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ABSTRACT

During the middle seventeenth century, tens of thousands of Irish people came to England’s Caribbean colonies. Cromwell captured and transported most of these individuals to Barbados and Montserrat, and those Irish persons became indentured servants to English masters on the islands. Despite living under English rule and participating in plantation economies in both colonies, the Irish inhabitants of Barbados and Montserrat display stark differences in social mobility toward the end of the seventeenth century. Rather than looking to Irish individuals’ agency in creating social difference or mobility, this research examines the roles crises and elites play in creating these disparate outcomes for the Barbadian and Montserratian Irish. I use comparative process tracing analysis to investigate how endogenous and exogenous crises affect elite responses to social instability and, subsequently, create varying levels of social mobility for Irish people on seventeenth-century Barbados and Montserrat.
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INTRODUCTION

Under Cromwell’s military campaign in Ireland during the middle seventeenth century, the English government forcibly transported tens of thousands of Irish people to England’s colonies in the Caribbean, primarily Barbados (Beckles 1990; Doan 2011; Fergus 1994; Shaw 2013). These Irish individuals provided free labor to the plantation owners of those colonies as indentured servants and suffered severe brutality at the hands of their English masters (Beckles 1990; Block and Shaw 2011; Doan 2011; Fergus 1994; Menard 2006; Rodgers 2007; Rugemer 2013; Shaw 2013). However, some Irish persons voluntarily migrated to the British Caribbean with hopes of regaining the wealth, estates, and lives they had before Cromwell invaded Ireland and England (Akenson 1997; Doan 2011; Fergus 1994; Ryzewski and Cherry 2015).

Henry and John Blake were two such Irishmen. Members from one of the distinguished Irish elite families known as the ‘Fourteen Tribes,’ the Blake brothers witnessed the Cromwell’s military strip their family of its assets and sought to recover their losses in order to purchase their confiscated lands (Hobson 2007; Ryzewski and Cherry 2015; Zacek 2010). Henry and John Blake, along with so many Catholic Irish elite under Cromwell’s military reign in Ireland, saw the Caribbean as their opportunity to do just that, with Henry traveling to Montserrat and John to Barbados (Hobson 2007; Jacoberger 2015; Messenger 1967).

On Montserrat, Henry Blake amassed wealth rather quickly under the relative autonomy the island’s officials offered Catholic Irish persons, and he promptly returned to Ireland to reconnect with his family by the 1650s (Hobson 2007; Jacoberger 2015; Messenger 1967). John Blake, on the other hand, struggled to find success on Barbados. John failed to secure a plot of land large enough to support the sugar plantation which would have allowed him to participate in the sugar economy of Barbados. John’s experience on Barbados was one felt by most Catholic
Irish inhabitants of the island (Jacobberger 2015; Messenger 1967).

Defeated by his inability to prosper as his brother Henry had done, John Blake and his nuclear family traveled to Montserrat where they ran the sugar plantation Henry owned. Once on Montserrat, John Blake thrived economically, culturally, and politically on Montserrat, acting as the “speaker of the General Assembly of the Leewards” in addition to him being a prominent planter on the island (Zacek 2010:86). Like his brother, John Blake enjoyed political and economic prosperity in the English colony of Montserrat that he could not access in Barbados (Doan 2011; Hobson 2007; Jacobberger 2015; Messenger 1967; Shaw 2013; Zacek 2010).

How is it that John’s effort to achieve financial success was effectively stifled on Barbados while Henry experienced financial and social growth on Montserrat? More interestingly, how come John Blake found economic prosperity and opportunities to hold political positions on Montserrat even though he could not even turn a substantial profit on Barbados? Barbados’ government openly and fervently discriminated against Catholic Irish people (Beckles 1990; Block and Shaw 2011; Shaw 2013), but elites on Montserrat did the same, implementing legal sanctions against practitioners of the Catholic faith (Akenson 1997; Doan 2011; Fergus 1978; Fergus 1994; Messenger 1967; Pulpisher and Goodwin 2013; Ryzewski and Cherry 2015; Zacek 2010). Even so, Irish people on Montserrat attained a level of autonomy and mobility that their Barbadian counterparts could not achieve.

Scholars often address these disparate outcomes by identifying the Irish population majority on Montserrat or the lack of available property on Barbados (Griffin 1911; Jacobberger 2015; Messenger 1967; Pulpisher and Goodwin 1982; Rodgers 2007). Some even forgo a

---

1 England’s Caribbean colonies were separated into two primary categories: Barbados and the Leeward Islands. The Leeward Islands consisted of the four islands of St. Kitts, Antigua, Nevis, and Montserrat. “Leewards” is a colloquial reference to that group of islands.
comparison altogether, intimating that Montserrat was simply an Irish anomaly in the British Caribbean. This thesis, by contrast, looks to those who wielded the power to grant or limit Irish people’s access to opportunity and, subsequently, their mobility on Barbados and Montserrat: the English elite. Specifically, I locate elite responses to events causing social instability, or crises, and how those various strategies of social re-stabilization affect Irish individuals’ outcomes in the colonial societies of Barbados and Montserrat.

Though both of these islands shared broad similarities—as English colonies they were structured around plantation economies, populated by the same ethnic and racial groups, shared the same ethnic and racial hierarchy, and governed by an English elite—the elites on these islands faced different challenges to their authority. These challenges culminated in unique crises on each island which demanded elite action in order to maintain social stability. By comparing moments of crisis on the islands of seventeenth-century Barbados and Montserrat, this thesis demonstrates how elite strategy to restore social order during crisis can alter or maintain status boundaries between elites and subordinate racial and ethnic groups by addressing two primary questions: “How do different types of crises affect elites’ strategy of societal restoration?” and “How do the chosen strategies alter the elite group’s structuring of opportunity and mobility for subordinate groups?”

To answer these questions, this thesis uses comparative process tracing (CPT) analysis to establish meaningful differences in elite responses to crisis on colonial Barbados and Montserrat by identifying the type crisis elites on each island faced and the resulting outcomes on the social order of those colonies. First, I draw on theoretical literature to identify an idealized process of elite response to crisis in a racially and ethnically stratified colonial society. Then after identifying the specific processes of elite response on seventeenth-century Barbados and
Montserrat, I use that ideal process to compare the two cases analyzed in this study. This comparison allows the researcher to identify the key differences which led to different outcomes on Barbados and Montserrat.

In comparing elite responses to crisis in the colonial Caribbean and assessing how those responses restructured or maintained racial and ethnic hierarchy, I hope to contribute to the literature analyzing stratification and inequality as well as the growing literature on ‘whiteness’ in the sociology of race. The Irish people have been an important case in the historical and sociological study of race, specifically the fluidity of racial categories. The dramatic shift in Irish experience has often been used to demonstrate the social construction of race, especially as it pertains to the twentieth century United States context. Much of this literature focuses on the ways in which Irish people themselves access opportunity or establish their whiteness. In demonstrating how elite decision making shifted or maintained boundaries, I hope to show how group status and stratification thereof are a result of elite strategy in preserving the hierarchical social order.

LITERATURE ON WHITENESS

Critical whiteness literature addresses the intricate relationship between power, whiteness, and group status through analyzing the normalcy, privileges, and hegemony associated with the social force of white sensibility. The normalcy of white skin and being white acts as the most pervasive aspect of whiteness. Since societies like the U.S. that ‘being white’ as a “taken-for-granted category,” all those people or groups deviating from white and whiteness are marked as other, as subhuman in the social narrative of racial inequality (Nayak 2007:737; 2

---

2 This language of ‘becoming white’ stems from a history of researchers racializing Irish people as nonwhite historically, but it most recently articulated in Noel Ignatiev’s How the Irish Became White.
Allen 2001; Frankenberg 1993; Harris 1993; Howard 2004; Levine-Rasky 2000b; Rabaka 2007; Urrieta 2006; Willoughby-Herard 2007). White people experience being a social norm and all of the unspoken privileges that come with that status. Subsequently, those deviating from the racial norm, or people of color, suffer intense policing from society and its structures so that they better conform to the norm or face punishment for not doing so (Allen 2001; Burgin 2013; Cabrera 2014; Frankenberg 1993; Harris 1993; Howard 2004; Hughey 2010; Leonardo 2004; Levine-Rasky 2000a; Matias et al. 2014; Nayak 2007; Rabaka 2007; Willoughby-Herard 2007).

In an attempt to encourage self-awareness and racial equality activism among white people, much of the literature focuses on the hegemonic nature of white supremacy in an abstract way. Approaching whiteness and its social power in this way shifts the onus of ‘white guilt’ beyond the individual white person (Frankenberg 1993; Garner 2017; Gillborn 2006; Hughey 2010; Levine-Rasky 2000a; Nayak 2007). At the same time, however, many of the researchers place the responsibility of social activism against racism and racial inequality on white individuals (Cabrera 2014; Burgin 2013; Frankenberg 1993; Gronold and Pedersen 2009; Hughey 2010; Leonardo 2004; Levine-Rasky 2000a, 2000b; Matias and Mackey 2015; Matias et al. 2014; Picower 2009; Tanner 2017; Willoughby-Herard 2007). By placing the burden of whiteness on the hegemonic structures of white supremacy and requiring action for racial equality from white people simultaneously, critical whiteness studies engages white individuals in self-reflexive praxis without alienating them from racial equality activism.

Some of the literature concerning whiteness also seeks to illuminate the ethnic divisions between racially homogenous, namely white, people (Garner 2017; Howard 2004; Nayak 2007). This literature concerning ethnicity often utilizes theories of boundary maintenance and ethnic conflict to describe these divisions. Boundary maintenance discusses a subcultural group
policing membership through shared religion and cultural forms in order to remain a distinct
category (Cheska 1984; Chong 1998; Barth 1969; Harrison 2003; Horowitz 1977; Megoran
2007; Olzak 1983; Smith 1978). Sociologists like Waters (1990) note that this ability to enforce
or even claim ethnic identity among white people is an extension of white privilege. This is due
to white people possessing an authority of choice over their racial and ethnic identity that people
of color cannot access or wield.

Ethnic conflict theory addresses ethnic difference in a similar vein, arguing that
competition and violence between racial or ethnic subgroups creates difference between them.
Conflict between ethnic groups can be created by the subgroups themselves or the dominant
group, and it often arises when ethnic and racial groups compete economically (Barth 1969;
conflict theory in examining whiteness is Ignatiev’s (1995) work How the Irish Became White
(Nayak 2007).

Ignatiev (1995) follows this theoretical framework in order to analyze how Irish people
‘created’ their whiteness by separating themselves from black people. By enforcing and
widening the social divide between themselves and black people in the twentieth-century U.S.,
Irish individuals enforced racial distance from black people and racial proximity to white people
through economic competition with black persons. This in turn altered the ethnic distinction of
being Irish amongst the white dominant group. What Ignatiev (1995) neglects, however, is the
hegemonic white superiority allowing Irish people to achieve such a task. Furthermore,
Ignatiev’s (1995) articulation of Irish social mobility does not address the variations in societal
mobility of Irish individuals on Barbados and Montserrat despite attempts to achieve similar
goals of economic, political, and religious freedom.
WHY BARBADOS AND MONTSERRAT?

