



OXFORD JOURNALS
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

To "Doe Some Good upon Their Countrymen": The Paradox of Indian Slavery in Early Anglo-America

Author(s): Michael Guasco

Source: *Journal of Social History*, Vol. 41, No. 2 (Winter, 2007), pp. 389-411

Published by: Oxford University Press

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/25096484>

Accessed: 18-02-2019 04:01 UTC

REFERENCES

Linked references are available on JSTOR for this article:

https://www.jstor.org/stable/25096484?seq=1&cid=pdf-reference#references_tab_contents

You may need to log in to JSTOR to access the linked references.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



JSTOR

Oxford University Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Journal of Social History*

SECTION III REGIONAL ISSUES

TO “DOE SOME GOOD UPON THEIR COUNTRYMEN”: THE PARADOX OF INDIAN SLAVERY IN EARLY ANGLO-AMERICA

By Michael Guasco

Davidson College

In the wake of the Pequot War in New England in 1637, seventeen Pequot Indians—fifteen boys and two women—were ordered to be sent out of New England by Massachusetts officials. Hundreds of captives had been taken by the English Puritans as a result of the colonists' triumphs in battle at Mistick and the Great Swamp. Subsequently, many Pequot men were put to death, while others were divided up among the soldiers, given to the Narragansetts, or assigned to the Connecticut or Massachusetts colonies. The seventeen women and boys, however, were placed on board the Salem-built craft of Captain Pierce and earmarked for sale in the remote Atlantic island of Bermuda. For some reason, Captain Pierce missed his landing and continued on to the West Indies. Once there, Pierce deposited his cargo on the tiny Puritan outpost off the coast of Nicaragua at Providence Island where, by a stroke of the Providence Island Company's pen, the rebel Pequots were transformed into “cannibal negroes,” condemned to serve out their lives in slavery in Anglo-America's first true slave society.¹

Indian slavery has become a subject of great interest to scholars in recent years, though the most important works have focused on the eighteenth century and the Anglo-Spanish or Anglo-French borderlands.² Newer scholarship has been particularly important because of the willingness of historians to treat slavery less as a static institution into which Indians were poured by imperial officials and labor-starved planters and more as cultural construction that emerged as a result of negotiations between Europeans and indigenous peoples, rulers and ruled, and men and women. As a result, historians have effectively reconceptualized Indian slavery as a normative institution with its own parameters which ought to be distinguished from the chattel slavery practiced by Europeans. Unfortunately, scholarship on the enslavement of Indians during the earliest decades of Anglo-American settlement has not evolved apace. The record of the small shipload of Pequot Indians, for example, is a familiar piece of early Anglo-American history that may appear in a number of contexts. Some scholars rightly employ this event to demonstrate the constancy of the classical notion that individuals captured in a “just war” could be justly enslaved.³ Others, however, see in the story an early example of something new coming to fruition in the colonies, such as the creeping encroachment of plantation slavery among the English in the Americas and the racialization of non-European peoples that was ongoing early in the seventeenth century and would only intensify with time.⁴

For students of early American history and, in particular, the history of American slavery in the seventeenth century, there are important problems with the efforts of historians to use this story as one of the stepping-stones in the chronological development of Anglo-American slavery. First, there is the institutional problem. Because the Pequot saga is regularly forced to conform to a historical narrative that is directed primarily toward telling the more general story of slavery in British North America, Indian slavery becomes something that was not significant in and of itself, but rather as a preliminary stage in the ultimate development of the plantation complex and the subsequent large-scale enslavement of African peoples. As this essay will suggest, however, when the earliest generation of Anglo-Americans enslaved Indians, they neither justified the practice nor understood the significance of their actions in the same light as their simultaneous enslavement of African peoples. Crudely put, Indian slavery and African slavery were distinct in the minds of seventeenth-century English Americans.⁵ When historians (particularly of the Americas) conceptualize slavery it is generally taken for granted that what is under study is fundamentally a form of human bondage designed to fill a labor void in the manpower-starved plantations of the New World. Whatever disagreements might exist over its legal definition, opportunities and restrictions, or the inherent power relations, few scholars doubt that slavery equaled labor and that anyone who found themselves enslaved suffered that fate because of labor demands. The Pequot episode, however, reminds us that there is a different story to tell.⁶

Second, there is the problem of race. Scholars interested in the development of slavery in early English America routinely consider race to be an issue that cannot easily be separated from the labor regime that came to define the New World. Whether they treat racism as cause or consequence, historians and literary scholars have effectively established that race and slavery are two sides of the same historical coin.⁷ Not surprisingly, then, the enslavement of Indians is commonly addressed in like fashion.⁸ Early modern Englishmen, however, did not think of the world in modern racialized terms. In the context of colonial settlement and early encounters with Indians, considerations grounded in natural philosophy and national identity played on the minds of Englishmen more than hardened assumptions about inherent and immutable biological differences. Environmental considerations and questions of national character were particularly pressing issues in the early seventeenth century because they spoke directly to the potential success or failure of Anglo-American colonizing missions, particularly Anglo-Indian relations and Anglo-Spanish competition.⁹ What happened to the Pequots in 1637, as well as other indigenous peoples during the first half of the seventeenth century, was therefore much more complicated than the racial slavery narrative allows.

Indian slavery in early Anglo-America differed in almost every regard from the enslavement of African peoples and it did so because it was contemplated less in light of labor demands and more as a problem related to the construction of legitimate Anglo-American societies. The justice of English colonialism was partly an abstract noble ideal, but it was also meaningful to commentators who wished to set their nation's Atlantic enterprises apart from those of other Europeans, especially the Spanish. On some matters, of course, Anglo-Americans

made little effort to depart from Spanish or Portuguese precedents. Thus, English colonists routinely absorbed Africans uncritically into their midst as slaves. A few questions were raised about the parameters of race-based, plantation slavery, but virtually no one wondered aloud about the propriety of holding African peoples as perpetual slaves.¹⁰ In the early modern Anglo-Atlantic world there was work to be done and enslaved Africans were a ready commodity that English planters eagerly purchased to fill their labor needs. When it came to Indians, however, Englishmen asked themselves challenging questions that effectively forestalled the exploitation of indigenous peoples as laborers for several generations. Indian slavery in the Americas led seventeenth-century Englishmen to wonder aloud about the purpose of human bondage, about what forms of bondage were appropriate, about who could be enslaved and under what conditions, and about what enslavement should accomplish for the enslaved. Not surprisingly, these concerns resemble the questions Englishmen were asking about the practicality of slavery within their own society and parallel the issues they raised when comparing their colonial efforts with those of the Spanish before them. If, in the long run, Indians would be enslaved indiscriminately, absorbed into the general population of enslaved peoples, and hunted down to satisfy the appetites of labor hungry planters, this was not initially the case. The enslavement of Indians forced Englishmen to delineate the boundaries between slavery and freedom and between Englishness and Otherness, and to address the basic nature of Anglo-American colonialism.

* * * * *

Early modern Englishmen liked to claim that their national antipathy for slavery distinguished them from much of the rest of the world.¹¹ In part because of their oft-professed commitment to the principle of personal liberty, at least as it was understood in the Elizabethan and early Stuart eras, colonial promoters boasted that the "humanity of the English" would effect "much gaine upon" the indigenous peoples of the Americas. The authors of *New Englands First Fruits*, a promotional tract published in 1643, were working with familiar language when they celebrated, almost before the flames of the Pequot War had been extinguished, that Puritan colonial enterprises were quite unlike "the wicked, injurious, and scandalous carriages of some other plantations."¹² Seventeenth-century English colonialism was a competitive enterprise that pitted colonies against each other, but it was also an international struggle among several European powers. How Anglo-Americans behaved toward the indigenous inhabitants was therefore a measure of how closely English colonialism echoed Spanish precedents. In this light, whether or not the English chose to enslave Indians and under what conditions they deemed such an extreme measure desirable spoke volumes about how early modern Englishmen thought about both slavery as an institution and what it meant to be English in the emerging Atlantic world.

