro University Press, 1970.

Donnan, Elizabeth. Documents Illustrative of the History of the Slave Trade to America. Vol. II, IV. Washington D.C: Carnegie Institute Press, 1935.

Douglass, Frederick. The Life and Times of Frederick Douglass: In his Own Words 1881; New York: Kennsington Press, 1983.

_____. My Bondage and My Freedom. 1855; New York: Dover Press, 1969.

_____. Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass, An American Slave Written by Himself. 1845; New York: Dell Press, 1997.

Dow, George Francis. Slave Ships and Slaving. Mineola: Dover Press, 2002

Drew, Benjamin. The Refugee: Or a North-Side View of Slavery. 1856; New York: Negro University Press, 1968.

Duke, Maurice ed. Don't Carry Me Back! Narratives of Former Virginia Slaves. Richmond: Dietz Press, 1995.

Egypt, Ophelia Settle, Masuoka, J., and Charles S. Johnson, eds. Unwritten History of Slavery: Autobiographical Accounts of Negro Ex-Slaves. Nashville, Fisk University Press, 1968.

Furman, Richard. Rev. Dr.Richard Furman's Exposition of the Views of the Baptists, Relative to the Coloured Population of the United States, in A Communication To the Governor of South-Carolina. Charleston: A.E. Miller Press, 1823.

Garrison, William Lloyd. Thoughts on African Colonization. 1832; New York: Arno Press, 1968.

Gibbs, Mifflin Winstar. Shadow and Light: An Autobiography with Reminiscences of the Last and Present Century. Washington, D.C: 1902.

Grandy, Moses. Narrative of the Life of Moses Grandy, Late a Slave in the United States of America. Hard Press, 1844.

Gray, Robert. "Good Speed to Virginia." (1609) Early English Books On Line.

Grotius, Hugo. The Rights of War and Peace: Including the Law of Nature and of Nations. 1625; Washington: M. Walter Dunne Press, 1901.

Harris, Joel Chandler. The Complete Tales of Uncle Remus. Boston: Houghton Mufflin Press, 1955.

Hawkins, Reverand William G. Lundsford Lane; or, Another Helper From North Carolina. Boston: Crosby and Nichols Press, 1864.

History of the Pequot War: The Contemporary Accounts of Mason, Underhill, Vincent and Gardener. Reprinted from the Massachusetts Historical Society, Cleveland: Helman-Taylor Press, 1897.

Holland, Edwin C. A Refutation of the Calumnies Circulated Against the Southern and Western States, Respecting the Institution and Existence of Slavery Among Them. Charleston: A. E. Miller Press, 1822.

Indiana Slave Narratives from the Federal Writers' Project of the W.P.A., 1936-1938 Indiana Narratives, Volume V.

Jacobs, Harriet. Incidents in the Life of a Slave Girl. New York: Oxford University Press, 1988.

Jefferson, Thomas. Notes on the State of Virginia. William Peden, ed. Chapel Hill: UNC Press, 1982.

Johnson, Clifton H. ed. god struck me dead: Religious Conversion Experiences and Autobiographies of Ex-slaves. Philadelphia: Pilgrim Press, 1969.

Johnson, Robert. "Nova Brittannia offering most excellent fruites by Planting in Virginia: exciting all such as be well affected to further the same." (1609) Early English Books On Line.

Kingsbury, Susan Myra, ed. The Records of the State of Virginia Company of London. Vol. 3, Washington: 1933.

Levine, Robert S, ed. Martin R. Delany: A Documentary Reader Chapel Hill: UNC Press, 2003.

Locke, John. Two Treaties of Government 1698; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1960.

Long, Richard A. ed. Black Writers and the American Civil War. Secaucus: Blue and Gray Press, 1988.

Love, William De Loss. Wisconsin in the War of the Rebellion. Chicago: Sheldon & Co. Press, 1866.

Mather, Increase. A Discourse concerning the Grace of Courage, where in The Nature, Beneficials, and Necessities of that Virtue for all Christians, is described. Delivered in a Sermon Preached at Boston in New-England. June 5th. 1710. Corn hill: Brick Shop Press, 1710.

_____. A Brief History of the War. Boston: 1676.

McLoughlin, William G. and Jordon,Winthrop D. eds. "Baptist Face the Barbarities of Slavery in 1710." The Journal of Southern History Volume 29, NO, 4 (Nov., 1963): 495-501.

Myers, Robert Manson ed. The Children of Pride: Selected letters of the family of the Rev. Dr. Charles Colcock Jones from the years 1860-1868, with the addition of several previously unpublished letters. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1984.

Nicholls, Mark. 'George Percy's "Trewe Relacyon": A Primary Source for the Jamestown Steelement.' (1625) Virginia Magazine of History and Biography 113:3 (2005): 212-75.

Parker, Allen. Recollections of Slavery Times by Allen Parker. Worcester, Mass: Chas. W. Burbank and Co. Press, 1895.

Pennington, J. W. C. A Narrative of Events of the Life of J. H. Banks, an Escaped Slave, from the Cotton State, Alabama, in America. Liverpool: M. Rourke Press, 1861.

Perdue, Charles L. Jr., Barden, Thomas E. and Robert K. Phillips, eds. Weevils in the Wheat: Interviews with Virginia Ex-Slaves. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1976.

Randolph, Reverend Peter. From Slave Cabin to the Pulpit. The Autobiography of Rev. Peter Randolph: the Southern Question Illustrated and Sketched of Slave Life. Boston: James H. Earle Press, 1893.

Ripley, Peter C. ed. The Black Abolitionist Papers Volumes 3-5, The United States, 1830-1865. Chapel Hill: UNC Press, 1992.