The seventeenth-century colonies of Barbados and Montserrat serve as prime examples to explore the connections between crises, elites’ agency, and subordinate groups’ mobility as well as to use CPT analysis due their similar, yet unidentical, social construction of difference and opportunity. Both Barbados and Montserrat modeled their laws and cultures after those of England, adopting fears and stigmas surrounding Irish people (Menard 2006; Beckles 1990; Ryzewski and Cherry 2015; Shaw 2013). The dominant groups of Barbados and Montserrat effectively barred Catholic Irish individuals from participating in the colonies’ governments and militaries. To the English elites, Irish individuals were an uncivil and backward people, a belief which originated during England’s colonization of Ireland (Beckles 1990; Menard 2006; Ryzewski and Cherry 2015; Shaw 2013).

During Ireland’s colonization, its English invaders quickly marked the Irish inhabitants as a “people bred to be dominated” (Painter 2010:135). English officials propagated this belief by describing Irish through ‘firsthand accounts’ which described the “wild Irish” (Lebow 1976:75) as “eaters of human flesh, murderers and thieves who reveled in sodomy and incest” (Lebow 1976:75; Leyburn 1997:83). By depicting Irish individuals as brutish and uncivilized, English officials instilled widespread fear and mistrust of Irishness and Irish people in English individuals. In accounts of Irish people, English narrators continually turn to a single source in explaining the source of their brutishness: Catholicism (Block and Shaw 2011; Painter 2010; Shaw 2013).

Because of this, English government officials in England and its Caribbean colonies enforced sanctions against Catholic Irish individuals, poor and wealthy alike. English elites stripped wealthy Irish families of their estates and possessions in Ireland, and in Barbados and
Montserrat they sought to restrict Irish people from accessing economic and social mobility. Barbados and Montserrat’s English elites passed legislation preventing Catholic Irish persons from holding positions in their governments and barred the public practice of Catholicism (Beckles 1990; Block and Shaw 2011; Doan 2011; Hobson 2007; Painter 2010; Shaw 2013).

In one case on Barbados, the English officials on the island “arrested, whipped, and deported” Patrick O’Callaghan, an indentured Irishman, for “speaking ‘irreverently and profanely of the Holy Bible and uttering bad expressions of Englishmen” (Beckles 1990:514). Another Catholic Irishman by the name of Cornelius Bryan endured a similar fate. Like many Irish Catholic people, Bryan arrived on Barbados and labored for an English master under an oppressive English government as an indentured servant. Bryan became known for his public “‘mutinous’ speech” where he threatened to drink the blood of English colonists and slandered their customs and religion (Block and Shaw 2011:33; Shaw 2013). His punishment? Twenty-one lashes by a whip on his bare back whilst tied to a post on a public bridge where all the colonists could view him, as prescribed by the courts of Barbados (Beckles 1990; Block and Shaw 2011; Shaw 2013).

Even on Montserrat which had a Catholic Irish population majority, the English elites legally discriminated against Catholic Irish people. The most apparent example of this discrimination is the geographic segregation of Catholic Irish individuals to St. Patrick’s Parish¹, a mountainous and inhospitable area of Montserrat’s volcanic landscape. Approximately 40% of Montserrat’s population lived in this parish, which constituted only 10% of the island’s forty-square-mile land area, and Catholic Irish individuals comprised a majority of St. Patrick’s

---

¹ A parish is equivalent to a U.S. county, or the state of Louisiana’s parishes. The name ‘St. Patrick’s’ was given to this parish due to its majority Catholic Irish population.
inhabitants. In containing Irish people in this small area unable to support large-scale cultivation of cash crops or sugar, the English elite believed they could better control their Catholic Irish population’s movement and overall social mobility (Cawley 2015; Hobson 2007; Jacobberger 2015; Pulpisher and Goodwin 2001; Ryzewski and Cherry 2015; Zacek 2010).

In addition to prohibiting Catholic worship and policing Catholic Irish people, both Barbados and Montserrat’s governmental officials legally sanctioned and required severe physical punishment of free laborers who shirked their duties to their English masters. Elites on these islands often required additional years of service, whippings, or even hangings for servants who left their master’s plantations without permission, the most common of these being years added to the end of their servitude (Beckles 1990; Block and Shaw 2011; Doan 2011; Fergus 1994; Rugemer 2013; Shaw 2013). Even though these punishments seem quite severe, slaves on seventeenth-century Barbados and Montserrat experienced much worse from their English oppressors. The English elites of these colonies mutilated, tortured, and executed enslaved black people for the same crimes Irish individuals committed (Akenson 1997; Beckles 1990; Block and Shaw 2011; Doan 2011; Fergus 1978; Menard 2006; Rodgers 2007; Shaw 2013).

On Barbados, where there were nearly as many slaves as white people, government officials executed enslaved black individuals by hanging for mere suspicion of rebellion. Barbadian elites even went so far as to order enslaved persons accused of wrongdoing or rebellion to be “burned alive, or drawn and quartered, or have their heads placed on spikes as their bodies were burned to ashes below, to send a message to others and to underscore the severity of the crimes” (Shaw 2013:153). The severity, however, seems contingent upon the race of the individuals committing the crimes. White servants, particularly Irish ones, received whippings, exile, or even acquittals for similar, if not the same crimes on Barbados when slaves
were often sentenced to death.

Likewise, the government officials of Montserrat required brutal punishment for slaves who broke the laws of the island. Slave revolts on Montserrat were rare when compared to Barbados. Even so, elites’ punishment of slaves was similar on both islands; Montserrat’s elites considered ‘running away’ a severe crime in their society. These government officials sentenced Jack, a runaway slave, “to be hanged, drawn, and quartered for running away for three months, and his body was to be displayed as a warning to others contemplating flight” (Shaw 2013:153; Akenson 1997; Fergus 1978). About one year later, Montserratian elites condemned another enslaved person who escaped “to dye… by being first broken to pieces and afterwards his limbs and body to be burnt” (Shaw 2013:153; Akenson 1997; Fergus 1978).

Conversely, Irish servants on Montserrat who ran away from their service endured a whipping “up to 39 lashes on their bare backs, complete their indenture, and then be sold for another four years as compensation to their masters” (Fergus 1994:25). Montserrat housed a much lower slave-to-white ratio than Barbados, yet the island displayed just as horrid and unequal treatment toward enslaved persons as Barbados, especially when compared to white servants. Both of the colonies of Barbados and Montserrat supported a broader racial hierarchy within which the ethnic hierarchy described through religious discrimination between English and Irish people was situated.

Furthermore, both Barbados and Montserrat witnessed the discrimination against Irish people subside by the end of the seventeenth century. These islands, however, varied greatly in terms of Irish individuals’ social advancement and achievement. Barbadian Irish persons attained freedom from indenture but largely remained poor freeholders unable to find land they could purchase, preventing them from accessing wealth that would help them infiltrate the dominant
group. This left Irish persons with one option regarding livelihood—paid servitude. Because of this, Irish people often returned to their former jobs or performed similar duties under a new master, but their English masters finally paid Irish people for their work. Regardless of achieving freedom and pay, Irish people generally remained a servile group of white laborers for mostly English planters (Amussen 2007; Beckles 1990, 2013; Block and Shaw 2011; Engerman 1986; Gemery 1986; Mernard 2006; Shaw 2013).

A lucky few Irishmen did become landholders and plantation owners. One such Irishman was the aforementioned Cornelius Bryan. The rebellious Bryan earned his freedom through either purchasing his freedom or finishing his indenture, and by 1680, he owned two servants, nine slaves, and twenty-two acres of land according to the 1680 Barbados census (Block and Shaw 2011; Menard 2006; Shaw 2013). Within a mere thirty years from his arrival on Barbados to the 1680 census, Bryan amassed enough wealth to purchase a sizeable plantation capable of producing large quantities of product. Bryan, however, could not participate in the government of Barbados or in its elections despite owning the proper acreage required to participate in such legislative activities. Because of his noted Catholic allegiance, Bryan could not occupy spaces or positions of power in Barbados. The elites kept Bryan, despite his wealth, out of the upper echelons of society that affected social stratification, just like they did for the poor Irish inhabitants of the colony (Beckles 1990; Block and Shaw 2011; Doan 2011; Shaw 2013).

Montserrat, on the other hand, showed much more upward mobility for its Catholic Irish inhabitants toward the end of the seventeenth century. Exiled Catholic Irish from St. Kitts, Virginia, and Barbados traveled to Montserrat, and because of this, they comprised a majority of the island’s population. Some of the Irish even descended from a wealthy elite known as the Tribes of Galway or the Fourteen Tribes in Ireland and came to comprise a portion of the
plantocracy on the island (Hobson 2007; Ryzewski and Cherry 2015; Zacek 2010). As time passed, the Irish within this group as well as outside of it became “on average, bigger planters, and owned more slaves, than did the British” (Akenson 1997:149). Even those Irish relegated to small, inhospitable area of St. Patrick’s accrued wealth by cultivating tobacco, and a majority of those Irish households owned slaves according to a 1678 Montserrat Census (Akenson 1997; Shaw 2013).

Additionally, the Irish on Montserrat found political opportunity and religious tolerance in the late 1600s. Multiple Irishmen acted as Governor of Montserrat and the Leewards, some practicing members of the Church of England while others remained loyal to the Catholic Church privately (Akenson 1997; Block and Shaw 2011; Fergus 1978; Fergus 1994; Shaw 2013; Zacek 2010). Regardless of the faith these governors ‘officially’ professed, these Irishmen displayed empathy for their fellow Irish people, passing laws providing economic protections for poorer Irish on the island and allowing for formal tolerance of Catholic practice (Akenson 1997; Block and Shaw 2011; Fergus 1978; Fergus 1994; Shaw 2013; Zacek 2010). Christopher Codrington, the Governor of Barbados who openly disdained Catholics, noted to English parliament that “the Irish of Montserrat do there enjoy their estates and Livelihoods as quietly and happily as the English subjects do” despite a rise of Irish Catholic insurrections in Barbados and the Leewards at large (Shaw 2013: 181; Fergus 1994; Zacek 2010).

THEORY

In order to explain the blatant discrimination Irish people faced in the seventeenth-century British Caribbean, many researchers attempt to ‘blacken’ Irish people, racializing their experiences to appear similar to that of black individuals oppressed by a history of slavery (Beckles 1985, 1990, 2013; Block and Shaw 2011; Chiles 2004; Eltis 2017; Ferreira 1999; Mac
An Gahill 2002; Palmié 2011; Pearl 2009; Rodgers 2007). This ‘explanation’ of Irish oppression overlooks the critical variations in the severity of slaves’ and servants’ punishments for crimes in the colonies. Furthermore, framing the English elites’ discrimination against Irish people in this way diminishes the role the racial hierarchy played shaping opportunity for Irish individuals during times of crisis.

Instead, I locate the Irish as white people that English governments oppressed on the basis of ethnicity, understanding that their whiteness allowed for the possibility of social mobility unavailable to enslaved black people on Barbados and Montserrat during the 1600s. In this study, I research the social mobility of a group within a racial category, not across racial categories. I do not attempt to demonstrate Irish people transgressing a racial boundary, nor am I comparing these cases to understand how the Irish ‘became white’ in the colonial Caribbean. Rather, I investigate how crises shape elites’ structuring of opportunity, noting the role infrastructure play in permitting or denying access to upward social mobility. To do this, I focus on how crises affect elites’ ordering of ethnic hierarchy within the white category because both islands exhibited strong racial hierarchies during crisis.

