VIOLENT IDENTITY: ELITE MANHOOD AND POWER IN EARLY BARBADOS

_____

A Dissertation

Presented to

The Faculty of the Department

of History

University of Houston

_____

In Partial Fulfillment

Of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

_____

By

Eric J. McDonald

August, 2019

VIOLENT IDENTITY: ELITE MANHOOD AND POWER IN EARLY BARBADOS

_____
Eric J. McDonald

APPROVED:

_____
Todd Romero, Ph.D.
Committee Chair

_____
Matthew Clavin, Ph.D.

_____
Catherine Patterson, Ph.D.

_____
David Ryden, Ph.D.
University of Houston-Downtown

_____
Antonio D. Tillis, Ph.D.
Dean, College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences
Department of Hispanic Studies

VIOLENT IDENTITY: ELITE MANHOOD AND POWER IN EARLY BARBADOS

_____

An Abstract of a Dissertation

Presented to

The Faculty of the Department

of History

University of Houston

_____

In Partial Fulfillment

Of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

_____

By

Eric J. McDonald

August, 2019

ABSTRACT

“Violent Identity: Elite Manhood and Power in Early Barbados” demonstrates that gender is essential to understanding Anglo-American colonialism and plantation slavery. Throughout the seventeenth century, manhood shaped and supported Barbadian planters' strategies for achieving and maintaining power. Violence proved key to performing masculinity. It achieved manly ideals like bravery, valor, duty, and fortitude. Possessing such traits buttressed planter superiority over servants, slaves, and women, while justifying the physical tools used to maintain their authority. Elite Barbadian manhood evolved over the first fifty years of settlement. However, violence remained fundamental to masculinity and power throughout the period. It became part of a unique Atlantic identity and permeated island life for all the island's inhabitants. “Violent Identity” broadens our understanding of the way that gender supported Anglo-American slavery. The study builds on a growing scholarship of gender and violence within early American systems of power. Going beyond the master-slave relationship, this work explains how manhood and violence were foundational to the entire colonial project. A violent masculinity guided planter interactions with the metropole and subject groups from Indians to Africans and the Irish. It helped forge colonial legal and economic institutions, including slavery. Scholars have long demonstrated that Barbados was a world of systemic violence. Rather than just an outgrowth of race and economics, however, this dissertation argues that such violence stemmed from an adapted English manhood.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction

In the 1650s, Richard Ligon reflected on his time as part-owner of a sugar plantation in Barbados. In his *True and Exact History of the Island of Barbados,* he described the hard, tedious lives of servants and slaves on the island. A "bell" rang them to "work, at six a clock in the morning, with a severe Overseer to Command them." Five hours later, they "are set to dinner," a meager affair of local roots and liquor made from sweet potatoes. "At one a clock, they are rung out again to the field, there to work till six." Living conditions, Ligon continued, were harsh. "If it chance to rain, and wet them through, they have no shift, but must lie so all night. If they be not strong men, this ill lodging will put them into a sicknesse," he explained. Pitiless disciplinary practices compounded the misery. "If they complain, they are beaten by the Overseer; if they resist, their time is doubled." Above all, Ligon's account highlights the extraordinary violence that planters in Barbados relied on to subjugate servants and slaves. He professed, for instance, to "have seen an Overseer beat a Servant with a cane about the head, till the blood has followed, for a fault that is not worth the speaking of; and yet he must have patience, or worse will follow." Ligon struggled to reconcile the excessive use of physical punishments, especially against whites, lamenting "truly, I have seen such cruelty done to Servants, as I did not think one Christian could have done to another."[1]

Where Ligon seemed unable to account for the brutality of his countrymen and coreligionists, scholars have long pointed to a cold drive for economic efficiency as the root of the extreme violence that imbued the island. Hilary Beckles recently put it

[1] Richard Ligon, *A True and Exact History of the Island of Barbados* (Originally published 1657), ed. Karen Ordahl Kupperman (Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing, 2011), 94.

succinctly, saying that "market thinking and actions transcended pedagogies of social restraint and respect for traditions of human relations." He added that "the entire legal, moral and social fabric of the colony was forged around quenching a thirst for quick profit without moral reflection." He echoed other historians of Barbados like Richard Dunn. Wider studies of Atlantic slavery likewise affirm that the particularly violent nature of the practice in Anglo-America stemmed from economic drive and a proto-capitalist mentality, first expressed in Barbados. Distance from the homeland and a desire for wealth forged a place of extraordinary oppression and exploitation. A "petty aristocratic" planter class rose to wealth and power, reaping all the benefit of this society. Once established, they left the island to live on estates in England, abandoning their plantations to be run by often even crueler overseers, described by one observe as "drunken, unreasonable and savage." Efficiency was their primary concern. In the meantime, the colony came to rely on black slave labor and white supremacist ideas, which further unshackled whatever limits existed on violence.[2]

---

[2] Hilary Beckles, *The First Black Slave Society: Britain's Barbarity Time in Barbados* (Cave Hill: The University of West Indies Press, 2016), 5. On the "aristocratic" nature of the planters see Richard Dunn, *Sugar and Slaves: The Rise of the Planter Class in the English West Indies, 1624-1713* (Chapel Hill, N.C.: Published for the Institute of Early American History and Culture at Williamsburg, Va. by the University of North Carolina Press, 1972); Natalie Zecek, *Settler Society in the English Leeward Islands, 1670-1776* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010). For histories that emphasize the economics of slavery see Sidney Mintz, *Sweetness and Power: The Place of Sugar in Modern History* (New York: Penguin Books, 1986); David Elits, *The Rise of African Slavery in the Americas* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1999). See also David Eltis, Frank D. Lewis and Kenneth L. Sokoloff, eds., *Slavery in the Development of the Americas* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004). For more economic studies of slavery in the Caribbean see Richard B. Sheridan: *An Economic History of the British West Indies, 1623-1775* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1973); B.W. Higman, "Population and Labor in the British Caribbean in the Early Nineteenth Century," in *Long-Term Factors in American Economic Growth,* eds. Stanley L. Engerman and Robert E. Gallman (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986), 605-640; John McCusker and Russell R. Menard, eds. *The Economy of British America, 1607-1789* (Chapel Hill, North Carolina: University of North Carolina Press, 1985). For more recent work that takes up the debates of slavery's connection to the creation of capitalist markets see Robin Blackburn, *The Making of New World Slavery: From the Baroque to the Modern, 1492-1800* (New York: Verso, 1997) and Swelwyn H. Carrington, *The Sugar*

"Violent Identity: Elite Manhood and Power in Early Barbados" argues that masculinity also had a vital role in producing the systemic violence of the island. Planter manhood formed the basis of power in the early colonial period (ca. 1627-1680). It legitimized elite male authority, while justifying and encouraging the physical tools used to maintain it. Wealth may have been the goal, but gender ideals ensured the central place of violence in its pursuit. In addition to advancing economic aims, violence fulfilled crucial aspects of planter masculinity. While Ligon could not countenance the punishments he witnessed, other planters rooted such violence to patriarchal duty. Physical punishment stemmed from the rights of elite, landowning men. Perpetrated against English, Scottish, and Irish servants, as well as African slaves, elite men's masculine violence transcended racial, religious, and geographic identity. Planter manhood promoted and defended otherwise excessive physical discipline against subordinate groups. It encouraged elite, male involvement in martial and other honorific violence. As the planters built legal and political structures, masculinity proved foundational to these institutions' development. In the process, an exceptionally violent

---

Industry and the Abolition of the Slave Trade, 1775-1810 (Gainesville, FL: University of Florida Press, 2002). For histories that illuminate the extraordinary violence of the early-modern Atlantic see Kathleen M. Brown, *Good Wives, Nasty Wenches and Anxious Patriarchs: Gender, Race, and Power in Colonial Virginia* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996); John Navin, "Intimidation, Violence, and Race in British America," *The Historian* 77, no. 3 (Fall 2015): 464-497; Bernard Bailyn, *The Barbarous Years: The Peopling of British North America* (New York: Vintage, 2013); Hilary Beckles, *The First Black Slave Society: Britain's Barbarity Time in Barbados* (Cave Hill: The University of West Indies Press, 2016); Gerald Horne, *The Apocalypse of Settler Colonialism: The Roots of Slavery, White Supremacy, and Capitalism in 17th Century North America and the Caribbean* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 2018); Vincent Brown, *The Reaper's Garden: Death and Power in the World of Atlantic Slavery* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2008); Christine Daniels and M. Kennedy, eds., *Over the threshold: Intimate Violence in Early America* (New York: Routledge, 2013). Quote on overseers is in Jack P. Greene, "Changing Identity in the British Caribbean: Barbados as a Case Study," in *Colonial Identity in the Atlantic World, 1500-1800* ed. Nicholas Canny and Anthony Pagden (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1987), 237.

manhood shaped the course of the island's history and became essential to a distinct, colonial identity.

Scholarship on the Anglo-Caribbean has demonstrated the central place of gender in supporting the power structures of slavery. Beckles, for instance, explained that planters in Barbados actively subordinated the manhood of slaves as part of the "conquest and control of the black male body." Eudine Barriteau, Aviston Downes, Trevor Burnard, and others have added to a sense of the way gender buttressed "practices of power." For Barriteau, the "oppressive power" found in the Anglophone Caribbean is "inscribed in the rituals and practices of gendered relations." Both master and slave experienced their gendered identity through their relative place within the social structure. Additionally, scholars like Sharon Block and Maria Fuentes have shown gendered violence to be central to systems of slavery. For example, regular sexual assault asserted a particularly brutal patriarchal authority.[3]

This dissertation builds on these works by broadening our understanding of the way that gender buttressed planter power beyond the master-slave relationship. A violent, elite planter manhood became foundational, not only to practices of slavery, but the entire colonial project. The planters asserted a right to rule through adapted

[3] Hilary Beckles, "Black Masculinity in Caribbean Slavery," in *Interrogation Caribbean Masculinities: Theoretical and Empirical Analyses*, ed. Rhoda E. Reddock (Kingston: University of West Indies Pres, 2004), 229. As Beckles argues, "the control of the enslaved required" a "complex apparatus for the ideological representation of black men." It was a system that "privileged the apparatus of mind power over body." Eudine Barriteau, *Confronting Power, Theorizing Gender: Interdisciplinary Perspectives in the Caribbean* (Cave Hill: University of the West Indies Press, 2003), 4-5; Aviston Downes, "Constructing Brotherhood: Fraternal Organisations and Masculinities in Colonial Barbados since 1740," in *Love and Power*, ed. Eudine Barriteau (Kingston: University of West Indies Press, 2012); Trevor Burnard, *Mastery, Tyranny, and Desire: Thomas Thistlewood and His Slaves in the Anglo-Jamaican World* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2004); Sharon Block, *Rape and Sexual Power in Early America* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2006); Maria Fuentes, *Dispossessed Lives: Enslaved Women, Violence, and the Archive* (Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2016).

English conceptions of masculinity. Claims to masculine superiority formed the root of their special rights and privileges in contrast to other groups. Often violent performances of manhood legitimized and protected power. Manly ideas, centering on violence, profoundly shaped legal, social, and economic structures. Manhood intoned planter interactions with servants, African and Indian slaves, white women, and poor freeholders on the island, as well as metropolitan visitors and the English Government.[4]

Elite, male planters relied on various types of violence to perform manhood and advance power. Through martial violence they demonstrated valor and masculine bravery against foreign foes. The militia deterred insurrection and otherwise kept order violently. Judicial violence directed through the island's courts and legal system projected terror by hangings, whippings, and, for particularly serious offenses, burning the condemned alive. Honorific violence to defend reputations or pursue individual goals, meanwhile, pitted planters against one another, resulting in occasional duels and murder. Patriarchal violence sought control in the extended household and included regular whippings or beatings by masters or overseers. Importantly, all types of planter violence projected patriarchal supremacy over servants, slaves, women, and children. Achieving manhood through violence also served as the basis to claim standing in the wider Atlantic World.[5]

---

[4] For the origins of thinking about gender as "legitimizing dominance" see Joan Wallach Scott, "Gender a Useful Category of Historical Analysis," *The American Historical Review* 91, no. 5 (1986): 1053-1075. See also, Joan Scott, *Gender and the Politics of History* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1988). The language of gender performance can be attributed to Judith Butler, *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity* (New York: Routledge, 1990).

[5] For extensive studies on patriarchal or "intimate violence" see Daniels and Kennedy, *Over the Threshold*. For duels, male honor, and social position see Cynthia Herrup, "'To Pluck Bright Honour from the Pale-Faced Moon': Gender and Honour in the Castlehaven Story," *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*

Manly ideals, attained through violence, supported and justified the planters' exclusive claim on power. By advancing gendered expectations for behavior, elite men steered members of the group toward activities that buttressed their collective and individual interests. In the process, they created what gender theorists refer to as a "normative manhood" that makes elite male dominance appear natural. For example, the high value placed on bravery helped promote effective militia service. Enthusiastic participation and leadership from elite men promoted social stability and the physical control of the master class. Martial violence also served as the most dramatic means to display masculine cultural ideals like loyalty, courage, and fortitude. In turn, these qualities spoke to the planters' worth as men and, therefore, fitness to rule. It became foundational to their efforts to negotiate autonomy with the metropole. Corporal punishment in the home, meanwhile, protected the social order atop which the planters sat. It also fulfilled the masculine duty to keep order over the household. Again, such efforts pointed to the manly quality of landed men and their suitability to power. Violence had a central role in elite Barbadian efforts to achieve masculinity and, thereby, legitimize and safeguard their authority.[6]

Vol. 6 (1996): 137-159; Mervyn James, "English Politics and the Concept of Honor," in *Society, Politics, and Culture*, ed. Mervyn James (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1986); Peter Spierenburg, *Men and Violence: Gender, Honor, and Rituals in Modern Europe and America* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1998); Ute Fevert, *Men of Honour: A Social and Cultural History of the Duel* (New York: Wiley, 2005), 39. See also Heather Kiernan, *The Duel in European History: Honour and the Reign of Aristocracy* (London: Oxford University Press, 1988); Jennifer Low, *Manhood and the Duel: Masculinity in Early Modern Drama and Culture* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003).

[6] For theoretical explorations of the "experience" of masculinity and creating "normative manhood" through "cultural codes" in the early modern world and uncovering it through "relations of power" see Karen Harvey and Alexandra Shepard, "What have Historians done with Masculinity? Reflections on Five Centuries of British History, circa 1500–1950," *Journal of British Studies* 44, no. 2 (2005): 274-80; John Tosh, "What Should Historians do with Masculinity," *History Workshop*, 38 (2004): 179-202; John Tosh, "Hegemonic Masculinity and Gender History," in *Masculinities in Politics and War: Gendering Modern*

The planters' conception of proper manhood and its benefit to elite, male power reflected their English heritage. To start, Barbadian planters brought English understandings that landownership spoke to masculine worth. Englishmen connected land to economic independence and male "competency." The basis of the planters' presumed superiority over servants and slaves rested in the possession of estates. From there, it was the landed man's duty to keep order in the home and his wider community. Militia participation and control of one's extended family, including servants, achieved manhood and spoke to the individual's quality. It also ensured a static social order through the consistent projection of elite, male authority. The English accepted violence as fundamental to this process. Martial prowess or bravery, meanwhile, proved a vivid way to claim masculinity in the English World. A willingness to sacrifice one's body for higher ideals like liberty or nation, especially, spoke to one's manhood and fitness to lead. In sum, masculine reputation was important for a man's social standing and access to political power in English culture. The planters rooted their authority and access to violence in understandings of their homeland.[7]

History, eds. Stefan Dudink, Harden Hagemann, and John Tosh (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2004), 52; J.H. Arnold and S. Brady, eds., *What is Masculinity: Historical Dynamics from Antiquity to the Contemporary World* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011). For contemporary English manhood see Alexandra Shepard, *Meanings of Manhood in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003); Elizabeth Foyster, *Manhood in Early Modern England: Honour, Sex and Marriage* (New York: Routledge Press, 1999).

[7] Ann Hughes, *Gender and the English Revolution* (London: Routledge, 2012). Christopher Fletcher, "The Whig Interpretation of Masculinity? Honour and Sexuality in Late Medieval Manhood," in *What is Masculinity?,* 61–62; Elizabeth Foyster, *Manhood in Early Modern England*; Jennifer Low, *Manhood and the Duel*; Alexandra Shepard, *Accounting for Oneself: Worth, Status, and the Social Order in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015); Peter Spierenburg, *Men and Violence: Gender, Honor, and Rituals in Modern Europe and America* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1998); Susan Amussen, *An Ordered Society: Gender and Class in Early Modern England* (New York: B. Blackwell, 1988); Henry French and Mark Rothery, *Man's Estate: Landed Gentry Masculinities, 1660-1900* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012); Cynthia Herrup, "'To Pluck Bright Honour'," 159; Mervyn James, "English

Despite English origins, the planters' efforts to assert their manhood in the colonial Caribbean often placed them at odds with England and became the foundation of a distinct elite planter masculinity. While it supported their power on the island, the Barbadian colonists' particularly violent execution of their manhood helped undermine their position within the expanding empire. Bravery in the militia and control over the household, for instance, served as the basis for planter arguments for political rights and representation. As proper, elite and landowning men, they expected the privileges and political autonomy granted to their English counterparts. However, excesses in violence and, for example, a reputation for drunkenness became the means for London to deny planters the status they craved. Continuing demands for rights and standing as elite men, which the metropole refused them, cemented a colonial identity. It forged an impasse between Crown and colony that proved a defining aspect of the planters' lives and forced them to adjust the meanings of manhood through the course of the seventeenth century. They continued to mimic England's gentry, but their masculinity manifested in unique ways that drove them apart.[8]

The early-modern Caribbean context helped shape elite masculinity in Barbados into something distinct (and distinctly violent). The planters' distance from home and family conflated anxieties caused by the unstable demographic conditions of a slave majority. A lack of outside regulation and oversight, at least early on, also removed

---

Politics and the Concept of Honor," 312; Carole Shammas, *A History of Household Government in America* (Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia Press, 2002).

[8] On the metropole coming to bear more heavily in Barbadian life see Gary A. Puckrein, *Little England: Plantation Society and Anglo-Barbadian politics, 1627-1700* (New York: New York University Press, 1984); Larry Gragg, *Englishmen transplanted: the English colonization of Barbados, 1627-1660* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003); Sara Barber, *Disputatious Caribbean: The West Indies in the Seventeenth Century* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014).

scrutiny on acceptable behavior. It meant that stabilizing social support systems would have to be created from scratch. Wildly speculative, but potentially extraordinary economic prospects and fear about foreign invasion added to this mix. In a vacuum of formal power, the planters enforced masculine behaviors they felt would best deal with an uncertain world. As James Messerschmidt argued, the "more intimidating" a situation is for "affirming masculinity," the more likely violence is to be invoked as a way of "distinguishing" masculinities from one another.[9] In the end, a singular context meshed with colonial goals and English culture to facilitate the creation of a unique Barbadian manhood that relied on violence.

Methodology

Sociologist R.W. Connell's construct of "hegemonic masculinity" (or what Alexandra Shepard modified to "patriarchal manhood" for the early modern context) best explains the process by which the planters took up cultural ideals (or "codes") of manhood in support of their power.[10] Hegemonic masculinity imposes an ostensibly natural, standardized model of manhood or manliness. The concept reflects the reality that men "are positioned differently throughout society" and benefit from patriarchy in unequal ways. It refers specifically to the powerful implications of a "normative

---

[9] James W. Messerschmidt, "Men Victimizing Men: The Case of Lynching, 1865-1900," in *Masculinities and Violence*, ed. Lee H. Bowker (London: Sage Publications, 1998), 131. For another example, see Jenifer Banks, "'A New Home' for Whom?: Caroline Kirkland Exposes Domestic Abuse on the Michigan Frontier," in *Over the Threshold*, 135–147.

[10] Alexandra Shepard, **"**From Anxious Patriarchs to Refined Gentlemen? Manhood in Britain, circa 1500-1700," *Journal of British Studies*, 44, no. 2 (2005): 291. On the origins and original intent and limitations of hegemonic masculinity as a concept see John Tosh, "Hegemonic Masculinity and Gender History," 48. R.W. Connell, *Masculinities* (Cambridge: Blackwell Publishers, 1995); R.W. Connell and James W. Messerschmidt, "Hegemonic Masculinity: Rethinking the Concept," *Gender & Society* 19, no. 2 (2005): 829 - 859.

manhood" that subjugates "lesser masculinities" and femininities. All others are measured against it and subordinated. For Barbados, the term's greatest worth is that it demarcates "the masculine norms and practices which are most valued by the politically dominant class and which help to maintain its authority." Elite men enact patriarchal manhood when they perform behaviors according to gendered cultural codes that support patriarchy but, specifically, the patriarchy of elite men. Taking a cue from historian John Tosh, rather than thinking about hegemonic masculinity as a "blanket term to refer to the gender norms to which most men subscribe," it is a tool for exploring how elite men thought about and justified their authority – over women and subordinate men.[11]

Achieving what this dissertation refers to as "patriarchal manhood" helped elite men in Barbados claim authority over other groups and support political aspirations. They legitimized supremacy by laying claim to ideals of masculinity. The planters emphasized bravery, loyalty, duty, good order, fortitude, courage, and generosity. They performed these traits, which attested to their superior manhood and differentiated them from "lesser" men. Elite Barbadian males also undermined competing claims to power by ascribing women, servants, and slaves with inferior qualities. They pointed to the ways that these groups threatened order, demanding patriarchal oversight. Servants lacked loyalty and "innate courage." Slaves were not "bold enough." Both groups were

[11] John Tosh, "Hegemonic Masculinity and the History of Gender," 41-56. Also quoted in Karen Harvey and Alexandra Shepard, "What Have Historians Done with Masculinity?," 278. For an overview of the uses and issues with hegemonic masculinity as a methodological construct, as well as gender in general, see Tosh, "Hegemonic Masculinity;" Connell, *Gender and Power: Society, the Person and Sexual Politics* (Palo Alto: Stanford University Press, 1987); French and Rothery, "Hegemonic Masculinities?: Assessing change and processes of change in elite masculinity, 1700 – 1900," in *What is Masculinity,* 139-66.

without honor. Enforcing gender ideals in this way advanced a "normative manhood," possessed by wealth, landowning men and denied to others. As scholars of gender have long contended, such gender norms legitimize patriarchal domination. Patriarchal manhood focuses specifically on the way that those ideals supported the dominance of certain men over subordinate males and women.[12]

The characteristics that made up patriarchal manhood encouraged behaviors that advanced the interests of elite men. The planters, conversely, belittled and restricted those actions or qualities that undermined their power. For instance, giving reverence and financial reward to those that sacrificed their bodies in battle pushed island men, rich and poor, to perform military responsibilities in ways that helped the planters defeat their enemies and secure control of the island. In contrast, the island's leaders punished or cast out those military officers that failed to demonstrate sufficient bravery. Elite Barbadian men thus made martial valor a part of their patriarchal manhood. The planters permitted only those actions that supported their authority and punished or condemned those that did not. In the process, they created a construct of "proper" manhood that defined worth and status.[13]

---

[12] Though they did not always do so explicitly, elite Barbadians associated themselves with culturally-normative masculine characteristics. As Scott pointed out decades ago, "attention to gender is often not explicit, but it is nonetheless a crucial part of the organization of equality or inequality." Joan Wallach Scott, *Gender and the Politics of History*, 48. John Tosh, "Hegemonic Masculinity and the History of Gender," 41-56. Quotes are in reference to TNA, CO 31/2, pp. 26-30 and Richard Ligon, *A True and Exact History*, 97. R. W. Connell, *Gender and Power.*

[13] Joan Wallach Scott, "Gender A Useful Category of Historical Analysis." Richard Ligon, *A True and Exact History*, 97-98. John Tosh, *Manliness and Masculinities in Nineteenth-Century Britain*, 42. Tosh, "What Should Historians do with Masculinity?," 192. See also, R.W. Connell, *Gender and Power*, esp. 183-88; Harry Brod, ed. *The Making of Masculinities* (New York: Routledge, 1987).

The planters similarly regulated slave and servant actions in support of elite male interests. Ligon related the story of a slave named Macaw. Referring to his role as “chief musician” and keeper of the “Plantain-Grove,” Ligon assessed him as an “excellent negro.” A master might reward the obedience of such a “brave fellow” by, for example, allowing him multiple wives. However, when Macaw determined his wife, also a slave, was unfaithful and resolved “to hang her,” Ligon transformed him into an “ignorant” man without “reason.” His inferiority, the author attested, meant that the only way to get through to him was violence. “Threatening,” Ligon observed, “wrought more with him than all the reasons of Philosophy.” Other groups could exercise manhood. Macaw enjoyed some patriarchal privileges as husband. But those in power regimented its meanings and benefits. Macaw could 'be a man' only in ways that served his master's interest. As Beckles has pointed out, slaveholders thus subordinated slave manhood to their own.[14]

The planters also used their position of social and political dominance to strengthen their special status in contrast to other groups. As Connell noted, hegemonic masculinity is inherently political, with gender norms and formal politics acting to reinforce one another. Through their political monopoly, elite men embedded understandings about their 'natural' superiority and exclusive right to power and violence into their institutions. For instance, laws ensured that the government could not restrain any master from violently punishing a servant. But the constable would “severely” penalize any violence “offered” by slaves. Because of their 'superiority',

[14] Richard Ligon, *A True and Exact History*, 97-98. Hilary Beckles, “Black Masculinity in Caribbean Slavery.“

planters claimed a right and duty to physically discipline subordinates. Through such violence they could fulfill the cultural ideal of a well-ordered household. In contrast, slaves could not use violence and could therefore not realize this aspect of masculinity. The restriction was thus practical, it deterred rebellious slaves. But it also reinforced the hierarchy by limiting the ability of subordinate men to perform patriarchal manhood. At various times some planters even used a lack of rebellion among slaves as proof that they lacked manly "boldness." The planters thereby confirmed the inferiority of slaves and other groups, as well as their unfitness for privileges like legal and political rights.[15] The government structure thus strengthened the legitimacy of male, landowner dominance by codifying their superiority and exclusive rights to markers of manhood like violence.

Importantly, "hegemonic masculinity" merely represents an "ideal," sets of standards meant to regulate behavior. Elite men judge and relate to one another through shared understandings of what is normal, but rarely is the goal realized in its totality. Different aspects of masculinity might be emphasized or altered depending on context. As Connell suggested, "everyday masculine practices draw on the cultural ideals of hegemonic masculinity but do not correspond necessarily to actual masculinities as they are lived." Variability does not undermine the importance of identifying masculine culture; but it is necessary to acknowledge that the application and effect of masculine ideals are fluid over both time and setting. The experience of

[15] See Tosh, "Hegemonic Masculinity and the History of Gender," 41-56. Also quoted in Karen Harvey and Alexandra Shepard, "What Have Historians Done with Masculinity?," 278. See also, R. W. Connell, *Gender and Power*: *Society, the Person and Sexual Politics* (Palo Alto: Stanford University Press, 1987). TNA, CO 30/2, pp. 17-18; TNA, CO 29/3, pp. 37. Richard Ligon, *A True and Exact History*, 97.

"being a man," with specific goals and within particular situations, necessarily shapes action. The idea of fluidity becomes especially important for considering how English ideals, when applied in a unique colonial context, gave rise to something new. It explains the evolution of elite Barbadian manhood through the dynamic seventeenth-century and their selective invocation of ideals to serve their interests at a given time.[16]

The behaviors that denoted masculine belonging and power in early Barbados varied over time and according to particular goals. This work will show how events like the English Civil War, Restoration, and Anglo-Dutch Wars moved the planters to disproportionately emphasize ideals like "bravery" or "loyalty." Or, for instance, as the metropole came to bear more heavily on their lives, the planters shifted to less violent displays of masculine superiority like hospitality. Increasing slave populations and the discovery of significant conspiracies in the last quarter of the century, meanwhile, brought more forceful demands for elite males to vigilantly punish subordinates in the extended household. The planters also dropped pretenses to patriarchal restraint in the discipline of slaves. In short, the planters did not abandon the major markers of elite manhood as the world changed around them. Instead, they altered emphasis in ways that strategically positioned them to advance their interests.

Given its fluidity, adequately understanding the role of "hegemonic masculinity" in early Barbados requires, as John Tosh has suggested, exploring how it was

[16] James W. Messerschmidt, "Men Victimizing Men," 131. See the work of David Gilmore on "becoming a man" and male rites of passage. David Gilmore, *Manhood in the Making: Cultural Concepts of Masculinity* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990). See also, Jeff Hearn and David Morgan, eds., *Men, Masculinities and Social Theory* (London: Unwin Hyman, 1990). For more on the psychic impact of slavery and how "infantalization" and "feminization" of male slaves played a role in "an apparatus of power, [which] provided slave owners with several privileges – particularly the psychic courage to manage the colonial enterprise," see Hilary Beckles "Black Masculinity in Caribbean Slavery," 234.

"subjectively experienced" through relations of power. Rather than relying too much on the power of "cultural representation" to explain the role of gender in colonial Barbados, I seek the Barbadian elite's gender identity in moments of interaction and confrontation – when they performed and achieved manhood. In these instances, masculine norms reinforced social structures of difference or "the material basis of power and inequality" (i.e., class, race, age, sexuality) in favor of landowning males. At such times, usually moments of crisis, the gendered cultural language of manhood is most explicitly evoked and adamantly enforced. The planters' masculinity, those manly ideals that they most valued, becomes evident in moments of confrontation, during which they tended to turn to violence.[17]

Violence permeated the planters' efforts to perform their patriarchal manhood. They demanded participation in violent punishments like whippings to keep order on their plantations. They believed that only the fear of violence kept servants and slaves from "all manner of villainy."[18] Particularly in perilous times, like the English Civil War, acts of violence in the militia demonstrated one's worthiness for power through a masculine cultural language of bravery. Physical punishments on private plantations displayed patriarchal control over the household. Public hangings reinforced the broader power structure. Violence created and enforced layered hierarchies in early

---

[17] See Karen Harvey and Alexandra Shepard, "What have Historians done with Masculinity?," 278; John Tosh, "What Should Historians do with Masculinity," *History Workshop*, 38 (2004): 179-202; John Tosh "Hegemonic Masculinity and Gender History," 52; John Arnold and Sean Brady, eds., *What is Masculinity?,* 2-4; Aviston Downes, "Constructing Brotherhood."

[18] Quote is from the Barbados Assembly, TNA, CO 29/4, pp. 8-10. See Chapter Six for more on this subject. See the work of David Gilmore on "becoming a man" and male rites of passage, which entails "doing masculinity." David Gilmore, *Manhood in the Making: Cultural Concepts of Masculinity* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990). See also Jeff Hearn and David Morgan, eds., *Men, Masculinities and Social Theory* (London: Unwin Hyman, 1990).

Barbados, including those of gender and race. Masculine ideals encouraged and justified its regular use. In this way, gender supported planter power in two ways. It helped them legitimize their dominance by establishing a normative masculinity and nurtured the use of physical tools they saw as necessary to keep control.[19] In the process, violence became foundational to the planters' specific masculine identity and imbued life on the island.

Historiography

Over the past few decades, scholars of British America have demonstrated the important role of gender in supporting American slavery. In particular, for Barbados, Hilary Beckles's *Natural Rebels* (1989) and Barbara Bush's *Slave Women in Caribbean Society* (1990) brought to light what Bush referred to as the "invisible black woman." Such work uncovered the particular plight of enslaved women, including the ways that their "sexual function...placed them in a separate category to black men." A broader scholarship has joined their work on enslaved women in America, including Jennifer Morgan's *Laboring Women* (2004), Stephanie Camp's *Closer to Freedom* (2004), and Beckles' *Centering Women* (1999). These studies broadened our understanding of the intersection between gender and power within American slavery. Enslaved black women faced distinct forms of oppression alongside unique opportunities. In the meantime, Kathleen Brown's study, *Good Wives, Nasty Wenches, and Anxious Patriarchs,* (1996) addressed the ways that patriarchy infused systems of power in Colonial America, including labor practices. Most significantly, Brown explained that

[19] For the connection between violence, times of crisis, and violence, see James Messerschmidt, "Men Victimizing Men" and Lee Bowker, *Masculinities and Violence,* 1.

gender and "white women's sexuality were integral to the process of defining race" and were central to the institutionalization of black slavery in colonial Virginia. Collectively, historians have made it difficult to discuss slavery, let alone the power structures that supported it, without considering the ways gender shaped the experience and reinforced slaveholder authority.[20]

A subset of the literature on slavery and gender has focused more explicitly on violence and power in the Caribbean. Trevor Burnard's *Mastery, Tyranny, and Desire*, (2004) for instance, revealed the physical, sexual, and psychological terror involved in asserting a slave-owner's patriarchal authority. The work of Rhoda Reddock has added to a picture of gendered violence as enforcing the oppressiveness of the Caribbean slave regime. Eudine Barriteau, likewise, has established a framework for thinking about the intersection of power and gender in Caribbean slavery more closely. Her efforts uncovered the importance of considering the way that "power relations underwrite and complicate all relations of gender in the Caribbean." She argued that considering gender is to engage with "dimensions of power," in the same way scholars might when

[20] Stephanie Camp, *Closer to Freedom: Enslaved Women and Everyday Resistance in the Plantation South* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press), 2004; Hilary Beckles, *Natural Rebels: A Social History of enslaved Black Women in Barbados* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1989); Hilary Beckles, *Centering Women: Gender Discourses in Caribbean Slavery* (Kingston: Ian Randle Publishers, 1999); Barbara Bush, *Slave Women in Caribbean Society, 1650-1838* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1990); Jennifer Morgan*, Laboring Women: Reproduction and Gender in New World Slavery* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004); Kathleen Brown, *Good Wives, Nasty Wenches, and Anxious Patriarchs*. See also, Sasha Turner, *Contested Bodies: Pregnancy, Childrearing, and Slavery in Jamaica* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2017); Cecily Jones, *Engendering Whiteness: White Women and Colonialism in Barbados and North Carolina, 1627-1865* (New York: Manchester University Press, 2007); Bernard Moitt, *Women and Slavery in the French Antilles, 1635-1848* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 2001); Hilary Beckles, "Sex and Gender in the Historiography of Caribbean Slavery," in *Engendering History: Caribbean Women in Historical Perspective*, eds. V. Shepherd, B. Brereton, and B. Bailey (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 1995), 125-140. For a comprehensive treatment of the literature on women in American slavery see Maria Fuentes, *Dispossessed Lives*, 149-152.

addressing race or class. Beckles, meanwhile, built upon his previous work with the article "Black Masculinity in Caribbean Slavery." (1996) Here he applied "hegemonic masculinity" to study the "multiple masculinities" at play in the eighteenth-century Caribbean. He emphasized the ways that planters subordinated black manhood in support of the power structure. More recently, Maria Fuentes in "Confronting Power and Politics: A Feminist Theorizing of Gender in Commonwealth Caribbean Societies" and *Dispossessed Lives: Enslaved Women, Violence, and the Archive* (2016) has tied together the unique ways that Barbados' patriarchal society oppressed women and spaces where they had "agency." She emphasized the violence that thoroughly infiltrated all systems of power to buttress elite male authority. Thanks to these historians and others, the inextricable relationship between gender, power, race, violence, and slavery has become clearer.[21]

"Violent Identity" builds on the existing scholarship to broaden our understanding of gender's role in supporting systems of power within Anglo-Caribbean slavery. It takes Barriteau's suggestion to explore the intersection of power and gender. However, rather than emphasizing the master-slave relationship, it will explain how manhood shaped systems of power within the colonial project more generally and from the very beginning. This dissertation pursues the origins of patriarchal authority within Caribbean slave societies in the gendered power structures that existed before and outside of racial slavery. Masculinity deeply impacted the planters' institutions,

[21] Trevor Burnard, *Mastery, Tyranny, and Desire*; Rhoda Reddock, ed., *Interrogation Caribbean Masculinities*; Eudine Barriteau, *Love and Power*, 5-6; Hilary Beckles, "Black Masculinity in Caribbean Slavery."

including slavery, but also state structures and relationships with Irish and English servants, Indians, white women, and the metropole. Focusing on English cultural precedent and colonial development, from the founding of Barbados, reveals how the planters adjusted patriarchal manhood to the exigencies of plantation slavery as their world evolved. Doing so will help explain the origins of the masculinity that historians have shown to buttress the brutal regime of terror in the decades that followed. A fuller picture of the patriarchy that supported elite, male power within Anglo-Caribbean slave societies emerges as a result.[22]

Sexual violence is not addressed at length in this study, but its importance to elite male power in the Caribbean has been well established by other scholars. As Sharon Block showed of seventeenth century America, sexual violence within slavery is a tool that asserts patriarchal hegemony. Trevor Burnard described the rape of slaves as affirming a "patriarchy [of] unbridled power" that stood in contrast to English ideologies of "metaphoric fatherhood." Sexual access to female slaves, including those married to other men, served as a way for white planters to claim hegemony through intimate violence. The rape of female slaves seemingly occurred with regularity in early Barbados. Indeed, biracial offspring from the period show that sexual relations between planters and black women were commonplace in the early Caribbean. Yet, a lack of direct evidence reminds us that, as Block noted, though pervasive, rape in the period was mostly invisible. The absence of sexual assault from the record attests to the

[22] Eudine Barriteau, ed. *Love and Power*. See also, E. Barriteau, "Confronting Power and Politics: A Feminist Theorizing of Gender in Commonwealth Caribbean Societies," *Meridians: Feminism, Race, Transnationalism* 3, no. 2 (2003): 57-92. For more on the ways that masculinity (or what it means to "be a man") shapes history see David Gilmore, *Manhood in the Making;* Hearn and Morgan, eds., *Men, Masculinities and Social Theory*.

persistence and effectiveness of patriarchy in the early-modern Atlantic, calling to mind Maria Fuentes' work on enslaved women and the archive. She noted that record keeping itself was a form of male power over Caribbean women, slave and free. The Barbadians of the early period so effectively established their authority that evidence of their villainy is virtually non-existent.[23]

Unfortunately, without sufficient source material to analyze, there is little more this dissertation can to add to the historiography of sexual violence against slaves directly. Without support, it would be difficult to give proper nuance to sexual assaults in early Barbados. The scholars mentioned above and others have done exceptional work on the topic. But they have rightly tended to focus on periods and places for which we have evidence. A lack of sources for seventeenth-century Barbados explains why Fuentes and the others mentioned here were able to address sexual violence of slavery only in the eighteenth century. Hopefully, though, better understanding the roots and pervasiveness of patriarchal authority in the early Caribbean will illuminate how it so successfully suppressed evidence of sexual violence against women. The very absence of any cases of rape from the record, despite its seeming frequency, itself becomes evidence for the effectiveness of the island's system of patriarchy and the planters' acceptance of violence as a normal part of manhood. In any case, the focus here is to outline the other means in which patriarchy asserted power over Barbadian society and set the stage for a world in which serial rape might occur. In the meantime, this work

[23] Maria Fuentes, *Dispossessed Lives*. Quote is from Trevor Burnard, "Domestic Violence in Thomas Thistlewood's Jamaica, 1750-1786," 243. Sharon Block, *Rape and Sexual Power in Early America.* See also Jennifer Morgan*, Laboring Women: Reproduction and Gender in New World Slavery* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004); Natalie Zacek, *Settler Society*; Gwyn Campbell and Elizabeth Elbourne, eds., *Sex, Power, and Slavery* (Athens, OH: Ohio University Press, 2014).

will attempt to highlight myriad ways in which men enforced power over white and enslaved women.

The historiography has long characterized Anglo-American slavery as denoting a particularly dichotomous power relationship. In his 1982 book, *Slavery and Social Death*, Orlando Patterson posited that slavery aims to utterly subordinate an individual to a master. He argued that it resulted in the slave's demise as a social being. He or she could only exist, only function, through the slave-owner. Slavery separates the individual from the role into which he or she was born, which Patterson termed “natal alienation.” Since Patterson's work, scholars have given more nuance to the process by which white men asserted a violent dominance over the enslaved. David Brion Davis' *Inhuman Bondage* (2006) extended Patterson's argument, asserting that American slavery in particular sought the utter dehumanization of enslaved Africans. Stephanie Smallwood's *Saltwater Slavery* (2007) describes the arrival of slaves through the middle passage as a reoccurring, destabilizing force in slaves' lives. Africans in America struggled to reckon with the ongoing process of their forced migration, disrupting their ability to reconstitute their lives and identity. The dehumanizing economic system of Atlantic slavery placed persistent burdens on African slaves' efforts to achieve agency outside of their masters. The lineage of Patterson's concept of “natal alienation” can be traced even to Beckles' work, where he explained how slavery denies male slaves the full expression of their manhood. In sum, Anglo-American slavery represented a singularly oppressive dynamic. Especially as the forces of white supremacy melded with a burgeoning emphasis on capitalist efficiency, slaveholders sought to undermine the

slave's humanity utterly. It was, in the words of Robin Blackburn, “remarkable” in both “scale and destructiveness.” Barbados, in particular, Simon Newman recently reaffirmed, created a radical new system of slavery.[24]

This dissertation seeks to better understand the way that, while singular, New World slavery formed atop an existing language of power. It explains the process by which Barbadian slave-owners adapted English ideals of manhood to support their authority and seemingly extraordinary use of violence. Historians have already established that Barbadians tailored English legal customs to sanction the brutality of the early period. As John Navin argued, the planters adjusted laws over time in response to changed circumstances, which eventually enforced a new racial order. John Smolenski and Thomas Humphrey agreed that laws were central to the social order and protecting the use of violence in colonial America. Susan Amussen, in *Caribbean Exchanges*, (2007) argued for a deeper process. The planters also had to learn to become slaveholders beyond just developing racial ideas and laws. They adjusted legal structures, but also all of their social relationships. They remained English, but slavery

[24] Orlando Patterson, *Slavery and Social Death: A Comparative Study* (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1982). For a more recent treatment of “social death,” see Vincent Brown, “Social Death and Political Life in the Study of Slavery,” *American Historical Review* 114, 5 (December 2009): 1231-1249. Hilary Beckles, *The First Black Slave Society*. Robin Blackburn, *The Making of New World Slavery: from the Baroque to the Modern, 1492–1800* (London: Verso, 1997), 3; David Brion Davis, *Inhuman Bondage: The Rise and Fall of Slavery in the New World* (Oxford, England: Oxford University Press, 2006); Stephanie Smallwood, *Saltwater Slavery: A Middle Passage from Africa to American Diaspora* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2007). See also Simon P. Newman, *A New World of Labor;* Saidiya Hartman, *Scenes of Subjection: Terror, Slavery, and Self-Making in nineteenth-century America*; (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997); Trevor Burnard, *Planters, Merchants, and Slaves: Plantation Societies in British America, 1650-1820* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2015); Betty Wood, *The Origins of American Slavery: Freedom and Bondage in the English Colonies* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1997); Betty Wood, *Slavery in Colonial America, 1619-1776* (Lanham, Maryland: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, 2005); Ira Berlin, *Many Thousands Gone: The First Two Centuries of Slavery in North America* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1998).

made their lives something else entirely.[25] This dissertation adds to our understanding of this split identity. It explains the central role of patriarchal ideas in bridging the gap suggested by Amussen and others between English ways and Caribbean realities.

Like the legislation described by Navin, English manhood supported the planters' power in the unique context of slavery and sugar-planting in the Caribbean. They relied on English ideals like duty, fortitude, and martial honor, which they adapted to their circumstances. In the process, they created something unique – a masculinity rooted in English traditions but expressed in disfigured and especially violent ways. Moreover, Navin asserted that the violence of the Old World "was embodied in colonial laws." However, he added, "physical abuse [in England] was a tool in the hands of men of rank and privilege."[26] To assert a right to patriarchal violence, then, the planters needed to first establish themselves as men of worth. They adjusted English manly ideals to do so. An adapted, elite masculinity legitimized the planters' systems of control, including legislation on slavery, by promoting their fitness to sit atop the social hierarchy in the first place. The extraordinary violence of the early Caribbean, then, grew of an English manhood, tailored to Caribbean circumstances, alongside economic goals and race.

By taking up the study of manhood before the full-fledged adoption of slavery and white supremacist racial ideas, the role of an adapted English patriarchy can be better understood. The literature on gender, slavery, power, and violence, cited above,

---

[25] John Navin, "Intimidation, Violence, and Race in British America" *The Historian* Vol. 77, Issue 3 (fall 2015): 464-497. John Smolenski and Thomas J. Humphrey, eds., *New World Orders: Violence, Sanction, and Authority in the Colonial Americas* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2005); Susan Amussen, *Caribbean Exchanges*: *Slavery and the Transformation of English Society, 1640-1700* (Chapel Hill, N.C.: The University of North Carolina Press, 2007).

[26] John Navin, "Intimidation, Violence, and Race in British America," 464-466.

provides a vivid sense of the workings of gender within Caribbean slavery. However, these works tend to all address the violent patriarchy of the Anglo-Caribbean once slavery is fully-formed in the eighteenth century. The systematic brutality of, for example, Thomas Thistlewood's plantation in Jamaica (seen in Trevor Burnard's work) is emblematic of the eighteenth-century Caribbean. Racial ideas and a practiced indifference toward the suffering of African peoples infused their lives with torture and misery. White supremacy reigned, propped-up by decades of laws and social practices. However, in the early period, racial ideas and legislation had not fully formed. As historians from Richard Dunn and Winthrop Jordan to Michael Guasco, Susan Amussen, and Edward Rugemer have made clear, race developed over time. Simon Newman recently laid out how, in the seventeenth-century, planters in Barbados tended to view all subordinate groups as innately inferior. Meanwhile, laws that advanced a racial hierarchy only began in the 1660s and, even then, did so imprecisely. Historians like Aviston Downes have established the important role gender played in Caribbean hierarchies of the eighteenth century, operating alongside race.[27] A focus on planter

[27] Trevor Burnard, *Mastery, Tyranny, and Desire*; Richard Dunn, *Sugar and Slaves*; Winthrop Jordan, *White over Black: American Attitudes toward the Negro, 1550–1812* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1968); Michael Guasco, *Slaves and Englishmen: Human Bondage in the Early Modern Atlantic World* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2014); Susan Amussen, *Caribbean Exchanges*; HIlary Beckles, *First Black Slave Society*; Edward B. Rugemer, "The Development of Mastery and Race in the Comprehensive Slave Codes of the Greater Caribbean during the Seventeenth Century," *The William and Mary Quarterly* 70, no. 3 (2013): 429-58. See also, Alden T. Vaughan, *Roots of American Racism: Essays on the Colonial Experience* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995). For more on the development of race in American slavery see Gene Dattel, *Cotton and Race in the Making of America: The Human Costs of Economic Power* (Blue Ridge Summit: Ivan R. Dee, 2009); John Sweet, *Bodies Politic: Negotiating Race in the American North, 1730–1830* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2003) and James Stewart, *Venture Smith and the Business of Slavery and Freedom* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2010). For more on the broader systems of power that governed "ordinary lives" in the early Anglo-Caribbean, outside of slavery, and the construction of "otherness" see Jenny Shaw, *Everyday Life in the*

power in the period where race was still forming, though, makes the function and centrality of gender clearer.

"Violent Identity" adds to the historiography of Barbados more generally as well by arguing for the importance of gender in shaping all aspects of colonial life. Since Richard Dunn famously described how the planters in Barbados created what Gary Nash later referred to as a "living hell," scholars have added nuance to our understanding of the formation of the island and its institutions. Gary Puckrein explored the development of a Barbadian political identity that included a fiercely independent streak in *Little England*. (1984) Larry Gragg, similarly, pushed back against the idea that the planters did not seek to create a full society, first in *Englishmen Transplanted* (2003) and then "The Pious and the Profane." (2007) He gave a clearer sense of Barbados' establishment as a colonial and religious project – rather than just an economic mission that descended into a brutal slave regime.[28] This work will highlight how the planters' evolving masculinity directed the processes laid out by these historians toward a violent and anxiety-ridden world. It acknowledges the cultural heritage, outside pressures, and internal struggles involved in forming Barbadian slave-owners' unique patriarchal manhood. Doing so sharpens the image of patriarchy on the island and reveals the essential influence of masculinity on the early colonial period more broadly. For

---

Early English Caribbean: Irish, Africans, and the Construction of Difference (Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 2013).

[28] Quote is from Gary B. Nash, foreword to *Sugar and Slaves: The Rise of the Planter Class in the English West Indies, 1624-1713* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2000), iii. Gary A. Puckrein, *Little England;* Larry Gragg, *Englishmen transplanted: the English colonization of Barbados, 1627-1660* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003); Larry Gragg, "The Pious and the Profane: The Religious Life of Early Barbados Planters," *The Historian* 62, no. 2 (October, 2007): 265-284; Kristen Block, "Cultivating Inner and Outer Plantations: Property, Industry, and Slavery in Early Quaker Migration to the New World, *Early American Studies* 8, no. 3 (October 2010): 515-548. See also, Sara Barber, *Disputatious Caribbean*.

example, it informs the planters' contentious interactions with the metropole, as noted by Puckrein and others.[29]

The shifting imperial context and growing importance of African slavery helped shape the creation of the planters' patriarchal manhood. They rooted their sense of themselves as justly hegemonic to existing masculine ideals. As they adapted English culture to their changing environment, the planters created a distinct identity. In turn, this sense of themselves shaped their relationship with others, including but not limited to the enslaved. Well before they committed to a racial identity or even slavery, the planters of Barbados engaged in regular violence to assert their authority and presumed an inherent right to power, according to masculine ideals. Examining the role of gender in colonial development from the start of the colony will give a more complete picture of the ways it interacted with slave-owner authority, supported and safeguarded the oppressive slave regime, and permitted extensive violence in the decades that followed.

Summary of Chapters and Scope

"Violent Identity" opens with the foundations of the colony in 1627 and traces gender and power through to about 1680. At this time, the makeup of the planter class changed and white supremacy became essential to control. The majority of the wealthiest landowners left for England due to deteriorating political and economic conditions on the island. A world dominated by wealthy, English elites fell to lesser

[29] Gary Puckrein, *Little England*; Barber, *Disputatious Caribbean*. For earlier histories that explore this contentious relationship see John Poyer, *The History of Barbados, from the First Discovery of the Island, in the Year 1605 till the Accession of Lord Seaforth, 1801* (London: Printed for J. Mawman, 1808); Robert Hermann Schomburgk, *The History of Barbados* (London: Brown, Green and Longman's, 1848). See also Natalie Zacek, *Settler Society,* 3-4. She argued that "depictions of Caribbean settler societies as social failures are widely inaccurate and in some cases based on wholly fictitious accounts."

planters, locally-born gentlemen, and hired overseers.[30] In this later period, Barbados helped set the mold for the fully-formed, racial slave societies of the wider eighteenth-century Caribbean. This dissertation follows the planters' adjustments to changing circumstances over the first half century of the colony. It explores the various ways that gender shaped their responses to an evolving environment, as the planters pursued a vision of manhood that would support their power in each circumstance. Though tethered to enduring manly, English ideals like duty, fortitude, and bravery, when directed toward distinct goals in the singular context of Caribbean slavery and often entailing extraordinary excesses of violence, their masculinity became the foundation for a distinct colonial identity.

This study begins with Barbados's colonial foundations. The first settlers created a hyper-masculine environment of excessive drinking and brawling. They related to one another and presumed the right to rule based on English traditions and patriarchal ideals attached to landownership. Chapter One contends that planters accepted violence as a legitimate means to claim and enforce power. They adopted a broad conception of their patriarchal authority and rights over the island, as well as white servants, Indians, and black Africans. Chapter Two argues that the planters formalized understandings about their just hegemony through the creation of a civil government in the 1640s. They embedded assumptions about their innate superiority and right to violence as landed men into political and legal structures. Meanwhile, interactions with

[30] Dunn, *Sugar and Slaves*, 101-103; Beckles, *First Black Slave Society*.

the Crown pointed to their expectations for political liberty within the English state, likewise rooted in a claim to patriarchal manhood.

The following two chapters deal with the disruption caused by the English civil wars. While the planters passed most of the conflict in happy neutrality, Parliament's beheading of King Charles I (1649) brought metropolitan politics crashing down on their shores. Political division and a more imposing Parliament followed. Chapter Three argues for the importance of the “Barbadian Rebellion” (1650-1652) to the history of manhood on the island. It shows how the planters engaged masculine ideals to justify their revolt against Parliament. The gendered language of war, involving bravery and corporal sacrifice, provided the means for leading Royalist planters to gain support for their cause and buttress their authority. Gendered rhetoric attached to war aims imprinted itself on the island's conception of patriarchal manhood. In Chapter Four, masculine ideals once again become the basis for the planters' negotiation with London. They demanded greater power on the island and within the budding empire by pointing to their “fortitude” and innate liberty as landowning Englishmen. Their presumption of innate political rights was grounded in English patriarchal traditions. But their separate identity becomes more evident in the face of metropolitan skepticism and the planters find a clearer sense of themselves as a distinct ruling group centered on manhood.

The final half of this dissertation explores the planters' adjustments to rapidly changing circumstances. Increased wealth, greater imperial oversight, rising numbers of enslaved Africans, regional warfare, and slave insurrection all challenged the basis of planter power. Often, a violent masculinity formed the heart of their response. Chapter

Five explores the growing importance of hospitality to patriarchal manhood. Private feasts became an important component in the planters' efforts to distinguish themselves as elite men, assert power over servants and slaves, and maintain access to the violence that buttressed their authority. As with violence, though, excesses of drinking and eating added fuel to metropolitan questions about their Englishness. Chapter Six demonstrates that the planters worked to protect their absolute power and right to violence by altering their legal code. Facing outside pressures, they legislated nuance in their treatment of whites and blacks. But they refashioned an English language of patriarchal duty to justify their continuing authority over both groups and protect standing in the empire. Finally, Chapter Seven argues that, in the last quarter of the century, the planters reaffirmed the centrality of violence to elite manhood in the face of new threats. Drawing on manly ideals, they demanded all landowning males participate in militia action and undertake regular physical discipline of slaves especially with a renewed vigor. Race and nationalism supported their efforts. This process ensured violence as essential to Barbadian life.

Throughout the seventeenth century, Barbadian planters called upon masculinity to justify and protect their right to rule. Their understanding of elite male hegemony and free access to violence infused their systems of power. Patriarchal manhood shaped their relationship with the metropole. It guided them as they made decisions, for instance, about going to war for the empire or staying at home. It structured their behavior with one another and toward servants and slaves, often steering them toward

violence. Gender, in this way, worked alongside economics and race to support and shape the formation of an especially brutal colonial society.

Chapter One: "The Island of Discord"

In the year 1629, Captain Henry Hawley sat aboard his ship in Carlisle Bay, Barbados. Still sparsely populated and dominated by jungle, the island held but promise. Hawley arrived to seize control and unlock its prospects on behalf of his benefactor, James Hay, the Earl of Carlisle. He invited the island's "Governor and Captain General," John Powell, to enjoy breakfast with him in the warm Caribbean air of his ship's deck. Accepting the gesture, Powell, his brother William, and a few other gentlemen planters arrived to eat and discourse with this new arrival. Once on board, however, Hawley had soldiers seize his guests. During the fray, "William Powell and some others leaped overboard and swam" to the safety of Captain William Bancock's nearby ship. Soaked and dripping seawater on the deck, William looked back to see his brother John "put in chains," stripped naked and made prisoner. Hawley bound John Powell to the "mayne mast" [*sic*] of the ship, where he would remain for above a month, continually exposed to the tropical sun. Hawley then bid Bandock return "his [escaped] prisoners. Bancock refused," telling "him if he used violence he would sink him." Regardless, "then after the Island was in Hawley's power."[31]

This episode is indicative of the struggle for political control in early Barbados. Violence proved an efficient means to claim the right to rule. Absent a formal government, threats and violence served as the bedrock of elite male politics. Hawley took power through violence. Bancock could only hold off Hawley's demands through

[31] Account of "Capt William Bandock, Esqr, Barbadoes," in *Colonizing Expeditions to the West Indies*, Series II, ed. V.T. Harlow (London: Hakluyt Society, 1924), 42. Powell was eventually shipped to St. Christopher, arriving in time to be captured by the Spanish in an attack.

martial capacity. Hawley left the vanquished Powell visibly imprisoned at the center of his ship – a symbol of his dominance over him and a warning to future challengers. For the next decade, various men would rule and keep order by similar means. Violence, in the process, became central to elite male identity and power.

During the early, disputed era of the 1620s and 1630s, violence emerged as a central component of Barbadian masculinity. The island's first prospective planters drew heavily upon a shared military background as they fought one another for the right to claim land and political control. Once settled, land ownership and a military ethos continued to form the heart of their identity as elite males. According to English cultural ideals, the possession of land and militia participation marked proper manhood, bestowing special privileges and liberties. The planters presumed particularly heavy on their patriarchal rights over the extended household, taking a wide mandate to subjugate and abuse servants and slaves.[32] The planters' colonial enterprise, in the early years, rested wholly on physical force and they developed an aggressive masculine culture to support it. Through a pervasive acceptance of violence, the first planters pursued power and wealth in the New World, setting the stage for the colony's future.

---

[32] David Lawrence, "Great Yarmouth's Exercise: Honour, Masculinity and Civic Military Performance in Early Stuart England," in *Worth and repute: Valuing Gender in Late Medieval and Early Modern Europe, Essays in Honour of Barbara Todd,* ed. Kim Kippen and Lori Woods (Toronto: Center for Reformation and Renaissance Studies, 2011), 365–89. Henry French and Mark Rothery, *Man's Estate: Landed Gentry Masculinities, 1660–1900* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012), 17; Christopher Fletcher, "The Whig Interpretation of Masculinity? Honour and Sexuality in Late Medieval Manhood," in *What is Masculinity?: Historical Dynamics from Antiquity to the Contemporary Word,* ed. John Arnold and Sean Brady (New York: Pelgrave and Macmillan 2011); Mervyn James, "English Politics and the Concept of Honor," *Society, Politics, and Culture*, ed. Mervyn James (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1986); Alexandra Shepard, *Meanings of Manhood in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006). For an explanation of the way that performance in battle spoke to one's innate, even racial, superiority see also Michel Foucault, *History of Sexuality*: *An Introduction*, trans. Robert Hurley (New York: Vintage Books, 1990), 15.

Most historians address the period briefly, focusing on politics or social history. They observe how uncertainty surrounding the patent claims bred a violent power struggle. Martial law kept the colony going until sugar and formal political institutions arrived in 1640.[33] In contrast, this chapter establishes how planter masculinity during this era was foundational.

"A Desolate and Disorderly Show"

The planters of the 1630s created what psychologists might readily call a "hyper-masculine" environment – with few women, regular violence, and a general atmosphere of aggressive male behavior.[34] As historian Jenifer Banks has observed of early Anglo-Michigan, frontier lawlessness tends to create "a void of authority into which free white men strode." In such circumstances, elite men rely heavily on "patriarchal governance." Combined with "alcohol abuse," violence (domestic abuse of women and servants specifically) becomes more regular. Others have confirmed the same circumstances in

---

[33] See, for example, Sarah Barber, *Disputatious Caribbean: The West Indies in the Seventeenth Century* (New York: Palgrave and Macmillan, 2014); Hilary Beckles, *A History of Barbados: From Amerindian Settlement to Caribbean Single Market* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006); Larry Gragg, *Englishmen Transplanted: The English Colonization of Barbados, 1627-1660* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003); Gary Puckrein, *Little England Plantation Society and Anglo-Barbadian Politics, 1627-1700* (New York: New York University Press, 1984); Richard Dunn, *Sugar and Slaves: The Rise of the Planter Class in the English West Indies, 1624-1713*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1972). See next chapter for more on formation of political structures of the 1640s. For examples of earlier general histories that treat this era in more depth than the above scholars see John Poyer, *The History of Barbados, from the First Discovery of the Island, in the Year 1605 till the Accession of Lord Seaforth, 1801* (London: Printed for J. Mawman, 1808); Robert Hermann Schomburgk, *The History of Barbados* (London: Brown, Green and Longman's, 1848).

[34] See Peter Spierenburg, *Men and Violence: Gender, Honor, and Rituals in Modern Europe and America* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1998). For a review of the scholarship and meanings of hypermasculinity see Amy B. Aronson, *Men and Masculinities: A Social, Cultural, and Historical Encyclopedia* (Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO, 2003), 418. See also, Hans Toch, "Hypermasculinity and Prison Violence," in *Masculinities and Violence,* ed. Lee H. Bowker (London: Sage Publications, 1998), 173.

early Virginia and Jamaica.[35] Context similarly shaped planter behavior in 1630s Barbados. Untethered by the oversight of family or metropole, these men engaged in excesses of drink and violence that seemed uncouth to metropolitan observers. They lived under martial law with an almost entirely male population. The colonists engaged in regular brawling and abused their servants beyond acceptable English limits. In the end, violence served as their chief expression of manhood. It was the sole means of projecting authority over servants, slaves, and other elites in an uncertain time.

Elite life in early Barbados also speaks to a specific, pre-existing masculinity, magnified by context. The planters shared basic understandings about what they could achieve with a bit of land and sufficient will. The colonists tied themselves to the belief, as visitor Henry Colt attested, that "nothing is impossible to stout & Valiant men." In other words, those with enough physical strength and sufficient boldness could have all they desired. In a language borrowed from England, this belief formed the foundation of their masculinity and proved central to the island's history. Over time, planters developed a repertoire of social and cultural practices "performed" through fighting and drinking with one another.[36] Shared ambitions, together with extremes of drinking and

---

[35] Jenifer Banks, "'A New Home' for Whom?': Caroline Kirkland Exposes Domestic Abuse on the Michigan Frontier," in *Over the Threshold: Intimate Violence in early America* (New York: Routeledge, 2013), 135-147; Terri L. Snyder, "As if there was Not Master or Woman in the Land: Gender, Dependency, and Household Violence in Virginia, 1646–1720," in *Over the Threshold*, 219–236. Trevor Burnard has confirmed the similarities with eighteenth-century frontier Jamaica as well. See Trevor Burnard, "Domestic Violence in Thomas Thistlewood's Jamaica, 1750–1786," in *Over the Threshold,* 237–253.

[36] Henry Colt, "The Voyage of Sir Henry Colt," (1631) in Harlow, *Colonising Expeditions to the West Indies and Guiana, 1623-1667* (London: Printed for the Hakluyt Society, 1925), 71. Judith Butler, "Performative Acts and Gender Constitution: An Essay in Phenomenology and Feminist Theory," *Theatre Journal,* 40, no. 4 (1988): 519-531. Butler explained how gender is socially constructed and reinforced by language and non-verbal action that define and maintain gender identities. See also Chris Brickell, "Masculinities, Performatitvity, and Subversion: A Sociological Reappraisal," *Men and Masculinities* 8, no. 1 (2005): 24 – 43.

violence, served as the backbone of elite masculine behavior. Excesses, distinct goals, and Caribbean context, meanwhile, became crucial to the formation of a divergent, colonial identity. The planters' violent manhood manifested in the contest for power against one another. It fed the brutal exploitation of Indians, Africans, and Irish from the outset of the colony.

The planters of the 1630s, accordingly, earned a rather rough reputation. "All young men," 1631 English visitor Henry Colt commented, the colonists needed to "bridle the excess of drinking together with quarrelsome conditions of...fiery spirits." The early planters proved quick to violence and not necessarily "valorous" in fighting one another, he argued.[37] While, by the mid-1630s, they had secured land claims, it took some time to begin turning a profit or behaving like the "gentlemen" they purported to be. According to Colt's account, they spent most of their time drunkenly brawling. Colt addressed the Barbadians, saying "you are devourers up of hot waters & such good distillers thereof, that I am persuaded a ship of good burthen laden therewith, could not return from you but in steed of hot water, you would fraught it with cold." Barely able to successfully plant tobacco, the Islanders had perfected the art of making liquor from all manner of local produce. The abundance of alcohol and lack of other comforts only served as "oil added to increase the flame" of the planters' "young and hot bloods." As a result, "worst of all," Colt attested, "was [their] manifold quarrels." Fights between the planters had "slight beginnings, so are they without much difficulty soon ended, but

[37] Henry Colt wrote in 1631 that "St. Christophers shows more valor in their quarrels then the Barbadians do; for in less time of my being at St. Christophers than at the Barbados we had one man killed in fight, but they not any." Henry Colt, "Voyage," 93. Henry Powell, for instance, was a trader and experienced Caribbean pirate. No stranger to violence, wealth and ambition drove him. The other early settlers largely fit this profile. See Larry Gragg, *Englishmen Transplanted,* 29.

only to the trouble of your governor." Solely through the physical power of the governor could constant and unruly violence be kept from driving the whole colony into chaos. Meanwhile, their half-cleared farms "lye like the Ruins of some village lately burned." "Timber trees, half burned" strewn about the land. Elsewhere rafters "singed all black," lay among bush and "long grass." The sum of plantation life, Colt attested, carried "the face of a desolate and disorderly show to the beholder."[38]

Henry Winthrop, whom Richard Dunn called the "scapegrace" second son of the Massachusetts Bay founder, John Winthrop, is emblematic of the first settlers on the island. Indeed, wayward younger sons and soldiers with few prospects back home made up most of Barbados' early population.[39] It was, after all, a risky ordeal that offered few guarantees of success. Even getting to the island could be fatal. As early planter Thomas Rous noted of his journey, "two hundred people became sick at a time," with many bodies going into the sea. In all, 80 of the initial 350 died on his voyage. The prospects for survival on the island were not much greater. Henry Colt thanked God for his surprisingly uneventful journey, with "neither sickness, or any other distemprature [*sic*] for all this hot season of the year with the danger of the Tropic[s]."[40] But those with

---

[38] Henry Colt, "Voyage," 65-66. Harlow notes that the writer "takes a more favorable view of the character of Henry Hawley...then his arbitrary conduct in Barbados would seem to warrant. Harlow, *Colonising Expeditions*, 66–67. Harlow attributes the poverty and neglect" to the fact that ever since the first settlement of the island the planters had been handicapped by constant ascensions arising out of the dispute between the rival claimants. See also William Duke, *Some Memoirs of the first Settlement of the Island of* Barbados (Barbados: Printed by Wm. Baeby, 1741), 14.