Salley, Alexander S. ed. Narratives of Early Carolina 1650-1708. NY: Charles Scribner's Press, 1911.

Savannah Unit Georgia Writers' Project Works Projects Administration. Drums and Shadows: Survival Studies Among the Georgia Coastal Negroes. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1940.

Seabrook, Whitemarsh B. A concise view of the critical situation and future prospects of the slave-holding states. Charleston: A..E. Miller Press, 1825.

Seaver, James E. A Narrative of the Life of Mrs. Mary Jameson. June Namias ed. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1992.

Shea, Deborah ed. "Spreading Terror and Devastation Wherever They Have Been: A Norfolk Woman's Account of the Southampton Slave Insurrection" The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography Vol. 95, No. 1 (Jan., 1987): 65-112.

Slave Narratives: A Folk History of Slavery in the United States, from interviews with former slaves. Ohio, Virginia, Tennessee Narratives. Vol. 18. St. Clair Shores: Scholarly P, 1976.

Slave Narratives: South Carolina Slave Narratives, Part II. Vol. I. St. Clair Shores: Scholarly Press, 1976.

Smith, James Lindsay. Autobiography of James L. Smith, Including, Also, Reminiscences of Slave Life, Recollections of the War, Education of Freedmen, Causes of the Exodus, Etc. Norwich: Press of the Bulletin, 1881.

South Carolina. Slave Narratives from the Federal Writers' Project. 1936-1938.

Stauffer, John, ed. The Works of James McCune Smith: Black Intellectual and Abolitionist. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.

Steward, Austin. Twenty-two Years a Slave and Forty Years a Freeman. Rochester, NY: William Alling Press, 1857.

Strachey, William The Historie of Travell into Virginia Britania 2d, ser., vol. 103, Edited by. Louis B. Wright and Virginia Freund. 1612; Cambridge: The Hakluyt Society.

Symmonds, William. "Virginia: A Sermon Preached at White Church." (1609) Early English Books On Line.

Taylor, Richard. Destruction and Reconstruction: Personal Experiences of the Late War. 1979; New York: Longmans Press, 1955.

Tragle, Henry Irving. The Southampton Slave Revolt of 1831: A Compilation of Source Material. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1971.

Tyler, Lyon Gardiner, ed. Narratives of Early Virginia 1606-1625. New York: Scribner Press, 1907.

Veney, Bethany. The Narrative of Bethany Veney, A Slave Woman. Worcester, Massachusetts, 1889.

Walker's Appeal and Garnet's Address to the Slaves of the United States of America. Salem, New Hampshire: Ayer Press, 1994.

Westergaard, Waldemar, ed. "Account of the Negro Rebellion on St. Croix, Danish West Indies, 1759." Journal of Negro History Vol. 11, No. 1 (Jan., 1926): 50-61.

White, Walter. "Memorandum for Governor Dorsey From Walter F. White," Submitted in person July 10, 1918." Papers of the NAACP, Group 1. Series C, Box 353. Library of Congress, Washington D.C.

Zeisberger, David. Diary of David Zeisberger: A Moravian Missionary Among the Indians of Ohio. Editor and Translator, Eugene F. Bliss, Volume 1, Cincinnati: Robert Clark for the Historical and Philosophical Society of Ohio, 1885.

Reports of Travelers, Contemporaries, Pamphlets, and Speeches

A Thrilling Narrative From the Lips of the Sufferers of the Late Detroit Riot, March 6, 1863, with the Hair breadth Escapes of Men, Women and Children, and Destruction of Colored Men's Property, Not Less Than $15,000. 24 p. Detroit, Mich. Published by the Author. 1863.

An Exposition of the African Slave Trade, From the Year 1840, to 1850, Inclusive. Prepared From Official Documents, And Published By Direction of the Representatives of the Religious Society of Friends, in Pennsylvania, New Jersey and Delaware. Philadelphia: J. Rakestraw Press, 1851.

Benezet, Anthony. A Short Account Of that Part of Africa, Inhabited by the Negroes. 1762; Bedford Press: Applewood Books.

Berry, John and Moryson, Francis. "Narrative of Bacon's Rebellion." The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography Volume IV. October, 1896. No. 2, 117-154.

Bolling, Philip A. The Speeches of Philip A. Bolling, (Of Buckingham) In the House of Delegates of Virginia on the Policy of the State in Relation to Her Colored Population: Delivered on the 11th and 25th of January, 1832. Richmond: Thomas W. White Press, 1832.

Brodnax, William H. The Speech of William H. Brodnax, (Of Dinwiddie,) In the House of Delegates of Virginia, On the Policy of the State With Respect to Her Slave Population. Delivered January 19, 1832. Richmond: Thomas W. White Press, 1832.

Brotz, Howard, ed. African-American Social and Political Thought 1850-1920. New Brunswick: Transaction, 1992.

Brown, Issac V. Biography of the Rev. Robert Finley, D.D. of Basking Ridge, N. J. With an Account of His Agency as the Author of The American Colonization Society; also A Sketch of the Slave Trade; A View of Our National Policy and That of Great Britain Towards Liberia and Africa. Philadelphia: John W. Moore Press, 1857.

Brown, John Thompson. The Speech of John Thompson Brown, In the House of Delegates of Virginia, On the Policy of the State With Respect to Her Slave Population. Delivered January 18, 1832. Richmond: Thomas W. White Press, 1832.

Bryan, Edward. Notice of the Rev. John B. Adgers's Article on the Slave Trade Published for the Author. Charleston: Steam Power Press of Walker, Evans, 1858.

Buxton, Thomas Fowell. The African Slave Trade and It's Remedy. 1839; London: Frank Cass Press, 1967.