Racial formation theory’s formulation of the racial state provides the framework to do just this, capturing the trajectory – the process of disruption and restoration – of a stratified society. In the racial state, disruption occurs when the existing social order is challenged while restoration involves the ways the dominant group regains their desired hierarchy through the state’s policies and programs. This trajectory is a recurring process because the racial state only maintains an unstable equilibrium where conflicting interests are rampant but controlled by the structuring of the state (Omi and Winant 1994).

In unstable equilibrium, the society experiences constant tension between stratified
groups; however, the racial state neutralizes and normalizes the competing interests of stratified
groups by sustaining the narrative justifying social, economic, and political differences between
groups. The operation of the racial state monitors and controls everyday intergroup conflicts
through strategic and hegemonic means, such as at the level of policymakers defining legislation.
This unstable equilibrium enters crisis when it can no longer control the ever-present tensions of
its stratified society, and the crisis consequently destabilizes the present racial and ethnic
hierarchy typically protected by the interdependent components operating the racial state.

The dominant group implements strategies to combat the crisis and restore unstable
equilibrium that are broadly characterized as absorption and insulation. With insulation, the
dominant group implements small changes to their social relations in order to maintain the racial
and ethnic hierarchy of the society, creating more of a symbolic shift in status for a subordinate
group. This change in social relations offers a subordinate group more liberties and opportunities
but does not restructure the nature of stratification for the society. The elites essentially restore
their society’s pre-crisis racial and ethnic hierarchy, continuing to use previous categories of
difference. The dominant group’s changes merely improve a subordinate group’s social
experiences while simultaneously restricting their mobility to remain below that of the elites.

Absorption, on the other hand, entails a rather substantial alteration to the existing
hierarchy of racial and ethnic difference. While the elites maintain their overall control of the
society, they also enact formal – i.e., legislation or public declaration – changes to the social
functioning of the racial state that positively affects outcomes of a subordinate group. These
changes, of course, still largely benefit the dominant group, but they also improve social status
and mobility for a subordinate group. In this way, absorption involves the elite controlled
incorporation of a subordinate group into spaces previously occupied solely by the dominant
group (Omi and Winant 1994).

**Application to Barbados and Montserrat**

For the cases of Barbados and Montserrat analyzed in this research, I use Irish individuals as the measurement for absorption and insulation in these highly stratified societies. I do this because both seventeenth-century Barbados and Montserrat maintained a racial and ethnic hierarchy that discriminated against non-English, specifically Irish, persons and enslaves black individuals, making them subordinate groups. However, Irish people display changes in outcome that enslaved persons do not because Montserrat and Barbados devalued, dehumanized, and enslaved black individuals throughout the 1600s that cemented them to the absolute bottom of the racial and ethnic hierarchy of the colonies.

In light of this, I focus solely on changes in the structuring of the ethnic hierarchy specifically, noting that the maintenance of the racial hierarchy was crucial to the economic operation of these two slave societies (Amussen 2007; Griffin 1911; Handler 1969; Jacobberger 2015; Libby 1991; Maudlin and Herman 2016; Messenger 1967; Palmie 2013; Pulpisher and Goodwin 1982; Reilly 2015; Rodgers 2007; Ryzewski and Cherry 2015). Because of this, insulation in these cases would appear as the strict enforcement of ethnic hierarchy before and after a crisis. Conversely, absorption would display a shift from a distinct ethnic hierarchy to the slight erasure of those ethnic boundaries of difference so that the elites maintain their overall control of the society.

**METHODS**

To establish elite strategy of social order restoration in seventeenth-century Barbados and Montserrat in addition to analyzing the variations between these processes on the two colonies, I use comparative tracing (CPT) analysis. CPT provides a two-step comparative-historical method
that allows the researcher to track changes within two societies as well as differences between them. In the first step, the researcher must use a theoretical model to create an ideal pathway for the process being studied and to construct pathways for the two cases. Constructing the models for these pathways requires pinpointing “the processes leading ‘from A to B’” for the ideal and in the given time period for each case (Bengtsson and Ruonovaara 2017:45). The researcher locates the aforementioned processes by identifying a critical juncture – a “transitional situation in which actors have the possibility to make choices that would open up a new path” – between points A and B (Bengtsson and Ruonavaara 2017:52).

Step 1: Establishing Pathways

The Ideal Type. Bengtsson and Ruonavaara’s (2017) conceptualization of critical juncture maps well onto the racial state’s crisis, with both identifying periods of severe social instability requiring action to combat this disruption. Because of this, I am able to clearly establish a pathway from Point A to Point B. Point A, for the purposes of this research, represents the ethnic hierarchy prior to a colonial society experiencing crisis. Similarly, Point B refers to the ethnic hierarchy after the elites restore unstable equilibrium. Ethnic hierarchy, using the theoretical framework provided by the racial state, is the strict policing between the elite group and a subordinate group within the dominant group’s racial category. Ideally for elites, the dominant group would maintain the same hierarchy in both Point A and Point B.

In this research, I define crisis as a moment or series of events causing disruption to the unstable equilibrium on the respective islands. Crisis can take two forms: endogenous and exogenous. Endogenous crises deal with elites’ concerns of internal issues of social norm disruption, such as insurrection or rebellion, whereas exogenous crises refer to the elite’s concern of external factors as impetuses for disruption, like war, invasion, trade disturbances, or natural
disasters.

While there are no clear definitions to which type of crisis would be more preferable for elites to deal with, endogenous crises seem to be preferable for elites because the threat they create is one able to be combatted solely by the state whereas exogenous threats could involve threats beyond the power of state and the elite. Moreover, elites can reinforce stratification and inequality through the suppression of the rebellious group. Because of this, endogenous crisis would be the most preferable crisis for elites to face. Following from this logic, the ideal process would read as follows for seventeenth-century Barbados and Montserrat: Irish subordinate to and separate from English – endogenous crisis – Irish subordinate to and separate from English.

**Barbados and Montserrat.** Ethnic hierarchy for the specific cases of Barbados and Montserrat is the treatment and mobility of Irish people during the chosen points. In light of this, Point A refers to the treatment and mobility of Irish persons before a crisis, and Point B represents the treatment and mobility of Irish individuals after a crisis. In order to establish Point A and Point B, I first locate a highly destabilizing event for each case. I then identify two similar sources of information, i.e., two sets of legal codes, in order to adequately compare points in time before and after a notable crisis. These sources of analysis must also offer insight into how elites structured and enforced ethnic difference on the islands of Montserrat and Barbados.

**Step 2: Comparison**

In the final step of CPT, the researcher compares the two processes to the ideal type. Comparing the two cases to the ideal allows the researcher to identify how the timelines on Barbados and Montserrat differ from and resemble the ideal process. I can then locate the social mechanisms or events that possibly affected the timelines’ variations and similarities to the ideal and, consequently, one another. By doing this, I can identify the primary factors in producing
similar or varied outcomes.

ANALYSIS

Barbados

Many archives from seventeenth-century Barbados have survived into the twenty-first century, making it fairly easy to access primary sources and establishing a timeline for the colony through microforms at the McWherter Library on University of Memphis’ campus. Because of this, I was able to locate microforms of Barbadian legal codes and an official correspondence concerning a well-known, well-researched conspiracy of rebellion. Although by no means the only planned or enacted rebellion to occur on seventeenth-century Barbados, the planned slave revolt of 1692 provides a typical example of the type of crisis that plagued Barbadian officials from 1654 to 1699 (Beckles 1990; Block and Shaw 2011; Doan 2011; Menard 2006; Rodgers 2007; Shaw 2013). Because of this, I use this account of rebellion as the crisis or critical juncture of Barbados’ ‘A to B’ timeline.

Points A and B are represented by the “Acts and Statutes of Barbados” (1654) and “The LAWS of BARBADOS: COLLECTED: In One Volume” (1699), respectively. I chose these two archives to represent points A and B because they offer a direct comparison and a comprehensive chronological analysis of hierarchical shifts in Barbadian society. First and foremost, both of these documents are legal codes, which allow the researcher to track changes made specifically by English elites to structure Barbadian society between point A and point B.

Secondly, 1654 represents the beginning of Irish indentures flooding into the Barbados labor market while 1699 marks the end of the seventeenth century, allowing the most time possible for change in ethnic hierarchy to be identified. The 1654 laws account for the massive influx of Irish indentures resulting from Cromwell’s invasion of Ireland, thus providing enough
time for elites to respond to any issues with Catholic Irish people. The 1699 laws give the researcher the most time allowable under the restrictions of the time period to trace any changes in ethnic hierarchy on Barbados. In using the latest available laws, I am able to fully account for the impact of rebellion on elites’ restoration of unstable equilibrium in colonial Barbados.

Point A: Acts & Statutes 1654. In these statutes scribed by William Bentley, the English elite of Barbados created a code of law in order to structure their society as they saw fit. The Assemblymen root their codes in the culture and laws of England immediately, beginning the codes with the proclamation “that we being of one Nation should be governed by the same Law, which our brethren in England are.”¹ In doing this, the English elites of the Barbados Assembly claimed the power of the English Crown, and they enforced laws matching those cultural beliefs of England, specifically those concerning Irish people.

Drawing from English propaganda concerning Irish individuals during the colonization of Ireland, these elites quickly targeted non-Anglican religions as the root of incivility and backward behavior. The English elites wrote,

1. That[sic] a Libertie of Conscience in matters of Reiligion be allowed to all, excepting such Tenents as are Inconsistent to a Civil Government, and that Laws be put in execution against Blasphemie, Atheisme and open Scandalous living, Seditious preaching, or unfound Doctrine sufficiently proved against him.

Those “Tenents” proving “Inconsistent to a Civil Government” were any that did not proclaim the teachings, beliefs, and practices of the Church of England, thus naming all non-Anglicans a threat to Barbados’ government. The two notable groups on the island who did not ascribe to the Church of England were Irish and enslaved people. Moreover, the language of “Seditious preaching,” “unfound Doctrine,” and “open Scandalous living” practically named Irish people as

¹ See Preamble in Appendix: Barbados Acts and Statutes 1654.
the primary targets of this law by drawing on the English narratives of incivility, brutishness, and backwardness of Irish persons. In this way, the English elites practically name Catholic Irish persons as their enemies, as substantial threats to English forms of government and culture.

In the second part of this act, the English assemblymen outright declare the practice of any religion other than that of the Church of England illegal. These elites require that the tenents of the Church of England “be duely observed by all the Inhabitants”² in order to be in accordance with the “Common-Wealth of England,”³ and in doing so named all those ‘non-Christians’ – generally speaking, anyone ascribing to any religion other than the Church of England – as different from English inhabitants of the island, wealthy and poor alike. More specifically, the elites mark individuals, such as Catholic Irish people, as threats to the English people, declaring those disobedient to the law to be punished “under such penalties as in, and by the said Statutes of the Parliament of England are ordained and appointed.”⁴

The elites continue to mark Irish people as other in Act 20, enforcing an ethnic hierarchy by devaluing the humanity and culture of Irish individuals:

20. And whereas it hath been taken into serious consideration, that the main and chief cause of our late troubles and miseries hath grown by loose, base, and uncivil languages tending to sedition and dvsion, too commonly used among many people here: It is therefore agreed, that at the next general Assembly a strict Law be made against all such persons, with an heavy penalty to be inflicted upon them that shall be guilty of any reviling speeches of what nature soever. By remembering or raveling into former differences, and reproaching any man with the cause he hath formerly defended.”