Sixteenth- and seventeenth-century colonial promoters liked to imagine that English settlers would be welcomed by the indigenous inhabitants of the Americas with open arms, even as liberators "from their [Spanish] devourers." The English, moreover, regularly envisaged overseas settlement as an endeavor that

would stem the tide of Spanish global expansion and efforts to establish a “universal monarchy” by taking up the cause of “their Brethren, the sons of Adam, from such hellish servitude and oppression.”¹³ With regard to the possible enslavement of Indians, then, the rhetoric of colonial promotion suggested that indigenous peoples would not be treated either indiscriminately or arbitrarily by English settlers. Whatever may have been espoused from London, however, the contrast between the idealized musings of colonial promoters and the behavior of often frightened colonists in North America was almost immediately apparent. The idea that the indigenous peoples of the Americas would celebrate the arrival of the English was rooted more in untested abstractions and wishful thinking than experience. Because colonial promoters and others subscribed to intellectual trends like environmentalism, which emphasized the basic similarity (at least in nature) of all human beings, English theorists were inclined to suggest that they differed from Indian peoples only by virtue of their religion and civil government. The land and its people simply wanted guidance, which the English could easily provide with settlers and settlements.¹⁴

Domestic intellectual trends and promotional necessity therefore combined to encourage a discourse of similitude in which early modern Englishmen and the indigenous peoples of the Americas were related to each other in essential ways while the Spanish were set apart as different. As Alexander Whitaker reminded his audience in a promotional tract published in 1613, Indians and the English had both been created by the same God and therefore possessed “reasonable soules and intellectuall faculties . . . : yea, by nature the condition of us both is all one, the servant of sinne and slaves of the divell.”¹⁵ In theory, the Spanish were no different, but they had treated the “Indians as Barbar’s, and thereby Naturally slaves,” as one writer put the matter in 1606. Anglo-Indian relations would be different. Thus, both Sir Thomas Gates in 1609 and Sir Thomas West, Lord De La Warr, in 1610, were instructed by the Virginia Company of London to “indeavor the conv[er]sion of the natives and savages to the knowledge and worship of the true god” which could best be achieved by taking “some of theire Children to be brought up in o[ur] language and mann[er]s.” John Rolfe’s assertion in 1617 (soon after the death of his wife Rebecca, otherwise known as Pocahontas) that the Indians were “very loving, and willing to parte w[ith] their children” may not have been a wholly accurate characterization of the situation, but it does suggest that the English preferred to believe that their presence in America was inoffensive to the indigenous inhabitants.¹⁶

Although the English routinely characterized their colonial endeavors in terms designed to distinguished their efforts from that of the Spanish, some English authors were more charitable. During the 1550s, Richard Eden had specifically praised Spanish dealings with American Indians. In response to those who might claim that the Spanish “possesse and inhabyte theyr [Indians’] regions and use theym as bondemen and tributaries, where before they were free,” Eden declared that the Spanish were actually the “mynisters of grace and libertie” whom “god hath ordeyned to be a lyght to the gentyles, to open the eyes of the blynde, and to delyver the bounde owt of pryson and captivitie.” Indeed, Eden declared, the “Spanyardes have shewed a good example to all Chrystian nations to folowe.” Thus, while Richard Hakluyt would later goad the English government into sponsoring overseas settlement to counteract Spain, Eden pro-

posed a plan of conscious imitation. "[T]here yet remayneth an other portion of that mayne lande reachyng toward the northeast," Eden suggestively noted, with "manye fayre and frutefull regions," that lay open for English colonization. Indeed, as late as 1616, Captain John Smith could declare that "[i]t would bee an historie of a large volume, to recite the adventures of the *Spanyards*, and *Portugals*, their affronts, and defeats, their dangers and miseries; which with such incomparable honour and constant resolution, so farre beyond beleefe, they have attempted and indured in their discoveries and plantations, as may well condemne us, of too much imbecillitie, sloth and negligence."¹⁷

As a rule, however, English propagandists were more inclined to set themselves apart by castigating rather than celebrating Spanish activities in the New World and, in so doing, they echoed the sentiments of other northern Europeans, especially the Dutch. The plight of American Indians served the needs of Dutch polemicists in support of the rebellion against Hapsburg rule that had been ongoing since the 1560s. A crucial component of the anti-Spanish literature of the era, and root of the Black Legend, was the translation and publication of Bartolomé de las Casas' *Brevísima Relación de las Indias* into Dutch, French, and English after 1578. In his text, Las Casas claimed that the Spanish entered the New World "as wolves, as lions, & as tigres most cruel of long time famished" who, when they confronted the natives, chose to "teare them in peeces, kill them, martyr them, afflict them, torment them, & destroy them by straunge sortes of cruelties."¹⁸ Characterizations of this sort only encouraged the view that "[t]he Spaniard is very haughty, vengeful, and tyrannical." "Let us imagine the example of the Indians," Philip Marnix van St. Aldedonde urged in 1578, "and let us keep in mind that our descendants will be abused as are they." Dutch and English writers emphasized that Spanish barbarism should not be viewed as an aberration, rather as a natural attribute of the predatory Spanish. Pay attention to what the Spanish "have done to the poore Indians," William of Orange declared in 1581, for nothing more clearly revealed to the world "their perverse, naturall disposition, and tyrannous affection and will."¹⁹

The Dutch and English propaganda machines emphasized Spanish cruelty and the suffering of innocent indigenous peoples, but the derogation of Spain could be even more comprehensive. English and Dutch writers were rarely content simply to criticize how the Spanish conducted themselves, they also cast aspersions on the Spanish character and engaged in what can only be described as a form of proto-racial stereotyping. In light of the decade-old Anglo-Spanish War, it was easy for Sir Walter Raleigh to comment in 1595 in his *Discoverie of Guiana* that the indigenous inhabitants of South America were initially reticent to treat with the English because they confused Raleigh's men with the Spanish. Raleigh accused the Spanish of the most pernicious carnal crimes when he claimed that the Spanish kidnaped Indian women "and used them for the satisfying of their own lusts." Unlike Englishmen who, Raleigh claimed, "by violence or otherwise, [never] knew any of their women," the Spanish behaved in a lascivious manner that revealed their essential nature.²⁰ Subsequent references to the "numerous multitudes of a mixt generation, which [the Spanish] beget in Negroes and Indian Women" were more benign, but they furthered the impression that the Spanish were "a confuse [sic] and beastly concept . . . mixed with the Goths and Vandals [and] mingled with the Mores."²¹ By accusing the Spanish

of doing violence toward the natives and by mixing freely with non-European peoples, English writers perpetuated the idea that the Spanish lacked propriety, integrity, and purity.²²

It was the subject of slavery, however, that provided some of the most compelling possibilities for linking the historical experience of Englishmen and Indians in their combined opposition to the Spanish in the Atlantic world. English condemnations of the Spanish character were augmented by the accusation that Indians and Englishmen were bound together by their shared vulnerability to Spanish rapacity and possible enslavement. Slavery was perceived to be many different things in Tudor and early Stuart society. A number of individuals were clearly aware of, if not actual participants in, the emerging race-based plantation system in the Atlantic world. The English government also routinely experimented with several forms of penal slavery, including a model of human bondage that involved the possibility that slavery could serve as a kind of redemptive or correctional institution. Slavery appeared in Sir Thomas More's *Utopia* (and in actual legislation for a brief period of time after 1547) as a practice that "intendeth nothyng else, but the destruction of vices, and savyng of menne."²³ With regard to their possible enslavement in the Atlantic world, the most useful conception of slavery to the English public was almost certainly another model—the enslavement of Englishmen to foreigners. The most widely publicized example of this omnipresent reality in early modern English society was the captivity and enslavement of English merchants and sailors by North African princes and pirates.²⁴

The rhetoric of the last half of the sixteenth century also consistently emphasized that the Spanish had designs on reducing the English nation to a state of slavery, not unlike that suffered by Indians in the Americas. The willingness to compare the plight of Indians and Englishmen was particularly evident in an English translation of a Dutch pamphlet in 1588. The document claimed that several Spanish prisoners, who had been captured in the aftermath of the failed Armada, reported that they had been ordered "to route out and murder without any respect of religion *all* the inhabitants of England," except the children "which so should have been reserved, to the ende that they might know them hereafter and so use them as they do use their Indian slaves, whose life is more wretched than a thousand deaths."²⁵ English authors also asserted that the Spanish had in fact enslaved Englishmen both in Spain and in the West Indies during this era. Some of these accusations were extensions of the treatment Englishmen received from the Spanish Inquisition, as when the English ambassador to Spain protested the fate of eight Englishmen "condemned to the galleys and perpetual imprisonment by the Holy Office in Seville." The threats were even more palpable in the West Indies. Several Spanish prisoners captured by Drake's marauding forces in 1586, for example, reported that it was the Spanish intention to kill all the English pirates except for twenty of the best who "shoulde bee made gallie slaves." Later, Samuel Purchas reprinted an account of the capture of eighteen Englishmen south of Cuba and the execution of fourteen of the men, "the other four beinge youths were saved to serve the Spaniards . . . as slaves."²⁶

Doubtless, Indians were often treated harshly by English settlers during the early modern era, but the historical and ideological context of early colonial settlement often sheltered natives from outright enslavement. Largely as a result of

the successful destruction of many of the Chesapeake's indigenous communities by the 1640s, explicit laws were enacted in Virginia to ensure that the remaining Indians were not treated as cheap commodities.²⁷ In 1656, the colony's governing elite declared that if any "Indians shall bring in any children" then "wee will not use them as slaves, but . . . bring them up in Christianity, civillity and the knowledge of necessary trades." Five years later, colonial legislators declared that if any traders brought in "Indians as servants," they could not "sell them for slaves nor for any longer time than the English of the like ages should serve." Only after the onset of Bacon's Rebellion in 1676 would lawmakers avow "that all Indians taken in warr [would] be held and accounted slaves dureing life." Even when imperial officials attempted to dissuade the colonists, Anglo-Virginians openly asserted their right in the years after Bacon's Rebellion to "reteyne and keepe all such Indian slaves or other Indian goods as they either have taken or hereafter shall take their owne proper use for their better encouragement to such service."²⁸ Early modern Englishmen accepted that captured Indians could be held, or sold, as slaves in a time of war but, at least during the first half of the century, during times of peace colonial leaders preferred to emphasize that Indians should be treated no differently than the English.