Cairnes, John Elliot. The Southern Confederacy and the African Slave Trade: The Correspondence Between Professor Cairnes, A. M. and George M'Henry, Esq. Dublin: Mcglashan and Gill Press, 1863.

Carrigan, William D. Making of a Lynch Culture:Violence and Vigilantism in Central Texas 1836-1916. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2004.

Chandler, John A.. The Speech of John A. Chandler, (Of Norfolk County,) In the House of Delegates of Virginia, On the Policy of the State With Respect to Her Slave Population. Delivered January 17, 1832. Richmond: Thomas W. White Press, 1832.

Churchyard, Thomas. A General rehearsal of warres and joyned to the same some tragedies and epitaphs. London, 1579, QI-RI.

Clarkson, Thomas. The History of the Rise, Progress And Accomplishment of the Abolition of the African Slave Trade By the British Parliament. 1839; Kessinger Publishing.

Corry, Joseph. Observations upon the Windward Coast of Africa. London: W. Bulmer and Co. Press, 1807.

Cromwell, Oliver. Cromwell's Soldier's Bible. 1643; London: Elliot Stock Press, 1895.

Curtin, Philip D. ed. Africa Remembered: Narratives by West Africans from the Era of the Slave Trade: Narratives by West Africans from the Era of the Slave Trade. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1967.

Delany, Martin R. Frank Rollin's Biography of Martin R. Delany. 1868; New York: Arno Press, 1969.

Drake, Frederick C.; R.W. Schufeldt, "Secret History of the Slave Trade to Cuba Written By an American Naval Officer, Robert Wilson Schufeldt, 1861." The Journal of Negro History Vol. 55, No. 3. (Jul., 1970): 218-235.

Equiano, Olaudah. The Interesting Life of Olaudah Equiano, or Gustavus Vassa, The African. Written By Himself. in The Classic Slave Narratives. ed. Henry Louis Gates Jr. New York: Mentor Press, 1987.

Edwards, Bryan. The History, Civil and Commercial, of the British Colonies in the West Indies in Two Volumes. Volume II, Dublin: Luke White Press, 1793.

Elliot, E. N. ed. Cotton is King, And Pro-Slavery Arguments: Comprising the Writings of Hammond, Harper, Christy, Stringfellow, Hodge, Bledsoe, and Cartwright, On this Important Subject. Augusta: Pritchard, Abbott & Loomis Press, 1860.

Embree, Elihu. The Emancipator. Sept 30 1820.

Faulkner, Charles Jas. The Speech of Charles Jas. Faulkner, (Of Berkeley,) In the House of Delegates of Virginia, On the Policy of the State With Respect to Her Slave Population. Delivered on January 20, 1832. Richmond: Thomas W. White Press, 1832.

Fitzhugh, George. "The Conservative Principle; Or, Social Evils and Their Remedies," De Bow's Review XXII, Issue 5, (May 1857) 449- 462.

Force, Peter, ed. Forces Collection of Historical Tracts Vol. 4, No. 5, Washington: Wm. Q. Force Press, 1846.

Fyfe, Christopher ed. Narrative of Two Voyages in the River Sierra Leone during the years 1791, 1792, 1793, with Alexander Falconbridge: an Account of the Slave Trade on the Coast of Africa. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2000.

Gholson, James H. "Speech of James H. Gholson." Constitutional Whig January 26, 1832.

Gogerty, L. J. "Southern Convention at Knoxville." DeBow's Review Vol. XXIII, No. 3, (Sept, 1857): 301-320.

Goodloe, Daniel. The Southern Platform: or, Manual of Southern Sentiment on the Subject of Slavery. Boston: John P. Jewett Press, 1858.

Great Newes from Barbadoes, or A True and faithful account of the grand conspiracy of the Negroes against the English and happy discovery of the same with the number of those that were burned alive, beheaded, and other wise executed for their horrid crimes." London: L. Curtis Press, 1676.

Hamilton, T. The Late Contemplated Insurrection in Charleston, S. C. with the Execution of 36 of the Patriots: Death of William Irving, The Provoked Husband: and Joe Devaul, For Reusing to be the slave of Mr. Roach: with the Capture of the American Slaver Trading Between The Seat of Govt. and New Orleans: together with an account of the Capture of the Spanish Schooner Amistad (Jan. 1850).

Heckewelder, Rev. John. History Manners, and Customs of The Indian Nations Who Once Inhabited Pennsylvania and the Neighboring States. Philadelphia: Historical Society of Pennsylvania, 1876.

Hewatt, Alexander. An Historical Account of the Rise and Progress of the Colonies of South Carolina and Georgia, vol. 2. London: A. Donaldson, 1779.

Higginson, Thomas Wentworth. Travellers and Outlaws: Episodes in American History. Boston: Lee and Shepard Press, 1889.

_____. Black Rebellion: Five Slave Revolts. New York: Arno Press, 1969.

Hill, Reverand Pascoe G. Fifty Days on Board a Slave Vessel. Baltimore: Black Classic Press, 1848.

Hippisley, John. "On Populousness of Africa: An Eighteenth-Century Text," Population and Development Review. Vol. 24, No. 3, (Sept., 1998): 601-608.

Holland, Edwin C. A Refutation of the Calumnies Circulated Against the southern and Western States, Respecting the Institution and Existence of Slavery Among Them. Charleston: A. E. Miller Press, 1822.

Jones, Adam, trans. German Sources for West African History 1599-1699. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag GmbH Press, 1983.

Kennedy, Lionel H. and Thomas Parker. An Official Report of the Trials of Sundry Negroes Charged with an Attempt to Raise an Insurrection in the State of South

Carolina. (Charleston, 1822) reprinted as The Trial Record of Denmark Vesey. John Killens, ed. Boston, Beacon Press, 1970.