Although not explicitly designated, Irish people appear to be a primary target of this act as well.

---

² See Act 1 in Appendix: Barbados Acts and Statutes 1654.
³ Ibid.
⁴ See Act 1 in Appendix: Barbados Acts and Statutes 1654.
The English, as covered in the literature review, often referred to Irish individuals as “loose, base, and uncivil” and experienced rebellions as well as small acts of defiance from Irish indentures on the island (Beckles 1990; Block and Shaw 2011; Doan 2011; Menard 2006; Rodgers 2007; Shaw 2013). This act exemplifies the English elite acknowledging the Irish and all other non-‘Christians’ as a problem needing to be dealt with promptly and efficiently.

The elites’ targeting of Catholic Irish people becomes particularly apparent when juxtaposed against their formal acceptance of Scottish individuals into the socially dominant group of English people:

“We Under-scribers of the Stewarty of ---- do hereby testifie and declare our voluntary acceptance of the Parliaments tender in their Declaration, that Scotland be incorporated into, and made one Common-wealth with England… And we declare that we will in the mean time live peaceably under, and yield obedience unto the Authority of the Parliament of the Common-wealth of England exercised in Scotland… It is therefore hereby further enacted and ordained by the Authority and consent aforesaid, that the late Prisoners of War, and all others of the Scottish Nation, lately arrived to this Island may enjoy the same benefit, Liberty, and Privilege of this Act, and all others of this Island equal with any, the Servants of the English, any thing heretofore to the contrary notwithstanding.”

Here we see how the English elites enacted a strict ethnic hierarchy between white inhabitants through them formally designating Scotland and Scottish people part of the commonwealth of England. These elites effectively offered Scottish people the benefits and protections English people freely enjoy in naming them members of the English commonwealth. The first of these protections comes in the act itself, with the English assemblymen declaring that even Scottish prisoners of war were to “enjoy the same benefit, Liberty, and Privilege of this Act, and all others of this Island equal with any, the Servants of the English.”

Through declaring Scottish prisoners of war equal to any servants of English masters,

---

5 See Act 72 (paragraphs 2 and 3) in Appendix: Barbados Acts and Statutes 1654.
these assemblymen granted Scottish people legal protections against the abuse of their masters and their children being taken as servants without their written consent. Furthermore, the most common penalty for servants, as ordained by law, was simply adding years to the end of their term of service, the amount of time depending on the severity of the crime. At face value, one would assume these laws protecting servants in general would apply to Irish individuals as well, and some ways these laws provided them protections unavailable to other subordinate groups on Barbados, namely enslaved black persons. However, the acts declaring Irish individuals’ primary religion as illegal, a threat to English customs and government, and punishable by Barbados law negated some of these protections, leaving them exposed to physical punishments more so than their English commonwealth counterparts.

*Crisis/Critical Juncture: Rebellion of 1692.* On Friday, October 21, 1692, a member of the dominant group wrote to his friend about a slave rebellion barely thwarted by English officials. The author writes of how “the Negro’s in this Island had made a PLOT to have distroy’d all the Christians therein” and the English officials prevented the implementation of this “wicked Design.” In this plot, the revolting slaves intended to take “up the Sirname and Offices of the Principal Planters and men in the Island, to have enslaved all the Black men and Women tothem, and to have taken the White Women for their Wives.” These rebellious individuals sought to redefine their ability to attain prosperity and power by forcibly taking the positions of the elite members on the island. In terms of the racial state, the enslaved persons rebelling against their oppression effectively challenged the dominant narrative of racial difference on the island.

---

6 See Acts 5, 6, and 48 in Appendix: Barbados Acts and Statutes 1654.

7 See Acts 8, 9, 10, 30, 48 (paragraph 2) and 50 in Appendix: Barbados Acts and Statutes 1654.
Responding to these slaves trying to effectively steal the lives of the elite Englishmen of the island, government officials arrested between two and three hundred enslaved black persons, and they “Tryed and Condemned many of them.” Of those convicted individuals, “Many were Hang’d, and a great many Burn’d. And, (for a Terror to others,) there are now seven Hanging in Chains, alive, and Starving to Death.” The immense brutality of this punishment alone displays the fear of rebellion the English elite experienced. Government officials not only executed these rebellious individuals but also tortured and mutilated them and their bodies to incite fear in any other slaves who wished to overthrow the racial hierarchy, to take the place of their English masters. The threat of rebellion incited such a fear in the dominant group because it endangered the unstable equilibrium the elites worked tirelessly to uphold and effectively destabilized the comfort English people had in the existing racial hierarchy.\(^8\)

**Point B: The Laws of Barbados 1699.** The English elites made this fear of insurrection apparent in Barbados’ 1699 laws, passing several acts restricting the unobserved wandering of servants and slaves.\(^9\) The assemblymen passed these laws because they thought servants made “use of all advantages and occasions to disturb the publick Peace”\(^10\) and slaves needed “good regulating and ordering” in order to restrain them from “the Disorders, Rapines and Inhumanities to which they are naturally prone and inclined.”\(^11\) According to the English elites, servants and slaves incessantly worked to disturb the social order of the island and thus needed to be closely monitored by the free people of the island.

---

\(^8\) See Appendix: Barbarous and Bloody Plot.

\(^9\) See Acts 21, 198, and 329 (paragraph 1) in Appendix: Barbados Laws 1699.

\(^10\) See Act 21 in Appendix: Barbados Laws 1699.

Furthermore, the English assemblymen address the reality of a slave rebellion explicitly, sanctioning punishments specific to any slave acting in or preparing for insurrection:

“If any Negroes or other Slaves, shall make Mutiny or Insurrection, or rise in Rebellion against this Place or People, or make preparation of Arms, Powder, Bullets, or Offensive Weapons, or hold any Council or Conspiracy of, or raising Mutiny or Rebellion against this Island... and proceed by Marshal Law against the Actors, Contrivers, Raisers, Fomenters and Concealers of such Mutiny or Rebellion, and them punish by Death or other Pains as their Crimes shall deserve... Now foras much as the Loss of the Negroes and other Slaves that shall suffer Death by this Act, would prove so heavy for the owner of them only to bear, and that the Owners of Negroes may not be discouraged to detect and discover the Offences of their Negroes ; and that thee Loss may be born by the Publick, whole safety by such Punishments is hereby provided for and intended.”

In directly addressing the possibility of “Mutiny or Insurrection,” the elites showcase the prevalence of this issue in their society. Rebellion served as a prominent, internal crisis afflicting Barbadian society, and the English elite sought to limit the probability of a revolt occurring. One method of preventing rebellion for the dominant group was to closely monitor and quickly punish slaves who appeared to be inciting rebellion. Another method the Englishmen employed was to offer a subordinate group, in this case Irish individuals, moderate social acceptance in the Barbados colony.

This action is observable through various laws that included Irish persons under the broad categorization of all white individuals or “other Person” in the 1699 legislation. Specifically, the English elites enacted laws that encouraged all white people to act collectively against enslaved black individuals in their society, effectively increasing their policing force. For

---

12 See Act 329 (paragraph 22 and continued by 23) in Appendix: Barbados Laws 1699.

13 See Acts 21 (paragraph 7) and 382 (paragraph 3) in Appendix: Barbados Laws 1699.

14 See Act 329 (paragraph 29) in Appendix: Barbados Laws 1699.
example, the elites barred any white individual from buying rum or any other strong liquor for slaves, a precaution taken to prevent the possibility of a slave insurrection.\textsuperscript{15} Moreover, the assemblymen passed a law protecting every white person, including Irish individuals, from being tried for the murder of slave, writing, “…if any poor small freeholder or other Person, kill a Negro or other Slave by Night… he shall not be accountable for it.”\textsuperscript{16} In this way, the English elite permitted Irish individuals a level of formal social acceptance unavailable to Irish people under the 1654 legislation.

The English elite also increased the social acceptance of Irish people by allowing acts and laws requesting the acquisition of Christian servants to expire. Four different Acts – 229, 337, 346, and 419 – called for the importation of Christian servants and a necessity for them on the island previously. In the laws of Barbados in 1699, the English elites marked such laws as expired (3) or obsolete (1). This action signifies reduced policing on the type of servants, specifically Catholic Irish ones, coming to the island. Whether an attempt to gain Irish people’s support or a recognition thereof, the English elite mark Irish individuals as a much less severe threat than those who created and enacted the 1654 statutes.

Despite these formal acceptances of Irishness, the English lawmakers still passed an Act that prevented Catholic individuals from participating in Barbados government in any official capacity. This Act “for preventing Danger which may happen from Popish Recusants” reinforces the ethnic hierarchy established in 1654 by preventing Irishmen from accessing any positions of power and influence in seventeenth-century Barbados. Through this act, Englishmen barred Catholic Irishmen from participating in elections, holding public office, or serving in the

\textsuperscript{15} See Act 329 (paragraph 3) in Appendix: Barbados Laws 1699.

\textsuperscript{16} See Act 329 (paragraph 29) in Appendix: Barbados Laws 1699.
Regardless of being included under ‘any person’ or ‘all white people,’ Irish individuals were still formally prohibited from entering any space occupied by the elite members of society—the Englishmen. The assemblymen merely offered Irish people a modicum of acceptance through inclusion under laws that had no impact on Irish individuals’ social mobility in colonial Barbados, and in doing so these Englishmen largely maintained the ethnic hierarchy they put in place under the 1654 statutes.

Montserrat

Unlike with Barbados, few archives originating in seventeenth-century Montserrat still exist or remain undamaged due to various natural disasters. Because of their scarcity, those places holding Montserratian historical documents from the 1600s or copies of them greatly restrict access to this data. This, of course, complicates the construction of Montserrat’s ‘A to B’ timeline in this study.

However, much of the secondary regarding seventeenth-century Montserrat provides quotes from primary data, most often legislation and correspondence between English elites caring for the island and the English Crown. It is these quotations of primary data, often repeated in different research studies, that I refer to as my secondary primary sources. The repetition of these sources allows me to cross-compare the quotes and look to how the various authors excerpted the primary data, granting me the ability to construct the whole picture of the quote in many cases. In a similar vein, the secondary data offers information about the general structuring of colonial Montserrat that tends to be repeated across studies. Furthermore, these studies reiterating the same information simply look to how legislation was constructed in a slave society or the heavy Irish cultural influence on the island, aims related to but not directly in line

---

17 See Act 254 in Appendix: Barbados Laws 1699.
In cross-referencing information from secondary sources and quotes from secondary primary sources, I create a dataset valid for the purposes of this research and locate a commonly referenced crisis for Montserratian society—France’s invasion of Montserrat in 1667. While the French military invaded the colony of Montserrat multiple times between 1664 and 1782, France’s longest occupation of the island endured for six months during 1667 (Fergus 1978). Since this occupation of the island marks the most prolonged upheaval of Montserratian society, I utilize this moment as the crisis or critical juncture in Montserrat’s ‘A to B’ timeline, and I use secondary references to this invasion in addition to secondary primary quotes originating in 1667 to mark this crisis or critical juncture.