Indeed, early colonial promotion was often couched in language to suggest that Indian peoples were, or should be, part of an inclusive (though fundamentally *English*) community and that the establishment of English colonies in the Americas would benefit Indians to the degree that it would insulate them from the Spanish and connect them in a more concrete fashion with their English brethren.²⁹ As late as 1672, while justifying the English conquest of Jamaica, the English editor and publisher Richard Blome noted that "*Indians*, who are the natural proprietors of *America*, do abominate and hate the *Spaniards* for their cruelty and avarice; and upon every occasion will shew their willingness to give themselves and their Countreys, freely into the power and protection of the *English*." Of course, few Indians remained in Jamaica at this late date. Nonetheless, "[w]e, as avengers of those peoples bloud and wrongs," another author maintained, "should have had a better Title to their Countries then their oppressors, and murtherers."³⁰ Ironically, this unique perspective promoted the notion that Indians *could* be enslaved but, unlike Africans, only for reasons that might be applied to the English themselves or the inhabitants of other recognized nations. Because colonial promoters initially emphasized the fundamental similarity between English and Indian peoples in order to promote and encourage overseas settlement and defray concerns about what might happen to English bodies in the New World, Anglo-Americans allowed the idea to develop that natives might be justifiably enslaved. Moreover, it was even imagined in some circles that there might be a purpose for Indian slavery that could be punitive, but it might also be redemptive, and it might have nothing to do with labor (or, at least, production).

Predictably, the idealistic musings of colonial promoters did not always find fertile soil in the New World, where the exigencies of survival trumped all other concerns. Thus, widespread animosity toward natives was routinely in evidence in the wake of violent conflicts between English colonists and Indians. In Virginia, anti-Indian sentiment was stirred up by the Powhatan Uprising of 1622.³¹ Fed up with the steadily growing demands English colonialism placed

on their resources, Opechancanough and members of the Powhatan Confederacy launched a devastating coordinated attack on the morning March 22 (Good Friday). Nearly 350 English men and women were killed, as were the efforts of colonial promoters to cultivate an optimistic image of the indigenous peoples in the region. A bitter Edward Waterhouse asserted that the actions of "that perfidious and inhumane people" revealed at last their true nature and that the English would take the battle to those "naked, tanned, deformed Savages" and exact revenge by "force, by surprize, by famine in burning their Corne, by destroying their Boats, Canoes, and Houses." As the Spanish had done before them, the English imagined they could finally set their colony on the right path "by pursuing and chasing them with our horses, and blood-Hounds to draw after them, and Mastives to seaze them." This proposal agreed with the sentiments of the Virginia Council, which ordered the colonists "to roote out from being any longer a people, so cursed a nation, ungratefull to all benefitts, and uncapable of all goodnesse." As a reward for service, colonists could expect to acquire "men for slaves" from among the defeated natives.³²

After the dramatic outbreak of violence in 1622, frustrated Englishmen began to think anew about holding Indians in bondage.³³ Accepting, as they did, that prisoners of war could legitimately be held as slaves, some Englishmen could comfortably conclude that Powhatan Indians had effectively made themselves candidates for bondage by their own actions. Indians, according to Waterhouse, "may now most justly be compelled to servitude and drudgery" in Virginia, including the "inferiour workes of digging in the mynes" or being "sent for the service of the *Sommer Islands*." John Martin wrote that the Indians were "fitt to rowe in Gallies & friggetts and many other pregnant uses too tedious to sett downe." In the midst of recounting his misery as an indentured servant in post-1622 Virginia, Richard Frethorne paused to note that "wee live in feare" of the natives, "yet wee have had a Combate with them . . . and wee took two alive and make slaves of them."³⁴

More acid-tongued Englishmen, however, were quick to note that the events of March 1622 were important because they revealed that Indians were not at all like the English and could never be truly incorporated into the Christian, much less the English, social order. Exceptionally angry yet prescient English authors reclothed (perhaps disrobed would be more accurate) Indians as an irreconcilably different human population. More conciliatory voices, like that of the Virginia Company of London in August 1622, hoped that colonists would remember "who we are, rather then what they have been," and advised that "the younger people of both Sexes, whose bodies may, by labor and service become profitable, and their mindes not overgrowne w[ith] evill Customes, be reduced to civilitie, and afterwarde to Christianitie."³⁵ Others, however, were eager to suggest that Indians should be treated with impunity: "[T]hat bloody Massacre . . . requires that servile natures be servily used," Samuel Purchas claimed in 1625, "that future dangers be prevented by the extirpation of the most dangerous, and commodities also raised out of the servileness and serviceablenesse of the rest." Clearly, John Morton asserted, recent events had demonstrated that "natives are apter for worke then yet o[ur] English are."³⁶

By May 1623, the Virginia Company of London took a giant step away from its avowed intention of "convertinge . . . the Infidells," something that would

have disqualified Indians as candidates for outright enslavement, by declaring that "itt was an attempt impossible they being descended of ye cursed race of Cham." As Edward Waterhouse put it in 1622, in his account of the efforts of George Thorpe to "earnestly affect their conversion," only to have "this Viperous brood" murder him "out of devillish malice," the "sinnes of these wicked Infidels, have made them unworthy of enjoying him, and the eternal good that he most zealously alwayes intended to them."³⁷ If the author of *The Planters Plea* (1630) is to be believed, the real problem was that "some conceive the Inhabitants of *New-England* to be *Chams* posterity, and consequently shut out from grace by *Noahs* curse."³⁸ The idea that the indigenous inhabitants of America may have constituted a separate race, in the modern sense of the term, was not embraced by many people in the seventeenth century. Nonetheless, the willingness of Anglo-Americans to posit alternate theories, especially ones that offered essentialist rather than circumstantial explanations for the differences between the natives and newcomers, allowed alternate justifications for Indian slavery to come to the fore and contributed to the racialization of Indian identity.³⁹

Native resistance prompted some Englishmen not only to reevaluate their impression of Indians, but also to reconfigure the image of Spain and Spanish conduct in the West Indies. Edward Waterhouse noted that "the Spaniard made great use for his own turne of the quarrels and enmities that were amongst the Indians" and applied the principle: "*Divide & impera*, Make divisions and take Kingdomes." He also reintroduced the impressions of Gonzalo Fernández de Oviedo y Valdés, whose *Summario de la Natural Historia de las Indias and Historia Natural y General de las Indias* had been partially available in English since first appearing in excerpted form in 1555.⁴⁰ According to Waterhouse, Oviedo declared that Indians were "by nature slothfull and idle, vitious, malancholy, slovenly, of bad conditions, lyers, of small memory, [and] of no constancy or trust." Referring again to the wisdom of Oviedo, Waterhouse added that they "are lesse capable then children of sixe or seaven yeares old, and lesse apt and ingenious." In the opinion of at least one man, the patterns of Spanish ethnology and conquest were useful precedents for explaining the course of events in Virginia, as well as what the English might expect in the future if they were too lenient or too inclusive. This rueful tone was not confined to Virginia in the 1620s. John Eliot, the noted Puritan missionary, lamented to a friend in a letter that the Spaniards had forced the Indians to convert and the French "would hire them to it by giving them coates and shirts." Thus far the English had tried neither tactic, by which "wee could have gathered many hundreds, yea thousands it may bee by this time, into the name of Churches." The failure to follow a more productive pattern of conversion as demonstrated by England's Catholic rivals in the Americas frustrated Eliot. "[W]ee have not learnt yet," he bemoaned, "the art of coyning Christians, or putting Christs name and image upon copper mettle."⁴¹