Klingberg, Frank J., ed. The Carolina Chronicle of Dr. Francis Le Jau 1706-1717. Berkley: University of California Press, 1956.

Lecky, William Edward Hartpole. A History of Ireland in the Eighteenth Century. Vol. 1, London: Elibron Press, 2006.

Ligon, Richard. A true and exact history of the island of Barbados illustrated with a map of the island as also the principall trees and plants there, set forth in their due proportions and shapes, drawne out by their severall and respective scales: together with the ingenio that makes sugar, with the plots of the severall houses, roomes, and other places that are used in the whole processe of sugar-making. (1657).

Long, Edward. History of Jamaica II. 3 volumes, London: T. Lowndes Press, 1774.

Lyman, Stanford M. ed. Selected Writings of Henry Hughes: Antebellum Southerner, Slavocrat, Sociologist. Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 1985.

Marshall, Thomas. Speech of Thomas Marshall, (Of Fauquier) In the House of Delegates of Virginia, On the Policy of the State With Respect to Her Slave Population. Delivered January 14, 1832. Richmond: Thomas W. White Press, 1832.

Mathieson, William Law. Great Britain and The Slave Trade 1839-1865. New York: Octagon Press: 1967.

M'Dowell, Jr., James. The Speech of James M'Dowell, Jr. (Of Rockbridge,) In the House of Delegates of Virginia, On the Policy of the State With Respect to Her Slave Population. Delivered January 21, 1832. Richmond: Thomas W. White Press, 1832.

Nalson, John. An Impartial Collection of the Great Affairs of State, From the Beginning of the Scotch Rebellion In the Year 1683 to the Murther of King Charles I. Vol. II, London: His Majesty's Special Command, 1683.

Norris, Robert. Memoirs of the Reign of Bossa Ahadee, King of Dahomy, An Inland Country of Guiney. To Which are added, The Author's Journey to Abomey, The Capital: And Short Account of the African Slave Trade. London: Lowndes Press, 1789.

Othello, "What the Negro was Thinking During the Eighteenth Century: Essay on Negro Slavery." The Journal of Negro History Vol. 1, No. 1. (Jan., 1916): 49-68.

Park, Mungo. Travels in the Interior Districts of Africa Volume 1, 1799; Project Gutenberg. www.gutenberg.org/ebooks.

Pettigrew, James J. "Protest Against the Slave-Trade Revival." De Bow's Review Vol. 25, Issue 3, (Sept. 1858): 289-308.

Phillips, Thomas. A Journal of a Voyage Made in the Hannibal of London, Ann. 1693, 1694, From England to Cape Monseradoe in Africa; And thence along the Coast of Guiney to Whidaw, the Island of St. Thomas, and so forward to Barbadoes. in A Collection of Voyages and Travels vol.VI, Editors Awnsham and John Churchill, London, 1746.

Quinlan, James E. Tom Quick, the Indian Slayer. Monticello, NY: De Voe & Quinlan, 1851.

Ramsey, William L. "Something Cloudy in Their Looks": The Origins of the Yamasee War Reconsidered." The Journal of American History Vol. 90, Issue 1, 44-75.

Redkey, Edwin S., ed. Respect Black: The Writings and Speeches of Henry McNeal Turner. New York: Arno Press, 1971.

Report of the Special Committee of the House of Representatives, of South Carolina, On So Much of the Message of His Excellency Gov. Jas. H. Adams, As Relates to Slavery and the Slave Trade. Columbia S.C.: Steam Power Press, 1857.

Ruffin, Edmund. Anticipations of the Future: To Serve as Lessons for the Present Time. 1860; Freeport, New York: Books for Libraries Press, 1972.

Snelgrave, Captain William. A New Account of Some Parts of Guinea and The Slave-Trade. 1731; London: Frank Cass Press, 1971.

"Southern Convention at Vicksburg: Debate of the Slavetrade-Speeches of Mr. Spratt of South Carolina, and Governor H. S. Foote of Mississippi." De Bow's Review XXVII, Issue 2, (Aug., 1859): 205-220.

Spratt, Leonidas W. "Report on the Slave Trade." De Bow's Review Vol. XXIV, Issue 6, (June 1858): 473-491.

Swanton, John R. The Indians of the Southeastern United States. Smithsonian Institution Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin 137. United States Government Printing Office: Washington, 1946.

Tocqueville, Alexis de. Democracy in America. Vol. I and II, Trans. Henry Reeve, New York: Bantam Press, 2000.

True History of the Massacre of Ninety-six Christian Indians, at Gnadenhuetten, Ohio. New Philadelphia, Ohio: Gnadenhuetten Monument Society, 1843.

Van Evne, Dr. "Slavery Extension." De Bow's Review Vol. XV, No. 1, (July 1853): 1-14.

Wilson, John Leighton. Foreign Slave Trade. Can it be Revived Without Violating the Most Sacred Principles of Honor, Humanity, and Religion? From the Southern Presbyterian Review. October, 1859 Cornell University Library Digital Collection.

Wright, Theodore S. "Address of the Rev. Theodore S. Wright, Before the Convention of the New York State Anti-Slavery Society, On the Acceptance of the Annual Report, Held at Utica, Sept. 20." Colored American October 14, 1837.

Wright, W. W. "The Coolie Trade, or the Excomienda System of the Nineteenth Century." De Bow's Review XXVII, Issue 3, (September 1859): 296-321.

Yancey, William Lowndes. "Late Southern Convention At Montgomery." De Bow's Review Vol. XXIV, Issue 6, (June 1858): 574-606.

Newspapers

Anglo-African Magazine (New York), 1859, 1860.

Atlanta Journal (Atlanta), 1918.

Boston Weekly News-Letter (Boston), 1739.

Charles Town Gazette (Charleston), 1761.