[39] While it is difficult to nail down any exact ages and ages were unreliable in the period anyhow, such first-hand accounts as that of Colt and the knowledge that leaders like Hawley were barely thirty gives us a good picture. Dunn's figures show that even in 1715 a majority of white males were between 10 and 29, with about thirty percent under the age of 10. Dunn, *Sugar and Slaves,* 331.

[40] Henry Colt, "Voyage," 64. For figures on life-expectancy in similar circumstances see Vincent Brown, *The Reaper's Garden: Death and Power in the World of Atlantic Slavery* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2008), 20–38; Richard Dunn, *Sugar and Slaves*, 57.

options elsewhere mostly pursued them. The outside chance at wealth and an otherwise insatiable drive for land were the only inducements to travel to the island for would-be planters in the early days. These conditions brought a specific type of middling 'gentleman' (in the loosest sense) to the island.[41] Necessarily, the early planters possessed a reckless ambition that led them to sail for the volatile Caribbean and participate in a precarious colonial project.

"Brave Resistance"

From the beginning, Barbadian planters viewed colonial settlement as a military matter. In February 1627, Captain Henry Powell Jr. arrived in Barbados aboard the *John and William* "supplied with men, arms, ammunition, and every thing requisite for establishing a colony, and securing it from invasion." Originally a Portuguese outpost, the island had since become a supply depot for English vessels trading with Brazil, settling Guiana, or preying upon Spanish merchants. The men under Powell chose William Deane as "commander in chief." They then hung the English flag in Holetown (aka Jamestown) and set about fortifying their position. Henry Powell left his nephew John to oversee Barbados, while he sailed on to secure supplies in South America. It was clear to these men from the outset that the success of their settlement, on the eastern extreme of the Caribbean Sea and dangerously near the Spanish Mainland, would require the force of arms and a clear hierarchy.[42]

---

[41] For more on the character of the planters there, see Richard Dunn, *Sugar and Slaves;* Sarah Barber, *The Disputatious Caribbean*. For more on English migration to the new world and the struggles of all male colonies in general see Alison Games, *Migration and the Origins of the English Atlantic World* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1999).

[42] Henry Powell travelled to Guiana to look in on another settlement of his benefactor, Courteen, and secure supplies from the Indians there to assist in planting Barbados. V.T. Harlow, *Colonising Expeditions,*

The possibility of landownership lured settlers to Barbados. In the 1620s, the island was uninhabited. The Spanish abandoned it, since Barbados had no gold or silver. At the time, English investors sought such spaces for settlement. Through a joint stock company with royal support, the wealthy London merchant William Courteen sent Powell to establish Barbados. Powell's contingent anticipated the fruits of an unclaimed colony. Not long after, Charles Wolverston sailed to secure the earl of Carlisle's competing patent to the island, promising the seventy men accompanying him 100 acres as incentive for their support.[43] Knowing that no precious metals existed there, these men risked much to pursue land ownership.

Beyond just a means to wealth, land ownership was a manly English virtue tied to self-sufficiency and political power. As other historians have argued, social identity, including manhood, was tied to the possession of real property. Anne Lombard showed that, in colonial New England, land inferred patriarchal authority. It "signaled social position" and masculinity. It was tied to "a man's ability to support himself and his family" without being dependent on wages paid by another. Landowning men also had power over individuals without it. Land carried freedom and political rights.[44]

---

x. This early history has been compiled from the works of John Poyer, *This History of Barbados*; Robert Schomburgk, *The History of Barbados*; William Duke, *Some Memoirs*; Gary Puckrein "Plantation Society, Factions, and the Origins of the Barbadian Civil War," (PhD diss., Brown University, 1985); BL, Egerton MS 2395, f. 629 and TNA CO 1/9, p. 32.

[43] See Harlow, *Colonising Expeditions*, xxix. Only a few months after Powell's arrival, the Earl of Carlisle secured royal support to a competing claim. A close friend of King Charles I, Carlisle's patent was for the "Caribee Islands," which he thought included Barbados. James Williamson, *Caribbee Islands: under the Proprietary Patents* (London: Oxford University Press, 1926), 219. See also, William Duke, *Some Memoirs,* 204; 'Brief Collection of Depositions' in Larry Gragg, *Englishmen Transplanted*, 31.

[44] See Anne Lombard, *Making Manhood: Growing up Male in Colonial New England* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2003), 4. Also see Henry French and Mark Rothery, *Man's Estate*, 17. While these authors, as well as Alexandra Shepard, have come to question the universality of landownership's absolute importance, pointing out some ambiguity and exceptions for elite or aspiring-elites, land still

Fundamental to patriarchal manhood in early modern England, land in America offered the opportunity to fulfill male cultural ambitions. The planters of Barbados likewise sought land, not only for wealth, but the power and privileges that landownership carried. Such expectations, outside of economic concerns alone, imbued the early contest for power.

Initially, the competing English settlements under Powell and Wolverston caused no significant conflict. Less than 200 colonists shared an island of 166 square miles. In mid-1628, Wolverston arrived to fulfill the patent held by the earl of Carlisle. Specifically, he was to secure ten thousand acres that Carlisle had already leased to several creditors in London in consideration of debts.[45] On arrival, Wolverston commanded that Powell's men were to "conform themselves immediately...to the order Rule and Government of the said Earl of Carlisle." He also carried permission from the King that, "if any person...infringe or break" the "Royal will," Powell should "take speedy Course for the punishment and reformation thereof." Carlisle wrote in separate instructions for Wolverston to "behave himself [and] that neither he nor his people [should] give...any Just occasion of offense or trouble."[46] For its part, Powell's group allowed Wolverston to settle a good distance south of Holetown without molestation.

---

held cultural resonance as a manly ideal. Many men who rose to wealth and prominence through other means, like Barbadian planters eventually did, often bought English estates as a means of affirming their status. The absolute importance of land was changing, but major shifts would not come until later in the century. Alexandra Shepard, *Accounting for oneself*: *Worth, Status, and the Social order in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015). See also Russell West-Pavlov, *Bodies and their Spaces: System, Crisis and Transformation in Early Modern England* (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2006), 98; Michael Neill, "'This Gentle Gentleman': Social Change and the Language of Status in *Arden of Faversham*'," *Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England* 10 (1998): 73-97; Amanda L. Capern and Judith Spicksley, eds., "Women, Wealth, and Power," *Women's History Review* 16, no. 3 (2007): 289-296.

[45] William Duke, *Some Memoirs*, 9; V.T. Harlow, *Colonising Expeditions*, xxxii.

[46] Rawlinson MSS., "C," 94. Reprinted in V.T. Harlow, *Colonizing Expedition*, 35-36; 'Brief Collection of Depositions', in Larry Gragg, *Englishmen Transplanted*, 31 – 32.

Several Courteen men even fled to support Wolverston because of his better royal standing. William Deane and Henry Winthrop were among these defectors. It appeared that Carlisle's authority enjoyed sounder footing and the two settlements coexisted.[47]

Tensions soon grew, however, centering on different views about the settlers' rights over the land. In London, the courtiers Carlisle and Courteen vied for royal favor to shore-up legal rights to Barbados. They viewed the territory, as historians like Michael Craton have argued, as something like "tenurial feudalism." Planter claims extended absolutely from royal authority. The king granted the rights over the land to a lord. However, those already on the island had little invested in such a system. The early planters risked much to sail to an isolated outpost on the promise of landownership and all that came with it. The rights of the proprietor and the King held less importance than the fact they stood on what appeared, to them, to be vacant territory. As one planter later put it, they had dug "out their fortunes in a strange" place. Accordingly, they earned the "liberty" to enjoy the fruits of their sacrifice regardless of what London decreed. Craton suggested that colonists viewed American possessions as an extension of English sovereign territory. While true, the early planters also inclined to view themselves as freeholders in their own right – an idea that later won out over the

[47] The earl of Carlisle acquired a patent for the "Caribee Islands" from Sir Thomas Warner, having just saved Warner's colony at nearby St. Christopher's from collapse. Convinced of the wealth to be had settling the region and particularly enthusiastic about the prospects of Barbados, Carlisle worked to secure rights for all the "Leeward Islands" from his friend, King James I. Not willing to let his own considerable interest go, however, Courteen appealed to his friend, the first Earl of Montgomery (then Lord Chancellor), to convince the King to exclude Barbados from Carlisle's claim. Arguing that the island lay outside the "Caribee Islands," Courteen eventually succeeded in securing Barbados when Carlisle was away from Court in early 1628. The incensed Carlisle returned though and acquired a second patent, this time explicitly including Barbados. See J.A. Williamson, *Caribbee Islands,* 219; William Duke, *Some Memoirs,* 204.

proprietary model. As Colt would soon observe, the planters of Barbados relied on the idea that nothing should be denied to "stout," "valiant" men. At one point, they even alleged to have settled under the King of Spain's realm in order to usurp London's authority over them altogether. English lords may have been concerned about legally establishing rights to the land, as it was the basis for them to collect rents. The first Anglo-Barbadians, though, proved more attached to the rights conferred by physical occupation and masculinity – rights they stood willing to violently protect.[48]

Indeed, Powell's camp refused to accept Carlilse's authority. Wolverston's insistence on power forced a confrontation for control of the embryonic colony. Viewing Wolverston as a threat to their hard-won claims, Powell's men did not receive him as a peaceful emissary or accept Carlisle as lord over their tenure. They rejected his overtures as "friend and countryman," desiring to "continue in freedom as they had settled in their own right, and enjoy the freedom of Englishmen." Having claimed land by their sacrifice and fortitude, Powell's men demanded respect for the status and rights that Englishmen associated with owning land. They had little interest or incentive to "conform themselves" to Carlisle, who made no guarantee of their land or liberty. They would not have their "freedom" subordinated to another man's ambitions. Instead, the

[48] Henry Colt, "Voyage," 71. Other quote is in Gary Puckrein, *Little England*, 115. For more on the meanings of land to proprietors and London see Michael Craton, "Property and Propriety: Land Tenure and Slave Property in the Creation of a British West Indian Plantocarcy, 1612-1740," in *Early Modern Conceptions of Property*, eds. John Brewer and Susan Staves (New York: Routledge, 1995), 497-529. Reference to the King of Spain is in Gragg, *Englishmen Transplanted,* 39-42. For an overview of the early settlement and its relationship to England and views of colonial territory as an extension of England, as well as the suspension of proprietary rent system see Michael Craton, *Empire, Enslavement, and Freedom in the Caribbean* (Princeton, NJ: Markus Wiener Publishers, 1997), 79-83. For more on the feudal nature of colonial settlement see Allan Greer, *Property and Dispossession: Natives, Empires and Land in Early Modern North America* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2018), 156-162.

planters forcefully protected their claims. The “Leeward Men” (Powell/Courteen supporters) took up arms against the “Windward Men” (led by Wolverston) in 1628. Having given “brave Resistance,” the latter won the day. The Leeward Men fled back to their camp, but still maintained their autonomy from Carlisle.[49]

The planters' insistence on asserting their perceived rights through violence left Wolverston with little choice but to respond in kind. He proceeded to secure his authority by force. Instead of working to integrate Powell's men into a joint venture or come to terms, as instructed, he now demanded their utter capitulation. Carlisle had expected a partnership to “further [their] security without any way impeaching...profit.” His agent moved to cement absolute authority over his vanquished foes and prevent any further challenges. Wolverston indeed took “speedy Course for the punishment and reformation” of Powell and his supporters. He promised to allow the Leeward Men to “continue in their former freedom,” if they forfeited their arms. Instead, he imprisoned them as soon as they complied. In his violent victory, Wolverston and his supporters asserted their power over the island. Without the physical ability to enforce their claims, the Leeward Men's pretensions as freeholders held little veracity.[50]

Wolverston's actions, though, merely initiated a cycle of violence that seemed to confirm martial strength as denoting legitimate authority on the island. Rather than just a legal and economic process, settling Barbados became a military campaign. Still unwilling to let the matter rest, Courteen dispatched Henry Powell back to Barbados

---

[49] See Carla Pestana, *The English Atlantic in an Age of Revolution*, *1640-1661* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2004), 158. Quotes are in Gary Puckrein, “Plantation Society,” 94. William Duke, *Some Memoirs*, 12.
[50] Per affidavit of John Darell. Reprinted in V.T. Harlow, *Colonising Expeditions*, 35.

with additional men and supplies. He landed and attacked the fort in Holetown, freeing John Powell in an ambush. He then detained William Deane as a deserter, in order to punish his disloyalty. His charge of "desertion" attests to the martial nature of the colony. His prosecution also enforced "loyalty" as a normative masculine trait. Henry Powell then arrested Wolverston as well, sending both men back to England in chains. John Powell had all the inhabitants declare him "governor and captain general," in accord with instructions from Courteen. He then, allegedly, seized all of Wolverston's belongings, servants, and land, symbolically removing any legitimate claim he had to status and authority.[51] This quick succession of regime change, meanwhile, demonstrated that physical force mediated London's influence over colonial settlement. Control rested on martial superiority and, by extension, manhood.

While the early colonists fought over contending patent claims, they shared basic understandings about masculinity. First, as noted above, they saw landownership as central to elite manhood and patriarchal authority. Second, they viewed honorific violence as an appropriate response to challenges of their rights and "freedoms" as landed men. The planters' characterization of the early conflict bears this out. As historian Larry Gragg noted, there are differing reports about how Powell achieved his victory. His supporters alleged that he landed an armed party and took the fort in battle; Wolverston's camp attested that Powell devised a deception, seizing Deane and Wolverston when they came to view a commission he supposedly held.[52] While often

[51] See Chapter Three for more on the importance of loyalty to manhood in Barbados. J.A. Williamson, *The Caribbee Islands*, 223-5. V.T. Harlow, *Colonising Expeditions*, xxxii & 39-40.
[52] Larry Gragg, *Englishmen Transplanted*, 34; V.T. Harlow, *Colonising Expeditions,* 40.

seen as an unanswerable and inconsequential detail by scholars of the period, the dispute over how control switched hands provides critical insight into the ways planters thought about masculinity. Powell's version aimed toward honorable victory, seeming to assume that martial prowess would buttress the legitimacy of his authority.[53] His opponents denied the honor in his success. They instead characterized him as 'deceitful,' dishonest. His actions did not, therefore, denote a right to rule. The diverging accounts are indicative of the planters' shared masculine culture. Each side saw honorable martial violence as a virtue that legitimized power.

"Spirited Resistance"

By 1629, the Crown had, for its part, settled the dispute between Courteen and Carlisle in favor of the latter. King Charles I suggested that "differences and debates" may arise between the two parties, but expected them to peaceably work together. Aware of the contentious disposition of the settlers, however, Carlisle did not depend on Powell's acquiescence to the King's expectations. The Earl moved to force the issue of his claim. He named Sir William Tufton, who agreed to invest in Carlisle's venture, the new governor. Carlisle then hastily granted lands for two purposes. First, it helped him settle more of the massive debt he incurred to London merchants and, second, it would hopefully secure his patent claim from further dispute through rapid settlement.[54] Meanwhile, Wolverston arrived to England in chains aboard one of Powell's ships. The timing could not have been more apropos. The governor-cum-prisoner landed on a

[53] See, for example, V.T. Harlow, *Colonising Expeditions*; Ronald Tree, *A History of Barbados* (London: Hart-Davis, MacGibbon, 1972); Larry Gragg, *Englishmen Transplanted*; Richard Dunn, *Sugar and Slaves*.
[54] Gragg, *Englishmen Transplanted*, 62; Robert Hermann Schomburgk, *The History of Barbados,* 262.

London dock as if to announce to Carlisle and the King what little stock Powell placed in their legal maneuvers and decrees.

Power in Barbados still needed to be claimed by force. It was at this stage that Henry Hawley sailed for Barbados to enact his subterfuge against Powell (recounted at the start of this chapter). Tufton had delayed his departure, so Carlisle sent Hawley ahead to respond to Powell's aggression. Carrying a commission to govern the somewhat distant Leeward Islands, Hawley sailed first to Barbados to solidify Carlisle's position there. As Gragg has noted, Hawley was only in his thirties. A man of unscrupulous ambition, his only real qualification was time spent as Captain of a fort in Bermuda.[55] When Powell refused to let him come ashore, Hawley planned his violent contrivance, which ended up with Powell chained naked to the ship's mast. Once in power, Hawley ruled as a fort's Captain might, relying on his physical superiority to keep control. A strong-armed approach kept the peace for a time. However, when Hawley left to take his post in the Leewards, trouble began anew.

Hawley's machination against Powell elicited a characteristic reprisal from the Leeward Men, still loyal to Courteen and Powell. The Leeward Men again took up arms and attacked Carlisle's settlement. Now under the leadership of Robert Wheatley, the Windward Men gave a “spirited resistance,” in the words of nineteenth-century historian Robert Schomburgk. Powell's supporters were forced again to retreat. Victory, in this case, carried further reward. Carlisle approved the settlers' martial “spirit” by granting seven years of “free storage of their goods” to repay their commitment and

[55] He would later betray Carlisle when it appeared he would be forced to sell his claim to a creditor named Robert Rich, the Earl of Warwick. Larry Gragg, *Englishmen Transplanted*, 35 & 39.

fidelity to his cause.[56] From his position of authority, Carlisle demonstrated how loyalty and martial bravery would be rewarded with wealth and power. These masculine characteristics played a key component in encouraging the early violence between the settlements.

Partly because of the legacy left by this early turmoil, violence continued to infuse Barbadian social politics and manhood over the next several decades. Beginning with the arrival of Sir William Tufton in September of 1629, the relationship between the metropole and colony simmered with potential hostility. The planters' presumed rights as landed men and their impulse to defend them through martial actions clashed with London's efforts to bring order to the island. As Carla Pestana wrote, the planters demanded the "benefits of independent propertied status." But the Crown and proprietor still viewed them as subject tenants. A violent masculine identity meant that the planters remained ready to claim their rights by force, even against the Crown's agents. According to Carlisle's grant and the planters' expectations, all Barbadian settlers possessed the same rights and liberties as "Freeborn" citizens of England. They would continue to demand those rights through violence in the face of heavy-handed governors.[57]

Tufton's rule thus proved tumultuous. He arrived with two hundred settlers (by far the largest contingent yet to come), extra supplies, and the designation of "commander-in-chief" from Carlisle. His title spoke to the state of political power on the

---

[56] Robert Hermann Schomburgk, *The History of Barbados*, 263.

[57] Carla Pestana, *The English Atlantic in an Age of Revolution*, 158. Martial law, as noted by Gragg, was only officially invoked by Henry Hawley but seems to have been in *de facto* practice already. He, for example, refused "to appoint a Council from among the principle plantation owners as Wolverston had done." Puckrein, *Little England*, 37.

island. The extra men decisively swung the balance of power once and for all to the "Windward." Still, Tufton confronted what V.T. Harlow, writing a century ago, called the "natural pugnacity" of the colonists. Superior numbers stabilized his authority, but holding sway rested absolutely on physical force. Carlisle expected Tufton to keep good order by whatever means necessary, which did not encourage respect for planter liberties and expected freedoms. His feverish granting of land threatened the already dubious property claims of the Courteen contingent. In response, the Leeward Men soon led another armed uprising. Tufton quickly put down the revolt with considerable force.[58] Honorific violence again served as the language of negotiation for the planters.

Discontent continued. Even some of Carlisle's supporters began to resent Tufton's heavy-handed tactics, which constrained planter freedom and grated against their expectations as landed men. According to Harlow, Tufton "proceeded to embark on a policy of social reform in a manner calculated to annoy the planters." Lord Dorchester's contemporary account held that his "chief offense" was that he attempted to curtail the planters' "abuses of cruelty...against servants." He had taken up the practice of "removing those servants from their masters and placing them with other men." In questioning the planters' supremacy over their servants, Tufton challenged their patriarchal rights over the household. A master's absolute control over his family, including servants, was fundamental to manhood in England. As historian Gary Puckrein put it, in undermining their control of servants he "reduced the authority of planters on

[58] V.T. Harlow, *Colonising Expeditions*, xxxiv. Powell had paid salaries to his supporters, whereas Carlisle and Wolverston granted land. In only a few months Tufton not only confirmed the grants Carlisle had made in England but added 140 more. Larry Gragg, *Englishmen Transplanted*, 62; Richard Dunn, *Sugar and Slaves*, 50-51.

their land."[59] He seemed to disregard the rights and status they presumed to possess. His actions challenged their masculinity, engendering potentially violent reactions from these first Barbadians.

Necessary for seizing control, superior martial might was therefore equally essential to the maintenance of power. Men who had come to expect and exercise liberty "as Englishmen" by owning and cultivating land, the planters recoiled under Tufton's constraints. A masculine culture that had already proven to be inclined toward violence secured a predictable response. A wealthy planter named Richard Peers, friend of Henry Hawley, led an increasingly aggressive opposition against Tufton. Hawley, meanwhile, worked back in London to foment displeasure with Tufton among investors, hoping to gain control of Barbados for himself. Together, Peers and Hawley hatched a "conspiracy against" the Governor. When Peers, blustering, threatened to kill Tufton, the latter arrested him and his followers. The governor sent the lot back to England and continued to rule absolutely.[60] Despite political unrest, without the physical means to depose him, the planters were left to simmer and merely complain about assaults on their freedom.

---

[59] Harlow, *Colonising Expeditions,* xxxiv. TNA, CO 1/5, pp. 220. See also, Puckrein, *Little England*, 37-38. In England and early America, central to hegemonic manhood was a patriarch's right to violence over his household. See, for example, Mary Beth Norton, *Founding Mothers and Fathers: Gender, Power, and the Forming of American Society* (New York: Knopf, 1996), 195. Puckrein also added that they suspected he might be using the support of such servants to mount a force that could be used to further diminish the power of the planters. Gary Puckrein, *Little England*, 38.

[60] By at least 1640, Peers held 360 acres of land in a plantation called 'Rendezous' with his business partner Lancelot Pace. In 1661, he left a now 600 acre Rendezous to his son John. See BDA, Hughes-Queree Collection, Abstracts in Queree Notebook, Book 8, pp. 314; BDA, Wills 15/199. Gragg, *Englishmen Transplanted,* 36.

Carlisle now acknowledged the necessity of violence to keep control, but he also understood violence alone as unsustainable. He sent Hawley with instructions to "depose Tufton...by force if need be." Yet he wished to bring about more stability. Rather than continue to press the issue of oversight, as Puckrein has noted, he "sided with the planters." His support of the colonists over the governor validated the planters' claims to liberty and political rights as landed Englishmen. It also confirmed the propriety of violence and threats to achieve their goals.[61]

Control continued to rest upon physical force for a time. Hawley first attempted to take power through a "free election," expecting to win easily. To his astonishment, Tufton received the majority vote. Keeping with local practice, Hawley seized power anyway. Tufton ceded to Hawley – at least momentarily. The new governor moved to solidify his power, but quickly faced the prospect of his own overthrow. During a "starving time," Tufton and a group of other colonists used Hawley's apparent "withholding victuals" as a pretext to depose him. Tufton even gave a handful of servants their "libertie" in exchange for their support. In spring of 1630, Tufton made his move. The two faced off in a dramatic showdown at Hawley's "lodging." Bringing just below thirty "followers...armed with muskets," Tufton confronted the man who had forced him to "yield up the government." With the jungle about them, Tufton initially forced Hawley to flee into the night. However, the latter gathered up his soldiers and

[61] Puckrein, *Little England,* 38. Carlisle's issues with Tufton were also personal. The Governor had, apparently, been too zealous in selling off lands, distributing parcels from the earl's "personal plantation." Tufton ran afoul of a powerful London investor in the mid-1630s, who selected Henry Hawley, not coincidently a friend of Richard Peers, to replace Tufton as governor. Carlilse was enraged when Tufton distributed land on his "personal plantation." TNA, CO 1/5, pp. 220. Courteen's heirs would later reopen the debate in a failed effort to overcome crushing debts. Larry Gragg, *Englishmen Transplanted*, 36.

"brought strength down with him...too strong for Tufton and his men."[62] Whatever political clout Tufton held, he needed to be successful in battle to control Barbados. Through victory, Hawley secured the planters' acceptance of his rule. Violence and martial prowess legitimated authority, even as lingering discontent with Hawley's leadership remained. An established tradition of power resting in superior masculine strength was well under way.

As leader, Hawley's physical control continued to hold sway above politics. He declared martial law and, in the words of historian William Duke, "prevail'd with the Council to sentence [Tufton], as a Mutineer, to be shot to Death; which was accordingly perform'd." While Duke noted that the execution took place the "following May," contradictory evidence suggests a shorter timeline. According to the contemporary account of Lord Dorchester, the confrontation took place on a Friday evening with Tufton and his followers "arraigned on Saturday and executed (being shot to death) by martial law" the same day.[63] If Hawley needed permission from the "Council," as Duke argued, it was a formality. Duke was correct, nonetheless, that in addition to Tufton, "any of those concern'd in the Death of Sir William [Tufton], came to a sad and sudden Ends Themselves." In executing his political enemies, however, Hawley tethered his power to an ability to continue meeting disgruntlement with sufficient physical force. Martial law paid dividends for authority, but left the colonists with a single option to express their displeasure – armed rebellion. Thus, again, in April 1633, "several Persons

[62] For more on the lack of planting as a result of too much leisure and fighting see Larry Gragg, *Englishmen Transplanted*; William Duke, *Some Memoirs*; Henry Colt, "Voyage," 66-67. For information about the "Starving Time" and Tufton giving servants their freedom to bolster his ranks for a showdown with Hawley see TNA, CO 1/5, pp. 220.
[63] TNA, CO 1/5, pp. 220.

were [again] try'd and sentence'd, for Mutiny and Rebellion against the Deputy Governor, Council and Country, and for having Designs to destroy them."[64] Sanctioned by London and accepted by the colonists, Hawley's reign rested in an ability to defeat and kill any that challenged his power.

Despite its tendency to infringe on their rights, the first planters of Barbados seemed to accept martial law as a legitimate, perhaps necessary, mode of authority. As Hawley "proceeded in...martial law," Dorchester tells us, it was his "followers," planters themselves, that preserved him and did not suffer "any to [even] speak with him." Moreover, martial law proved effective, at least in part, because the planters abided a military ethos as an essential part of their masculinity. Victory conferred some sense of respect, though usually fleeting, attached to their conception of manhood. Even when punished, the planters preferred being treated with a soldiers' honor, rather than as civilian settlers or farmers, pointing to their respect for martial duty. In December of 1635 on nearby Antigua, for instance, Captain William Kitterich murdered Captain William Biech. Initially, a court sentenced him to hang. Then, "upon the Petition of his Friends, alleging that he was a Soldier, the Court alter'd the sentence to that of being shot, which was accordingly perform'd."[65] The idealization of martial prowess fed into Hawley's power. By conducting a "court-martial" of Tufton, as opposed to a civilian trial, Hawley had appealed to the planters' reverence for the military. Instead of having to acknowledge civil rights, he could censure political rivals for insubordination and stirring up "mutiny" without a messy trial.

---

[64] Two were ultimately executed. William Duke, *Some Memoirs*, 17 & 265-266.
[65] TNA, CO 1/5, pp. 220. William Duke, *Some Memoirs,* 18-19.

“Abuses of Cruelty”

The early planters' manhood led to political violence and obstinacy against Crown and proprietor; but it also shaped their subjugation of laboring groups. They viewed the physical “valiance” (or courage) they had shown in settling the island, along with landownership, as bestowing broad patriarchal power over servants and slaves. In England, the patriarchal order gave landholders “franchise,” particularly in the use of violence, to punish subordinates. In fact, it was the elite man's duty to keep servants and laborers obedient and at work. As Alexandra Sheppard explained, dominant, patriarchal manhood subordinated male and female servants alike in England. Non-landowning free men were also dependents to elite males, their shared status with women and servants undermining their masculinity. All such individuals were expected to adhere to “codes of deference” as a matter of course. As L.H. Roper put it, these were meant to come “in the form of doffed caps, rents and general obedience, owed to 'betters.'” They thereby acknowledged the supremacy of the master. The planters, accordingly, subjugated white servants, American Indians, and Africans alike on the basis of their assumed superiority and patriarchal authority as landed men.[66]

At the same time, elite manhood within the household also took on new meanings in the colonial Caribbean context. Namely, the planters violently projected power over enslaved Indians and Africans, alongside white servants. Susan Amussen has

[66] John Beattie, “Violence and society in early-modern England,” in *Perspectives in Criminal Law*, ed. Anthony Doob and Edward Greenspan (Aurora, Ontario: Canada Law Book, 1985), 37 & 31. Alexandra Sheppard, “From Anxious Patriarchs to Refined Gentlemen? Manhood in Britain, ca. 1500-1700,” *Journal of British Studies* 44, no. 2 (2005): 291; L.H. Roper, *The English Empire in America: 1602-1658: Beyond Jamestown* (London: Routledge, 2009), 27. See also Robert Showmaker, “Reforming Male Manners: Public Insult and the Decline of Violence in London, 1660–1740', in *English Masculinities, 1660–1800*, ed. Tim Hitchcock and M. Cohen (New York: Longman, 1999): 133–150.

demonstrated how the use of violence was key to "model manhood" and male authority in early modern England. Barbadian settlers similarly utilized great violence to accomplish their aims and enact their will over subordinate people. However, according to contemporary reports, their violence against these groups exceeded the acceptable limits of the homeland. Indeed, it was Tufton's attempts to combat extraordinary abuse of servants that led to his downfall. The planters took wide latitude in their use of violence to punish, which they refused to temper. As one visitor would recall in the 1650s, when one slave "had stolen a pig" he was put in irons. Then, "the overseer had him beaten every day with scourges...his hands constantly manacled, until he was covered in blood." After about a week, "the overseer cut his ear off, had it roasted, and forced him to eat it." Biet acknowledged the intent of this violence, "to keep these sorts of people in obedience." As an early modern European, he understood violence as necessary to patriarchal governance. However, he saw the planters as going beyond acceptable limits, believing "it is inhuman to treat [slaves] with such harshness." The confluence of presumptions about superior rank and race met economic drive, releasing inhibitions that other Europeans expected.[67] The planters engaged in a distinct and excessive application of English patriarchal traditions.

---

[67] Susan Amussen, '"The part of a Christian man': the cultural politics of manhood in early modern England," in *Political Culture and Cultural Politics in Early Modern England*, ed. Susan Amussen and Mark Kishlansky (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1995), 220 – 227. See Hilary Beckles, *The First Black Slave Society: Britain's Barbarity Time in Barbados* (Cave Hill: The University of the West Indies Press, 2016)*;* Michael Guasco, *Slaves and Englishmen: Human Bondage in the Early Modern Atlantic World* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004). For more on Europeans seeing violence as necessary see John Beattie, "Violence and society in early-modern England," in *Perspectives in Criminal Law*, ed. Anthony Doob and Edward Greenspan (Aurora, Ontario: Canada Law Book, 1985); Alexandra Sheppard, "From Anxious Patriarchs to Refined Gentlemen? Manhood in Britain, ca. 1500-1700," *Journal of British Studies* 44, no. 2 (2005): 291; L.H. Roper, *The English Empire in America: 1602-1658: Beyond*

Barbadians' cruel relationship toward enslaved, non-white people took shape from the first days of settlement. After dropping off John Powell in 1627, Henry Powell had proceeded on to the Spanish Mainland to acquire supplies. He traveled up the densely forested "river Disacaba," (Essequibo River). There he "traded with the Indians of the aforesaid Mayne for all things that was to be gotten for planting of this Island of the Barbados." Native seeds and plants were foremost on his list. Once satisfied, Powell went back down river but noticed that "three canoes with the Indians of the people [he] had trade with followed" some distance behind him. A bit nervous, he proceeded steadily to the mouth of the "Disacaba," where his ship and the rest of his men waited. The Arawak Indian boats went ashore on a "small Island...a little before night faire by [Powell's] ship." Now realizing they had a "desire to speak with" him, Powell wrote, "I went ashore...to know their intent to follow me so far." The Native Americans made clear that they "perceived[d] by the things [he] bought of them that [Powell] was bound to plant an Island that lay to the north ward." Under the pretense that Barbados had been their ancestral home, which it easily could have been, they expressed "a desire to go with [Powell] as free people." The Indians agreed to convert to the Protestant Religion and wanted only a "piece of Land" where they could "Manure those fruits and bring up their children to Christianity." Powell agreed to these terms, each side perceiving the benefit of such a partnership. These families would serve as a conduit of

---

Jamestown (London: Routledge, 2009). Quotes from Biet are in Derek Hughes, *Versions of Blackness: Key Texts on Slavery from the Seventeenth Century* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 314.

trade between Barbados and the vast Spanish Main.[68] The reality the Indians faced once they arrived on the island, though, demonstrates the planters' pre-conceived assumptions of their right to absolute power over other groups.

Barbadians readily enslaved these native people to whom Powell promised freedom and friendship. Returning to Barbados, Powell discovered that Carlisle's agent, Wolverston, had seized control. The new governor refused to honor Powell's agreement with the Indians. Many of those who had traveled with Powell were the "wives and children" of men that stayed behind. They had sent their loved ones as a show of good faith, peace, and friendship. Among these were "Yow: a woman and her three Children," as well as "a boy [that came to live] (as a servant to) Coll. Ellis." Despite their apparent desire to conform to the expectations of English culture by adopting sedentary farming and Christianity, the very basis of the planters' own claims to superiority, the planters refused to accept these people as partners. Even though the alliance would have served the fledgling colony, asserting power over other groups and extracting labor from them proved to be the dominant drive among the Englishmen. Powell tried to petition for the Indian's release in both London and Barbados, but the planters kept them in "bondage." The colonists possessed a sense of themselves as dominant Englishmen with land and

[68] Henry Powell, "The Humble Petition of Captain Genry Powell," Rawlinson MSS., "C" 94, reprinted in V.T. Harlow, *Colonising Expeditions,* 36–37. The Arawak were the dominate cultural group by this time in the region. These particular Indians could also have been part of an Arawak tribe but ancestrally Carib. Carib people had been arriving on the mainland, dominated by the Arawak, from islands in the Caribbean since the 1500s. They seem to have been Arawak though, based on their friendliness and desire for allies against the Spanish who had made a habit of kidnapping their leaders and women. Lawrence Keymis, *A Relations of the Second Voyage to Guiana* (London, 1596), reprinted (New York: Da Capo Press, 1968). Handler identifies them as Arawak. Jerome Handler, "The Amerindian Slave Population of Barbados in the Seventeenth and early Eighteen Centuries, *Caribbean Studies* 8, no. 4 (1969): 38-64..

sufficient physical force to enact their will. Theyg considered the right to subjugate Indian women and children as a natural extension of that identity.[69]

The precedent set by the enslavement of native women like Yow reflected a mentality that continued to prevail long after the initial, "unruly" settlement period. Nearly two decades later, the enslavement of Indians had become systematic. Richard Ligon noted in the late 1640s how native laborers are "fetched from other Countries; some from the neighboring Islands, some from the Main," adding flippantly, "which we make slaves." The planters had no qualms about taking free men and women and enslaving them without justification. Their sense of masculine superiority as English landowners proved sufficient. Ligon recounts the story of a tragic Indian woman named Yarico. Once living with her people on the Spanish Mainland, she fell "in love with [a young Englishman] and hid [him] from her Countrymen...till they could safely go down to the shore...But the youth, when he came ashore in the Barbados, forgot the kindness of the poor maid...and sold her for a slave, who was as free born as he: And so the poor Yarico for her love, lost her liberty." As with Yow, an elite man ignored a promise. He enslaved a free Indian woman in exchange for wealth, a right no one challenged. Ligon acknowledged Yarico's initial "liberty," but did not dispute her enslavement. In Barbados, her rights, like all non-landowning groups, were determined by and subordinate to white, male planters. Not until much later in the century, long after

[69] Henry Powell, "Petition," in Harlow, *Colonising Expeditions*, 37-38. For more on justifications for enslaving Indians by English colonists see Alan Gallay, ed., *Indian Slavery in Colonial America* (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 2010); Gary Nash, *Red, white, and Black: the peoples of early North America* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall); Alden T. Vaughan, *Roots of American Racism: Essays on the Colonial Experience* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995); Guasco, *Slaves and Englishmen*.

Massachusetts placed some restrictions on Indian slavery, did Barbados attempt to restrain the bondage of free Natives.[70]

The early settlers of Barbados denied rights and legal status to outside groups according to a broad conception of patriarchal power. Existing English ideas about elite, male superiority supplied sufficient ideology to subordinate laborers (slave, free, or servant). The planters did not engage in justifications for their use of slavery, any more than they did the use of servants. As landowning males, the planters perceived their rights over all laborers as absolute. Yow's case and Ligon's account make clear that there were few, if any, dissenting opinions to the idea that white landowners could enslave Indians and Africans. It was an unspectacular event or, as Winthrop Jordan put it, an "unthinking decision" for Barbadians to use slave labor. In 1636, the island passed its first "directive" about slaves, declaring that any brought to the island, Amerindian or African, would be slaves for life. Again, they did so without justification. Michael Guasco, likewise, has made it clear that Englishmen in the early Caribbean merely adopted an ongoing Atlantic practice. Africans, specifically, were already widely associated with slavery in the English world.[71] It was "unthinking," however, only because the planters

---

[70] Richard Ligon, *A True and Exact History of the Island of Barbados* (originally published 1657), ed. Karen Ordahl Kupperman (Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company, 2011), 107. For more on the history of Indian slavery in Barbados and its connection to the Atlantic and New England specifically see Linford Fisher, "'Dangerous Designes': The 1676 Barbados Act to Prohibit New England Indian Slave Importation," *The William and Mary Quarterly* 71, no. 1, (January 2014): 99–124. See also Jerome Handler, *The Unappropriated People: Freedmen in the Slave Society of Barbados* (Kingston: University of the West Indies Press, 2009), 12; Robert Schomburgk, *The History of Barbados*, 266.

[71] See Jerome Handler, "An Early Edict on Slavery in English America: The Barbados Resolution of 1636," Jerome Handler, accessed Feb. 21, 2019, http://jeromehandler.org/wp-content/uploads/1636-edict.-SA-submit-1.pdf. Handler cites extensive references to the law by Robin Blackburn, *The Making of New World Slavery: from the Baroque to the Modern, 1492–1800* (London: Verso, 1997) and Hilary Beckles, Winthrop Jordan, Michael Guasco, Russell Menard and others, including Edward Rugemer and Schomburgk. Winthrop Jordan, *White over Black: American Attitudes toward the Negro, 1550-1812* (Chapel Hill:

already possessed a patriarchal ideology that supported their absolute and potentially violent authority over non-elite, non-landowning groups. Belonging to the dominant class and possessing enough motivation and physical will was all the explanation that planters needed in the 1630s to purchase and exploit slaves. Their manhood stood as the root of their presumed right to enslave.

As several scholars argue, economic ambition provided the material incentive for the enslavement of Africans and Indians. The Anglo-American adoption of slavery was a cultural novelty or paradox in light of English cultural reverence for 'liberty' – one driven by wealth. Indeed, as tax collector Peter Hay noted in the mid-1630s, "a plantation in this place...is worth nothing unless there be good store of hands upon it." The planters may have thought they could achieve anything through "stoutness," but they also needed laborers to execute their will. Hegemony cannot exist without subordinates. In the early years, the socio-economic order rested largely in the physical, violent subordination and exploitation of other men. Like the planters themselves, most of the first servants and slaves were male. Among these, a few black Africans were present, probably slaves captured in battle with other European ships. Henry Powell, for instance, brought ten African slaves with his group, comprised of about eighty men in total. The rest, though, were white servants, Irish and English. As Richard Dunn tells us,

---

University of North Carolina Press, 1968), chapter 2; Richard Dunn, *Sugar and Slaves*, 73; Michael Guasco, *Slaves and Englishmen*. For more on the transition to slave labor, see Hilary Beckles and Andrew Downes, "The Economics of Transition to the Black Labor System in Barbados, 1630-1680," *The Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 18, no. 2 (Autumn, 1987): 225-247; Carl and Roberta Bridenbaugh, *No Peace Beyond the Line: The English in the Caribbean, 1624-1690* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1972); Colin A. Palmer, ed., *The Worlds of Unfree Labour: from indentured servitude to slavery* (Aldershot: Ashgate, Variorum, 1998).

"there were no women in this party."[72] Regardless, their goals for wealth and use of their land rested in the mass exploitation of subjugated laborers, white, black, and Indian.

The early planters exploited the labor of all subordinate groups in similar ways. White servants labored and lived alongside black Africans and Indians, sometimes cohabitating in this period. Ligon even argued that servants had the "worser [*sic*] lives." He wrote of their "ill lodging" and meager diets. Whether this was Ligon's racial sympathy coming through or a material fact is subject to debate, but his statement is not wholly without foundation.[73] The planters needed laborers and, through physical control, could as readily subordinate one as another. Eventually, white supremacy came to play an important role in legitimizing African slavery and its attendant violence, but as Edward Rugemer put it, "racial ideology developed slowly" in English America. In the

---

[72] See RIchard Dunn, *Sugar and Slaves*; Sidney Mintz, *Sweetness and Power: The Place of Sugar in Modern History* (New York: Penguin Books, 1986); David Elits, *The Rise of African Slavery in the Americas* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1999). See also David Eltis, Frank D. Lewis and Kenneth L. Sokoloff, eds., *Slavery in the Development of the Americas* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004). For more economic studies of slavery in the Caribbean see Richard B. Sheridan, *An Economic History of the British West Indies, 1623-1775* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1973); B.W. Higman, "Population and Labor in the British Caribbean in the Early Nineteenth Century," *Long-Term Factors in American Economic Growth,* eds. Stanley L. Engerman and Robert E. Gallman (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986); John McCusker and Russell R. Menard, eds., *The Economy of British America, 1607-1789* (Chapel Hill, North Carolina: University of North Carolina Press, 1985). Quotes are in Richard Dunn, *Sugar and Slaves*, 52-53 and Letter from Peter Hay to Sir James and Archibald Hay, Oct. 9, 1638, in BDA *Journal of the Barbados Museum and Historical Society* XXVII (1959-1960), 125. See also, Games, *Migration and the Origins of the English Atlantic World*, 75; Susan Amussen, *Caribbean Exchanges: Slavery and the Transformation of English Society, 1640-1700* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2007). For insight into the first African slaves see Hilary Beckles, *Black Rebellion in Barbados: The Struggle Against Slavery, 1627-1838* (Christiansted, VI: Antilles Publications, 1984), 10. We know little about the African men that came to Barbados in these early years and servants only slightly more. Of the 985 that left London in 1635, most were single males, many less than twenty years old.

[73] Richard Ligon, *A True and Exact History,* 94 & 107. For a detailed, in-depth treatment of Ligon's views on servants and the "trope" of the mistreated servant see Laura Martin, "'Servants Have the Worser Lives': The Poetics and Rhetorics of Servitude and Slavery in *Inkle and Yarico's* Barbados," in *Invoking Slavery in the Eighteenth-Century British Imagination*, ed. Srividhya Swaminathan and Adam R. Beach (New York: Routledge, 2016).

meantime, the planters' blanket subjugation of blacks, whites, and Indians is attested to by the "combination" of these groups in multiple insurrections through the century. As Jerome Handler argued, "the proximity of indentured servants and slaves, the similarity of the harsh treatment both groups experienced, and their shared mistrust and animosity toward their masters probably resulted in a mutual influence of the forms of resistance both groups took."[74] All laboring groups, in the planters' view, existed to serve their designs and were ready victims of the elites' unrestrained, violent manhood.

The planters utilized extensive violence against all subordinate groups without much seeming concern for race or national origin. As Ligon witnessed, they performed "such cruelty...to Servants, as [he] did not think one Christian could have done to another."[75] He spoke of metropolitan expectations for Christian morality and restraint that seemed to be of little concern to the planters. In both early modern England and Anglo-America, as historian Terri Snyder put it, masters were "entitled to correct [their] servants' obstinacy." It was a right of elite men to punish subordinates with violence. Snyder added, though, that this violence should be "within reason." However, the planters largely rejected the limits placed on their violence. Again, the "chief offense" of Tufton's rule had been that he removed "servants from their masters" for what he saw

---

[74] "Combination" quote came out of the 1685 slave revolt. See Jerome Handler, "Slave Revolts and Conspiracies in Seventeenth-Century Barbados," *New West Indian Guide* 56, no. 1/2, (1982): 7 & 20. Edward Rugemer "The Development of Mastery and Race in the Comprehensive Slave Codes of the Greater Caribbean during the Seventeenth Century," *The William and Mary Quarterly* 70, no. 3 (2013): 443.

[75] Richard Ligon, *A True and Exact History*, 94. Such reports would come to haunt the planters by the end of the 1650s, as Parliament took steps to curb abuses of white servants. See Chapter Six for more on this and the language of "restraint."

as “abuses of cruelty” through an elite metropolitan lens.[76] Attempting to place the well-being of subordinated laborers over the rights of landowning men offended the latter's sense of their just hegemony. Absolute access to physical violence against all their laborers was something the planters viewed as fundamental to their patriarchal manhood.

Barbadian elites depended upon violence to project terror and authority, just as they did to defend their rights to land against each other. As a result, “if [a servant] resist[ed] [a beating], their time [would be] doubled,” a policy that reflected the centrality of violence to order. The planters, committed to the necessity of physical control, even “built [houses] in the manner of fortifications,” including bulwarks, and bastions to defend themselves against “any uproar or commotion...either by Christian servants, or Negro slaves.” They could, if “besieged...throw down upon the naked bodies of the Negroes, scalding hot” water, which they thought “as good a defense against their underminings as any other weapon.” The planters' construction of their homes in this manner reflected their understanding of violence as being necessary to protect their power.[77]

The planters' success in exploiting their laborers, at least early on, was dubious though. As Henry Colt chided in 1631, “your servants also [are kept] too Idly; they continually pestered our ship without any occasion or acquaintance, the lingering

---

[76] Terri L. Snyder, “Gender Dependency, and Household Violence in Virginia, 1646-1720,” *Journal of Technological Studies* 33, no. 2 (2007): 220. TNA CO 1/5, pp. 220.

[77] Ligon, *A True and Exact History*, 75, 94 & 96-97. Despite all the planters' preparation, slaves engaged in puzzlingly little organized rebellion. Ligon noted one thwarted incident in which “some” slaves planned to burn down a “boiling house” and make it look like an accident. For figures on white servants, see Richard Dunn, *Sugar and Slaves*. For information about early revolts see Jerome Handler, “Slave Revolts,” 7. As Handler also noted, other incidents may have occurred in early times, but were not reported.

sometimes 24 hours with us, although no man spoke to them, to avoid labor, which I am persuaded few of you look after."[78] It is clear that translating land into something more socially and economically meaningful rested on an ability to better subjugate and extract labor from these non-elite persons. The first planters seem to have had little ability to do so, something demonstrated by the slight financial gains of the settlement in the 1630s. As Harlow put it, "starvation was never far from their doors, and experience in the art of making sugar and tobacco was only learned (slowly) by repeated failure."[79] The planters would have to buttress their absolute reliance on violence with something more durable to be successful. As they did so in the next decade, though, their power remained tied to the potentially violent patriarchal ideals outlined above.

Conclusion

In the first decade of settlement, the planters established violence as a central and acceptable expression of their status and identity. It served as a legitimate form of political authority. It was also their chief means of impressing their presumed power upon servants and slaves. The planters fought efforts to restrain their absolute right to violence over subordinates, just as they did to protect the land claims upon which they based their superiority. As landowning Englishmen, they expressed pretensions to a special status. Without a formal government, militia, or system of courts, however, they had few other tools than physical force to enact the authority they presumed to possess.

---

[78] Henry Colt, "Voyage," 66.
[79] V.T. Harlow, *Colonising Expeditions,* xxxiv.

Practical motives for wealth drove them, but the language and means of rule in this early period were attached to English patriarchal conceptions. Landed males had certain “freedoms” and privileges that demanded defense. A clear understanding of their “superior masculinity,” tied to English cultural ideas, necessarily supported the colonizing project by legitimizing planter dominance and their use of violence to protect it. The planters pursued goals for landownership and wealth in the 1620s and 1630s through largely unchecked, masculine violence. Violence became systemic and they readily exploited and enslaved Africans and Indians, while abusing white servants with impunity. The practices they established in the first decade and a half set the stage for their future interactions with one another, the homeland, and their subordinate laborers. Examining the ways manhood shaped the first settlers' pursuit of wealth and power in the early years, then, is essential to the rest of the island's history.

The planters also began to develop a sense of colonial identity in this era. In rejecting limits on violence, for example, or aggressively drinking and brawling they shaped a distinct vision of manhood and its associated performances and privileges. These behaviors became indicative of their character to outside observers like Henry Colt. They also extended the ideology of elite male authority from the homeland by enslaving hundreds of non-white people, something with which the English patriarchy had little experience. The early planters also exhibited an antagonistic, martial identity. They revered freedom and jealously guarded liberty in action and conscience. They willingly resisted the authority of the proprietor and, by extension, the King. They remained English, but demonstrated competing goals with London and a separate

conception of their status within the imperial hierarchy. This situation changed only by degrees and form over the next several decades.

The confluence of Caribbean context and English ideals in the early period impressed itself upon the history and state structures that followed. By the time the 1640s arrived, the planters largely built their sugar colony and its institutions around (and in support of) these existing practices of power. Richard Dunn noted decades ago that Barbados was "highly transient" in its first several decades. Still, many of the leading families and planters from the first years were the most prominent at the end of the century as well.[80] Moreover, the chief markers of hegemonic manhood did not diverge much through the century, even as the planters grew wealthier and more reputable. Success did not change their belief in martial valor as indicative of manliness. It did not remove the need for labor or their assumptions about being able to enslave Indians and Africans. It also did not undermine their pervading faith in elite, male violence to control servants and slaves – it only magnified it. The structures of government and race, as well as additional performances of manhood that the Barbadian elite used to buttress their perpetual hegemony remained rooted in the violent patriarchal power staked-out in the island's wild, formative years.

[80] Richard Dunn, *Sugar and Slaves,* 58.

Chapter Two: "From the worse to the better, praised be God"

In the 1640s, the Barbadian planters formalized legal, military, and political structures to support their power. Ending martial law, they turned to civil government. Richard Ligon noted how, by late in the decade, "the law [was] administered by a Governor, and ten of his Council, four Courts of ordinary Justice, in civil causes, which divided the land in four Circuits." Meanwhile, "Justices of Peace, Constables, Church Wardens, and Tithingmen" worked to prevent disorder. Additionally, an elected Assembly of twenty-two landowning men created legislation that governed behavior and protected planter autonomy. These layers of bureaucracy, mimicking England buttressed the social structure atop which the planters sat. At the same time, Ligon noted that "the strength of the island" remained vested in the forts, ammunition, and militia. Barbadian militiamen, he claimed, were "as resolute as any in the world."[1] Elite masculinity and power remained tied to violence, even as civil institutions took root.

Existing ideals of manhood, attached to landownership and enacted through violence, permeated island institutions. The Barbadian government and militia consolidated and better defined the basis of planter power. The colonial institutions solidified English beliefs about landowning male superiority and privilege. Only freeholder men had voting rights or access to political and martial posts. Through legislation, the Assembly reinforced cultural expectations for these elite men to control servants, slaves, women, and non-landowning freemen. One Act, for example, demanded that all "masters of families" give religious instruction to subordinates in

[1] Richard Ligon, *A True and Exact History of the Island of Barbados,* (originally published 1657), ed. Karen Kupperman (Indianapolis: Hacket Publishing Company, 2011), 173.

order to create a better-behaved populace. Additional laws shielded male rights over property, which eventually came to include African slaves. Protecting rights of inheritance to all "estates real," meanwhile, perpetuated the social order through generations. Elite male authority, though, continued to rely on various types of physical force. The island's new courts used judicial violence to supplement individual planter power over servants, slaves, and poor freemen. Legislation also safeguarded male rights to patriarchal discipline against subordinates in the home. Leading planters also formally tied manhood to martial violence through the organization and prominence given to the militia. In short, the Barbadian government solidified elite colonial masculinity, often performed by violence and defined by landownership, martial prowess, the duty to keep order, and good governance of the household. In the process, it provided the foundation for a brutal slave society, dominated by a few wealthy white males, which largely came to fruition by the end of the next decade.[2]

The planters also used their government to claim both belonging and liberty within the wider English World. Legislation and political structures ostensibly conformed to English standards. The Assembly even passed laws that redefined acceptable sexual behavior to align with metropolitan gender ideals. For example, Ligon made special note of a "standing commission...for punishing Adultery and Fornication." Though, he noted, it was "rarely put in execution." The commission is emblematic of the early Barbadian Government. On the surface, it sought to parallel the gender practices of the homeland and make the island, in the words of Larry Gragg, "truly English." By extension, the

[2] Richard Hall, *Acts, passed in the island of Barbados. From 1643, to 1672* (London: Printed for Richard Hall, 1764), 5 & 64.

planters hoped to claim belonging as Englishmen like any other, which included political rights in Parliament.[3] In practice, though, the government did little to curtail expressions of manhood that diverged from metropolitan standards. It primarily avoided actions that might undermine the planters' patriarchal autonomy. In the end, the early government often proved a vehicle for leading Barbadians to pursue greater sovereignty in relation with London, as much as it aimed to make them more firmly part of England. Power, wealth, and freedom as landowning men were the driving imperatives, above being "truly English." These drives set the stage for a growing colonial identity.

Historians have tended to treat the Barbadian Government's founding as a formality. Except for Gragg and earlier historians like P.F. Campbell, most (from Richard Dunn to Sarah Barber and Hilary Beckles) address it briefly. To them it was, more or less, a simple matter of course. A colony needs a government. The Barbadians logically modeled theirs on English precedent. John Navin, for instance, has demonstrated how the colonists throughout Anglo-America based most of their laws on the English legal code (and incorporated its brutality). At the encouragement of London investors, the Barbadians likewise adopted English legalese to generate stability and secure their estates. Familiar legislation, in Gragg's estimation, added to a "sense that they dwelled in a little England."[4]

---

[3] Richard Ligon, *A True and Exact History,* 173. Larry Gragg, *Englishmen Transplanted: The English Colonization of Barbados, 1627-1660* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003); Gary Puckrein, *Little England: Little England: Plantation Society and Anglo-Barbadian Politics, 1627-1700* (New York: New York University Press, 1984), 116–117.

[4] Larry Gragg, *Englishmen Transplanted,* 87. Usually a euphemism to deny or assert that the Barbadians were interested in forming a "complete" society, the concept of "Little England" has been widely referenced in histories of the island. For more examples of histories that largely pass over the period, see, for example, Richard Dunn, *Sugar and Slaves: The Rise of the Planter Class in the English West Indies,*

A gendered analysis of this period demonstrates that the planters did more than adopt English legal and social institutions though. The early Barbadian leaders also sustained a patriarchal manhood that supported their place atop the social and economic structure. As Navin pointed out, the violence systemic to the English legal system placed "physical abuse...in the hands of men of rank and privilege." Legitimizing the violence upon which the planters relied did not only require legislation. It meant first distinguishing themselves as elite males. The government solidified the planters' superiority as landowning men. It called upon gender ideals to justify their power over subordinates – servants, women, poor freeholders, and slaves. Patriarchal manhood legitimized planter supremacy and, in the process, the exclusive access to violence upon which it depended. Exploring the formation of Barbadian institutions in greater depth demonstrates the essential role of masculinity in shaping colonial structures and supporting the planters' absolute authority.[5]

1624-1713 (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1972); Hilary Beckles, *A History of Barbados from Amerindian Settlement to Caribbean Single Market* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007); Carl and Roberta Bridenbaugh, *No Peace Beyond the Line: The English in the Caribbean, 1624-1690* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1972). John Navin, "Intimidation, Violence, and Race in British America," *The Historian* 77, no. 3 (Fall 2015): 464-497.

[5] John Navin, "Intimidation, Violence, and Race," 494. For more on the reciprocal relationship between government institutions and patriarchal power see Eudine Barriteau, *Confronting Power Theorizing Gender: Interdisciplinary Perspectives in the Caribbean* (Kingston: University of the West Indies Press, 2004); Joan Scott, *Gender and the Politics of History* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1999); Henry French and Mark Rothery, "Hegemonic Masculinities?: Assessing change and processes of change in elite masculinity, 1700 – 1900," in *What is Masculinity?: Historical Dynamics from Antiquity to the Contemporary World* (New York: Palgrave and Macmillan, 2011), 144. For more on the creation of institutions in Barbados see Larry Gragg, *Englishmen Transplanted*, 86. For studies of gender and power in the early Caribbean, Eudine Barriteau, *Confronting Power;* Hilary Beckles, "Black Masculinity in Caribbean Slavery," in *Interrogation Caribbean Masculinities: Theoretical and Empirical Analyses*, ed. Rhoda E. Reddock (Kingston: University of West Indies Pres, 2004), 225-243; Rosina Wilthsire-Bordber, "Gender, Race and Class in the Caribbean" in *Gender in Caribbean Development*, ed. Patricia Mohammed and Catherine Shepard (St. Augustine, Trinidad and Tobago: University of West Indies Press, 1988), 136–148. For more on the development of colonial identity and gender see Marty Beth Norton, *Founding Mothers and Fathers: Gendered Power and the Forming of American Society* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1996);

"Prodigious Success"

Formal Government arrived just in time to cope with radical economic, demographic, and environmental change in Barbados. The island's wealth and population grew rapidly from the moment Henry Hawley seized power. In 1635, there were 1,226 taxpayers on the island. By 1639 that number had grown sevenfold to 8,707. While numbers for the 1640s and 1650s are unreliable, Richard Dunn estimated that by 1660 there were at least 40,000 inhabitants, split evenly between whites and blacks. The small island of 166 square miles thus held nearly as many people as the contemporary colonies of Virginia and Massachusetts combined. It also meant that early Barbados had a population density of around 240 people per square mile.[6] The period between 1631 and 1650 saw a "desolate and disorderly show" become the crown jewel of all Anglo-American colonies. Barbados went from colonial backwater to the beginnings of what historian Jack Greene called "the most prosperous seventeenth-century insular colony on the globe." Russell Menard and Eric Williams, meanwhile, agreed that it transformed from a peripheral outpost in Spanish America to the "'hub' of the English Empire." The era of an "English Atlantic," in which England came to dominate the region, was dawning. It would revolve around a triangular trade rooted in slaves and sugar with Barbados as the nexus. A Barbadian resident reported back to Archibald Hay in 1646 that "there is a great change on this island of late, from the worse

---

Susan Amussen, *Caribbean Exchanges: Slavery and the Transformation of English Society, 1640-1700* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2007); Lucille Mathurin Mair, Hilary Beckles, and Verene Shepherd, eds., *A Historical Study of Women in Jamaica, 1655–1844* (Kingston, Jamaica: University of the West Indies Press, 2006); V. Shepherd, Bridget Brereton, and Barbara Bailey, eds., *Engendering History*: *Caribbean Women in Historical Perspective* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1995).

[6] Numbers from Richard Dunn, *Sugar and Slaves,* 55 & 75-76. Virginia had around 27,000 and Massachusetts 20,000. For reference, the modern state of Massachusetts is over 10,000 square miles.

to the better, praised be God." With more people and money came increased interest and competition from abroad – but for those in position to benefit, it was a "great change" indeed.[7]

Initially, Barbados's prospects had appeared dim. There were no great resources to exploit and the island was heavily forested. The colony did not thrive, especially "according to the Imaginations" of the first landholders. Early settlers planted an array of crops with little market value. Attempts at growing tobacco proved uninspiring. Henry Winthrop's father, for example, complained about investing in his son's plantation. Winthrop echoed the more general market opinion that tobacco grown in Barbados was "ill conditioned, foul, full of stalks and evil colored." It held little worth compared to Virginia's product and the Barbadian economy languished. The chaos of competing patent claims, meanwhile, had cast a shadow of instability that proved unappealing to investors back home. No quick fortunes awaited those who traveled to the island between 1627 and 1640. Indigo kept optimism alive, though, and Henry Colt noted in 1631 that "the trade of Cotton fills them all with hope."[8] Hawley's military rule

---

[7] See Hilary Beckles, *The First Black Slave Society: Britain's Barbarity Time in Barbados* (Cave Hill: University of the West Indies Press, 2016); Phyllis Emert, ed., *Colonial Triangular Trade: An Economic Based on Human Misery* (Carlisle, MA: Discovery Enterprises, 1995); Alison Games, *The Web of Empire: English Cosmopolitans in an Age of Expansion, 1560-1660* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008); Sideny Mintz, *Sweetness and Power: The Place of Sugar in Modern History* (New York: Penguin Books, 1986), 43. Quote in William Hay and William Powrey to Archibald Hay, 8 Oct. 1646, "Papers Principally Relating to the Island of Barbados," in Hay of Haystoun Documents, GD 34, Scottish Record Office, Edinburgh. Quoted in Dunn, *Sugar and Slaves*, 59. Microfilm copy available in BDA.

[8] John Winthrop to Henry Winthrop, January 30, 1629, *Winthrop Papers,* Volume II, *1623-1630* (Boston: Massachusetts Historical Society, 1931), 66-69. For more on the attempts to sell tobacco and transition to cotton and other early crops like ginger see Larry Gragg, *Englishmen Transplanted*, 93-96. Henry Colt, "The Voyage of Sir Henry Colt," (1631) in V.T. Harlow, *Colonising Expeditions to the West Indies and Guiana, 1623-1677* (London: Printed for the Hakluyt Society, 1925), 69.

maintained order. However tenuous, it kept the project together until sugar's rise in the 1640s.

Sugar transformed the colony. Scholar Sidney Mintz described how "from humble beginnings on the island of Barbados in the 1640s sugar "engulf[ed] that island" and soon Jamaica too. During the period, Barbados witnessed tremendous ecological, economic, and demographic transformations. Sugar came to reign supreme, and the island's planters transitioned their multipurpose estates where they grew "Indigo, Cotton-wool, Tobacco, Sugar, Ginger," and all manner of fruit almost exclusively to sugar production. Wealthy men and middling fortune seekers flocked to Barbados to claim their piece of the sugar boom. Small farmers sold out to cash-laden newcomers or wealthy neighbors, taking advantage of a glut in land prices. Whereas Colt noted in the 1630s that "all plantations must be by the sea by reason of transportation," settlers now filled the interior. Crude roads knitted them together.[9] Meanwhile, wealth and power concentrated even further into the hands of a small few – aided by new institutions that favored the wealthiest men.

The developments of the 1640s made landownership even more central to elite male standing. By the late 1640s, little arable land was not in private hands. About one fifth belonged to London merchants, but the rest went to planters themselves. Sugar, a land and labor-intensive enterprise, tended to favor those with the most capital. Land prices increased up to four-fold between 1640 and 1650. By the end of the 1640s, very

[9] Sidney Mintz, *Sweetness and Power*, 38. Richard Ligon, *A True and Exact History*, 89. While they did not transition wholly to monoculture, sugar nonetheless dominated the economic function of the island. See Dunn, *Sugar and Slaves.* Henry Colt, "Voyage," 61.

few small plots existed. While some poor, former servants subsisted on five to ten acres, fulfilling colonial ambitions required planting sugar on a grand scale. To be an elite male required increasing amounts of wealth, further distinguishing leading planters from ex-servants and poor freeholders. Plantations of around fifty acres were typical, with the wealthiest men owning well over a hundred. The amount of land one owned became a reliable barometer for the "quality" of the man. "Splendid Planters," came to stand out through "Sumptuous Houses" and "prodigious Success" in cultivating their numerous acres, which the middling or poorer sort could not match.[10]

Planter dominance through landholding was further bolstered by their new Assembly. Power came to have a nearly direct relationship to estate size. They initially granted political privileges to all "freeholders." The Assembly later increased restrictions on voting and office-holding to ten acres.[11] Tying political rights and authority to land prevented former servants, who occasionally held small plots, from claiming any real power – a practice typical of England and the English Atlantic. L.H. Roper has made clear that "the ownership of landed estates [in the English World] constituted the barometer of social status," according to the idea of a "Great Chain of Being." The English saw this

---

[10] By 1638 over 760 individuals on the island owned ten or more acres – the minimum for political rights. All others, five or less, were mostly former servants. Gragg noted that most ex-servants by 1660 could obtain at least a few acres, many holding non-deeded lands under five acres. In 1638, 760 individuals owned ten acres or more. Prior to this period, though, as Dunn argued, few plantations existed smaller than 10 acres. By 1660, Gragg added, only 6% of sales involved fewer than ten acres. See Richard Dunn, *Sugar and Slaves,* 50–51; Larry Gragg, *Englishmen Transplanted,* 102, 132-133, & 150. Quote is from Anon., *Great Newes from the Barbadoes* (London: Printed for L. Curtis, 1676), 7. The wider understanding is drawn from BDA, Hughes Abstracts in Queree Notebooks.

[11] "It was decided that the owner of less than ten acres of land was not qualified to vote as a freeholder; that non-resident freeholders were eligible as voters, and that being a Quaker...was not a disability." From the House of Assembly session of 1676-1677. "Freeholders" having the right to vote was not legislated officially, until the 1660s. "Some Records of the House of Assembly of Barbados," *BHMS Journal* 11, no. 2 (Feb 1944).