* * * * *

What, then, about those seventeen Pequot Indians who were sold, or traded, into slavery on Providence Island in 1637? Whereas this story has often been

treated as a stepping-stone in the linear development of slavery, or even racism, it seems rather to be a particularly cloudy historical moment. On the one hand, even in the wake of the breakdown of Anglo-Indian relations in the Chesapeake, numerous Englishmen espoused their conviction that Indians were candidates for Christian instruction and inclusion in the Anglo-American community. At the very least, Indians made good trading partners. Even more, however, English settlers continued to believe that Indians were particularly useful military allies and nowhere was this truer than on Providence Island. Located as they were in the heart of Spain's American empire, the Puritan settlers on this distant and lonely outcrop could ill afford to foster enmity with the local indigenous peoples. Thus, the enslavement of Indians, particularly the nearby Mosquito Coast natives with whom they did business, was forbidden. It was perhaps this precedent that underlay the suggestion from the Providence Island Company in London to the governor and ruling council on the island itself that special care be taken of the New England Indians.⁴²

At the same time, it is worth remembering that the seventeen Pequot Indians shipped out of New England were but a fraction of the several hundred captured Pequots who continued to be held in some form of bondage locally. Before the war, colonial leaders had endeavored to ensure that Indians were neither preyed upon nor enslaved by Anglo-Americans. Soon after their arrival in Massachusetts Bay, for example, local officials ordered that "whatever p[er]son hath receaved any Indian into their Famylie as a serv[ant] whall discharge themselves of them" within a year unless he was granted a "license from the Court." This measure was desirable, in part, to prevent "the hurt that may follow through o[ur] much familiaritie w[ith] the Indians."⁴³ Explicit plans to enslave Indians as a means of introducing them to civility were quite rare in the early seventeenth century. In 1610 the Virginia Company expressed its unwillingness to pursue this route as part of a critique of Spanish colonialism. "To preach the gospel to a nation conquered; and to set their souls at liberty when we have brought their bodies to slavery" seemed to these English officials somewhat disingenuous. "[I]t may be a matter sacred to the preachers," they continued, "but I know not how justifiable in the rulers, who for mere ambition do set upon it the gloss of religion. Let the divines of Salamanca discuss that question how the possessors of the West Indies first destroyed then instructed."⁴⁴

Yet, just as the Powhatan Uprising had altered the ideological landscape of the Chesapeake after 1622, Anglo-Americans were increasingly willing to condone holding Indians against their will in Puritan New England after 1636. In the wake of the war, Indians appeared more frequently in Puritan households, although it is difficult to determine how many continued to serve their English masters as domestic servants and slaves over the long run. A 1643 promotional tract indicated that "Divers of the Indians Children, Boyes and Girles, we have received into our houses . . . and in subjection to us." Regardless, John Mason claimed that although the English had divided up a number of Indians amongst themselves after the war, "intending to keep them as Servants," they soon found that "they could not endure that Yoke; few of them of them continuing any time with their masters."⁴⁵

Mason chose his words carefully. The unwillingness of Anglo-Americans to label Indians as slaves, even after their capture in a just war, is indicative of the

English tendency to distinguish the indigenous inhabitants of the Americas from newly arrived Africans. Already, by the late 1630s, slavery in the Americas had clearly been tainted by its almost universal association with bound African laborers. In this regard, the characterization of the captured Pequots as "Cannibal negroes" once they arrived in the West Indies was a significant, although exceptional, choice of words. Cannibalism fascinated English observers during the era of European overseas expansion and often served as a way of measuring the degree of civility or barbarity of various native groups. Not only was cannibalism recognized as a particularly degenerate practice, it justified the conquest and enslavement of Indians who otherwise may have been offered friendship or protection. The use of the word "negro" was not an accident either. First, as "cannibal negroes" the New England Indians were distinguished from the Mosquito Coast natives with whom the English hoped to maintain amicable relations. Second, as "negros" they were condemned to a recognized status—slavery—that was increasingly contingent in the Atlantic world upon a particular identity. The well-traveled Anglican Morgan Godwyn would later note that "[t]hese two words, *Negro* and *Slave*, being by Custom grown Homogenous and Convertible; even as *Negro* and *Christian*, *Englishman* and *Heathen*, are by the like corrupt Custom and Partiality made *Opposites*; thereby as it were implying, that the one could not be *Christians*, nor the other *Infidels*."⁴⁶ Thus, the seventeen Pequots were called "negros" not because of confusion about their physical appearance or the absence of even the most basic understanding of national or ethnic characteristics, but because the definitive slave in the broader Atlantic world was the "negro." In an important sense, then, as punishment for their capture in a just war, the Pequots ceased to be Indians and instead became "negros," that is, "slaves."⁴⁷

Of course, the Pequots were originally bound for Bermuda, not Providence Island, and it is from that island that we have some of the most intriguing evidence that Indian slavery may have been valued less at this time for its ability to provide laborers and more for its ability to facilitate Anglo-American colonialism. Indeed, Patrick Copeland informed John Winthrop late in 1639 that if the original shipment had arrived "I wold have had a care of them, to have disposed them to such honest men as should have trained them up in the principles of religion." When they were ready, Copeland imagined, they could be shipped back to New England where they could "doe some good upon their countrymen." If others could be procured, Copeland wrote to Winthrop, "or if you send mee a couple, a boy and a girle for my selfe, I will pay for their passage, so they be hopefull." Copeland's language in this exchange is striking and demonstrates the ability of at least one Englishman to imagine that slavery could serve the same purpose for Indians that other Englishmen hoped enslavement would serve *among* the English themselves during the sixteenth and even into the seventeenth century. Copeland, after all, did not place any emphasis on slavery as a labor system, rather he suggested that slavery was a means to a different end. In this case, slavery might even be an agent of conversion and would last until such time as the Indians were ready to return to New England as, theoretically, examples for their brethren to emulate. Slavery would, quite literally, redeem the Pequots, but this was conceptually possible only because Copeland was able, at some level, to imagine that Indians were not so different from the English themselves.⁴⁸

In the main, Indians continued to be viewed as a distinctive ethnologic cohort with unique rights with regard to their treatment and potential enslavement well into the seventeenth century. Roger Williams wrote to John Winthrop from Rhode Island several times during 1637 in an effort to prevent English settlers from enslaving Pequots who willingly gave themselves up to England's native allies: "it would be very gratefull to our neighbours that such Pequots as fall to them be not enslaved, like those which are taken in warr, but . . . be used kindly." Several months later, Williams openly wondered about the grounds that existed for enslaving the defeated Pequots. Writing once again to Winthrop "concerning captives," Williams noted that "the Scripture is full of mysterie & the Old Testament of types." Should the Pequots be enslaved? Williams believed that "the enemie may lawfully be weaknd & despoild of all comfort of wife & children &c., but I beseech you well weigh it after a due time of trayning up to labour & restraint, they ought not to be set free: yet so as without danger of adjoyning the enemie." If the Pequot captives were to be enslaved, Williams contended, their enslavement should be temporary and directed toward productive ends. Indian slaves should be instructed in Christian morality and develop a proper sense of labor and responsibility before they should be freed. Slavery could be, in Williams' mind, their path to salvation.⁴⁹

That Englishmen looked to slavery as a realistic punitive and rehabilitative institution in the Americas is demonstrated by their willingness to condemn some of their fellow English men and women to slavery during the first half of the seventeenth century. Virginia governor Samuel Argall determined in 1617 that individuals found guilty of price gouging could be punished with "3 years Slavery to the Colony." In 1618, an Englishmen could "be a slave" for failing to attend Church, not planting corn, or wasting ammunition without due cause.⁵⁰ Virginia was not exceptional in this regard. A Bermudian court sentenced Nicholas Gabriel to be "a slave unto the colony" for slandering the governor. As late as November 1650, Bermuda officials sentenced four more men to slavery for terms ranging from one to three years. In each of these cases, however, the crime was for engaging in sexual relations, quite often across color lines.⁵¹ Nonetheless, the notion that Englishmen might fall into, or be sentenced to, slavery in Virginia and Barbadoes was troubling. In 1619 John Rolfe questioned the propriety of the commodification of fellow Englishmen when he complained that the practice of "buying and selling men and bois," something that was held to be "most intolerable" in England, was already the subject of numerous complaints. Inhabitants in Bermuda issued a list of grievances in 1622 expressing their worry that orphans were "kept here in litle better Condition than Slaves." More important, however, Bermudians were disturbed that, although the aforementioned Nicholas Gabriel had not been executed for his particular offence, he was "notwithstanding censured in direct wordes, insteed therof, to remaine a slave to the Colony."⁵²