De Bow's Review (New Orleans), 1854-1860.

Douglass' Monthly (Rochester), 1863.

Franklin Repository and Transcript (Chambersburg, PA), 1859.

Frederick Douglass' Paper (Rochester), 1854-55.

London Morning Herald (London), 1864.

Milwaukee Daily Sentinel (Milwaukee, Wisconsin), 1866.

New Orleans Delta (New Orleans), 1858.

News and Courier (Charleston), 1876.

New-York Daybook (New York), 1864.

New York Freeman's Journal & Catholic Register (New York), 1864.

New York Times (New York), 1860, 1862, 1865, 1866, 1871.

Niles National Register (Washington D.C.) 1847.

Providence Journal (Providence, RI), 1831.

Provincial Freeman (Chatham, Canada), 1857.

Rhode Island American & Gazette (Providence, RI), 1831.

Richmond Enquirer, (Richmond), 1831-32.

Richmond Recorder (Richmond), 1802.

South Carolina Gazette, (Charleston), 1732-37; 1739; 1743; 1749; 1754; 1772; 1804.

Staunton Vindicator (Staunton, Virginia), 1860.

The Christian Recorder (Philadelphia, PA), 1862, 1864, 1883.

The Colored American (New York),1837.

The Congregationalist (Boston), 1885.

The Constitutional Whig (Richmond), 1831-32.

The Denver Evening Post, (Denver, CO) 1899.

The Independent (Okaloosa, Kansas), 1865.

The Liberator (Boston), 1831, 1863, 1865, 1866.

The National Era (Washington D. C.), 1859.

Weekly Anglo-African (New York, N.Y.) 1865.

Statistical and Census Information

U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Negro Population. 1790-1915 Washington D.C. 1918.

The Lynching Calendar: African Americans Who Died in Racial Violence in the US During 1865-1899. http://www.autopsis.org/foot/lynch.html

"Lynching: By State and Race, 1882-1968." University of Missouri-Kansas City School of Law. "Statistics provided by the Archives at Tuskegee Institute." http://www.law.umkc.edu/faculty/projects/ftrials/shipp/lynchingsstate.html.

Secondary Sources

Books and Articles Published before 1900

Drewry, William Sidney. The Southampton Insurrection. 1900; Murfreesboro: Johnson Press, 1968.

Du Bois, W. E. B. The Suppression of the African Slave Trade to the United States of America 1638-1870. 1896; Baton Rouge: Louisiana State Press, 1969.

Poyers, John. The History of Barbados, From the First Discovery of the Island, in the year 1605, till the Accession of Lord Seaforth, 1801. London: J. G. Barnard Press, 1808.

Books and Articles Published Since 1900

Abzug, Robert H. "The Influence of Garrisonian Abolitionists' Fears of Slave Violence on the Antislavery Argument, 1829-40," The Journal of Negro History Vol. 55, No. 1. (Jan., 1970): 15-26.

Alden, John R. "John Stuart Accuses William Bull," The William and Mary Quarterly. (July 1945): 315-320.

Alleyne, Warren and Henry Fraser. The Barbados–Carolina Connection. London: Macmillan Press, 1988.

Ambler, Charles H. Sectionalism in Virginia from 1776 to 1861. New York: Russell and Russell Press, 1964.

Aptheker, Herbert. American Negro Slave Revolts. New York: International Press, 2008.

_____. Nat Turner's Rebellion. New York: Humanities Press, 1966.

Axelrod, Alan. The Horrid Pit: The Battle of the Crater, The Civil War's Cruelest Mission. New York: Carroll & Graf Press, 2007.

Bales, Kevin. Disposable People: New Slavery in the Global Economy. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999.

Ballagh, James Curtis. History of Slavery in Virginia. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1902.

Bay, Edna G. Wives of the Leopard: Gender, Politics, and Culture in the Kingdom of Dahomey. Charlottesville: University of Virginia p, 1998.

Bay, Mia. The White Image in the Black Mind: African-American Ideas about White People, 1830-1925. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Beckwith, Martha Warren. Black Roadways: A Study of Jamaican Folk Life. New York: Negro University Press, 1969.

Berstein, Barton J. "Southern Politics and Attempts to Reopen the African Slave Trade." The Journal of Negro History Vol. 51, No. 1. (Jan., 1966): 16-35.

Breene, T. H. and Innes, Stephen. "Myne Owne Ground": Race and Freedom on Virginia's Eastern Shore. New York: Oxford University Press, 1980.

Brown, Christopher Leslie. Moral Capital: Foundations of British Abolitionism. Chapel Hill: UNC Press, 2006.

Brown, Kathleen M. Goodwives, Nasty Wenches, and Anxious Patriarchs: Gender, Race, and Power in Colonial Virginia. Chapel Hill: UNC Press, 1996.

Canny, Nicholas P. "The Ideology of English Colonization: From Ireland to America." The William and Mary Quarterly Third Series, Vol. 30, No. 4 (Oct, 1973): 575-598.

Cimprich, John. Fort Pillow, a Civil War Massacre and Public Memory. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State Press, 2005.

Clegg, Claude A. The Price of Liberty: African Americans and the Making of Liberia. Chapel Hill: UNC Press, 2004.

Cornish, Dudley Taylor. The Sable Arm: Negro Troops in the Union Army, 1861-1865. New York: W.W. Norton, 1966.

Craton, Michael. Testing the Chains:Resistance to Slavery in the British West Indies. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1982.

_____. "Proto-Peasant Revolts? The Late Slave Rebellions in the British West Indies 1816-1832." Past and Present (1979) 85(1): 99-125.

Creel, Margaret Washington. "A Peculiar People"; Slave Religion and Community-Culture Among the Gullahs. New York: NYU Press, 1988.