"chain" as ordering the world into a fixed hierarchy with the King on top and hereditary landowners just below. Landholding signified a "natural" supremacy that carried privileges like political rights and liberty in the planters' culture. Subordinates owed deference to these individuals. Land accordingly became foundational to the presumed superiority of elite men over servants, slaves, women, and other non-landowning groups in Barbados as well. It served as both the material and ideological root of planter hegemony.[12]

The planters used their monopoly in the government to further cement their place atop the social order by protecting their land claims. Laws of the 1640s, for instance, ensured that that the landowner could now "expect his, or their satisfaction," in making use of any land sold to them "according to their Bill of Sale...without molestation." Guarding rights to real property preserved the status of the landholder. No longer could a governor or the actions of London strip colonists of the standing and patriarchal power that they presumed to extend from land. Moreover, the Assembly ensured that the right to rule fell to male heirs. An additional Act guaranteed "that all the Inhabitants of this Island, that are in quiet possession of any Lands...shall have, hold, and enjoy the same as their free Estate." While "some scruples" arose as to "whether [a plantation was] an Estate for life, or inheritance," the Act moved to "abolish" any further such disputes. It declared "the said Inhabitants are hereby adjudged...to have and to hold their Lands of Right to them, to dispose of, or alienate, or otherwise

[12] L.H. Roper, *The English Empire in America 1602-1658: Beyond Jamestown* (London: Routledge, 2009), 8. As Eudine Barriteau argued, gender ideals might translate claims on "material resources" to "nonmaterial resources such as status." Eudine Barriteau, *Confronting Power*, 31.

descend, or confirm to their Heirs for ever." In this way, the planters used their newfound voice in government to secure their real property in perpetuity. Status quickly became hereditary. Formally attaching power to blood advanced the distinctions between the male planters and subordinate groups as something innate. It became all the more difficult for outsiders to enter the ranks of the elite. Most former servants thus became a "wage proletariat," in the words of Hilary Beckles. The wealthy elite grew into a "plantocracy."[13] Through the early government, the planters protected the land at the heart of their supremacy.

Rights of inheritance not only secured the material basis of the planters' power and status, it was key to fulfilling ideals of manhood. The ability to pass wealth to heirs was central to masculinity in early modern England. In the words of Henry French and Mark Rothery, the "capabilities of a man" depended on leaving an inheritance to his heirs. As Tim Reinke-Williams added, "a chief responsibility of fathers...was to ensure adequate financial provision for future generations." Leaving sons without a means of sustaining their success would have been unmanly. The planters, therefore, sought "full remedy" of the "ambiguities" in inheritance laws in order to protect the "rights" of heirs. In doing so, they ensured the ability to fulfill masculine obligations. The Assembly eventually extended rights of inheritance to slaves, as they became an asset at least as valuable as land. In 1668, the planters put it in "certainty" that "all Negro-slaves...be held, taken, and adjudged to be Estates Real, and not Chattels...according to the manner

[13] Richard Hall, *Acts,* 12 & 14-15. See also, "Some Records of the House of Assembly of Barbados," *BHMS Journal* 11, no. 2 (Feb 1944). Hilary Beckles, *White Servitude and Black Slavery in Barbados, 1627–1715* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1989), 142-166.

and custom of Lands of Inheritance." The Act reinforced an understanding that Africans belonged to a different racial category from which they could not escape. It also protected the valuable assets they had become, as other historians have made clear. But it also helped the planters fulfill their patriarchal responsibility to pass down wealth and status. Inheritance laws reinforced land- and slave-ownership as central to patriarchal manhood.[14]

Inheritance practices around real property also point to the way that legislation advanced elite male power over white women on the island. The 1640's law concerning land referred to "his, or their" rights and those of "Heirs," which according to early modern practice would be male. But, the 1668 Act making slaves real estate referred to "Heir and Widow, who claims Dower," protecting the rights of all claimants over an estate regardless of gender. If slaves really were "Estates Real" like any other, then the Act seemed to give women some privileges in regard to real property. In practice, though, land and slaves fell to male heirs above widows in Barbados. For example, in 1660, Colonel John Yeamans allegedly killed his friend and neighbor Colonel Benjamin Berringer. Within two weeks, Yeamans married Berringer's widow, Margaret. The two then sued to claim Berringer's nearly two-hundred acre plantation. The deceased left no will and depositions clearly found him to have proclaimed while dying that his wife and

[14] Richard Hall, *Acts,* 64. Henry French and Mark Rothery, *Man's Estate: Landed Gentry Masculinities, 1660-1900* (London: Oxford University Press, 2012), 17 & 222. Tim Reinke-Williams, "Manhood and Masculinity in Early Modern England," *History Compass* 12, no. 9 (2014): 687. See also Karen Harvey, *The Little Republic: Masculinity and Domestic Authority in Eighteenth-Century Britain* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012), 172–74 and 177–82. For more on this Act and its connection to race see Edward Rugemer, "The Development of Mastery and Race in the Comprehensive Slave Codes of the Greater Caribbean," *The William and Mary Quarterly*, vol. 70, no. 3, 2013, pp. 429–458; Michael Guasco, *Slaves and Englishmen: Human Bondage in the Early Modern Atlantic World* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2014), 223.

children were to inherit everything. One man, James Browne, even declared that he said "all his estate he would give unto his wife." By the follow year, though, his son John had sole possession of the plantation. Margaret settled for the remaining assets. The outcome fit with English common law. However, the case highlights the way that early legislation and practices on the island favored men. It ensured that land, which engendered power, masculinity, and status, remained only in the hands of elite males.[15]

Island practices concerning the control of real property stymied women's ability to function outside the patriarchal order. Even slaves needed to be explicitly willed to widows for women to exercise rights to them. For instance, James Beek had to ensure that "Joane a negroe woman serve my wife...whilst she live." George Brown, in 1676, left his "loving wife Catherine...five negroes," along with the furniture, a "copper kettle," and other house wares. The rest of the estate, "both lands and negroes, cattle and chattels" went to his son. Unless provided specifically by their husbands, as the Berringer case showed, land and slaves went to male heirs in accord with the English system. Significant estates do, occasionally, appear in the record as owned by women. In 1687, Colonel Thomas Lewis left his 214 acre plantation to his wife Joan Lewis. In 1680, "madam Joyce Sparke" owned a 133 acre plantation in St. James. Yet, such examples are few, especially in the early period, and usually only temporary until the

[15] BDA, RB5/15, p. 10. Following a fight between Berringer and his wife, perhaps stemming from the somewhat dubious origins of their most recent child, Yeamans initiated a duel in defense of his reputation. Berringer fell, later dying from his wounds. In another version, Yeamans lured Berringer to his home in league with Margaret and poisoned him. Again, it was never proven, but suspicion remained. "Nicholas Plantation and Some of its Associations," *Journal of the Barbados Museum and Historical Society,* 9, no. 3 (1942): 120-125. For more on the nuances of inheritance overtime and in different areas of the English Atlantic World see Carole Shammas, *A History of Household Government in America* (Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia Press, 2002), 25-26 & 50-51.

widow remarried. Women might obtain some measure of agency in deciding the political and economic status of men through their choice of husband (or the choice not to marry on occasion). However, even in this, the island's Anglo-Caribbean patriarchy limited their power. In 1674, the widow of Colonel Edward Chamberlaine married Sir John Witham; the two had tenant rights for life over her 185 acre plantation, but Chamerlaine's son Sir Willoughby Chamberlaine inherited ownership. Women often found themselves having to fight even to claim property rights granted in wills. Unable to get justice in Barbados, Averina Holdip, in 1663, had to petition King Charles II for her husband Richard Holdip's 413 acre property. Governor Francis Willoughby had seized and sold the plantation for £25,000 after her husband's death. The Barbadian Government reinforced practices of English patriarchy and supported male planter authority by restricting the rights of women over real estate. Control fell to male heirs or new husbands. Sometimes, the governor or island courts seized property. Colonial institutions, legislation, and practices regarding land converged with English common law to support elite male authority over white women and reinforced landownership's specific connotations with masculinity. In the process, planter men protected and legitimized their absolute control over the island by monopolizing the power and privileges that land inferred.[16]

[16] BDA, Abstracts in Queree Notebook, 185, 232-233, 241, 247, and 367. BDA, RB7/2, 237; Will 41/261; RB6/8, 457; RB3/19, 236. For more on white female property owners see Cecily Jones, *Engendering Whiteness: White Women and Colonialism in North Carolina and Barbados*, 1627-1865 (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007), chap. 3.

“Nothing more Terrible to them”

As authority consolidated in the hands of wealthy men, the island's underclass transformed. Planters gobbled up available land, forced out small-holders, and subjected their servants to brutal working and living conditions. In the process, they drove away the free white population. Meanwhile, laboring opportunities and pay in England would improve following the English Civil War (ca. 1649). White servants became even less available as they pursued opportunities in England. African slaves, however, grew more accessible via Portuguese, Dutch, and English merchants trading along the African coast. Making money in sugar came to mean harnessing large teams of these enslaved laborers. Most historians estimate that a sugar plantation required around one slave per acre. Sidney Mintz argued that a harvest of about eighty acres might take up to one hundred men and women. In any case, the largest plantations had hundreds of slaves. By the 1650s, Barbados achieved a decisive black majority.[17] Tall, sweeping stalks of sugar, cultivated and processed by tens of thousands of black Africans came to dominate the countryside. Sugar and slavery remade the demographic and physical landscape of Barbados, presenting new challenges to the basis of planter rule.

---

[17] See Ward Barrett, “Caribbean sugar-production standards in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries,” in John Parker, ed., *Merchants and Scholars: Essays in the History of Exploration and Trade* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1965), 165; Richard Dunn, *Sugar and Slaves,* 198; Sidney Mintz, *Sweetness and Power*, 49. Quote is in Larry Gragg, *Englishmen Transplanted,* 103. Unable to attract new white laborers from Europe because of the poor reputation they developed, planters looked elsewhere for workers. For more on the transition to large plantations and African labor, as well as the decline of the small-holder, see Russell R. Menard, *Migrants, Servants and Slaves*: *Unfree Labor in Colonial British America* (Burlington: Aldershot, 2001). The number of slaves grew to 20,000 in three decades. Richard Dunn, *Sugar and Slaves*; Russell Menard, *Migrants, Servants and Slaves: Unfree Labor in Colonial British America* (Aldershot, England: Ashgate, 2001).

The demographic transformations of the 1640s meant that simple martial law and improvised physical punishments would be insufficient to rule the island. In particular, growing fear about bondsmen uniting in revolt tested planter authority. Ligon, for example, arrived on the island in 1647 in the wake of a general conspiracy among servants and slaves to overtake the island. In response to such threats, the planters turned to patriarchal violence to reassert their authority. Punishments by masters or overseers remained regular. Additionally, though, the planters created a militia to organize their collective, physical capacity. As opposed to the *ad hoc* efforts or a dependence on the governor's men that defined the previous decade, the militia required all free males to participate in unison to support the island's stability. The planters designed the force especially to deal with those "servants and runaway Negroes" who rejected the absolute authority of their masters. It would hunt down rebels and "suppress or destroy them."[18] The personal participation of the planters in the militia, extended the importance of violence to elite masculinity. Through it, they enacted patriarchal authority at times when the number of subordinates made individual violence alone untenable.

The codification of the militia in the 1640s reinforced martial violence as central to elite manhood and power. As the island's historians, Jerome Handler, Larry Gragg, and others, have observed, the militia was the chief means of control on the island in the early decades. Fulfilling masculine obligations to keep good order, then, meant participation in the force. The planters were especially keen to prevent "in bred"

[18] Richard Ligon, *A True and Exact History*, 94 & 96. Also see Richard Dunn, *Sugar and Slaves,* 69; Larry Gragg, *Englishmen Transplanted,* 86 & 108.

insurrection among servants. Little is known about its early organization but, by the 1650s, elite men dominated the militia. Only landowning men could be officers. For instance, "a field officer was required by law to own a hundred acres, and an ensign had to have at least fifteen." Through such restrictions, the planters formalized the place of martial leadership as indicative of status. In England, the ruling elite had begun to obscure the importance of participation in the military. But, for Barbadians, militia officership denoted masculine worth, something reflected in the tendency for it to overlap with elected civil authority. A majority of Assemblymen in the seventeenth century held militia positions. Even in 1682, fourteen of the twenty-two members of the Assembly had military titles. At least one represented each parish. Even as civil institutions became prominent, martial prowess was still central to masculinity and political authority. Military men stood in high esteem and had a firm hand in directing the island. The militia's prestige in Barbados encouraged elite males to actively engage in martial violence, which paid dividends for their collective power. Added requirements that all landed men participate in the militia personally by the 1670s cemented martial duty as vital to patriarchal manhood.[19]

---

[19] Gary Puckrein, "Plantation Society, Factions, and the Origins of the Barbadian Civil War," (PhD Diss., Brown University, 1985), 63. He referenced P.F. Campbell, "The Barbados Militia, 1627-1815," *BMHS Journal*, vol. 35, (1976): 107-108. By the 1680s, it had been firmly established that each possessor "of Twenty acres of Land or upward...find and provide...one sufficient able man to beare Armes," per twenty acres. In this way, those with the largest land-holdings had control over the make-up of the militia. Those in charge, naturally had to hold the consent of those land-owners who provided the bulk of its soldiers, servants, "Negroes and slaves worthy [of] great trust and Confidence to bee reposed in them." BDA, "Act for the Settlement of the Militia of this Island," in the *Journal of the Assembly of Barbados, from 13 Sept. 1684 to 17 May 1687.* TNA, CO 31/2, pp. 471-484. This system reflected a cultural legacy in which the landed elite practiced what has been called "colonel proprietorship." England's forces had traditionally been led by the nobility, who mustered men as needed. These otherwise civilian gentlemen obtained military rank according to a hierarchy of wealth. Tenants owed service to these "colonel proprietors," leaders on the battlefield by birthright. See Christopher Duffy, *The Military Experience in the Age of*

The militia supported social order and the patriarchal authority of landowning men over servants and slaves beyond just its capacity to squash rebellion. A 1652 law helped fill the ranks of the infantry and cavalry by requiring every freeholder to supply one man for every twenty acres he owned. As Jerome Handler has made clear, this required relying on both servants and slaves as militia soldiers. The Assembly reiterated this requirement in the 1680s. For failing to show up when called, a servant or slave "listed to serve" had to "lye neck and Heeles runye Gatlope [*sic*] or ride the wooden horse at the next meeting." The punishment was a brutal ordeal, common in the English military after about 1640. The malefactor rode naked through a column of his company members who whipped him using sharpened reeds. Through compulsory service, enforced by violence, the planters enlisted subordinate men to support the social order that held them in bondage. Those who resisted faced harsh punishments. Commanders had a mandate, for instance, to punish "any mutinies or Disturbances whatsoever." The penalty, again, had the offender "running Gantlope lying neck and Heels" over a horse. By 1685, legislation codified similar punishments for "soldiers striking or threatening

---

Reason (New York: Routledge Press, 1987). While traditional to English society as well, such connections had been waning and continued to over the course of the seventeenth century. See, for example, Arthur N. Gilbert, "Law and Honour among Eighteenth-Century British Army Officers," *The Historical Journal* 19 (March, 1976): 75-87; Christopher Duffy, *The Military Experience in the Age of Reason* (New York: Atheneum, 1988); Richard Holmes, ed., *Oxford Companion to Military History* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001); Michael Braddick, "Civility and Authority," in *The British Atlantic World, 1500-1800*, ed. David Armitage and Michael J. Braddick (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009), 113-132. For more on violence and martial service in the medieval era see Richard Kaeuper, *Chivalry and Violence in medieval Europe* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999); Warren Brown, *Violence in Medieval Europe* (New York: Pearson, 2011). Participation in local militias in England, as noted by historian David Lawrence, still served as an effective path to gaining status for lower gentry. Such men used militias to distinguish themselves and display "honor" and "military prowess," paying dividends on a local level, even as the upper nobility eschewed participation in such violence. This seems to have been the strategy of the Barbadians as well, but their ambitions outstripped its usefulness. David Lawrence, "Great Yarmouth's Exercise: Honour, Masculinity and Civic Military Performance in Early Stuart England," in *Worth and repute: valuing gender in late medieval and early modern Europe: essays in honour of Barbara Todd,* ed. Kim Kippen and Lori Woods (Toronto: Center for Reformation and Renaissance Studies, 2011), 365–89.

officers" in any way.[20] Militia practices thus reinforced the potentially violent supremacy and special status of landowning males over servants and slaves. Through its commanders' use of demeaning physical punishments, the militia reiterated the patriarchal authority and masculine superiority of landowning men over subordinate male bodies. Laws created a militia system that not only guarded against servant and slave insurrection and advanced landowning male supremacy, but forced these groups' complicity in supporting it.

The militia played an important ideological and psychological role in showcasing the planters' superior masculinity as well. The island's leaders often used it to display the physical, masculine power at their disposal to growing numbers of African slaves. For example, Ligon could imagine "nothing more terrible to [slaves than] the mustering of our men, and the hearing their Gun-shot." Mere drilling, he believed, so frightened the slaves that they "dare not look up to any bold attempt." Most historians have referenced Ligon's statement as representative of the militia's "socio-political purpose," as Michael Craton put it. The performances described by Ligon, in fact, did play a role in preventing large-scale revolts according to Jerome Handler.[21] The militia served as a reminder of the violent basis of the planters' authority. But it also projected their

---

[20] In contrast to servants or slaves, landowners only had to pay a fine of "five shillings sterling, and no more for every day each man according to his proportion of Land shall be wanting" in providing for the militia. *Journal of the Assembly of Barbados, from 13 Sept. 1684 to 17 May 1687,* 73 & 77. John M. Collins, *Martial Law and English Laws, c. 1500-1700* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016). Jerome Handler, "Freedmen and Slaves in the Barbados Militia," *Journal of Caribbean History* 19, (1984): 1-25.

[21] Richard Ligon, *A True and Exact History*, 97. See, for example, Michael Craton, "Reluctant Creoles: The Planters' World in the British West Indies," in *Strangers in the Realm: Cultural Margins of the First British Empire,* ed. Bernard Bailyn and Philip Morgan (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1991), 327; Jerome Handler, "Slave Revolts and Conspiracies in Seventeenth-Century Barbados" *New West Indian Guide* 56, no. 1/2 (1982): 8.

superior manhood, tied to physical strength and defined by a will to violence. Ostensibly, their masculine prowess cowed the enslaved. African men's lack of "boldness" in comparison with the planters confirmed the former's inferior masculinity to elite whites like Ligon. French Protestant Charles de Rochefort echoed a similar conclusion about a decade later. He proclaimed that, in contrast to men of worth learned in Arms, African slaves in the Caribbean were 'inferior men' because, while "very strong and hardy," they were "so fearful and unwieldly in the handling of Arms, that they are easily reduc'd under subjection."[22] As a result, in addition to preventing revolt through its psychic impact, marital display supported a sense of masculine superiority among the planters. It helped to legitimize their supremacy over enslaved men, who lacked sufficient manliness to contest the power of landowning whites.

The ideological role of the militia in supporting the planters' patriarchal manhood proved especially essential to the maintenance of power as slaves became a decisive majority during the 1650s. One writer claimed that, in 1650, the planters could "muster 10,000 foot" and 1,000 good horse to meet the threat of a growing population of Africans. However, in no time during the decade could militia commanders boast such numbers. As noted by V.T. Harlow, in 1652 Governor Francis Willoughby was only able to muster 6,000 foot and 400 horse to defend the island. As the numbers of enslaved blacks grew in the mid-century to rival and then pass the number of whites, the militia's actual ability to stop a full-scale revolt is questionable. As a result, its

[22] Charles de Rochefort, *The History of the Caribby-Islands*, trans. John Davies (London: Printed by John Macock for Thomas Dring, 1666), 201.

symbolic support for the planters' power by advancing their superior manhood proved all the more important. [23]

The Barbadian Government offered non-military opportunities for planters to perform patriarchal manhood as well. In the 1640s, the men of the Assembly provided fees for a formal bureaucracy of freeholders, extensive compared to the 1630s. New offices provided avenues to obtain power and achieve masculine ideals. Positions like "Clerk of the Peace" could provide prestige and wealth to the individual. For every "action entered" the Clerk received 100 pounds of sugar. For each indictment, he received fifty pounds and for "every Execution" forty. Such rewards bound the individual to vigilantly project governmental authority. But it also supported his personal manhood. Again turning to Roper's analysis of England and Virginia, "occupying local offices" was a key "responsibility" of landowning men. Proper manhood carried the expectation to not only keep order in the household, but also the wider community by, for instance, "overseeing manorial courts." Likewise, in Barbados, the faithful execution of governmental duties attested to the officeholder's manly worth. Through official positions, landowning men on the island could fulfill manly ideals.[24]

Achieving manhood through administrative posts, though, required the officer to behave according to certain standards. The Assembly enforced gender ideals on its officeholders in two ways. First, a candidate had to put in "security" before being admitted to office to assure of "his honest and just demeanor." Financial penalty

---

[23] See V.T. Harlow, *Colonising Expeditions,* 71. For more on the importance of the militia for maintaining order see Larry Gragg, *Englishmen Transplanted,* 86; Jerome Handler, "Slave Revolts;" Richard Dunn, *Sugar and Slaves*; Hilary Beckles, *The First Black Slave Society,* 24-25.
[24] L.H. Roper, *The English Empire in America,* 8. Richard Hall, *Acts*, 8-11.

awaited those who did not meet manly values of probity and justice in service to the government. Second, the Assembly sought to extract proper behavior by placing the officer's masculine honor on the line through oaths. Men of early modern England (and extending far into the medieval period) took oaths regularly. "Swearing" was a pervasive feature of English life. While attitudes toward them varied, many took oaths, in historian Simon Schama's words, "with deadly seriousness." Oaths were tied to honor and served as a "performative language" that "force[d] its [swearer]...to act in certain ways."[25] In Barbados, the Assembly focused on enforcing masculine ideals of "honesty" and "duty" through oaths of office. "No Person or persons" would be "employed, or received in the Office of a Clerk in any of the several Courts in [the] Island, until they" took "oath before the Governor...for their honest, true, and faithful and careful performance of their several duty, or duties." Before being granted power within the government, one had to make a public declaration of his intent to behave according to the standards of his peers. He had to vow not to "raze, deface, or embezzle any Action, Order, or Record" that might diminish the reputation and legitimacy of the government by violating gendered ideals of duty and honesty.[26]

---

[25] Richard Hall, *Acts*, 8-11. Simon Schama, *A History of Britain: At the Edge o f the World?* (New York: Hyperion, 2000), 86; Ann Hughes, *Gender and the English Revolution* (New York: Routledge, 2012), 7; Melissa Jane Mohr, "Strong Language: Oaths, Obscenities, and Performative Literature in Early Modern England," (PhD diss., Stanford University, 2003); Jonathan Gray, *Oaths and the English Reformation* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012). For oath taking and its connection to violence see Steve Hindle, "The State and Social Change in Early modern England" in *The Keeping the Public Peace*, ed. by Paul Griffiths, Adam Fox, and Steve Hindle (London: Macmillian, 1996), 94-115.
[26] Richard Hall, *Acts,* 13.

“Power in correcting their Servants”

The militia and courts assumed some of the patriarchal responsibilities that previously fell on male heads of the household; but the government also encouraged individual landowning men to continue using disciplinary violence. One law, in the 1640s, punished “all manner of Vices.” In particular, it provided “four hours” in the stocks for “drinking, Swearing, Gaming, or otherwise misdemeaning.” The courts now regulated social behavior among lesser sorts. Legislation, though, also gave elite men wide latitude in their own use of physical force to keep order. As studies of pre-1660 England demonstrate, it was a patriarch's right (and indeed his duty) to control the household (servants, wives, and children), using violence if necessary. Physical discipline was fundamental to manhood. Barbadian legislation confirmed that cultural understanding. The law made clear that, while the courts were assuming some of the responsibility for keeping order, it did not “take...away any Master's power in correcting their Servants.” Daragh Grant has argued that, in South Carolina, the government assumed the duties for punishments often “against the interests of individual slave-owners” by subsuming “unfettered personal power and authority” over slaves. But, in Barbados, the Assembly went out of its way to protect the individual planter's access to disciplinary violence, reiterating its centrality to elite masculinity. Barbadians also did not restrict spousal abuse as Carole Shammas has noted of Massachusetts Bay. Such prohibitions, she argued, gave “household dependents” some measure of power. The Act in Barbados, though, reflected the idea that the planters could not be “men,” not

properly, without free access to the violence that kept their homes in obedience.[27] Doing so laid the groundwork for the especially brutal methods of power enacted on servants and slaves in the early-modern Caribbean.

Beyond just protecting elite male rights over the household, the laws of the 1640s also demanded that planters exercise their patriarchal control. For instance, "An Act concerning Morning and Evening Prayer in families" coerced landowning males to undertake the moral education of children and servants. This fit with cultural expectations of the homeland. As Elizabeth Foyster argued of contemporary England, "a man's public political credibility was closely tied to" the governance of his family, which especially included their "religious government." A well-ordered family attested to masculine worth. Fulfilling such duties, moreover, supported social stability and patriarchy. As sociologists and historians have long noted, early-modern Christianity reinforced male supremacy. The Christianity of the time reinforced the legitimacy of the patriarch's authority through a connection to the divine. The privileges enjoyed by all men over women (and elite men over all dependents) rested on proper religious instruction of subordinates. In Barbados, failure to instruct "their Children, or Servants

[27] "An Act concerning Morning and Evening Prayers in Families, &c," in Richard Hall, *Acts,* 5. Daragh Grant, "'Civilizing' the Colonial Subject: The Co-Evolution of State and Slavery in South Carolina, 1670-1739," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 57, no. 3 (07, 2015): 617. Carole Shammas, *A History of Household Government*, 47. See also Elizabeth Foyster, "Male Honour, Social Control and Wife Beating in Late Stuart England," *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 6th series, 6 (1996): 215–224. Susan Amussen has also noted how masters of household commonly used violence against their wives, children, servants and apprentices. Susan Amussen, '"The part of a Christian man': the cultural politics of manhood in early modern England', in Susan Amussen and Mark Kishlansky, eds., *Political Culture and Cultural Politics in Early Modern England* (Manchester, 1995), 220 & 227. See also John Beattie, "Violence and society in early-modern England," in *Perspectives in Criminal Law,* ed. Anthony Doob and Edward Greenspan (Aurora, Ontario: Canada Law Book, 1985), 37 & 31; Terri L. Snyder, "Gender Dependency, and Household Violence in Virginia, 1646-1720," in *Over the Threshold: Intimate Violence in Early America* (New York: Routledge, 2013), 220.

under years of Discretion, in the Fundamentals of the Christian Religion" resulted in a "penalty of forty pounds of sugar." The Assembly thereby enforced English masculine expectations. It would pay dividends for planter authority over women, servants, and slaves, as it did for English landholders.[28]

Aside from just furthering existing expectations, though, the Act sought to correct lapses of planter masculinity. It noted that "little care hath been observed to be taken by Parents, or Masters of Families," in matters of religion. Failures of manhood resulted in Christianity becoming "scandalized, and the worship of God condemned, and all manner of Vices [encouraged], through the ignorance of persons attaining maturity of Years." A lack of patriarchal religious instruction had encouraged social chaos. The Assembly now worked to force the planters to meet masculine expectations, explicitly laying out the proper behavior for the island's "masters of families."[29]

To better maintain control of the island, the Barbadian Government also attempted to ensure conformity in religion. Instruction in a general "Christianity" was not enough. The Assembly focused on advancing Anglicanism, specifically, believing it to most effectively buttress planter superiority. As Roper pointed out of England, Anglican

---

[28] In accordance with the early modern view of the household as a microcosm of the whole social order, religious instruction at home helped attain a more stable society overall, which primarily benefited landowning men. Elizabeth Foyster, *Manhood in Early Modern England: Honour, Sex, and Marriage* (New York: Routledge, 1999), 117. For the law see Richard Hall, *Acts,* 4–5. For more on the household's relationship to the state and social order see Susan Amussen, *An Ordered Society: Gender and Class in Early Modern England* (New York: B. Blackwell, 1988); Alexandra Shepard, *Meanings of Manhood in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006). On religion and patriarchal order see, for example, Bryan Turner, *Religion and Social Theory* (Santa Barbara, CA: Sage Publications, 1991). See also, for a general study, J.B. Elshtain, "Christianity and Patriarchy: The Odd Alliance," *Modern Theology*, 9 (1993): 109-122. For the importance of religion to masculinity and order in Early Modern England see Mark Breitenberg, *Anxious Masculinity in Early Modern England* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 64. For more on the norms of household practices in England and North America see Carole Shammas, *A History of Household Government,* 50.

[29] Richard Hall, *Acts*, 5.

teachings encouraged a more stable social order. Indeed, "heterodoxy" to the Church of England proved a "source of acute anxiety" for English elites. Antinomian or other radical Protestantism threatened stability, where the Anglican Church supported traditional hierarchies by advancing a view of the world consistent with the "Great Chain of Being." It supported the dominance of landowning males over other groups, the "drains" or "tenants, servants, and wage laborers," as something natural, God-given. Accordingly, the Barbadian Assembly seemed to believe that by allowing "all manner" of ideas to flourish, so too had vice. Noting the "divers opinionated and self-concerted persons" who "declared an absolute dislike to the Government of the Church of *England*," the Assembly passed "an Act or Order for the Publication and Execution of the Acts concerning the uniformity of Common-Prayer." The law sought Anglican consistency. To express dissenting ideas was to be "self-concerted." The leading planters cast such individuals as dangerous, not on religious grounds, but because heterodoxy worked to the detriment of the masculine imperative to keep good order.[30]

Despite these Acts, the Barbadian patriarchy did not necessarily depend on religion. Like many laws aimed at the planters, these 1640s Acts seem to have been little enforced. In itself, this is instructive. The Assembly aspired to guide the island toward English standards through legislation. However, the unique context of the colonial Caribbean complicated matters. For instance, even as the ink dried on these Acts, African slaves were steadily replacing Christian servants as the primary laborers. The planters had a dubious will and even less incentive to convert Africans to Christianity.

[30] L.H. Roper, *The English Empire in America,* 27-28. Richard Hall, *Acts,* 4-6.

For one, they were unsure how it would impact a slave's legal status. In the 1640s, Ligon enquired about converting an eager slave named Sambo. The owner's reply is telling. He responded to the request by expressing the belief that "being once a Christian, he could no more account him a Slave." Sambo might go from "slave" to "Christian servant" under the law. In the context of slavery, religious instruction would actually undermine patriarchal power rather than support it. Paltry early efforts gave way to the active prevention of Christianizing slaves by the 1670s. Even when the Bishop of London assured the island, in 1680, "that [slaves] becoming Christian does not at all deprive the owners of the same power and disposal of them, as they had before," most Barbadians remained reluctant. By this time, rigid racial views became an excuse not to Christianize Africans. The planters replied to London that "their savage brutishness renders them wholly uncabpable [*sic*] and many have endeavored it without any success." Soon after one Anglican woman declared sardonically that it would be more useful to "Baptize a Puppy" than convert "Negros."[31] In Barbados, the planters' power relied on a range of ideologies, which included a broad conception of patriarchal control over the household and, eventually, race. Religion may have supported their sense of superiority over slaves, but religious instruction of the household did not necessarily become central to elite manhood or authority, where racial and cultural considerations stood in the way. So, they instead relied more heavily upon patriarchal violence.

[31] Richard Ligon, *A True and Exact History,* 101. TNA, CO 29/3, pp. 61-62. Morgan Godwyn *The Negro and Indian's Advocate* (London: Godwyn, 1680), 137. On the colonial context and the challenges of asserting a social order on cultural 'others' see David Hackett, *The Rude Hand of Innovation: Religion and Social Order in Albany, New York, 1652-1836* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991). For the links between high politics and social order in local settings see Susan D. Amussen, *An Ordered Society*, 184.

Laws concerning religion and moral behavior did however reinforce the island's gendered hierarchy by delineating who could be the victim of violent judicial punishments. For example, if a servant did not attend Church and the "default be in his Master, then his Master [was] to pay ten pounds of Cotton" – a small pittance for any landowning male. In contrast, "if the neglect [lay] in the Servant...he [was] to be punished at the discretion of the next Justice of the Peace." Such punishments, early on, usually involved a brutal, public whipping or some time spent in the stocks. Likewise, servants would be "imprisoned" in the "stocks" for "the space of four hours" for amoral behavior like drunkenness. In addition to the physical pain involved, the stocks constituted a public shaming that emasculated the individual for his behavior. It became a manifestation of the government's control over him, displaying his inferiority to a wide audience. Elite men merely had to quietly pay "five shillings" for the same misdemeanor. Exemption from the ordeal of the stocks distinguished elite men as superior. The courts did not have the same control over their bodies. It prevented a night of drunkenness from undermining their masculine integrity. The government thus enforced a hierarchy of masculinity. Elite men had special privileges that inferior men did not. The distinctions the planters made in regard to judicial violence helped to reinforce their patriarchal manhood.[32]

[32] Richard Hall, *Acts,* 5–6. John Tosh, "Hegemonic Masculinity and Gender History," in *Masculinities in Politics and War: Gendering Modern History*, eds. Stefan Dudink, Harden Hagemann, and John Tosh (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2004), 41-56.

“In Full Force and Power”

In addition to asserting greater power over the island and its population, the Barbadian Government also aimed to advance the planters' interests in negotiation with London. It focused on preserving sovereignty in the imperial context. For instance, one of the Assembly's first major actions was to suspend proprietary rents in 1641. Henry Hawley's heavy-handed rule of the 1630s had encouraged initial efforts to create a new government. Given the chance, the planters pursued a system of power that was less reliant on the governor's physical ability to keep control. Dispersing authority, away from the Royal Governor, might place more power in colonists' hands. Through the Assembly, eventually containing twenty-two principal planters, the Barbadian elite combated demands from London throughout the era.

The death of the earl of Carlisle in 1636 gave the planters' their first chance to have a greater say in the island's governance. His estate passed to his heir, James Hay, who became the second earl of Carlisle. However, his debts left the fate of Barbados largely in the hands of creditors. They sent Peter Hay to better oversee the collection of rents in consideration of Carlisle's arrears. This new “receiver general” quickly came to view Hawley as the “president of mischief.” The Governor reported income poorly at best, perhaps duplicitously. He also kept or distributed property meant to go to the proprietor.[33] In the meantime, Robert Rich, the earl of Warwick, worked to purchase Barbados through the trustees of Carlisle's estate. Hawley traveled to London in 1638 and threw his weight behind Warwick to protect his position on the island. His

[33] See Larry Gragg, *Englishman Transplanted, 39*; J.H. Bennett, “The English Caribbees in the Period of the Civil War, 1642-1646,” *William and Mary Quarterly* 24, no. 3 (July, 1967): 359-362.

relationship with the Hays further deteriorated. Carlisle, furious about his disloyalty, immediately replaced him with Henry Hunks, who left for the island in early 1639. Hawley sailed just ahead of him, however, having gained a royal commission as "Lt. General and Governor of Barbados." (Hawley took advantage of his knowledge that King Charles I never read anything he signed about the management of the empire).[34] When Hawley arrived back in the Caribbean, he set about trying to gain support from the island's planters. Having a good knowledge of their disposition, he focused on appealing to their desire for wealth and power. He granted more lands and called an Assembly to represent planter interests. In doing so, he provided the colonists with their first real platform for exercising power against the metropole, outside of violent rebellion. Initially, the Assembly was, in the words of Larry Gragg, little more than a "rubber stamp for the governor." In a short time, though, the planters employed their miniature "parliament" toward their own purposes.[35]

The presumed power inferred by their new political voice melded with the planters' potentially violent patriarchal manhood, leading to an aggressive pursuit of autonomy. Through the Assembly, they confirmed Hawley's right to the governorship. As Gragg has previously noted, nothing in the island's charter or Hawley's commission gave them such authority. But the planters used their political body to press the boundaries of their power. When Hunks arrived to take his rightful place as governor, the Assembly defended their control over the island. Refusing to let him read his royal

[34] J.A. Williamson noted that Hawley bragged about it three years prior that "his majesty took no notice of our commissions, but set his hand to the letter as it was presented to him'." J.A. Williamson, *The Caribee Islands under the Proprietary Patents* (London: Oxford University Press, 1926), 140.
[35] See Larry Gragg, *Englishmen Transplanted,* 37–39.

commission, they instead “bid their Clark to take it and lock it up.” Intent on protecting their sovereignty (and Hawley intent on keeping power), one Assembly member went so far as to claim that Barbados did not fall under the English King's authority, but rather the King of Spain. “They would not obey or acknowledge nor receive any Governor but Capt. Hawley,” according to Hunks. If necessary, the planters would back up their presumed right to autonomy through violence. The same member declared openly that, should the Earl of Carlisle take issue and attempt to collect rents, or even show his face “on the island, he would cut his throat.” Hunks claimed he “was threatened to be pistoll'd if [he] demanded the Government.” Challenges to the wide-ranging powers the leading planters now presumed to possess elicited a characteristically violent response, attached to a sense of manhood perpetually capable of violence to enact authority. When rumor soon circulated that a group of colonists planned to murder both Peter Hay and Hunks, the two fled. Hay went to London to make his report to the proprietors and Hunks left for Antigua.[36] The Assembly's authority supported and blended with the power that Barbadians saw as extending from their patriarchal manhood to shape a potentially violent pursuit of colonial autonomy.

Having obtained a taste for self-rule, the planters jealously guarded their newfound political power. Henry Ashton, leader of a group of royal commissioners, arrived in March of 1640. He forced Hawley to give up his post and Hunks finally took over the governorship. Hunks' rule, however, was doomed from the start. He made few friends, tossing the slightest critic in jail for extended periods. He threatened enemies

[36] Quotes can be found in Larry Gragg, *Englishmen Transplanted,* 39-42 and a letter by Hunks reprinted in J.A. Williamson, *Caribbee Islands*, 141-142. See also J.H. Bennett, “The English Caribbees.”

with violence and appointed outsiders to important posts. The planters must have perceived his actions as an overt infringement on the rights they came to expect – a return to martial law. The planters responded by slandering his character and refusing to accept his rule. They painted him, in Larry Gragg's words, as "a drunken, vindictive tyrant...given to intimidating language." The planters here selectively invoked gendered cultural ideals to advance their interests (knowing well their own propensity to drink and tyrannize). They further cast Hunks as an enemy of the Church, who declared that it "should sink and the parson swim," (though few planters had displayed any love for the Church themselves).[37] Hoping to take back control, the planters characterized Hunks as unfit to lead because he had strayed into dishonorable, unmanly ground. In the process, the colonists made clear that, in the future, London's desires would need to be mediated by their own, profound expectations for political autonomy.

The planters soon achieved their goals. By the end of the year, they had traded Hunks for a more indulgent Phillip Bell. With his reign came greater local control over the island and an expansion of their institutional power. Bell gave more legal authority to the Assembly, allowing it to make laws, many of which are noted above. He led only with the advice of a "Governor's Council," made up of leading planters. He also undermined faction by reorganizing the island's six parishes into eleven, dispersing influence. Each parish received two representatives in the Assembly. Parliament soon recognized the body, giving it legitimacy and, by extension, affirming the planters' right

[37] For concepts of liberty and the influence of Machiavellian ideas about its defense prior to the English Civil War and, in particular, the ways free will and freedom of speech became part of the meaning of liberty see Hilary Gatti, *Ideas of Liberty in Early Modern Europe: From Machiavelli to Milton* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2015). Quotes are in Larry Gragg, *Englishmen Transplanted,* 41.

to political liberty. The planters could now direct their new government toward their own aims. As scholar J.H. Bennett put it, by 1641 "the people themselves began to take a hand in forcing of change." Thanks to the civil war, which began the following year, the planters largely enjoyed the autonomy from England they sought. The chaos of the war kept England too busy to worry much about its periphery.[38]

The Assembly moved to secure the credibility of planter political power. Ensuring the legitimacy of its right to legislate, it declared that "all and singular the said statues, Laws, and Ordinances, so made by the General Assembly, shall from henceforth continue, be, and remain in full force and power." The measure lent gravitas to the planters' political authority. None of their Acts, they declared, could "at any time...be repealed, or nullified, in part, or in whole, nor any thing thereunto added, without the assent, consent, advice and approbation of a like General Assembly...which Freeholders are freely to be elected and chosen, by the major voice of the several parishes."[39] The planters, in this way, laid out their expectations for political rights and power as landed men. They claimed autonomy and reinforced the legitimacy of their government. Neither proprietor nor Parliament could alter their Acts without their consent – so they declared. Bell's indulgences and the autonomy enjoyed during the war seemed to confirm the planters' belief that they possessed relative freedom to conduct their affairs. The events of the next decade would challenge that assumption. As the civil war came to end in the early 1650s and the planters found themselves confronted by an

---

[38] See J.H. Bennett, "The English Caribbees," 368; Carla Pestana, *The English Atlantic in the Age of Revolution, 1640-1661* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2004); Gary Puckrein, *Little England*.
[39] Richard Hall, *Acts*, 12 & 14-15.

expansionist-minded Protectorate that wanted firmer control over its colonies. The clash would test the veracity of their claims to political autonomy and their identity as elite Englishmen.

Conclusion

By the end of the 1640s, the planters had consolidated power. Legislative and political organization buttressed their absolute authority over the island. Rooted in existing masculine ideals, formal government reinforced and legitimized the planters' sense of superiority. It protected their use of physical force to keep control, including violent punishments in the household and martial violence in the militia. Through new courts, the planters enacted physical judicial discipline in support of their authority as well. The colonial government further cemented the planters' supremacy through laws that added to the physical and ideological project of subjugating women, servants, and slaves. The Assembly also became the primary tool by which the planters tried to claim the political autonomy they desired within the imperial context. Ultimately, legal, political, and militia structures, modeled on the homeland and rooted in existing patriarchal ideals, helped the planters' pursue shared goals for wealth and power in a new social, political, and economic environment.

While grounded in English tradition, the Barbadian Government betrayed distinctly local concerns. Their emphasis on protecting property rights, taken for granted by English elites, demonstrated a colonial sensitivity about land claims. The marriage of military posts with civilian authority, meanwhile, points to a distinctly local necessity for the ruling elites to also personally participate in military violence. Additionally, African

slaves and Irish servants made up the vast majority of their subordinates. Protestantism helped distinguish the planters as a result, but it also undermined the importance of Anglican religious instruction to elite manhood in contrast with England. Collectively, the formation and application of Barbadian institutions in the 1640s helps highlight the development of a fundamentally Barbadian masculinity – still English, but transformed by parochial concerns and context.

A distinctly Barbadian masculinity would eventually become the basis for London to reject planter claims to parity. In particular, as the planters proved intent on turning local political power toward autonomy, through violence if necessary, a separate colonial identity emerged. It created tensions with the metropole. Some planters had even been willing to trade their English King for Catholic Spain if it meant achieving the control to which they felt entitled. The planters used their power in the government to reinforce their absolute authority against all challengers. Their disposition shaped their relationship with subordinate groups and would set the stage for future conflicts with London.

Chapter Three: "Old Heroic Virtues"

The era of a free civil government in Barbados did not last long. In 1649, the English Parliament executed King Charles I, following a long and bloody English Civil War. Shortly after, Royalist planters seized Barbados. Lord Francis Willoughby of Parham, who the late King had made Lieutenant-General of the "Caribee Islands," took the lead. He hoped to turn the island into a Royalist stronghold. From there he would rally his "warlike brothers," to quote nineteenth-century historian Nicholas Darnel Davis, and return the Stuarts to power.[1] The Barbadian Government soon became the agent of a Royalist agenda. Cavaliers removed Parliament's supporters ("Roundheads") from office and appointed Royalist sympathizers ("Cavaliers") in their place. They sequestered estates, banished opponents, and threatened to hang others. A recently arrived Cavalier refugee named Colonel Humphrey Walrond headed the most aggressive faction. He brokered a deal with the more judicious Willoughby to be president of the Assembly. Together, they pushed through twenty-five laws to help legitimize and solidify their takeover. Governor Bell posed little resistance, choosing to capitulate to this "violent party." Those unwilling to conform, like a "Captain Tienman" and "Lieutenant Brandon," were "disenfranchised, their Estates to be seized, their Tongues cut, their cheeks burnt with the Letter T, and afterwards...banished."[2] The island's

---

[1] This is a reference to Charles I's nephews Prince Rupert of the Palatine and Prince Maurice of the Rhine. Nicholas Darnel Davis, *Cavaliers and Roundheads in Barbados, 1650-1652* (British Guiana: Argosy Press, 1883), 83.

[2] For details on the Royalist takeover see Larry Gragg, *Englishmen Transplanted: The English Colonization of Barbados, 1627-1660* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003), 45-48. Carlisle had leased his proprietorship over the Leewards to Willoughby. Motivated, in part, by Parliament's seizure of his estates in England, he set out to shore up his this last remaining asset. Refugees like Walrond joined him. The two initially butted heads, but eventually reached an accord that left Willoughby in power in order to appease

representative government had become a puppet for the ambitions of Parliament's enemies with violent consequences.

The period of rebellion in Barbados (ca. 1649-1652) reinforced the crucial role of violence to authority and elite masculinity on the island. Willoughby and Walrond's abduction of the government demonstrated that political authority remained intimately tied to physical force. As in the early settlement years, martial strength was at the heart of power. Men like Tienman and Brandon became victims in a struggle for control. In the charged atmosphere of a protracted civil war, such violence was about more than colonial ambitions. Rhetoric from England suffused the conflict in Barbados. A language of "liberty" and masculine "duty" held particular resonance. Local concerns, though, shaped the fight as well. Most historians suggest that the rebellious island aimed to protect the political autonomy it came to enjoy during the 1640s. The planters feared Parliament's victory would undermine their sovereignty. While true, the "Barbadian Civil War," as it came to be known (or, as Richard Sheridan called it, the "Barbadian Civil Wars"), was also an ideological struggle intimately tied to manhood. For instance, while liberty was central to the identity of all Englishmen, the planters attached it, as Willoughby would argue, to the masculine fortitude they showed in settling a "wild

---

moderate planters. Figure for the number of laws is borrowed from John Poyer, *The History of Barbados, from the First Discovery of the Island* (London: Printed for J. Mawman, 1808), 51. For details on some of the laws enacted see N.D. Davis, *Cavaliers and Roundheads,* 83–88. Gragg noted that between 1649 and 1655, they actually passed over 200 laws in total. Larry Gragg, *Englishmen Transplanted*, 65. Examples of laws include countering of Parliamentary religious radicalism with legislation to punish those who opposed the established Anglican Church. Violators would have all their possession seized. For a history of radical religion's connection to the English Civil War see, for example, Christopher Hill, *The World Turned Upside Down: Radical Ideas during the English Revolution* (New York: Penguin Books, 1984). Concerning punishment of Tienman and Brandon see Bulstrode Whitelocke, *Memorials of the English Affairs* (London, 1682), 456.

country."[3] The planters expressed their manhood in the context of contemporary Atlantic politics; but, in the process of advancing immediate aims of the war, they explicitly laid out local goals and a separate vision of elite masculinity that endured long after.

During the Royalist takeover of Barbados, the planters came to more precisely articulate the meanings of patriarchal manhood on the island. For the colonists, manliness was the basis for their right to power. Cavaliers and Roundheads alike spoke of bravery and a willingness to sacrifice their bodies as foundational to masculine superiority and, therefore, political rights. Royalist attempted to legitimize their rule, in part, by associating themselves with masculine ideals like loyalty and courage – traits they often demonstrated through violence. They attacked opponents as unmanly "dogs," whose encouragement for social disorder indicated an inferior manhood. Meanwhile, the patriarchal responsibility to keep order took on added significance in Barbados during the war, as fears over servant insurrection gave immediacy to the

---

[3] See, for example, Gary Puckrein, *Little England: Plantation Society and Anglo-Barbadian Politics, 127-1700* (New York: New York University Press, 1984); Richard B. Sheridan, *Sugar and Slavery: An Economic History of the British West Indies, 1623-1775* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1973), 364. "A Declaration of my Lord Willoughby Lieutenant-General and Governor of Barbados," February 18, 1651, in R.H. Schromburgk, *History of Barbados* (London: Brown, Green and Longman's, 1848), 706-708. This transcription differs from that held in TNA and is likely in reference to Zach Grey's edition of Daniel Neale's *History of the Puritans*, vol. iv (London, 1739), appendix XII. Davis references an original, seemingly pointing toward TNA, CO 1/11, no. 34, by citing "America and West Indies: June 1651," in *Calendar of State Papers Colonial, America and West Indies: Volume 1, 1574-1660*, ed. W Noel Sainsbury (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1860), 357. However, while using similar language, this document seems to be different from the transcribed copy reprinted in Grey's edition of Neale's *History* and Eric Williams, *Documents of West Indian History*, *Vol. 1, 1492-1655* (Port of Spain, Trinidad, West Indies: PNM Publishing, 1963), 301-303. Unless otherwise stated, I have used the version noted and transcribed in Nicholas Darnell Davis, *Cavaliers & Roundheads*, 197-200, as well as the copy in TNA, CO Item 1837, Vol. 1 (1574-1660), pp. 357, cited from here simple as Willoughby, "Declaration." For manhood in England during the war see Ann Hughes, *Gender and the English Revolution* (New York: Routledge, 2012).

Royalist claim that Roundheads would encourage a rebellion of "workmen."[4] Ultimately, though, the ideals of manhood expressed by both sides during the standoff, which lasted from 1649 to 1652, revealed shared ideals that transcended the immediate conflict.

Background on the Wars and Historiography

The causes of the English Civil War were varied and complex. For generations, scholars have wrestled to explain its origins and nature.[5] At a basic level, the conflict pitted the supporters of Charles I and monarchy against Parliamentarians who sought, initially, to check the King's authority. Eventually, the better fighting force of Parliament claimed victory. King Charles I surrendered to Scottish troops in 1646. As time went on, the Parliamentary cause had become more radical. Parliament's New Model Army (NMA) seized the ideological aspects of the war. Made up of middling and lesser sorts, it infused the Roundhead cause with a "millenarian spirit" and advanced ideas about social leveling. In some respects, this played into the hands of Royalists. It confirmed their characterization of Parliamentarians as dangerous to social stability. The NMA, they argued, would turn the social order on its head and make "slaves" of gentlemen. Carla Pestana has noted that Barbadian royalists likewise attached the Parliamentary cause to stirring up servant insurrection. In any case, once imprisoned, the King faced an

---

[4] N.D. Davis, *Cavaliers and Roundheads,* 82. See also Nicolas Foster, *A Briefe Relation of the horrid rebellion acted in the island Barbadas, in the West Indies* (London: Printed by John Grismond for Richard Lowndes, 1650).

[5] See Lawrence Stone, *The Crisis of the Aristocracy, 1558–1641* (London: Oxford University Press, 1972); Lawrence Stone, *The Causes of the English Revolution* (London, 1972); Conrad Russell, *The Causes of the English Civil War* (London: Oxford University Press, 1990); Anthony Fletcher, *The Outbreak of the English Civil War* (London: Edward Arnold, 1985); David Underdown, *Revel, Riot, and Rebellion* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1985); Ann Hughes, *The Causes of the English Civil War* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1991).

increasingly radicalized foe. The NMA, under Oliver Cromwell, and radical Roundheads soon forcibly removed any moderates from Parliament. The remaining members became part of what is called the "Rump Parliament." This move opened the way for the shocking execution of Charles I. His death, however, proved too drastic a move for most early-modern Britons.[6]

The Royalist claim that Parliament would turn the social order "upside down," to reference Christopher Hill's seminal work on the subject, seemed to be coming to fruition. Some, including the Irish and Scottish armies, as well as elite Roundheads like Francis Willoughby, switched sides. The King's execution seemed to undermine the patriarchalism that elite men, including the planters, used to justify their rule. Scholars of early modern England have long demonstrated that ideologies of monarchical authority had a symbiotic relationship with patriarchal control, especially over the extended household. The "well-run household" was a "'domestic kingdom, a monarchy' over which the father ruled." To reject the *"Patriarcha*" of the king called into question what Kathleen Brown referred to as the "apparent naturalness of the father's authority" (and vice versa).[7] As a result, the war did not end with Charles I's execution. Men like

---

[6] For specifics on the evolution of gender and the millenarian spirit in relation to hegemonic masculinity, see Henry French and Mark Rothery, "Hegemonic Masculinities?: Assessing change and processes of change in elite masculinity, 1700 – 1900," in *What is Masculinity?: Historical Dynamics from Antiquity to the Contemporary World*, ed. John Arnold and Sean Brady (New York: Palgrave and Macmillan, 2011), 139–141; Derek Neal, "Meanings of Masculinity in Late Medieval England: Self, Body and Society," (Ph.D. diss., McGill University, 2003). For specifics on the New Model Army, its evolution, and impact on the civil war, see David Underdown, *Revel, Riot, and Rebellion*; Hill, *The World Turned upside Down;* Michael Braddick, *God's Fury, England's Fire: A New History of the English Civil Wars* (New York: Penguin, 2008). For more on the rhetoric of slavery, gender, the NMA, and the civil wars see Ann Hughes, *Gender and the English Revolution.* Carla Pestana, *The English Atlantic in an Age of Revolution, 1640-1661* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press), 94-96.

[7] Kathleen Brown, *Good Wives, Nasty Wenches, and Anxious Patriarchs: Gender, Race, and Power in Colonial Virginia* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996), 15-16. For more instances see

Willoughby viewed the event as a fundamental threat to the legitimacy of their special status and privileges as elite males. By mid-1649, some such former Parliamentarians joined ardent Royalists like Walrond to throw their hopes behind Charles II, son of the late King. They sought to restore the monarchy and thereby return England to stability and order – with landowning men in a firm position of authority.[8]

In Barbados, the planters had passed the war with a policy of neutrality. In the words of contemporary Parliamentarian Nicolas Foster, "considering that it could not any way conduce to their advantage, (for us to have Parties and Sidings amongst us) we conclude[d] rather to embrace Neutrality, and accordingly [did], holding a very fair correspondency each with other for several years together with great content." The island focused on production and wealth. The planters chose the project of planting sugar and subordinating servants and slaves over Atlantic politics. As Carla Pestana put

---

especially Susan Amussen, *An Ordered Society: Gender and Class in Early Modern England* (New York: B. Blackwell, 1988); Alexandra Shepard, "From Anxious Patriarchs to Refined Gentlemen? Manhood in Britain, ca. 1500-1700," *Journal of British Studies* 44, no. 2 (2005): 281-95; Elizabeth Foyster, *Manhood in Early Modern England* and *Marital Violence: An English Family History 1660–1857* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005). For an overview of changes in domesticity in later centuries see Carole Shammas, *A History of Household Government in America* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 2002); Carole Shammas, "The Domestic Environment in Early Modern England and America," *Journal of Social History* 14, no. 1 (Autumn, 1980): 3-24.

[8] Once a Parliamentary commander, Willoughby had fallen out with Cromwell and his fellow officers. He also became uneasy with the leveling and radical elements of the NMA. He even fought a duel with fellow officer, the Earl of Manchester, who out-ranked him. Eventually becoming Speaker of the House of Lords in 1647, Willoughby took part in a moderate plot to disobey the New Model Army. Landing briefly in prison in 1648, he then fled to the Netherlands and declared himself an ardent Royalist. Parliament then seized Willoughby's English estates. C.H. Firth, *Francis, fifth baron Willoughby of Parham*, DNB, 1900. Ronald Hutton, *The Royalist War Effort* (New York: Routledge, 2012); David Underdown, *Pride's Purge: Politics in the Puritan Revolution* (London: Clarendon Press, 1971); Christopher Hill, *The World Turned upside Down*. For more on the Rump Parliament see J.H. Hexter, *The Reign of King Pym* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1961).

it, they sought "to maintain their privileged but precarious position" in the face of growing fears about insurrection.[9]

Gary Puckrein and others like J.H. Bennett have argued that the planters also exploited the war period to gain greater autonomy. They used the competing claims over the island by the King and Parliament to defy the authority of both. They especially reveled in not paying proprietary rents.[10] In 1645, the Assembly officially declared they would admit "no alterations or new commissions from either side" of the war in England. They attested that "if we should partake or declare ourselves on either side we were undone: for against the king we are resolved never to be, and without the friendship of the parliament and free trade of London ships we are not able to subsist." They avoided offending one side by refusing to bow to either. When the Earl of Marlborough, now the island's proprietor, arrived in August of 1645 to take over the government, the planters forcibly turned him away. They would not see their autonomy subjugated or be pulled into the English conflict by anyone. According to Bennett, the island thus "achieved virtual independence of King, Parliament, and proprietor."[11] In short, the planters' policy of neutrality reflected their distinct, colonial goals for autonomy.

Since perpetuating their sovereignty seemed to shape the planters' actions during the English Civil War, some historians have seen their reaction to the King's beheading in 1649 as merely a continuation or, at most, an escalation of that effort.

---

[9] Carla Pestana, *The English Atlantic in the Age of Revolution*, 38.
[10] Gary Puckrein, *Little England*, 104–123. See also, J.H. Bennett, "English Caribees in the Period of the Civil War, 1642-1646," *William and Mary Quarterly* 24, no. 3 (July, 1967): 359-377; R.H. Schromburgk, *History of Barbados.*
[11] Powrey to Archibald Hay, July 5, 1645, Hay MSS in J.H. Bennett, "English Caribees," 373.

Puckrein, for example, noted how the death of the King "sent a shock wave through the Barbadian planter class." He cast the succeeding conflict with Parliament as a "war for home rule." When pressed by the victorious Parliament to obey, the Barbadians decided to fight for their "autonomy." Indeed, the planters did not relish the return of a unified central government in London. They had enjoyed the relative independence of the 1640s. The return of an imperialist, mercantile agenda with its trade restrictions and taxes would have been incongruous with their aims.[12]

The role of manhood in shaping the planters' reactions in 1649, however, complicates what has traditionally been a political and economic narrative. The planters' pursuit of conformity and autonomy through a language of masculinity helped better define the meanings of patriarchal manhood on the island. Whereas Pestana and others have seen Royalist efforts in Barbados in terms of politics, religion, and practical considerations, gender ideals played a central role as well. The Barbadians sought to gain autonomy and keep power over servants by better delineating essential markers of elite manhood – those characteristics that entitled them to political hegemony and economic freedom in the first place. As will be argued below, ideals of loyalty, fortitude, duty, and martial bravery served as the basis of the planters' justifications for their power. As Ann Hughes argued of the civil conflict in England, war "demanded a particularly zealous performance" of manhood by challenging "understandings of what it meant to be a man." As Karen Harvey added, there are crisis points in the story of masculinity in any particular place, often arising from war. Faced with the "crisis" of a

[12] Gary Puckrein, *Little England,* 104-123.

war that they had hoped to avoid, the planters of Barbados accordingly took steps to reiterate (and in some cases alter) the basis of patriarchal authority. The Barbadian civil war proved essential to the story of masculinity on the island. The planters' reaction to the King's beheading was a concerted effort to redefine the boundaries of belonging according to a profoundly altered socio-political world. Masculinity was fundamental to accomplishing that aim.[13]

"Men only truly deserving"

The execution of the King challenged the basis of the planters' authority. As Pestana has made clear in her work, the Royalist planters saw it as encouraging social unrest.[14] Their justifications for subordinating servants and slaves rested in gendered English assumptions about their natural superiority. The death of the King at the hands of a radical army, primarily made up of laboring groups, was a challenge to their patriarchal manhood. The prospect of a radical overturning of the social hierarchy stirred Barbados out of neutrality. They may not have desired involvement in English politics, but now the planters declared to be "bound in duty" as men to "not cease to be active in...behalf" of the King. Beyond just a political agenda, it became a question of masculine "duty." In direct contradiction to Parliament, which had made it treason for the colonies to proclaim anyone King of England, Barbadians "declared openly for the Prince of Wales as Charles the Second."[15] In doing so, they tied themselves and their

---

[13] Carla Pestana, *The English Atlantic in an Age of Revolution*; Ann Hughes, *Gender and the English Revolution,* 90–91; Karen Harvey, "The History of Masculinity, ca. 1650-1800," *Journal of British Studies* 44, no. 2 (2005): 296–311.
[14] Carla Pestana, *The English Atlantic in an Age of Revolution,* 94-96.
[15] N.D. Davis, *Cavaliers and Roundheads*, 82. Gary Puckrein, *Little England*, 108. Foster, *A briefe relation,* 28.

patriarchal manhood expressly to the cause of Royalism. The Assembly went on to pass an Act requiring all men to swear an oath of loyalty to the Royalist government. The oath attempted to bind elite, male honor to support for monarchy. Both explicitly and implicitly, Royalist planters went on to attack remaining Parliamentarians and buttress their own claims to power through an English language of masculinity.

A majority of planters were already Royalists (or at least moderates). Few colonists held radical religious affinities that might have swayed them to support Parliament or the New Model Army, as among some elites in England. According to Puckrein, largely "only poor planters, propertyless freemen, and indentured servants" were Roundheads. As he went on, after the execution of the King, these local "sectarians saw the beginnings of the social revolution they longed for in the colony, and they were eager to promote a Parliamentary takeover of the island." Elite Barbadians thus associated Parliamentarianism with inferior men and social disorder. Royalist planters claimed that "the best part of this Island" supported the King. True elite males were for monarchy and social stability.[16]

To shore up their position, Royalists cast support for Parliament as a rejection of proper manhood that threatened the island's hierarchy and elite male power. They degraded landowners who "cohorted with workemen" to sow seeds of mayhem. To encourage the ideals of Parliament was a failure to protect social order and, therefore, a failure of manhood. In particular, Cavalier planters targeted Henry Drax who had

[16] According to Puckrein, those "ideologically bound to Parliament were several groups of radical Protestants on the island. A few large plantation owners can be identified as members of radical sets, but sectarianism was most common." Gary Puckrein, *Little England*, 106. Foster, *A briefe relation,* 4-5.

authored a petition against the oath of loyalty. They called him an "Imp of the Devil." Going against the divine order, the Great Chain of Being, Drax became an "imp" in service to evil, not a man at all. He was furthermore a "traitor" to the patriarchy, working to undermine the natural order and tear apart the solidarity of elite men. Criticizing the oath invited "ruin" and would subvert the planters' "liberty and [bring about the] dissolution of [the] Government." His critics believed he had committed himself to the "charge of Roguery." "Rogue," in the early-modern lexicon was a pointed means of describing an unmanly outsider – "a vagabond," without ties to the social fabric. Drax would make all men rouges by undermining the structure that bound them together. Worse still, by questioning the legitimacy of the government, Drax attacked the idea that landed men were naturally superior. In calling for fresh elections, his enemies claimed, he "not only [sought] to overthrow [the] Assembly, but impeach[ed] the judgments of all Islanders." The exclusive right of freeholder men to vote rested in an assumption of their superiority, which made them best suited to make decisions about leadership. Drax, according to his opponents, had challenged such notions by questioning their choice of Assemblymen. This, his critics insisted, was the very "height" of his "roguery." It epitomized why his complaints should not be countenanced. Associating Parliamentarians with "dogs," "devils," and "rogues," called into question their masculine integrity, weakening their criticism of Royalist actions.[17]

[17] Foster, *A Briefe Relation,* 26-27. N.D. Davis, *Cavaliers and Roundheads,* 82. Henry Hexham, *A Copious English and Netherdutch Dictionary Composed out of our Best English Authors* (Rotterdam: 1647 - 1648), 347.

In contrast, Cavaliers painted themselves as heroic, properly masculine figures. They claimed a superior masculinity that carried a right to power. With the civil war's arrival on Barbadian shores, the planters especially reiterated military service and sacrifice as elemental to patriarchal manhood. As Parliament appeared on the verge of victory in England, many of the King's forces began fleeing to Barbados. Having "done great service for his Majesty...these men were by the Governor (and others of their own Spirits who had the government in their hands) very courteously Embraced, and looked upon as the men only truly deserving." Their sacrifice and military service for the King, in other words, ingratiated them to like-minded individuals on the island. As Parliamentary planter Nicolas Foster explained, "in a short time, they began to possess Estates (though other men's) and by the subtle practicing of *Absalons* policy, began to insinuate themselves into the people's favor and to gain the esteem and repute of the only knowing men." Absalon was a famous Danish-Saxon hero of the middle ages. He supported a strong monarchy and reveled in warfare. "Policy" was likely a reference to Absalon's skill in making friends, even of adversaries. The author insinuates, then, that the newly arrived Royalists should have been the planters' enemies. Instead, they gained standing and the dispossessed estates of fleeing Roundheads. The planters revered them as "deserving" such honor because of the perceived merit found in their martial service.[18]

[18] On Absalon see Hugh Chisholm, The Encyclopedia Britannica: a Dictionary of Arts, Sciences, Literature And General Information, 11th ed., Vol. 1 (New York: Encyclopedia Britannica, 1910), 74-a. Quotes from Foster, *A briefe relation*, 4-5. For a histories that covers the seizing of estates see Gary Puckrein, *Little England*; N.D. Davis, *Cavaliers and Roundheads*.

By elevating these veterans to positions of political authority, the planters reinforced martial valor as indicative of masculine worth. As Foster pointed out, they had few other qualifications than their military service in the war, possessing "little or no knowledge of the Country [or] the People." Still, Royalist officers like Walrond "must and were made Councellers." [*sic*] Sacrifice to Royalist cause eased the path of political power for Walrond, Willoughby, and their supporters. As other historians have made clear, these men quickly came to dominate the government – much to the dismay of island Roundheads.[19] Rewarding martial sacrifice to the King in this way entrenched it as part of patriarchal manhood on the island.