When Massachusetts leaders sentenced at least eight men and one woman to slavery for assault, rape, and theft between 1638 and 1642, they were likewise resorting to a conception of human bondage deeply rooted in English society. William Andrews, for example, was "censured to bee severely whiped, & delivered up as a slave" for "haveing made assault upon his m[aster], Henry Coggan." In addition to this breach of conduct in the master-servant relationship, the Court determined that Andrews had also conspired "against the peace & welfare

of this whole com[m]on welth." Massachusetts leaders, like those in Virginia and Bermuda, did not condemn Andrews to slavery because they needed laborers, rather they believed that this extreme form of bondage would encourage Andrews to reform his ways and accept his place in the social order. It was, fundamentally, a utopian conception of slavery. And, in this case, the Boston court appears to have been satisfied with the results. In September 1639, less than a year after his original sentence, William Andrews, "who was formerly com[m]itted to slavery for his ill & insolent carriage," was "released (upon his good carriage) from his slavery, & put to Mr Endecott."⁵³ Even so, Massachusetts Bay leaders demonstrated that they were ultimately dissatisfied with the use of slavery in criminal justice when they enacted the *Body of Liberties* in 1641, declaring that "there shall never be any bond-slavery, villenage or captivitie amongst us."⁵⁴

The use of human bondage as a means of punishing English settlers in the Americas, and as a way of reforming their behavior, was consistent with early modern English attitudes about slavery.⁵⁵ Debating the issue in Parliament in 1621, one member suggested that criminals who were "adjudged to die for smale fautes" might "be saved and Condemned as Slaves during lief and be used as in other Cuntreys unto anie Publique workes." If, after several years, "they become newe men, and Demeane themselves well," their master could "release them of theire bondage and Slaverie, into theire former libertie and fredome, never after to be taxed or twitted in the teeth either with theire bondadge or with theire Crimes for which they weare soe punished." Special attention was also given to those who might run away "or doe anie violent Acte against the Master of the Worke, their Captain or Keeper or anie other." In that case, prisoners would "never have their libertie but contynue Slaves all their lief time, without release or Redempcion."⁵⁶ Similar proposals were offered to secure the seas. In his "Discourse on Pirates," Sir Henry Mainwaring argued that the only way to suppress pirates would be to "put them all to death, or make slaves of them."⁵⁷ Sir William Monson's contemporary plan for reintroducing galley slavery in England specified that, although they should be termed "the King's labourers . . . and not slaves," galley slaves should be treated in all other regards as slaves, including being "shaved both head and face, and marked in the cheek with a hot iron."⁵⁸

When compared with the willingness of the English to categorize their own countrymen as slaves, there was nothing particularly remarkable about the capture and enslavement of a handful of Indians during the Pequot War. On a global perspective, early modern Englishmen were more than willing to sell human beings into slavery. The English privateer Sir Thomas Shirley, in his description of the Ottoman Empire during the first decade of the seventeenth century, even noted that in that part of the world "our English shippes doe use to carye Christian slaves for the Turkes from porte to porte." Indeed, Shirley continued, "noe Christian shippes that trade with the Turke . . . wyll carye anye of these, but onely the English."⁵⁹ Rapsallion Englishmen also plucked Indians off the North American coastline in the years before the establishment of permanent settlements. In many cases Indians were kidnaped to further the interests of colonial promoters, but some Indians were clearly bartered into slavery. In the most notorious case, Captain Thomas Hunt kidnaped more than two dozen Indians off the coast of New England in 1614, including the Patuxet Tisquantum (Squanto), and sold them into slavery in Spain.⁶⁰

Compared to these vivid examples, however, the enslavement of the indigenous inhabitants of the Americas by English settlers is even more remarkable for the exceptionally narrow ways Indian slavery was justified during much of the seventeenth century. Indians were rarely enslaved indiscriminately. The European notion that "Just Wars" legitimately allowed the victors to hold their captives as slaves was endorsed by a long line of distinguished political theorists. Early modern English law continued to allow for the use of bondage as form of punishment, and Anglo-American officials did not hesitate to condemn criminals to slavery. Thus, because Englishmen were initially inclined to imagine Indians in an inclusive fashion, traditional modes of human bondage were extended to, and applied in, early Anglo-Indian encounters. Once this pretence, that there was a natural affinity between Indians and Englishmen, exploded in their faces, however, Englishmen in America began to rearticulate the logic of Indian slavery. In a world where plantation agriculture was on the rise, the enslavement of Africans was increasingly ubiquitous, and Spanish colonialism was looked upon with new appreciation, the transformation of seventeen Pequots into "cannibals" and "negroes" made perfect sense.

* * * * *

The deliberate designation of the seventeen Indians as both "cannibals" and "negroes" at Providence Island is a telling reminder that, just as there were rhetorical and conceptual shifts in the way the indigenous peoples of America were imagined in Anglo-America, the practice of slavery itself underwent subtle transformations during the colonial era. In order to justify transplanting themselves in what was technically and materially someone else's land, as well as to assuage the fears of prospective settlers, early English colonial promoters churned out literature espousing the natural affinity that existed between natives and newcomers. English writers studiously emphasized the bonds that tied Englishmen and Indians together, particularly and most graphically in their joint opposition to the Spanish. The enslavement of Indians did not easily fit into this construction, unless the practice was a result of a just war or the intention was punitive or, even, rehabilitative. Early Indian slavery was not, therefore, primarily a labor institution that was predicated on difference. Instead, the enslavement of Indians was justified, at least in theory, by pointing to the need to punish Indians for their crimes and rationalized as something that could effect a change in individual Indians (and among indigenous peoples) based on the assumption that there was some measure of affinity between the natives and newcomers. It was their similarities rather than their differences that served to make Indians candidates for human bondage in the English colonies. As the seventeenth century progressed, however, and indigenous peoples' displeasure generated violent resistance, it became increasingly common for Anglo-Americans to differentiate themselves from Indians in essentialist terms. The enslavement of the seventeen Pequots, their forced transportation and reclassification, therefore epitomizes the complexity of human bondage and protoracial ideology in colonial America.

In the long run, fanciful notions about how slavery might be used to reconstruct society, or rehabilitate a given individual or group, would fade.⁶¹ English-

men would continue to be sentenced by the courts for their crimes, of course, but magistrates would more studiously avoid the language of slavery as its meaning took on new associations over time. Similarly, Indian slavery would ultimately be absorbed by the plantation complex, particularly in the Carolinas and Georgia.⁶² For quite some time, however, and throughout Anglo-America, there continued to be important differences between the intellectual conceptualization of Africans and Indians in the Anglo-Atlantic world. For one, voices that were silent with regard to what was happening to African peoples throughout the Atlantic world were otherwise raised in opposition to the treatment, or enslavement, of Indians from an early date. In April 1655, Captain Jennins took up the cause of enslaved Bermudian Indians before the Bermuda Company in England. Jennins declared that Captain Preston had taken them "by deceit" and prompted the Company to request that "some course may be taken for the restoring of this freeborne people to their form[er] libertyes." Bermudians almost certainly ignored this request, for six years later the Company again declared that they had received multiple complaints "touching the Indians for so manie yeares in bondage." Once again, they requested the General Assembly "to consider of a way and manner for the enfranchising of these people." A similar sentiment emanated from Barbados during the 1650s when the plight of a group of non-native Indians encouraged Captain Henry Powell to go to the Governor and ask for their liberation after nearly thirty years of "slavery and bondage." Powell had recruited 32 natives from Guiana in 1627 with promises of land and freedom, but the subsequent "Government of this Iland hath taken them by force and made them slaves."⁶³

Thus, in spite of the growing willingness to treat Indians more like Africans and less like Europeans, they were rarely made part of an undifferentiated class of bondmen. Colonial records, official and unofficial, typically distinguished African slaves from Indian slaves.⁶⁴ Upon Richard Ligon's arrival in Barbados in 1647 he noted that Colonel Modyford purchased the property of Major William Hubbard, which contained "[h]ouses for Negroes and Indian slaves, with 96 Negroes, and three Indian women. . . ." And although both Indians and Africans were slaves, Ligon distinguished them by virtue of their intellectual capacity and physical appearance. Indians were "very active men, and apt to learn any thing, sooner than the Negroes; and as different from them in shape, almost as in colour." In a manner consistent with earlier pronouncements, however, Ligon also concluded that Indians were "much craftier, and subtler then the Negroes; and in their nature falsier." Decades of interaction with the natives, including frequent conflicts over land, religion, and government, had conditioned otherwise optimistic Englishmen to view Indians, in the words of John Smith, as "[c]raftie, timerous, quick of apprehension and very ingenious." They were thought to be "covetous" and "soone moved to anger, and so malitious, that they seldome forget an injury." These notions, however, were rooted in the recognition that Indians, unlike African slaves, were to be feared for the power they were able to exercise in the Americas. During the first half of the seventeenth century, Indians were more easily imagined as members of identifiable political entities and therefore, unlike black slaves, English settlers needed to approach them with greater caution.⁶⁵

The idealized depiction of Indians as passive and malleable subjects open to

benevolent guidance and possible inclusion in English society was put to rest by the continuing independent behavior of indigenous peoples. Thus, the fiction that there might be a practical, even educational, component to human bondage dissipated as slavery increasingly revealed itself as a base and brutal labor institution that most Englishmen were able to tolerate so long as they avoided thinking about it too much. What this moment in time reveals, however, is important. Indian slavery was not simply a subtext for early colonial racial formation or an aspect of Anglo-African relations. Retelling the story of Indian slavery in the context of the early modern Atlantic world, including Anglo-Spanish relations, compels us to think more seriously about human bondage as something much more complex than a simple system of labor. As the plight of the seventeen Pequots reveals, as well as that of other indigenous peoples in the Anglo-Atlantic world, Indian slavery was also a cultural construction suffused with subtlety, apparent contradictions, and rationales that seem fanciful in retrospect. Much as we might like to think that slavery was almost an accident of Anglo-American colonialism, the early history of Indian slavery suggests that the subject of human bondage elicited a great deal of thought well before the birth of the plantation complex.