Cromwell, John W. "The Aftermath of Nat Turner's Insurrection." The Journal of Negro History Vol. 5, No. 2. (Apr., 1920): 208-234.

Crow, Jeffrey J. and Tise, Larry E. eds. The Southern Experience in the American Revolution. Chapel Hill: UNC Press, 1978.

Churchill, Ward. A Little Matter of Genocide: Holocaust and Denial in the Americas 1492 to the Present. San Francisco: City Lights Press, 1997.

Crouse, Maurice A.. " Gabriel Manigault: Charleston Merchant." South Carolina Historical Magazine Vol. 68 (1967): 220-231.

Davis, David Brion. Inhuman Bondage: The Rise and Fall of Slavery in the New World. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.

Dederer, John Morgan. War in America to 1775 Before Yankee Doodle. New York: NYU Press, 1990.

Dillon, Merton L. Slavery Attacked: Southern Slaves and Their Allies 1619-1865. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1990.

Diouf, Sylvaine A. ed. Fighting the Slave Trade: West African Strategies. Athens: Ohio University Press, 2003.

Dolan, Frances E. Marriage and Violence: The Early Modern Legacy. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2008.

Donagan, Barbara. War in England, 1642-1649. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Donnan, Elizabeth. "Slave Trade in South Carolina Before the Revolution." The American Historical Review Vol. 33, No. 4 (Jul., 1928): 804-828.

Du Bois, W. E. B. Black Reconstruction in America 1860-1880. 1935; Free Press, 1962.

Dubois, Laurent. A Colony of Citizens: Revolution and Slave Emancipation in the French Caribbean, 1787-1804. Chapel Hill: UNC Press, 2004.

Dunn, Richard S. "The Barbados Census of 1680: Profile of the Richest colony in English America." William and Mary Quarterly 3rd Series, Volume 26, No. 1, (Jan, 1969): 3-30.

Durden, Robert F. "J. D. B. De Bow: Convulsions of a Slavery Expansionist." The Journal of Southern History Volume 17, No. 4. (Nov., 1951): 441-461.

Dusinberre, William. Them Dark Days: Slavery in the American Rice Swamp. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2000.

Ekeberg, Carl J. Stealing Indian Women: Native Slavery in the Illinois Country. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2010.

Elkins, Stanley. Slavery: A Problem in American Institutional and Intellectual Life. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1959.

Eltis, David. The Rise of African Slavery in the Americas. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

_____. Eltis, David and Stanley L. Engerman, "Fluctuations on sex and age ratios in the transatlantic slave trade, 1663-1864." Economic History Review XLVI, 2 (1993): 308-323.

Epstein, Dena J. "African Music in British and French America." The Music Quarterly Vol. 59, No. 1 (Jan., 1973): 61-91.

Faulkner, William. Requiem for a Nun. New York: Random House, 1951.

Ferling, John E. A Wilderness of Miseries: War and Warriors in Early America. Westport: Greenwood Press, 1980.

Fetts, Sharla. Working Cures: Healing, Health, and Power on Southern Slave Plantations. Chapel Hill: UNC Press, 2002.

Foner, Eric. Reconstruction: America's Unfinished Revolution 1863-1877. New York: Perennial Classics, 2002.

Forbes, Jack D. Africans and Native Americans: The Language of Race and the Evolution of Red-Black People. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1993.

Foyster, Elizabeth A. Marital Violence: An English Family History 1660-1875. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Franklin, John Hope. From Slavery to Freedom: A History of African Americans. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1994.

_____. The Militant South 1800-1861. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2002.

Frederickson, George M. The Black Image in the White Mind: The Debate on Afro-American Character and Destiny, 1817-1914. Middletown: Wesleyan University Press, 1971.

Freehling, Alison Goodyear. Drift Toward Dissolution: The Virginia Slavery Debate of 1831-1832. Baton Rouge: Louisiana University Press, 1982.

Freehling, William W. The Road to Disunion: Secessionist at Bay 1776-1854. New York: Oxford University Press, 1990.

French, Scot. The Rebellious Slave: Nat Turner in America Memory. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 2004.

Gallay, Alan. The Indian Slave Trade: The Rise of the English Empire in the American South, 1670-1717. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002.

_____. Ed. Voices of the Old South: Eyewitness Accounts, 1528-1861. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1994.

Genovese, Eugene D. Roll, Jordon, Roll: The World the Slaves Made. New York: Vintage Press, 1976.

Gomez, Michael. Exchanging Our Country Mark: The Transformation of African Identities in the Colonial and Antebellum South. Chapel Hill: UNC Press, 1998.

Greene, Lorenzo. The Negro in Colonial New England 1620-1776. NY: Columbia University Press, 1942.

Grenier, John. The First Way of War: American War Making on the Frontier. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Hall, Gwendolyn Midlo. Slavery and African Ethnicities in the Americas: Restoring the Links. Chapel Hill: UNC Press, 2005.

Hann, John H. Apalachee: The Land between the Rivers. Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 1988.

Hammer, Paul E.J. Elizabeth's Wars: Wars and Government and Society in Tudor England, 1544-1604. New York: Palgrave, 2003.

Herskovits, Melville J. The Myth of the Negro Past. Boston: Beacon Press, 1990.

Higginbotham, A. Leon. In the Matter of Color: Race and the American Legal Process. New York: Oxford University Press, 1978.

Higgins, Robert W. "Charles Town Merchants and Factors Dealing in the External Negro Trade 1735-1775." South Carolina Magazine 65 (1964): 205-217.

Hirsch, Adam J. "The Collision of Military Cultures in Seventeenth-Century New England." The Journal of American History Vol. 74, No. 4 (Mar., 1988): 1187-1212.