Once elevated to legislative authority, the Royalist newcomers strengthened their position by naming themselves officers in the militia. Consuming both civil and martial authority reinforced the foundation of their superiority. It seemed to widen the Royalists' mandate to enact control. Indeed, Foster lamented, having so "fitted themselves...they begin to Act in a very high nature." Cavalier officers and officials attacked opponents "with no less severity then cruelty [and they began] to prosecute all such persons as any way seemed to declare their approbations of the Parliament's proceedings." Through 1650 and 1651, the Royalists arrested, harassed, and banished many Parliamentarian planters.[20] Control of the island's militia solidified the Royalists' ability to assert their will over their enemies, further advancing the connection between martial service and male hierarchy. They used the legitimacy inferred by civil institutions

---

[19] Nicholas Foster, *A briefe relation*, 4.
[20] Nicholas Foster, *A briefe relation,* 4-5. For more on the actions of the Royalists against the Parliamentary Planters see Gary Puckrein, *Little England;* Carla Pestana, *The English Atlantic in an Age of Revolution.*

and officership in the militia to advance their political interests, presuming broad latitude to do so, attached to masculinity.

Leading Cavaliers went on to make Royalism prerequisite to belonging. New sedition laws meant that "any Deeds or Words [that] maliciously deprave, vilify, or oppose the" government of the island led to prison for a first offense and loss of all lands and possessions for a second. Even going "under the name of an Independent" proved unacceptable. Only active support for monarchy sufficed. As planter Giles Sylvester complained, for declaring his independent stance he had all his sugar "daily taken." The ruling planters also requisitioned "25 of [his] Servants & made Soldiers of them," fitting them out at his own expense. The Cavaliers removed servants and turned them to their own control and purpose. In the process they subordinated those, like Sylvester, who did not support their cause. The freedom to exercise control over servants and slaves, central to patriarchal manhood, rested in conformity to the Royalist government. A monopoly over the government allowed Royalists to define elite male belonging, which included political orthodoxy.[21]

The Royalists curtailed criticism of these actions by tying manhood to physical support for the Royalist Assembly. Proper masculinity meant a willingness to sacrifice one's body for this "noble" cause. According to the oath of loyalty, as Foster understood

[21] Sylvester was a member of a prominent Puritan family in New England. His faith may have accounted for some of the harassment. V.T. Harlow noted that he corresponded frequently with John Winthrop. V.T. Harlow, *Colonising Expeditions to the West Indies and Guiana, 1623-1667* (London: Printed for the Hakluyt Soceity, 1925), 48-53. Middleton had business dealings with James and William Drax. He owned over 250 acres in the late 1640s. By 1680, the family remained prominent. His heir, Benjamin Middleton, had grown the family property to 379 Acres with 130 slaves. See Richard Dunn, *Sugar and Slaves: The Rise of the Planter Class in the English West Indies, 1624-1713* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1972), 114; BDA, *BMHS*, XXIII, 73-77; BDA, Hughes Abstracts in Queree Notebooks, book 6.

it, he and his Roundhead friends had to, "with [their] life and fortunes, maintain, uphold, and defend the" government and the king "against any power or opposition whatsoever." It became the duty of elite men to protect the government with their lives. "To the utmost of [their] endeavors," the planters were also to "make known and discover to the Governor, or any other of his counsel, all Plots, Conspiracies and Attempts against the same...and to...oppose, and defeat the same." Fulfilling patriarchal obligations to keep order, deeply rooted in the planters' culture, became attached to a political agenda through a gendered language of sacrifice and duty.[22] Parliamentarian and moderate planters alike would have to turn their physical capacity to the advantage of Royalism or risk being cast out (or killed).

The ruling planters also justified their efforts by further associating themselves with the masculine ideal of "loyalty." In England, one Royalist cleric argued that the Cavalier held a "boulder look than other men, because of a more loyal heart." He was a "child of honor, a gentleman well born and bred." Loyalty was central to masculinity and individual worth. In Barbados, the planters similarly attempted to emphasize loyalty as essential to manhood and the root of their right to rule. As the war ended in England, making their support for the Stuarts technically treason, they proved especially defensive about their "loyal hearts." One anonymous writer wanted to "assure" his readers that "Piety and Loyalty dwell[ed] in [his] breast." While some clamored "against the intended (Oath) [of loyalty] with seditious Petitions," the Royalists attested, there was nothing offensive about it. It "proceed[ed] from [their] Election, and the vote of all

[22] "Act for the uniting of the Inhabitants of the Island, under the Government thereof," in Nicholas Foster, *A briefe relation,* 10. See Susan Amussen, *An Ordered Society*.

men, and Loyalty to our King."[23] The Royalists' absolute power was legitimate because it grew of their manly loyalty.

In contrast, the Royalists painted Parliamentarians as undeserving of the freedom and rights of elite men because they were disloyal. Men like Drax would bring about the "destruction of a Nation" under the "pretense of Liberty...[with] not so much as the shadow of Loyalty," as one Cavalier put it. Roundheads were lesser men for trading against their King and their class. They undermined the social order they should have protected, bringing their masculinity into question. As the Barbadian Royalists agreed, "where there was Loyalty there cannot but be piety, but there [could] be no piety, where there is no loyalty."[24] The planters thus justified their actions against Parliamentarians as acceptable, indeed "pious." Though it undermined Roundhead liberty, their disloyalty made them lesser, impious men, giving the superior Royalists the right and duty to exercise power over them.

Cavalier colonists added to such arguments for their just authority by marrying the ideal of "loyalty" with the understood masculine duty to keep order. Those that did not support the Royalist cause, like the moderate Thomas Middleton, became "unworthy" men because they threatened good order. Drax's "disloyalty," for example, encouraged "Rebellion, and Ruine." Only Royalists and their manly steadfastness prevented the "rapines [and] murders" of the rebellion in England, which Drax would bring upon the island. Cavaliers painted elite Parliamentarians like Drax as "the most

---

[23] Ann Hughes, *Gender and the English Revolution,* 91. Edmund Symmons, *Militarie Sermon* (1644) quoted in Jerome de Groot, *Royalist Identities* (New York: Macmillan, 2004), 92. Foster, *A Briefe Relation,* 28 & 32.
[24] Foster, *A Briefe Relation,* 29 & 32.

dangerous of Enemies." Elite males, they had a duty to protect the social hierarchy. Their encouragement of rebellion, instead, represented a failure of manhood that called into question the natural superiority of all landowning men. Drax was not a proper man but a many-headed "dragon" that would destroy the social hierarchy. As a result, "the best step and advance to the security" of "worthy Gentlemen," the Royalists attested, was to remove these unworthy men from the ranks of the elite. The planters thus justified taking away the property and political rights of their opponents through a language of masculine duty and loyalty to their class. They would slay the "dragon" Drax. In the process, they could claim to be fulfilling masculine obligations to uphold the social order, which spoke to their superior manhood and further distinguished them as men fit to rule.[25] In the process, they reinforced these characteristics as an essential part of elite masculinity on the island.

"Mischievous Designs"

Royalist actions destroyed the neutrality of the island. They quickly alienated the smaller numbers of Parliamentarian planters and the few radical Protestants that existed. Even moderates began to complain about the puppet government, ostensibly "freely elected," but now violating the liberties of its constituents. The oath of loyalty proved especially offensive. Bell, not wishing to provoke a confrontation, had "suffered...[the] Oath to pass...for quietness-sake." Like many on the island, he accepted the Royalist takeover to keep the peace. But not all felt as passive as Bell did. Some, like Drax, openly criticized the Royalists' "mischievous designs." In the spring of 1650, some

[25] Foster, *A Briefe Relation,* 26-27 & 29.

“inhabitants of *Philips* Parish” on Barbados demanded that Bell suspend the colony's Royalist Assembly and hold fresh elections. It was, they claimed, “the Liberty and Privilege of free-borne English-men, that are Inhabitants and free-holders” to elect a new Assembly annually. The petitioners chaffed under the usurpation of their patriarchal “privileges.” Led by Drax, this group perceived the “Act and Oath” to be unlawful. It was a means for Royalists “to set up themselves (above legal or intended power) by us.” Royalists were “inslaving” [sic] the “free People Inhabitants of [the] Island.” In the process, they had called into question the non-Royalists' “good integrity,” their character. The petitioners viewed the Royalist denial of their privileges as an insulting subordination, so much that it made them “slaves.” While most planters had little love of the Parliamentary cause, the Royalists' heavy-handed approach had cut against their sense of themselves as elite men. It challenged honor.[26] The planters could no longer hold the peace that neutrality once provided.

Where the rhetoric of loyalty and duty to the social order left off, the Royalist planters came to defend their position through more overt assertions of masculinity. They responded to the petition against them by announcing their willingness to use violence and sacrifice their bodies to preserve order. One even acknowledged that Drax had the high ground as a “point of law.” But, he vowed, while Drax might “subdue” him in court, he would “prosecute [Drax]...at the point of [a] sword.” The anonymous Royalist placed his physical capacity for violence above legal considerations as the root of his power and superiority over his foe. Others echoed this sentiment. In the words of

[26] Foster, *A briefe relation,* 3, 4, 18-19, & 22. See also Gary Puckrein, *Little England*, 106.

another Cavalier, the implications of the petition against the oath of loyalty necessitated that "regular power make an appearance against" it. However, if this should fail, he proclaimed, he would not "rest...until I have sheathed my sword in his Bowels that first began it."[27] If the government failed to protect the social order from attack, the responsibility fell to the individual man. Manhood, achieved through violence proved the basis of the Royalists' right to power, even above the law.

Violence was foundational for Royalists seeking to contrast themselves with those bent on debasing "the nobility of the nation" with their seditious petition. A sense of masculine duty, so one Royalist claimed, engendered a deep "disquiet" that only some fierce action against Drax could silence. In the words of another planter, he stood prepared to "exercise at arms" against the "traitor" in their midst. He implored his fellow planters to show the same "readiness" against all subversive Roundheads. The Royalists proclaimed, indeed, an "extreme will" to defend the social order. They were prepared "to hazard [their lives] against these Libertines in the behalf of the King." By demanding that all "loyal" men be willing to give their lives for the cause, the Royalist planters reinforced martial sacrifice and violence as fundamental to patriarchal manhood and elite belonging on the island.[28]

In evoking the necessity of physical violence (and sacrifice), good order, and loyalty, the planters borrowed heavily from the wartime rhetoric of the homeland. In England, the civil conflict led Royalists to identify with an idealized vision of "manhood"

---

[27] Foster, *A briefe relation*, 26-30.

[28] T.H., *A True and Exact Narrative of the Proceedings of the Parliaments Fleet, against the Island of Barbadoes, written by an Eye-witnesse* (London, Printed for Richard Harper in Smithfield, 1652), 10. For details on the internal political struggle see Larry Gragg, *Englishmen Transplanted*, 51. Nicolas Foster, *A Briefe Relation,* 26-30.

that demanded valor and corporal sacrifice. Physical bravery was an ever-present ideal of "manliness" in English culture, used to defend honor and demonstrate masculine worth. Ann Hughes noted how "in 1644 a royalist cleric defined the ideal...cavalier as 'a child of honor, a gentleman well born and bred...of a clearer countenance and bolder look than other men, because of a more loyal heart'."[29] In other words, the Royalist was "more of a man" than his counterparts. As among the planters, "loyalty" was key to contrasting Cavaliers with the supposed disloyalty of their foes and lesser men. An English Royalist performed manhood by being "courageous in his undertakings, discrete and gallant in all his executions." Perhaps most importantly, though, they preserved ancient traditions and social hierarchy with their lives:

> He dares accept of death's challenge to meet it in the field...he is the only preserve of English gentility and ancient valor, and hath rather choose to bury himself in the tomb of honor, than to see the nobility of his nation vassalaged, the dignity of this country captivated by any base domestic enemy, or by any foreign conquered foe.[30]

The Royalist's inherent masculine honor demanded he make the ultimate sacrifice to prevent the rise of inferior, "base" men into power. In the eyes of English Royalists, the civil war challenged patriarchal manhood. Ultimately only the "zealous," violent performance of masculinity through a bold act of physical bravery could preserve the "natural" hierarchy from being debauched by some lesser foe.

---

[29] Ann Hughes, *Gender and the English Revolution*, 100.
[30] Edmund Symmons, *Militarie Sermon* (1644) quoted in de Groot, *Royalist identities*, 92.

The Royalist planters understood manhood and its implications for their authority in similar ways to their English counterparts. Willingness to violently defended honor proved particularly central. As Willoughby put it, "we can not imagine that there is no mean & base minded a fellow amongst us, that will not prefer an honorable Death, before a Tedious & slavish life."[31] The planters had a superior masculinity, proven by their willingness to die for honor. It contrasted them with lower sorts and slaves, who accepted subordination. Their manhood cast death in defense of power and liberty as preferable to subjugation. To do otherwise would degrade their manliness and bring into question the very basis of their privileges and liberty as elite males. Willoughby and the other Royalists advanced their agenda, not by laying out the merits of their political position, but by attaching it to this vision of masculinity. Willoughby implied that those who refused to support his cause with their lives were, in fact, "base-minded," lesser men. As another planter claimed in his criticism of Drax, "we are resolved to live and die, to the comfort of [those] Loyal" to the Royalist government and the social order.[32] Cavalier planters thus proclaimed a willingness to undertake violence and sacrifice one's life in defense of order. It became foundational to elite power and masculinity, just as it had been in the metropole.

Roundheads in contemporary England, meanwhile, disparaged their enemies as popish rogues. They feminized Royalists as being under the undue influence of women, just as the King supposedly had been with his Catholic wife. The Royalists were perverse "swaggerers," drunks, "an amalgam," of "violent aggression and effeminate display." In

[31] In Carla Pestana, *The English Atlantic,* 102.
[32] In Foster, *A Briefe Relation,* 28-29.

Hughes' summation, they were merely a "pretty face." They lacked substance and Godly fortitude against corrupting (and feminine) influences. They were not properly men. English Roundheads similarly criticized Royalist planters. Using language from the Old Testament, they called them Midianites, godless enemies who would "rather be in hell with [their] comrades, than in heaven with the Roundheads."[33] Thus, a gendered rhetoric served English Parliamentarians but was intimately attached to the moral and religious elements of their cause.

Compared to island Royalists, the Parliamentary planters borrowed little from their metropolitan peers. Barbadian Roundheads had somewhat less interest in engaging in a religious or moralist debate. Instead, they focused on rhetoric that revealed distinct purposes. They emphasized especially their "liberty" as landowning men. According to island Parliamentarians and moderates, Royalist rule had "entrench[ed]....upon the Peoples just rights and privileges." They had stripped the other planters of the fundamental markers of their elite status and identity. Their goals were not religious or even overtly political, but aimed to protect their special status as landed males. In fact, echoing their Royalist enemies, these colonists turned to the rhetoric of "slavery" to describe their condition. Foster, for instance, called the Royalist takeover a "design of enslaving the Country." To submit to Willoughby and Walrond undermined the masculine privileges that made them distinct from lesser men. The oath of allegiance, especially, went against the "Law of God, Nature and Nations" by infringing on the rights of "free People." Just as the Royalists accused Roundheads of

[33] Ann Hughes, *Gender and the English Revolution,* 93-95.

threatening the “natural order,” the Royalists' actions had gone against the “Law of Nature” and undercut their patriarchal manhood.[34] Beyond an attachment to English politics and religion, island Roundheads' main concern was to assert their natural superiority as elite men. Their position stood closer to their Royalist counterparts, in many ways, than it did their political allies in England.

By emphasizing the rights of “freeholders” rather than religion or politics, Roundhead planters demonstrated that, on the island, the two sides shared a masculine identity that superseded politics. Each side called upon their 'natural' access to power as “freeholder” males in order to support claims to power. Both hoped to undermine their opponents by casting them as inferior men, “rouges” outside the social structure. All landed Barbadians seemed to understand “liberty” as fundamental to their identity. Any subversion of their authority was “enslavement.” Each perceived subordination to another man as an intolerable affront, something worse than death. Indeed, Roundhead and Cavalier colonists alike espoused a willingness to die for their cause. Parliamentary planters, for example, explained that they deserved to exercise political rights because the governor could “ever engage [them] to be ready to serve you with our lives and fortunes from all opposers.”[35] [*sic*] An eagerness to lay down their lives for the government attested to their superior manhood. It set them apart from lower sorts, Africans and servants, who accepted their subordination. It made them men deserving of privileges like political liberty. Thus, the conflict revealed that, at their core, the

[34] Foster, *A Briefe Relation*, 16.
[35] Foster, *A Briefe Relation,* 22.

planters shared common understandings about manhood and its implications for their authority as elite men.

"Resolved to sell themselves at a dear rate"

While the planters fought one another for control of the island, Parliament moved to punish colonial Royalists for "treason." They passed an embargo in late spring of 1650, hoping it would bring about the planters' "fidelity and due obedience." Parliament prohibited all "Commerce with Barbados," attacking that which the planters' ostensibly valued most – making money. Parliament also cut off the island's communication with the rest of the English World, isolating the colonists from their Atlantic brethren.[36]

Rather than accomplishing its aim, however, London's actions effectively united the Barbadians against it. The Act of Embargo confirmed Royalist fears that a victorious Parliament would dismantle the planters' autonomy. Even those initially unsure about supporting Willoughby and Walrond came to view Parliamentary rule as the greater evil. Nicolas Davis pointed out how tenuous support among most planters for Royalism swung decisively with the embargo. The Act challenged free trade (and therefore planter wealth), clearly helping to motivate the island's shift toward a more unified defiance of London, as other historians have concurred.[37] However, Parliament's actions

[36] "October 1650: An Act for prohibiting Trade with the Barbadoes, Virginia, Bermuda and Antego," in *Acts and Ordinances of the Interregnum, 1642-1660*, ed. C H Firth and R S Rait (London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1911), 425-429. *British History Online*, accessed August 14, 2017, http://www.british-history.ac.uk/no-series/acts-ordinances-interregnum/pp425-429; "October 1651: An Act for increase of Shipping, and Encouragement of the Navigation of this Nation.," in *Acts and Ordinances of the Interregnum,* 559-562. *British History Online*, accessed August 14, 2017, http://www.british-history.ac.uk/no-series/acts-ordinances-interregnum/pp559-562.

[37] See, for the clearest explanation, Carla Pestana, *The English Atlantic*, 101-104.

also undercut the planters' shared expectations as men. It violated their presumed rights. Above material concerns, Willoughby seized upon Parliament's affront to their patriarchal manhood in order to strengthen his cause. He pointed to the embargo as a violation of planter liberty through a cultural language of "just rights" and "freedoms" – "innate privileges" of landowning English males as he called them. Parliament's plan backfired. Willoughby now had the leeway undertake revenge on those that had rejected his authority. He sequestered the estates of banished Parliamentarians and killed their cattle and stock. In the words of Davis, he "did them all alike as much injury as he could."[38] London had miscalculated the extent to which the planters in charge of Barbados valued wealth over liberty and how far they would go to preserve autonomy. Eventually, instead of subordinating their power and sovereignty to London, the island officially declared independence from the metropole in early 1651 through a brief, but powerful document.

The Barbadian "declaration of independence" echoed the sentiments of elite masculinity established during the previous two years. Violence, honor, duty, loyalty, and liberty proved central themes. The document, for example, held that without

[38] See, for example, "A Declaration of my Lord Willoughby." TNA, CO Item 1837, Vol. 1 (1574-1660), pp. 357. Referenced from here as Willoughby, "Declaration." At his arrival, each side had mistrusted Willoughby, either seeing him as a former Roundhead or an interloper. As Davis pointed out, "Willoughby now, more and more, allied himself with the violent party, he, at the same time, promised the moderates, that, if ever good terms were offered, he would accept them. In this way he secured the hearty support of most men in putting the Island into a state of defence." Davis, *Cavaliers and Roundheads,* 83. For more on embargo and petitioners in England for both sides of the conflict see Larry Gragg, *Englishmen Transplanted,* 46–49 & 195. Willoughby initially sought to assure the metropole that he was merely working to bring order to the island. Parliamentary planters, though, painted a more dire picture that had some powerful Roundheads in England clamoring for an invasion. Meanwhile, merchants with an interest in the island preached moderation in a response. For more on this, see Gary Puckrein, *Little England,* 109–116; Davis, *Cavaliers and Roundheads,* 200. For more on the way that attacking trade hardened colonial support for the King in both Virginia and Barbados, see Carla Pestana, *The English Atlantic* 99-102.

representation in Parliament the planters' were “slaves,” unable to enjoy the natural rights they were entitled to as elite men. In addition to political representation, this meant the right to pursue “commerce” to their advantage. Parliament, it argued, would attempt to undermine the planters' innate superiority and make them no better than slaves. Instead, like “true Englishmen,” they would not “alienate [them]selves from those old heroic virtues” that were the basis of their manhood and right to power. This meant, above all, liberty and its violent defense. The Barbadian Government, in fighting for these ideals, stood as the “nearest model of conformity” to those values and systems of government, “under which...the English nation have lived and flourished for above a thousand years.” In this way, the declaration evoked loyalty to enduring cultural ideals as being the more honorable, manlier course than “fidelity” to the current regime in Whitehall. It was the planters' duty to defend their natural liberties. Indeed, they indicated a special willingness to fight and die on behalf of their cause. The planters would show themselves to be deserving of their rights by proving their manhood through “all honest means,” including honorific violence.[39] In couching his declaration in gendered ideals, Willoughby provided themes to which all planters could connect, regardless of their political position.

While Willoughby's declaration referenced trade and “correspondence,” he also made clear that Barbados's defiance was not just about wealth. The Governor specifically explained that above material comforts, without “freedom” the planters' “lives would be uncomfortable to [them].” Recognition for their status as elite men was

[39] Willoughby, “Declaration.”

fundamental to their well-being and happiness. Therefore, Willoughby wrote, they refused to "prostitute the freedom and privileges, to which [they were] born," (to the interests of trade companies especially). Willoughby's choice of the verb "prostitute" points to his view of the conflict through a gendered lens. His immediate intention seems to be that they refused "to set open sale: to offer to every man for money" their natural liberties, as one contemporary dictionary defined the word. In addition to this general usage as a verb, however, is the obvious connection to the noun "prostitute," which to early modern Englishmen meant a woman who suffered "herself to be abused by all that come, a common Harlot." Willoughby seemed to have had the dual meaning in mind, deliberately aiming to be provocative. He drew attention to the contrast between the planters' view of themselves as 'proper' elite men and Parliament's unfitting "abuse" of them as "a common Harlot." Willoughby went on to cast the Royalist planters as masculine, "heroic" figures, set to defend the helpless virtue of "the English Nation." The planters would bravely guard the island against the "tyranny" of Parliament, whose actions opposed "the *freedom, safety, and well-being"* of the island in accord with their patriarchal duty. They would rather fight and die like 'men' than live in peace and debase themselves for money.[40] The planters' manhood, Willoughby indicated, was on the line and no amount of wealth would lead them to abandon it.

---

[40] John Bullokar, *An English Expositor*, (London: John Legatt, 1616); Thomas Blount, *Glossographia or a Dictionary*, 1656. Willoughby, "Declaration." Parliament had restricted the island's essential trade with the Dutch and prohibited any interaction with their North American counterparts prior to Willoughby's "declaration." He specifically addressed Parliament as attempting "to perfect and accomplish [their] intended slavery," by making their "necks pliable for to undergo the yoake." Parliament would rather make them "slaves to the [Royal African] company...just as our negroes are to us" and have them "submit...the whole advantage [their] labor and industry" to a select group of merchants and noblemen in

In support of his efforts against Parliament, Willoughby's declaration took particular strains to reinforce martial valor as essential to the planters' masculine worth. Martial violence was "honest" and virtuous – the very opposite of a "harlot." He boasted that the men of the island would not "be forced or persuaded to so ignoble a submission" as to give up their status or power without a fight. There were none, he claimed, "amongst us, who are so simple and so unworthily minded, that they would not rather choose a noble death, then forsake their old liberties and privileges."[41] The declaration thus doubled as a call to arms that depended on a shared understanding that sacrificing one's body to protect the inherent rights of landowning men was a masculine ideal. Willoughby's emphasis on the idea that no planter was "so unworthily minded" reiterated that a willingness to die in support of his cause was fundamental to patriarchal manhood, something "noble." To do otherwise undermined masculinity, the very basis of the privileges that the planters enjoyed over women, servants, and slaves. Accordingly, the Royalist planters prepared to defend their status and privileges as Englishmen, even against England itself.[42]

Historians have tended to downplay the significance of the Barbadian declaration of independence. Gragg and Pestana, for instance, bypassed the document altogether. Both also questioned the planters' eagerness to fight for independence.

England. This reflected the concerns of moderate islanders for economic freedom and such rhetoric helped to bring them to the side of Willoughby and Walrond.

[41] Willoughby, "Declaration."

[42] They had already passed "An Act for the Speedy fortification of forts of this Island" after Parliament beheaded the King, allegedly in case the Spanish attacked. As Davis pointed noted, the measure's real goal was to guard against a potential Parliamentary invasion. The Royalists placed their men in command of the militia, with Humphrey Walrond leading the way. TNA, CO 1/11, pp. 17. Davis, *Cavaliers and Roundheads,* 83.

Gragg noted that Governor Willoughby "overstated the enthusiasm for war" and Pestana argued that he sought to avoid actual conflict, seeing little to gain from a bloody struggle. Both scholars emphasized economic concerns as the root of the impasse. Puckrein, meanwhile, characterized independence as a strategy to negotiate for continuing autonomy. Following Parliament's refusal to grant representation to the island, the declaration was a last, desperate alternative. Rebellion, in the estimation of many scholars, was a tool in the planters' drive for wealth and political authority. The colonists merely sought to avoid paying rents or aimed to receive tax cuts – goals that existed before and after the rebellion.[43]

While Willoughby may have "overstated" the planters' willingness to fight and die, his conviction that they would is nonetheless significant. His declaration focused on eliciting support for his cause by appealing to ideals of manhood that his audience understood. Ultimately, this included the otherwise illogical imperative to undertake honorific violence against a superior force. Even moderates, Willoughby attested, "like true Englishmen, [were] resolved to sell themselves at a dear rate, rather than to live less free than any of their countrymen."[44] Indeed, while Pestana and others have shown that the planters had nothing to gain from fighting, the fact that they ultimately did, as

---

[43] Older historians like Schormburgk and Davis in the late nineteenth century left it without comment. Puckrein notes briefly that it was "as close to a declaration of independence as any English colony was to come before 1776." After giving a few quotes, he leaves it under-analyzed, calling it merely the enunciation of "their position," their intent to "defy the power of the mother country. Gary Puckrein, *Little England,* 118; J.H. Bennett, "Caribee Islands;" Larry Gragg, *Englishmen Transplanted*, 49-50; Carla Pestana, *The English Atlantic*. For histories that either borrow a brief quote or leave it out altogether see Sara Barber, *Disputatious Caribbean: The West Indies in the Seventeenth Century* (New York: Palgrave and Macmillan, 2014); Hilary Beckles, *A History of Barbados from Amerindian Settlement to Caribbean Single Market* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007); Richard Dunn, *Sugar and Slaves*.

[44] Quoted in N.D. Davis, *Cavaliers and Roundheads*, 200.

detailed in the next chapter, makes the role of masculinity clear. The need to prove manhood (and therefore the right to rule) through violence weighed heavily alongside more temporal concerns like wealth and politics. Willoughby could rely on shared masculine ideals of honor and martial bravery to induce the planters to go to war with Parliament. As Gragg himself pointed out, the Governor explained how news that "many ships were coming with men to reduce the island...stirred up the spirits of the Assembly," putting the "island in a posture of war...well-resolved to stand by one another to the last man."[45] It is true that many planters had little interest in fighting London and some fled. Most stayed and prepared to fight though, despite long odds and dubious material incentive. Had it only been a question of wealth and rights, Willoughby's call to arms would have fallen short. Indeed, the only colony that could rival Barbados' wealth, St. Christopher, refused Willoughby's overtures. They would "not be Aliens to [their] native Country," seeking instead to protect the "peace and quietnes of [the island] and reape the fruits of theire labours."[46] St. Christopher's leaders seemed to believe the better financial decision was to remain at peace with the Commonwealth. In Barbados, though, their willingness to fight demonstrates the importance of manhood, alongside Royalist politics and a desire for autonomy, in bringing about the Barbadian rebellion. It also laid the foundations for a distinct sense of themselves in the English World moving forward.

---

[45] Gragg argued this was just an overstatement with little support. Larry Gragg, *Englishmen Transplanted*, 49.

[46] Quoted in J.A. Williams, *Caribbee Islands under the Proprietary Patents* (London: Oxford University Press, 1926), 168.

Conclusion

The Barbadian civil war elicited a clearer expression of patriarchal manhood on the island, tied to essentially English ideals. The planters relied on masculine duty, loyalty, and bravery as indicative of their superior masculinity. Ultimately, they vowed to demonstrate these qualities through violence and bodily sacrifice, even against England itself. In doing so, they would distinguish themselves and prove their right to power. Indeed, the "disquiet" they felt until they violently asserted themselves spoke to their worth as men. The rhetoric of the war further entrenched honorific violence as central to elite manhood.

By expressing shared patriarchal values like loyalty, duty, liberty, and bodily sacrifice, the planters also attached themselves to gendered ideals that went beyond the war. Historians like Davis have tended to see the Barbadian civil war as an ideological split along the same lines as the conflict in England. Pestana added that "the confrontation revealed the self-images of Barbados' planters," each associating "its enemies with tyranny and cruelty, [and] its own cause with liberty."[47] Indeed, liberty proved foundational to each side. The planters especially emphasized their political rights as landed men. However, beyond colonial economic and political interests, gender played a central role in shaping the planters' "self-image" and reactions to Parliament too. London's embargo and succeeding invasion threatened the planters' sense of themselves as elite men with innate privileges. In response, they moved to violently demonstrate the manhood upon which they based political rights and

[47] Carla Pestana, *The English Atlantic*, 108. N.D. Davis, *Cavaliers and Roundheads in Barbados, 1650-1652*.

patriarchal authority. The planters' decision to declare independence in the face of an encroaching metropole highlighted a growing divide between their expectations for autonomy and London's willingness to grant it. The Barbadian rebellion centered on this disconnect, as the next chapter will show. But it also highlights the shared and often violent masculinity at the heart of the planters' claims to power and collective identity as ruling elites.

Chapter Four: "Maintain us in our Freedoms"

Colonel Reynold Alleyne, one of the first Roundhead planters banished from the island during the civil war, had gone in search of an army to reclaim his standing and estate. With the help of other escaped planters and interested merchants, he succeeded. As Parliament's embargo seemed to have failed with Willoughby's defiant "declaration," Alleyne found himself on board a ship teeming with Parliament's soldiers. Oliver Cromwell (then chairman of the Council of State) commissioned a fleet "to force them, the violent party, to a submission to peace."[1] Under the leadership of Admiral George Ayscue, a Roundhead hero, seven ships sailed into Carlisle Bay off the coast of Barbados in October of 1651. "Blazing guns at the fort" in Bridgetown, the Admiral intended to subdue the Royalists with an overwhelming display of force. He "also seized 12 Dutch/Hamburg ships that were there trading" (in violation of Parliament's embargo). Despite exchanging "many pieces of Cannon," Ayscue "lost only of one man."[2] The admiral blockaded the port and eventually began planning his invasion. The planters' expectations for liberty now brought them into a physical confrontation with a sizeable English fleet. As outlined in the previous chapter, Barbadians had declared a willingness to die like men for their ideals – Ayscue's arrival gave them the chance to prove it.

Masculinity is essential to explaining the Barbadian rebellion. Toward the end of the civil war, the island's planters began fostering a more complete and distinct vision of

---

[1] Letter from Mr. John Bayes to Colonel Modiford, quoted in N.D. Davis, *Cavaliers and Roundheads in Barbados, 1650-1652* (British Guiana: Argosy Press, 1883), 164.

[2] T.H., *A True and Exact Narrative of the Proceedings of the Parliaments Fleet, against the Island of Barbadoes* (London: Printed for Richard Harper in Smithfield, 1652), 3-4. J. D. Davies, *Sir George Ayscue*, Oxford DNB, 2004.

their collective identity, grounded in patriarchal manhood. With greater urgency, they emphasized rights like “autonomy” and “liberty” as essential masculine privileges. To borrow Gary Puckrein's phrase, the Barbadians explicitly made “self-rule” and individual freedom elemental to their identity. The island's elite defined themselves as “English men.” They grounded rights for political power in English traditions that gave landed males privileges like liberty, economic freedom, and representation in Parliament. English ideals of manhood, in particular masculine fortitude and martial bravery, they believed, reinforced these claims. But the planters' disposition placed them in opposition to the aims of England itself, whose government characterized them as subordinates. As Willoughby put it, the planters remained “that people of England” and “therefore *ought* to be subject to the same nation,” but only if they felt Parliament respected their inherent “freedoms” and rights as elite “English men,” a recognition that was not forthcoming. If London would not grant the planters their “innate privileges,” masculine honor demanded they fight for them.[3]

The Royalist rebellion against Parliament is central to the overall history of gender and colonial identity in Barbados. It set the stage for the island's contentious relationship with London for the remainder of the century. As asserted in the previous chapter, the imposition of the metropole at the end of the 1640s forced the planters to politicize and better articulate the meanings of elite manhood. Deciding to battle with Ayscue, though, revealed their concern with something even more fundamental. As

[3] Quotations from Francis Willoughby, “A Declaration of my Lord Willoughby Lieutenant-General and Governor of Barbados,” February 18, 1651, TNA, CO Item 1837, Vol. 1 (1574-1660), pp. 357. Referenced from here as Willoughby, “Declaration.”

Puckrein argued, they fought for a continuation of the political autonomy they had enjoyed during the civil war. But the planters' confrontation with Parliament sought more precisely to advance the idea that they inherently possessed political rights within the empire. They had formed a sense of themselves as English elites or gentry. Landownership and the possession of masculine traits like liberty, courage, physical bravery, and loyalty made them men worthy of political power and economic autonomy. Regardless of political affiliation, all colonists desired recognition of this status within the larger state. The metropole appeared unwilling to grant the "privileges" that the colonists saw as "innate" to that identity. To be denied the rights of elite men brought into question their masculinity. As a result, when conjoined with civil war politics, elite Barbadians stood willing to shed allegiance to England in 1651. They would defend manhood as a seemingly more crucial aspect of themselves than even their Englishness.[4] That choice provided a basis around which the planters on both sides came together after the conflict ended. Ideals of manhood and the implications of martial valor and honor, in particular, became fundamental to elite Barbadian masculinity and identity. Along with the collective experience of colonial settlement, it helped define them as a unique group and often placed them at odds with the metropole. They also explicitly tied patriarchal manhood to recognition for their political liberty as Englishmen within the expanding state. Over the next fifty years, this frequently placed them at odds with a metropole that refused to concede the planter's the status they sought.

[4] Quotations from Willoughby, "Declaration." See Gary Puckrein, *Little England: Plantation Society and Anglo-Barbadian Politics, 1627-1700* (new York: New York University Press, 1984), 104–123.

“Lawful Superiors”

Parliament and the planters had clashing ideas about the latter's place within English society. Before the Barbadian rebellion, Parliament determined not to grant colonial Barbadians the full rights and privileges of other English elites. The Council of State demanded submission and “obedience,” where the planters sought recognition as relative equals. The colonists believed they held their land free and independent, “same as any English town, city, shire, or island” within the Commonwealth. As part of a deal to return the island to “conformity,” the colonists, “as freeborn Englishmen,” argued that “as all power in all places...in England do receive their immediate commissions for the exercise of all authority from the High Court of Parliament which is representative of the whole nation, so Barbados as a branch belonging to this commonwealth may be entirely incorporated into the same.” Parliament ignored the question of whether to grant the island a seat in its chambers. Instead, it passed the embargo that led to Willoughby's declaration of independence. As one Roundhead put it, the men of Parliament were the colonists' “lawful superiors.” But the planters resented the implication. Instead, they would go on to live up to the rhetoric of the previous year, opting to claim their innate, masculine privileges “at the point of a sword,” even if they were bested in the “point of law.”[5]

The impasse between Crown and colony was implicitly gendered. The planters were demanding rights according to a vision of themselves as patriarchal English men,

[5] “Humble Proposals of Several Barbadians,” TNA, CO 1/11/25 in Gary Puckrein, *Little England*, 116–117. See Michael Craton, *Empire, Enslavement, and Freedom in the Caribbean* (Kingston, Jamaica: Ian Randle Publishers, 1997), 79-83. T.H., *A True and Exact Narrative,* 6. Reference for “point of law/sword” is from Nicholas Foster, *A Briefe Relation of the horrid rebellion acted in the island Barbadas, in the West Indies* (London: Printed by John Grismond for Richard Lowndes, 1650), 28.

tied to the cultural implications of landownership. Independent landownership was vital to manhood at the time. It meant, as Anne Lombard has argued, “freedom from dependence on feudal lords.” Having land was thought of in manly terms, as the root of a one's ability to provide for himself and his family. It also carried “political privileges.” However, Parliament seemed to perpetuate the Crown's view of the colony as something more like a fiefdom, with the properitor acting as lord over his colonial “tenants.” The planters hoped for recognition as elite, landowning Englishmen like any other. But London subordinated them by denying political representation and restricting trade through its embargo. As noted in the previous chapter, the planters characterized their fight as a struggle to gain recognition for their “ancient liberties” as landed “English-men.” To be “bound to the Government and Lordship of a Parliament in which [they had] no Representatives” undermined their identity as English landowning males, which *should* have carried certain political rights.[6] Far from acknowledging the planters' status, London, in the planters' view, attacked their identity as elite men.

Gender thus infused an essentially political power struggle. The family was a metaphor for the early-modern English state, as many scholars have argued. The king sat as a loving patriarch that held society together, followed by landowning men. The planters, seeing themselves as elite males, therefore expected to be below only the monarch. Willoughby, accordingly, curtly responded to Ayscue's overtures for submission by saying as much. He refused to “acknowledge [any] supreme Authority over English-men, but the King.” He would not constrain the planters' liberties to other

[6] Anne Lombard, *Making Manhood: Growing up Male in Colonial New England* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2003), 4.

men that should have been their equals.[7] In contrast, according to at least one member of the Parliamentary fleet, those that supported the Royalists' designs in Barbados were "children-like," frightened into the cause. Such language infantilized the Barbadian Royalists, compounding the offense of Parliament's attitude toward them by further challenging their manhood. Parliament made itself the Patriarch, whose duty it was to keep unruly children in line. It reduced the planters to dependents, little more than children, servants, women, or, as the Royalists argued, "slaves." Nicholas Foster further indicated that the island should have been grateful for London's patronage and accepted their subordinate role joyfully. If not, as another observer boasted, Ayscue would "make this, then stubborn Island, know their obedience" and submit to Parliament's governance "and protection." Parliament demanded the utter submission of the planters to its authority and, barring that, would use violence. The planters equated such a position to slavery, in part, because it was the same strategy they used against Africans within their own extended households. Indeed, as Cecily Jones has argued, Englishmen cast Africans and women in similar ways, as "childlike, in need of white male guidance and protection." To allow Parliament to assume control and responsibility for their "protection," feminized the planters and enflamed tensions.[8]

---

[7] For some of the many discussions of the relationship between the family and the state see Susan Amussen, *An Ordered Society: Gender and Class in Early Modern England* (New York: B. Blackwell, 1988); Carole Shammas, *A History of Household Government in America* (Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia Press, 2002), 24-25; Su Fang Ng, *Literature and the Politics of Family in Seventeenth-Century England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007). Willoughby to Ayscue, 17 October, 1651, printed in *Several Proceedings in Parliament* 99 (12-19 February 1651/2).

[8] Nicholas Foster, *A Briefe Relation,* 71. T.H., *A True and Exact Narrative,* 7–10. Willoughby, "Declaration." For masculinity and the idea of 'infantilization' see Hilary Beckles, "Black Masculinity in Caribbean Slavery," in *Interrogation Caribbean Masculinities: Theoretical and Empirical Analyses*, ed. Rhoda E. Reddock (Kingston: University of West Indies Pres, 2004), 232. For more on the hierarchy of the household and the patriarchal father's control in England and America during this time, see Carole

Moreover, Parliament sought to consume the very roots of the planters' masculinity. In particular, Ayscue specifically demanded that the Barbadians should give up their "Strengths, Fortifications, Ports, and places thereof, for the use of the Parliament of England." Doing so would strip the planters of their patriarchal right to violence. The personal control of the militia was fundamental to masculinity. Allowing another man to take control must have also offended their manhood. Moreover, giving up their "ports...for the use of Parliament" curtailed their economic independence, likewise an essential aspect of manliness. Parliament's expectations for colonial deference not only threatened colonial economic prosperity, but attacked the planters' sense of themselves as elite men. As Willoughby had already assured, they would not be forced to so "ignoble" a submission.[9]

The arrival of Parliament's fleet therefore forced the island to confront and confirm the basis of their right to power, which rested in their sense of patriarchal manhood. Beyond just political or economic interests, they would go on to fight in order to assert their fundamental claim to manhood through martial valor. Willoughby assured Ayscue that "he was resolved to defend and keep the island, unto the utmost of his strength and power," with "firm resolution." Parliament's posture toward the island as "superiors," grated against the planters' masculinity. They would have to reaffirm it through a demonstration of their "strength," "power," and "resolution." These ideals,

---

Shammas, *A History of Household Government in America* (Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia Press, 2002), 24-24; Cecily Jones, "Contesting the Boundaries of Gender, Race, and Sexuality in Barbadian Plantation Society," *Women's History Review* 12, no. 2 (2003): 211.

[9] T.H., *A True and Exact Narrative,* 7–10. Willoughby, "Declaration."

according with English understandings of manliness, would assure London that the planters were, indeed, proper men and not open to subordination.[10]

Furthermore, Parliament's imposition on the planters' freedom grated against their particular sense of manhood tied to the conquest of American lands. As Willoughby wondered, having shown the "courage...to seek [a] livelihood in this wild country" were they now to "be subject to the will and command of those that stay at home?" Here, Willoughby ignores the question of political hierarchies and, instead, emphasized masculine courage as a more important basis for power. They would not be subjugated, he implied, to less manly individuals that sat safely in England while they risked all to conquer America. As in the 1620s and 1630s, the planters again seemed to root their rights more in physical occupation and masculine fortitude than political and legal edicts from London. Settlers across English America, scholars have demonstrated, equated the conquest of wild or "virgin" lands to an achievement of manhood and expected all the rights that came with it. The planters, as Willoughby indicated, had eked out an existence at "great danger...great charge and trouble" by sheer will and masculine strength. The same courage, the same competent masculinity, Willoughby opined, would now again "maintain [them] in [their] freedoms." If Parliament determined to try and subordinate them, the planters would reiterate their masculinity and the basis of their power through a display of their masculine "courage."[11]

---

[10] Willoughby to Ayscue, 17 October, 1651.

[11] Willoughby, "Declaration." For some examples of recent work that problematizes the European conquest and settlement of America see Francis Jennings, *The Invasion of America: Indians, Colonialism, and the Cant of Conquest* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2010); Allan Greer, *Property and Dispossession: Natives, Empires, and Land in Early Modern North America* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018); Annette Kolodny, *The Lay of the Land: Metaphor as Experience and History in*

Throughout what became the Barbadian rebellion, masculinity helped escalate the conflict from a rhetorical and political battle to a physical one. Moderates and Parliamentarians had been petitioning London for a compromise that would avoid conflict, including (as mentioned above) direct representation for the island. Peace required Parliament to acknowledge the planters' place in English society, which meant a seat in Parliament. As Willoughby learned, on the advice of some friends in England, though, he could "expect nothing but fire and sword" from Parliament with "no terms offered." Since Parliament saw itself as the island's superior, it had no obligation to negotiate. If, as the Barbadians seemed to believe, they were honorable men, possessing a patriarchal manhood, they could not accept such a submission. Honor, in European culture at the time, stipulated that only an act of "physical bravery" could reaffirm manhood. The planters certainly perceived Parliament's posture toward them as an insult. As they put it, submitting to Parliament without being given their innate right to representation "would be a slavery far exceeding all that the English nation hath yet suffered." The source of their complaints remained political. The planters demanded their rights as landed Englishmen. But masculine cultural ideals left them with little choice in how to respond when Parliament refused. They could not be meek in the face of a battle, but would have to meet the challenge. The planters needed to defend their manhood and its attendent rights through a demonstration of manly bravery. To otherwise would make them "unworthy," as Willoughby contended. Alongside practical

---

American Life and Letters (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2017); J.H. Elliot, *Empires of the Atlantic World: Britain and Spain in America* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2006).

concerns, then, the planters' sense of male honor forced them to physically fight subjugation to Parliament.[12] Willoughby, therefore, prepared the planters for war.

Parliament's similar understanding of honor, meanwhile, forced the confrontation in the first place. Just as an individual man's status demanded violent defense, the same was true of political structures. As political scientist R.J. Rummel once succinctly put it, “honor is a central variable in a state's relations with others and in the genesis of violence.” Parliament felt compelled to “make them know their obedience.” The Council of State explained that any other outcome would be “dishonorable to the Council.” It was explicitly not a question of policy, but a matter of male “honor.” Like the planters, if Parliament believed themselves superior, they could not bend to the planters' rebellious demands. As the figurative patriarch, they needed to establish their absolute authority over these 'subordinates', making them “know their obedience.” Cromwell thus sent Admiral Ayscue with a fleet of ships and 860 men to achieve the planters' submission by force.[13] Practical issus abounded, but the actual conflict grew out of masculinity, for both Crown and colony.

---

[12] “Humble Proposals of Several Barbadians,” TNA, CO 1/11/25 in Puckrein, *Little England*, 116–117. Willoughby, “Declaration.” Cynthia Herrup, “'To Pluck Bright Honor from the Pale-Faced Moon': Gender and Honour in the Catlehaven Story,” *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 6 (1996): 137-159; Pieter Spienrenburg, *Men and Violence: Gender, Honor, and Rituals in Modern Europe and America* (Columbus, OH: University of Ohio State Press, 1998), 2. Mervyn James, “English Politics and the Concept of Honor,” in *Society, Politics, and Culture*, ed. Mervyn James (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1986), 309. Slavery quote is from Willoughby, “A Declaration,” June 11, 1651, TNA, CO 1/11, pp. 34-43.

[13] R.J. Rummel, *Understanding Conflict and War*, Vol. 4, (Beverley Hills: Sage Publications, 1979). See Gary Puckrein, *Little England*, 116 - 117. For more on the important connects between honor and manhood see Cynthia Herrup, “'To Pluck Bright Honor';” Robert Nye, *Masculinity and Male Codes of Honor in Modern France* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995). For an overview of views on the relationship between the household and the state see Carole Shammas, *A History of Household Government in America,* 2 & 20-21; Susan Amussen, *An Ordered Society*.

“Their Contempt of Us”

While they shared a sense of masculine honor, Ayscue and Willoughby's conflicting views on the Parliamentary fleet also revealed fundamental differences between the two sides. As noted in the work of Tim Hitchcock and Michele Cohen on the English Civil War, Cavaliers espoused essentially medieval conceptions of honor, while Roundhead men adhered to “precepts of contemporary religion.” The tension between these cultural imperatives “formed an important component” of the war. Likewise, from onboard Ayscue's ship in Barbados, Foster evoked the language of contemporary Protestant culture. Parliamentarians claimed that success in bringing peace earned “the blessing of God, on the unwearied endeavors of the Parliament.” The fleet came to “lift up the Oppressed.” Willoughby, meanwhile, clung to “steadfastness and aggression,” which characterized ideals of manhood through medieval English history. Ayscue saw liberty and called upon piety where Willoughby saw tyranny and evoked fortitude. Parliament carried a “spirit of peace” but the planters abided a spirit of violence, to paraphrase Foster.[14] The colonists had no interest in “lifting up the oppressed” but, instead, sought to assert the power they presumed to possess as landed men by demonstrating courage in battle.

Ayscue initially adhered to his orders, placing economic pressure on the colonists to erode support for the rebellion. He prevented any trade coming in or out for almost a month in autumn of 1651. The fleet sailed “from place to place, about the Island,” burning and attacking coastal plantations. Ayscue sought “to keep [the planters] in

[14] See Tim Hitchcock and Michelle Cohen, *English Masculinities, 1660-1800* (New York: Routledge, 1999), 13-15. BL, E. 655, 12. Nicholas Foster, *A Briefe Relation*, 19 & 104.

alarms in all parts of the island hoping that way would conduce to the speedy rendition of it." He expected to soon "bring them to their due obedience." The fleet's tactician, William Hilliard, believed that the planters would come around when faced with raids that undermined their economic interests and the rest would surrender "if given an act of oblivion," (a general pardon). Ayscue expected, he wrote to Willoughby, the "present rendition of [the] island" by preserving "the inhabitants thereof in their Estates." The strategy worked, to some extent. Discontent with Willoughby's rule began to show. Moderates, like Thomas Modiford (in secret talks with Henry Hawley), started to favor a settlement and even contemplated switching sides.[15] If it had only been a matter of peace and prosperity, most planters likely would have accepted the pardon. As noted in the previous chapter, this was precisely the course taken by St. Christopher. But the role of masculinity and, specifically, masculine honor helped ensure otherwise.

First, as described above, the island's leaders had little interest in anything but their full recognition as members of the English elite. Willoughby and the planters continually demanded respect for their status throughout Ayscue's blockade. When the Admiral first made contact and demanded Willoughby's submission, for instance, he scoffed. Instead, he responded with feigned surprise, "rather expect[ing] some overture about [Ayscue]...making reparation for those acts of hostility committed...upon those ships in the Bay, and the person of his Marshal," whom Ayscue had captured upon arrival. Willoughby dismissed the Admiral's further calls for capitulation. He adopted a

[15] T.H., *A True and Exact Narrative*, 10. Ayscue quote in "Sir George Ayscue to Lord Willoughby," printed in *Several Proceedings against Parliament* 99. A reprinting can be found in N.D. Davis, *Cavaliers and Roundheads*, 213-214. See also Carla Pestana, *The English Atlantic*, 105-106; James Williamson, *Caribbee Islands*, 176.

posture that indicated he was at least an equal with Ayscue and the members of Parliament. Instead of submitting, Willoughby expected Ayscue to be contrite for the offense he showed in his "hostility" toward him. Willoughby appeared not to view the Admiral as his superior, but a peer in an honor community who had disrespected him and who owned "reparation" for the offense to his honor.[16] Such apology not forthcoming, the Royalists refused the "act of oblivion," choosing to go to war in accord with ideals of manly honor.

Secondly, the planters' indignation toward Ayscue and their expectations for contrition grew, in no small part, of their sense that martial prowess signified superior manhood. Willoughby, Walrond, and other prominent leaders like Colonel Modiford apparently "little regarded" the arrival of Parliament's force. They and other "chief officers continued feasting of it 12 miles up in the Island." The Parliamentary author of this account attributed their indifference to "their contempt of us," having heard a rumor that the Dutch ran "our Fleet...away from England, to seek for shelter in another place."[17] Willoughby and the other Barbadian leaders, with resolute confidence, sent the message that they would not submit to men who had run from a fight. In doing so, they demonstrated the enduring importance of martial prowess to masculinity. The rumor buoyed the planters' confidence that they could, and should, continue to be in power and not subject themselves to the less manly fleet. Their supposed greater

[16] This according with literature on reputation and honor during the period. See Hitchcock and Cohen, *English Masculinities,* 13-15.
[17] T.H., *A True and Exact Narrative,* 5.

martial prowess confirmed their superior manhood and right to demand deference from Ayscue.

Partly as a result of planter masculinity, then, when Ayscue "sent a second, and a third summons unto the Lord Willoughby," it proved as "ineffectual" as his first. The fight with Ayscue was about politics and estates; but these matters could have been resolved merely by agreeing to the Admiral's terms. Hilliard had, after all, instructed him to grant favorable concessions.[18] Violence did not only ensue for "home rule," the preservation of wealth, or even civil war politics. It had become a point of honor, a matter of manhood. Even as Ayscue received reinforcements, consisting of a "fleet of merchants, and some Men of War from England" and prepared to invade, the planters refused to yield. Their expectations for respect as elite men within the English realm and the necessities of masculine honor appear to have won out over more temperate considerations. Parliament may have been their "lawful superiors," but there were even more elemental imperatives of honor.[19]

Fighting between Parliament's forces and Royalist planters was not prolonged, but bloodier than historians often characterize it. Ayscue's men eventually snuck ashore at Speightstown, killing "several dozen," while taking less than twelve losses themselves.[20] Walrond met him with the Barbadian militia, consisting of "nine

---

[18] See Puckrein, *Little England*; Carla Pestana, *The English Atlantic*.
[19] T.H., *A True and Exact Narrative,* 10. See Larry Gragg, *Englishmen Transplanted*, 51.
[20] Gragg, for instance, blamed "a three-day downpour" for Willoughby's surrender. While true, it came only after other skirmishes and did not indicate a lack of willingness on the side of the Royalist leaders to fight. Pestana, likewise, indicates that the rain prevented a battle and the two came to terms without one. Dunn ignores the event of the conflict altogether, saying only "they came to terms with Ayscue." Larry Gragg, *Englishmen Transplanted*, 50-53; Carla Pestana, *The English Atlantic*, 106-107; Dunn, *Sugar and*

companies of foot, [and] three troops of horse, to oppose" the landing. The Barbadians charged upon the fleet as they disembarked their boats, "very resolute." However, "after a short but hot dispute," the invaders forced the smaller Royalist group to retreat. In the fray, though, the defenders stabbed Colonel Alleyne to death. The man who had helped put the whole confrontation in motion paid the greatest cost. The assault, however, in "no way moved" the planters to "compliance." Willoughby and Walrond remained determined to fight. By this time, though, Modiford defected to Ayscue's side with most of his 2,000 man regiment. He then secured the "windward side of the island" for Parliament. The Admiral informed Willoughby of the defection and asked for his surrender; but Willoughby stood firm. Once again, leeward men would go to war with those to the windward for control of the island. In a downpour that lasted three days, Willoughby stood with 3,000 men against the combined forces of Ayscue and Modiford. However, the former's troops insufficiently met the gallantry of their leader. As Puckrein noted, the servants who were necessary to fill the militia ranks actively fled to the fleet, which had promised their freedom during the standoff. Ultimately, by the time the rain stopped and the two sides finally met at Spikes Bay, Willoughby surrendered.[21] Barbadians had once again resolved political differences through military superiority. The rhetoric and actions of their leaders further promoted ideals of martial prowess and honor as masculine ideals, reinforcing violence as central to patriarchal manhood and the right to rule.

Slaves, 80. Puckrein, by contrast, acknowledges the 100 "slain" on Parliament's side but gave few details about the battle itself. Gary Puckrein, *Little England*, 121.

[21] T.H., *A True and Exact Narrative,* 8 & 10. Larry Gragg, *Englishmen Transplanted,* 51. See N.D. Davis, *Cavaliers and Roundheads,* 229; V.T. Harlow, *Colonising Expeditions,* 75; Foster, *A Brief Relation*, 7. See also, Carla Pestana, *The English Atlantic*, 106-107; Puckrein, *Little England,* 121.

“Articles of Agreement”

In defeat, the Barbadian rebellion accomplished many of the planters' major goals. Willoughby “produced a treaty and [exchanged] hostages.” The “Articles of Agreement” to end hostilities dictated that “Lord *Willoughby*, Col. *Walrond*, Col. Mudiford, [*sic*] and others of their Part” have full “protection for the enjoyment of their Estates, either in England or Elsewhere.” Land, the fundamental basis for the planters' claims to patriarchal manhood and the rights that came with it, remained the first order of business. The Royalist leaders were to “also be pardoned and indemnified for all past by Actions.” The Articles even allowed Willoughby to temporarily remain as governor, while returning all rights, economic and political, to the rebels. They did have to agree to act “nothing prejudicial to the Government which should be established over them,” but could otherwise “enjoy and live peaceably in their Habitations.” The agreement disbanded the forces, but provided for the continuation of the militia “as shall seem fit.” The Royalists had to retract any hope for total independence; however, they maintained their estates and their local autonomy. They continued to have control of the militia to enact good order. Thus, they maintained most central aspects of their masculinity, even if they still had no seat in Parliament.[22]

The Articles seemed to confirm the planters' identity as elite males. As James Williamson put it, the Barbadians therefore “chose to regard them as the charter of the island.” Additional terms reflected the planters' expectations and goals for respect and

[22] *Articles of Agreements, made, and concluded on the 11th. day of January, 165[2]* (London: Printed for Francis Coles, 1652). Puckrein details how this agreement was in accordance with Hillard's instructions, wanting to bring the important and wealthy colony back into the fold. See Gary Puckrein, *Little England,* 122.

political autonomy as freeholders. The agreement provided that "no Taxes, Customs, Impost, Loans, or Excise" could be passed "on any of the Inhabitants of [the] island without their free consent in a general Assembly." Ayscue thus affirmed the legitimacy and autonomy of the Barbadian political structure. Even if they did not have representation in Parliament directly, he seemed to waive London's right to impose taxes unilaterally. In doing so, it bestowed the Barbadians with veto power and reversed demands for absolute obedience. It essentially secured the planters' economic independence. The agreement also assured that no Barbadian could be dispossessed of his lands, "other goods or Chattel whatsoever, without due proceedings according to the known and common Laws of England."[23] The permanent protection of their lands as freeholders and confirmation of political and economic rights mirrored the planters' expectations for status within the larger state.

The agreement further reflected the colonists' deeper goal for recognition as elite males by tempering London's ability to subordinate them. First, the Barbadians were free to settle their own legal suits and would not be "compelled to go into England." Legal sovereignty had been a long-standing issue for the planters. Often, opponents in cases would secure a favorable ruling in advance of their arrival, undermining colonists' access to a fair hearing. Patriarchal manhood in England at the time entailed privileges before the court. In protecting their legal rights, the planters' safeguarded their masculinity. The Barbadians also attempted to ensure that Parliament would not place trade companies "over them." The Articles allowed free trade "with all

[23] *Articles of Agreement*, 4-8.

Nations that...Trade, or are in amity with England." According to the agreement, England could no longer subordinate colonial interests to those of metropolitan investors in trade companies. The planters thus further secured economic and political freedoms in relative parity with peers in London. Doing so further protected their masculine status. In the English household, legal and economic matters all flowed through the patriarch. Women, servants, slaves, and children, by contrast, did not enjoy such rights. While not explicit, securing these concessions from Parliament sought to defend the planters' place in the patriarchal order of the imperial state. It protected their manhood.[24] Having acknowledged that standing, the agreement mostly removed the basis of their revolt, outside of civil war politics and a desire for a seat in Parliament.

The lenient settlement of the conflict, however, set unrealistic expectations for power and autonomy. As Puckrein noted, just a few months after the agreement most planters felt ill at ease "about the future of Anglo-Barbadian relations." While they had prevented "their worst fears" from manifesting, "it soon became apparent that the articles of surrender could not be used to preserve the island's former independence." Indeed, the terms by which Barbados returned to the Commonwealth reflected the planters' idealistic desire for status, autonomy, and free trade.[25] Time proved that it exceeded what the Protectorate would permit in practice. After 1660 and the Restoration of the monarchy, the Stuarts showed themselves equally reluctant to abide

---

[24] *Articles of Agreement*, 3-4. For more on patriarchal economic and legal privilege see Carole Shammas, *A History of Household Government*; Cynthia Herrup, "'To Pluck Bright Honour';" Alexandra Shepard, "Manhood, Credit, and Patriarchy."

[25] Gary Puckrein, *Little England*, 124. See Carla Pestana, *The English Atlantic*, 57; Newton Key and R.O. Bucholz, *Sources and Debates in English History, 1485-1714* (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2004); and Austin Woolrych, *Commonwealth to Protectorate* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1982).

by the agreement. In the end, the conflict failed to permanently secure London's respect for the planters' expected rights and, by extension, their manhood. It set the stage for an ongoing battle to claim standing within the empire, first touched-off by the civil war.

"For its better Government, Regulation, and improvement"

Elite Barbadian anticipation of political and economic autonomy, as well as status as elite men, had to reckon with the expansionist aims of the English Government. With the end of the war, the metropole became more involved in colonial affairs. In the words of Hilary Beckles, the era saw "the imperial center...momentarily weak, and the colonial periphery" push out "to the maximum frontiers of economic fanaticism." As argued above, so too did the Barbadians' "fanaticism" about elite, male liberty grow. But now, the metropole set about an aggressive policy of control and taxation in its colonies. Cromwell aimed to expand his reach, especially in the Caribbean, through the so-called "Western Design." These changes again threatened the planters' dreams of autonomy.[26]

Meanwhile, as Puckrein has suggested, the Barbadians immediately came to resent the few capitulations they made to Ayscue. In particular, their acceptance of an English Governor, to be appointed by London, grated against their sense of innate patriarchal power and political freedom. In fact, they argued that "to appoint Governors over them is not Freedom but King-like."[27] Still expecting the privileges of elite

[26] Hilary Beckles, *The First Black Slave Society: Britain's Barbarity Time in Barbados* (Cave Hill: The University of the West Indies Press, 2016), 5. For more on the Western Design, conquest of Jamaica, and other changes in this era see Carla Pestana, *The English Conquest of Jamaica: Oliver Cromwell's Bid for Empire* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2017). For a classic work on the Western Design see S.A.G. Taylor, *The Western Design* (Kingston: Institute of Jamaica, 1965).
[27] In J.A. Williamson, *Caribbee Islands*, 179. He cited the original as TNA, CO 1/12, no. 2.

Englishmen, they bristled at subordinating their control over the island. In Parliament, proprietor John Bayes successfully persuaded the Council of State that, if the planters were allowed to elect their own governor, their pick would look at them "as his superiors." He would be a tool of the planters' ambitions to the detriment of the Commonwealth. Speaking to the colonists' separate goals, Bayes referred to the "giddy multitude" ready to again "quit the Parliament's interest," as reason enough to refuse them such political authority.[28] Barbadians' insistence on autonomy and the pursuit of their interests in opposition to London required that Parliament take steps to reinforce its supremacy over the colony. The opposing ideas about the colonists' place within the English Empire that had started the conflict not two years earlier remained. Men like Bayes seemed to continue looking down on the planters as a rebellious lot, unfit to be trusted with power. He subordinated their manhood, again infantilizing them, lumping them together as rebels instead of proper elite males who deserved the political rights of English gentry. The planters continued to push for greater autonomy, which they felt stemmed from their patriarchal manhood. The impasse, first highlighted by the gendered rhetoric of the civil war conflict, set the stage for tensions between London and Bridgetown through the rest of the century.

Anxieties attached to gender and privileges like liberty, which the war had brought to the forefront of the planters' minds, found ample fuel after it ended. Almost immediately, Parliament seemed to disregard much of the agreement Ayscue signed. In doing so, London stripped the colonists of security for their masculine autonomy. The

[28] Quotes from Bayes are in Gary Puckrein, *Little England*, 125-127. For more background on post-war politics see Larry Gragg, *Englishmen Transplanted*, 52.

“Embargo Act of 1650” and the “Navigation Act of 1651” remained in force, even though the former had supposedly been passed only to end the rebellion. Both Acts though, the planters' believed, violated the “Articles of Agreement.” Once again, as in the civil war, Parliament's actions disrespected the planters' political authority and, by extension, their masculinity. Parliament would never ratify the articles of surrender. By refusing to abide by the treaty Ayscue had made, London continued to subordinate the planters. It would not allow them to control their own interests as they hoped, especially at the expense of aims for imperial expansion. As London embarked on a mercantilist mission to control and profit from Atlantic trade, the Acts of Navigation proved a central component.[29] Parliament's escalating efforts to rule over the colony provided a common grievance for the planters on both sides of the civil war.

London's continuing lack of respect for the Barbadians led to increasing resentment, even among its former supporters. London's post-war disposition, which reflected the posture of the previous two years, vexed all. The colonists held a persisting expectation for recognition as landed, English elites that was not forthcoming. The Barbadians particularly resented having to comply with a government that seemingly refused to recognize them as equal to other elite Englishmen by still denying them a seat in Parliament. Even Thomas Modiford, who had handed Ayscue his victory, wrote with agitation to London about the island's lack of representation, saying “to demand to have burgesses with you to sit and vote in matters concerning England may seem

[29] Gary Puckrein, *Little England,* 125-127. For a comprehensive, classic look at the Acts of Navigation see Lawrence Harper, *The English Navigation Laws: A Seventeenth Century Experiment in Social Engineering* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1939). For more recent work see John McCusker and Kenneth Morgan, eds. *The Early Modern Atlantic Economy* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000).

immodest, but to desire two representatives to be chosen by that island...I presume may be both just and necessary." The planters acknowledged that, to England, their desire for a seat in Parliament might be arrogant; but to them, they "presumed" this to be an inherent privilege. It spoke to the persisting impasse between the planters' view of themselves and London's. For landowning men, access to political power was a natural part of their existence. It was "just." It was also "necessary" to maintain normal relations between a people and its government in the English mind. How could Parliament expect the colony to cooperate and participate in the growing English Empire if that London would not acknowledge them as fully English? The Council of State, once again, "ignored the question" of allowing the planters a seat in Parliament.[30] London's disregard for the planters' status and expectations for political rights proved to still be offensive. It insinuated that they were lesser, unworthy men. Ultimately, a desire for greater power and its denial by Parliament provided the planters with persisting grievances.