Due to the nature of the data I use to construct Montserrat’s ‘A to B’ timeline, I define points much more abstractly than for that of Barbados. Points A and B establish the general life and culture of stratification for inhabitants of the island, specifically wealthy and poor Irish persons, before and after the crisis. Because of this, Point A refers to the life of Montserrat’s inhabitants before 1667 and Point B to the same after 1667. I analyze secondary sources describing life during and secondary primary quotes originating from these respective time frames to produce my findings. In comparing the lives of Irish individuals before and after the crisis in 1667, I can locate similarities and differences in Irish people’s ability to access wealth and enjoy various liberties, specifically freedom of religion.

Point A: Before 1667. Much of the literature referencing the early history of Montserrat references Irish individuals being the largest component of the colony’s population (Griffin 1911; Hobson 2007; Jacoberger 2015; Ryzewski and Cherry 2012; Shaw 2013). On January 1, 1634, wrote of his first visit to the colony:
“By noon we came to Monserat, where is a noble plantation of Irish Catholique whome the Virginians would not suffer to live with them because of their religion;’ or as he expresses it in the Latin phrase, ‘The inhabitants of Montserrat are Irishmen, who were expelled by the English of Virginia for the profession of the Catholic faith.’” (Griffin 1911:84).

Here we see two themes of the island emerge, one being that Catholicism was a prominent feature of the island and the other that Montserrat acted as somewhat of a safe haven for Irish individuals. In fact, many islands in the Caribbean and North America expelled Irish Catholics from their respective territories for insubordination, and they exiled them with Montserrat in mind. The nearby British island of St. Kitts and the colony of Virginia are the most notable contributors to this legacy of Irishness and Catholicism on Montserrat (Griffin 1911; Hobson 2007; Jacoberger 2015; Ryzewski and Cherry 2012).

Other Catholic priests visited the island and commented on the immense number of Catholic Irish on the island. Father John Stritch in particular labeled Montserrat “an Irish Catholic settlement” (Jacoberger 2015:40; date unspecified in data). Lord Willoughby, who reigned as Governor of Barbados from 1650 to 1652, concurred with Father Stritch’s description, labeling Montserrat the “irish colonie” (Jacoberger 2015:45; Shaw 2013: 182). By 1639, Catholic Irish people increased their majority on the island to about 70% of the population, or around three thousand Irish persons (Hobson 2007; Shaw 2013). The English persons ruling over Montserrat even concluded that the “Irish were a potential ‘fifth column’” on the island (Hobson 2007:16). In Montserrat, the Irish were their own group of people by census and law because the enormity of their population forced the English elite to formally recognize them.

Maintaining the largest portion of the population on the island also meant a relatively large amount of religious freedom for Catholic Irish persons (Cawley 2015; Jacoberger 2015; Jacoberger 2015:40; date unspecified in data). 18

---

18 Included in this section because it corresponds with other data from this time period.
Messenger 1967; Shaw 2013). This, however, did not mean the Montserratian government or the English elite of the island approved of Catholic practice or failed to discriminate on the basis of Catholicism as in other English colonies. One such example of this is St. Patrick’s Parish. The English elite of Montserrat forced the majority of Catholic Irish persons to live in the cramped, inhospitable landscape of St. Patrick’s Parish. In doing so, the English officials effectively limited the upward economic potential of the Catholic Irish people on the island (Cawley 2015; Hobson 2007; Jacobberger 2015; Pulpisher and Goodwin 2001; Ryzewski and Cherry 2015; Zacek 2010).

Even the Irishmen who occupied positions of power in Montserrat – such as governor, military official, and prominent planter – experienced limitations based on their faith (Fergus 1978; Hobson 2007; Jacobberger 2015; Messenger 1967). Most Irishmen who gained this social and economic mobility hid their religious ties to Catholicism, adopting an ambiguity surrounding their religious beliefs and practices. Instead, the wealthy Irish displayed loyalty to the English government of Montserrat through large-scale participation in the Montserratian economy, serving in positions of political authority, and by taking an oath of fealty to the English Crown and the Church of England (Fergus 1978; Hobson 2007; Jacobberger 2015; Pulpisher and Goodwin 1982; Shaw 2013).

In other words, the English government strictly regulated the mobility of Irish individuals, only permitting a few Anglo-Irish men who often hailed from the ‘Fourteen Tribes’ of Ireland. Being from the ‘Fourteen Tribes,’ these Irishmen were well educated and socialized according to norms of gentility, both of which made them more palatable to Englishmen. Furthermore, these Anglo-Irish individuals brought great profit to Montserrat’s economy and fully served the government that allowed them to amass such wealth for themselves. Basically,
the English elite permitted Irish individuals who acted and lived similarly to them already into their fold while they closely monitored Catholic Irish people, who they forced to live in St. Patrick’s Parish. In this way, the English government of Montserrat effectively created an ethnic hierarchy based on religion in their society.

**Critical Juncture: French Occupation.** France’s invasion and occupation of Montserrat in 1667 marks the most notable disruption to the everyday functioning of Montserrat. Willoughby, the Governor of the Leeward Islands, disregarded his obligations to improve Montserrat’s military defense, and the island suffered miserably for his neglect in 1667 (Cawley 2015). The primary issue surrounding the constant threat of French invasion was that Montserrat’s largest sect of the population and the people of France practiced the same religion—Catholicism. Because of this and the resulting promise of religious freedom, Irish individuals aided French invaders in capturing the English colony. Catholic Irish people participated in widespread insurrection against the English government of the island whenever the English’s control was threatened by an imperial competitor, and being surrounded by French colonial territories, this was most often the French (Cawley 2015; Fergus 1978; Higham 1923; Hobson 2007; Jacobberger 2015).

In fact, Willoughby blamed the restless and treacherous Irish population for the French military’s success in overtaking Montserrat rather than highlighting his own shortcomings in protecting the island (Cawley 2015; Messenger 1967; Ryzewski and McAtackney 2015). Some wealthy Irish persons joined the Irish insurrection as well, the most notable example being Anthony Brisket. Brisket not only joined his fellow Irishmen in aiding the French invaders against the English military and government of Montserrat but also acted as governor of the French puppet regime implemented on the island during 1667 (Fergus 1978; Jacobberger 2015). A
French military captain wrote to Brisket that the French wished him “to be governor over all, and more especially the Irish inhabitants of the Leeward side of the said island” in 1667, and Brisket promptly accepted French Governorship of Montserrat during the colony’s temporary French occupation (Fergus 1978:36).

After a treaty in 1667, France returned Montserrat to England. While Montserrat did return to the control of England, this abrupt transfer of governmental power to France and then back to England marks a moment of severe crisis and social instability for elites and inhabitants more generally. This crisis is marked by total social upheaval of the established ethnic hierarchy through entirely disrupting the English elite’s political control of the island. Because of this, English officials were forced to reestablish control through attempting to restore the ethnic hierarchy they upheld before France’s six-month occupation of Montserrat.

**Point B: After 1667.** The Irish’s majority status scared the elites of the island, and rightly so considering Irish individuals’ history assisting French forces. To set an example, the English elites of the island stripped Brisket, the impromptu governor of French Montserrat in 1667, of his estate, a plantation of more than a thousand acres (Fergus 1978; Hobson 2007; Pestana 2005). Brisket petitioned the reinstated English government to restore his previous land to him, arguing that he only accepted the governor position offered to him by the French under duress (Fergus 1978).

Rather than granting Brisket his previous estate, the English elite grasped the opportunity to reward Irish loyalty to the Crown. The English Crown perceived a division between those wealthy Irish who lost land during the invasion and those Catholic Irish, most often poor, who helped overtake the island. Because of this stark difference in outcome for wealthy and poor Irish individuals in addition to the economic necessity of avoiding desertion of Montserrat, English
elites decided to gift Brisket’s repossessed lands to those wealthy Irish and English planters who lost land during French rule on Montserrat (Fergus 1978; Jacoberger 2015). These Irishmen regained their wealth and continued to amass more property and free labor as Montserrat entered into the eighteenth century (Hobson 2007; Jacoberger 2015; Pulpisher and Goodwin 1982, 2001; Shaw 2013). William Stapleton received a majority of these lands, and the elites quickly named him governor of the island.

According to Willoughby, Stapleton’s behavior during the war and French occupation proved him to be "a Gentleman of known valour, good conduct, and great integrity" of Irish descent, "and therefore understands the better to governe his Countrymen" (Jacoberger 2015: 46; Willoughby 1668). Willoughby’s statement makes the motivation for the English’s choice extremely clear—political strategy. After Catholic Irish persons revolted against the Crown and its government, English elites saw an opportunity to place an individual like them in the place of governor, while still maintain English culture and loyalty to the English crown. In placing an Irishman with English loyalties, at least in the way of economics, the English elite discovered a way to handle the crisis at hand: they incorporated select Irishmen into elite spaces.

To further re-stabilize the colony of Montserrat, English officials also offered fairly significant protections for all Irish individuals, regardless of their religion. One attempt at gaining Irish people’s favor through protections can be seen in the following act:

"Sect. 2 sets forth several odious distinctions used by the English, Scotch, and Irish reflecting on each other ('English Dog, Scots Dog, Tory, Irish Dog, Cavalier, Roundhead, and many other opprobious, scandalous, and disgraceful terms'), and therefore ordains that if any such or the like reflections are used in the island by any person, stranger, or foreigner, the offenders shall be prosecuted as breakers of the public peace, and shall abide such fines or punishments as shall be imposed on them by the Governor and Council; and if any murders, riots, or unlawful assemblies should arise upon such words, the offender shall suffer as a mutineer and disturber of the public peace…” (Messenger 1967:15; 1668 and later).
In this article of legislation, English elites make protections for Catholic Irish persons, preventing any person from uttering hateful speech toward this group. Furthermore, English officials attempt to create a semblance of social equality between Irish and English individuals by setting forth this code of conduct disallowing ‘hate speech’ between different ethnic groups on Montserrat. By attempting to establish social equality between ethnic groups, the English elites significantly alter the social infrastructure present before 1667.

Despite this attempt at restoring unstable equilibrium, the English elite’s fear of Irish insurrection continued. Chris Wheeler wrote to the Crown in 1671 that “[H]is majesty would take speciall Care, y’t after Colonel Stapleton’s time (whose fidelity he is sure of) that not onely an English Governour be always instituted, but that there be some Cittadell and small Garrison of English in pay” (Ryzewski and McAtackney 2015:126; Shaw 2013:47). Here, Wheeler admits his trust in Stapleton’s loyalty to the Crown while displaying a strong distrust in the other Irish living on the island. Apparently, Wheeler’s apprehension was not unfounded. Lord Willoughby reiterates a previous sentiment, writing to England,

"That Wee wth all other of his Majs. Loyall subjects of this Island have so much above any other of or. Neighbours been devastated wasted and destroyed in the late unhappye Warr, not only by or. Enymes in the tyme of their short staye wth. us, but have likewise than as many tymes since in a most barbarous manner been Robbed, Plundred Stripped & allmost utterly Consumed of all that wee had in ye. world by a P[ar]ty of REbellious & wicked people of the Irish nation or. neighbours & Inhabitants in such sort, as it is allmost Impossible either for man or penn to utter or discribe...” (Messenger 1967:14; 1688).