Horne, Gerald. The Deepest South: The United States, Brazil, and the African Slave Trade. New York: NYU Press, 2007.

Horsman, Reginald. Race and Manifest Destiny: The Origins of American Racial Anglo-Saxonism. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1981.

James, C.L.R. The Black Jacobins: Toussaint L'Ouverture and the San Domingo Revolution. NY: Vintage, 1989.

Jennings, Francis. The Invasion of America: Indians, Colonialism, and the Cant of Conquest. Chapel Hill: UNC Press, 1975.

Johnson, Michael P. "Denmark Vesey and His Co-Conspirators." William and Mary Quarterly 3rd Series, Volume 58, No. 4 (Oct., 2001): 915-976).

Johnson, Walter. Soul By Soul: Life Inside the Antebellum Slave Market. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1999.

Johnston, Sir Harry. The Negro in the New World. Plymouth: W. Brendon, 1910.

Jordon, Winthrop. White Over Black: American Attitudes Toward the Negro, 1550-1812. Chapel Hill: UNC Press, 1968.

Kaplan, Sidney. "The Miscegenation Issue in the Election of 1864." Journal of Negro History Volume 34, No. 3. (July, 1949): 274-343.

Kemble, Frances Anne. Journal of a Residence on a Georgian Plantation. BiblioBazaar, 2006.

Kilson, Martin L. and Rotberg, Robert I. eds. The African Diaspora: Interpretive Essays. Cambridge, Mass: 1976.

King, Wilma. "Mad Enough to Kill: Enslaved Women, Murder, and Southern Courts," The Journal of African American History Volume 92, No. 1, Women, Slavery, and Historical Research (Winter, 2007): 37-56.

Law, Robin. "Dahomey and the Slave Trade: Reflections on the Historiography of the Rise of Dahomey." The Journal of African History Volume 27, No. 2, Special Issue in Honour of J. D. Fage, (1986): 237-267.

_____. "Human Sacrifice in Pre-colonial West Africa." African Affairs (London) Volume 84, No. 334 (Jan., 1985): 53-87.

Lee, Wayne E. "Early American Ways of War: A New Reconnaissance, 1600-1815." The Historical Journal Volume 44, No. 1. (Mar., 2001): 269-289.

Lepore , Jill. The Name of War: King Philip's War and the Origins of American Identity. NY: Vantage, 1998.

_____. New York Burning. New York: Knopf, 2005.

Littlefield, Daniel C. Rice and Slaves: Ethnicity and the Slave Trade in Colonial South Carolina. Champaign: University of Illinois Press, 1991.

Litwack, Leon. Trouble in Mind: Black Southerners in the Age of Jim Crow. New York: Vintage, 1998.

Lovejoy, Paul. Transformations in Slavery: A History of Slavery in Africa. Second Edition, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

_____. "The Children of Slavery –The Transatlantic Phase." Slavery and Abolition Volume 27, No. 2, (August 2006): 197-217.

Magness, Phillip and Page, Sebastian N. Colonization after Emancipation: Lincoln and the Movement for Black Resettlement. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2011.

Malone, Patrick M. The Skulking Way of War: Technology and Tactics Among the New England Indians. Lanham: Madison, 1991.

Marck, Jeff. "Aspects of Male Circumcision in Subequatorial African Culture History." Health Transition Review Supplement to Volume 7, (1997): 337-359.

Martin, Thomas P. "Conflicting Cotton Interests at Home and Abroad, 1848-1857." The Journal of Southern History Volume 7, No. 2. (May, 1941): 173-194.

McConnell, Roland C. Negro Troops of Antebellum Louisiana: A History of the Battalion of Free Men of Color. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1968.

Merrell, James H. The Indians' New World: Catawbas and Their Neighbors from European Contact Through the Era of Removal. New York: W.W. Norton, 1991.

Morgan, Jennifer. Laboring Women: Reproduction and Gender in New World Slavery. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004.

Mukherjee, Rudrangshu. Spectre of Violence. New Delhi: Penguin Books, 1998.

Mullin, Gerald W. Flight and Rebellion: Slave Resistance in Eighteenth Century Virginia. London: Oxford University Press, 1972.

Nash, Gary B. "The Image of the Indian in the Southern Colonial Mind." The William and Mary Quarterly Third Series, Volume 29, No. 2 (Apr., 1972): 197-230.

_____. Red, Black, and White: The Peoples of Early America. Englewoods Cliff: Prentice-Hall, 1974.

Nash, R. C. "Trade and Business in Eighteenth Century South Carolina: The Career of John Guerard, Merchant and Planter." South Carolina Historical Magazine Vol. 96, No. 1, (Jan., 1995): 5-29.

O'Malley, Gregory. "Beyond the Middle Passage: Slave Migration from the Caribbean to North America, 1619-1807." The William and Mary Quarterly Vol. 66, Issue 1 (Jan., 2009): 125-172.

Onuf, Peter, ed. Jefferson's Legacies. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1993.

Ostler, Jeffrey. The Plain Sioux and U.S. Colonialism from Lewis and Clark to Wounded Knee. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Painter, Nell Irvin. "Soul Murder and Slavery: Toward a Fully Loaded Cost Accounting." Southern History Across the Color Line Chapel Hill: UNC Press, 2002.

Pearce, Roy Harvey. The Savages of America: A Study of the Indian and the Idea of Civilization. Baltimore: John Hopkins Press, 1965.

Pearson, Edward, ed. Designs Against Charleston: The Trial Record of the Denmark Vesey Slave Conspiracy of 1822. Chapel Hill: UNC Press, 1999.

Perdue, Theda. Mixed Blood Indians: Racial Construction in the Early South. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2003.

Phillips, U. B. Plantation and Frontier 1649-1863. Volume 2, New York: Burt Franklin, 1969.