Masculinity and the collective desire to claim elite, male privileges added to the foundations of an increasingly separate, colonial identity. Parliament had initially disparaged the manhood of their beaten foes in the Barbadian rebellion. In an attempt to cement the victory, one account called the Royalist commanders "perfidious Cowards" that "ran away," ostensibly undermining their manliness rooted in ideals of martial bravery. However, in time, the ordeal would be remembered differently on the island. The planters cast aside the distinctions of political difference involved. Instead,

[30] Gary Puckrein, *Little England,* 125-127.

the fight became the basis for men on both sides to claim manhood and its attendant rights. In particular, they came together around a shared reverence for martial valor as indicative of masculine worth. For example, Colonel Alleyne's death in battle earned him a reputation as "a man of worth and honor" among the whole island for many years to come.[31] Though he had fought for Parliament, the planters found a general admiration of his masculinity. Understandings of honor and sacrifice in battle could heal political wounds. Together with the pursuit of political and economic autonomy from the homeland, manhood provided a shared sense of self.

The "Articles of Agreement" had reflected the planters' desire to overcome civil war politics and move forward to pursue shared economic and legal interests. Claiming that the trouble stemmed from "uncivill Language tending to Sedition and Division, too commonly used among the people here," they resolved that "a strict Law be made against all such persons...guilty of any reviling Speeches of what nature soever, by remembering or raveling into former differences, and reproaching any man with the Cause he formerly defended." Colonists were not to associate one another with the politics of the war era. Additionally, they chose to absolve "every the Inhabitants of [the] Island...for and concerning any Act or thing whatsoever done by them" during the course of the war.[32] The articles thus represented at least the aspiration to set aside past differences.

---

[31] T.H., *A True and Exact Narrative,* 10. Alleyne was killed by musket shot in confrontation with Willoughby's men. His son of the same name later moved to New England and then New York, where he died. Effie Lousie Chapman and Josephine Elizabeth Rayne, eds., *The New England Historical and Genealogical Register* (Boston: New England Historic Genealogical Society, 1906-1907), 180. Quote is quoted in N.D. Davis, *Cavaliers and Roundheads*, 158.
[32] *Articles of Agreement*, 4 & 6.

Eventually, the Restored monarchy would reinforce the colonial vision of the Barbadian rebellion as a moment of honor. Their bravery, even in defeat, spoke to the worthiness of the planters and seemed to belatedly achieve the status they sought. When the Stuart Monarchy returned in 1660, Charles II bestowed knighthoods and titles, such as "baronet," on several prominent planters for their loyalty during the civil war.[33] The King praised them for performing their "Duty... in the year 1651," when the island "was disturbed by a fleet sent from England, which besieged [the] Island Barbados." He absolved Willoughby for coming to terms when the fleet "threatened the good People thereof with...war, if they did not submit." The Crown thus confirmed that Ayscue's fleet had been an unlawful aggressor, against whom the planters behaved admirably. Willoughby was not a "coward" that "ran away," but a wise and "dutiful" man. As such, Charles II happily placed the "Right trustie, [*sic*] and Right well Loved" Willoughby back into power over the island "for its better Government, Regulation, and improvement." He was to either take the governorship for himself or appoint another as he saw fit.[34] For the next decade, the planters were able to select their own governor, which included stints by Walrond, Willoughby's nephew and brother, and a wealthy, respected planter named Peter Colleton. The King appeared to reward the island's "loyalty" and "courage" by granting the planters power over their own affairs. Performing their masculinity through heroic battle against the King's enemies became

[33] See Richard Dunn, *Sugar and Slaves,* 81. For more on the sale of titles like "baronette" and the 'cheapening' of nobility during the Stuart Era see Linda Levy Peck, *Court Patronage and Corruption in Early Stuart England* (London: Routledge, 2003); Kevin Sharpe, *The Personal Rule of Charles I* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1992).
[34] Egerton MS 2395, 1627-1699, 267. "His Majesty's Lord in behalf of my Lord Willoughby," TNA, CO 31/1, pp. 32.

the basis for authority and status. Access to new hereditary titles even tied the planters to the broader English elite, seeming to confirm their acceptance by London as proper Englishmen. Rewarding the rebellion, the King affirmed the Barbadians' belief that masculine valor carried with it a right to power and authority. It suggested that they were correct in assuming to be English gentry like any other.

An evolving memory of the war as something noble that demonstrated manhood and the right to rule, despite defeat, continued to infuse power on the island. The willingness of men like Walrond and Willoughby to stand and fight became the basis to reclaim socio-political position. When Walrond wrote to Modiford to encourage support for Willoughby's reinstatement as governor, for example, he echoed the King's language. Referencing the many “revolutions and Disorders” of the previous decade, he harkened to the time when “the Governor of [Barbados] in the year (1651) was disturbed by a fleet sent from England to besiege it, [threatening] the good people thereof with...war if they did not submit to the powers then laying before them.” Willoughby became the benevolent patriarch, his manly courage preventing “disorder” and ruin. Revising history a bit, Walrond attested how Willoughby had “thought it fit out of tender [concern] of the good people of His Majesty's Island, and for its better Governance, Regulation and Improvement to Encourage and require the Right Honorable Francis Lord Willoughby of Parham instantly to...take [over] the affairs and Government” ahead of Ayscue's arrival. Walrond attempted to use the memory of Willoughby's masculine worth to soften Modiford to the idea of his leadership. By memorializing Willoughby as a heroic figure, Walrond reinforced martial valor as

supporting claims to power. The Barbadian civil war continued to shape the planters' hierarchy, serving as the root of Willoughby's authority. His willingness to stand against Parliament's unjust attempt to usurp the island's power and wisdom to protect the island from ruin helped him oversee a relatively unified and peaceful period of prosperity through the 1660s.[35]

Despite high expectations, though, the planters received little better treatment from the King than Parliament and Cromwell. Only four months after Walrond wrote to Modiford demanding obedience to the Charles II and Willoughby, in February of 1661, the planters tone toward the new regime changed. In particular, they decried the Acts of Trade and Navigation, which the latest Parliament had reaffirmed. The planters also complained about the increased duty on sugar, from two and a quarter to four percent. Walrond and his Council, along with the Assembly explained how sugar was "the first and almost the only manufacture...in this island." If Parliament did not lift the tax and trade restrictions, the planters' claimed, "many of the Inhabitants must in all probability in a short time quit this place unless his Majesty and Parliament of England" repeal or

[35] The King granted Willoughby a portion of Royal revenue from the Leeward Islands for seven years as part of his reward for "loyalty" in the conflict with Parliament. Along with prestige and wealth went political power. In June of 1663 Willoughby became governor for a second time, hand-picked by the King, who placed "special Trust & Confidence in his Prudence, Industry, Circumspection, Fortitude, and Magnanimity." Charles granted him wide-ranging power to choose his Deputy Governor and "appoint Justices, Judges, and other Offices by such titles as he shall think good...to determine all matters, causes, and complaints...And to Grant and to Allow into the said Judges, Justices, and officers, such powers, Authority, Fees, and Privileges, as he the said Francis Lord Willoughby shall conceive fit and reasonable." Not only did he have complete authority but Willoughby could autonomously determine the extent to which others possessed influence and prestige, and even their salaries, with little interjection or oversight from London. No governor thereafter possessed such power, all of which stemmed from his willingness to aggressively undertake martial violence in the name of the King. Using his wide mandate from London and his capital as a successful military leader and planter, Willoughby forged a tight, stable coalition of Barbadian elites and used it to expand his wealth and attain further prestige through martial conquest against the French and Dutch in the region. See TNA, CO 29/1, pp. 25 and TNA CO 29/1, pp. 31.

modify the laws. The colonists sought to “be at liberty to transport” their produce “to any Port in amity with His Majesty,” rather than merely London. The Assembly complained that they were “growing poorer and [their] ground every day decaying” and that these new burdens would soon crush the colony altogether. Their economic independence as men again threatened, they continued to pursue the freedoms they had in the previous decade. Warning of the imminent extinction of the Crown's most profitable American plantation, the planters hinted that even Cromwell had treated them better. They “Beseec[ed] His Majesty that he...not put us into a worse condition than formerly we were in...but that we may hold our land as heretofore we did.” Though the King suspended proprietary rents in favor of an export tax, the planters still longed for the days of autonomy they had enjoyed during the English Civil War. The fight over what came to be the “4 ½ per cent duty,” though, would continue into the next century.[36]

To that end, memory of the conflict with Ayscue continued to shape the planters' colonial identity and relationship with the metropole. Soon the conflict had seemingly little to do with civil war politics. Instead, London's increasing imposition into their lives led the planters to emphasize it as a tyrannical assertion of metropolitan power. In 1675, for example, the Crown asked for an accurate accounting of the number of servants and slaves on the island. Gathering such census data was a central piece of metropolitan schemes to better categorize and manage the American colonies. The

[36] TNA, CO 31/1, pp. 45. For more on the sugar duty and the ongoing struggle with it on the island see William Duke, *Some Memoirs of the First Settlement of the Island of Barbados* (Barbados: Printed by Wm. Beeby, 1741). TNA, CO 31/1, pp. 53. For the suspension of proprietary rents see Michael Craton, *Empire, Enslavement, and Freedom*, 79-83.

planters may have perceived it as a usurpation of their own absolute authority over the household. At the very least, it seemed to again be a means to subject them to metropolitan rule. In any case, Barbadians recoiled. Apparently, they were still on alert for slights to their identity and privileges as elite men with innate liberties, left over from the civil war. According to then Governor Jonathan Atkins, the island's leaders professed to be anxious about the "Rebellion of Virginia" (Bacon's Rebellion). They were not nervous about the implications of former and current servants attacking and burning plantations there, as might be expected. Instead, the Governor attested, the English fleet sailing to support Virginia's Governor Berkley evoked memories of "Sir George Askue's [*sic*] expedition" to subdue Barbados.[37] Their pause at the rebellion in Virginia is indicative of an increased sensitivity about the political rights of landowning men in juxtaposition to the metropole, born in their experience of civil war. To be reminded that London once tried to subordinate and subjugate the planters with an invasion amplified their offense about a seemingly simple request like census data. It picked at old wounds of honor and respect for their status as elite, English males. Gendered ideals and expectations for power thus continued to hold salience for the island's identity and its relationship with London. Memories of the Barbadian rebellion led the planters to be on guard about slights to their autonomy and were increasingly central to their shared sense of themselves.

---

[37] For a clear and relevant exploration of the power of census-taking in the early Leeward Islands and Barbados see Jenny Shaw, *Everyday Life in the Early English Caribbean: Irish, Africans, and the Construction of Difference* (Athens, GA: The University of Georgia Press, 2013), 58-68. TNA, CO 29/3, pp. 7-10. For Bacon's rebellion and its importance see Edmund Morgan, *American Slavery, American Freedom: The Ordeal of Colonial Virginia* (New York: Norton, 1975); James D. Rice, *Tales from a Revolution: Bacon's Rebellion and the Transformation of Early America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013).

Conclusion

Though tied to the politics of war, gender ideals played an important part in the Barbadian Rebellion. Through the era, the planters came to better define themselves in an Atlantic context. Their shared identity and expectations for masculine privilege, hardened by their collective experience with the war, served as the basis for their continuing hostility with the metropole. The planters had resolved to fight because they believed Parliament would not recognize their identity as hegemonic English men. Their masculine culture encouraged a violent response. As David Morgan put it, in particularly threatening situations like war, manhood is "explicitly put on the line." As a result, "violence may be...invoked as a practice for doing masculinity and distinguishing masculinities from one another."[38] Barbadian elites had attempted to lay claim to patriarchal manhood within the empire in the face of a fleet bent on subordinating them. To "distinguish" their masculinity and claim the rights they believed extended from it meant violence. Even as political and economic considerations shaped the impasse, it was manhood that led the call to arms. Only a performance of martial daring would affirm honor, securing the planters' patriarchal manhood and right to power within the English World.

The ideals of manhood expressed during the Barbadian Rebellion helped the planters continue to cultivate a distinct identity. Through the course of the civil war, the colonists came to define the specific meanings of elite manhood more clearly.

---

[38] D.H. Morgan, *Discovering Men,* Volume 3 (New York: Taylor & Francis, 1992), 47. See also James W. Messerschmidt, "Men Victimizing Men: The Case of Lynching, 1865-1900," in *Masculinities and Violence*, ed. Lee H. Bowker (London: Sage Publications, 1998), 126-151.

Willoughby characterized the planters as a separate group who had left England and, through “courage” and sacrifice, obtained land and the rights that came with it. His rhetoric points to the foundation for a distinguishing, colonial personality. They rooted themselves in a separate history, which memory imbued with a heritage of masculine fortitude. During and after the war, the planters seemed to consider this foundational to their status within the English World. It carried expectations for “liberty” and “autonomy” in the face of imperial expansion. The same masculine ideals existed within the homeland, but took on fresh importance in the colony, as the planters felt London had placed them beneath metropolitan landowners. Growing anxiety about their place within the Commonwealth added to their separateness from it. As the planters' pause at Bacon's Rebellion demonstrates, their sense of themselves was no longer only tied to an English history with its “ancient liberties.” That cultural past remained important, but it also meshed with their own, more recent history and masculine identity.

Chapter Five: "Being at a Feast and Drinking to Excess"

By the end of the 1650s, most Barbadian planters lived on large estates, often exceeding 100 acres.[1] Their houses were "handsome and [had] many rooms." Here, hosts and guests frequently joined together. With few outside diversions, they tended to spend leisure time eating and drinking. As Father Antoine Biet noted in 1655, they indulged in quality, imported and locally-made alcohol so that "when they dine, no one is forced to drink, one drinks willingly...whatever one wants: wines from Spain, Madeira, the Canaries; French wines, and sweetened Mauby." Then, "after one has dined," a staff of African slaves and white servants cleared the table and set out "a trencher full of pipes and another full of tobacco," along with "a bowl full of brandy." They added sugar and eggs, set it on fire, and let it "burn down." Next, "the host" took up a fine "little silver cup, fill[ed] it with this liquor and [drank] to the health of whoever is in front of him." All present repeated this ceremony of communion and hospitality. Such occasions were, according to Biet, merely a way to "pass" an "afternoon" for elite men. The priest, though, missed the larger importance of such events in the planters' lives.[2]

Feasts and hospitality demonstrated patriarchal manhood and belonging as English gentlemen in seventeenth-century Barbados. Through the course of the civil war and Interregnum, (ca. 1640-1660) Barbadian wealth increased dramatically. As it did, the planters transformed a penchant for drinking, first noted by Henry Colt in the 1630s,

---

[1] Richard Dunn, *Sugar and Slaves: The Rise of the Planter Class in the West Indies, 1624-1713* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1972), 50–58.

[2] Antoine Biet, *Voyage de la France Eguinoxiale en l'isle de Cayenne Entrepris par les France en l'Anne M. DC. LII* (Paris: 1667) trans. Jerome Handler, "Father Antoine Biet's Visit to Barbados in 1654," *Journal of the Barbados Museum and Historical Society* 32 (May 1967): 50-76. Noted from here as 'Antoine Biet, *Voyage'* with page numbers from original document, as referenced by Handler. Pages 278-279 are quoted here.

into a more formal culture of feasts and hospitality that mimicked the gentry of the homeland. These occasions demonstrated the masculine competency of the host. They also bound guests in reciprocal obligation, helping to foment sociability and establish community among elite males. Feasts were foundational to island political power and relationships throughout the era as well. Additionally, these occasions impressed the planters' superiority and authority over the enslaved, as well as poor whites, servants, and even elite women. Servants and slaves facilitated the affairs and ensured that planters had all they desired, but could not indulge themselves. Indeed, as will be argued below, their diets were highly regulated. Masters barred them from access to the foods enjoyed by the elite. Ultimately, then, feasts supported the planters' access to violence and power by further cementing the distinctions between themselves and other groups. Even elite white women had limited roles in hospitality and feasts, advanced the existing patriarchy. Lastly, hospitality's connection with European luxury goods and gentry traditions sought to impress an Atlantic audience. The planters frequently aimed to fete metropolitan visitors, occasionally overcoming a generally poor reputation back in Europe.

In the end, Barbadian feasting culture further contributed to the creation of a unique, colonial identity and masculinity. The planters expected that hospitality would help ingratiate the island to metropolitan elites and indicate them as European gentlemen like any other. As part of a language of elite masculinity, hospitality should have cemented belonging and privileges. Over time, it became clear that such concessions were not forthcoming. Instead, the planters' particular brand of hospitality

fed into metropolitan bias. Barbadian feasting culture and hospitality served as another marker of the planters' distinct, colonial identity and manhood. In their efforts to compensate for their bad reputation, they often went to extremes. As with violence, which regulated race and rank, the excesses of drinking and feasting did not bring acceptance. Overindulgence became part of an unfavorable metropolitan view of the colonists, used to deny them the status they sought.

"It is not necessary for them to have taverns in the countryside"

Historians of early Barbados have frequently noted, mostly in passing, that the island's planters engaged in excessive drinking. Dunn, for instance, commented how "the chief planters in the English islands dined richly, drank copiously, and entertained lavishly...Dinner and after-dinner drinking lasted four or five hours." Dunn intended to highlight the opulent lifestyle of the planters. "The master class enjoyed" a distinct feasting culture and "culinary style," as he put it. By contrast, servants and slaves lived meagerly. Jack P. Greene likewise has recounted the evolving role of hospitality in shaping the planters' Atlantic reputation. Sarah Barber, in *Disputatious Caribbean,* (2014) gave more nuance to feasts and drinking as key to socialization.[3] Beyond this, though, it was also a performance of manhood, central to the power structure of the island.

[3] Richard Dunn, *Sugar and Slaves,* 279. Jack P. Greene, "Changing Identity in the British Caribbean: Barbados as a Case Study," in *Colonial Identity in the Atlantic World, 1500-1800* ed. Nicholas Canny and Anthony Pagden (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1987), 213-266. Sarah Barber, *Disputatious Caribbean: The West Indies in the Seventeenth Century* (New York: Palgrave and Macmillan, 2014), 128. See also Larry Gragg, *Englishmen Transplanted: The English Colonization of Barbados, 1627-1660* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003).

Drinking and feasts helped project slave-owner superiority through a gendered English cultural language of hospitality and largesse. In early modern England, as Felicity Heal has pointed out, "hospitality" meant freely offering "food, drink and [secondarily] accommodation" in one's household. It was also a form of nostalgia. Hospitable gentlemen evoked the "Noble" practices of "good old" England, as Heal put it. Enacted properly, hospitality also elicited respect from "subordinate Neighbours." Additionally, the ability to provide in English culture was a central tenet of elite manhood. In fact, as Anne Lombard has pointed out, being a husband was as much an "economic act...as a personal and social one." Extravagant hospitality denoted a gentleman's superior manliness. As Elizabeth Foyster put it, hospitality was "the ideal forum" to place male honor on display. As contemporary historian Charles de Rochefort wrote, the Caribbean planters were men of "Quality," in no small part, because of their "entertainments," in particular their well-dressed "Tables." Indeed, the planters aimed, according to Rochefort, to "outvye" one another for the most extraordinary feast. As Natalie Zemon Davis has explained, such competition fed into masculine status and rivalries in Europe.[4] Feasts gave planters the means to claim patriarchal manhood through their masculine, economic competency and associate themselves with the gentry of the homeland by mimicking their practices munificence. It also served as a way to denote status among their peers.

---

[4] Felicity Heal, "The Idea of Hospitality in Early Modern England," *Past & Present*, 102 (Feb. 1984), 66-67; Anne Lombard, *Making Manhood: Growing Up Male in Colonial New England* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2003), 99. Elizabeth Foyster, *Manhood in Early Modern England: Honour, Sex, and Marriage* (New York: Routledge, 1999), 66 & 37; Alexandra Shepard, "Manhood, Credit and Patriarchy in Early Modern England c. 1580-1640," *Past & Present* 167 (May, 2000), 79. Natalie Zemon Davis, *The Gift in Sixteenth-Century France* (London: Oxford University Press, 2000). See also, Felicity Heal, *Hospitality in Early Modern England* (London: Oxford University Press, 1990).

Hospitality and drinking supported the socio-political order throughout the English World. Keith Wrightson has pointed out of early modern England that "the maintenance of order, harmony and subordination" required "neighborliness" and "direct face-to-face interaction." "Formal festivities," for example, "village sports and games, dancings, wakes and ales, rush bearings and parish feasts" were essential to a functioning English society. Such occasions established "relationships of neighborliness between effective equals," but also "ties of patronage and clientage between persons of differing status, wealth and power." L.H. Roper, meanwhile, argued that in early English America colonists shared a sense that society needed "a system of reciprocity which required the cultivation of patronage links." Zemon Davis has highlighted the way that gifts bound the receiver to repay in kind, building relationships. Doing so, as Roper put it, provided "a keen sense of locality, especially in terms of local administration and in negotiation with the central government and their counterparts in England." As in Europe, men fomented mutually-beneficial bonds in "numerous alehouses to drink, talk, sing, play at bowls or shove-groat" (aka 'shove-halfpenny,' a gambling game related to shuffleboard). These interactions might cover "the whole world of regular personal contact." James Reardon recently even highlighted the importance of taverns to homosociality and manhood in late Puritan Massachusetts.[5]

Early Barbados, however, placed an uncommon emphasis on private feasts because it lacked other traditional settings for male interaction. Charles de Rochefort

[5] Keith Wrightson, *English Society*, *1580-1680* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1982), 61-64. L.H. Roper, *English Empire in America 1602-1658: Beyond Jamestown* (London: Routledge, 2009), 8. James Reardon, "The Bonds of Manhood: Public Life, Homosociality, and Hegemonic Masculinity in Massachusetts, 1630-1787," (PhD Diss., University of Iowa, 2012); N.Z. Davis, *The Gift in Sixteenth-Century France* (London: Oxford University Press, 2000).

characterized the wider Caribbean as providing ample "Hunting, Fishing, and other commendable," manly "exercises." Biet, however, went out of his way to note the lack of "game" and sport on Barbados. John Oldmixon later confirmed this assessment, adding that the "Disposition of the country...is not fit for Hunting or Hawking." Indeed, the island could not boast the important "divertisement" of hunting, which Rochefort indicated was important sign of male worth and was a pastime commonly associated with gentry, even royalty. The Barbadian planters' efforts to "hunt Hogs, which have been left wild in the Woods, or Goats with Mongrells," however, could but only be "properly call'd a Mungrel Sport," Oldmixon opined. Hunting in Barbados hardly lived up to billing as the "Sport of Kings." As a result, "the Diversions of the gentlemen in [the] Island [were] mostly within Doors." In particular, "the Gallant People delight[ed] most in Balls and Concerts; the good Fellows, in Drink and good Company." Barbados also did not have traditional public establishments at which to gather, socialize, and talk politics. An absence of "taverns in the countryside," Biet pointed out, made private hospitality in the home essential to the functions traditionally performed by more diverse public occasions and commercial "alehouses." The more personal nature of the settings for drinking on the island fed into the ability for feasting to speak to a particular man's competency and foment bonds of reciprocal obligation among guests. It also allowed elite men to more closely control who could participate.[6]

---

[6] Charles de Rochefort, *The History of the Caribby-Islands*, trans. John Davies (London: Printed by John Macock for Thomas Dring, 1666), 198-199. Biet, "*Voyage*," 293. For histories of hunting's implications for power see Daniel C. Beaver, *Hunting and the Politics of Violence before the English Civil War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008); Jonah Stuart Brundage, "The Pacification of Elite Lifestyles: State Formation, Elite Reproduction, and the Practice of Hunting in Early Modern England," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 59, no. 4 (Oct. 2017): 789-817; Roger Manning, *Hunters and Poachers: A*

Hospitality built relationships and supported the social structure of the early Caribbean. Most scholars have seen Barbadian drinking and feasting as a culture of excess. It spoke to the planters' questionable character and "vulgar" aspirations to aristocracy.[7] But these behaviors served a purpose. Private feasts in Barbados helped to sustain political relations, ultimately perpetuating the dominance of landowning men by steadying the social order atop which they sat. For example, early in the English Civil War, the Barbadian planters had relied upon the powerful symbolic language of sharing food and drink to keep the peace. They held good accord by the "Treaty of Turkey and Roast Pig," an informal "Law amongst themselves that whosoever named the word Roundhead or Cavalier, should give all those that hear him, a Shot and a Turkey, to be eaten at his house that made the forfeiture." Hospitality became the means for elite men to make amends to the group and restore harmony. Most historians have either accepted the "treaty" at face value or disregarded it. However, sharing a "shot" and a meal reiterated common status and elite male obligations through the cultural language of generosity and neighborliness. The treaty, then, is indicative of hospitality's central role in planter sociability. In Barbadian honor culture, political matters could quickly devolve into violence. Drinking and feasting were a social lubricant that maintained peace. Moreover, Carla Pestana has argued that the planters' chief goal in the war (and with the "treaty") was to preserve the status quo in the face of growing fears over servant insurrection. By supporting political cohesion among the planters, then, the

---

Social and Cultural History of Unlawful Hunting in England, 1485-1640 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993). Alexandra Shepard, "Manhood, Credit and Patriarchy," 105. For discussion of male competency, see Anne Lombard, *Making Manhood,* 4. John Oldmixon, *The British Empire in America*, Vol. II (London: Printed for John Nicholson, 1708), 126-127.

[7] Richard Dunn, *Sugar and Slaves*, 78.

treaty of hospitality helped safeguard order. It thus protected the power of landowning men and fulfilled a central duty of their manhood.[8]

Hospitality might also bridge gaps of political difference. Michael Lacombe has noted how, in Virginia, "public assertions of legitimacy" relied on food, especially in forging bonds between different groups like Anglicans and Indians.[9] Private feasts in Barbados, likewise, served as a setting for political progress by nurturing relationships between cultural rivals. For example, the Quaker leader George Fox arrived in Barbados in the 1670s, hoping to improve the condition of "Friends" there. In the process of his mission, he took part in several feasts. Most importantly, he dined with Governor William Willoughby, who kept him "most *part* of the *Day*." Engaging in an intimate social setting allowed Fox to humanize and ingratiate himself and his cause to a powerful leader. He established a good impression of his character among Willoughby and other prominent Anglicans. Following the feast, he secured agreements on behalf of the island's Friends to "the general satisfaction" of all parties. Participation in hospitality demonstrated belonging and character. The planters questioned Quaker masculinity. But by going through the ritual of an island feast, Fox showed that, while he had a non-

---

[8] For Ligon's reference to the treaty see Richard Ligon, *A True and Exact History of the Island of Barbados,* (originally published 1657) ed. Karen O. Kupperman (Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Co., 2011), 110. For scholarly references, see, for example, L.H. Roper *The Torrid Zone: Caribbean Colonization and Cultural Interaction in the Long Seventeenth Century Caribbean* (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 2018); Gragg, *Englishmen Transplanted*; N.D. Davis, *Cavaliers and Roundheads in Barbados: 1650-1652* (British Guiana: Argosy Press, 1883). Richard Dunn ignored it altogether. For more, see Puckrein, *Little England: Plantation Society and Anglo-Barbadian Politics, 1627-1700* (New York: New York University Press, 1984), 106.

[9] Michael A. LaCombe *Political Gastronomy: Food and Authority in the English Atlantic World* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2012), 20.

conforming faith, he otherwise belonged as an elite man. He thereby overcame a limited degree of anti-Quaker bias.[10]

Feasts in private homes, more conspicuously than public gatherings or alehouses in English communities, spoke to a particular male's patriarchal standing and reputation. As a result, hospitality not only served general socio-political functions but became a performance of individual manhood for the host. Sufficient hospitality could raise his standing within the group. As Julie Kerr argued of medieval England, a "host who willingly welcomed his visitor and demonstrated courtesy as well as largesse, might secure the goodwill of the guest and enhance his own reputation." Likewise, the client–patronage relationship noted by Wrightson worked within elite hierarchies of relative equals, just as it did for unequal relationships.[11] A system of genteel generosity was alive and well in Barbados around the mid-century. Richard Ligon, for example, described "Planter...Colonel James Drax" as one "who lives like a Prince" because he killed a cow "now and then." Beef on an island with "ill husbandry...cost too dear" to eat regularly. When Drax slaughtered a cow, it gave him a chance to flaunt his abundance and generate goodwill among his peers through a "great *Regalio*, to which he invite[d] his fellow Planters." He gesture demonstrated masculine worth. By successfully keeping his

---

[10] George Fox, *Journal*, ed. Nigel Smith (London: Penguin, 1998), 356. For more on Quakers in Barbados, see Kristen Block, "Cultivating Inner and Outer Plantations: Profit, Industry, and Slavery in Early Quaker Migration to the New World," *Early American Studies, An Interdisciplinary Journal* 8, no. 3 (2010): 515-548; Larry Gragg, *Quaker Community on Barbados: Challenging the Culture of the Planter Class* (Columbia, MO: University of Missouri Press, 2009). Also see Chapter Seven of this dissertation for more on Quaker-planter relations.

[11] Feasts also obliged peers to one another and sealed bonds of patronage in unequal relationships. Julie Kerr "'Welcome the coming and speed the parting guest': Hospitality in twelfth-century England," *Journal of Medieval history* 33, no. 2 (June 2007): 130-146. See also Catherine Patterson, *Urban Patronage in Early Modern England: Corporate Boroughs, the Landed Elite, and the Crown, 1580-1640* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1999); Keith Wrightson, *English Society*, 61-64.

guests “cheerful” with plentiful liquor and imported foods, Drax legitimized his place atop the Barbadian socio-political hierarchy through an English language of generosity. It certainly seems to have indebted Ligon, who went to great length broadcasting Drax's largesse to an Atlantic audience.[12]

Food and imported wines became an effective way to show wealth and masculine quality. In English culture, a gentlemen's manhood partly rested in providing, not only for his house, but also his peers and subordinates within the larger community. Hospitality was also something that tended to be competitive in European culture, as other scholars have made clear. It fed into masculine rivalries. Indeed, as Rochefort noted, the planters of the Caribbean likewise attempted to “outvye” each other for the grandest feast. Largesse spoke to manly worth.[13] Barbados' lack of local produce and isolation made food and European drinks an especially effective way to demonstrate individual quality. Ligon described Colonel Drax's table as extremely “well dressed” with the first course consisting of “two messes of meat” from cattle “he [fed] extremely fat.” Drax would then lay out “14 dishes at the Table and all of Beef.” Serving up the delicacy that was red meat endeared him to his peers and signaled his affluence and rank. Drax followed up the main course with one of several dishes, from pudding to mutton and “young goat,” veal, and three turkeys, rabbits, duck, and other meats all “well seasoned,” and succeeded by yet two more courses. Drax's ability to provide such splendor even in the trying circumstances of the civil war era gave him status that he

---

[12] Ligon, *A True and Exact History*, 82.

[13] See, for example, Elizabeth Foyster *Manhood in Early Modern England*, 66; Natalie Zemon Davis, *The Gift in Sixteenth-Century France*. Additionally, Lacombe noted how it was essential in Virginia for leaders to provide food. Michael Lacombe, *Political Gastronomy*, 130. Charles de Rochefort, *Caribby-Islands*, 198.

translated into political clout. It was a performance of his superior manhood. For Drax, butchering a cow was a pretext to build community but ultimately served individual power. In the wake of the feasts Ligon describes, it was precisely his prominence as a Roundhead political figure that made him the central target of island Royalists, as described in Chapter Three.[14] Hosting a feast was a chance to prove one's worthiness to rule, to stand out among elite men.

"Damn the Souls of those who would not drink"

Receiving hospitality with gratitude was also a necessary performance of elite manhood. According to European tradition, the receiver should be thankful and heap "praise" on his benefactor, like Ligon did for Drax. Denying a man the chance to demonstrate their grandiosity and generosity, on the other hand, proved insulting. Pretexts for an invitation to feast might be flimsy. Henry Whistler, traveling with the expedition to invade Jamaica in 1655, found that even asking directions was an occasion to drink and entertain. "If one comes to a house to inquire the way to any place," he claimed, "they will make him drink." A lost metropolitan was a chance to display hospitality. The planters insisted that Whistler participate in their feasting culture. Indeed, Whistler noted, "if the traveler does deny to stay to drink they take it very

[14] Richard Ligon, *A True and Exact History*, 82–84. The Royalists seized Drax's estate and he fled to England. He regained his estate following Ayscue's successful mission and continued to have a role in the island's government. Cromwell even gave him a knighthood in 1658. His son, Henry, continued his legacy after James's death in England in 1662, eventually writing one of the most famous treatises on plantation management. Sarah Barber, "Power in the English Caribbean: the Proprietorship of Lord Willoughby of Parham" in *Constructing Early Modern Empires: Proprietary Ventures in the Atlantic World, 1500-1750,* ed. LH Roper and B. Van Ruymbeke (Leiden: Brill 2007), 193. See also, Mark Noble, *Memoirs of the Protectoral-House of Cromwell,* 2 vols. (3d ed., London: Robinson, 1787), 1: 445. Beef, in the medieval world, was something only the wealthiest could afford because its inefficient use of resources. Additionally, producing and sharing a variety of alcohol was part of one's status in medieval Europe.

unkindly of him." Sarah Barber attested that "travelers or neighbors [on Barbados] were judged according to whether they accepted the hospitality of their hosts." Accepting invitations to feast became a measure of one's worth on the island – a demonstration of belonging among other elite men. Zemon Davis argued that the weight or, indeed, pressure of such obligations could ebb and flow over time and place. Early Barbados, though, certainly seemed to place heavy emphasis for both the giver and receiver of hospitality.[15]

Scholars have noted how social activities like drinking might sustain male bonds throughout the early modern Atlantic. Alexandra Shepard, writing of late seventeenth-century England, argued that "men in 'patriarchal' positions...derived masculine status and identity from violent conduct and participation in drinking culture." It also supported ties through mutual obligation, the receiver becoming indebted to the provider, as Kerr and scholars like Zemon Davis have made clear. In Barbados, drinking buttressed power for individuals and was part of the group identity. Participation was a mutual recognition of the status shared by host and guest, strengthening the legitimacy of their collective claims to superiority. The planters took sociability seriously as a result. Through social pressure, they encouraged participation in drinking, which shaped elite culture, homosociality, and masculinity.[16]

---

[15] "Extracts from Henry Whistler's Journal of the West India Expedition," in *The Narrative of General Venables, with an Appendix of Papers Relating to the Expedition to the West Indies and the Conquest of Jamaica, 1654-1655*, ed. C.H. Firth (London, 1900), 145-147. See also Dunn, *Sugar and Slaves*, 77. Barber, *Disputatious Caribbean*, 128. Zemon Davis, *The Gift in Sixteenth-Century France*, 200.

[16] Natalie Zemon Davis, *The Gift in Sixteenth-Century France*; Julie Kerr "'Welcome the coming and speed the parting guest': Hospitality in twelfth-century England," *Journal of Medieval history* 33, no. 2 (June 2007): 130-146. Shepard, "Manhood, Credit and Patriarchy," 105.

Some planters saw participation in drinking as so vital that a guest's refusal to drink could lead to open confrontation. For example, in the early 1680s, Colonel Timothy Thornhill was a prominent, second-generation militia leader on the island. "Being at a Feast, and drinking to Excess," he besmirched "some of the Company [that] refused to drink so hard as he would have them, whereupon [Thornhill wished] 'himself was God Almighty, that he might damn the Souls of those who would not drink'." Thornhill demanded participation in extreme drinking as a show of manly solidarity. When "a Person standing by reproved him for using such wicked Expressions...he fell to beating him, calling him 'Son of a Whore,' and asking, 'if he were to be taught by him'."[17] The episode points to the way leading planters enforced drinking and feasting as standard male behavior. Through violence, Thornhill reiterated the necessity that everyone drink heavily. To do otherwise undermined the activity as something that bound elite men together.

The obligation of receiving hospitality also made it a useful tool of political intrigue. Feasts served as an effective pretext to eliminate rivals. The tradition began with Henry Hawley in 1629, when he used the excuse of breakfast to lure the Powells on board before seizing them, as noted in Chapter One. Similar subterfuge occasionally arose over the next fifty years. Feigned hospitality became a successful means to remove political rivals because of its cultural salience as a gesture of male fellowship. In the early 1670s, Christopher Codrington invited Henry Willoughby to his home for supper. Willoughby was a political and economic foe who had previously besmirched

[17] Joseph Besse, *A Collection of the Sufferings of the People Called Quakers*, Vol. II (London: Luke Hinde, 1689), 351.

and threatened to “ruin” his host. By the time Willoughby arrived back at his plantation, he “fell into a violent burning of the stomach” and died the next morning. While the court ultimately acquitted Codrington, widespread suspicion remained that he had poisoned his guest. Male honor had made it necessary to redress the insult Willoughby made against his character. Cynthia Herrup has demonstrated how such codes of honor were essential to social hierarchies in the early modern English World. Recognition of one's honor proved foundational to respect and standing. Insults to “reputation” in contemporary Europe threatened manhood. Honor required a “forceful response” to such affronts. The idea that Condrington might have killed for honor was not surprising to any of his peers. He used the feast to redress his honor more directly than simple hospitality would accomplish.[18]

The planters also used hospitality as a means to more publicly and collectively broadcast their manhood and patriarchal control of the island. Thornhill demonstrated the potential for impromptu displays of violent, manly power. Feasts likewise might be the site of collective, premeditated performances of physical, masculine authority. As noted over the previous chapters, Barbadians strongly associated manhood with their militia, upon which they depended to keep order. As “noble entertainment” for visiting dignitaries they often exhibited their martial masculinity. The arrival of a neighboring governor or metropolitan official meant that “the Militia of the Town” would “be in Arms” and “attended with Reveling, Drinking and Feasting to excess” so that all

[18] Griffith Hughes, *The Natural History of Barbados* (London: Arno Press, 1750), 55. Cynthia Herrup, “To Pluck Bright Honor';” Pieter Spienrenburg, *Men and Violence: Gender, Honor, and Rituals in Modern Europe and America* (Columbus, OH: University of Ohio State Press, 1998), 2.

participants awoke "drowsie" in the morning. Military display and immoderation of food and drink were expressions of male Barbadian culture – one the planters proudly displayed for Atlantic luminaries. The festivities also encouraged attendance by English and Irish servants, as well as African slaves. Such occasions thus showcased the planters' capacity for violent, martial power to an Atlantic audience and potential rebels, demonstrating patriarchal manhood in support of their authority and island stability.[19]

"He should not have so good"

Feasts not only played a leading role in status and relations among elite men; it also reinforced the supremacy of landowning males over women, servants, and slaves. The excesses and luxuries of food enjoyed by the island's planters differentiated them from subordinate men and women. Servants and slaves lived off of "Indian Corn" and "Loblolly," (Cassava). Elites, meanwhile, enjoyed a regular diet of "large, fat" turkeys "full of gravy...Ducks...larded with pig fat...Eggs and Chickens." Such distinctions demonstrated relative wealth and standing. As other scholars have noted, Caribbean planters attempted to feed slaves at as little cost as possible, while enjoying rich diets of plenty themselves. Beyond just economic considerations, though, food and drink were tools of power unto themselves. For example, while they drank heavily, the planters punished drunkenness among servants as a "crime" with time in the stocks. As theories of hegemonic masculinity insist, men in positions of authority commonly use their political dominance to monopolize performances of manhood, reinforcing their

[19] Henry Pitman, *A Relation of Great Sufferings and Strange Adventures* (London: Andrew Sowle, 1689), 14. For more on the importance of the militia see Handler, "Slave Revolts and Conspiracies in Seventeenth-Century Barbados," *New West Indian Guide* 56, no. 1/2 (1982): 7 & 20.

superiority as natural. Treating drunkenness differently for servants or slaves became a way to further subordinate these groups. Preventing women from participating in ritualized drinking, like passing the brandy bowl, similarly preserved drinking as a manly activity. Their exclusion marked their secondary position.[20] Its exclusivity, whether by custom, law, or practical accessibility, made the consumption of fine foods and liquor that attended feasts of landowning men a useful tool for advancing their dominance. As Oldmixon would later put it, having "every thing that is requisite for Pomp or Luxury" symbolized their position as "Lords of all things, Life and Limb of their Servants excepted, within their own Territories."[21]

Access to specific types of food was crucial to English identity and the projection of white male supremacy throughout the early-modern Atlantic. LaCombe has noted how, in seventeenth-century Virginia, colonists saw "English food" as an essential part of their constitution. English bodies required certain things like "wheat." Indians ate lesser corn grains, meanwhile, without issue – a manifestation of their inferiority. Adam Fox has laid out the ways that, in contemporary England, "both the quantity and quality of essential consumption expressed and created the distinctions upon which caste systems or class structures [were] built." People of different social position (and even "complexions") had divergent capacities to handle certain food in the early-modern

---

[20] Henry Drax, "Instructions I would have observed by Mr. Harwood in the management of my plantation," (probably written in 1679), Rawlinson MSS, A 348, folio 7, Bodleian Library, Oxford University, in Peter Thompson, "Sources and Interpretations: Henry Drax's Instructions on the Management of a Seventeenth-Century Barbadian Sugar Plantation," *The William and Mary Quarterly* 66, no. 3 (2009): 565-604. For another reprinting, see William Belgrove, *Treatise upon Husbandry or Planting* (Boston: D. Fowle, 1755), 51–86. Page numbers noted here and through the rest of the work are in reference to Thompson's article, rather than the original document. On the diets of slaves see Sarah Barber, *Disputatious Caribbean*, 126.

[21] Oldmixon, *The British Empire in America*, Vol. II, 115.

European mind. Fresh fruits and vegetables suited the “idle” gentry, tougher fare befit their laborers and servants. Diet and social place went hand-in-hand.[22]

The planters in Barbados likewise used food to reiterate their supremacy over the enslaved. The planter elite ate well and varied their foods, including beef, mutton, fish, and wheat as part of their regular diet. In contrast, slaves existed on meager provisions. Biet explained that in “there is no nation which feeds them so badly as the English.” A dehumanizing economization had already taken hold by the 1650s. Moreover, slaves' paltry diets reinforced the supposed natural superiority of Englishmen, who needed better (and more) food. In contrast, the more 'barbarous' African could survive and work on less. As Oldmixon put it, though the slave's “Diet is very course...they are very well contented.” The planters allowed them, “for every dish and every form of meat they have only potato, which serves them for bread, meat, fish, and for everything.” Here Biet is probably referring to cassava root, which resembles a potato and others like Ligon have noted was a staple. In any case, “they keep some poultry for the eggs, which they give to their little children.” In the most striking contrast to the master's feast, slaves “are given meat only one time in the entire year, namely on Christmas day, which is the only feast day observed.” Biet's assessment largely concurred with Ligon, who had explained that slave only received “bone-meat” when a horse died. Beef in England, from the medieval era on, was something only the wealthiest could afford because its inefficient use of resources. It served as “a symbol of power, a tool for generating vigour, physical energy and the ability to do combat.” It

[22] Specifically, he provides evidence that Indian Corn provided less nourishment than “wheat, rye, barley, or oates.” Michael A. LaCombe *Political Gastronomy*, 49 & 60.

other words, it was deeply associated with masculinity and with the landed gentry. Oldmixon would later compare the planters' "Diet" favorably, being "the same with ours in *England*," including "Beef, Pork, Veal, Mutton, and Lamb."[23] Through food, the planters not only established themselves as elite men among their neighbors and countrymen, but asserted their bodily superiority over black slaves.

Types of food also became important to differentiating the planters from an increasingly complicated white servant population. As Biet pointed out, "English and French indentured servants [were] scarcely treated better" than African slaves when it came to diet. Elite Englishmen in America eschewed eating the foods of slaves and Indians, seeming to have difficulty processing them. Food became a marker of a supposedly inherent, natural and pseudo-racial superiority.[24] Black and Indian ability to subsist on harsh foods stemmed from their inferior constitutions. By forcing white (and especially English) servants to eat the food of slaves, it reinforced the master's supremacy and degraded status and racial integrity. A vivid example of this process arose in the wake of the Monmouth Rebellion, which took place in England in 1685. Henry Pitman was a wealthy, educated surgeon shipped as a prisoner to Barbados for serving the Duke of Monmouth. He stood appalled by the diet he received. As a servant, Pitman's master barred him from the foods he was used to as an English elite. Calling

---

[23] Biet, *Voyage*, 290. This translation is borrowed from Derek Hughes, *Versions of Blackness: Key Texts on Slavery from the Seventeenth Century* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 313. Richard Ligon*, A True and Exact History*, 43 & 188. For quote on the meaning of meat see Massimo Montanari, *The Culture of Food* (Oxford: Blackwell Press, 1994), 14. For an overview of the evolution of the meanings and production of meat at various times and places throughout Europe see David Cottle and Lewis Kahn, eds., *Beef Cattle Production and Trade* (Collingwood, VIC: CSIRO Publishing, 2014), 6-9. Oldmixon, *The British Empire in America*, 114 & 119.

[24] Biet, *Voyage*, 290. This translation is borrowed from Derek Hughes, *Versions of Blackness,* 313.

the fare "very mean," Pitman detailed that he and his brother were given only "five Pound of salt Irish Beef, or salt Fish a Week for each man, and *Indian* or Guiny [*sic*] Corn ground on a Stone, and made into Dumplins [*sic*] instead of Bread." When he asked for flour to replace his Indian corn, in order to relieve the "violent Flux" the food had put him into, his master (Robert Bishop) was "not moved with Pity." Instead, Bishop "angrily replied, [*Pitman*] *should not have so good*." As a 'lowly' servant, he did not deserve the finer, English diet of flour. Food marked and reinforced his subjugation. Planter access to wheat and meat buttressed their elite status while servants and slaves lived on local roots and undesirable corn grains that became emblematic of their inferiority.[25]

Pittman may have been an elite male in England, accustomed to certain foods; but in Barbados, his master indoctrinated him into a new, lowly status through a slave's diet. Pitman continued to protest, but his challenge to the authority of his master merely compounded "the fiery Zeal of his immoderate Passion" which was already "heightened by some lying Stories of a fellow Servant." Pitman's master, therefore, "could not content himself with the bare execution of his Cane on [Pitman's] Head, Arms and Back, although he had played so long thereon like a furious Fencer, until he had split it in pieces but he also confined [Pitman] to close Prisoner in the Stocks, which stood in a open place, exposed to the scorching heat of the sun, where [he] remained above twelve Hours."[26] Such violence picked up where the symbolic power of food left

[25] For more on Monmouth Rebels in the West Indies, see Mark S. Quintanilla, "The Monmouth Rebels in the West Indies," (PhD diss., Arizona State University, 1993). For a general history see Wigfield MacDonald, *The Monmouth Rebels, 1685* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1985); Robert Dunning, *The Monmouth Rebellion: A Complete Guide to the Rebellion and Bloody Assizes* (Wimborne, England: Dovecote, 1985). Henry Pitman, *A Relation of Great Sufferings*, 12.
[26] Henry Pitman, *A Relation of Great Sufferings*, 12.

off, driving home Bishop's authority over his servant's body. It punctuated the message that elites (and their stomachs) had greater worth than those of non-landowning men. To press this boundary was to question the social order of the island. Bishop imprinted the lesson of his power and privilege over his servants through food and, failing that, turned to violence.

In addition to food itself, the planters staged its consumption at feasts in ways that highlighted their superiority over servants and slaves. Biet explained that elite men often drank together through the whole day. As they did, "built young slaves" would refill everyone's pipes and cups "on their knees" as long as the planters pleased.[27] The slave's place on the floor, serving whatever the planters' desired, was an inescapable reminder of his or her degraded position. It was a physical acquiescence to the master's patriarchal authority that buttressed the supremacy of the host and his guests. Coupled with their inability to access the expensive liquors and wines enjoyed by the planters, slaves' presence at feasts made these affairs useful for advancing the social hierarchy. Such occasions mimicked the island's wider structure. The planters conceived of slaves as existing to ensure that landowning elites had access to an abundance of luxury items. Their labor served the master's masculine competency by providing him the means to provide for his family and be generous to his guests, while slaves received nothing for themselves. The clothing worn by each group at these affairs worked similarly. Slaves went about "completely naked, except for Sundays, when they put on some wretched cotton shorts, and a shirt." In contrast, the planters and their wives and children

[27] Antoine Biet, *Voyage* 278-279.

"economize[d] on nothing to dress well," according to the latest fashions in Europe.[28] The difference further highlighted the superiority of Europeans over the "naked" slave.

The structure of feasts even helped perpetuate patriarchy over elite white women. The planters marked drinking, especially, as a male domain. Respectable Barbadian women did not seem to have partaken in the more boisterous aspects of Barbadian drinking culture. In the ritual described by Biet to start this chapter, a male "host" passed the cup to another man and "he" the next until the bowl was drained. Biet assured us that this was a life that "gentlemen" found "extremely pleasant." Gentlewomen were not involved. Women participated in other extravagances of an increasingly prospering planter class. "The ladies and young women" wore fine imported clothing. They attended "Balls" and other such occasions. But, even here, the male's monopoly on household income and expenditures meant that the clothes of his family spoke to his ability to provide for them as much as anything. The extravagances of drinking culture, meanwhile, remained a male affair. It was only the "good Fellows" who enjoyed "Drink and good company," unlike the more public occasions like "concerts" that were mixed. The planters marked off most aspects of their drinking culture as an exclusively male domain. They protected drinking as a performance of manhood. As a means to assert standing and belonging, women's exclusion perpetuated patriarchy.

Of course, just as women helped to run alehouses in England, Barbadian wives and female servants were intimately involved in making feasts possible. Plantation

[28] Antoine Biet, *Voyage*, 290-293.

mistresses, Biet noted, made it "not necessary for them to have taverns in the countryside, for when an English lady sees someone pass by she freely asks if he needs anything. She invites him into the house, has him sit in a hammock...and she immediately brings some brandy or any other drink that is desired. She does this with such graciousness and with such good nature that one can ask for nothing more." Women's hospitality and generosity thus fulfilled an essential role of the tavern in English culture for island men.[29] Women might also carry elite socio-political relations and solidarity in times of crisis. William Byam, for example, fled the island after Parliament's victory against the Royalists there. Byam, Biet opined, had been banished for wanting to "uphold the authority of his King against the unjust usurpation of *my lord* Cromwell...[and] his plantations...[were] plundered and ruined." In her husbands' absence, his wife and "one of the most beautiful women [Biet] had ever seen," Dorothy Knollys, frequently hosted such sympathetic guests. Knollys "sighed deeply, saying that she would have hoped her husband had been on the island, and that we would have seen much more to him."[30] Within the wreckage caused by war, Byam's wife cultivated (and held together) bonds of friendship, kinship, and political alliance under the pretense of hospitality.

Yet, women's roles in feasts, however vital, merely perpetuated the patriarchy. Biet offered praise for island women, but only for their service to the contentment of

---

[29] Antoine Biet, *Voyage*, 293. For more on the importance of taverns, see Michelle O'Callaghan, "Tavern Societies, the Inns of Court, and the Culture of Conviviality in Early Seventeenth-Century London," in *A Pleasing Sinne: Drink and Conviviality in Seventeenth-Century England*, ed. Adam Smyth (Cambridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2004).

[30] Handler holds, correctly, that this was William Byam, an ardent Royalist who fled after Ayscue's victory to Suriname where he later became governor. Jerome Handler, "Father Antoine Biet's Visit to Barbados," 62–63. Biet, *Voyage*, 293.

male guests. A hostess would bring any "drink that is desired," Biet assured his readers. "She fills a pipe, lights it herself, and presents it when it is lit." A gracious hostess offers the pipe, brings the drink, and facilitates the affair. But women were ancillary in all accounts of Barbadian feasting culture. Their supporting roles reinforced their subordinate position within the household and social structure. A hostess was judged according to "feminine" qualities of "beauty" and "graciousness," whereas the same hospitality for a man spoke to his ability to provide and advanced his social standing. However admiringly writers like Biet looked upon island women, their actions ultimately spoke to the male host's generosity and worth in a patriarchal world. As scholars have noted of English culture at the time, the behavior of all family members was a reflection of the household head's masculine capability. Without economic independence, Knollys' generosity began with Byam's male competence. Indeed, as Oldmixon implied, the "fashionable and courtly" ladies of the island lent the male planters an "Advantage of most of our [English] Country Gentlemen." The graces of their wives, to outside male observers like this, largely affirmed the worth of the husband.[31]

Indeed, a woman's participation in drinking and revelry would have worked against her reputation and, by extension, degraded her husband's masculinity. In contemporary England, as Alexandra Shepard has argued, it was viewed as "unseemly" for women to "tipple" in the alehouse. Englishmen associated casual drinking among men with prostitutes or, at best, a loose morality. It was hardly the behavior of a

[31] Biet, *Voyage*, 293. See Alexandra Shepard, "Manhood, Credit and Patriarchy," 105; Carole Shammas, *A History of the Household in America*; Anne Lombard, *Making Manhood*. Oldmixon, *The British Empire in America*, Vol. II, 114.

respectable woman. In Barbados, even when describing the hospitality of island mistresses, Biet seemed to associate their presence around drinking men with illicit sex. He immediately followed praise of Dorothy Knollys by noting that "the greatest of all the vices which prevail in this country...[is] lewdness," including "adulterers, incest and all the rest." Overindulgence in sins of flesh, at least in the view of this man of God, went hand-in-hand with a culture of generosity and drinking. Perhaps not an intentional juxtaposition, his concern nonetheless raises an important point. Scholars like Mark Breitenberg have described the way in which women's sexuality caused considerable anxiety among men in early modern England. The family, as a symbol of social order, required male regulation of women's sexuality. Infidelity was associated with social unrest. It was the patriarch's duty to control women's sexual appetites. Biet's criticism was implicitly a challenge to planter manhood. To allow wives, daughters, or other women as full participants in the planters' all-night drinking fests may have invited sexual temptation. Consternation over control of female sexuality may have been the root of female segregation from certain aspects of the feast. It was a means to not only subjugate women, but protected the manhood of the host. As the event took place in his home, managing the potential threat posed by the sexuality of the women living there was directly tied to patriarchal worth.[32]

---

[32] For quotes and information on English alehouses asserted here see B.S. Capp, "Gender and the Culture of the English Alehouse in Late Stuart England," *Studies across Disciplines in the Humanities and Social Sciences* 2, Vol. 2 (2007): 104 and 109-112. Biet, *Voyage*, 293. See also, Mark Breitenberg, *Anxious Masculinity in Early Modern England* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1996), esp. 23, 33, & 175; Susan Amussen, *An Ordered Society*; Lawrence Stone, *Family, Sex, and Marriage in England 1550-1800* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1977); Anthony Fletcher, *Gender, Sex, and Subordination in England, 1500-1800* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995).

Food and feasts symbolically and physically reinforced the subordination of women, servants, and slaves in early Barbados. It advanced the existing social hierarchy by maintaining, in the words of Eudine Barriteau, “relations of power” through the planters' exclusive access to luxury foods and excesses of alcoholic drinks. As Barriteau argued, gender ideals might translate claims on such “material resources” to “nonmaterial resources such as status.” The Barbadians made drinking and feasting a masculine behavior on which they reserved an exclusive claim. They ensured that women, servants, and slaves had access only to what was “allowed” them, as Ligon attested. These practices preserved the superiority of landed men. Indeed, even in producing alcohol they fulfilled masculine ideals. Oldmixon noted how “good Husbands use their Manufacture of Rum, instead of French Brandy.” The ability to produce an abundance of drinks spoke to a man's ability to provide. Feasts also marked the “appropriate roles,” as Joan Scott called them, for different groups. Landowning men leisurely drank to “pass an afternoon.” Women brought pipes and served drinks graciously. Servants or slaves, perhaps “on their knees,” facilitated these occasions for their master and his friends. Moreover, it was their labor that provided the luxury goods that masters' purchased and produced. The denial of the fruits of their labor spoke to their subordinate position. As Rochefort made clear, a central aspect of elite masculinity was the ability “to hire people to oversee their Servants and Slaves, and to see that they do their work.” The planters' very ability to get others to work for them, so that they could enjoy leisurely lives, made them men of worth. The structure of hospitality, the origins of the goods at feasts, and types of food consumed on the island thus

represented and reinforced the subject social position of each of these groups in contrast to elite men.[33]

Additionally, the ability for elite planters to provide hospitality was central to differentiating their manhood from other males. As noted above, in English culture, "honorable manhood" depended upon a male patriarch's ability to provide ample food for his household. Status rested in hosting subordinate neighbors. Yet, servant or slave dependency on another man for victuals subordinated (or feminized) them, as Beckles has shown in his work on black masculinity in the early Caribbean. Food and drink thus helped the planters buttress claims to patriarchal manhood even as it degraded the masculinity of subordinates. The excesses and types of food elite men consumed at feasts became part of a system that established and legitimized elite male authority over other groups. Other scholars have noted, in reference to Oldmixon's history, that "good hospitality" extended from "those of the better rank to the meanest Inhabitants, who think it a great want of civility to dismiss any one from their houses, before they have presented them with somewhat to eat and drink." Poor freeholders' hospitality emulated the elite planters, but the disparity in wealth and power between such men and elite landowners meant that it paid little service to their standing within the island's hierarchy.[34]

---

[33] See Barriteau, *Confronting Power Theorizing Gender: Interdisciplinary Perspectives in the Caribbean* (Kingston: University of the West Indies Press, 2004), 31; Joan Wallach Scott, *Gender and the Politics of History* (New York: Columbia University Press). Charles Rochefort, *Caribby-Islands*, 198. Oldmixon, *The British Empire in America*, Vol. II, 115.

[34] In Jack P. Greene, "Identity in the British Caribbean," in *Colonial Identity in the Atlantic World, 1500-1800,* ed. Nicholas Canny and Anthony Pagden (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1987), 233. Elizabeth Foyster, *Manhood in Early Modern England*, 66; Hilary Beckles, "Black Masculinity in Caribbean

“The Sins of Egypt, Babylon and Sodom”

The planters' hospitality served elite male authority and political interests on the island, but it also aimed to improve their standing in the wider Atlantic. In contemporary England, as Felicity Heal argued, hospitality was a principal obligation of the gentry. “Liberal entertainment,” according to contemporary observers, was a noble and “Christian Practice.” As Rochefort insisted, the planters' “magnificent” feasts were “extraordinary expressions of civility” that compared favorably with the “*European* parts of the world,” marking them as men of “Quality.” By insisting on providing something to drink and eat for passersby, Barbadians attempted to fulfill cultural expectations and claim an identity as English elites. The planters especially hoped that hospitality would ingratiate them to metropolitans. Demonstrating largesse through European luxuries spoke to a shared Atlantic material culture that helped the planters' demonstrate belonging. “English spirits [and] *French* Brandy,” for example, were a taste of home on the imperial periphery. Served in grand halls, modeled after English estates, visitors were “seldom dry or thirsty.” “Great abundance as at the best Tables in Europe,” indicated them as on par with the metropole. Imported goods, especially expensive in the remote Caribbean, represented wealth and status. Scholars have described the way that such a material culture helped bind together the English Atlantic World. Barbadians particularly emphasized consumption of food and drink, alongside other displays like clothing, “handsome horses...covered with very rich saddlecloths,” “Equipages,”

Slavery,” in *Interrogation Caribbean Masculinities: Theoretical and Empirical Analyses*, ed. Rhoda E. Reddock (Kingston: University of West Indies Pres, 2004), 230. Richard Ligon, *A True and Exact History*, 86.

“Coaches,” “Chairs,” “Chaises, and all the Conveniences for their travelling,” along with stately homes, to do just that.[35]

Charles de Rochefort provided an outline for Caribbean planters to overcome the unfavorable reputation they had acquired in the metropole. As noted above, this meant being able to “hire” overseers, along with servants and slaves, so that they would not have to work. The planters certainly had enough wealth to acquire others to do their bidding. The 1650s saw the fruition of the island's transition to slave labor. As Russell Menard noted, “slave deliveries rose rapidly to a peak in the 1650s, when more than three thousand persons per year were delivered to Barbados.” By the end of the decade, the island had a black majority. The planters had successfully reached a place where they would never have to sweat in the fields themselves. Secondly, Rochefort emphasized the importance of being “well-arm'd” for demonstrating masculine worth. He assured his readers that the planters were equipped to protect the public “Peace.” The “Heads of Families” in the Caribbean, he bragged, “seldom walk abroad without their Swords” and “Every Quarter is dispos'd under the command of certain Captains

[35] Felicity Heal, “The Idea of Hospitality,” 66-68. Richard Ligon, *A True and Exact History*, 73. Biet, *Voyage*, 292-293. Charles Rochefort, *Caribby-Islands*, 198-199. Michael Braddick has demonstrated that elite English asserted a collective identity throughout the Atlantic by marking themselves through the purchase and display of the same luxury material goods. This “material culture” and the comportment of oneself as a “gentleman” were essential to social and political authority in the English Atlantic. Michael Braddick, “Civility and Authority,” in *The British Atlantic World, 1500-1800*, ed. David Armitage and Michael J. Braddick (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009), 115. For more on material culture and houses in colonial Barbados see Douglas V. Armstrong and Matthew C. Reilly, “The Archaeology of Settler Farms and early Plantation Life in Seventeenth-Century Barbados,” *Slavery and Abolition* 35, no. 3, (2014): 399-417; Douglas V. Armstrong, *The Old Village and Great House: An Archeological and Historical Examination of Drax Hall Plantation, St. Ann's bay, Jamaica* (Campaign, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1990); Jerome Handler and Stephanie Bergman, “Vernacular Houses and Domestic Material Culture on Barbadian Sugar Plantations, 1640-1838,” *The Journal of Caribbean History* 43, no. 1 (2009): 1-IX; and Daphne Louise Hobson, “The Domestic Architecture of the Earliest British Colonies in the American Tropics: A Study of the Houses of the Caribbean 'Leeward' Islands of St. Christopher, Nevis, Antigua and Montserrat, 1624-1726,” (PhD diss., Georgia Institute of Technology, 2007). Oldmixon, *The British Empire in America*, Vol. II, 114.

and other Officers, who have the oversight thereof." As argued throughout this work, Barbadians frequently emphasized their martial valor and will to violence as the root of their masculinity and right to power as well. The planters of the mid-century thus had only one missing ingredient, according to Rochefort's strategy, to claim full status as European elites. If it was their goal, as highlighted in Chapter Four, to be seen as English gentry like any other, they needed only to provide generous "entertainments" and ensure their hospitality was relayed back to England.[36]

Indeed, hospitality sometimes successfully combated metropolitan skepticism about colonial character and manhood. From early on, Barbadians tended to draw criticism from outside visitors. Henry Whistler, for example, wrote critically of the population when he arrived on the island in 1655. He called Barbados "the dunghill whereon England doth cast forth its rubbish." Specifically citing the "rogues and whores and such like people" that lived there, he contrasted the standards of island masculinity unfavorably to the homeland. "A rogue in England," he claimed, "will hardly make a cheater here." Meanwhile, "a bawd brought over puts on a demure comportment, a whore if handsome makes a wife for some rich planter." The island's leading men abided rogues and married prostitutes, Whistler professed. Their manhood stood in doubt as a result. Whistler spoke to enduring metropolitan uncertainty about the

---

[36] Russell Menard, *Sweet Negotiations: Sugar, Slavery, and Plantation Agriculture in Early Barbados* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2006), 46 and 115. Land cost around £18-45 an acre; slaves around £15-£25. A hundred acre plantation would have at least equal value in the slaves and no value without their labor. By 1669 the slave population nearly tripled. Thomas Modiford told Ligon that he planned to make £100,000 as a sugar planter. Richard Dunn, *Sugar and Slaves,* 81 & 203. As Sidney Mintz pointed out, "West Indies sugar imports to London, negligible before the Civil War, rose from 148,000 cwt. in 1663 to 371,000 cwt. in 1699." Sidney Mintz, *Sweetness and Power: The Place of Sugar in Modern History* (New York: Penguin Books, 1986), 64. Charles de Rochefort, *Caribby-Islands*, 198-199.

planters' claims to English gentry status through a gendered language of sexual immorality and non-conformity. Yet, for all its faults, he went on to confess that "the island of itself [was] very delightful and pleasant." The planters successfully overcame some trepidation about their character and masculinity through what Whistler described as a "very generous fashion."[37] Hospitality helped the Barbadian elite mitigate some of the more unfavorable Atlantic opinions of them.