History Department
Davidson, NC 28035-6955

ENDNOTES

An earlier version of this essay was presented at the Seventh Annual Omohundro Institute of Early American History and Culture Conference in Glasgow in 2001. This article has subsequently benefitted from the comments and insights of many people, but especially Jennifer Baszile, Colin Calloway, Joyce Chaplin, Suzanne Cooper Guasco, Wim Klooster, Kris Lane, Philip Morgan, and an anonymous reader. I would also like to thank the Folger Shakespeare Library and the John Carter Brown Library for providing me both time and support in the research and writing of this article.

1. The details of this story appear in a number of sources, but see *The Journal of John Winthrop, 1630–1649*, Richard S. Dunn, James Savage, and Laetitia Yeandle, eds. (Cambridge, MA, 1996), 237; Almon Wheeler Lauber, *Indian Slavery in Colonial Times within the Present Limits of the United States* (New York, 1913), 122–25; Alison Games, “‘The Sanctuarye of our rebell negroes’: The Atlantic Context of Local Resistance on Providence Island,” *Slavery & Abolition* 19:3 (December 1998): 7. On the distinction between “slave societies” and “societies with slaves,” see Ira Berlin, *Many Thousands Gone: The First Two Centuries of Slavery in North America* (Cambridge, MA, 1998), 7–8.

2. James F. Brooks, *Captives & Cousins: Slavery, Kinship, and Community in the Southwest Borderlands* (Chapel Hill, 2002); Alan Gallay, *The Indian Slave Trade: The Rise of the English Empire in the American South, 1670–1717* (New Haven, 2002); Brett Rushforth, “‘A Little Flesh We Offer You’: The Origins of Indian Slavery in New France,” *William and Mary Quarterly* 60:4 (October 2003): 777–808; Juliana Barr, “From Captives to Slaves: Commodifying Indian Women in the Borderlands,” *Journal of American History* 92:1 (June 2005): 19–46.

3. Certainly, this notion of the justice of enslavement that followed from legitimate warfare was essential to Emanuel Downing's determination in the 1640s that captured Narragansetts could also be taken to the West Indies and sold as slaves. See George H. Moore, *Notes on the History of Slavery in Massachusetts* (New York, 1866), 10; Lorenzo Johnston Greene, *The Negro in Colonial New England* (New York, 1942), 60–1; Winthrop D. Jordan, *White over Black: American Attitudes toward the Negro, 1550–1812* (Chapel Hill, 1968), 68–9.
4. Betty Wood, *The Origins of American Slavery: Freedom and Bondage in the English Colonies* (New York, 1997), 20–39.
5. The idea that Indians and Africans were generally part of an undifferentiated class of bondmen is common. Several examples of this emphasis can be found in older works, such as Moore (pp. 15–41) and Lauber (esp. 48–102, 105–17, 211–16, 222–29, and 250–82). More conventional examinations of Indian slavery include John A. Sainsbury, "Indian Labor in Early Rhode Island," *New England Quarterly* 48:3 (1975): 378–93; Donald Grinde, Jr., "Native American Slavery in the Southern Colonies," *Indian History* 10:2 (1977): 38–42; Rodney M. Baine, "Indian Slavery in Colonial Georgia," *George Historical Quarterly* 79:2 (1995): 418–24; and Hilary McD. Beckles, "The Colours of Property: Brown, White and Black Chattels and their Responses on the Caribbean Frontier," *Slavery & Abolition* 15:2 (1994): 36–51.
6. Two recent works have moved away from the labor paradigm by emphasizing the theme of Indian captivity among the English. See Michael L. Fickes, "'They Could Not Endure That Yoke': The Captivity of Pequot Women and Children after the War of 1637," *New England Quarterly* 73:1 (March 2000): 58–81, and Joyce E. Chaplin, "Enslavement of Indians in Early America: Captivity Without the Narrative," in *The Creation of the British Atlantic World*, Elizabeth Mancke and Carole Shammas, eds. (Baltimore, 2005), 45–70.
7. Alden T. Vaughan, "The Origins Debate: Slavery and Racism in Seventeenth-Century Virginia," in *Roots of American Racism: Essays on the Colonial Experience* (New York, 1995), 136–74. Historians, like Kathleen Brown, tend to be much more skeptical of the utility of race as a meaningful category of analysis before the late seventeenth century when "the social meanings attached to physical appearance" would ultimately be "used in the service of economic and imperial goals." Literary scholars, like Kim Hall, are generally more willing to use race as an interpretive device during the early modern era when "descriptions of dark and light became . . . the conduit through which the English began to formulate notions of 'self' and 'other' so well known in Anglo-American racial discourse." Kathleen M. Brown, *Good Wives, Nasty Wenches, and Anxious Patriarchs: Gender, Race, and Power in Colonial Virginia* (Chapel Hill, 1996), 4; Kim F. Hall, *Things of Darkness: Economies of Race and Gender in Early Modern England* (Ithaca, 1995), 2.
8. See, for example, Edmund Morgan's argument that "it was easy for Virginians to extend to blacks some of the bad feelings they harbored toward Indians" in the 1680s. According to this logic, Indians and Africans were both "seen as slaves," as "outlanders," and it was therefore natural "for their owners . . . to lump them together in a lowest common denominator of racist hatred and contempt." Morgan, *American Slavery, American Freedom: The Ordeal of Colonial Virginia* (New York, 1975), 330. Morgan's view of slavery follows from David Brion Davis, *The Problem of Slavery in Western Culture* (Ithaca, 1966). According to Davis: "In spite of a widespread tendency to differentiate the Negro from

the Indian and to associate the latter with the freedom of nature, Negro slavery was in actuality imposed on top of a pre-existing Indian slavery; in North America, at least, the two never diverged as distinct institutions" (176).

9. See, especially, Joyce Chaplin, *Subject Matter: Technology, the Body, and Science on the Anglo-American Frontier, 1500–1676* (Cambridge, MA, 2001).

10. Important early critics of African slavery included Thomas Tryon, Morgan Godwyn, and George Fox. See Phillipe Rosenberg, "Thomas Tryon and the Seventeenth-Century Dimensions of Antislavery," *William and Mary Quarterly* 61:4 (October 2004): 609–42; Daniel Carey, "Sugar, Colonialism, and the Critique of Slavery: Thomas Tryon in Barbados," *Studies on Voltaire and the Eighteenth Century* (2004:09): 303–21; Kenneth L. Carroll, "George Fox and Slavery," *Quaker History* 86:2 (1997): 16–25; and Alden T. Vaughan, "Slaveholders' 'Hellish Principles': A Seventeenth-Century Critique," in *Roots of American Racism*, 55–81.

11. So, too, did the French. See Sue Peabody, "There Are No Slaves in France": *The Political Culture of Race and Slavery in the Ancien Régime* (New York, 1996).

12. *New Englands First Fruits* (London, 1643), 8. This critique was directed at both other English and other European settlements.

13. Robert Johnson, *Nova Britannia* (London, 1609), C2; 'Philo-Caledon', *A Defence of the Scots Settlement in Darien with an Answer to the Spanish Memorial against it* (Edinburgh, 1699), 24. Both works cited in Anthony Pagden, *Lords of all the World: Ideologies of Empire in Spain, Britain and France, c. 1500–c. 1800* (New Haven, 1995), 88. See also Patricia Seed, *Ceremonies of Possession in Europe's Conquest of the New World, 1492–1640* (Cambridge, UK, 1995).