Porter, Kenneth Wiggins. "Negroes on the Southern Frontier, 1670-1763" The Journal of Negro History. Volume 33, No. 1 (Jan., 1948): 53-78.

Quinn, David. The Voyages and Colonizing Enterprises of Sir Humphrey Gilbert, Volume I. London: Hakluyt Society, 1940.

Raboteau, Albert J. Slave Religion: The "Invisible Institution" in the Antebellum South. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Reckford, Mary. "The Jamaica Slave Rebellion of 1831." Past and Present No. 40 (Jul., 1968): 108-125.

Richardson, David, Schwarz, Suzanne and Anthony Tibbles, eds. Liverpool and Transatlantic Slavery. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2007.

Roberts, Joseph C. Road to Monticello: A Study of the Virginia Slavery Debate of 1832. Durham: Duke University Press, 1941.

Rodney, Walter. How Europe Underdeveloped Africa. Washington D.C.: Howard University Press, 1982.

Rothman, Adam. Slave Country: American Expansion and the Origins of the Deep South. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2005.

Roundtree, Helen C. Pocahontas's People: The Powhatan Indians of Virginia through Four Centuries. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1990.

Sherwood, Henry Noble. "The Formation of the American Colonization Society." The Journal of Negro History Volume 2, No. 3 (Jul., 1917): 209-228.

Sinha, Manisha. The Counterrevolution of Slavery: Politics and Ideology in Antebellum South Carolina. Chapel Hill: UNC Press, 2000.

Smith, H. Shelton. In His Image, But…:Racism in Southern Religion, 1780-1910. Durham: Duke University Press, 1972.

Smallwood, Stephanie E. Saltwater Slavery: A Middle Passage from Africa to American Diaspora. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2007.

Smith, Robert S. Warfare and Diplomacy in Pre-colonial West Africa. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1989.

Stampp, Kenneth M. The Peculiar Institution: Slavery in the Ante-bellum South. New York: Knopf, 1956.

Steele, Ian K. Warpaths: Invasions of North America. New York: Oxford University Press, 1994.

Stone, Lawrence. The Family, Sex, and Marriage In England 1500-1800. New York: Harper & Row, 1977.

Takaki, Ronald. The Proslavery Crusade: The Agitation to Reopen the African Slave Trade. New York: The Free Press, 1971.

Thomas, Hugh. The Slave Trade: The Story of the Atlantic Slave Trade: 1440-1870. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1997.

Thornton, John K. Warfare in Atlantic Africa 1500-1800. London: UCL Press, 1999.

_____. African Dimensions of the Stono Rebellion." American Historical Review 96 (1991): 1101-1113.

Thurman, Howard. Jesus and the Disinherited. Boston: Beacon, 1996.

_____. The Luminous Darkness. Richmond, Indiana: Friends United, 1999.

Urwin, Gregory J. W. Black Flag Over Dixie: Racial Atrocities and Reprisals in the Civil War. Gregory J. W. Urwin ed. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2004.

Vandals, Gilles. "Bloody Caddo": White Violence Against Blacks in a Louisiana Parish, 1865-1876." Journal of Social History Volume 25, No. 2, (Winter, 1991): 373-388.

Vaughan, Alden T. "Expulsion of the Savages": English Policy and the Virginia Massacre of 1622." The William and Mary Quarterly Third Series, Volume 35, No. 1 (Jan., 1978): 57-84.

Ward, Andrew. River Run Red: The Fort Pillow Massacre in the American Civil War. New York: Penguin Press, 2005.

Waselkov, Gregory A., Wood, Peter H. and Tom Hatley, eds. Powatan's Mantle: Indians in the Colonial Southeast. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2006.

Wax, Darold. "Negro Resistance to the Early American Slave Trade." Journal of Negro History Volume 51, No. 1 (Jan., 1966): 1-15.

_____. "Preferences for Slaves in Colonial America." Journal of Negro History Volume 58, No. 4 (Oct., 1973): 371-401).

Wesley, Charles H. "Lincoln's Plan for Colonizing the Emancipated Negroes." Journal of Negro History 4 (January 1919): 7-21.

Williams, Eric. From Columbus to Castro: The History of the Caribbean. New York: Vintage Press, 1970.

_____. Capitalism and Slavery. Chapel Hill: UNC Press, 1944.

Williamson, Joel. The Crucible of Race: Black-White Relations in the American South Since Emancipation. New York: Oxford University Press, 1984.

Winch, Julie. A Gentleman of Color: The Life of James Forten. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.

Wish, Harvey. "The Revival of the African Slave Trade in the United States, 1856-1860." The Mississippi Valley Historical Review Volume 27, No. 4. (Mar., 1941): 569-588.

White, Deborah Gray. Aren't I a Woman: Female Slaves in the Plantation South. New York: W. W. Norton, 1985.

Wright Jr., J. Leitch. The Only Land they knew: The Tragic Story of the American Indians in the Old South. New York: Free Press, 1981.

Wolff, Patrick. "Land, Labor, and Difference." American Historical Review Volume 106, No.3 (Jun., 2001): 866-905.

Wood, Forrest G. Black Scare: the Racist Response to Emancipation and Reconstruction. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1968.

Wood, Peter H. Black Majority: Negroes in Colonial South Carolina From 1670 through the Stono Rebellion. New York: W. W. Norton, 1974.

Theses and Dissertations

Scott, Julius Sherrard. "The Common Wind: Currents of Afro-American Communication in the Era of the Haitian Revolution." PhD. Dissertation, University Microfilms International 1986.

Snell, William R. "Indian Slavery in Colonial South Carolina, 1671-1795." Ph.D. Dissertation., University of Alabama, 1972.