Throughout the period, Barbadian planters sought to insinuate themselves as English landowning elites through a masculine, cultural language of abundance and hospitality. At times, it worked. By the 1670s, one author noted how wealth (supported by slaves and sugar) had transformed the planters' lives. Referring back to the late-1640s, when "Mr. Ligon happened to be there," the author testified that the island had developed well since. He noted that despite Ligon's account of Drax's table, his was one of a few "great Estates," of which there were not "many." There was, in Ligon's time, no "House which could boast a Grandeur much more considerable than those, most of [the island's] Villages" had by the 1670s. Wealth in sugar and slaves had, indeed, transformed the planters' lives. Contact with the Atlantic World became more regular, as did access to imported foods and drinks. Hospitality at private feasts served as the chief means for the planters to display newfound riches. The anonymous author highlighted as much in his efforts to speak on the planters' worth, saying "the splendid Planters [had] Sumptuous Houses, Cloths and Liberal Entertainment [that] cannot be Exceeded by this their Mother Kingdom itself." The colonists had obtained all the

[37] "Extracts from Henry Whistler's Journal," ed. Firth, 145-147. See also Richard Dunn, *Sugar and Slaves*, 77.

refinements of home, so they would proclaim. Their "Prodigious Success," moreover, could be tied to their food, including "*Oranges*...Musk-Melons, Grapes, Figs, Prickle Pears, Guavers, Pomegranates," and more, all with "delicate pleasant taste." Displaying their wealth through "Liberal Entertainments" in their "splendid" homes and access to tropical fruits, delicacies in England, seemed to speak to their worth and insinuate them as Atlantic elites. They were Englishmen, living English lives. By 1708, Oldmixon came to distinguish the "Planter in the *West-Indies*," as a "Country Gentleman." They were worthy of respect, comparable to the elite of England because they had "Servants of their Household, and those of the Field," as Rochefort had insisted was important. But, moreover, because "their Tables are spread every Day with Variety of nice Dishes, and their attendants are more numerous than many of the nobility's in *England*" they could pass as English gentry.[38]

The planters' eagerness to socialize and drink often had the opposite of its intended effect however. While they expected grand fetes to ingratiate them to the Atlantic community through a culture of generosity, the excesses that attended these occasions created critics as well as friends. Father Biet admitted that he did not like to go on social calls in the island because "one has to drink in an extraordinary way." An

[38] See L.H. Roper, *English Empire*, 8. Quotes in Anon., *Great Newes from the Barbados* (London: Printed for L. Curtis, 1676), 6-8. For the planters efforts to be recognized as English elites see, for example, "Humble Proposals of Several Barbadians," TNA, CO 1/11/25 in Puckrein, *Little England,* 116–117. For comprehensive works on the expanding English Atlantic commerce in this period see Thomas Benjamin, *The Atlantic World: Europeans, Africans, Indians and Their Shared History, 1400-1900* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009); Allison Games, *Web of Empire: English Cosmopolitans in an Age of Expansion, 1560-1660* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008); Philip Curtain, *The Rise and Fall of the Plantation Complex: Essays in Atlantic History* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1990). For economic assessments of Barbados' growth see Russell Menard, *Sweet Negotiations*, 46 & 115; Sidney Mintz, *Sweetness and Power*, 64. Oldmixon, *The British Empire in America*, 114.

early Barbadian Quaker, Lydia Fell, noted how nothing would keep the planters from immoderation. When facing a great fire that ravaged Bridgetown, she claimed, the planters called out to God "*spare us this time, and surely we will Repent and Amend our Lives*." However, she continued, they "knew that [they] did lie to God; for [they] still went on in the same Excess after." Reports from the island of "great debaucheries and excess" in drinking and eating added to the general opinion in England that Barbadians were a barbarous sort, lacking refinement, civility, and morality.[39] Drinking, so important to elite male culture and status on the island, became the basis to call into question the planters' patriarchal manhood in an Atlantic context.

In particular, religious leaders like Biet and Fell condemned the intemperance of the Barbadian elite. Fell begged the planters to "consider if Iniquity doth not greatly abound in your Island, and even the Sins of *Egypt, Babylon* and *Sodom."* The analogy of Sodom, in particular, held relevance for the Barbadian planters, whom she accused of "sins" of "Pride, Idleness and [not without foundation] Fullness of Bread." They had strayed, in her mind, from the path of the faithful. Puritan leaders in America, as Todd Romero has pointed out, similarly condemned drinking as, in fact, unmanly. It was the purview of "Youth effeminante and wanton." But Barbados planters had come to abide

[39] Quote is from Joseph Besse, *Sufferings*, 347. BL, Lydia Fell, *A Testimony and Warning given Forth in the Love of Truth and Is for the Governour, Magistrates & People Inhabiting on the Island of Barbadoes* (1676), 1. David Lambert notes, for example, that "The white men who constituted the West Indian plutocracy were therefore demonized by their metropolitan 'cousins' as cruel, unmanly, immoral drunkards." See Hilary Beckles "Sex and Gender in the Historiography of Caribbean Slavery," in *Engendering History: Caribbean Women in Historical Perspective,* ed. Verene Shepherd, Bridget Brereton, and Barbara Bailey (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1995), 456; David Lambert, *White Creole Culture, Politics and Identity during the Age of Abolition* (Cambridge University Press, 2005).

it as a fundamental aspect of their masculine culture.[40] Such reports of excessive appetites for food and liquor undermined the planters' manliness to an Atlantic audience by speaking to their betrayal of cultural mores. To moralist outsiders, the interactions around food and drink that served to cement social and political ties for Barbadian leaders spoke to an inferior, unchristian masculinity.

Reports from travelers, regardless of their particular agendas, gave Caribbean planters a reputation as excessive drinkers. Through the seventeenth century, nearly all the English sugar colonies faced charges of lewdness and drunkenness. Visitors went into great detail about island drinking practices in their accounts. Modern scholars, like Barber, have therefore gone on to describe “drink” as “the most poisonous substance in the West Indies.” Indeed, once in the Caribbean, she continued, “everyone...drank prodigiously, making it impossible for commentators to tell whether the West Indies attracted drunkards and sots, or conditions created them.” At least in Barbados, though, the harshest critics had strong reasons for bias. Fell and Biet, possessing conservative religious views, possessed relatively extreme moral standards. Joseph Besse, who wrote about Thornhill's behavior, sought to demonize the island's leaders for their mistreatment of Quakers. Whistler, as Carla Pestana has recently pointed out, confronted a group of Barbadians that deeply resented his presence as part of Venables' unpopular fleet. The planters' hostile disposition likely shaped his opinion of the island's leading men. Going back to Nicholas Foster, he charged the planters as a “People...whose Belly is their God, whose glory is their shame, and whose lust is their

[40] Lydia Fell, *A Testimony*, 1-2. R. Todd Romero, *Making War and Minting Christians: Masculinity, Religion, and colonialism in Early New England* (Boston: University of Massachusetts Press, 2011), 187.

Law." But Foster sought to revile his Royalist opponents during the war. Whether elite Barbadian males actually drank much more than their metropolitan counterparts is difficult to quantify but the distinction is ultimately unimportant. Excessive drinking became the lens through which London viewed and degraded Caribbean colonists. As historian Jack Greene put it, metropolitans came to see drinking as the "custom of the country" – fair or not.[41]

In any case, the planters appear to have abided drinking as the centerpiece of their homosociality into the eighteenth century. They continued in "excess and luxury," Jack Greene's work tells us, even if those in the late-seventeenth and early-eighteenth century might have done so with better "taste." By the 1730s, many believed that Barbadian slaveholders had "undone themselves by their own excessive behavior." The planters may have literally been drinking and eating themselves to death. Drinking took a toll on their Atlantic reputation, as well as their health. Barber noted how a special rum was so strong as to dehydrate and "overheat their bodies." Even just trying to make one's way home after a feast was dangerous. John Merrick found out as much when, "riding to his own House in Drink, [he was] thrown by his Horse to the hurting of his Brain." Merrick "continued some few Days in a violent raving Condition, to the Terror of his Friends, and then died." Drinking could have dangerous consequences, but neither this knowledge nor outside criticism seemed to dissuade Barbadians from it. Indeed, they continued to spend many a leisurely afternoon in a style that fit their pretensions

[41] Besse, *Sufferings*, 349. Foster, *A Brief Relation*, 104. Jack Greene, "Identity in the British Caribbean," 224-226. Greene explains that metropolitan opinion of the islanders began to transform into greater emphasis on their achievements beginning in the 1660s. Sarah Barber, *Disputatious Caribbean*, 128.

to nobility, "drinking and smoking, [so that] quite often one is so drunk that he cannot return home." Barbadians therefore often slept over, further building relationships and ties of mutual obligation, which hospitality through feasts facilitated. Indeed, the need to return a gift or hospitality was essential to European culture. As Zemon Davis has made clear in her work on sixteenth-century France, "the unreciprocated gift...makes the person who has accepted it inferior." It becomes "charity," which undermines honor and manhood. Ultimately, then, excessive drinking worked to create a sense of community by binding the planters to return hospitality, supporting the cohesion of elite Barbadian men. Regardless of metropolitan views and other undesirable side-effects, hospitality remained essential to male planter socialization through the century and beyond.[42]

Conclusion

Hospitality served broad patriarchal functions in early Barbados. Private affairs filled the many roles of the English alehouse on an island that had few such establishments. Feasts supported elite male cohesion and fomented political alliances. Hospitality was also the pretext for political intrigue, as some planters turned communal customs toward selfish ends. The intimacy of the setting fostered bonds and could raise individual standing for successful hosts. These occasions also projected patriarchal authority more broadly. Excesses of expensive food and drink unavailable to servants, the poor, or the enslaved, helped reinforce the special status of land- and slave-owning

[42] Jack Greene, "Changing Identity in the British Caribbean," 233-234, 247, 254, and 264. Besse, *Sufferings*, 349. Sarah Barber, *Disputatious Caribbean*, 128. For more on client-patronage relationships and the creation of mutual obligations see L.H. Roper, *The English Empire in America,* 8. N.Z. Davis, *The Gift in Sixteenth-Century France*, 6.

males. Feasts became foundational to solidifying a separate identity for the planters as ruling elites. Hospitality distinguished them, broadcasting their superiority and justifying their right to rule, as well as the special access to violence that physically projected their power. Drinking went hand-in-hand with other performances of patriarchal manhood as well, notably marked by occasional violence or bound together with martial displays that projected the planters' patriarchal supremacy. Over time, participating in feasts or providing the venue and victuals for these events became crucial to elite masculinity and the power structure of the island. Understanding the way that hospitality helped support slaveholder authority elucidates the varied ways that gender ideals shaped power in Anglo-American slave societies.

Feasts also helped foster a distinctly "Barbadian," Atlantic identity. The planters hoped to overcome a reputation first established by Henry Colt in the 1630s that they needed to "bridle the excess of drinking together with quarrelsome conditions of...fiery spirits." To do so, they turned to luxury European foods and refinements, feted metropolitan guests, and sought to bring a sense of English normalcy to the Caribbean periphery. However, despite its success at making friends and supporting slave-owner power, the planters' continued insistence on excessive drinking fed the bias of English elites. Perceived immoderation, local rituals like passing the brandy bowl, and the use of Caribbean drinks like mauby and homemade rum all gave social occasions a decidedly local flavor. The ubiquity of slaves who facilitated these affairs, meanwhile, demonstrated the basis of elite Barbadian wealth and standing. Through to the next

century, the shape of Barbadian feasts became symbolic of "Barbadian," colonial reputation that did not always work in their favor.[43]

[43] See, for example, Beckles, *First Black Slave Society*. Colt quote from Henry Colt, "The Voyage of Sir Henry Colt," (1631) in V.T. Harlow, *Colonising Expeditions to the West Indies and Guiana, 1623-1667* (London: Printed for the Hakluyt Society, 1925), 93. For more on their reputation into the next century see David Lambert, *White Creole Culture, Politics and Identity during the Age of Abolition*. Jack Greene, "Changing Identity in the British Caribbean."

Chapter Six: "Masters of Families"

In the mid-1670s, planter Henry Drax (James Drax's heir) outlined the importance of a well-ordered household. In his "instructions" to the overseer of his plantation, he emphasized the imperative of "the [good] government of the family both Whites and Blacks." He noted key differences between the two races. For example, he claimed, "Negroes" had a general addiction "to thieving." With white servants, he was more concerned about "punishing all Vice and Especially drunkenness," it being "the vice the Whites are Much addicted to." He explained that "if at any time you take Notice of a Fault that you design to punish let it be Immediately executed, especially on Negros, Many of them being of the humor for avoiding punishments when threatened to hang themselves." In other words, he felt that whites and blacks should be physically punished for any "fault;" but it was especially important to discipline a black person quickly. Drax did not necessarily engage in commentary about innate racial hierarchies. Instead, his focus was to encourage measured, patriarchal violence against both groups "either to reclaim the Malefactor or to terrify others from Committing the like fault." To achieve a well-ordered "family," he also advised some restraints on physical punishment. For example, "Stocks or laying them by the neck and heels until they are Sober and Sensible of their Error" was the "properest [*sic*] punishment" for drunkenness, "blows usually Enraging a Drunken Man, [making] him fit for any mischief." Drax also advised his overseer to "never punish either to satisfy [his] own anger or passion." Violence should be calibrated to prevent even greater disobedience. Distinguishing between whites and blacks and limiting violence aimed to most

effectively control servants and slaves. Success would ensure the subordination of these dependents, as Drax aimed to achieve the masculine ideal of a well-ordered household.[1] Drax's instructions reflect a growing emphasis on the need for elite men to effectively control servants and slaves in Barbados during the mid to late seventeenth-century.

Through slave and servant codes passed in 1661, the Assembly codified the special status of elite men in contrast to servants, slaves, and women, while protecting the planters' access to violence in a transforming social, political, and racial landscape. The 1661 Acts imposed expectations for elite men to keep order in the extended household. Similar to Drax's instructions, the laws distinguished between the races, but ultimately reiterated the absolute authority of landowning males over all subordinate groups – slaves, servants, and women. Like Drax's instructions, the Assembly rooted these acts in the patriarchal ideal that a household head had the right and responsibility to control subordinates, through violence if necessary. In certain cases, provisions aimed to temper that violence. Such restrictions, though, were practical. The Assembly sought to prevent even greater "mischief" and discourage metropolitan scrutiny of their labor practices. Limits protected force as a legitimate means of keeping order through an English language of 'proper' manhood. As Susan Amussen put it, the "legitimacy of

---

[1] Henry Drax, "Instructions I would have observed by Mr. Harwood in the management of my plantation," (probably written in 1679), Rawlinson MSS, A 348, folio 7, Bodlein Library, Oxford University, in Peter Thompson, "Sources and Interpretations: Henry Drax's Instructions on the Management of a Seventeenth-Century Barbadian Sugar Plantation," *The William and Mary Quarterly* 66, no. 3 (2009): 573 & 587-588. For another reprinting, see William Belgrove, *Treatise upon Husbandry or Planting* (Boston: D. Fowle, 1755), 51–86. Page numbers noted here and through the rest of the work are in reference to Thompson's article, rather than the original document. Noted from here as 'Drax, "Instructions." For works on the importance of a well-ordered family to masculinity see Carole Shammas, *A History of Household Government in America* (Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia Press, 2002); Anne Lombard, *Making Manhood: Growing up Male in Colonial New England* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2003); Elizabeth Foyster, *Manhood in Early Modern England: Honour, Sex and Marriage* (New York: Routledge, 1999).

patriarchal power [in contemporary England] depended on restraint and wisdom in" the use of violence.[2] The laws of 1661 expressed the belief that elite men on the island similarly had a duty to use violence sensibly. Aimed toward the gendered ideal of a well-behaved household, physical punishments were justified and protected the patriarchal order. Taken to extremes, violence might do the opposite. In the process, the laws advanced physical control of the household as central to patriarchal manhood on the island.

Masculinity played a foundational role in the 1661 slave and servant codes. The acts protected the planters' status in the English World and advanced power over subject whites and blacks. By appealing to gender ideals of duty, good order, and restraint, the Assembly relied on an English language of manhood to encourage greater vigilance and legitimize planter methods for control, including violence. John Navin has made clear that English legal custom "sanctioned" the brutality of colonial slavery. He pointed toward the existing precedents upon which planters based the 1661 slave code. Lawmakers, he added, were "deliberate – one might say discriminating – in their use of violence and intimidation, carefully considering the race and economic value of the targeted individual, or group." In this way, Navin highlighted the practical motives in colonial legislative efforts, as well as American legislation's tendency to advance white supremacist ideology. He concurred with scholars like Hilary Beckles and Edward Rugemer that distinguishing between blacks and whites through the laws of 1661 helped to create the racial order. These historians cast the infamous "Barbadian Slave

[2] Susan Amussen, "Punishment, Discipline, and Power: The Social Meanings of Violence in Early Modern England," *Journal of British Studies* 34, no. 1 (1995): 14.

Code" as codifying the dehumanization of enslaved Africans. This chapter adds to such insights by demonstrating that gender deeply shaped the 1661 acts. It will explain the role of manhood in creating and justifying these laws, credited by many as foundational to race throughout America. Doing so will provide a better understanding of how English planters adapted cultural precedent to the exigencies of colonial slavery to create something unique and singularly brutal. It highlights the important ways that the planters used English cultural ideals to protect their absolute authority.[3]

---

[3] John Navin, "Intimidation, Violence, and Race in British America," *The Historian* 77, no. 3 (Fall 2015): 464-466 & 475-477. Edward B. Rugemer, "The Development of Mastery and Race in the Comprehensive Slave Codes of the Greater Caribbean during the Seventeenth Century," *The William and Mary Quarterly* 70, no. 3 (2013): 429-58; Hilary Beckles, *The First Black Slave Society: Britain's Barbarity Time in Barbados* (Cave Hill: The University of the West Indies Press, 2016). For changing expectations on patriarchal responsibility see Carole Shammas, *A History of Household Government in America*. For more on the slave codes see Kenneth Morgan, "Review of *Caribbean Exchanges: Slavery and the Transformation of English Society, 1640-1700*, by Susan Dwyer Amussen," *The Journal of Modern History* 81, no. 3 (2009): 667; Bradley J. Nicholson, "Legal Borrowing and the Origins of Slave Law in the British Colonies," *The American Journal of Legal History* 38, no. 1 (1994): 51; M. Eugene Sirmans, "The Legal Status of the Slave in South Carolina, 1670-1740," *The Journal of Southern History* 28, no. 4 (1962): 462–73. Christopher Tomlins and Bruce H. Mann, eds., *The Many Legalities of Early America* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2001); Newman, Simon P., *A New World of Labor: The Development of Plantation Slavery in the British Atlantic* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013). For more on "whiteness studies" and the creation "whiteness," see Theodore Allen, *The Invention of the White Race*: *Whiteness as Property* (London: Verso, 1993); Elizabeth Wallace, *The British Slave Trade and Public Memory* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2006). See Fuentes, *Dispossessed Lives: Enslaved Somen, Violence, and the Archive* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2016), 61; See Winthrop Jordan, *White over Black: American Attitudes toward the Negroes*, 2nd. ed. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2012), 85 & 106. Jordan demonstrated the connection between adoption of Barbadian Slave Codes in South Carolina and the "unharnessed personal power" of the slave owner. See also, Edward Rugemer, *Slave Law and the Politics of Resistance in the Early Atlantic World* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2018); Alden Vaughan, *Roots of American Racism: Essays on the Colonial Experience* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995). Scholars have also pointed to the importance of these laws as a precursor to the black codes elsewhere in Anglo-America. South Carolina (and then much of the Antebellum South) adopted the "codes" in whole or part, which helped to divide the races within these slave societies. See Jack P. Greene, "Colonial South Carolina and the Caribbean Connection," *The South Carolina Historical Magazine* 88, no. 4 (1987): 192-210; Peter Wood, *Black Majority: Negroes in Colonial South Carolina from 1670 through the Stono Rebellion* (New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 1975); Betty Wood, *Slavery in Colonial America, 1619-1776* (Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, 2005); Richard Dunn, *Sugar and Slaves: The Rise of the Planter Class in the English West Indies, 1624-1713* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1972), 238. The 'Slave Code' is from TNA, CO, 30/2, pp. 16–26; the "Servant Code," in Hall, *Acts*, 35–42. A reprinting of the slave code is also available in Stanley Engerman, Seymour Drescher, and Robert Paquette, *Slavery* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001), 105–113.

“Reason and Order”

The need for laws that might better enforce patriarchal expectations grew out of the particular historical context of mid-seventeenth century Barbados. Growing numbers of African slaves generated anxiety among slaveholders. As noted in the previous chapter, the slave population swelled to a sizeable majority in the 1650s. With that growth, came fears of revolt. In 1655, “several Irish servants and Negroes [were] out in rebellion,” leading to laws that placed more restrictions on both groups the following year. Toward the end of the 1661 Slave Act, the Assembly specifically noted they needed better regulation “because the Negroes of this Isle in these late years past are very much increased and grown to such a great number.” They could no longer expect to be able to “safely or easily govern” slaves as they did in the past. However, the planters had always been concerned about insurrection. As the slave act itself attested, the planters already had “many good Laws and Ordinances.” Even if recent demographic shifts made the problem of revolt more acute, it would not necessarily account for the distinctions the 1661 laws made between whites and blacks. Early rebellions, after all, usually involved both Irish and Africans. As Beckles has made clear in his work, the immediate need for these new acts grew out of the increased role of London in the island's affairs. Specifically, metropolitan criticism about the planters' extensive use of violence against English laborers forced a response. The laws had to deal with an increasingly complicated white, servant population. The civil war brought new groups into servitude and their presence complicated the existing basis of elite identity and supremacy. Facing increasing pressure to enact nuance and better regulate slaves, first

from Parliament and then from the Restoration Council of State, the planters codified a clearer racial order, as other scholars have noted. Even while appearing to mitigate the abuse of white subordinates in order to appease London, the laws also reiterated the authority of individual planters over whites in the extended household through an appeal to patriarchy.[4]

English ideals provided a basis for the colonial social order to rest on the potentially violent masculinity of individual household heads. Historians of early-modern England and Colonial American manhood have described the importance of a "well-ordered household" to masculine worth. As scholar Elizabeth Foyster wrote, "a man's honor was tied to his virtue...but also to his behavior in his household;" in particular, she emphasized "his control over it." While strategies later "softened," violence was still an acceptable path to achieving household obedience in the seventeenth century. Moreover, in the English world, the home was a "little commonwealth" and its stability was representative of good order in the "whole body." Especially in the medieval, Tudor, and early Stuart eras, Englishmen applied social pressure on their peers to

---

[4] Quotes are from Preamble to Clause 22 of 1661 Slave code. TNA, CO 30/2, 25–26. For the rebellion in 1655 and its impact see Edward Rugemer, *Slave Law and the Politics of Resistance*, 26. For demographic changes see John McCusker and Russell Menard, *The Economic of British America, 1607-1789* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1985), 153. The planters switched to slavery because white laborers became scarce at home, as wages rose after the civil war. Furthermore, as wealth and capital increased, Dunn has noted, the planters began to prefer slaves over servants (as opposed to the first decade of settlement, noted in Chapter One). Richard Dunn, *Sugar and Slaves*, 72. For more see Russell R. Menard, *Migrants, Servants and Slaves: Unfree Labor in Colonial British America* (Aldershot, England: Ashgate, 2001). For information on revolts in Barbados prior to the 1650s, see Jermone Handler, "Slave Revolts and Conspiracies in Seventeenth-Century Barbados," *New West Indian Guide* 56, no. 1/2 (1982): 5-42; Hilary Beckles, *The First Black Slave Society*, 5 & 44. There are very few surviving legislative records from before the Restoration, as Richard Dunn pointed out long ago. Richard Dunn, *Sugar and Slaves,* 238. The 1661 Act begins by acknowledged the existing laws, reading "Whereas heretofore many good Laws and ordinances have been made for the governing, regulating and ordering the Negroes, Slaves in this Isle." TNA, CO 30/2, pp. 16.

encourage the maintenance of obedience at home, considering it foundational for an orderly society. Carole Shammas previously uncovered the way colonists in all of Anglo-America were slow to construct the sort of institutions, like poor-houses, that supplemented individual efforts to support social order. As a result, the responsibility fell even more decisively on patriarchal duty and discipline in the home, often involving violence.[5]

European understandings about the probity of violence to achieve manly ideals gave Barbadian planters a means to justify harsh punishments of servants and slaves. As Shammas noted of early New England, men might excuse violent acts as "discipline," even when there was no "legal reason to do so." Additionally, English migrants "not only put into place an English version of household law but began expanding the powers of the head over his dependents." In Barbados, Oldmixon pointed to a similar expansion of patriarchal power and its general merit, praising elite Barbadians because each lived "like little Sovereigns in their Plantations," in complete control. Physical force, meanwhile, proved a legitimate means for these 'petty-monarchs' to maintain that

[5] Carole Shammas, *A History of Household Government in America*, 24-25 & 38. Alexandra Shepard *Meanings of Manhood in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 11. The modern historical idea of the household being a metaphor for the state originated with John Demons, *A Little Commonwealth: Family Life in Plymouth Colony* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1970). See also, Anthony Fletcher, *Gender, Sex, and Subordination in England, 1500-1800* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995), 223; Lawrence Stone, *The Family Sex, and Marriage* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1977); Elizabeth Foyster and Helen Berry, eds., *The Family in Early Modern England* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008); Elizabeth A. Foyster, *Manhood in Early Modern England: Honour, Sex and Marriage* (New York: Routledge Press, 1999). On violence, specifically, see also, Christine Daniels and M. Kennedy, *Over the threshold: Intimate violence in Early America* (New York: Routledge, 2013), 5 & 9. Daniels argued that the family is defined as encompassing "relations between masters, slaves, and servants...the dependent position of slaves and servants in families was distinct from those of wives and children, but free men and single women were legally and economically responsible for their salves and servants. Cultural constructs of such people as 'family' members followed social fact; slaves and servants were indeed intimates in many early American families...Patriarchal control...was an important political and social concept in England and Anglo-America; it infused the very marrow of the early modern British American world."

power. Even European critics of Barbadian violence accepted it as necessary to protect the social hierarchy and keep slaves in obedience. French clergyman Père Labat, for example, described planter practices as "cruel" and excessive; but he refused to blame "the inhabitants of [the] island...for being frequently compelled to pass the bounds of moderation...for it must be remembered that the object of these punishments is to make slaves fear and respect their masters." He understood patriarchal control as central to social stability. Labat accepted that, without some access to violence, slaveholders "would otherwise become the victims of their [slaves'] fury."[6] Gendered ideals of good order and the necessity of physical discipline to maintain could thus potentially defend the endemic violence on Barbadian plantations.

Patriarchal power in English culture rested in the idea that elite, landowning men were naturally superior and had a responsibility to care for their dependents. English elites long justified male authority through claims that landed men had a responsibility to "protect" inferior laborers (and women and children) from their own "base nature." English men justified the subordination of women based on their "lesser minds," as Anthony Fletcher tells us. Meanwhile, historian Michael Guasco has pointed out, Sir Arthur Chichester wrote in 1602 how Irish "barbarism gives us cause to think them unworthy of other treatment than to be made perpetual slaves to her Majesty." The English justified controlling Ireland to protect the Irish from those who might take advantage of their inferiority. Male patriarchs in English society should "protect, guard,

---

[6] Carole Shammas, *A History of Household Government in America*, 24. Oldmixon, *The British Empire in America*, Vol. II (London: Printed for John Nicholson, 1708), 114. Père Labat, *The Memoirs of Père Labat, 1693-1705*, trans. and ed. John Eaden (London: Frank Cass and Co. Ltd., 1970), 127.

and care" for dependents," according to "ancient origins of the concept of family." The absolute authority of elite men over inferior men and women was thus justified in the English worldview.[7]

The planters' power and rights similarly rested in assumptions about their superior rank and a nascent white supremacy. The Slave Act of 1661 specifically acknowledged African slaves "as being created Men though without the knowledge of God." Thus being a "heathenish" sort, it was the planters' duty as "masters" to use "reason and order" to protect (and control) the "dangerous" impulses of these lesser, "brutish" Africans. In this way, the slave code held stark racial connotations, as other historians have pointed out. However, at other times the planters validated their authority over white servants on similar grounds. The Assembly defended the abuse of Scottish servants, for instance, by explaining that "men of any honor or innate courage

---

[7] Chichester quote is in Guasco, *Slaves and Englishmen: Human Bondage in the Early Modern Atlantic World* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2014), 50. As Guasco pointed out, the English defended the dubious subjugation of Ireland in the late sixteenth century by claiming through English suppression would "liberate" the Irish from enslavement by their own lords. The English, though, would magnanimously rescue the Irish from their condition. In this way, England relied on moralist ideals, born of their presumed cultural and racial superiority, to justify Irish bondage. Guasco, *Slaves and Englishmen*, 48. Christine Daniels, *Over the Threshold,* 10. Daniels references Philip Morgan, "Three Planters and their Slaves: Perspectives on Slavery in Virginia, South Carolina and Jamaica, 1750–1790," in *Race and Family in the Colonial South*, ed. Winthrop Jordan and Sheila Skemp (Jackson, MS: 1987), 50. Edward Baptist also pointed out of the antebellum American South that "only dishonorable men failed to regulate members of their households, whether enslaved blacks, white children, or white women." Edward Baptist, "'My Mind is to Drown You and Leave you Behind': 'Omie Wise', Intimate Violence, and Masculinity," in *Over the Threshold,* ed. Daniels and Kennedy, 94. See also, Stephanie McCurry, *Masters of Small Worlds: Yeoman Households, Gender Relations, and the Political Culture of the Antebellum South Carolina Low Country* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997); Peter Bardaglio, *Reconstructing the Household: Families, Sex, and the Law in the Nineteenth-Century South* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996). For more on cultural traditions see Mervyn James, *Society, Politics, and Culture* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1986; Derek Neal, "Meanings of Masculinity in Late Medieval England Self Body and Society," (PhD Diss., McGill University, 2003), 453; Susan Amussen, '"The part of a Christian man': the cultural politics of manhood in early modern England', in *Political Culture and Cultural Politics in Early Modern England* ed. Susan Amussen and Mark Kishlansky (New York: Manchester University Press, 1995), 220–227; Susan Amussen, *An Ordered Society: Gender and Class in Early Modern England* (New York: B. Blackwell, 1988), 14. For more on the feudal language of "protection" see, for example, Gerda Lerner, *The Creation of Patriarchy* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1984), 70-75.

do not leave their native country for servitude abroad." The planters viewed servants as inherently lesser, men with no honor whom they might freely subjugate. In doing so, they attached their power to a long tradition in which those in positions of authority justified dominance as something "natural." The legitimacy of the planters' authority rested in patriarchal assumptions about the need to control dependents within the household.[8]

An apparent breakdown in this patriarchal tradition forced the Barbadian Assembly to reiterate the duty of household heads to keep order over dependents. Indeed, they expressed the need for the slave act of 1661 in terms of patriarchal duty. The preamble, for instance, explained that "Masters of Families" had collectively fallen short of what "might have been reasonably expected," according to cultural standards. If the planters had been sufficiently "careful of their [Negroes] obedience and compliance" with existing "laws as they ought to have been" there would be no need for this updated Act.[9] The Assembly seemingly wrote the new Acts, in part, because of systemic, individual failures to meet existing masculine ideals. If the planters had merely met manly expectations to keep subordinates in line, the slave code would not now need to regulate their behavior. Instead, the new acts enforced ideals of manhood to achieve a more stable, patriarchal social order.

The servant and slave acts of 1661 encouraged the planters to more vigilently enact their patriarchal authority through violence by calling upon masculine ideals. The

---

[8] See, particularly, Edward Rugemer, "The Development of Mastery and Race." "Letter to the Gentlemen Planters in London," TNA, CO 31/2, pp. 26-30 or TNA, CO 1/22, no. 23.
[9] TNA, CO 30/2, 16. Carole Shammas, *A History of Household Government in America*, 129.

Assembly laid out the responsibilities of being a landowning man, which included "punishinory" violence. The Slave Act of 1661, for instance, deemed it necessary for elite males to personally, physically punish transgressions of authority. For example, those that did "not apprehend" a runaway slave on their plantation "and punish them by a moderate whipping" were to "forfeit 500 pounds of...sugar" to the "Justice of the Peace." In this way, the Act enforced violence as a necessary behavior on the part of the planters. Physical punishment was acceptable because it supported good order. Only such violence could sufficiently "govern...Negroes" and thus protect the "public safety." The provision aligned with English cultural understandings of elite male responsibility. By encouraging physical punishment through a language of masculine duty to control subordinates, the slave and servant codes advanced disciplinary violence as central to patriarchal manhood on the island and sought to protect the social order.[10]

The laws also guarded violence as an exclusive right of elite men, helping reinforce the island's hierarchy. For instance, "if any Negro Man or Woman shall offer any violence to any Christian by Striking or the like, the Negro shall for his and their first offense...be severely whipped by the Constable." The Assembly, in this way, stepped in to deny subordinate individuals the right to use violence. For the second offense, the Justice of the Peace would beat him or her severely, he would have "his nose slit and be burned in [the] face." The third offense meant still "greater Corporal punishment" – a

[10] Quote is from slave act, TNA, CO 30/2, pp. 17. On the importance of violence to good order, see Christine Daniels, *Over the Threshold*, 9. For the traditional, cultural acceptance of violence to keep order, see Mervyn James, *Society, Politics, and Culture*, 375.

probable death sentence.[11] Christian servants likewise received punishment for putting "violent hands upon his or her Master, Mistress, or Overseer or any person put over them in Authority to govern them." The acts thus marked off violence as the purview of elite men, reinforcing their supremacy. Again, this corresponded with gendered ideals from England. Going back into the medieval period, as Geoffrey de Charny explained, violence should be the exclusive "honor of great Lords and those of middle rank." It was essential that such superior men use "wisdom and good judgment to keep safe" their monopoly on violence and protect it from "lesser-men."[12] Restricting violence was practical. Harsh punishments for servants or slaves that attacked their masters offered a sense of security. However, as a manifestation of privilege and rank in English culture, an exclusive claim on violence also symbolically reinforced the planters' masculine superiority. If those who could not use violence were "lesser men," access to it denoted a man of worth. Legislating violence thus enforced the patriarchal order in two ways. It protected the planters' use of it to physically keep control and, through that very use, legitimized their power over servants and slaves by displaying their natural superiority.

The 1661 laws attempted to further reinforce the superior manhood of landowners through the control of sexual activity. Most vividly, the "Act for better ordering Servants" constricted the most primary and fundamental performance of manhood – reproduction. The law ordained that "whosoever shall beget a Woman-servant with child, shall, for such offense personally serve the Owner of such Servant

---

[11] Edward Rugemer, "Making Slavery English," 13. For law see TNA, CO 30/2, 17–18.
[12] Hall, *Acts*, 35–42. Geoffroi de Charny, *A Knight's Own Book of Chivalry*, trans. by Elspeth Kennedy (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013), 60.

three years, or put one in his place for the said time." Conceiving a child and thus "disabling [an elite man's] Woman–servant" would not be tolerated. It undermined the master's own uses for her body. The law thus restricted the ability of subordinate males to express their sexuality, degrading their manhood. Bastardy was treated even more severely. If it was a servant that fathered a "bastard...then, after his time is expired, he shall serve the Owner of the said Woman-servant, double the time she had to serve at the time of the offense committed." In contrast to poor whites, elite men had relatively free sexual access to servant women. A wealthy man merely had to find someone to serve in the place of a woman he impregnated. The law thus subordinated non-elite masculinity by barring them from the same patriarchal privilege.[13]

Statutes regulating servant sexuality also helped subjugate women. As noted above, household heads had a duty to prevent "disorderly conduct" among dependents. Carole Shammas has described how, like in Barbados, Virginians cast pregnancy as misconduct for female servants. She noted that "in almost every colony, female indentured servants had their service extended for the offense of bastardy...colonial masters desperate for workers had the incentive of squeezing additional time out their labor force."[14] Such penalties incentivized planters to punish their servants for sexual reproduction. These laws also reflected English cultural expectations that household heads should constrain female sexuality, including that of servants. As the law in Barbados read, "the said Woman-servant so offending," by becoming pregnant, "shall serve her said Master or Mistress, two years after her time by Indenture." We can

[13] Hall, *Acts,* 36-37.
[14] Carole Shammas, *A History of Household Government in America*, 37.

assume this applied to cases of rape as well as consensual sex. If a poor freeman impregnated a female servant, whatever their relationship, he became bound, and so the woman also saw her servitude extended. The Act attempted to regulate the sexuality of servants, poor free whites, and women in accord with patriarchal traditions. Cecily Jones has pointed to the ways that colonial Patriarchs brought "a tradition of inherent distrust towards lower class women, who appeared in elite imaginations as sexually loose and immoral creatures." Bastardy provisions particularly constricted female sexuality by making it a higher risk for her to engage in sex outside of marriage. They also more generally sought to control their supposed wanton sexuality.[15]

By also controlling the marriages of servants, the Acts further enforced the white planters' patriarchal power. Getting married "without his Master or Mistress's consent" required a servant to "serve his Master or Mistress, four years after his said time of Apprenticeship is expired." This constrained female servant freedom and made it difficult for them to abide by cultural sexual norms. It forced them into illicit sexual relations outside of wedlock. These relationships might become a further indication of their inferiority and supposed need for elite men to control them. Additionally, for a freeman to marry a woman servant was prohibitively expensive. He would have to "pay unto the Master, or Owner of such servant, double the value of what the Maid, or Woman-servant is worth." Such provisions helped discourage relationships for female servants without the approval of her master. In the process, it preserved the master's

[15] Hall, *Acts,* 36-37. Cecily Jones*, Engendering Whiteness: White Women and Colonialism in Barbados and North Carolina* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2014), 53-54. For contrasting attitudes about black sexuality and links to race see Jennifer Morgan*, Laboring Women: Reproduction and Gender in New World Slavery* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004).

control over his servant women's right to marry and, with it, any infringement on his power over her by another man. As Jennifer Morgan has pointed out, “an indentured woman who married introduced two competing masters' into a situation where mastery should reside with the holder of the indenture.” In sum, the 1661 Servant Act attempted to regulate sexual and romantic behavior among servants, protecting the supremacy of the master in the process.[16]

Elite Barbadian understandings of male duty, superiority, and access to violence thus lay at the heart of the 1661 Acts. The legislation codified (and in some cases extended) the master's power over his servants and slaves, as well as poor free white men and women, to preserve the social order. These structures of power were rooted as much in English masculine ideals as the context of a slave society. The codes subordinated both blacks and whites on the basis of planter presumptions about each group's inferiority to landowning men, born of long cultural traditions. The laws treated whites and blacks differently. As Rugemer pointed out, for example, the Acts distinguished “Christians” from “Negros” in the physical punishment of the body. In such instances, “the ideological work of race was clearly in operation.” However, while the laws of the 1660s contained an implied racial awareness, they remained mired in hierarchies, ideals, and identities attached to older English patriarchal practices. If, as Aviston Downes explained, “contestations over masculinity [in the sugar colonies] were

[16] Hall, *Acts,* 37. Jennifer Morgan, *Laboring Women,* 76. See Introduction for discussion of sexual violence within Caribbean life. In sum, as among English masters, Barbadian elites seem to have enjoyed free sexual access to their female servants and slaves. For sexual access to servants in England, see Susan Amussen, “Punishment, Discipline, and Power,” 4. On rape and slavery, see Trevor Burnard, *Mastery, Tyranny, and Desire: Thomas Thistlewood and His Slaves in the Anglo-Jamaican World* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2004); Sharon Block, *Rape and Sexual Power in Early America* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2006).

inextricably linked to contestations over 'race'," the servant and slave codes are useful to understanding the origins of that relationship.[17]

"Punishionary Laws"

Emphasizing patriarchal duty helped to clarify the planters' authority over the island's increasingly complicated racial milieu. Other scholars have noted that London began pressuring the planters to treat white servants better in the 1650s. Cromwell had sent large numbers of prisoners to the island after the civil war. Along with poor Irish, these included English Cavalier soldiers and officers. England's racial views of the Irish had long been unflattering. They were "more uncivil, more uncleanly, more barbarous, and more brutish...than any other part of the world that is known," according to English contemporary Barnaby Rich. Such assessments became foundational to English justifications for conquest in Ireland. Africans, meanwhile, represented a clear "other." As Michael Guasco noted, the English had long associated black African people with slavery. Thus, the treatment these groups received in the Caribbean raised few concerns from officials in London. Nor did it require much work on the part of the planters to justify their authority over them. Former Cavalier soldiers, imprisoned and shipped to Barbados, though, challenged what Beckles called English "identity rights." As he put it, "by the mid-1650s, when the supply of enslaved African labor was considered adequate for sugar production...the ethnicity of white servants became an issue for enslavers and imperial politics." But for a twist of fate, some of the Cavalier planters might be toiling

[17] Aviston Downes, "Constructing Brotherhood: Fraternal Organizations and Masculinities in Colonial Barbados since 1740," in *Love and Power: Caribbean Discourses on Gender (Cave Hill: University of the West Indies Press, 2012), 455.*

alongside their new English servants. To treat these men no differently than Irish or Africans brought into question the planters' claims to special privileges, so Parliament would indicate. To be tossed "under hatches" (in the cargo hold of a ship) and "to see no light" and then be "sold for £100" was slavery, one member of Parliament confirmed, and Englishmen could not enslave other Englishmen. Another MP cited "Paul's case" from the Bible, arguing that "A Roman ought not to be beaten." He confirmed that if they did not protect the fundamental liberty of every Englishman, they might "all" become "miserable slaves" subject to the same abuse.[18] The planters could not rely solely on their "natural" superiority as English to justify authority and the right to violence against English servants. Faced with the complicating implications of middling, white cavalier veterans as servants, growing metropolitan pressure, and an increased slave majority, the planters needed to better define and enforce the basis of their power.

---

[18] Reference to Bible is in Acts, 22:25. Hilary Beckles, *The First Black Slave Society*, 39. For more on recent debates and controversies surrounding idea of "white slavery" in Barbados see Jerome Handler and M. Reilly, "Contesting 'White Slavery' in the Caribbean: Enslaved Africans and European Indentured Servants in Seventeenth-Century Barbados," *New West Indian Guide* 91 (2017): 30-55; Don Jordan and Michael Walsh, *White Cargo: The Forgotten History of Britain's White Slaves in America* (New York: New York University Press, 2008). Hilary Beckles, *The First Black Slave Society*, 32, 39, 41 & 44. Michael Guasco, *Englishmen and Slavery*, 46–50. Guasco tells us that Chichester and Rich rooted understandings in ideas from the previous century that God had punished the Irish for their sins by making them bondsmen, related to the Curse of Ham – long a justification for anti-black prejudice as well. According to the 1486 *Booke of Saint Albans*, the descendants of Japheth had been "ennobled" by Noah of the *Bible*, granting them the privileges claimed by the English nobility. Descendants of Ham, meanwhile, had been cursed, made ignoble, doomed to serve. Africans constituted a clearly-defined "other," who could be described in racial terms stark enough to mark them "cursed" and thus not entitled to full rights of man. Scholars of slavery have long referenced the Japheth-Ham dichotomy in explaining Anglo-American justifications for the enslavement of blacks. Indeed, it was one employed by seventeenth-century planters, something "usually discoursed... because they are Black, therefore they are *Cham's* Seed; and for this [reason] under the *Curse,* and therefore no longer *Men,* but a kind of *Brutes."* For an in-depth treatment see, David M. Goldenberg, *The Curse of Ham: Race and Slavery in Early Judaism, Christianity, and Islam* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2009). See also, Mervyn James, *Society, Politics, and Culture*.

The Assembly accomplished this, in part, through *de facto* racial distinctions. As scholars like Edward Rugemer have made clear, for example, legislation gave white servants some legal rights, in line with English common law. If a servant wasted or stole a master's "goods or Provisions, or commodities whatsoever," his punishment required a proper "conviction...by one or more testimonies upon oath, before [a] Justice of the Peace." Servants charged with fathering a bastard likewise had the right to "a Jury." In contrast, Rugemer noted, in the planters' view, "'Negroes...being brutish Slaves' did not deserve to be tried for such offenses by a jury of twelve of their peers as English law prescribed." Instead, the planters created a "slave court" that was an "impromptu" affair.[19] How often the planters actually respected the process of justice for white servants is an open question; but the Assembly at least gave the appearance of greater respect for white legal rights. By delineating between servants and slaves, they might undermine Parliament's charge that the island engaged in "white slavery." In the process, the Assembly laid the foundation for a hierarchy attached to skin color.

The acts of 1661 also tactfully emphasized landowning male supremacy over both white servants and black slaves. Though the two acts supposedly separated the races, some clauses lumped "Christian Servants, for distinction" and "negroes" or "slaves" together. The 1661 Act "governing Servants," for instance, ensured that "no freeman or trader...presume to buy or sell any commodities whatsoever, with any Servant or Slave."[20] The law therefore ensured that all dependent individuals, free or slave, black or white, could not exercise economic autonomy, which was the purview

[19] Hall, *Acts,* 36–38. Edward Rugemer, "Making Slavery English," 9 & 11.
[20] 'Slave Code', CO 30/2, pp. 16–17; 'Servant Code', Hall, *Acts,* 36 & 38.

only of elite men. According to English ideals, such a restriction subordinated the manhood of each group. Reinforcing dependency on the master, meanwhile, buttressed the hierarchy and the power of landowning men over their servants and slaves.

The 1661 legislation on the island also restricted slave and servant movement in nearly identical ways. The first clause in the slave law reads, "no Master, Mistress, Commander, or Overseer of any family within this Island shall give their Negroes leave on Sabbath days, Holy days or at any other time to go out of their plantations except...with a ticket under his Master, Mistress, Commander, or Overseers' hand." Meanwhile, the servant act dictated that "whatsoever servant, or servants shall, willfully and obstinately absent him, or herself out of his, or her Master, or Mistress's Plantation, or service, either on *Saturdays*, *Sundays*, or any other days or times" without a "license or Ticket in writing under his Master, Mistress, or Overseer's hand" would be punished. Scholars have emphasized the widespread use of "tickets" as part of the systematic racial oppression in American slave societies from Jamaica to Mississippi.[21] However, seventeenth-century Barbadians seemed to have seen it as equally necessary to constrain the movement of white servants, pointing to the underlying importance of masculinity.

---

[21] 'Slave Code', CO 30/2, pp. 16–17; 'Servant Code', Hall, *Acts,* 36 & 38. For more on American slavery and the mechanisms of control see David Brion Davis, *Inhuman Bondage: The Rise and Fall of Slavery in the New World* (Oxford, England: Oxford University Press, 2006); Patterson, *Slavery and Social Death: A Comparative Study* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1982); Betty Wood, *Slavery in Colonial America*; Ira Berlin, *Generations of Captivity: A History of African-American Slaves* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2003); Ira Berlin, *Many Thousands Gone: The First Two Centuries of Slavery in North America* (Cambridge, MA: Blknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1998); Saidiya Hartman, *Scenes of Subjection: Terror, Slavery, and Self-Making in nineteenth-century America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997). For more background on the existence of pervious laws and the slave codes in Barbados and Jamaica, see RIchard Dunn, *Sugar and Slaves*, 238-239.

An English language of patriarchal duty helped the Acts of 1661 to support the planters' continuing power over both servants and slaves, even while offering these groups some protections and rights. The clauses that constrained movement, in particular, buttressed the authority of landowning men by keeping servants and slaves subject to the oversight of household heads. Dependents could only move about at the discretion of their master. Such provisions reinforced the patriarchal order by making landless individuals perpetually subject to landed ones. The strategy reflected vagrancy laws in England and previous legislation in Barbados. The Assembly, in the early 1650s, had already sought to bring "masterless men" under the control of landed males and thus make them "useful" to society. They noted the "great number of loose, idle, vagrant persons in and about this Island," men with no occupation, no means, and no purpose. Indeed, in a world dominated by bound laborers, the chance of finding wage employment was limited. Rather than working "to the prejudice of this place," Justices of the Peace were to send "such persons" to the Governor so that he, with the Council and Assembly, might decide how best they could "be employed in some necessary work, to the defense of this island, and the peace and tranquility thereof." If not already under the control of some honorable man, the colonial government would act as a surrogate patriarch, keeping these "lesser sorts" in line and at work until they might be otherwise employed. As other scholars have noted, elite Englishmen of the time saw propertyless males, in particular, without some employment as undermining good order. They were "rogues," inferior, failed men. Superior males had a right and duty to prevent them from undermining the social peace. Vagrancy laws preserved order by forcing violators into

some form of "domestic government," either in an actual household or under the power of the state. They were a form of patriarchal control that "presumed everyone should have a place of residence." In the end, the acts of 1661 similarly reinforced the superiority of landowning males over their dependents, regardless of race, by restricting movement. Laws ensured that all "lesser" individuals were under the authority of a household patriarch, even while wandering away from the actual household.[22] Patriarchal rights and responsibility, as well as English law, thus provided a precedent by which the planters might continue to justify and support their authority over all groups, even as they made some distinctions and concessions.

Attaching the new laws to patriarchal ideals also protected the legitimacy of the planters' ongoing use of violence. To justify physical punishments, the Acts of 1661 touted them as necessary for fulfilling the masculine duty to keep order. Like their counterparts in England, the colonists still viewed violence as fundamental to patriarchal authority. In England and early America, according to scholar Christine Daniels, "patriarchs were to keep order in their households and ensure that household

[22] England enacted vagrancy laws extensively to deal with the wandering poor displaced by enclosure and economic change. See Susan Amussen, "Punishment, Discipline, and Power"; A.L. Beier, *Masterless Men: The Vagrancy Problem in England, 1560–1640* (London: Methuen, 1985). Vagrancy laws of the early 1650s in Barbados are in Richard Hall, *Acts*, 18. For additional scholarship on vagrancy and its connection to patriarchy more broadly, see Michael Braddick, *State Formation in Early Modern England, c. 1550-1700* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 150-153; Mark E. Kann, *Punishments, Prisons, and Patriarchy: Liberty and Power in the Early American Republic* (New York: New York University Press, 2005); Mark Dubber, *The Police Power: Patriarchy and the Foundations of American Government* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2005), 51-62. For more on the importance of Barbados law to American slavery, see Betty Wood, *The Origins of American Slavery: Freedom and Bondage in the English Colonies* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1997), 84; Hilary Beckles, *The First Black Slave Society*. For more on legal apparatus of slavery and its relationship across geographic space, see Thomas D. Morris, *Southern Slavery and the Law, 1619–1860* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996). For information on the prospects of employment on the island for landless individuals, see Richard Dunn, *Sugar and Slaves*; Simon P. Newman, *New World of Labor.*

members did not disturb the civil peace...chastisement...was their right." The violent practices of early Barbados reflected an acceptance of such patriarchal traditions. The Assembly opined how good "punishionary [*sic*] Laws" that standardized penalties would help to better preserve the "peace and utility of this Ilse." [*sic*] Violence still kept control. Rather than giving up their power over servants, whom they needed not only for labor but to serve in the militia, the planters turned to an English cultural language of masculine restraint to safeguard their continuing use of it.[23]

The Acts of 1661 moved, primarily, to curtail the worst abuses against "Christian servants," to which Parliament had so objected. The Assembly acknowledged and "much feared, that some persons within this Island, have exercised violence and great oppression, to, and upon their Servants." Thus, for example, "to prevent the murder and destruction of the bodies [of servants] as evidence, by which killers have gone clear, undiscovered and unpunished," the servant code set in place provisions to ensure a proper examination of any servant's death. If a "Christian servant" died for any reason, the Assembly resolved to now take it seriously. For merely failing to have "the body...viewed by a Justice of the Peace and two neighbors," the fine was a considerable twenty thousand pounds of sugar.[24] Limiting unfettered violence against servants, the Assembly hoped, would help appease Parliament and prevent further scrutiny into their systems of power. It aligned with ideals from the homeland that cast extraordinary violence as undermining its legitimate uses as a tool of patriarchal authority.

---

[23] Christine Daniels, *Over the Threshold,* 9–10. TNA, CO 30/2, pp. 25.
[24] Hall, *Acts,* 39.

The slave act even attempted to limit violence against Africans according to cultural standards for male household heads. The Assembly confessed that they had no compass on how to proceed from the "Laws of England" with regard to slavery, so they turned to "the right rule of reason and order." Without legal precedent, Barbados made the practices of slavery English, in part, by applying recognizable cultural standards of elite manhood. English authorities frequently worked to limit or condemn "excessive discipline" in the household, which "might increase disorder rather than diminish it."[25] The acts of 1661 attempted to conform slave practices to this ideal by likewise restraining violence. To "leave [slaves] to the Arbitrary, cruel, and outrageous wills of every evil disposed person," they recognized, went against the obligations of English patriarchs. Thus, in 1661, the Assembly decreed that a master's "willful" murder of a slave carried a fine of "three thousand [pounds] of Muscovado sugar." If a planter killed another man's slave, the fine went up to "five thousand pounds of Muscovado Sugar," and "farther" he was "bound to...good behavior during the pleasure of the Governor and Council." Scholars have emphasized the distinctions in penalties for murdering whites and blacks as part of a swelling white supremacy. While true, attempting to limit the most extraordinary violence of slavery, even with relatively trivial penalties, reflected efforts to at least appear to be bringing slavery more in line with contemporary cultural limits on violence. The Assembly ascribed greater value to white lives. They may have only protected slaves "as [they did] other goods and Chattels." But,

[25] Mary Beth Norton *Founding Mothers and Fathers: Gendered Power and the Forming of American Society* (New York: Alfred. A. Knopf, 1996), 3-180; Susan Amusseen, "Punishment, Discipline, and Power," 18. See also, Susan Amussen, "'Being stirred to much Unquietness': Violence and Domestic Violence in Early Modern England," *Journal of Women's History* 6 (1994): 70 -89.

combined with efforts to align punishments of white servants with patriarchal ideals in order to appease London, this step seems to have been part of a similar effort to head-off criticism about their treatment of slaves. It was likewise tied to English ideas about the necessity of limiting patriarchal violence to protect its legitimacy.[26]

The Acts also safeguarded the planters' access to violent punishments more explicitly. For example, if white servants did not actively engage in preserving the socio-racial order, they would become ready victims of violence along the same lines as the enslaved. A runaway slave might receive a “moderate whipping,” but a Christian Servant complicit or indifferent likewise received a violent punishment of thirty-nine “lashes.” Violence reinforced planter power over their slaves' bodies, but also could be used to ensure poor white support for the patriarchal structure. The slave act also protected elite, male freedom to use extensive violence, as long it was in the course of punishment. As noted above, "wanton" murder was prohibited. However, accidentally killing a slave in the course of “punishment [by] his Master” carried no “accountability to any” man. Rugemer implied this provision reflected racial views about Africans. But it also ensured access to an extreme level of physical punishment, which the planters still viewed as necessary to fulfilling patriarchal duty. As an essential tool of elite masculinity and power, killing a slave during discipline did not make a man “evil.” It was an acceptable consequence of the need to exercise his control. Fulfilling manhood sometimes might indeed require killing, the Slave Act of 1661 acknowledged. Shielding

[26] TNA, CO 30/2, pp. 25. Edward Rugemer, “The Development of Mastery and Race.”

planters from prosecution for violence executed in the course of punishment encouraged the use of extraordinary physical discipline by slaveholders.[27]

Despite the restraints and distinctions laid out in the 1661 slave and servant codes, the planters seemed to continue using violence against both groups as they always had. Indeed, they fought vigorously against further restrictions on their patriarchal authority. In the 1680s, for example, the King directed the new Governor, Edwyn Stede, to ensure that the Assembly passed laws "to prevent the over-severe dealing with [Christian] Servants by the cruelty of bad masters." The King had in mind the patriarchal duty to balance discipline with restraint. The 1661 Act had, apparently, not produced the intended effect of curtailing London's criticism of planter practices. The mandate emphasized only "overly severe" violence and, Stede claimed, that it did not "often happen" that servants appealed to him against ill-treatment. But he also expressed Barbadian attitudes about the necessity of elite male freedom in punishing all subordinates. As he put it, "it [would] be impossible to keep the servants in duty and obedience to their masters as they ought to be; and indeed with safety to the Island if there not be severe laws to restrain and punish their disobedience and insolency [*sic*] to their masters." The planters believed that ignoble individuals only understood physical violence; without it, there was little hope to keep order among them. They could not fulfill their duty as elite males to control and protect the social peace without it. Stede went on to justify planter violence, since "most of the Christian Servants of this island

[27] Edward Rugemer, "Making Slavery English," 14. For more on the slave codes and property in North America see Peter Wood, *Strange New Land: African Americans, 1617-1776* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996), 37–39; Thomas D. Morris, *Southern Slavery and the Law, 1619–1860* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996), 161–179. See also Ira Berlin, *Many Thousands Gone*. Clause 2, Slave Act CO 30/2, 17.

are brought out of the several jails in England, Scotland and Ireland," which made them capable of "all manner of villainy...and many times so wicked they are as to beat their overseers, and sometimes their masters themselves."[28] He echoed earlier sentiments that white servants lacked "honor or innate courage," which justified their condition. Like slaves, the relative 'lesser masculinity' of these "villains" in contrast to landowning men made it the planters' duty to keep them in obedience and protect the social order. Violence was fundamental to that goal. Planters viewed any restrictions as dangerous.

The planters believed that even discussing limits on violence against servants threatened good order. One time attorney general of Barbados, Thomas Montgomery, made an argument that "masters ought not to correct their servants by beating, striking or whipping them on any occasion whatever, especially so far as to break the skin." Stede explained that merely the debate over his suggestion gave "such encouragement to the servants...that they have appeared much more refractory than heretofore."[29] In the view of ruling Barbadians, direct, unfettered violence was the only path to maintaining their authority over servants and slaves. The masculine imperative to keep order over the household superseded the moral objections raised by the Crown and metropolitans like Montgomery or even their own laws. Appealing to the patriarchal ideal of good order, they hoped, justified the extraordinary levels of violence on which they continued to depend.

In the end, the planters' effort to curtail questions about their labor practices by regulating violence and making distinctions between servants and slaves seemed to

[28] TNA, CO 29/4, pp. 8-10.
[29] TNA, CO 29/4, pp. 8-10.

work. Throughout the 1670s, along with increasing colonial revenue, London moved to bring the colony more firmly aligned with metropolitan interests and standards. They began with the island's legal code. The planters had previously stymied the Crown in its demand for "the speedy transcription" of all laws "for [his] Majesty's approbation," a request "never complied with." The planters worked to confound London's ability to get a grasp on the island's legal situation, whereby it might reshape it against the planters' will.[30] They guarded control of the island's laws. However, London soon decided to account for and do away with non-conforming legislation directly, without waiting for collaboration from the obstructive colonists. In 1679, the Committee sent "Mr. Sergant Baldwin one of your Majesties Council learned in the Law [to] examine with all care whether [Barbados' laws] be consistent with your majesty's authority." By the next year, Baldwin had completed his report and made few changes. Specifically, he confirmed "that the Laws there concerning Negroes [were] reasonable Laws," despite not conforming to English precedent, "for...being a bruttish sort of People it is of necessity or at least convenient to have Laws for the Government of them different from the Laws of England." Baldwin nearly verbatim repeated the 1661 slave code's justifications for treating Africans differently, them being "a heathenish brutish...pride of people."[31] The planters had seemingly successfully justified the legal distinctions made to keep Africans in perpetual slavery and open to extraordinary violence by landowning whites.

---

[30] TNA, CO 29/2, pp. 269

[31] To the certain relief of the planters, Baldwin reported that most of the island' laws were "agreeable to His Majesty's Authority." Baldwin acknowledge that inconsistencies stemmed from their unique environment, specifically the denial of rights and free exercise of violence against "Negroes... by reason of their numbers become dangerous, and being a brutish sort of people." The planters had won Baldwin over to their way thinking, at least on this subject. TNA, CO 29/3, pp. 6. TNA, CO, 30/2, pp. 16

Parliament affirmed racialized slavery as acceptable, in accord with English values, which Baldwin and the Council later confirmed.

Conclusion

The Acts of 1661 created a racial order but also reiterated the planters' patriarchal authority more broadly. Daragh Grant posited of South Carolina that colonial government took greater control of punishments, which helped legitimize violence. Despite being, as Grant and David Brion Davis have pointed out, "often unevenly enforced," the slave code in Barbados worked similarly. However, it did not do so simply by absorbing punishment into the state's responsibility as Grant suggested, or by creating racial distinctions. Instead, it codified expectations of elite male behavior that more closely reflected gendered English cultural traditions. It set standards for elite violence that would prevent its legitimacy from being undermined by "arbitrary abuses." Indeed, the need for provisions like the ticket system merely buttressed existing practices. Biet recounted that, already in the 1650s, "if some [slaves] on a Sunday leave the limits of their plantation, they receive a beating of fifty strokes, with which they are sometimes completely broken.[32] By incorporating restrictions on slave movement into the Act of 1661 and laying out specific punishments, the Assembly protected the right to continue using violence to punish absconders. In the end, through a cultural language of restraint, the laws advanced existing understandings about the propriety of violence when used by elite men to keep order. It codified violence, ensuring the planters'

[32] Daragh Grant, "'Civilizing' the Colonial Subject: The Co-Evolution of State and Slavery in South Carolina, 1670-1739," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 57, no. 3 (07, 2015): 617. These quotes from Biet are from the translation in Derek Hughes, *Versions of Blackness: Key Texts on Slavery from the Seventeenth Century* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 314.

continuing use of it against both whites and blacks, even as it gave greater legal status to the former. If planters had grown increasingly keen to demonstrate themselves to be English gentry like any other, as this dissertation argues, it was necessary legitimize violence in the face scrutiny.

The laws of 1661 are emblematic of the way that Barbadians attempted to conform themselves to metropolitan standards, while the exigencies of colonial life and slavery made it impossible. The Acts aimed to appease London and indicate the planters as true Englishmen. They used English masculine ideals to reinforce their patriarchal power. Ultimately, though, the legislation moved them toward a reliance on skin color to denote identity, uncommon in the English world. Furthermore, the Barbadians failed to abide by the restraints on violence that they prescribed. The King and Montgomery's concerns demonstrate how the planters' treatment of servants in particular indicates that it continued to exceed acceptable limits. Criticism about the abuse and treatment of whites and blacks into the 1680s and beyond speaks to ongoing questions as to whether the planters were proper patriarchs. Some of the more extraordinary violence was accompanied by the development of white supremacist ideologies that had less relevance in contemporary England. Through the 1661 slave and servant codes the planters attempted to cast themselves as Englishmen like any other by conforming to London's expectations through masculine cultural ideals. But, the context of slavery and their over-indulgence in violence became the foundation for their separateness.[33]

[33] Parliament may have initially accepted the practice of slavery in the 1650s, but over time the use of slaves at all became an increasing source of metropolitan skepticism about the Englishness of the planters. For more on the pressure placed on plantation slaveholders by London see Thomas Bender, *The*

Antislavery Debate: Capitalism and Abolitionism as a Problem in Historical Interpretation (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992); Christopher Brown, *Moral Capital: Foundations of British Abolitionism* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2006); Seymour *Drescher, From Slavery to Freedom: Comparative Studies in the Rise and Fall of Atlantic Slavery* (New York: New York University Press, 1999); Kenneth Morgan, *Slavery and the British Empire: from Africa to America* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007); Derek *Peterson,* ed. *Abolitionism and Imperialism in Britain, Africa, and the Atlantic* (Athens: Ohio University Press, 2010); Richard S. Reddie, *Abolition! The Struggle to Abolish Slavery in the British Empire* (Oxford: Lion Hudson, 2007); James Walvin, ed., *England, Slaves and Freedom, 1776-1838,* (Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 1986).

Chapter Seven: "Though we Plant Sugar You May see we can plant our cannons too"

In 1665, the famed Dutch Admiral Michel de Ruyter sailed ahead a massive fleet and surrounded the island of Barbados. Reports started arriving "About 6 O'clock in the morning of [his] coming." The Barbadians caught their first glimpse of fourteen ships a few hours later, "when he came by the fort." De Ruyter fired a "whole volley of small shot, and his broadsides and so did all the rest." In response, the English "fort and shipping fired at him," shooting "away all his foresail," stripping him of his "mayne yard and two others lost their Top sails." Still the Admiral "stayed, and in staying, [the Barbadians] shot down" upon his ships. "De Ruyter fired his broadside again, and six of the rest." So, back and forth, proceeded a fierce exchange of cannon fire. Much of de Ruyter's "stern" having caved in, the Admiral "did not fire any more" and onlookers supposed (incorrectly) he "was then killed." Finally, the ships that had not been sunk or laid on their sides "went away." As one Barbadian later put it, the planters had managed to send their would-be conquerors "Crawling with the Crabs."[1]

An anonymous islander captured the Dutch assault in a poem entitled "Barbados Bravery." He celebrated the fierceness with which the colonists fought, as they "rung" the "snouts" of the Dutch "with a Peal of Ordinance." Comparing their assailants to hogs like those that roamed Barbados's sugar fields, he described "the wild Blood [the planters] spilled," declaring that "a *Boar* is never good till he be killed." Rejoicing in the

[1] "A True Relation of the Fight at Barbadoes between the English and the Dutch, under De Ruyter, on April 20, 1665," TNA CO 1/19, pp. 77. Anon., *The routing of De-Ruyter, or The Barbadoes bravery, by the author of the Broad-side* (London: Printed by R. Davenport, 1665). Cited from here as '*Barbados Bravery*'. For a brief biography of de Ruyter and his fleet and exploits, as well as a brief summary of the fight and context at Barbados see David Marley, *Wars of the Americas: A Chronology of Armed Conflict in the Western Hemisphere, 1492 to the Present,* Vol. 2 (Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO, 2008), 248-249.

island's victory, he called de Ruyter the "Dutch Don Quixote," madly swinging away in a futile effort against Barbadian windmills. Perhaps with Cervantes's protagonist in mind, the poem's author continued by evoking legends of literature, comparing the Dutch to Aesop's Dog, losing "a substantial shoulder for a shadow" and asking if, "like thy *Trojans...*[the Dutch] Embrace the Water to escape the Fire," leaping into the sea for fear of their mighty foes. The poet extolled a culture of martial masculinity by comparing the planters themselves to a European emblem of manly conquest, "Alexander the Great," whose "portion" they gave de Ruyter. The Barbadians reveled in overcoming their better-equipped attackers, daring them to "return." As the anonymous poet proclaimed to his Atlantic audience, "though we plant sugar, You May see that we can Plant our Canons too."[2] Famed as a sugar island, the Barbadians now firmly laid claim to another Atlantic identity attached to bravery.