Willoughby articulates the incessant nature of Irish insurrection alongside Catholic French invasion, exposing his fear and distrust of the Irish. The Irish’s fickle loyalty to England enraged Willoughby, and their ability to wreak havoc on Montserrat and its elite members terrified him.

The English’s fears, well represented by those sentiments of Codrington and Willoughby, required Stapleton and other Montserrat officials to repeatedly report the condition of the island,
specifically Montserrat’s Irish inhabitants. Stapleton quickly referenced the Catholic, and consequently Irish, presence on the island when corresponding with the Lords of Trade in 1676, noting that not only was the "Protestant Tenett or perswasion [sic] not prevalent and professed in all the islands" but also that "in Mounserrat there are the most part Roman Cathoiques" (Jacoberger 2015:47; Messenger 1967:17). Going even further, Stapleton expresses how much the Catholic Irish truly outnumbered the Protestant English by explaining the island ratio of "six Catholics to one Protestant” (Messenger 1967:17).

Despite his remarks concerning the overwhelming majority of Irish individuals, Stapleton quickly added that the Irish Catholics gave “noe scandal to the Protestant Church which is the prevalent perswasion, for the minister when any comes preaches as in any other Island, every Licence of marriage, Probatt of wills, and all other Ecclesiasticall Acts are done according to the Cannons of the Church of England" (Jacoberger 2015:47; Messenger 1967:17). Christopher Codrington, who was the Governor of Barbados and the Leewards at the time his letter, echoed Stapleton’s sentiment in his correspondence with the Crown over almost fifteen years late in 1690:

"…there are but few men so desperately wicked that will gratify their Revenge at the Expense of their own Ruine and I believe fewer so very generously virtuous and pious, at least wise on this side of the Tropick, that will either hang or starve for their Country or Religion" and that “the Irish on Monsterat do there enjoy their estates and Livelyhoods as quietly and happily as the English subjects do” (Block and Shaw 2011:57; Shaw 2013:181).

Codrington’s description of the Montserratian Irish displays a growing trust in that population both in Montserrat and the British Caribbean at large.

In claiming “there are but few men so desperately wicked that will gratify their Revenge” and even “fewer so very generously virtuous and pious… that will either hang or starve for their Country or Religion,” Codrington simultaneously holds Irish individuals’ characters in high
esteem while downplaying the importance Catholicism plays in their lives. In doing this, Codrington essentially describes the Irish as becoming more palatably English. Codrington even compares the English with the Irish in a positive manner by saying that the Montserratian Irish enjoy their land and wealth just as the English do—“quietly and happily.”

By drawing a direct line between the characters of the two people, Codrington effectively showcases the Irish’s slight assimilation into the dominant group. Irish individuals settled into English society on the elite’s terms, but their majority along with the imminent threat of French invasion forced England to consider how to cater to the Irish issue of insubordination without disrupting English rule and without causing another Irish insurrection. This resulted in further incorporation of Irish individuals into English culture.

The English maintained more explicit suspicion of Irish persons as well through direct policing. In fact, English officials recorded that they threatened the Irish into submission to the Crown. Codrington described partaking in such an act in the same year he wrote relatively kind words concerning the Irish examined above:

“At Montserrat I at large layd before the Irish the ruine in all respects they would certainly bring upon themselves should they prove treacherous to the Government, and on the other hand the advantage of behaving them selves like good subjects . . . they then with great appearance of joy promised faithful obedience to their maj[esties] Government” (Block and Shaw 2011:58; Shaw 2013:182; 1690).

Essentially, Codrington forced the Irish to succumb to English rule by explaining the “ruine” the English Empire would bring down upon them for disobeying and committing treason against England. This obvious threatening of Irish persons demonstrates how cautiously the dominant group integrated the Irish into their fold, yet again an indication of Absorption.

Other English officials took a softer approach in garnering Irish support for English rule. One official emphasized to the Irish that “by cordially uniting with us they may rationally
promise to themselves to secure the island and for the future to live happily and with esteeme among us, and even as to theire Religion may have some toleration and allowance” (Block and Shaw 2011:57-58; 1690). Through this statement, the government official effectively promised social mobility to Irish people and tolerance for the practice of Catholicism should the Irish declare fealty to the English Monarch.

The war for English officials on whether to fear or trust the Irish resulted in an ambiguous ethnic hierarchy for post-1667 Montserrat. While the English elite maintained rather substantial reservations concerning Irish individuals’ loyalty, the group also realized that it needed to incorporate Irish people better into English society in order to possibly win their favor. Because of this, Catholic Irish individuals still occupied a distinct ethnic group; however, they also found much social mobility in the way of religious freedom.

Relative to other Catholic Irish people in the Caribbean, Montserratian Irish enjoyed immeasurable liberty after 1667. Yet compared to the English elite on Montserrat, Irish individuals accessed only moderate autonomy over their lives. However, in gaining some liberties that disrupted the English status quo, Irish individuals achieved a higher level of social mobility than available in the ethnic hierarchy maintained on Montserrat prior to 1667. The English rearticulated the ethnic hierarchy, blurring some limes of social difference, and thus granted Irish people greater social mobility in seventeenth-century Montserrat.

Comparison

The ethnic hierarchies present in Point A and Point B on Barbados largely resemble one another. Despite some differences in the social acceptance of the Irish under the title of ‘all white people’ or ‘any person,’ the English elite on Barbados maintained a strong ethnic hierarchy by denying Catholic Irish individuals the opportunity to occupy positions of power in Barbados.
society. Because of the English elite’s ability to reinforce the preexisting ethnic hierarchy, the strategy implemented to restore unstable equilibrium after crisis is classified as insulation.

Conversely, Montserrat’s ethnic hierarchies in Point A and Point B show some substantial differences. Before the French invasion in 1667, English officials formally discriminated against Montserrat’s Catholic Irish majority by preventing public worship of Catholicism and by showing no tolerance for Catholics in governmental spaces. However, after the crisis in 1667, Catholic Irish individuals experienced not only an officially recognized freedom of religion but legal protections against slander from English persons. In this way, the English elites of Montserrat restructured its ethnic hierarchy in response to the crisis it experienced, thus classifying the elites’ strategy to restore unstable equilibrium as absorption.

When compared to the ideal type, Barbados’ timeline is practically identical to that of the ideal. The Barbadian elites implemented some changes in social acceptance for Irish individuals, but they largely maintained a strictly enforced ethnic hierarchy. Also like the ideal type, the Barbadian elites dealt with an endogenous crisis. Unlike Barbados’s timeline, that of Montserrat deviated from the ideal rather significantly. Montserrat experienced an exogenous crisis and displayed a notable restructuring of its ethnic hierarchy. The Montserratian elite displayed tolerance for the Catholic faith, assuring the English Crown that the Catholic Irish inhabitants of the island no longer posed a threat of treason. Furthermore, the elite on Montserrat granted Irish individuals the ability to enjoy autonomy just as the English inhabitants, even in terms of religious freedom, if they agreed to not assist invaders in overthrowing the colony’s government.

The primary difference between these two timelines is the type of crisis these two societies faced. Montserrat underwent crisis from an exogenous source while Barbados did so from an endogenous one. These two colonies were vulnerable to different types of crises. With
its Catholic Irish majority and French neighbors, Montserrat’s elites primarily feared exogenous threats that could give its subordinate Catholic Irish population the means to overthrow their governance and ethnic hierarchy. Barbados, on the other hand, maintained a strong military and could easily protect its island and enforce its government’s legislation, making it vulnerable mainly to internal threats. The nature of these two cases’ vulnerabilities and consequent crises appears to be the source for the difference in outcomes in Montserrat and Barbados’ timelines.

Unlike other studies analyzing Irish and white ethnic social mobility, namely Ignatiev’s (1995) *How the Irish Became White*, this thesis centers the role of elites in shaping Irish individuals' outcomes in a stratified society rather than the collective agency of the subordinate group. In doing so, elites, the dominant group of society, become the focus of the study and, subsequently, the agents shaping the structures creating white hegemony. White privilege and whiteness then acts as product of elite actors through structural means rather than a byproduct of historically racist structures as the whiteness literature largely claims. Because of this, I find that the type of crisis and elite strategy in restoring unstable equilibrium shape social mobility for a subordinate group. Endogenous crisis allows the dominant group to retain its pre-crisis racial and ethnic hierarchy for the most part, the only changes for the subordinate group being symbolic. Conversely, exogenous crisis prompted elites to consider the power of the subordinate group when restoring unstable equilibrium, resulting in a restructuring of the ethnic hierarchy.

Because of this, those Irish people of Montserrat experienced relatively high social mobility after France's invasion of the island. The English elites needed the support of their Irish population in order to maintain control of the territory, and they did so by offering Irish people liberties unmatched by any other English colony in the Caribbean. Elites reestablished unstable equilibrium by granting Irish people the freedom to practice Catholicism publicly and defending
their character when the Crown expressed concerns of Irish disloyalty. Barbados, on the other hand, faced an internal crisis that let them maintain their racial and ethnic hierarchy. Consequently, the English elites of Barbados were able to prevent Irish persons from entering official positions of authority in the colony. Instead, the elites offered their Irish inhabitants a symbolic social acceptance that established unity between these two groups without sacrificing their control and societal authority.

CONCLUSION

As Bonds and Inwood (2016) succinctly state, “A settler colonial perspective illuminates the interconnections between colonization and anti-black and anti-indigenous racisms” (728). Barbados and Montserrat exemplify this, their elites doling extreme physical punishments against enslaved black people that white servants never suffered. This thesis takes the benefits of analyzing the racial and ethnic hierarchy of a colonial society a step further however; it examines the benefits of white privilege as well as active gatekeeping of that privilege in a colonial setting. The critical whiteness literature largely examines the impact whiteness has on people of color and utilizes ‘hegemonic white supremacy’ as though racial discrimination only penalizes nonwhite individuals and structural facets of racism require no maintenance. When critical whiteness literature does examine how white hegemony is sustained, it focuses primarily on those white individuals functioning within white-oriented system.

This thesis addresses this gap, analyzing the gatekeepers of whiteness and the mobility white ethnic groups enjoy during and after moments of societal and hierarchical instabilities. Rather than treating white privilege as “unearned social privilege[s],” I examine whiteness and its subsequent privilege as carefully created and actively maintained by the dominant group of society (Nayak 2007:738). Structural aspects of racism do not continue to exist without effort,
yet the literature examining racial and ethnic discrimination speak of structures and systemic racism as though the dominant group has no agency in shaping it. If critical whiteness studies illuminates anything about whiteness, it is that whiteness’ power predominately lies in its ability to remain overwhelmingly silent or normal in society. Why then does research continue leave the actors at the systemic and structural levels largely unnamed and unexamined?

The fact that elites have a critical role in determining inequality and stratification between categories of difference is not a novel concept. Yet, literature does not regularly examine how white elites in particular actively police racial stratification through formal and systematic means. This thesis shows how elite groups maintain hierarchy and does so by naming their agency in using societal infrastructure to shift and maintain an elite-dominated hierarchy regardless of the instability a place faces. In the case of Barbados and Montserrat, the English elites sought to retain the distinction between English persons and culture from that of Irish individuals and Catholicism. The Irish inhabitants of seventeenth-century Barbados and Montserrat experienced social mobility because of crisis and their white phenotype.