14. The literature on climates, natural philosophy, and history is steadily expanding. See, for example, Mary Floyd-Wilson, *English Ethnicity and Race in Early Modern Drama* (Cambridge, UK, 2003); Joyce E. Chaplin, "Natural Philosophy and an Early Racial Idiom in North America: Comparing English and Indian Bodies," *WMQ* 54:1 (January 1997): 229–52; Chaplin, *Subject Matter*; Kupperman, "Climate and Mastery of the Wilderness in Seventeenth-Century New England," in David D. Hall and David Grayson Allen, eds., *Seventeenth-Century New England* (Boston, 1984), 3–37; Kupperman, *Indians & English: Facing Off in Early America* (Ithaca, 2000); Alden T. Vaughan, "From White Man to Redskin: Changing Anglo-American Perceptions of the American Indian" and "Early English Paradigms for New World Natives," in *Roots of American Racism*.

15. Alexander Whitaker, *Good Newes from Virginia* (London, 1613), 24.

16. Susan Myra Kingsbury, ed., *Records of the Virginia Company of London*, 4 vols. (Washington, D.C., 1906–33), 3:3, 27, 71.

17. Richard Eden, *The First Three English Books on America [1511?–1555 A.D.]*, Edward Arbor, ed. (Birmingham, 1885), 50–55. Edmund Morgan has characterized English awareness of Spanish activities in the New World as a "horror story" from the first appearance of Peter Martyr's *De Orbo Novo* in 1511. Clearly, however, there was plenty of room for more positive assessments, at least through the 1550s, as evidenced by Eden's lavish praise. Morgan, *American Slavery, American Freedom*, 7; Smith, *A Description of New England* (London, 1616), in *The Complete Works of Captain John Smith (1580–1631)*, 3 vols., Philip L. Barbour, ed. (Chapel Hill, 1986), 1:348.

18. Bartolomé de las Casas, *The Spanish Colonie, or Briefe chronicle of the acts and gestic of the Spaniards in the West Indies* (London, 1583), A1v. On emerging European perceptions of Spain, see William S. Maltby, *The Black Legend in England: The Development of Anti-Spanish Sentiment, 1558–1660* (Durham, 1971), and J.N. Hillgarth, *The Mirror of Spain, 1500–1700: The Formation of a Myth* (Ann Arbor, 2000).

19. Cited in Benjamin Schmidt, *Innocence Abroad: The Dutch Imagination and the New World, 1570–1670* (Cambridge, 2001), 86–8. Schmidt argues convincingly that the changing political and constitutional situation in the Low Countries resulted in “a revolution in Dutch representations of America” (68).

20. Richard Hakluyt, *The Principal Navigations Voyages Traffiques & Discoveries of the English Nation*, 12 vols. (New York, 1965), 10:390–1. See the useful discussion of Raleigh’s narrative in Louis Montrose, “The Work of Gender in the Discourse of Discovery,” in Stephen Greenblatt, ed., *New World Encounters* (Berkeley, 1993), 177–217. The Dutch, too, were not beyond characterizing the Spanish as exceptionally lascivious. Marnix argued in 1578 that the Spanish intended to steal their “wives and daughters to satisfy their unchaste desires.” Cited in Schmidt, *Innocence Abroad*, 86.

21. *Certain Inducements to Well-Minded People* (London, 1643), 21; Daunce, *A Briefe Discourse of the Spanish State* (1590), cited in Hillgarth, *The Mirror of Spain*, 388.

22. English authors paid special attention to the genealogical make-up of identifiable human populations during the early modern era in great part because they were engaged at home in an intellectual enterprise concerned with demonstrating the origins of the English “race.” In 1605, for example, Richard Verstegan vociferously argued that English national greatness was closely tied to Germanic origins. Therefore, it was significant, as the increasingly fashionable writings of Tacitus revealed, that “the Gemans are home-bred & the natural people of their country, & not mixt with others, coming from other places.” Verstegan, *The Restitution of Decayed Intelligence* (Antwerp, 1605), 43. It was this sentiment that underlay Reverend William Symonds’s admonition, during the initial years of the Virginia settlement, that God promised Abraham to make him a great Nation, as long as “Abraham’s posterity keep to themselves. They may not marry nor give in marriage to the heathen, that are uncircumcised. . . . The breakers of this rule may break the neck of all good success of this voyage. . . .” Cited in Robin Blackburn, *The Making of New World Slavery: From the Baroque to the Modern, 1492–1800* (London, 1997), 237.

23. Thomas More, *A fruteful pleasaunt, & wittie work, of the best state of a publique weale, and of the newe yle, called Utopia*, Raphe Robynson, trans. (London, 1556), 23. It could be argued that the process of manumission amounted to a ceremony of inclusion in the Tudor world, by which the tainted individual became part of the community, or truly “English.” Edward VI declared that the charges that bondmen should pay into Augmentations should be “such fees and charges as are paid for making denizens.” *Calendar of the Patent Rolls: Edward VI*, 6 vols. (London, 1924–1929), 3:215–6.

24. Michael Guasco, “Settling with Slavery: Human Bondage in the Early Anglo-Atlantic World,” in *Invisioning and English Empire: Jamestown and the Making of the North Atlantic World*, Robert Appelbaum and John Wood Sweet, eds. (Philadelphia, 2005), 236–253. On English slaves in the Mediterranean world, see Nabil Matar, *Turks, Moors, and Englishmen in the Age of Discovery* (New York, 1999), esp. 71–81.

25. *The Holy Bull and Crusado of Rome* (London, 1588), cited in Hillgarth, *The Mirror of Spain*, 384.
26. *Calender of State Papers: Spain (Elizabeth)*, 4 vols. (London, 1892–1899), 2:535–8; “The Primrose Journal,” in Mary Frear Keeler, ed., *Sir Francis Drake’s West Indian Voyage, 1585–86* (London, 1981), 199; Samuel Purchas, *Hakluytus Posthumous, or Purchas His Pilgrimes*, 20 vols. (Glasgow, 1905), 19:295–6.
27. Lauber, *Indian Slavery in Colonial Times*, 212. The Powhatan perspective on these issues is treated by Helen Rountree, *Pocahontas’s People: The Powhatan Indians of Virginia through Four Centuries* (Norman, 1990). A number of instructive sources concerning the Anglo-Indian *detente* after 1646 are reprinted in Warren M. Billings, ed., *The Old Dominion in the Seventeenth Century: A Documentary History of Virginia, 1606–1689* (Chapel Hill, 1975), 226–32.
28. William Waller Hening, ed., *The Statutes at Large, being a collection of all the Laws of Virginia*, 18 vols. (Richmond, 1809), 1:396, 2:143, 404, 440. On Bacon’s Rebellion, see Morgan, *American Slavery, American Freedom*, 250–79.
29. Even John Smith, who otherwise had little room for a generous attitude toward the natives and regularly applauded Spain, sounded a regretful tone when he recalled that Thomas Hunt had “abused the Salvages . . . and betrayed twenty seven of these poore innocent soules, which he sould in Spaine for slaves.” Smith, “A Description of New England,” in Barbour, ed, *The Complete Works of Captain John Smith*, 1:352.
30. Richard Blome, *A Description of the Island of Jamaica . . .* (London, 1672), 52; *A Declaration of His Highnes, By the Advice of His Council; Setting forth . . . the Justice of their Cause against Spaine* (London, 1655), 138–9.
31. On the events of 1622, see Alden T. Vaughan, “‘Expulsion of the Salvages’: English Policy and the Virginia Massacre of 1622,” *William and Mary Quarterly* 35:1 (1978): 57–84, and J. Frederick Fausz, “George Thorpe, Nemattenew, and the Powhatan Uprising of 1622,” *Virginia Calvacade* 28:3 (1970): 110–117.
32. Kingsbury, *Records of the Virginia Company of London*, 3:557–8, 672. On the Spanish debates concerning slavery and the nature of Indians, see Anthony Pagden, *The Fall of Natural Man: The American Indian and the Origins of Comparative Ethnology* (Cambridge, UK, 1982).
33. In so doing, Spanish precedents came to be viewed as more worthy of emulation. The broader issue of the relationship between Anglo-Virginia colonialism and information derived from Spanish precedents is the subject of April Lee Hatfield, “Spanish Colonization Literature, Powhatan Geographies, and English Perceptions of Tsenacommacah/Virginia,” *Journal of Southern History* 69:2 (2003): 245–82.
34. Kingsbury, *Records of the Virginia Company*, 3:558–9, 706, 4:58.
35. Kingsbury, *Records of the Virginia Company*, 3:672.
36. “Virginias Verger,” in Purchas, *Hakluytus Posthumous*, 19:246; Kingsbury, *Records of the Virginia Company* 3:706.
37. Kingsbury, *Records of the Virginia Company*, 2:397, 3:552.