Facing rising threats to their control of the island, the Barbadian planters further refined the meanings of manhood into the last thirty-five years of the seventeenth century. The growing prospect of foreign invasion and large-scale slave rebellion, in particular, elicited reactions among elite men. The need to keep servants and slaves in obedience or participate in the militia to protect the island from attack had largely been abstract concerns. These fears now began to manifest in vivid ways. The Anglo-Dutch Wars of the 1660s and succeeding conflict with France placed Barbados in seemingly

[2] Anon., *Barbados Bravery*. For history of De Ruyter's exploits in Africa and America, as well as the Dutch Wars in general see, for example, Gijs Rommelse, *The Second Anglo-Dutch War 1665-1667: International Raison d'Etat, Mercantilism and Maritime Strife* (Hilversum: Verloren, 2006); Wim Klooster *The Dutch Moment: War, Trade, and Settlement in the seventeenth-century Atlantic World* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2016); Roger *Hainsworth and Christine Churches, The Anglo-Dutch Naval Wars 1652-1674* (Stroud: Sutton Publishing, 1998).

constant peril of assault. A succession of slave conspiracy in the 1670s, meanwhile, pointed to internal hazards as well. The planters responded to these threats as they always had, advancing a vision of manhood that justified their right to rule and encouraged the physical tools necessary to maintain power. However, the escalating role of nationalism and race that attended the specific challenges of this period helped facilitate an even more violent society. Manhood couched in honor, duty, and bravery still supported planter superiority. But, embedded with English pride and imperial goals, Barbadian men more aggressively rewarded martial valor and punished cowardice in this era, as they found themselves increasingly engaged in warfare. In the wake of slave conspiracies, meanwhile, the planters removed all pretenses to limits on violent deterrents and discipline. They refused to accept any risk of rebellion while enslaved Africans appeared hell-bent on displacing them as both landowners and husbands to white women. Racial fears led to greater insistence that all landed men use physical punishments in the household and participate in the militia. Especially as growing numbers of Quaker planters challenged the existing basis of planter authority by preaching pacifism, Anglican elites reinforced the necessity of violence to masculine belonging. Whether on the surrounding seas or their plantations, the planters demanded elite, male participation in violence with greater diligence during the last half of the seventeenth century. In the process, they further solidified their Atlantic identity. Elite Barbadian aims remained economic – they continued to plant sugar. But their strategies for manhood and power depended evermore on violence, so they made

certain to plant "cannons too."[3] Alongside wealth, masculine ideals like martial prowess and valor would prove essential to their reputation and status in the English world.

"Thy Ship Affords a Rope"

Martial victory continued to affirm manhood and the right to power in 1660s Barbados. In defeating the Dutch, for instance, the Barbadians proved their masculine "bravery" and valor. Repulsing de Ruyter against long odds in their "Makrel boats" and "forsaken Rags," they demonstrated a collective superiority, rooted in martial prowess. "Barbados Bravery" loudly pronounced as much to the world. It boasted of the Barbadians' masculine integrity in contrast to the inferior manhood of their foreign foes. The poet challenged the manliness of the Dutch, whose panic and fear in battle made them not men fit to rule, but lowly scavenging hogs on the fringes of the Barbadians' great plantations. Through his defeat and flight, de Ruyter showed himself as unworthy to control and reap the fruits of the island. Thus disgraced to the world, he had to "Pray" that his "Attempt may be forgotten." His manhood degraded, the poet snidely advised that "if that fails, thy Ship affords a Rope." The only way to regain his masculine honor was to return in the "hope" he might prevail in a second attempt. Otherwise, his shame as a man afforded him but one option – to hang himself. According to the Barbadian ethos, having lost his honor in such a public fashion, de Ruyter's best remaining prospect was suicide. He would never rule the island because he lacked the

[3] See Christine Daniels, *Over the Threshold: Intimate Violence in Early America* (New York: Routledge, 203). For more on the geo-politics and endemic warfare of the period see Sarah Barber, *Disputatious Caribbean: The West Indies in the Seventeenth Century* (New York: Palgrave and Macmillan, 2014); Bernard Bailyn, *The Barbarous Years: The People of British North America: the conflict of civilizations, 1600–1675* (New York: Alfred Knopf, 2012); Carl and Robert Bridenbaugh, *No Peace Beyond the Line: The English in the Caribbean, 164-1690* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1972).

masculine fortitude that the planters, by contrast, claimed to possess.[4] The right to power in post-Restoration Barbados remained tied, in the planters' minds, to manhood proved through martial prowess.

Elite Barbadian claims to martial masculinity, though, were becoming bound up with nationalism and imperial aims in new ways. In 1650, Francis Willoughby had attested that the planters' "courage" was sufficient to stand up to an invasion of the English Parliament and professed a willingness to die for "liberty" against London. When the Protectorate set out to invade Jamaica in 1655, the planters famously refused to help or even sell provisions to the force. They resented this imperial expansion, which they perceived would come at the expense of their freedom.[5] By the next decade though, even Willoughby, again Governor of Barbados, actively risked life and limb in support of English power in the region. In 1666, the "Captain General of all the Caribbean Islands, [came] down from Barbados with a fleet...to repair the loss" of St. Christopher to the French. France had joined the Dutch in their assault on English possessions and King Charles II became increasingly frustrated with territorial losses. Willoughby moved to salvage the defeat of St. Christopher, setting a small fleet upon the well-fortified French. His aspirations, in this case, proved his demise. Before he could confront the French, Willoughby encountered "a Hurricane near Guadeloupe wherein most of that fleet and men were lost." For the rest of the war St. Christopher

---

[4] Anon., *Barbados Bravery.* For more on de Ruyter's attack see, Wim Klooster, "De Ruyter's Attack on Barbados: The Dutch Perspective," *Journal of the Barbados Museum and Historical Society* 60 (2014): 42–53.

[5] For more on this event see Larry Gragg, *Englishmen Transplanted: The English Colonization of Barbados, 1627-1660* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003), 53–54; Carla Pestana, *The English Atlantic in an Age of Revolution* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2004), 176-178.

"could not be recovered again."[6] Even though unsuccessful, Willoughby's effort marked a turning point for the island. Barbadians would no longer resist engaging in war to expand the empire. In fact, they enthusiastically took up the imperial mission and attached their efforts to existing understandings about the importance of bravery to masculine worth.

Of course, the planters did not change tactics out of a pure love of country or even manhood. As European imperial contests heated up throughout the Caribbean in the last half of the seventeenth century, elite Barbadians found themselves caught in the middle. They may have still desired relative autonomy from the homeland; however, two changes made that impossible. First, the English Empire was coming into form and London had grown too powerful and involved in colonial affairs to resist directly as in 1650. Second, increasing numbers of slaves, a shrinking white population, and the threat of foreign invasion meant, as noted by Gary Puckrein, that the planters were "obliged to look to England for military protection." Richard Dunn added that "at the Restoration the Barbadians had to surrender much of their economic and political independence." Larry Gragg agreed, saying the "planters could continue to make great profits, but, like other colonists in the Stuart empire, they had to acknowledge their dependence on imperial officials in London."[7] Patriotism and loyalty became more viable options to achieve concessions from the homeland than defiance as a result.

---

[6] TNA, CO 1/42, pp. 79-81.

[7] Gary Puckrein, *Little England: Plantation Society and Anglo-Barbadian Politics, 1627-1700* (New York: New York University Press, 1984), 124-125; Dunn, *Sugar and Slaves,* 80; Gragg, *Englishmen Transplanted,* 57.

Even so, the Barbadians continued to rely upon manly ideals of martial prowess to enact their loyalty to London and gain recognition for their status and liberties. Usefulness in arms, they hoped, would demonstrate them as men of worth and attain dispensations on trade restrictions and taxes. Therefore, beginning with the wars against the Dutch in the 1660s, the planters declared their enthusiasm to fight for the Crown regardless of their disputes. When called on in 1667, for example, the Barbadians "speedily advanced...the immediate setting forth a fleet of ships for his Majesty's honor and Interest." The planters would perform their masculine and national duty. However, they did so with selfish motivations. In declaring their willingness to sacrifice for the empire, they alluded to their chief "Mission of Sugar" and referenced the King's "Gracious Letter...confirming of their Just rights and Liberties." The planters called it "the foundation of their cheerful and ready aide." They implied that Barbados would provide much needed military service to the empire but only if they felt the Crown respected their autonomy and "liberty" as elite men. They would serve, but only as members of the Empire, not subjects to it.[8] The planters enacted nationalism through arms, which accorded with their sense of manhood. But they expected it to pay dividends for their standing and freedom.

The planters' new approach led to increasing involvement with imperial military conflicts through the rest of the century. They seized many opportunities to glorify virtuous violence and claim honor in battles against the Dutch and French. In the process, they continued to emphasize valor as essential to masculinity and it became

[8] TNA, CO, 31/1, pp. 109

further a part of their Atlantic identity. For instance, when a Dutch force took Suriname and joined with the French, intending "many Murth and Rapes" [*sic*] for the English at Nevis, "the only Island then left untaken" other than Barbados. Together with "all the forces" from the French Windward Islands, the Dutch worked toward their goal. The English, only through sufficiently bold action, managed to thwart their designs. Barbadians later praised Sir John Berrie, who "engaged them so smartly that they were forced to" seek shelter back on St. Christopher.[9] Outside Nevis in 1667, the Barbadian leadership again trumpeted their bravery, tellingly attached to national pride. They had "behaved like Englishmen," which carried the implied claim that English males were inherently bolder than their counterparts. Therefore, engaging "20 men-of-war" from France with only "10 able ships and a fire-ship" on their side, they nonetheless won the day. One vessel from Bristol took heavy losses when it blew "up by her own powder" and lost "most of her seamen and 30 soldiers." With a subtle insinuation that victory had come only through the effective service offered by his colonial squadron, William Willoughby explained that the remaining Barbadian fleet "beat the enemy before them to the very shore of St. Christopher's." Willoughby believed their foes to "have sustained considerable loss" in the fray while bragging about losing only twenty-four soldiers with "28 wounded." The governor wished to pursue the French further, only held back by "wanting" supplies. Willoughby was certain that if they received the reinforcements England had promised, he "would not doubt to make all places English between

[9] TNA, CO 1/42, pp. 79.

Barbados and Porto Rico."[10] His confidence advanced Barbadians' continuing efforts to associate themselves with martial prowess and usefulness. It directed them toward greater involvement in imperial wars.

The few historians who explore Barbados in the Dutch Wars tend to focus on economic concerns or broad political issues.[11] Carl and Roberta Bridenbaugh, for instance, discussed the war for its effect on agricultural output on the island. The Barbadians fought, as in most accounts, to protect their precarious geopolitical position and estates. They needed to buttress the English forces in the region to prevent losing control of the island. For Christian Koot, the war was important for the way it devastated the planters' economic situation and strained relations with London, which offered little aid aside from a temporary softening of the Navigation Acts. The war put the planters in a difficult position. They had to "guard instead of planting" and "the people of Barbados still had but a 'scantity of bread to put in their mouthes.'" [*sic*] Into the third Anglo-Dutch War, (1672-74) Willoughby pleaded that since "the Island of Barbados doth not furnish of its own growth one quarter of Victuals sufficient for its inhabitants" and England could not supply them in this time of war, London should suspend the Navigation Acts, allowing free trade. The Crown gave them little satisfaction in this request during the Dutch campaigns. Even a softening of Navigation laws, as Koot noted, came with other measures that lessened Barbadian autonomy.[12]

---

[10] TNA, CO 1/21, pp. 92-95.

[11] See, for example, Larry Gragg, *Englishmen Transplanted*; Gary Puckrein, *Little England*; Richard Dunn, *Sugar and Slaves: The Rise of the Planter class in the English West Indies, 1624-1713* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1972).

[12] Most scholars of the general conflict in the Caribbean, like Wim Klooster and Gijs Rommels, have focused on the mercantile or imperial aspects of the conflict. Gijs Rommelse, *The Second Anglo-Dutch*

While economic goals indeed dominated the colonists' concerns, their unprecedented willingness to fight for the empire anyway and choice to emphasize bravery speaks to the role of manhood in shaping their strategies in this period. In 1666, the Dutch took the English settlement of Suriname (a colony settled mainly by Barbadians) with a fleet of just seven ships. The planters viewed the loss of Suriname, as resulting from a failure of masculine bravery. Having no respect for the Dutch troops, the governor saw defeat as undermining the manhood of the English. William Willoughby later chastised the men there, having "pitifully" surrendered "without resistance" to "brewers and cheesemongers." The Dutch were tradesmen, not proper soldiers. True Englishmen should have been able to defeat them handily. The commander, Lieutenant–General William Byam, had initially demonstrated the bravado expected by his peers. In answer to demands for surrender, he boasted "that he was commanded to keep this fort, which he would endeavor to do against all opposers, and 'so you may act your hostility as soon as you please'." Eventually, however, the Lt.-General surrendered "after two or three hours' fight...having but 50 pounds of powder left." To preserve some measure of dignity, Byam agreed to surrender if he and his soldiers were allowed to "march forth with their arms and flying colors." Byam made a practical decision, choosing not to sacrifice all his men in a futile effort, aware that his forces were in ill health. Settled at great expense to Francis Willoughby, his brother and

---

War; Wim Klooster *The Dutch Moment*; Bridenbaughs, *No Peace Beyond the Line,* 211; R.H. Schomburgk, *The History of Barbados* (London: Brown, Green and Longman's, 1848). Quotes from Christian Koot, *Empire and the Periphery: British Colonists, Anglo-Dutch Trade, and the Development of the British Atlantic, 1621-1713* (New York: New York University Press, 2012), 98. Koot also provides additional context for the Anglo-Dutch war and relations with the homeland, including the planters use of them to mitigate the navigation acts.

heir, William, took the loss personally. William Willoughby used Byam's refusal to fight as the pretext to ostracize him from elite Barbadian society, his late brother having trusted Byam with the colony's defense. Willoughby even arrested and brought Byam up on criminal charges. The new governor prevailed on the Assembly to indict him "with Disloyalty to his Prince," calling upon expectations for a high level of "personal bravery" in battle.[13] Surrender, even to avoid bloodshed against a superior force, failed the standards of masculine behavior and reflected poorly on the group. Byam had no choice but to appeal to the Crown, which he hoped would take a more sympathetic view. The loss had destabilized Barbados's geopolitical position even further and reflected poorly on the reputation of the planters.[14] Through an attack on his manhood, the Barbadians cast Byam out. As they did, they reinforced martial prowess as central to masculine worth and used it to motivate greater diligence against England's enemies in the region. Barbadians would not accept anything sort of a readiness to die to guard against invasion. To do otherwise was cowardice.

Emphasizing martial bravery in this way, the planters of Barbados further entrenched it as fundamental to patriarchal manhood. A shrinking geo-political position had led them to accentuate masculine qualities that might meet the challenge. Bound up with imperial efforts, it became tied to nationalist ideals. But the planters continued

---

[13] "A Narrative of the taking the English Colony Surynam by the Zealand Foote." TNA, CO 1/21, pp. 42.
[14] TNA, CO 1/21, pp. 183. "Prompted by Robert Sanford, Byam's old 'inveterate and malicious enemy'," Byam letter, HMC, (Historical Manuscripts Commission), vol. 3, 309. Byam was eventually acquitted of the charges. Francis Willoughby funded the conquest and settlement of the colony at great personal expense, as much as martial valor this proved the root of his aggressive prosecution of Byam; yet, he relied upon expectations of bravery to accomplish his indictment. For more on Suriname and Willoughby's efforts there, see See Matthew Parker, *Willoughbyland: England's Lost Colony* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 2017), 219-232.

to lean on manhood tied to military violence, as much as patriotism, to encourage behavior that would support their power. They, for instance, had criticized the leader of St. Christopher, William Watts, for being "more generous than prudent." The island was split between French and English sides and Watts "gave forth notice...to the French inhabiting the said Island three days time for submission to him on some hard terms" during the Dutch conflict. His peers in Barbados, though, felt the proper move, him "being far inferior in strength" to his enemies, would have been a bold, surprise attack. In their estimation, a lack of bravery and valor, not his smaller numbers, had lost the island. Francis Willoughby, therefore, had stripped him of his commission.[15] Martial prowess and an inclination to sacrifice for English territory were becoming more and more necessary to elite masculinity.

Thanks to increasingly vocal efforts to broadcast victories like the one over de Ruyter, martial service and bravery became foundational to the planters' Atlantic identity. The poem from 1666 had praised the Barbadians' "bravery" to a wide English audience. Into the late-1670s, the planters continued to hearken back to their success as a reminder of their masculine capability and fitness to rule. Following a "general Rising" of enslaved Africans in 1675, for instance, another anonymous author wrote an exalting account of the island and its "noble" leadership. Attempting to dissuade notions that they were unequipped to keep the island's populace in obedience, he began by reminding his audience in England of the great fort that stood watch over Carlisle Bay. It had, after all, "40 Guns, whose war Mouths spoke Terror to *De Ruyter* in his Attempt." A

[15] TNA, CO 1/42, pp. 79.

decade on and the fort still “saluted” a “stranger's Eye” and “reassured the apprehensive visitor.” The author intended to assure English readers that nothing was amiss in Barbados. The planters' capacity for violence was the root of the island's “Pleasant Prospect,” in the account. He implicitly connected to the broader idea that martial valor spoke to masculine quality. The planters were men of worth, “commendable” because their forts could and had kept the island safe. The firm hand of the militia had repulsed the Dutch and could so deal with the few “ungrateful wretches (who...confess to live better in servitude [in Barbados], then in Liberty in their own Native Country).” Forts and capable officers stood as symbols of the planters' authority. The victory over de Ruyter served as an important reference point for cultivating that reputation. It was the basis on which the planters worked to brush aside a massive “Cunningly and Clandestinely carried” conspiracy of slaves.[16]

The Barbadians attached their Atlantic identity to martial bravery through the era. Island Colonel, Robert Rich, for instance, took offense when a book by Dr. Peter Heylan suggested that “the Plantations made by the *English*” were held “at the Courtesie of the *Spaniard*, without whose Leave and Liking, [Barbadians were] not of Force to hold it.” For Rich, the idea that they lived in Barbados at only because the Spanish allowed them to offended his masculine honor and was “also much to the Dishonour of the English Nation.” As such, in 1670, Rich had felt it his duty to insert his “own observations,” which centered around the Fort, “Standing on Nedhams Point” and

[16] Anon., *Great Newes from the Barbados* (London: Printed for L. Curtis, 1676), 4. For more on the conspiracy, see below, as well as Jerome Handler, “Slave Revolts and Conspiracies in Seventeenth-Century Barbados,” *New West Indian Guide* 56, no. 1/2 (1982): 5-42. De Ruyter went on to Monteserrat. He then attacked a fishery at Newfoundland before returning home to “a hero's welcome.” See Gijs Rommelse, *The Second Anglo-Dutch War*, 137.

its “Great Guns” that ensured no enemy could “do the Ships or the Town injury.” Moreover, Rich explained, the “standing Militia” was ever “in readiness to meet together on all occasions, and which at other times are often and well Disciplined.” After giving a (probably exaggerated account) of the island's regiments of horse and foot, he quipped, “you may easily apprehend how little of truth there is in that Saying, '*That we hold this Island at the Courtesie of the Spaniards*'.” Indeed, referencing the superior prowess of Englishmen, he noted how even “those few English in Jamaica give the Spaniards such work to defend themselves.” Surely, the well-fortified and better-established Barbadians would have no trouble doing the same, he implied.[17] In this way, the planters ensured that those abroad did not underestimate their manliness, tied to their ability and will to defend the colony by violence. Regardless of their other motives, participation in the imperial wars and the propaganda that accompanied it advanced the centrality of martial violence to elite masculinity and became essential to the island's reputation abroad into the last quarter century.

“No Punishment too Terrible”

The slave conspiracy of 1675 led the planters to place greater emphasis on the use of violence to achieve patriarchal control within the island as well. Jerome Handler and others have pointed to discovery of the slave plot as the catalyst for a string of laws to better shore up planter control. Linford Fisher, for instance, argued that it led to an update on the 1661 slave code. Specifically, it targeted the ability of Africans to meet and plot “on Saturday Nights Sundays or other Holy-days.” Though this language

[17] Quotes are from copy of Rich's account in John Ogilby, *America: being the latest, and most accurate description of the New World* (London: Printed by John Ogilby, 1671), 378-379.

mirrored the 1661 Act, the new law included some additional restrictions. No Africans could hold a public meeting or feast, beat drums, blow horns, or play loud instruments of any kind. Aside from increasing constraints on slaves, though, Handler argued that a militia act of 1676 was also in direct response to the preceeding conspiracy. The Assembly passed at least fifteen Acts concerning the militia before 1699, which centered on codifying elite male responsibilities in supporting the force and the necessity of violence to guard against rebellion. These acts represented a growing anxiety about slave revolt and the necessity of violence for preventing it.[18]

The racial implications of the 1675 conspiracy gave white supremacy a more decisive role in the planters' reaction to it than previous such occasions. The "Cormantee or Gold-Coast Negroes," for three years, had worked "Cunningly and Clandestinely" at a plot, which they "kept secret, even from the knowledge of their own Wives." The plan had not been simply about revenge on their enslavers. Making it the more terrifying to whites was that it more closely resembled a black *coup-d'état.* The conspirators did not plan to overthrow the planters' system with a more egalitarian world but had chosen a King, a man named Coffee (or perhaps Cuffy from the West African or Akan name for Friday, according to Handler). Coffee would be "Chair of State," replete with his very own locally-crafted throne.[19] The slaves involved in the conspiracy were not lashing out in a fit of rage at an abusive master. They sought to

[18] 'Slave Code', TNA, CO 30/2, pp. 17. CO 31/2, pp. 193. See Linford Fisher, "'Dangerous Designes': The 1676 Barbados Act to Prohibit New England Indian Slave Importation." *William & Mary Quarterly* 71, no. 1 (2014): 110.

[19] Jerome Handler, "Slave Revolts," 16. Handler Notes the importance of a "chair of state" as "fundamental significance to the Ashanti and other Akan peoples as a symbol of political authority and group permanence and identity." Anon., *Great Newes from Barbados* (London: Printed for L. Curtis, 1676), 9-10.

usurp the planters' power altogether through a carefully organized plot. They would replace a white plantocracy with a black one.

The planters' worse fears lay before them. Atlantic accounts indicate that the 1675 scheme "*was a general Design amongst them the* [Coromantee] Negro's *to kill all the Baccararoes or White People in the Island within a fortnight*." Such a conspiracy would overturn the entire basis of the planters' identity and worldview. It challenged a supposed "natural" order – racial, economic, and gendered. The plot revealed the planters' precarious, arbitrary hold on power. Making matters worse, "some affirm[ed] they intended to spare the lives of the Fairest and Handsomest Women (their Mistresses and their Daughters) to be Converted to their own use." Such rhetoric could have been merely white fears. Certainly, at other times and places, whites used tropes of helpless women in the hands of 'barbarous' blacks to stoke racial animosity. Others believed that "they intended to Murder all the White People...Men as Women." Whatever the case, reports of the conspiracy stoked a state of racial fear and paranoia among the white population. By taking their plantations, their land, their means, and their wives, the conspirators would undo all that marked the planters as superior.[20]

The marriage of racial fear with existing patriarchal responsibilities to keep order facilitated a perceptible increase in elite violence against African slaves in the last quarter of the seventeenth century. Henry Drax had attested in his "instructions" that patriarchal violence aimed to "terrify others from" repeating behaviors that undermined

[20] Anon., *Great Newes from Barbados,* 10. See Sandra Gunning, *Race, Rape, and Lynching: The Red Record of American Literature, 1890–1912* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996). For an example of the ways slave conspiracies might be conflated through process of interrogation, see Peter Charles Hofer, *The Great New York Conspiracy of 1741: Slavery, Crime, and Colonial Law* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2003).

order. Both he and the slave code of 1661 had affirmed the need to use violence and prescribed varying degrees of punishment depending upon the severity of the crime and who committed it. However, each also placed restrictions on violent expressions of patriarchal power, aligning with English practices. Drax, for example, believed there was "no punishment too terrible" for theft. He explained, though, that such punishment should "not deprive the party of Either life or limbs" and one "must never punish either to satisfy [his] own anger or passion." Extreme cases of insubordination like insurrection appeared to overcome such restraint. The planters indeed sought to leave no doubt that a sufficient amount of "terror" had been enacted to deter future attempts. "After strict and due Examination of the matter of Fact of their Conspiracy, at first seventeen were found guilty and Executed." Rather than a hanging, like a common criminal, or firing squad, like a court-martial, "Six [were] burnt alive, and Eleven beheaded." In England, such deaths were reserved for the worst crimes, heresy and treason respectively. Driving home the planters' intent to use this violence to "terrify others," though, they also had the "dead bodies...dragged through the streets, at *Spikes [Bay]* a pleasant Port–Town in that Island, and were afterwards burnt with those that were burned alive." The brutality used against these conspirators sent a loud message about the planters' belief in violence as a means to project patriarchal authority.[21] Fear about large-scale, general

[21] Anon., *Great Newes*. Drax, "Instructions." Henry Drax, "Instructions I would have observed by Mr. Harwood in the management of my plantation," (probably written in 1679), Rawlinson MSS, A 348, folio 7, Bodlein Library, Oxford University, in Peter Thompson, "Sources and Interpretations: Henry Drax's Instructions on the Management of a Seventeenth-Century Barbadian Sugar Plantation," *The William and Mary Quarterly* 66, no. 3 (2009): 565-604; Trevor Burnard, *Mastery Tyranny and Desire: Thomas Thistlewood and His Slaves in the Anglo-Jamaican World* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2004), 269. English precedent gave men of honor "franchise," that is freedom, from morality in punishments if it kept order. Mervyn James, for instance, noted of the medieval period that men of honor

insurrection or conspiracy in Barbados seemed to be unshackling whatever bonds existed on planter violence.

The extraordinary measures taken in response to the conspiracy speak to the planters' general faith in violence to keep order, but also the increasing role of race. As Susan Amussen has noted, such state punishments were "an important component of the exercise of power in early modern England." They sought to "emphasize the consensual and unifying power of the government," which might ease worry among the population about disorder. Trevor Burnard has noted of eighteenth-century Jamaica that such "terror [was] an instrument of rule."[22] Asserting patriarchal power in the sugar colonies meant violence on a grand scale. The executions in Barbados, accordingly, both reassured the public of the government's control over the situation and demonstrated the dividing lines between white and black people. The white population engaged in a sort of catharsis through the executions. At one point "the spectators observing cried out to *Tony*, [one of the defiant condemned] *Sirrah we shall see you fry bravely by and by*." They worked to dismiss this "sturdy Rogue," who stood by his "Country-men," refusing to name other conspirators. But Tony responded, "undauntedly, if you Roast me today, you cannot roast me tomorrow." The doomed man pointed to the limits of

---

had a responsibility to keep commoners in fear. It was the landed man's duty to "punish the wicked." Indeed, he argued, the essential nature of elite, male violence to keeping order freed him from considerations of Christian morality. James, "English Politics and the Concept of Honor," in *Society, Politics, and Culture: Studies in Early Modern England,* ed. Mervyn James (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1986), 375. For information on punishments in English World see Ralph A. Houlbrooke, *Death, Relition, and the Family in England, 1480-1750* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 25; Drew D. Gray, *Crime, Policing and Punishment in England, 160-1914* (London: Bloombury Academic, 2016).

[22] Susan Amusseen, "Punishment, Discipline, and Power: The Social Meanings of Violence in Early Modern England," *Journal of British Studies* 34, no. 1 (1995): 10. Trevor Burnard, *Mastery, Tyranny, and Desire,* 269.

violence for preventing future unrest and the enduring threat posed by what he called his "Country-men." His defiance highlights awareness, on both sides, of a clear racial divide and the inherent threat posed by the slave majority. The fear of another revolt was precisely the root of the planters' harsh punishment of the conspiracy. To assert their patriarchal power, Barbadian leaders claimed an unfettered control over the lives of black people in ways that were clearly becoming more attached to white supremacy.[23]

As anxieties increased about insurrection, the planters began to lift whatever restraints supposedly existed on their use of violence through more overtly racial justifications. An act of the Assembly in 1680 explained that "the said Negroes and other Slaves brought unto the People of this Island" possessed racial deficiencies. It criticized their "barbarous, wild and savage nature" that rendered "them wholly unqualified to be governed by the Laws [and] Customs...of our Nation." In other words, the planters explained that slaves were not capable or worthy of the liberty enjoyed by whites. Slaveholders, therefore, should not be bound to "custom," including restraint on violent discipline. Following its most stark pronunciation of black racial inferiority yet, through the next two decades the planters became more willing to kill in the preservation of social order. Following another conspiracy, Timothy Thornhill was said to wonder, "what

[23] England usually reserved burning for heresy and gendered crimes, like witchcraft or a wife who killed her husband. A different account heralded the "bloody Tragedy intended... by the Heathen the Negroes," but its veracity as been called into question. [Nathaniel Saltonstall], *A Continuation of the State of New-England: Being a Farther Account of the Indian Warr...Together with an Account of the intended Rebellion of the Negroes in the Barbados* (London: Printed by T. M., 1676), 19-20. For more analysis on the 1676 conspiracy and, particularly, the source issues and slim actual evidence see Jason Sharples, "Discovering Slave Conspiracies: New Fears of Rebellion and Old Paradigms of Plotting in Seventeenth-Century Barbados," *The American Historical Review* 20, no. 3 (June 2015): 811-843. Anon., *Great Newes from Barbados,* 12.

was it for Barbadoes to put twenty or thirty negroes to death yearly for example-sake?"[24] Thornhill spoke to a belief about the efficacy of violence to keep order, but only facing large-scale revolt and the decreasing value of black lives in white minds do we see the planters become inclined toward such mass execution. The cost of "twenty negroes" had become a small price to pay for the order and power the planters might gain. A 1676 law even adjusted punishments for old crimes in the wake of conspiracy. Rather than a "moderate whipping," as in 1661, runaway slaves were now to be executed. Fear about insurrection met racial distinctions, leading the planters to escalate the violence use to punish.[25]

To fulfill ideals of patriarchal order in a world seemingly beset by black conspiracy, the planters readily executed slaves through the 1680s. Consequently, the minutes of the Assembly are filled with notes about compensation to slave owners for executed slaves. In February 1686, for instance, Thomas Seawall petitioned for the "payment of two negroes" that had been executed "according to the laws of [the] island." "At a meeting 19 April 1687...it [was] resolved that several persons be paid for Negro executions." Again in July, the Assembly took the same course and in September 1687, paid William Siston "five and twenty pounds being for a negro of his that was Executed according to the laws of this island." Robert Turnity was paid twenty pounds Sterling for a negro man named Harry...that was executed pursuant to an Act of this Island," the "said negro" having cost Turnity "the use of his right hand by a blow given

[24] Richard Hall, *Acts, passed in the island of Barbados. From 1643, to 1762* (London: Printed for Richard Hall, 1764), 113. For the later laws, see Hall, *Acts,* 130; Handler, "Slave Revolts," 21. Joseph Besse, *A Collection of the Sufferings of the People Called Quakers*, Vol. II (London: Luke Hinde, 1689), 350.
[25] TNA, CO 31/2, 164-183. Handler, "Slave Revolts," 16.

him."[26] The readiness with which the Barbadians gave money for executed slaves speaks to the seriousness with which they took their mandate to enforce order violently. It also points to the lifting of restraint on disciplinary violence in this era.

"Being in Arms"

Fear over insurrection and invasion did not only lead to more warfare and the harsher treatment of slaves. It also meant greater insistence that all elite males participate in the violence that planters imagined kept the island in obedience. In the last quarter of the century, the island's leaders reiterated the necessity of participation in the militia and corrected perceived lapses in island defenses. Tellingly, one of new Governor Richard Dutton's first orders of business upon taking office in the 1680s was the island's military needs. Almost immediately after arriving, he appealed to London for, among other things, "forty guns for the armament of our forts." He would shortly also make a speech to the Assembly asking for increased funding to the militia, claiming that "the peril is the more pressing for we may soon be on ill terms with France and in case of war we shall feel its effects sooner than our friends at home…The enemy is one who will bite before he barks, so you must be on your guard at all times."[27] Dutton encouraged martial vigilance and depended upon individual male accountability. Soon members of the Assembly met in Bridgetown, along with Councilmember Sir Timothy Thornhill. Among other items, they "humbly pray[ed] that the act of Militia be revived"

[26] TNA, CO 31/4, pp. 22, 35, 49, 59, and 144.
[27] "Proposals of Sir Richard Dutton concerning Barbados," America and the West Indies: August 1683, Calendar of State Papers Colonial, 474; "Speech of Sir Richard Dutton to the Assembly of Barbados," America and the West Indies: April 1682, Calendar of State Papers Colonia, 486.

to more effectively preserve "the safety of this place."[28] As the planters' fears grew, they fell back on militia violence to protect themselves. Elite men had a duty to participate. In the process, the Assembly reinforced disciplinary violence and martial duty as central to patriarchal manhood.

Through new legislation, the planters sought to ensure military participation as obligatory to elite manhood and belonging. The extensive, revamped "Act of Militia" buttressed their ability to assert landowning male authority violently. As the 1685 law concluded, it would "better [preserve]" the island "in Case of foreign Invasion or any Intestine Domestick broyles [*sic*] disturbances or insurrections." They had only recently passed "An Act for the Settlement of the militia of this Island" in 1676 and "revived" it in 1682. Now they wanted something even "better." They lamented the "great Defects of late" in "Arms both offensive and Defensive." The Assembly warned that "unless some strict Course be taken for the speedy remedy thereof It may be justly feared that many will appear unusefull [*sic*] in time of need."[29] The planters turned to familiar tools of war and violence to ease trepidation over the uncertain variables in their lives. They considered a well-funded militia, manned by honorable, landowning men to be the cornerstone of their power and ability to control uncertainty.

Above all, the Act reinforced the necessity of military readiness as part of the duty of every landowning male. It focused on ensuring the collective participation of all "persons of quality," as the Assembly put it, in supporting the militia. Masculine worth

---

[28] BDA, *Journal of the Assembly of Barbados, from 13 Sept. 1684 to 17 May 1687*, (Barbados Museum and Historical Society), 5.

[29] BDA, "Act for the Settlement of the Militia of this Island," *Journal of the Assembly of Barbados, from 13 Sept. 1684 to 17 May 1687,* 77. CO 31/2, pp. 193. See William Rawlin, *The Laws of Barbados* (London, 1699), 230. A largely similar act to that of 1685 was passed in October 1697.

required military service. Barbados had a long history of enforcing militia service with laws dating back to the 1640s. For the most part, these concerned ensuring that planters supplied sufficient numbers to man the force, including provisions that every planter had to keep "such a number of white Servants as Law is directed, and...they [to] appear in Arms at all such times as they shall be required." Reflecting the troubled age, though, the 1685 act reinforced expectations that each planter also personally participate. The "Act of Militia" dictated that "no...person of quality soever...shall be freed or exempted from personally riding his own horse or otherwise being in Arms on Foot when thereunto required." To be elite carried the responsibility to not only support a militia, but physically defend the social order. Handler and others have connected the Act to discriminatory policies against pacifist Quakers, (see below); but it also reinforced more general ideals about masculine duty and bravery in the process. Every planter had to be prepared to undertake the violent defense of the island.[30]

The Act of Militia also advanced a layered social hierarchy rooted in the superiority denoted by martial bravery. It reiterated landownership as marking supremacy, but also connected social standing to usefulness in battle. For instance, it deemed "two Tenants" as equivalent to "Three common Freemen." Tenants could be counted on as offering proportionally greater service in the militia than "commoners." The planters found Irish, meanwhile, to be of "little value." These men were inferior because, rather than preserving the social order, they tended to ally with Africans in

[30] "Act for the Settlement of the Militia of this Island," 66-120. Katharine Gerbner, "The Ultimate Sin: Christianising Slaves in Barbados in the Seventeenth Century," *Journal of Slave and Post-Slave Studies* 31, no. 1 (2010: 57-73; Jerome Handler, "Slave Revolts."

revolt. Such understandings of merit had roots in England where, as LH Roper has pointed out, "the lord, by virtue of his holdings, had the responsibility of condescending to maintain order." Landownership, he argued, was presumed to tie one to the community in ways that tenanthood and servitude did not.[31] The Act of Militia cemented such understandings about hierarchy but also assigned them a specific military value, which connected it to manhood.

The Assembly reinforced martial valor as a marker of masculine worth. They even proved willing to raise one's standing for "honorable" service, regardless of their previous status. Defending the social order, no matter one's presumed stake in it, demonstrated masculine quality – at least for white servants. The 1685 law, for instance, dictated that "every servant that shall [engage the enemy with distinction] is hereby Declared a Freeman & to be absolutely held Free from all future service towards his Master or Mistress from & immediately." The planters "further Enacte[d] and Ordained [that] if in service aforesaid any Freeman or servant shall happen to be maimed or disabled by the enemy that the cure of the said Freeman or servant shall be

[31] The Irish made at least three attempts at armed resistance themselves in the 1630s and 1640s. Irish and Africans also engaged in small-scale maroonage together on the island, harboring "themselves in woods and caves, living upon pillage for many months together." Such maroonage was a more subtle subversion of the social order than revolt but one that the planters worried might be a breeding ground for a larger plot. See John Poyer, *The History of Barbados, from the First Discovery of the Island* (London: Printed for J. Mawman, 1808), 46; Jerome Handler, "Slave Revolts," 7; Richard Ligon, *A True and Exact History of the Island of Barbados,* (originally pubished 1657), ed. Karen O. Kupperman (Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Co., 2011), 96. For more on the implications of maroonage in the Americas see Richard Price, ed., *Maroon societies: rebel slave communities in the Americas* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996). Even in the 1690s, the Council noted, "a rising Design...by the Negroes, and a Combination of some white Servants with them to Destroy all their masters." Irish proved complicit in nearly all African conspiracies. TNA CO, 31/1, pp. 675-679. L.H. Roper, *The English Empire in America 1602-1658: Beyond Jamestown* (London: Routledge, 2009), 8. Act in William Rawlins, *The Laws of Barbados*, 212-213.

paid for and allowed...yearly out of the public treasury to maintain him during his life."[32] The ruling elite thus recognized and encouraged bravery among lesser men, though that service ultimately only protected elite authority. Their efforts reflected growing concern about black slave insurrection and foreign invasion, while further entrenching martial courage as central to manhood.

"Highly Necessary"

During a period in which the planters placed increasing emphasis on violence as a necessary performance of patriarchal manhood and belonging, landowning, but pacific, Quakers presented a growing threat. The Society of Friends preached pacifism and temperance. Many refused to serve in the militia or physically abuse subordinates. These ideas clashed with the dominant culture, making Friends the target of growing persecution in the last quarter of the century. In a period of precarious stability, Anglicans worked diligently to force Quaker conformity or cast them out of the ranks of elite men. They thereby might preserve the legitimacy of the dominant worldview, which saw violence as just and necessary. Far more than religious doctrine itself, the Quaker threat to good order served as the root of planter criticism. Most historians have focused on the practical and religious roots of the tensions between the two groups. Rather than a question of faith or power alone, though, the conflict between them had more to do with competing visions of masculinity. As Ann Little has noted of colonial New England, "men were called to battle...not just to serve state interests, but because it was a central duty of manhood." During times of war, anti-Quakerism was accordingly

[32] "Act for the Settlement of the Militia," 86.

revived.[33] In Barbados, the Quakers similarly rejected Anglican Barbadian masculinity, opening themselves up as targets, especially as concern over invasion and insurrection took hold.

A majority of Quakers owned slaves and land, making their beliefs and seeming critique of the dominant culture all the more troubling. More than eighty percent of Barbadian Friends owned property. They also often possessed disproportionately large amounts of land in various parishes. In St. Thomas and St. Peter, for example, Quakers held eleven percent of the acreage, along with twelve percent of the slaves. In St. James, Henry Freak was one of the larger landowners with 245 acres and 120 slaves. Indeed, many Quakers in the 1680 census owned over a hundred acres of land, a critical barometer for true elite status. The "considerable quantities" of slaves they owned, especially, presented issues for the planters' violent strategy for order, which depended on its acceptance by elite men.[34] Quakers were wealthy elites with a measure of potential political authority, making their rejection of dominant schemes for power the more threatening.

As elite males, in the Anglican viewpoint, Quaker landowners should have accepted the patriarchal responsibility to physically punish household disorder. Most planters saw power as depending upon a universal acceptance and execution of

---

[33] For detailed studies of Quakerism and the religious aspects of tensions between Quakers and Anglicans in Barbados see Larry Gragg, *Quaker Community on Barbados: Challenging the Culture of the Planter Class* (Columbia, MO: University of Missouri Press, 2009); Kristen Block, "Cultivating Inner and Outer Plantations: Profit, Industry, and Slavery in Early Quaker Migration to the New World," *Early American Studies, An Interdisciplinary Journal* 8, no. 3 (2010): 515-548. Ann Little*, Abraham in Arms: War and Gender in Colonial New England* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press)*,* 172-173.

[34] Larry Gragg *Quaker Community on Barbados*, 61. Calculation are made from from E.M. Shilstone, "Some early Records of the Friends in Barbados," (Research Notes, Barbados Museum and Historical Society).

violence by landowning men. Quaker ideology challenged dominant ideas about family governance. It spurned the use of violence to keep their slaves in line. In particular, George Fox taught his coreligionists in Barbados to "not use Cruelty" toward "their Negros." His vision for a benevolent planter class ran directly counter to the prevailing idea espoused by planters like Drax that violence was necessary. Quakers, like most Europeans at the time, considered African slaves to be "naturally inclined to Looseness and Wickedness." Instead of justifying violence, as among their Anglican counterparts, their supposed inferiority meant Quakers "believed it their indispensable Duty to set some Time apart to labor with them, and to instruct them in the Things of God: And in order thereunto, most Friends that had Negroes set apart an Hour or two once a Week, to instruct them." The Quaker slaveholders, according to Fox, "read the Scriptures to them, directing them to the inward Teacher, whereby they might be led out of Stealing, Murdering, Plotting, and out of their Uncleanness and Adultery." Quakers pursued a strategy for order that ran counter to dominant norms. Fox, meanwhile, not only advised his pupils to treat Africans more gently but "after certain years of Servitude" to "make them free." While not universally followed, many Quakers did pursue Fox's suggestions.[35]

As an extension of the dominant group, the island's Council and Assembly passed legislation specifically targeting Quakers for their rejection of the Anglicans' violent strategies for power. For "willfully [refusing]" to participate "in military affairs," for

[35] George Fox, *The Journal*, ed. Nigel Smith (London: Penguin, 1998), 131. Henry Drax, "Instructions," in Puckrein, *Little England*, 78-79. Richard Hall, *Acts*, 64. George Fox, *A Journal...of...George Fox* (London: Northcott, 1694), 354. Joseph Besse, *Sufferings,* 349.

example, the Assembly fined them, “as soldiers being lawfully summoned...500 (pounds) of sugar” for the first offense, 1000 pounds for the second, and 1000 pounds thereafter.” They imprisoned those who did not pay. Thomas Foster, one of the largest landowners among the Quakers in 1680 (133 acres), was arrested five times for refusing to send any servants (he owned no slaves) to serve in the militia. In 1673, he owed “for defaults of sending Men and Horses to the *Militia,* 4900lb. and for Priest's Wages, 3200lb. In all 8100lb.” The planters viewed militia violence as “highly necessary,” in the sardonic words of one critical Quaker.[36] They determined to force all men to support their plans for power, which included the mainstream Church. In the process, they reiterated the importance of violence to patriarchal manhood.

Influential Anglican planters worked to mark Quakers as outsiders in less formal ways as well. One, for instance, turned to the symbolic power of “fresh meat” to do so. In the 1690s, planter, colonel, Council member, and judge, Alexander Ruddock, “seemed not only to delight, but even to glory in” persecuting Quakers openly and publicly. According to Joseph Besse, who chronicled the Society of Friends' sufferings across the Atlantic World, “one of the People called Quakers had bought some fresh Meat in the Market.” As he “was paying the Butcher for it, [Ruddock] came and took away the Meat, saying, He would have it, and constrained the Butcher to break his Contract, saying 'The Quakers should not eat fresh Meat'.” As noted in Chapter Five of this work, beef was a marker of elite status and manhood. It was a symbol of authority and provided the “vigour” for armed combat, according to English understandings. Quakers refused to

[36] For law see TNA, CO 31/1, pp. 12. Joseph Besse, *Sufferings*, 318 & 350. For a response, see the petition by Quakers against the Act of militia placing “hardships” on them. TNA, CO 29/3, pp. 379.

participate in the violence of the militia, a duty the dominate Anglicans saw as essential. Ruddock resolved that they would therefore not enjoy the privileges afforded other elite males. Perhaps he considered it unnecessary for them to eat meat if they would not be exerting themselves through physical violence.[37] In any case, his forceful denial of this key marker of social position to Quakers represented an effort to denigrate Quaker masculine worth publically. By marking them as inferior, Ruddock might remedy the insult of Quakers' cultural critique of the dominant Barbadians.

In addition to his episode at the butchers, Alexander Ruddock "took many [additional] Opportunities" to assert the otherness of Quakers with his "persecuting Temper." Throughout the 1690s, Ruddock "appeared...very bitter and envious against [them]. He [once] caused a Friend to be rated four Hundred pound of Sugar towards Payment of the Priest's Wages, (who never had done anything for him) the Priest being the Colonel's Son-in-Law." When the Quaker complained, Ruddock, "to avenge himself on the Man...being Judge of the Quarter Sessions, fined him five pounds for not answering to perform the office of a Constable, and granted a Warrant for Distress, by which they took from him a Negro Woman."[38] Those who did not support the just use of violence, in Ruddock's view, belonged outside the slave-owning class.

Faced with the perceived threat of Quakerism, the planters responded with a characteristic aggression rooted in their manly ideals. The Quakers' refusal to participate

---

[37] Joseph Besse, *A Collection of the Sufferings,* 350. Long a ritualized activity, symbolic of standing and abundance, meat held powerful symbolic implications. LaCombe argued that food conveyed "meanings... about ecology, diplomacy, civility, gender, status, and power." Michael LaCombe, *Political Gastronomy: Food and Authority in the English Atlantic World* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2012), 8. Richard Ligon notes of the 1640s that servants were permitted four barrels of beef and four of pork each year for 30 of them. Richard Ligon, *A True and Exact History*, 188.

[38] Joseph Besse, *Sufferings*, 350.

in the militia not only challenged good order but specifically the basis of the authority of military officers. It is little wonder that those most vested in a martial identity and whose power most depended on reverence for martial valor seemed to detest them the most. Quaker observers, for example, dubbed militia Major-General Sir Timothy Thornhill "a Man who wanted not Will to have persecuted the *Quakers* to Death, as he often threatened: A Man full of Wickedness and blasphemous Discourse, of whom it may be said, *he neither feared God nor Man*, as appeared by his Words and Actions." Speaking to the wide-ranging power Barbadian society granted to militia leaders, "at the Time when the *Articles of War* [against France] were published in the island, he swore desperately, that 'Now he had Power." He vowed to use it, not only against his French enemies but those he viewed as equally dangerous. "The first Time an Enemy appeared, he would [use the pretext to] hang the Quakers" that he despised.[39] Thornhill gained standing and presumed an absolute power through his militia leadership. He set himself to the task of violently dealing with those who did not recognize or support the clout his prowess gave him. Threats of violence accorded with his understanding of masculine honor – a perception shared by his peers.

Pacifism among landowning elites proved problematic enough, but Anglican planters saw it as doubly threatening that Friends insisted on converting African slaves to Quakerism. As Katharine Gerbner has shown in her work on the subject, the Barbadians moved "from hesitant discomfort...to [a] virulent rejection" of Christianizing slaves by 1680. She blamed, in particular, the 1675 attempted rebellion, which planters

[39] Joseph Besse, *Sufferings,* 351.

accused Quakers of inciting. Many Anglicans believed Friends would teach slaves to "rebel." The planters saw Fox's non-conforming, leveling ideas as carrying a dangerous message about social hierarchy. Preached to white servants and black slaves alike, it seemed to encourage a conception of society that placed women and the poor on equal footing with elite males, undermining the ideological basis of male Barbadian superiority and patriarchal power.[40]

Quakers and Anglican Barbadians viewed the effects of slave conversion very differently. Fox reminded Friends that "the Gospel is preached to every creature under heaven; which is the power that giveth liberty and freedom, and is glad tidings to every captivate created under the whole heavens." Liberty of the soul was no different for a black person than anyone else, though it did not necessarily require freedom of the body. For Anglican planters, though, talk of slave "liberty" and "freedom" seemed subversive. The Barbadian slaveholders worried that Quakerism might encourage slaves to "cut their throats."[41] Fox called this a "slander and Lye," arguing that he taught slaves "to be Sober, and to Fear God, and to love their Masters and Mistresses, and to be Faithful and Diligent in their Masters' Service and Business; and that then their Masters and Overseers will Love them, and deal Kindly and Gently with them." However, the

[40] For more on Quakerism's ideology and history in the Americas see Thomas Hamm, *Quakerism in America* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003). Katerine Gerbner, "The Ultimate Sin," 57-73.
[41] In Hilary Hinds, *George Fox and Early Quaker Culture* (New York: Manchester University Press, 2011), 21; George Fox, "To Friends beyond Sea, that have Blacks and Indian Slaves," (1657) in *Selections from the Epistles of George Fox*, second edition, ed. Samuel Tuke (London: Edward Marsh, 1848), 63. See also Brycchan Carey, "'The Power that Giveth Liberty and Freedom':" The Barbadian Origins of Quaker Antislavery Rhetoric, 1657-76," *ARIEL* 38, no. 1 (2007): 27-47. Joseph Besse, *Sufferings,* 244.

Barbadian elites continued to believe "that [he] should teach the Negroes to Rebel."[42] Fox's doctrine emphasized rejecting the very things that the other planters deemed of the utmost importance to their success, unfettered access to violence justified by the innate and irredeemable inferiority of servants and slaves.

The Anglican planters thus moved to prevent the Quaker conversion of Africans, which seemed to contain dire implications. In 1676, as Handler and Katharine Gerbner have pointed out, the Barbadian Council passed "An Act to prevent the People called Quakers from bringing their Negroes to their meetings" in direct response to the previous year's conspiracy. The penalty for allowing slaves at meetings was the forfeiture of each slave (or ten pounds), an attempt to remove the potential rebel from the root of his supposed temptation.[43] If Quakers insisted on stoking the threat of rebellion through the conversion of slaves, the Anglican planters would remove the slave from their care. Doing so undermined the Quaker's masculinity, by infringing upon his patriarchal rights and placing his dependents in the care of another man.

In presenting an alternative approach to social order and slavery, the Quakers challenged the legitimacy of the violence other Barbadians wielded. The fundamental differences in how the two groups viewed the maintenance of power led to increasing tensions through the turbulent years between 1675 and the end of the century. The planters continued utilizing strategies that involved fear and unfettered brutality. They viewed moral questions about their actions as dangerous. The Quakers faced growing

---

[42] Fox, *Journal*, ed. Smith, 69 & 137. See Hilary Hinds, *George Fox and Early Quaker Culture* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2011), 22.
[43] Joseph Besse, *Sufferings,* 249. Katharine Gerbner, "The Ultimate Sin;" Jerome Handler, "Slave Revolts."

persecution that degraded their manhood as the dominant planters enforced their own worldview. As a result, few Friends remained by the 1720s, many leaving their estates behind for friendlier confines in Pennsylvania.[44] The Anglican planters sought to undermine the Quaker's masculinity and, by extension, the perceived critique of their own. The relentless persecution of the Quakers sent a message that violence and, in particular, military service was a necessary performance of elite manhood in Barbados. The planters thus reinforced violence as central to their masculinity and collective identity.

Conclusion

Into the second half of the seventeenth century, the planters continued to organize their identity around masculine ideals of violence. In the Dutch Wars, they reaffirmed that they deserved to rule Barbados because of their superior manhood tied to martial prowess. Patriarchal violence remained the chief means of exerting authority against servants and slaves on the island as well. Slave conspiracies and international warfare in this period threatened their hold on power. In response, the planters relied on an increasing level of violence, attached to nationalism and race. Participation in violence became, not only expected but demanded of all "persons of quality" whatsoever. Pacifist Quakers challenged the violence at the heart of dominant, male culture. However, the planters worked, through legislation and everyday action, to ensure their vision of masculinity won out.

[44] For more on the Quakers in Barbados see Kristen Block, "Cultivating Inner and Outer Plantations: Profit, Industry, and Slavery in Early Quaker Migration to the New World"; Jenny Shaw, *Ordinary Lives in the Early Caribbean: Religion, Colonial Competition, and the Politics of Profit* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2012); Brycchan Carey and Geoffrey Plank, eds., *Quakers and Abolition* (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2014).

Conclusion

Throughout the seventeenth century, the planters of Barbados rooted their colonial project in violence. Brutal modes of discipline projected power over servants and slaves. Militia action safeguarded the island from foreign invasion. The island's courts and Assembly enacted stringent, public punishments on those who threatened good order. Importantly, each type of violence achieved key ideals of manhood. Control of the extended household spoke to masculine worth. Fighting in the militia displayed manly bravery and courage. Protecting the social hierarchy through judicial violence fulfilled the duty of elite, landowning men. Individually and through the colonial government, the planters encouraged elite male participation in violence, which they viewed as necessary to their authority. An attachment to masculine ideals justified it. In turn, violence became the defining component of elite manhood on the island.

Masculinity provided a language of power that elite Barbadians adapted to the unique circumstances of the Caribbean and plantation slavery. English ideas merged with colonial dispositions, goals, and context to create a unique basis of power. Already at work before sugar arrived on the scene, excesses of drinking and violence, a reverence for martial valor, and a sense of their privileges as landowning men formed the heart of elite masculine culture. Couched in English traditions, the planters' manly ideals legitimized their supremacy over subordinate groups and became a means to claim standing in the Atlantic World.[1] The colonists continued to define and amend markers of elite manhood and set up structures to guarantee their authority as

[1] See Hilary Beckles, *The First Black Slave Society: Britain's Barbarity Time in Barbados* (Cave Hill: The University of the West Indies Press, 2016).

circumstances around them changed. Eventually, race became predominant alongside gender. However, the same underlying values and understandings about their "natural" right to power as landowning males remained.

The Barbadian planters' strategies for power evolved through the first fifty years of settlement in response to internal and external change. Manhood played a central role. As the metropole took a more active interest in colonial affairs, the planters found themselves fighting for autonomy by, for instance, emphasizing their "courage."[2] The African majority increased along with planter affluence in the 1650s. Elite Barbadians used growing wealth to engage in hospitality that spoke to their manly quality and highlighted their superiority over servants and slaves. New legislation in the 1660s codified and bolstered assumptions about their patriarchal rights, as London began to scrutinize their labor practices. Growing fears over slave insurrection in the 1670s and 1680s led to an increasing emphasis on disciplinary violence and escalated the use of capital punishments. Elite colonists aimed always to protect their power, a goal for which English masculine ideals proved especially useful. Applied in the unique context of Caribbean slavery and tending toward extremes of violence, the planters ultimately cultivated a distinct vision of manhood they felt might best accomplish their objective. A violent masculinity proved foundational to their authority.

Manhood remained essential to the power structure and systemic violence of Barbados into the eighteenth century. As Hilary Beckles put it, "the tendency to

---

[2] See, for example, Nicholas Foster, *A Briefe Relation of the horrid rebellion acted in the island Barbadas, in the West Indies* (London: Printed by John Grismond for Richard Lowndes, 1650), 22. Francis Willoughby, "A Declaration of my Lord Willoughby Lieutenant-General and Governor of Barbados," February 18, 1651, TNA, CO Item 1837, Vol. 1 (1574-1660), pp. 357.

privilege race above gender as an analytical category has no basis...in the logic and culture of the slave mode of production."[3] New racial ideas added to an existing power structure, rooted in gender. White supremacy provided cover for the planters to continue engaging in (and escalating) the violent pursuit of patriarchal authority, which they already presumed to be fundamental to their masculinity. Manhood is thus essential to the story of Barbadian colonialism and the formation of its government and economic structures, including the evolution of racialized slavery. Better understanding its foundation and adaptation, prior to the arrival of assertive racial views, adds to a sense of how the structures of slavery grew out of existing English ideas about landowning men and their (potentially violent) patriarchal authority.

"Inhumanities to which they are naturally prone"

By about 1680, race was becoming more central to elite Barbadian identity and power, alongside gender. The planters came to see "whiteness" as an essential aspect of their innate superiority. Enslaved Africans had made their determination to challenge the Anglo-Barbadian elite's exclusive claims to power apparent. Most starkly, a succession of slave conspiracies revealed that African men sought to overthrow their masters and assume control of the island's plantations and women. White Barbadians began transforming a relatively vague belief about their superiority as landed males into the articulation of distinct new racial categories tied to skin color. Spurred by the twin forces of slave insurrection and outside criticism of slave practices, they slowly

[3] Hilary Beckles, "Sex and Gender in the Historiography of Caribbean Slavery," in *Engendering History: Caribbean Women in Historical Perspective*, eds. V. Shepherd, B. Brereton, and B. Bailey (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 1995), 138

cultivated and articulated a vision of white superiority that they had never fully expressed in the past. The planters gave greater status to poor whites and developed stricter laws and punishments for Africans. They also started to use more severe anti-black language. The Assembly had adopted the position that blacks had an innate, immutable inferiority. It had become, in the Assembly's view, "absolutely necessary, that such other Constitutions, Laws, and Orders, should be in this Island....enacted...as both restrain the disorders, rapines and inhumanities to which they are naturally prone and inclined." They would thus need to be regulated the more closely because innate flaws made them irrevocably dangerous. Conspiracies of the 1680s and 1690s would, accordingly, result in similar legislative pronouncements about racial distinctions between blacks and whites. The threat of rebellion to good order thus encouraged a harsh racial assessment, setting the stage for unprecedented new means of pursuing obedience. Race helped justify the planters' ongoing use of slave labor and the increasing violence they undertook to keep control.[4]

Race exaggerated distinctions in the violence used against slaves and the, still regular, patriarchal punishment of whites. Increasingly, the planters removed all pretext to abiding by English cultural limits on discipline when it came to African slaves. To borrow Trevor Burnard's term, they "unbridled" violence. Where masculine duty once

---

[4] Hall, *Acts,* 113. For an example of later laws, see Hall, *Acts,* 130; Jerome Handler, "Slave Revolts," 21. See Chapter Seven and Jerome Handler, "Slave Revolts and Conspiracies in Seventeenth-Century Barbados," *New West Indian Guide* 56, no. 1/2 (1982): 5-42. For full exploration of how the planters responded to conspiracies, see Chapter Six and Seven. For examples of racial ideological change see the justifications made for the "act for the governing of Negroes" in Richard Hall, *Acts Passed in the Island of Barbados* (London: Richard Hall, 1764), 113. For more on the legal innovations that attended state formation and "legitimizing violence" through racial degradation in early slave regimes, see Daragh Grant, "'Civilizing' the Colonial Subject: The Co-Evolution of State and Slavery in South Carolina, 1670-1739," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 57, no. 3 (07, 2015): 606-636.

justified physical punishments, some patriarchal restraint seemed to follow. But, as the work of historians like David Brion Davis and Burnard have made clear, astonishing new levels of violence (even in a violent early-modern world) attended the solidification of white supremacy. The planters' goal was still "good order" and patriarchal authority, but they seemed to drop the pretext of responsibility and care. Punishments of slaves in the 1680s included "Emasculating and Beheading, their *cropping off their Ears* (which they usually cause the Wretches to broil, and then compel to eat them themselves); their *Amputations of Legs,* and even Dissecting them alive."[5] A more sadistic conception of authority replaced the comparative judiciousness of the early century. The planters moved from the symbolic subordination of slave manhood to the literal removal of their genitalia. They would no longer abide ambiguity. An apparently new level of cruelty reflected a slave-owning cultural environment that felt no moral obligation toward the

[5] As Alden T. Vaughan has pointed out of North America, scholar David Grimsted has noted a palpable "absence from the American record of any clear argument for the innate inferiority of blacks before 1776" and referenced George M. Fredrickson, who claimed "that in the seventeenth century 'there was little or no overt sense that biological race or skin color played a determinative role in making some human beings absolute masters over others'." Vaughan, *Roots of American Racism: Essays on the Colonial Experience* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995), 57. Vaughan also articulated the way that English metropolitans seemed generally less opposed to the idea blacks were "truly human" by the 1680s – even though Godwyn heard "'divers even in *England*" defend the "*monstrous opinion*" that blacks were brutes rather than humans." Vaughan explains that it was in part "because Englishmen at home suffered less from the psychological insecurities that seem to have fostered exploitation and cruelty" in Barbados. By contrast, in Barbados, Godwyn observed that racial views about blacks had grown into a near universal ideology of inferiority. Alden T. Vaughan, *Roots of American Racism,* 66. Jermone Handler has attributed a change in attitude to slave conspiracies. Handler, "Slave Revolts." For more on the development of race in American slavery, see John Sweet, *Bodies Politic: Negotiating Race in the American North, 1730–1830* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2003); James Stewart, *Venture Smith and the Business of Slavery and Freedom* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2010); David Ericson, *The Debate Over Slavery: Antislavery and Proslavery Liberalism in Antebellum America* (New York: New York University Press, 2000). For a complication of the planters' development of racial ideology, see Simon P. Newman, *A New World of Slavery: The Development of Plantation Slavery in the British Atlantic* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2016). Newman acknowledges the role of ideologies that allowed for brutality against white servants as foundational to the violence of plantation slavery. Joseph Besse, *A Collection of the Sufferings of the People Called Quakers*, Vol. II (London: Luke Hinde, 1689), 350. Morgan Godwyn, *A Supplement to the Negro's and Indians Advocate* (London, 1681), 10.

enslaved on the fact of their race and chattel status. Increasingly anxious about the need to assert their masculine supremacy, brutality grew in kind.

"Coeorians"

Jack Greene has noted how, during the 1660s and 1670s Barbados began to acquire a more positive image abroad. As evidence, in 1708, Oldmixon offered that "more of that Island [had been] Knighted by the Kings of *England,* than of all the rest of the English Plantations in *America,*" including "13 Baronets and Knights." The planters' movement upward in English society, he accounted, was the result of their "Industry," (meaning wealth). Oldmixon wished to show that the "common Reflection made upon the Plantations, as to the Meanness of the Planters Origins, is groundless as to *Barbadoes*." He went on to account them as well-off as "many of [the] Nobility and Gentry, of the first Rank in *England*." "Wealth and Pleasure" had made their way to this distant land. However, it was not economic success alone that brought this change of opinion.[6] The Barbadians had intentionally cultivated laws, political institutions, and a refined culture of metropolitan luxury to insinuate themselves as English elites. They used formal institutions to stabilize their world and create a sense of living in a "Little England." A patriarchal ideology tied to English ideals, meanwhile, supported their claims to power and status. These efforts, over the years, more than just the acquisition of wealth, became the basis to refute metropolitan criticisms.

[6] Jack Greene, Jack P. Greene, "Changing Identity in the British Caribbean: Barbados as a Case Study," in *Colonial Identity in the Atlantic World, 1500-1800* ed. Nicholas Canny and Anthony Pagden (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1987), 226. Oldmixon, *The British Empire in America*, Vol. II (London: Printed for John Nicholson), 110-112.

Full acceptance as elite Englishmen, though, was never forthcoming for most planters. Oldmixon, despite his compliments of the island, remained unsure how to equate the planters with English gentry. He wondered, despite their wealth, which could "maintain several Families...how much more such a Man is useful than an *English* mere Country Gentleman." He left it to the "reader...to judge of it as he thinks fit." Additionally, the author noted that the former "Hospitality [of the previous century was] almost lost there, the Gentlemen learning in *England* to keep their good things to themselves." The generosity with which the planters' once hoped to engender good will among metropolitans had fallen away – perhaps because it did not work. While living on the island, the colonists never enjoyed the belonging or political rights and privileges they expected. The exigencies of colonial life, including slavery and their independent economic goals, drove an inescapable wedge between themselves and the homeland. As they performed English ideals of manhood toward colonial aims, often entailing excessive violence and drinking, the planters of Barbados created a distinct masculinity that London's leaders did not necessarily recognize as their own. In the end, it stood in the way of them rising beyond "mere Country gentlemen."[7]

As the eighteenth century drew near, many of the wealthiest planters moved back to England. Dunn noted that, even by 1680, many "big planters" lived in Europe. They maintained their estates in the colony through overseers. Henry Drax, for instance, never returned to his plantation after leaving his "instructions" in the 1670s. As Dunn put it, the Crown had successfully imposed itself by 1680 and the planters "lost for good

[7] Oldmixon, *The British Empire in America*, Vol. 1, xxii & Vol, II, 114.

the aggressive self-confidence of the master class," persuading many to "retire to England." They used their wealth to buy English estates, transforming aspirations for acceptance as English landowners into reality. Richard Guy and Richard Howell, two of the wealthiest planters, for example, both lived in England by 1693. Howell's heir, former Barbadian Colonel and Assemblymember William Wheeler, returned himself not long after. He even sat on Parliament in 1701-1702, working to lobby on behalf of Barbadian proprietors. Barbados, though, never obtained a direct seat in Parliament. Only through the purchase of English estates did the planters gain access to the power of other wealthy Englishmen, which they long tried to claim from America. By the time of the Glorious Revolution, (1688) in fact, most of the major public leaders of Barbados lived in Europe. By 1713, "absenteeism had become a permanent way of life."[8]

Around the 1680s, many English-born planters even looked skeptically at their Barbadian-born peers. They decried the base nature of these native landowning elites. English planter John Witham, for instance, complained of the ill-tempered, immoderate men that made up a political party of "native-born" Barbadians, derisively calling them "Coeorians."[9] A divide had emerged. The wealthy planters who aimed for acceptance as English elites grew increasingly uncomfortable in their association with the tropical

---

[8] Richard Dunn, *Sugar and Slaves: The Rise of the Planter Class in the West Indies, 1624-1713* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1972), 101-103. Howell and Guy jointly owned 425 in 1680. Howell left it to his nephew William Wheeler, who lived on the island for some time before returning to England himself for a time, actually serving as a member of Parliament in 1701-1702, before returning to Barbados and sitting on the Council until his death in 1708. Published in *The History of Parliament: the House of Commons 1690-1715*, ed. D. Hayton, E. Cruickshanks, S. Handley, 2002. Howell and Guy had substantial landholdings of their own in Barbados. Guy served as a colonel in the Barbados Militia and on the island's Assembly, representing St. Michael's Parrish alongside Lt.-Colonel Codrington.