The findings presented in this research add to the current literature on whiteness by examining those white elites determining the organization of opportunity in society at large. Furthermore, this thesis challenges previous literature analyzing Irish categorical ambiguity and fluidity in England and its legacy territories in the Americas through centering elites as the primary subjects in Irish histories. By displaying Irish people’s opportunity for mobility in a racially stratified society results from elite agency, this research displays that Irish individuals’ agency without elite assistance may not have produced the upwardly mobile stories produced by studies such as *How the Irish Became White* (Ignatiev 1995). This is not to say these previous studies are incorrect or analyze events of Irish categorical shifts; rather, it forwards that previous
research might ignore the roles dominant groups play in creating social, economic, and political opportunities for Irish people to actualize these shifts.

Despite its important insights, this research does have notable limitations, especially in terms of data collection. Montserrat had no archives from the seventeenth century I could directly access. Due to this, I relied on the research and findings of other scholars analyzing entirely different issues. There could be more Montserratian archival data that better displays the ethnic hierarchy the English elite maintained in Montserrat. This thesis also only studies the mobility of Irish individuals due to elite responses and does not attempt analysis on how other subordinate groups may have experienced increased oppression as a result of these actions. In analyzing this other dimension to story of social ordering, future research could examine how a strategic group may benefit after a crisis while other subordinate groups may face increased restrictions and punishments. This begs the questions: Were Irish people a strategic measure, an easily manipulated group to maintain the overall racial hierarchy of these islands? In other words, was maintaining the racial hierarchy the priority for the elites and the Irish were the easiest way to do so?

Future research should address these questions, investigating the ways in which the elite identify strategic groups in maintaining their authority and control. What do these groups look like? Do they possess similar qualities across contexts? Research should further evaluate the uses of elite power in maintaining social order, specifically one that benefits and protects the privileges of the dominant group. In examining this power and how the dominant group uses it, studies may be able to examine how these processes repeat across historical contexts and societies. Future research should also consider how elites may reinforce hierarchy more strongly in order to restore unstable equilibrium in contexts beyond that of colonial Barbados and
Montserrat and that of Irish histories.

Despite its limitations, this thesis does offer insight into how the achievements of white ethnic groups rely heavily on the agency and decisions of the white elite in a racially and ethnically stratified society. Narrative surrounding white ethnic achievement often negate the discriminatory struggles that people of color face daily in societies with a strict racial hierarchy. Furthermore, research surrounding white privilege often leaves the benefits of being white unnamed and unexamined. Instead, the literature leaves readers examining white privilege in terms of what people of color cannot access in a racially stratified society. This thesis seeks to provide a complementary narrative to these facets of knowledge and research. The Irish of seventeenth-century Barbados in Montserrat benefited in times of crisis because of their whiteness and because their societies’ elites provided them the opportunity to do so. Their whiteness and the elite groups of their societies granted Irish people the chance to use their agency effectively in garnering wealth and social acceptance.

In this way, the Irish people of seventeenth-century Barbados and Montserrat serve as a starting point from which researchers can analyze how individuals, specifically the dominant group, structure difference and produce inequality at the structural level. Because their histories are well-documented, Irish individuals grant researchers the possibility of studying the impact of power on subordinate groups and the amount of power elites wield in a colonial society. This thesis exemplifies that, analyzing the differing outcomes on seventeenth-century Barbados and Montserrat for Irish people through the elite group’s response to crisis. In analyzing these differences, I find that elites do determine the outcomes for subordinate groups and that certain crises can create enough social instability that the dominant group must restructure the society’s social hierarchy, creating varying levels of opportunity for a subordinate group. Moreover, I
articulate how white privilege and elite agency play pivotal roles in determining outcomes of social mobility for a white ethnic group, a reality that should be examined in various contexts and through different relationships between white ethnic and dominant white groups.
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Preamble. “And well weighing how needfull It is, that we being of one Nation, should be
governed by the same Law, which our brethren in England are, have therefore caused these
ensuing Acts to be published, in which is contained the true substance of all the Laws made in
this Island...”

1. “That[sic] a Libertie of Conscience in matters of Reiligion be allowed to all, excepting such
Tenents as are Inconsistent to a Civil Government, and that Laws be put in execution against
Blasphemie, Atheisme and open Scandalous living, Seditious preaching, or unfound Doctrine
sufficiently proved against him... It is enacted, ordained, and declared by authority and consent
aforesaid, that all the Acts which are now of force within the Common-Wealth of England,
concerning free enjoyment of Religion, be published within this Island. And that the same be
duely observed by all the Inhabitants of the same, in such manner and under such penalties as in,
and by the said Statutes of the Parliament of England are ordained and appointed.”

5. “… that all servants under the age of eighteen years, which are hereafter brought to be
assigned over, or disposed of as servants in this Island, having made no contract in England,
shall serve for the space of seven years and no longer: and such as are above eighteen years, shall
serve during the space of five years and no longer, and at the end of their time shall receive four
hundred pounds of Sugar.”

6. “… no person whatsoever shall presume to bring any children to be sold as servants of the
English Nation to this Island under the age fourteen years, unless they can bring a Certificate
from the Principal persons of the Parish where the said childe last lived, that it is done with their
consents.”

8. “… that servant that shall lay violent hands on his, or her Master, or Mistress, or Overseer, and
be convicted thereof before any Justice of Peace of this Island, the said Justice is hereby required
and Authorized to order such servants to serve his said Master, or Mistress two years after his
time by Indenture, or Custom is expired.”

9. “… whatsoever servant, or hired en, as Overseers, Fallers Affènego-men, or others
whatsoever, shall imbezil, purloin, steal, wilfully waste, or make away any of his matters or
Mistresses Fowls, Hogs, Sheep, Cattel, Cotton, Tobacco, Sugar, Indico, Ginger, Money,
CLoaths, or any other goods, provisions or Commodities whatsoever or that shall steal or purloin
the goods of the Guests or his fellow-servants in his said Master, Mistreess three years after his
first time is expired, the said servant or hired man to receive no sallary for the time so hereby
appointed, The same Laws and punishment for such OVerseers as shall lend their Mr., or Mrs.
servants, Slaves, Horses, or Cattle without the privity of their said Mr. or Mrs...”

10. “… that in regard that the whole Wealth of the Inhabitants of this Island/ consisteth chiefly in
the labour of their servants, It is further established, that whosoever shall beget a woman servant
with child, shall for such his offence personally serve the owner of such servant three years, or
put one in his place for the said time, to recompence his loss and charge in bringing up the
bastard Childe, but if the said Childe be brought up by the Parish, then the reputed Father to
serve the said Parish three years, or put one in his place for the said time, And the said Woman-
servant so offending, shall serve her said Mr. or Mrs. three years later after her time by
Indenture, or otherwise, is expired... And the said man and woman for their unlawful copulation
are to suffer such further punishment, as by the Laws of the Common-wealth of England(i) is provided”

12. “… whosoever, either Master or Family, or Captain, or Master of a Ship, or other that shall entertain any man, or woman, White or Black, above one night, if doth not know him to be a Free-man, shall for every night after the first, forfeit one hundred pounds of Sugar, and if he know him to be a servant, or slave to another man, and do not withstanding wilfully entertain him, he shall forfeit five hundred pounds of Sugar for every night.”

23. “… it shall be lawfull for such Marshall as shall attache goods up in the Countrey, to compel the Debtors, Negroes, or Cattle to bring down the same to the Sea-sides. But if the Debtor have none, then the said Marshall is to hire Carriage (in case the Debtors will not.) And is hereby autherized to attache so much over and above the sum mentioned in his execution, as will satisfie for the said carriage…”

30. “… in regard the whole substance of this Island consists in the labour of the servants: It is hereby ordained, that if any man-servant shall marry without his Mr. or Mis. Consent during the time of his Apprentiship, he shall serve his Mr. or Mis. four years after the time of his said Apprentiship is out, and if any Free-man shall marrie the Maid, or Woman-servant of any person within this Island, he shall forthwith pay unto the Mr. or owner of the said servant double the value of the said Maid, or Woman. But if he be a servant, then after his time is expired, he shall serve the Owners of the said Maid, or Woman, double the time she hath to serve.”

48. “… to prevent the injurious keeping of Run-away Negroes. It is ordained that no Master of a Family, or Overseer shall wittingly, or willingly keep such Negro in the Plantation above forty eight hours: If they do they shall forfeit for every twenty four hours after the said forty eight, one thousand pound of sugar, the one half to the Owner of the said Negro, and other half to the Informer: Which Informer if he be a servant to the party that shall wrongfully detain the Negro, he shall from thenceforth gain and enjoy his freedom for such his honest information: And if a servant shall keep or detain any mans Negro, he shall serve the Owner of the said Negro for such his offence, four years after his time by Indenture, or otherwise out. And the said Negroes shall be delivered to their proper Owners, or be carried into the custody of the Provost-Marshal: And he that brings the Marshal's Certificate thereof to Ms. James Beak, store-house-keeper to Colonel Drax, shall receive the value of thirty four pounds of sugar of him the said Beak. And the said Marshall may lawfully keep such Negro in his custody until he be paid four pounds of sugar perday for his diet, for every day he hath been in Goal, and thirty eight pounds of sugar to the said Beak for what he hath laid out, (the party owning the said Negro, bringing a Certificate thereof under the said Beak's hand to the Marshal.) And if the said Beak, or any person hereafter to be named by the Governour and Council shall refuse to pay the said thirty four pounds of sugar... and if any Negro shall die in Goal for want of food, the Marshal shal be responsible for him to the Owner.

… And if a servant shall keep, or detain any mans Negro he shall serve the Owner of said Negro for such his offence, four years after his tim by Indenture, or otherwise out. And the said Negroes shalle be delivered to their proper Owners, or be carried into the custody of the Marshal's Certificate thereof to Ms. James Beak…”

72. “Whereas hath been taken into consideration, the great trouble that doth oftentimes arise between the Masters and Servants within his Island, in, and concerning the time and term of years the said Servants were bound for and the many prejudices that would therein arise, unless
some way of relief as well to the said Servants as their Masters be appointed (the way and manner of proceedings at Law, being altogether unknown to the most part of them, besides the time of delay and trouble in Trials) For the more speedy administration of Justice there, or in the premisses and cafe, both to Masters and Servants in all such cafes, where differences in point of time arise between them... that any two Justices of the Peace within this Island, within the Precincts where the Servants live, that shall complain of difference in point of time of servitude with their Masters: Have hereby power to send for both parties and all witnesses therein concerned, and them hear & examine upon Oath, and such examination and hearing to determine and conclude as to Justice and right shall appertain...

... We Under-scribers of the Stewarty of ---- do hereby testifie and declare our voluntary acceptance of the Parliaments tender in their Declaration, that Scotland(i) be incorporated into, and made one Common-wealth with England(i), without a King, or House of Lords under the free State and Common-wealth of England(i) may be derived to the people of Scotland(i). And we declare that we will in the mean time live peaceably under, and yield obedience unto the Authority of the Parliament of the Common-wealth of England(i) exercised in Scotland(i).