38. *The Planters Plea, Or the Grounds of Plantations Examined, And usuall Objections answered* (London, 1630), in Peter Force, *Tracts and Other Papers*, 4 vols. (Washington, D.C., 1836–47), vol. 2.
39. Jill Lepore, in a generally excellent treatment of the issue of Indian slavery in the context of King Philip's War, notes that the enslavement of Indians in the wake of that conflict was yet another "critical step in the evolution toward an increasingly racialized ideology of the differences between Europeans and Indians." She is surely correct, but it should be noted that this was an ongoing struggle throughout the seventeenth century and would not be resolved for several more generations. Lepore, *The Name of War: King Philip's War and the Origins of American Identity* (New York, 1998), 166.
40. The use of Oviedo to demean Indians was, in reality, quite a significant departure from the prevailing trends in English publishing, where more favorable sources like Las Casas and José de Acosta were more well known. Oviedo, for example, has only been translated into English in the twentieth century, while both Las Casas and Acosta were printed in English in 1583 and 1604 respectively. Moreover, Acosta was clearly central to Purchas' collections, whereas only "Extracts" concerning the physical landscape were translated and reprinted from Oviedo. See C.R. Steele, "Latin America," in *The Purchas Handbook*, 2 vols., L.E. Pennington, ed. (London, 1997), 1:303. Gonzalo Fernández de Oviedo y Valdés, *Natural History of the West Indies*, Sterling A. Stoudemire, ed. (Chapel Hill, 1959); José de Acosta, *The Natural & Moral History of the Indies*, Edward Grimston, trans. (London, 1604).
41. Kingsbury, *Records of the Virginia Company*, 3:562; Eliot to Richard Baxter, 7 Oct. 1657, cited in Michael Leroy Oberg, *Dominion and Civility: English Imperialism and Native America, 1585–1685* (Ithaca, 1999), 126.
42. Kupperman, *Providence Island*, 166–7.
43. *Records of the Governor and Company of the Massachusetts Bay in New England*, 5 vols., Nathaniel B. Shurtleff, ed. (Boston, 1853–54), 1:83, 394.
44. *True Declaration of the Estate of the Colonie in Virginia* (London, 1610), in Force, *Tracts*, 3:1.
45. *New Englands First Fruits*, 3; Mason cited in Fickes, "'They Could Not Endure That Yoke'," 73–74.
46. Morgan Godwyn, *The Negro's and Indians Advocate* (London, 1680), 36. Godwyn's concerns about the plight of Africans and Indians is treated more fully in Alden T. Vaughan, "Slaveholders' 'Hellish Principles': A Seventeenth-Century Critique," in *Roots of American Racism*, 55–81.
47. Games, "'The Sanctuarye of our rebell negroes,'" 7. On the significance of the use of the word "negro" in the colonial era, see Jack D. Forbes, *Africans and Native Americans: The Language of Race and the Evolution of Red-Black Peoples*, 2nd ed. (Urbana, IL, 1993). The literature on European conceptions of cannibalism is rich, but for a suggestive analysis see Peter Hulme, *Colonial Encounters: Europeans and the Native Caribbean, 1492–1797* (London, 1986), esp. ch. 1: "Columbus and the cannibals" (13–42). On the tension between English conceptions of civility in the New World and cannibalism, see Michael Zuckerman, "Identity in British America: Unease in Eden," in Nicholas Canny & Anthony Pagden, eds., *Colonial Identity in the Atlantic World, 1500–1800* (Princeton, 1987), esp. pp. 143–57.

48. J.H. Lefroy, *Memorials of the Discovery and Early Settlement of the Bermudas or Somers Islands*, 2 vols. (1879; reprint, Toronto, 1981), 1:698, 700.
49. Moore, *Notes on the History of Slavery in Massachusetts*, 2, 3. The Narragansett and Mohegan perspective on this subject is considered in Michael Leroy Oberg, *Uncas: First of the Mohegans* (Ithaca, 2003), 72.
50. Kingsbury, *Records of the Virginia Company*, 3:69, 93 (2).
51. *Bermuda Colonial Records* (microfilm), 3:63–4.
52. Barbour, ed., *The Complete Works of Captain John Smith*, 2:268; *Calendar of State Papers: Colonial Series*, 40 vols. (London: 1860–1939), 2:28–9 (12 April 1622); *The Rich Papers: Letters from Bermuda, 1615–1646*, Vernon A. Ives, ed. (Toronto, 1984), 237–9.
53. *Records of the Governor and Company of the Massachusetts Bay in New England*, 5 vols., Nathaniel B. Shurtleff, ed. (Boston, 1853–54), 1:246, 269 (Andrews). Other cases appear at 1:284, 297, 300, and 2:21, and *Records of the Court of Assistants of the Colony of Massachusetts Bay, 1630–1692*, 3 vols., John Noble and John F. Cronin, eds. (Boston, 1901–28), 2:78–9 (3), 86, 87, 90, 94, 97, 118 (2).
54. *Book of General Lawes and Libertyes Concerning the Inhabitants of the Massachusetts* (facsimile reprint of the 1648 ed.; San Marino, CA: Huntington Library, 1975), 4.
55. European observers, when it suited their needs, also commented upon the existence of human bondage among the English. The Spanish Ambassador to England, Don Diego de Molina, highlighted the instability in early Virginia when he reported to Don Alonso de Velasco in 1613 that the English were not only struggling to maintain a settlement, but also that many settlers believed they were “treated like slaves, with great cruelty.” A half-century later, Peter Stuyvesant reported that the Dutch settlers at New Amstel (Delaware) had been “stripped, utterly plundered and many of them sold as slaves to Virginia” by callous English invaders. Alexander Brown, *Genesis of the United States*, 2 vols. (New York, 1890), 2:648; Peter Stuyvesant, “Report on the Surrender of New Netherland, 1665,” in *Narratives of New Netherland, 1609–1664*, J. Franklin Jameson, ed. (New York, 1909), 465. On the changing fortunes of Spain and England in Dutch writings, see Schmidt, *Innocence Abroad*, 298–303.
56. *Commons Debates 1621*, 7 vols., Wallace Notestein, Frances Helen Relf, and Hartley Simpson, eds. (New Haven, 1935, 7:54–55).
57. Sir Henry Mainwaring, “Of the Beginnings, Practices, and Suppression of Pirates,” in *The Life and Works of Sir Henry Mainwaring*, 2 vols., G.E. Manwaring and W.G. Perrin, eds. (London, 1922), 2:42.
58. *The Naval Tracts of Sir William Monson*, 5 vols., M. Oppenheim, ed. (London, 1913), 4:107–09. The shorn head of slaves was a common feature of most early modern slave societies. Orlando Patterson, *Slavery and Social Death: A Comparative Study* (Cambridge, MA, 1982), suggests that not only has hair, or lack thereof, been singularly important in setting slaves apart in all slave societies, but also that the shorn beard was a symbol of castration (60).
59. “Discours of the Turkes by Sir Thomas Sherley,” E. Denison Ross, ed. (ca. 1607), in *Camden Miscellany*, XVI, 3rd series, 52 (London, 1936), 10–11.

60. Alden Vaughan, "Sir Walter Raleigh's Indian Interpreters, 1584–1618," *William and Mary Quarterly* 59:2 (April 2002): 341–76. Lauber, *Indian Slavery in Colonial Times*, 157–9.
61. Similar proposals, however, would continue to emerge in the British Isles for several more generations. See Michal J. Rozbicki, "To Save Them from Themselves: Proposals to Enslave the British Poor, 1698–1755," *Slavery & Abolition* 22:2 (August 2001): 29–50.
62. See especially, Peter Wood, *Black Majority: Negroes in Colonial South Carolina from 1670 through the Stono Rebellion* (New York, 1975), 37–42, and Gallay, *The Indian Slave Trade*.
63. Lefroy, *Memorials*, 2:54–5, 154–5; V.T. Harlow, ed., *Colonising Expeditions to the West Indies and Guiana, 1623–1667* (London, 1925), 30, 32, 37–8. Brief mention and the context of the Barbados Indians can be found in Richard S. Dunn, *Sugar and Slaves: The Rise of the Planter Class in the English West Indies, 1624–1713* (Chapel Hill, 1972), 227.
64. The exception to this rule occurred when slaveowners purposely characterized all their bondmen as "negroes," perhaps in an effort to evade the greater opposition to Indian as opposed to African slavery. This occurred in sixteenth-century Spanish America, where the enslavement of indigenous peoples was condemned by the papal bull *Veritas Ipsa* in 1537, and generally prohibited after the promulgation of the New Laws in 1542. Indian slavery was outlawed in Brazil in 1570.
65. Richard Ligon, *A True & Exact History of the Island of Barbadoes* (London, 1673), 54; John Smith, *A Map of Virginia* (Oxford, 1612), cited in Billings, ed., *The Old Dominion in the Seventeenth Century*, 214. The ever-expanding slave population and the increasing significance of marronage would, by the last half of the century, reorient English apprehension in the general direction of their African slaves.