[9] "A general view of the affairs of the Island of Barbados, by John Witham, Deputy Governor," Aug 6, 1683, TNA, CO 29/3, pp. 222-230.

colony and “native” peers. They viewed the allegedly intemperate locally-born planters as reflecting poorly on the whole. Absenteeism may have offered a chance to distance oneself from the association. In any case, it allowed wealthy colonists to remove the island as a barrier to claims of masculine worth and standing in England.

In many ways, the planters who left in the 1670s and 1680s did so at the right time. Into the next century, demands from the expanding empire intensified. Increased competition from places like Jamaica and the French islands cut margins. Decreasing profits and yields made sugar-planting more challenging and less rewarding. Many Barbadians existed in a state of perpetual debt. Imperial warfare and racial animosity, meanwhile, further strained economic and social stability.

These pressures merely accentuated the patterns of elite male behavior established in the seventeenth century. Violence still imbued local politics and relations with the Crown, as when planter George Lillington attempted to assassinate a Royal Governor, once in 1704 and again the following year. Soon after he became president of the Council and later served as interim governor. The planters also persisted in exuding a “hospitable and generous Spirit...in which it cannot be denied they exceed Persons of like Estate or Wealth in *Europe*.” They lived, according to one observer in the 1730s, “in great Splendor, and at vast Expence,” despite declining profits and soil that was “very much worn out.” Indeed, many came to believe that Barbadian slaveholders had

"undone themselves by their own excessive behavior." In addition to the debts they incurred, they may have literally been drinking and eating themselves to death.[10]

Above all, the whole project continued to rest on the planters' violent discipline of servants and slaves. "The least disobedience [was] punished severely." In 1700, slaves who dared subvert the social order and attack their master or overseer were "burnt alive or put into iron cages...and left to die of hunger and despair." Militia action still deterred rebellion. As one visitor noted, "on these occasions the English take up arms and there are massacres." Maria Fuentes, moreover, has vividly depicted the regular (and often sexualized) punishments enacted against enslaved women in the late-eighteenth century. "Firebrands" left breasts permanently "marked." In the 1780s, a teenage girl lay "chained to the floor" and subjected to consecutive beatings of "thirty-nine lashes." According to one witness, her owner's whip elicited "the most dreadful cries that could come from a human being." Meanwhile, the island's leaders frequently enlisted the gallows in Bridgetown to execute enslaved people, bodies sometimes weighted and tossed in the sea to prevent proper burial.[11] Time, practice, and race had transformed justifications for violence, which once rested largely in adapted English ideals of patriarchy and manhood, into an extraordinary disregard for human life.

---

[10] "George Lillington and His Age," *Journal of the Barbados Museum and Historical Society* 38 (1987): 163; Sarah Barber, *The Disputatious Caribbean: The West Indies in the Seventeenth Century* (New York: Palgrave and Macmillan, 2014), 113–115. Robert Robertson, *A detection of the state and situation of the present sugar planters, of Barbadoes and the Leward Islands* (London: J. Wilford, 1732), 3. For more on the expenditures, Atlantic reputation and excess of drinking see Jack P. Greene, "Changing Identity in the British Caribbean: Barbados as a Case Study," in *Colonial Identity in the Atlantic World, 1500-1800*, ed. Nicholas Canny and Anthony Pagden (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1987), 213-266; Jack P. Greene, *Creating the British Atlantic: Essays on Transplantation, Adaptation, and Continuity* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2013).

[11] Père Labat, *The Memoirs of Père Labat, 1693-1705*, trans. and ed. John Eaden (London: Frank Cass and Co. Ltd., 1970), 127. Maria Fuentes, *Dispossessed Lives: Enslaved Women, Violence, and the Archive* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2016), 14, 101, & 124.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Archives

Barbados Museum and Historical Society, Shilstone Library, Bridgetown

Rare Book Collection
Shilstone Notebook Collection

Barbados National Archives, Black Rock, St. Michael

Baptism Records – 1637 to 1930
Burial Records – 1643 to 1930
Census Records – 1679-1700
Deed Records – 1636 to 1949
Marriage Records – 1643 to 1930
Parliamentary Records: House of Assembly & Senate Debates & Minutes
Probate Records – 1647 to 1959
Hughes Abstracts in Queree Notebooks

The National Archives (UK), Kew

Colonial State Papers
Court of Chancery Records: Pleadings before 1714
Navy Board Records
Prerogative Court of Canterbury: Files of Exhibits pre-1722

British Library, London

Early Printed Books
Egerton Manuscripts
Stowe Manuscripts
Sloane Manuscripts
Sloane Printed Collection

John Carter Brown Library, Providence, RI

Manuscript Collection
North American Imprints

Huntington Library, San Marino, CA

Manuscript Collection
Rare Books Collection

Published Works and Online Databases

British History Online http://www.british-history.ac.uk

"Early Modern Letters Online" http://emlo.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/

Laws of Barbados, Volume 1, 1667-1. Barbados: Advocate Printing works, 1912. http://archive.org/stream/cu31924017514427/cu31924017514427_djvu.txt

Articles of Agreements, made, and concluded on the 11th. day of January, 165[2]. London, 1652.

Allestree, Richard. *The Gentlemen's Calling*. London, 1677.

Allestree, Richard. *The Gentlemen's Calling*. London, 1677.

Anonymous. *A True Relation of the fight at Barbados between the English and the Dutch.* Barbados, 1665.

Anonymous. *A Letter to a friend: A Brief, but most True Relation of the late Barbarous and Bloody Plot of the Negro's in the Island of Barbados*. Friday 21, October, 1692.

Anonymous. *Great Newes from the Barbados.* London: Printed for L. Curtis, 1676.

Anonymous. *The routing of De-Ruyter, or The Barbadoes bravery, by the author of the Broad-side*. London: Printed by R. Davenport, 1665.

Barlow, John. *A True Guide to Glory*. Originally Published 1619. Edited by Bettie Anne Doebler and Retha M. Warnicke. London: Scholars' Facsimiles & Reprints, 2000.

Besse, Joseph. *A Collection of the Sufferings of the People Called Quakers*, Vol. II. London: Luke Hinde, 1689.

Biet, Antoine. *Voyage de la France Eguinoxiale en l'isle de Cayenne Entrepris par les France en l'Anne M. DC. LII* (Paris: 1667) trans. Jerome Handler, "Father Antoine Biet's Visit to Barbados in 1654," *Journal of the Barbados Museum and Historical Society* 32, May 1967: 50-76.

Bohun, Edmund. *A Brief, but most true Relation.* London: Printed for Edmund Bohun, 1693.

Brathwaite, Richard. *The English gentleman; and the English gentlewoman:* London, 1641.

Burton, Thomas. *Diary of Thomas Burton Esq: Volume 4, March - April 1659*, ed. John Towill Rutt. London: H Colburn, 1828. *British History Online*. http://www.british-history.ac.uk/burton-diaries/vol4/pp254-273.

de Charny, Geoffroi. *A Knight's Own Book of Chivalry.* Translated by Richard W. Kaueper and Elspeth Kennedy. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1996.

Defoe, Daniel. *The Complete English Gentleman*. London, 1661.

Fell, Lydia. *A Testimony and Warning given Forth in the Love of Truth and Is for the Governour, Magistrates & People Inhabiting on the Island of Barbadoes*. London, 1676.

Firth, C.H., ed. *The Narrative of General Venables, with an Appendix of Papers Relating to the Expedition to the West Indies and the Conquest of Jamaica, 1654-1655*. London, 1900.

Foster, Nicholas. *A Briefe relation of the horrid rebellion acted in the island Barbadas, in the West Indies.* London, 1650.

Fox, George. *Journal.* Edited by Nigel Smith. London: Penguin, 1998.

Frere, George. *A Short History of Barbados from its first Discovery and Settlement, to the End of the Year 1767*. London: J. Dodsley, 1768.

Godwyn, Morgan. *A Supplement to the Negro's and Indians Advocate*. London, 1681.

H., T. *A True and Exact Narrative of the Proceedings of the Parliaments Fleet, against the Island of Barbadoes.* London, 1652.

Hall, Richard. *Acts, passed in the island of Barbados. From 1643, to 1762.* London: Printed for Richard Hall, 1764.

Harlow, V.T. *Colonising expeditions to the West Indies and Guiana, 1623-1667*. London: Printed for the Hakluyt Society, 1925.

Hughes, Griffith. *The Natural History of Barbados*. London: Arno Press, 1750.

Labat, Père. *The Memoirs of Père Labat, 1693-1705.* Translated and edited by John Eaden. London: Frank Cass and Co. Ltd., 1970.

Ligon, Richard. *A True and Exact History of the Island of Barbados*. Originally Published 1657. Edited by Karen Ordahl Kupperman. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company, 2011.

Oldmixon, John. *The British Empire in America, Containing the History of the Discovery, Settlement, Progress and present State of all the British Colonies*. Volume II. London: Printed for John Nicholson, 1708.

Ogilby, John. *America: being the latest, and most accurate description of the New World.* London: Printed by John Ogilby, 1671.

Pitman, Henry. *A Relation of the Great Sufferings and Strange Adventures of Henry Pitman, Chyrurgion to the Late Duke of Monmouth, Containing an Account.* London, 1689.

Rawlin, William. *The Laws of Barbados*. London, 1699.

Rivers, Marcellus, *England's slavery or Barbados Merchandize: Represented in a Petition to the High and Honourable Court of Parliament*. London, 1659.

Robertson, Robert. *A detection of the state and situation of the present sugar planters, of Barbadoes and the Leward Islands*. London: J. Wilford, 1732.

Rochefort, Charles de. *The History of the Caribby-Islands*. Translated by John Davies. London, 1666.

Whitelocke, Bulstrode. *Memorials of the English Affairs.* London, 1682.

Winthrop, John. *Winthrop Papers,* Volume II, *1623-1630*. Boston: Massachusetts Historical Society, 1931.

Secondary Sources

Aaronson, Amy B. *Men and Masculinities: A Social, Cultural, and Historical Encyclopedia*. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO, 2003.

Adamson, J. S. A. *The English Civil War: Conflict and Contexts, 1640-49*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009.

Agbe-Davies, Anna, Carrie Alblinger, Marley Brown III, Edward Chappell, Willie Graham, and Kelly Ladd. "The Architectural and Archaeological Analysis of Bush Hill, The Garrison, St. Michael, Barbados." The Colonial Williamsburg Foundation for the Barbados National Trust, 2000.

Alden T. Vaughan, *Roots of American Racism: Essays on the Colonial Experience*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1995.

Allen, David. *In English Ways: The Movement of Societies and the Transferal of English Local Law and Custom to Massachusetts Bay in the Seventeenth Century*. New York: Norton, 1982.

Allen, T. *The Invention of the White Race: Whiteness as Property*. New York: Verso, 1993.

Amussen, Susan. *An Ordered Society: Gender and Class in Early Modern England*. New York: B. Blackwell, 1988.

_____. "'Being stirred to much Unquietness': Violence and Domestic Violence in Early Modern England." *Journal of Women's History* 6 (1994): 70 -89.

_____. "Punishment, Discipline, and Power: The Social Meanings of Violence in Early Modern England." *Journal of British Studies* 34, no. 1 (1995): 1-34.

_____. *Caribbean Exchanges*: *Slavery and the Transformation of English Society, 1640-1700*. Chapel Hill, N.C.: The University of North Carolina Press, 2007.

Amussen, Susan and Mark A. Kishlansky, eds., *Political Culture and Cultural Politics in Early Modern England: Essays presented to David Underdown*. New York: Manchester University Press, 1995.

Anonymous. *Antigua and the Antiguans: A Full Account of the Colony and its Inhabitants*, Vol. 1. London: Saunders and Otley, 1844.

Arnold, John and Sean Brady, eds. *What is Masculinity?: Historical Dynamics from Antiquity to the Contemporary World.* New York: Palgrave and Macmillan, 2011.

Ashton, Robert and Raymond Howard Parry. *The English Civil War and after, 1642-1658*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1970.

Baddeley, Michelle. "Herding, Social Influence and Economic Decision-making: Socio-psychological and Neuroscientific Analyses." *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B* 365, no. 1538 (2010): 281-90.

Bailyn, Bernard and Philip D. Morgan, eds. *Strangers Within the Realm: Cultural Margins of the First British Empire.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, for the Institute of Early American History and Culture, 1991.

Bailyn, Bernard. *Atlantic History: Concept and Contours*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2005.

_____. *The Barbarous Years: The People of British North America: the conflict of civilizations, 1600–1675.* New York: Alfred Knopf, 2012.

Ballagh, James Curtis. *White Servitude in the Colony of Virginia: A Study of the System of Indentured Labor in the American Colonies.* New York: B. Franklin, 1969.

Barber, Sarah. *Disputatious Caribbean: The West Indies in the Seventeenth Century*. New York: Palgrave and Macmillan, 2014.

Bardaglio, Peter. *Reconstructing the Household: Families, Sex, and the Law in the Nineteenth-Century South.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996.

Barratt, John. *Cromwell's Wars at Sea*. Yorkshire: Barnsley, 2006.

Barros, Juanita. *Reproducing the British Caribbean: Sex, Gender, and Population Politics after Slavery*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 2014.

Barriteau, Eudine. "Confronting Power and Politics: A Feminist Theorizing of Gender in Commonwealth Caribbean Societies." *Meridians: Feminism, Race, Transnationalism* 3, no. 2 (2003): 57-92.

———. *Confronting Power Theorizing Gender: Interdisciplinary Perspectives in the Caribbean*. Kingston: University of the West Indies Press, 2004.

———, ed. *Love and Power: Caribbean Discourses on Gender*. Cave Hill, Barbados: University of the West Indies Press, 2012.

Beaver, Daniel C. *Hunting and the Politics of Violence before the English Civil War.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

Beckles, Hilary, and Andrew Downes. "The Economics of Transition to the Black Labor System in Barbados, 1630-1680" in *The Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, Vol. 18, No. 2 (Autumn, 1987): 225-247.

Beckles, Hilary and Verene Shepherd. *Caribbean Slavery in the Atlantic World: A Student Reader*. Kingston: Ian Randle, 2000.

Beckles, Hilary. *Black Rebellion in Barbados: The Struggle Against Slavery, 1627-1838*. Bridgetown, Barbados: Caribbean Research & Publications, 1984.

———. *Natural Rebels: A Social History of Enslaved Black Women in Barbados*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1989.

———. *White Servitude and Black Slavery in Barbados, 1627-1715.* Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1989.

_____. *Centering Woman: Gender Discourses in Caribbean Slave Society*. New York: Ian Randle, 1999.

———. *A History of Barbados From Amerindian Settlement to Caribbean Single Market*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

_____. *The First Black Slave Society*: *Britain's Barbarity Time in Barbados*. Cave Hill: The University of the West Indies Press, 2016.

Bederman, Gail, *Manliness and Civilization: A Cultural History of Gender and Race in the United States*, 1880-1917. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995.

Beidler, P., and Taylor, G., eds. *Writing Race Across the Atlantic World: Medieval to Modern*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan US, 2005.

Beier, A.L. *Masterless Men: The Vagrancy Problem in England, 1560–1640.* London: Methuen, 1985.

Bender, Thomas. *The Antislavery Debate: Capitalism and Abolitionism as a Problem in Historical Interpretation*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992.

Benjamin, Thomas. *The Atlantic World: Europeans, Africans, Indians and Their Shared History, 1400-1900*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

Bennett, Martyn. *The Civil Wars in Britain and Ireland, 1638-1651*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell Publishers, 1997.

Bennett, J.H. "The English Caribbees in the Period of the Civil War, 1642-1646." *William and Mary Quarterly* 24, no. 3 (July, 1967): 359-377.

Bergquist, Charles. *Labor and the Course of American Democracy: US history in Latin American perspective.* London: Verso, 1996.

Berlin, Ira. *Many Thousands Gone: The First Two Centuries of Slavery in North America*. Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1998.

———. *Generations of Captivity: A History of African-American Slaves*. Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2003.

Bieber, Judy, ed. *Plantation Societies in the Era of European Expansion*. New York: Ashgate, 1997.

Billacois, F. *The Duel: Its Rise and Fall in Early Modern France*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1990.

Blackburn, Robin. *The Making of New World Slavery: From the Baroque to the Modern, 1492-1800*. New York: Verso, 1997.

Block, Kristen. "Cultivating Inner and Outer Plantations: Property, Industry, and Slavery in Early Quaker Migration to the New World." *Early American Studies* 8:3 (2010): 515-48.

_____. *Ordinary Lives in the Early Caribbean: Religion, Colonial Competition, and the Politics of Profit*. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2012.

Block, Sharon. *Rape and Sexual Power in Early America.* Chapel Hill, N.C.: University of North Carolina Press, 2006.

Bolland, Nigel. *The Politics of Labour in the British Caribbean: The Social Origins of Authoritarianism and Democracy.* Princeton, N.J.: Markus Wiener Publishers, 2001.

Bolster, W. Jeffrey. *Black Jacks: African American Seamen in the Age of Sail*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1997.

Boose, Lyndae. "'The Getting of a Lawful Race': Racial Discourse in Early Modern England and the Unrepresentable Black Woman." In *Women, "Race," and Writing in the Early Modern Period*, edited by Margo Hendricks and Patricia Parker. London: Routledge, 1994.

Bowker, Lee H. *Masculinities and Violence*. London: Sage Publications, 1998.

Braddick, Michael. *State Formation in Early Modern England, c. 1550-1700*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

———. *God's Fury, England's Fire: A New History of the English Civil Wars*. New York: Penguin, 2009.

Bradstock, Andrew. *Radical Religion in Cromwell's England: A Concise History from the English Civil War to the End of the Commonwealth*. London: I.B. Tauris, 2011.

Breen, Timothy H., and Stephen Innes. *"Myne owne ground": Race and Freedom on Virginia's Eastern Shore, 1640-1676.* 25th anniversary edition. New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Breitenberg, Mark. *Anxious Masculinity in Early Modern England*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Brenner, Robert. *Merchants and Revolution: Commercial Change, Political Conflict, and London's Overseas Traders, 1550-1653*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1993.

Brewer, John and Susan Staves, eds. *Early Modern Conceptions of Property.* New York: Routledge, 1995.

Brickell, Chris. "Masculinities, Performativity, and Subversion: A Sociological Reappraisal." *Men and Masculinities* 8, no. 1 (2005): 24-43.

Bridenbaugh, Carl, and Roberta. *No Peace Beyond the Line: The English in the Caribbean, 1624-1690*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1972.

Brown, Christopher. *Moral Capital: Foundations of British Abolitionism.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2006.

Brown, Kathleen M. *Good Wives, Nasty Wenches, and Anxious Patriarchs: Gender, Race, and Power in Colonial Virginia*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996.

Brown, Vincent. *The Reaper's Garden: Death and Power in the World of Atlantic Slavery*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2008.

———. "Social Death and Political Life in the Study of Slavery." *American Historical Review* 114, no. 5 (December 2009): 1231-1249.

Browne, Randy M. *Surviving Slavery in the British Caribbean.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2017.

Brubaker, Leslie, and Julia Smith. *Gender in the Early Medieval World: East and West, 300-900*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Brundage, Jonah Stuart. "The Pacification of Elite Lifestyles: State Formation, Elite Reproduction, and the Practice of Hunting in Early Modern England." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 59, no. 4 (October 2017): 789-817.

Burnard, Trevor G. *Mastery, Tyranny, and Desire: Thomas Thistlewood and His Slaves in the Anglo-Jamaican World*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2004.

———. *Planters, Merchants, and Slaves: Plantation Societies in British America, 1650-1820*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2015.

Bush, Barbara. *Slave Women in Caribbean Society, 1650-1838*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1990.

Butler, Judith. “Performative Acts and Gender Constitution: An Essay in Phenomenology and Feminist Theory.” *Theatre Journal,* 40, no. 4 (1988): 519-531.

———. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity.* New York: Routledge, 1990.

Butler, Sara M. *The Language of Abuse: Marital Violence in Later Medieval England*. Boston: BRILL, 2014.

Camp, Stephanie. *Closer to Freedom: Enslaved Women and Everyday Resistance in the Plantation South*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2004.

Campbell, Gwyn and Elizabeth Elbourne, eds. *Sex, Power, and Slavery.* Athens, OH: Ohio University Press, 2014.

Campbell, P.F. *The Church in Barbados in the Seventeenth Century.* St. Michael, Barbados: Barbados Museum and Historical Society, 1982.

Canny, Nicholas and Anthony Pagden. *Colonial Identity in the Atlantic World, 1500-1800*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1987.

Capern, Amanda L. and Judith Spicksley, “Women, Wealth, and Power,” *Women's History Review* 16, no. 3 (2007): 289-296.

Carey, Brycchan, and Geoffrey Plank, eds. *Quakers and Abolition.* Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2014.

Carey, Brycchan. “'The Power that Giveth Liberty and Freedom':” The Barbadian Origins of Quaker Antislavery Rhetoric, 1657-76.” *ARIEL* 38, no. 1 (2007): 27-47.

Carey, Brycchan and Geoffrey Plank, eds. *Quakers and Abolition*. Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2014.

Carney, Judith Ann. *Black Rice: The African Origins of Rice Cultivation in the Americas*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2001.

Carrington, Swelwyn H. *The Sugar Industry and the Abolition of the Slave Trade, 1775-1810*. Gainesville, FL: University of Florida Press, 2002.

Carter, Philip. *Men and the Emergence of Polite Society, Britain 1660-1800.* New York: Routledge, 2000.

Chapman, Effie Louise and Josephine Elizabeth Rayne, eds. *The New England Historical and Genealogical Register.* Boston: New England Historic Genealogical Society, 1906-1907).

Chapman, Mary and Glenn Hendler eds. *Sentimental Men: Masculinity and the Politics of Affect in American Culture.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999.

Clark, Peter. *The English Alehouse: A Social History, 1200-1830.* New York: Addison-Wesley Longman Ltd., 1983.

Clay, C.G.A. *Economic Expansion and Social Change: England, 1500–1700*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1984.

Coates, Rodney. *Race and Ethnicity: Across Time, Space, and Discipline.* Leiden: Brill Academic Publishers, 2004.

Collins, John. *Martial Law and English Laws, c. 1500-1700*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016.

Connell, R.W. *Masculinities*. Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1995.

Connell, R.W. and James W. Messerschmidt. "Hegemonic Masculinity: Rethinking the Concept." *Gender & Society* 19, no. 2 (2005): 829 - 859.

Cottle, David and Lewis Kahn, eds. *Beef Cattle Production and Trade.* Collingwood, VIC: CSIRO Publishing, 2014.

Craton, Michael. *Empire, Enslavement, and Freedom in the Caribbean*. Kingston, Jamaica: Ian Randle Publishers, 1997.

Craton, Michael, James Walvin, and David Wright. *Slavery, Abolition and Emancipation: Black Slaves and the British Empire.* London: Longman, 1976.

Cressy, David. *Birth, Marriage, and Death: Ritual, Religion, and the Life-Cycle in Tudor and Stuart England*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1997.

Crouse, Nellis Maynard. *French Pioneers in the West Indies, 1624-1664.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1940.

Curtin, Philip D. *The Rise and Fall of the Plantation Complex: Essays in Atlantic History* New York: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

Dalleo, Peter. "From Anti-Colonial to Postcolonial: Authority and Masculinity in the Caribbean Literary Field." PhD Dissertation, State University of New York at Stony Brook, 2004.

Dalton, John and Tin Cheuk Leung. "Why is Polygamy More Prevalent in Western Africa?: An African Slave Trade Perspective." *Economic Development and Cultural Change* 62, no. 4 (July 2014): pp. 599-632.

Daniels, Christine and M. Kennedy, eds. *Over the Threshold: Intimate Violence in Early America*. New York: Routledge, 2013.

Dattel, Gene. *Cotton and Race in the Making of America: The Human Costs of Economic Power*. Blue Ridge Summit: Ivan R. Dee, 2009.

Davis, David Brion. *The Problem of Slavery in Western Culture.* Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1966.

———. *The Problem of Slavery in the Age of Revolution, 1770-1823*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1975.

———. *Challenging the Boundaries of Slavery*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2003.

———. *Inhuman Bondage: The Rise and Fall of Slavery in the New World*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press, 2006.

Davis, Natalie Zeamon. *Society and Culture in Early Modern France*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1975.

Davis, Nicholas Darnel. *Cavaliers and Roundheads in Barbados: 1650-1652*. British Guiana: Argosy Press, 1883.

De Groot, Jerome. *Royalist Identities.* New York: Macmillan, 2004.

Dean, David. *Law-Making and Society in Late Elizabethan England: The Parliament of England, 1584-1601.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Demos, John. *A Little Commonwealth: Family Life in Plymouth Colony*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1970.

Donaldson, Mike. "What is Hegemonic Masculinity?" *Theory and Society*, Vol. 22, no. 5 (October, 1993): 643-657.

Doob, Anthony and Edward Greenspan, eds. *Perspectives in Criminal Law.* Aurora, Ontario: Canada Law Book, 1985.

Doss, B.D. and J.R. Hopkins, "The Multicultural Masculinity Ideology Scale: Validation from Three Cultural Perspectives," *Sex Roles* 38, no. 9/10 (1998): 719-20.

Drescher, Seymour. *From Slavery to Freedom: Comparative Studies in the Rise and Fall of Atlantic Slavery*. New York: New York University Press, 1999.

Dresser, Madge. *Slavery Obscured: The Social History of the Slave Trade in an English Provincial Port* The Black Atlantic. New York: Continuum, 2001.

Dubber, Mark. *The Police Power: Patriarchy and the Foundations of American Government*. New York: Columbus University PRess, 2005.

Dudink, Stefan. "'The trouble with men: problems in the history of 'masculinity'." *European Journal of Cultural Studies,* Vol. 1 (1998): 419–431.

Dudink, Karen Hagemann and John Tosh, eds. *Masculinities in Politics and War*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2004.

Duffy, Christopher. *The Military Experience in the Age of Reason*. New York: Atheneum, 1988.

Duffy, Eamon. *The Voices of Morebath: Reformation and Rebellion in an English Village.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2003.

Duke, William. *Some Memoirs of the First Settlement of the Island of Barbados*. Barbados: Printed by Wm. Beeby, 1741.

Dunn, Richard S. *Sugar and Slaves: The Rise of the Planter Class in the English West Indies, 1624-1713*. Chapel Hill, N.C.: Published for the Institute of Early American History and Culture at Williamsburg, Va. by the University of North Carolina Press, 1972.

Dunning, Robert. *The Monmouth Rebellion: A Complete Guide to the Rebellion and Bloody Assizes.* Wimborne, England: Dovecote, 1985.

Elits, David. *The Military Revolution in Sixteenth-Century Europe*. New York: I.B. Tauris, 1998.

———. *The Rise of African Slavery in the Americas*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Eltis, David, Frank D. Lewis, and Kenneth Lee Sokoloff, eds. *Slavery in the Development of the Americas*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Elshtain, J.B. "Christianity and Patriarchy: The Odd Alliance." *Modern Theology*, 9 (1993): 109-122.

Emert, Phyllis, ed. *Colonial Triangular Trade: An Economic Based on Human Misery.* Carlisle, MA: Discovery Enterprises, 1995.

Engerman, Stanley, Seymour Drescher, and Robert Paquette, eds. *Slavery*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2001.

Engerman, Stanley and Robert E. Gallman, eds. *Long-Term Factors in American Economic Growth*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986.

Escott, Paul. "*What Shall We Do with the Negro": Lincoln, White Racism, and Civil War America.* Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2009.

Fevert, Ute. *Men of Honour: A Social and Cultural History of the Duel.* New York: Wiley, 2005.

Fine, Michelle, ed. *Displacing Whiteness: Essays in Social and Cultural Criticism.* Durham: Duke University Press, 1997.

Fisher, Linford. "'Dangerous Designes': The 1676 Barbados Act to Prohibit New England Indian Slave Importation." *The William and Mary Quarterly* 71, no. 1 (January 2014): 99–124.

Fitzmaurice, Andrew. *Humanism and America: An Intellectual History of English Colonisation, 1500-1625*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Fletcher, Anthony. *The Outbreak of the English Civil War*. New York: New York University Press, 1981.

———. *Gender, Sex, and Subordination in England, 1500-1800*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995.

Foster, Thomas, Toby Ditz, and Mary Beth Norton. *New men: Manliness in early America*. New York: NYU Press, 2011.

Foster, William Henry. *Gender, Mastery and Slavery: From European to Atlantic World Frontiers.* New York: Palgrave, 2009.

Foucault, Michel. *History of Sexuality*: *An Introduction*. Translated by Robert Hurley. New York: Vintage Books, 1990.

Foyster, Elizabeth A. "Male Honour, Social Control and Wife Beating in Late Stuart England," *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 6th series, 6 (1996): 215–224.

———. *Manhood in Early Modern England: Honour, Sex, and Marriage*. New York: Routledge, 1999.

Foyster, Elizabeth and Helen Berry, eds. *The Family in Early Modern England*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

French, Henry and Mark Rothery. *Man's Estate: Landed Gentry Masculinities, 1660–1900*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2012.

Fuentes, Marisa J. *Dispossessed Lives: Enslaved Women, Violence, and the Archive.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2016.

Gallay, Alan, ed. *Indian Slavery in Colonial America*. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 2010.

Galenson, David W. *White Servitude in Colonial America: An Economic Analysis*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1984

———. *Traders, Planters, and Slaves: Market Behavior in Early English America*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1986.

Games, Alison. *Migration and the Origins of the English Atlantic World*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1999.

———. *The Web of Empire: English Cosmopolitans in an Age of Expansion, 1560-1660*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Gaspar, David Barry, and Darlene Clark Hine. *More than Chattel: Black Women and Slavery in the Americas*. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1996.

Gatti, Hilary. *Ideas of Liberty in Early Modern Europe: From Machiavelli to Milton*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2015.

Geertz, Clifford. *The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays*. New York: Basic Books, 2000.

Gerbner, Katharine. "The Ultimate Sin: Christianising Slaves in Barbados in the Seventeenth Century." *Journal of Slave and Post-Slave Studies* 31, no. 1 (2010): 57-73.

Gilbert, Arthur N. "Law and Honour among Eighteenth-Century British Army Officers." *The Historical Journal*, Vol. 19, No. 1. (March, 1976): pp. 75-87.

Gillingham, John. "From Civilitas to Civility: Codes of Manners in Medieval and Early Modern England." *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, vol. 12 (2002): pp. 267-289.

Gilmore, David. *Manhood in the Making: Cultural Concepts of Masculinity.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990.

Goldenberg, David M. *The Curse of Ham: Race and Slavery in Early Judaism, Christianity, and Islam*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2009.

Gomez, Michael Angelo. *Exchanging Our Country Marks: The Transformation of African Identities in the Colonial and Antebellum South*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1998.

Grant, Daragh. "'Civilizing' the Colonial Subject: The Co-Evolution of State and Slavery in South Carolina, 1670-1739." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 57, no. 3 (2015): 606-636.

Gragg, Larry. *Englishmen Transplanted: The English Colonization of Barbados, 1627-1660*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2003.

———. "The Pious and the Profane: The Religious Life of Early Barbados Planters." *The Historian* 66, no. 2 (October, 2007): 265-284.

———. *The Quaker Community on Barbados: Challenging the Culture of the Planter Class*. Columbia, Missouri: University of Missouri Press, 2009.

Graubart, Karen B. *With Our Labor and Sweat: Indigenous Women and the Formation of Colonial Society in Peru, 1550-1700.* Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 2007.

Gray, Jonathan. *Oaths and the English Reformation.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.

Greene, Jack P. Greene. *Pursuits of Happiness: The Social Development of Early Modern British Colonies and the Formation of American Culture*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1988.

———. *Negotiated Authorities: Essays in Colonial Political and Constitutional History*. Charlottesville, VA: University Press of Virginia, 1994.

———. *Creating the British Atlantic: Essays on Transplantation, Adaptation, and Continuity.* Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia Press, 2013.

Greene, Lorenzo J. *The Negro in Colonial New England, 1620-1776*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Greer, Allan. *Property and Dispossession: Natives, Empires and Land in Early Modern North America*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2018.

Griffiths, Paul, Adam Fox, and Steve Hindle, eds. *The Keeping the Public Peace***.** London: Macmillian, 1996.

Grubb, Farley. "The Incidence of Servitude in Trans-Atlantic Migration, 1771-1804. *Explorations in Economic History*, Volume 22, Issue 3 (July, 1985): 316-340.

Guasco, Michael. *Slaves and Englishmen: Human Bondage in the Early Modern Atlantic World*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2014.

Gunning, Sandra. *Race, Rape, and Lynching: The Red Record of American Literature, 1890–1912*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1996.

Hackett, David. *The Rude Hand of Innovation: Religion and Social Order in Albany, New York, 1652-1836.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991.

Hainsworth, Roger and Christine Churches. *The Anglo-Dutch Naval Wars 1652-1674.* Stroud: Sutton Publishing, 1998.

Hall, Catherine. "Gender Politics and Imperial Politics: Rethinking the Histories of Empire," in *Gendered*," in *Gendered Nations: Nationalisms and Gender Order in the Long Nineteenth Century* edited by Ida Blom, Catherine Hall, and Karen Hagemann. Oxford: Berg Publishers (2000): pp. 48-62.

Hall, Gwendolyn Midlo. *Slavery and African Ethnicities in the Americas: Restoring the Links Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2005.*

Hall, Kim F. *Things of Darkness: Economies of Race and Gender in Early Modern England*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1995.

Hamm, Thomas. *Quakerism in America.* New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Handler, Jerome S. "Slave Revolts and Conspiracies in Seventeenth-Century Barbados." *New West Indian Guide* 56, no. 1/2 (1982): 5-42.

———. "Freedmen and Slaves in the Barbados Militia." *Journal of Caribbean History*, Vol. 19 (2004): 1-25.

———. *The Unappropriated People: Freedmen in the Slave Society of Barbados*. Kingston: University of the West Indies Press, 2009.

Handler, Jerome and M. Reilly. "Contesting 'White Slavery' in the Caribbean: Enslaved Africans and European Indentured Servants in Seventeenth-Century Barbados." *New West Indian Guide* 91 (2017): 30-55.

Handler, Jerome S. and Robert S. Corruccini. "Plantation Slave Life in Barbados: A Physical Anthropological Analysis." *Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, Vol. 14, No. 1 (1983): pp. 65-90.

Handler, Jerome S. and Stephanie Bergman. "Vernacular Houses and Domestic Material Culture on Barbadian Sugar Plantations, 1640-1838." *The Journal of Caribbean History*, Vol. 43, no. 1 (2009): 1-36.

Harlow, Vincent T., *A History of Barbados,* 1625-1685. New York: Oxford University Press, 1926.

Harper, Lawrence A. *The English Navigation Laws: A Seventeenth-Century Experiment in Social Engineering.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1939.

Harris, Tim, and Stephen Taylor, eds. *The Final Crisis of the Stuart Monarchy: The Revolutions of 1688-1691 in their British, Atlantic and European Contexts*. Rochester, NY: Boydell Press, 2013.

Harris, Tim. *Restoration: Charles II and His Kingdoms, 1660-1685*. London: Penguin, 2006.

Hartman, Mary S. *The Household and the Making of History: A Subversive View of the Western past*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Hartman, Saidiya V. *Scenes of Subjection: Terror, Slavery, and Self-Making in Nineteenth-Century America*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1997.

Harvey, Karen. "The History of Masculinity, circa 1650–1800." *Journal of British Studies* 44, no. 2 (2005): 296–311.

———. *The Little Republic: Masculinity and Domestic Authority in Eighteenth-Century Britain.* New York: Oxford University Press, 2012.

Harvey, Karen, and Alexandra Shepard. "What Have Historians Done with Masculinity? Reflections on Five Centuries of British History, circa 1500–1950." *Journal of British Studies* 44, no. 2 (2005): 274-80.

Heal, Felicity. "The Idea of Hospitality in Early Modern England." *Past & Present*, No. 102 (Feb. 1984): 66-93.

———. *Hospitality in Early Modern England.* London: Oxford University Press, 1990.

Herrup, Cynthia B. *The Common Peace: Participation and the Criminal Law in Seventeenth-Century England.* Cambridge Studies in Early Modern British History. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1987.

Herrup, Cynthia. "'To Pluck Bright Honour from the Pale-Faced Moon': Gender and Honour in the Castlehaven Story." *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 6, (1996): 137-159.

Higman, B.W., Carl Campbell, Patrick Bryan, and Brian L. Moore, eds. *Slavery, Freedom and Gender: The Dynamics of Caribbean Society*. Cave Hill: University of West Indies Press, 2003.

Higman, B.W. “Population and Labor in the British Caribbean in the Early Nineteenth Century,” in *Long-Term Factors in American Economic Growth.* Edited by Stanley L. Engerman, and Robert E. Gallman. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986.

———. “Population and Labor in the British Caribbean in the Early Nineteenth Century.” From *Long-Term Factors in American Economic Growth*. Engerman, Stanley L. and Robert E. Gallman, eds. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986.

Hill, Christopher. *The World Turned Upside Down: Radical Ideas during the English Revolution*. New York: Penguin, 1984.

Hinds, Hilary. *George Fox and Early Quaker Culture*. New York: Manchester University Press, 2011.

Hitchcock, Tim and Michele Cohen. *English Masculinities, 1660-1800*. New York: Routledge, 1999.

Hobson, Daphne Louise. “Domestic Architecture of the Earliest British Colonies in the American Tropics: A Study of the Houses of the Caribbean Leeward Islands of St. Christopher, Nevis, Antigua and Montserrat, 1624-1726.” PhD Diss., Georgia Institute of Technology, 2007.

Hodges, Graham Russell. *Slavery and Freedom among Early American Workers*. New York: Routledge, 1998.

Holmes, Geoffrey S. *The Making of a Great Power: Late Stuart and Early Georgian Britain*, *1660-1722.* London: Longman Press, 1993.

Holmes, Richard, ed. *The Oxford Companion to Military History*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2001.

Holstun, James, ed. *Pamphlet Wars: Prose in the English Revolution*. London: Routledge, 1992.

Horne, Gerald. *The Apocalypse of Settler Colonialism*: *The Roots of Slavery, White Supremacy, and Capitalism in Seventeenth-Century North America and the Caribbean*. New York: Monthly Review Press, 2018.

Hughes, Ann. *Gender and the English Revolution.* London: Routledge, 2012.

Hutton, Ronald. *The Royalist War Effort, 1642-1646*. New York: Longman, 1982.

———. *The Restoration: A Political and Religious History of England and Wales, 1658-1667*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.

Huzzey, Richard. “Free Trade, Free Labour, and Slave Sugar in Victorian Britain.” *The Historical Journal*. Volume 53, Issue 2 (June 2010): 259-379.

Innes, Stephen. *Work and Labor in Early America*. Chapel Hill: Published for the Institute of Early American History and Culture by the University of North Carolina Press, 1988.

James, Mervyn, ed. *Society, Politics, and Culture: Studies in Early Modern England*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1986.

Johnson, Howard, and Karl Watson, eds. *The White Minority in the Caribbean*. Kingston, Jamaica: Ian Randle Publishers, 1998.

Jones, Cecily. “Contesting the Boundaries of Gender, Race, and Sexuality in Barbadian Plantation Society. *Women's History Review* 12, no. 2 (2003): 195-232.

———. *Engendering Whiteness: White Women and Colonialism in Barbados and North Carolina*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2014.

Jones, Jacqueline. *American Work: Four Centuries of Black and White Labor*. New York: W.W. Norton, 1998.

Jordan, Don and Michael Walsh. *White Cargo: The Forgotten History of Britain’s White Slaves in America*. New York: New York University Press, 2008.

Jordan, Winthrop. *White over Black: American Attitudes toward the Negro, 1550–1812*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1968.

Jordan, Winthrop and Sheila Kemp, eds. *Race and Family in the Colonial South.* Jackson, MS: University Press of Mississippi, 1987.

Kann, Mark. *Punishments, Prisons, and Patriarchy: Liberty and Power in the Early American Republic*. New York: New York University Press, 2005.

Keating-Miller, Jennifer. “Explorations of Affiliation: Irish Indentured Servitude in the English West Indies.” *Working Papers in Irish Studies*. Rock Hill, South Carolina: Department of English, Winthrop University, 2008.

Kempadoo, Kamala. *Sexing The Caribbean: Gender, Race, and Sexual Labor.* New York: Taylor & Francis, 2004.

Kerr, Julie. “'Welcome the coming and speed the parting guest': Hospitality in twelfth-century England.” *Journal of Medieval history* 33, no. 2 (June 2007): 130-146.

Key, Newton, and R. O. Bucholz. *Sources and Debates in English History, 1485-1714*. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2004.

Kiernan, Heather. *The Duel in European History: Honour and the Reign of Aristocracy*. London: Oxford University Press, 1988.

Kimmel, Michael S. *Manhood in America: A Cultural History*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2006.

Kippen, Kim and Lori Woods, eds. *Worth and Repute: Valuing Gender in Late Medieval and Early Modern Europe, Essays in Honour of Barbara Todd.* Toronto: Center for Reformation and Renaissance Studies, 2011.

Kishlansky, Mark A. *The Rise of the New Model Army*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1979.

Klooster, Wim, and Alfred Padula, eds. *The Atlantic World: essays on slavery, migration, and imagination.* Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Pearson/Prentice Hall, 2005.

Klooster, Wim. "De Ruyter's Attack on Barbados: The Dutch Perspective." *Journal of the Barbados Museum and Historical Society* 60 (2014): 42–53.

———. *The Dutch Moment: War, Trade, and Settlement in the seventeenth-century Atlantic World*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2016.

Koot, Christian. *Empire at the Periphery: British Colonists, Anglo-Dutch Trade, and the Development of the British Atlantic, 1621-1713*. New York: New York University Press, 2012.

Kulikoff, Allan. *Tobacco and Slaves: The Development of Southern Cultures in the Chesapeake, 1680-1800*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1986.

LaCombe, Michael A. *Political Gastronomy: Food and Authority in the English Atlantic World.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2012.

Lake, Peter, and Steven Pincus, eds. *The Politics of the Public Sphere in Early Modern England.* Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007.

Lambert, David. *White Creole Culture, Politics and Identity during the Age of Abolition*. Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Laslett, Peter. *The World We Have Lost*. London: Methuen, 1965.

Lee, Debbie. *Slavery and the Romantic Imagination*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2002.

Lee, Wayne E. *Barbarians and Brother: Anglo-American Warfare, 1500-1865.* New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Lerner, Gerda. *The Creation of Patriarchy.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1984.

Leverenz, David*, Paternalism Incorporated: Fables of American Fatherhood, 1865-1940.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2003.

Libby, David J, Paul Spickard, and Susan Ditto, eds. *Affect and Power: Essays on Sex, Slavery, Race, and Religion.* Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 2005.

Littlefield, Daniel C. *Rice and Slaves: Ethnicity and the Slave Trade in Colonial South Carolina*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1981.

Lombard, Anne S. *Making Manhood: Growing Up Male in Colonial New England*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2003.

Low, Jennifer A. *Manhood and the Duel: Masculinity in Early Modern Drama and Culture.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003.

MacDonald, Wigfield. *The Monmouth Rebels, 1685*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1985.

MacMillan, Ken. *Sovereignty and Possession in the English New World: The Legal Foundations of Empire, 1576-1640*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Mair, Lucille Mathurin, Hilary Beckles, and Verene Shepard, eds. *A Historical Study of Women in Jamaica, 1655–1844*. Kingston, Jamaica: University of the West Indies Press, 2006.

Manning, Roger B. *Hunters and Poachers: A Social and Cultural History of Unlawful Hunting in England, 1485-1640.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.

———. *An Apprenticeship in Arms: The Origins of the British Army, 1585-1702.* New York: Oxford University Press, 2006.

Marley, David. *Wars of the Americas: A Chronology of Armed Conflict in the Western Hemisphere, 1492 to the Present,* Vol. 2. Santa Brabara, CA: ABC-CLIO, 2008.

Martin, Laura, "'Servants Have the Worser Lives': The Poetics and Rhetorics of Servitude and Slavery in *Inkle* and *Yarico's* Barbados," in *Invoking Slavery in the Eighteenth-Century British Imagination,* eds. Srividhya Swaminathan and Adam R. Beach. New York: Routledge, 2016.

McCusker, John J., and Russell R. Menard, eds. *The Economy of British America, 1607-1789*. Chapel Hill, North Carolina: University of North Carolina Press, 1985.

McCusker, John and Kenneth Morgan, eds. *The Early Modern Atlantic Economy.* New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

McNeill, John Robert. *Mosquito Empires: Ecology and War in the Greater Caribbean, 1620-1914*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

McSheffrey, Shannon. *Marriage, Sex, and Civic Culture in Late Medieval London*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006.

Mechner, Emily. *Paupers and Planters: The Transition to Sugar in Barbados, 1638-1674.*

Menard, Russell R. *Migrants, Servants, and Slaves: Unfree Labor in Colonial British America*. Aldershot, England: Ashgate, 2001.

———. *Sweet Negotiations: Sugar, Slavery, and Plantation Agriculture in Early Barbados*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2006.

Miller, Joseph C., *The Problem of Slavery as History: A Global Approach*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2012.

Mintz, Sidney Wilfred. *Sweetness and Power: The Place of Sugar in Modern History*. New York: Penguin Books, 1986.

Mohammed, Patricia and Catherine Shepard, eds. *Gender in Caribbean Development*. St. Augustine, Trinidad and Tobago: University of West Indies Press, 1988.

Mohr, Melissa Jane. "Strong Language: Oaths, Obscenities, and Performative Literature in Early Modern England." PhD diss., Stanford University, 2003.

Moitt, Bernard. *Women and Slavery in the French Antilles, 1635-1848*. Blacks in the Diaspora. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 2001.

Montanari, Massimo. *The Culture of Food*. Oxford: Blackwell Press, 1994.

Moore, Rosemary. "Seventeenth-century Context and Quaker Beginnings" in *The Oxford Handbook of Quaker Studies*. Stephen W. Angell, and Ben Pink Dandelion, eds. London: Oxford University Press, 2013.

Morgan, Edmund S*. American Slavery, American Freedom: The Ordeal of Colonial Virginia.* New York: Norton, 1975.

Morgan, David and Jeff Hearn, eds. *Men, Masculinities and Social Theory.* London: Routledge, 1990.

Morgan, Jennifer. "'Some Could Suckle over Their Shoulder': Male Travelers, Female Bodies, and the Gendering of Racial Ideology, 1500-1770," *The William and Mary Quarterly* 54, no. 1 (1997): 167-92

———. *Laboring Women: Reproduction and Gender in New World Slavery*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004.

Morgan, Kenneth. *Slavery and the British Empire: From Africa to America*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Morgan, Philip D. *Slave Counterpoint: Black Culture in the Eighteenth-century Chesapeake and Lowcountry*. Chapel Hill, N.C.: University of North Carolina Press, 1998.

Morris, Richard B. *Government and Labor in Early America*. New York: Octagon Books, 1975.

Morris, Thomas. *Southern Slavery and the Law, 1619–1860*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996.

Mullin, Michael. *Africa in America: Slave Acculturation and Resistance in the American South and the British Caribbean, 1736-1831*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1992.

Murphy, Kevin P., Jennifer M. Spear, eds. *Historicising Gender and Sexuality*. Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons, 2011.

Nash, Gary B. *Red, White, and Black: The Peoples of Early America* Prentice-Hall History of the American People Series. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1974.

Navin, John. "Intimidation, Violence, and Race in British America." *The Historian* 77, no. 3 (Fall 2015): 464-497.

Neal, Derek, "Meanings of Masculinity in Late Medieval England: Self, Body and Society." PhD Diss., McGill University, 2003.

Neill, Michael, "'This Gentle Gentleman': Social Change and the Language of Status in *Arden of Faversham." Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England* 10 (1998): 73-97.

Newman, Simon P. Newman. *New World of Labor: The Development of Plantation Slavery in the British Atlantic.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013.

Ng, Su Fang. *Literature and the Politics of Family in Seventeenth-Century England.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Nicholson, Bradley J. "Legal Borrowing and the Origins of Slave Law in the British Colonies." *The American Journal of Legal History* 38, no. 1 (1994): 38-54.

Noble, Mark. *Memoirs of the Protectoral-House of Cromwell.* 2 vols., 3d ed. London: Robinson, 1787.

Norris, John. *Pistols at Dawn: A History of Dueling*. New York: History Press, 2009.

Norton, Mary Beth. *Founding Mothers and Fathers: Gendered Power and the Forming of American Society.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1996.

Norton, Matthew. "Temporality, Isolation, and Violence in the Early Modern English Maritime World. *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 48, no. 1 (Fall 2014): 37-66.

Nye, Robert. *Masculinity and Male Codes of Honor in Modern* France. New York: Oxford University Press, 1995.

Nye, Robert A., "Western Masculinities in War and Peace." *American Historical Review*. vol. 112, no. 2 (2007): 417-438.

O'Callaghan, Sean. *To Hell or Barbados: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ireland*. Dingle, Co. Kerry, Ireland: Brandon Press, 2000.

O'Rourke, David K. *How America's First Settlers Invented Chattel Slavery: Dehumanizing Native Americans and Africans with Language, Laws, Guns, and Religion*. New York: Peter Lang, 2004.

Pagden, Anthony. *Lords of All the World: Ideologies of Empire in Spain, Britain and France C. 1500-C. 1800*. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1995.

Palmer, Colin A. ed. *The Worlds of Unfree Labour: from indentured servitude to slavery* Aldershot: Ashgate, Variorum, 1998.

Parker, John, ed. *Merchants and Scholars: Essays in the History of Exploration and Trade.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1965.

Parker, Matthew. *Willoughbyland: England's Lost Colony*. London: Hutchinson, 2015.

Paton, Diana. *No Bond but the Law: Punishment, Race, and Gender in Jamaican State Formation, 1780-1870* Next Wave. Durham: Duke University Press, 2004.

Paton, Diana. "Punishment, Crime, and the Bodies of Slaves in Eighteenth-Century Jamaica." *Journal of Social History* 34, no. 4 (2001): 923-54.

Patterson, Catherine F. *Urban Patronage in Early Modern England: Corporate Boroughs, the Landed Elite, and the Crown, 1580-1640*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1999.

Patterson, Orlando. *Slavery and Social Death: A Comparative Study*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1982.

Pestana, Carla. *The English Atlantic in an Age of Revolution*, *1640-1661*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2004.

———. *Protestant Empire: Religion and the Making of the British Atlantic World.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2009.

———. *The English Conquest of Jamaica: Oliver Cromwell's Bid for Empire.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2017.

Peterson, Derek, ed. *Abolitionism and Imperialism in Britain, Africa, and the Atlantic.* Athens: Ohio University Press, 2010.

Peltonen, Markku. *The Duel in Early Modern England: Civility, Politeness and Honour*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Pennington, D. H. *Europe in the Seventeenth Century.* New York: Longman Press, 1989.

Pincus, Steven. *1688: The First Modern Revolution*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009.

Pittman, Frank Wesley. *The Development of the British West Indies, 1700-1763*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1917.

Pleck, Joseph. *The Myth of Masculinity*. *American Journal of Sociology*. 88, no. 6 (1983): 1336-1338.

Price, Richard. *Maroon societies: Rebel Slave Communities in the Americas*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996.

Poyer, John. *The History of Barbados, from the First Discovery of the Island, in the Year 1605 till the Accession of Lord Seaforth, 1801*. London: Printed for J. Mawman, 1808.

Puckrein, Gary. *Little England: Plantation Society and Anglo-Barbadian Politics, 1627-1700*. New York: New York University Press, 1984.

———. "Plantation Society, Factions, and the Origins of the Barbadian Civil War." PhD diss., Brown University, 1985.

Quintanilla, Mark S. "The Monmouth Rebels in the West Indies." PhD dissertation, Arizona State University, 1993.

Reay, Barry. *Popular Culture in Seventeenth-Century England*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1985.

Reddie, Richard S. *Abolition! The Struggle to Abolish Slavery in the British Empire.* Oxford: Lion Hudson, 2007.

Reddock, Rhoda. *Interrogating Caribbean Masculinities: Theoretical and Empirical Analyses*. Kingston: University of the West Indies Press, 2000.

Reinke-Williams, Tim. "Manhood and Masculinity in Early Modern England." *History Compass* 12, no. 9 (2014): 685-693.

Rice, James D. *Tales from a Revolution: Bacon's Rebellion and the Transformation of Early America*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2012.

Rodgers, Nini. *Ireland, Slavery and Anti-slavery: 1612-1865.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.

Roediger, David R, ed. *Black on White: Black Writers on What it means to be White*. New York: Schocken Books, 1998.

Rommelse, Gijs. *The Second Anglo-Dutch War 1665-1667: International Raison d'Etat, Mercantilism and Maritime Strife* (Hilversum: Verloren, 2006.

Romero, R. Todd. *Making War and Minting Christians: Masculinity, Religion, and Colonialism in Early New England*. Boston: University of Massachusetts Press, 2011.

Roper, L.H. *The English Empire in America 1602-1658: Beyond Jamestown*. London: Routledge, 2009.

———. *The Torrid Zone: Caribbean Colonization and Cultural Interaction in the Long Seventeenth Century Caribbean*. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 2018.

Roper, L.H. and B. Van Ruymbeke, eds. *Constructing Early Modern Empires: Proprietary Ventures in the Atlantic World, 1500-1750.* Leiden: Brill, 2007.

Rotundo, E. Anthony, *American Manhood: Transformations in Masculinity from the Revolution to the Modern Era*, New York: Basic Books, 1993.

Rugemer, Edward B. "The Development of Mastery and Race in the Comprehensive Slave Codes of the Greater Caribbean during the Seventeenth Century." *The William and Mary Quarterly* 70, no. 3 (2013): 429-58.

———. *Slave Law and the Politics of Resistance in the Early Atlantic World*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2018.

Rummel, R.J. *Understanding Conflict and War*, Vol. 4. Beverley Hills: Sage Publications, 1979.

Russell, Conrad. *The Causes of the English Civil War* London: Oxford University Press, 1990.

Sacks, David Harris. *The Widening Gate: Bristol and the Atlantic Economy, 1450-1700*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991.

Salih, Sarah. *Versions of Virginity in Late Medieval England*. Suffolk: D.S. Brewer, 2001.

Santos, Martha S. *Cleansing Honor with Blood: Masculinity, Violence, and Power in the Backlands of Northeast Brazil, 1845-1889*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press, 2012.

Schama, Simon. *A History o f Britain: At the Edge of the World?* New York: Hyperion, 2000.

Schweiger, Tristan James. "Planters, Mariners, nabobs, and squires: Masculine types and imperial ideology, 1719-1817." PhD Dissertation, The University of Chicago, 2015.

Schmidt, Benjamin. *Innocence Abroad: The Dutch Imagination and the New World, 1570-1670*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Schomburgk, Robert Hermann. *The History of Barbados*. London: Brown, Green and Longman's, 1848.

Scott, Joan W. "Gender: A Useful Category of Historical Analysis." *The American Historical Review* 91, no. 5 (1986): 1053-075.

———. *Gender and the Politics of History.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1999.

Scott, Jonathan. *England's Troubles: Seventeenth-Century English Political Instability in European Context*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Sewell, William Grant. *The Ordeal of Free Labor in the British West Indies.* New York: Harper and Brothers, 1861.

Shammas, Caroles. *A History of Household Government in America*. Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia Press, 2002.

Sharpe, J.A. *Early Modern England: A Social History, 1550–1760.* London: Bloomsbury Academic, 1988.

Sharpe, Kevin. *The Personal Rule of Charles I.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1992.

Sharples, Jason. "Discovering Slave Conspiracies: New Fears of Rebellion and Old Paradigms of Plotting in Seventeenth-Century Barbados," *The American Historical Review* 20, no. 3 (June 2015): 811-843.

Shaw, Jenny. *Everyday Life in the Early English Caribbean: Irish, Africans, and the Construction of Difference*. Athens, G.A.: The University of Georgia Press, 2013.

Shepard, Alexandra, and Garthine Walker, eds. *Gender and Change: Agency, Chronology and Periodisation*. New York: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009.

Shepard, Alexandra. "Manhood, Credit and Patriarchy in Early Modern England c. 1580-1640." *Past & Present* 167 (May, 2000): 75-106.

———. "From Anxious Patriarchs to Refined Gentlemen? Manhood in Britain, circa 1500–1700." *Journal of British Studies* 44, no. 2 (2005): 281-95.

———. *Meanings of Manhood in Early Modern England*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.

———. *Accounting for Oneself: Worth, Status, and the Social Order in Early Modern England*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015.

Shepherd, Verene A. *Slavery Without Sugar: Diversity in Caribbean Economy and Society since the 17th Century.* Gainesville, Florida: University Press of Florida, 2002.

Shepherd, Verene, Bridget Brereton, and Barbara Bailey, eds. *Engendering History: Caribbean Women in Historical Perspective.* New York: St. Martin's Press, 1995.

Sheridan, Richard B. *Sugar and Slavery: an Economic History of the British West Indies, 1623-1775*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1973.

Sherwood, Marika. *After Abolition: Britain and the Slave Trade Since 1807.* London: I.B. Tauris & Co. Ltd, 2007.

Sirmans, Eugene. "The Legal Status of the Slave in South Carolina, 1670-1740," *The Journal of Southern History* 28, no. 4 (1962): 462–73.

Sinha, Mrinalini. *Colonial Masculinity: the 'Manly Englishman' and the 'Effeminate Bengali' in the Late Nineteenth Century*. Manchester, 1995.

Smallwood, Stephanie E. *Saltwater Slavery: A Middle Passage from Africa to American Diaspora*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2007.

Smith, Abbot Emerson. *Colonists in Bondage: White Servitude and Convict Labor in America, 1607-1776*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1947.

Smith, Frederick H., and Karl Watson. "Urbanity, Sociability, and Commercial Exchange in the Barbados Sugar Trade: A Comparative Colonial Archaeological Perspective on Bridgetown, Barbados in the Seventeenth Century." *International Journal of Historical Archaeology*, Vol. 13 (2009): 63-79.

Smolenski, John and Thomas J. Humphrey, eds. *New World Orders: Violence, Sanction, and Authority in the Colonial Americas*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2005.

Smyth, Adam. *A Pleasing Sinne: Drink and Conviviality in Seventeenth-Century England.* Cambridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2004.

Snyder, Mark R. "The Education of Indentured Servants in Colonial America." *Journal of Technological Studies* 33, no. 2 (2007): 65-72.

Solow, Barbara L. *Slavery and the Rise of the Atlantic System*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Sowerby, Scott. *Making Toleration: The Repealers and the Glorious Revolution*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2013.

Spierenburg, Peter. *Men and Violence: Gender, Honor, and Rituals in Modern Europe and America*. Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1998.

St. Clair, William. *The Grand Slave Emporium: Cape Coast Castle and the British Slave Trade*. London: Profile, 2006.

Stampp, Kenneth. *The Peculiar Institution: Slavery in the Ante-Bellum South*. New York: Vintage Books, 1956.

Stanwood, Owen. *The Empire Reformed: English America in the Age of the Glorious Revolution*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2011.

Steek, Ian K. *The English Atlantic, 1675–1740: An Exploration of Communication and Community*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1986.

Stewart, James Brewer, ed. *Venture Smith and the Business of Slavery and Freedom*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2010.

Stinchbombe, Arthur L. *Sugar Island Slavery in the Age of Enlightenment: The Political Economy of the Caribbean World.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1995.

Stone, Lawrence. *The Crisis of the Aristocracy, 1558-1641*. Oxford,: Clarendon Press, 1965.

———. *The Causes of the English Revolution, 1529-1642*. London: Routledge and K. Paul, 1972.

———. *The Family, Sex and Marriage in England 1500-1800*. London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1977.

Stubbs, Jean. "Gender in Caribbean history." In *General history of the Caribbean Volume VI: Methodology and historiography of the Caribbean,* edited by B. H. Higman, 95-135. London: Macmillan, 1999.

Swaminathan, Srividhya and Adam R. Beach, eds. *Invoking Slavery in the Eighteenth-Century British Imagination*. New York: Rougtledge, 2016.

Sweet, John Wood. *Bodies Politic: Negotiating Race in the American North, 1730-1830*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2003.

Taylor, S.A.G. *The Western Design.* Kingston: Institute of Jamaica, 1965.

Thiery, Daniel E. *Polluting the Sacred: Violence, Faith and the 'Civilizing' of Parishioners in Late Medieval England*. Boston, MA: Brill, 2009.

Thomas, Hugh. *The Slave Trade: The History of the Atlantic Slave Trade, 1440-1870*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1997.

Thomas, Keith. *Religion and the Decline of Magic*. New York: Scribner, 1971.

Thompson, Peter. "Sources and Interpretations: Henry Drax's Instructions on the Management of a Seventeenth-Century Barbadian Sugar Plantation." *The William and Mary Quarterly* 66, no. 3 (2009): 565-604.

Thornton, John Thornton. *Africa and Africans in the Making of the Atlantic World, 1400-1800.* New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012.

Tomlins, Christopher and Bruce H. Mann, eds. *The Many Legalities of Early America.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2001.

Tosh, John. *Manliness and Masculinities in Nineteenth-Century Britain*: *Essays on Gender, Family, and Empire*. London: Pearson Longman, 2004.

———. “What Should Historians do with Masculinity,” *History Workshop*, 38 (2004): 179-202.

Tree, Ronald. *A History of Barbados.* London: Hart-Davis, MacGibbon, 1972.

Tutino, John. *Making a New World: Founding Capitalism in the Bajío and Spanish North America*. Durham NC: Duke University Press, 2011.

Turner, Bryan. *Religion and Social Theory.* Santa Barbara, CA: Sage Publications, 1991.

Turner, Sasha. *Contested Bodies: Pregnancy, Childrearing, and Slavery in Jamaica.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2017.

Underdown, David. *Pride's Purge: Politics in the Puritan Revolution*. Oxford, U.K.: Clarendon Press, 1971.

———. *Revel, Riot, and Rebellion: Popular Politics and Culture in England, 1603-1660.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1985.

Van der Zee, John. *Bound Over: Indentured Servitude and American Conscience*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1985.

Vaughan, Alden T. *Roots of American Racism: Essays on the Colonial Experience*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1995.

Walker, Garthine. *Crime, Gender, and Social Order in Early Modern England*. Cambridge: Studies in Early Modern British History, 2003.

Wallace, Elizabeth. *The British Slave Trade and Public Memory*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2006.

Walsh, Lorena Seebach. *From Calabar to Carter's Grove: The History of a Virginia Slave Community.* Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1997.

Walvin, James. *Slavery and British Society 1776-1846*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1982.

———. *England, Slaves and Freedom, 1776-1838.* Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 1986.

———. *Making the Black Atlantic: Britain and the African Diaspora* The Black Atlantic. New York: Cassell, 2000.

West-Pavlov, Russell. *Bodies and their Spaces: System, Crisis and Transformation in Early Modern England*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2006.

Wiener, Martin J. *Men of Blood: Violence, Manliness and Criminal Justice in Victorian England*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Williams, Eric. *Capitalism and Slavery*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1944.

Williamson, James Alexander. *The Caribbee Islands under the Proprietary Patents.* London: Oxford University Press, 1926.

Wilson, Adrian. *Rethinking Social History: English Society, 1570–1920, and Its Interpretation.* Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1993.

Withington, Phil. "Company and Sociability in Early Modern England," *Social History* Vol. 32 No. 3 (August 2007): 291-301.

Wood, Betty. *The Origins of American slavery: Freedom and Bondage in the English colonies*. New York: Hill and Wang, 1997.

———. *Slavery in Colonial America, 1619-1776.* Lanham, Maryland: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, 2005.

Wood, Peter H. *Strange New Land: African Americans, 1617-1776*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1996.

———. *Black Majority: Negroes in Colonial South Carolina from 1670 through the Stono Rebellion*. New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 1996.

Woolrych, Austin. *Commonwealth to Protectorate*. London: Oxford University Press, 1982.

Worden, Blair. *The Rump Parliament, 1648-1653*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1974.

Wrightson, Keith, and David Levine. *Poverty and Piety in an English Village: Terling, 1525-1700*. New York: Academic Press, 1979.

Wrightson, Keith. *English Society, 1580–1680*. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 1982.

———. *Earthly Necessities: Economic Lives in Early Modern Britain* The New Economic History of Britain. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2000.

Zacek, Natalie A. *Settler Society in the English Leewards Islands, 1670-1776*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

Zemon Davis, Natalie. *The Gift in Sixteenth-Century France*. London: Oxford University Press, 2000.

———. "The Rites of Violence: Religious Riot in Sixteenth-Century France." *Past & Present* 59 (May, 1973): 51-91.