And we do heartily beg the Lord to direct out hearts in the prosecution of this great work, as may most advance his glory in the establishment of Religion setting of the Nations in a fair and happy Union, and the freedom and tranquility of all his people within that bond. It is therefore hereby further enacted and ordained by the Authority and consent aforesaid, that the late Prisoners of War, and all others of the Scottish(i) Nation, lately arrived to this Island may enjoy the same benefit, Liberty, and Privilege of this Act, and all others of this Island equal with any, the Servants of the English(i), any thing heretofore to the contrary notwithstanding

81. “Whereas there was an Act made the 17 of September last past, and therein (amongst other things) any two Justices of the Peace, or more Authorized & appointed to hear, and determine all differences, which should arise between any Master and Servants, in, and concerning the time of their servitude and the terms of years they were to serve, and that upon further consideration: It is found that many inconveniences and prejudices may thereby arise, both to Master and Servants, for the prevention whereof, and the due administration of Justice therein for the future. It is hereby enacted and ordained by the Governour, Council, and Assembly, and by the Authority of the same, that the said clause concerning the hearing and determining of any differences between Masters and Servants, in point of their times of servitude in the said Act mentioned, be, and is from henceforth void, frustrate, and null to all intents and purposes. And all the said differences which shall there upon arise between any Master and Servants be heard, and determined at the Common-Law in the Court of Precincts where such Master and Servant shall there live, as in other Cases of Right between party and party, and that all Servants, who have any ground, or occasion to commence sute therein, be allowed such reasonable time for performances thereof by their respective Masters...”

86. “Whereas by reason of the smallness of the pay, for th taking up, & whipping Negro's that wander and run from their Masters Plantation, the Act formerly made and published in that behalf, hath not been so duely observed. Be it ordained and enacted by the Governour, Council, and Gentlemen of the Assembly, that if the said Negro's Master be known, that then the taker up shall give the Owner notice within forty eight hours of his taking up, and shall, and may lawfully detain the same Negro, until the said Owner send him his sufficient note, for ten pounds of Sugar per Mile that is betwixt the Plantation of which the said Negro is, and the Plantation where he is taken up: but if the Owner of said Negro, or Negro's be not known, that then the said
Negro, or Negro's be sent to the Bridge, as in the said Act, they being to receive one hundred pounds of Sugar of Mr. James Beak, or who else shall be by the Governour appointed, and the Marshall is hereby authorized, and required to keep the said Negro, or Negro's, one hundred and ten pounds of Sugar in satisfaction of his said disburse, and six pounds of Sugar per day for the provision which the said Marshal is to give every such Negro. Provided nevertheless, that in case the Masters, or Overseers of any Family do not take up such Negro's so without Tickets in their Plantations knowing of the same shall forfeit one hundred pounds of Sugar to the Informer, the same to be recovered by Action of Debt, in any Court of Record within this Island, and also if he do not whip such Negro, though he do take him up such Master, or Overseer shall lose all the Sugar due to him by vertue of this Act, anything herein contained notwithstanding.”
A Brief, but most True
RELATION
Of the late Barbarous and Bloody
PLOT
Of the Negro's in the Island of
BARBADOS
On Friday the 21. of October, 1692.
To Kill the Governor and all the Planters, and to destroy
the Government there Established, and to set up a New
Governor and Government of their own.
In a LETTER to a Friend.

S. I. R.,
This day I arrived, — But I had like
to come short of the Governor. For
the Negro's in this Island had made a
PLOT to have diftroy'd all the
Christians therein: And it was to
have been done that very day that we
came hither. But as it happen'd, the Night before
it was found out very providentially, by Two of
them that were a talking of this their wicked
Design; who being fully overheard to discourse
thereof, they were taken up, and Examined, and so
frankly
frankly confessed (when it could not be help'd) what their Design was. Upon which discovery, the Government hath taken up between two and three hundred Negro's: And Tried and Condemned many of them. Of which Number of the Condemn'd persons, Many were Hang'd, and a great many Burn'd. And, (for a Terror to others,) there are now Seven Hanging in Chains, alive, and so Starving to Death. It is reported they design'd to have taken up the Sirname and Offices of the Principal Planters and men in the Island, to have Enslaved all the Black men and Women to them, and to have taken the White Women for their Wives. This Plot was formed by the Negro's that were born in the Island, and no imported Negro was to have been Admitted to partake of the Freedom they intended to gain, till he had been made Free by them, who should have been their Masters. The old Women (both Black and White) were to have been their Cooks and Servants in other Capacities. And they had chosen a Governor among themselves, and every thing was prepared and settled in Readiness for giving the Fatal Stroke. They have been contriving of this Wicked and Bloody design this three years, and had so long kept it very secret until the very day before it was to have been done. But we hope in a little time to see a Stop fully put to their Contrivance, and the Villains themselves speedily discovered and detected.

Adieu.

January 18th. This may be Printed Edmund Bobbin.

LONDON,

Printed for George Croom, in Thames-street. 1693.
APPENDIX: Barbados Laws 1699

An ACT for the good governing of Servants, and ordering the Rights between Masters and Servants. 21.

1. Whereas much of the Interesst and Substance of this Island, consists in the Servants brought to, and disposed of in the same, and in their Labour during the Term they have to serve, wherein notwithstanding Provision hath been made by many good Laws, yet great and often Damage hath happened to the People of this Place through the Unruliness, Obstinancy and Refractoriness of the Servants.

2. … also it much concerns the Peace of this Island, that a continual strict course should be taken to prevent the bold Estravagancies and wandring of Servants, who frequently run from, and desert their Master's Service, making use of all advantages and occasions to disturb the publick Peace, and prejudice their Masters:

3. … and for the good regulating and governing of Servants in all things concerning their Masters and themselves, during the time they have to serve by Indenture or otherwise, and as well concerning such Servants Wages, have thought fit to Enact Ordain and Published by the President, Council and Assembly, and by the Authority of the same, That no Person whatsoever shall presume to bring into this Island, any Children of the English, or the Dominions thereunto belonging, to be sold as Servants, under the Age of Fourteen Years, unless they can produce a good Certificate, or an Indentture or Writing from the Principal Persons of the Parish, wherein the said Child last lived, that it is done with their consent, or with the consent, or at the request of the Parents of such Child; the Age of such Child or Servant to be judged by Inspection.

4. And whosoever shall do otherwise, shall upon Conviction by sufficient Testimony, or the Parties Confession before the President or the Superior Officer of the Island for the time being, be imprisoned by the said President or Superior Officer's Warrant, until he hath given in Security by recognizance of Two sufficient Free-holders of this Island, in One Hundred Pounds Sterling, to the Secretary for the time being, that he will return such Child or Children unto their Parents or Guardians, or such as have or should have the keeping of them, and of his Performance thereof, to bring or send a Certificate within Twelve Months next ensuing, proved as aforesaid.

5. And whereas it hath been an ill Custom and Usage of divers Merchants and other Persons coming to this Island, indirectly and by delusive means and practices to obtain Men and Women on Board of Ships in England, so cause them to be Transported hither, and are here disposed of to serve according to the Custom of the Country, having no Indenture, Covenant or Contract for the same.

6. … all Persons so indirectly sent, or brought over, the Master of them, or Persons, to whom they are consigned, or who are concerned therein, having no Covenant, Indenture or Contract made in Writing, or other Verbal Agreement by him or them to proved by the Oath of one or more Witnesses, or by the Servant's Confession, That such Servant came with his own Consent or Knowledge, That all such Persons so brought over, have hereby power, and are at liberty to implead the Persons who brought them, or to whom they are consigned, according to the Laws of England, for their Freedom, and to recover their Damages and Satisfaction for such wrongful and injurious dealing. Provided that he or she declare the same, and make his or her Complaint to some Justice of the Peace within
Thirty Days after his or her Landing in this Island, unless they be prevented by Sickness, and then within Thiery Days after he or she is able.

7. And all Servants whose time shall expire at any time hereafter having had no Indenture or Contract, shall receive for their Wages Four Hundred Pounds of good Mulcovadoe Sugar: And in case of Indenture or Covenant, to be paid according to his Covenant or Indenture; as the antient Usage and Custom of this Island hath been. And whatsoever Servant shall hereafter come to this Island, and serve their Time therein by Indenture or otherwise, shall receive as aforesaid (the last Master always to pay the said Wages.)

8. It is further Enacted… That no Freeman or Trader whatsoever, with any Servant or Slave within this Island, without the consent of the Master or Owner of such Servant or: And all Contracts and Covenants so made by such Servant or Slave, to be utterly void and of no effect: And such Trader or Freeman for every such his Offence, further to forfeit Five Hundred Pounds of Sugar, the one half to the Informer, the other half to the Treasurer for the publick use, the same to be recovered by Action in any Court of Record within this Island.

9. It is further Enacted and Ordained… That whatsoever Servant or Servants by Indenture, Custom of the Country, or by Monthly or Yearly Wages, or Day Labourer, shall lay violent Hands upon his or her Master, Mistress or Overseer, or any Person put over them in Authority, to govern them, and being thereof convicted before any of his Majesty's Justices of the Peace of this Island, by the Oath of one or more Witnesses, or by his or her own Confession, shall serve his or her said Master or Mistress, one whole Year after his or her time by Indenture, Customs or Bargain be expired; the same to be ordered upon such Conviction as is aforesaid, by the said Justice of Peace, and he to make Record thereof.

10. It is further Enacted and Ordained… That whatsoever Overseer, Servant or hired Labourer or Artificer, by Custom, Covenant or Hire, who shall imbeazel, purloyn, or wilfully waste or make away any of his Master's or Mistress's Sugar, Cotton, Ginger, Indigo, Tobacco, Hogs, Sheep, Cattel, Fowls, Stock or other Goods or Provisions, or Commodities whatsoever, shall upon Conviction of every such Offence, by one or more Testimonies upon Oath, before any of his Majesty's Justices of Peace within this Island, or the Parties own Confession, be adjudged by the said Justices of the Peace, to serve his said Master or Mistress Two Years after the said time, by Indenture, Custom or Bargain, is expired without any consideration of Wages or Sallary to be paid him, and be further liable, in case that time of Servitude will not make full Satisfaction. And whereas many Women Servants are begotten with Child by Freemen or Servants, in great prejudice to their Masters or Mistresses whom they serve,

11. It is therefore Ordained and Enacted… that whosoever shall beget a Woman-Servant with Child, shall for such Offence, personally serve the Owner of such Servant Three Years, or put one in his Place for the said time, which is in recompence for the said Master or Mistress of his and her Loss and Charge, in bringing up the Bastard Child, and Damage received by disabling their Woman Servant. But if the said Child be brought up by, and at the Costs and Charge of the Parish, and satisfie the said Owner for his said Damage. But in case of the said Child's Death, before the said Three Years be expired, that then the said Person is only to serve the said Owner One Year: But if the said Woman-Servant shall happen to Dye, or become infirm, by reason of her of her Labour in Child-bed, Then
the reputed Father shall serve the said Owner, during the whole time the said Woman had to serve, when the conceived by him.

12. And the said Woman Servant so offending, shall serve her said Master or Mistress Two years after her Time by Indenture, or otherwise be expired; the same to be ordered by the next Justice of the Peace, before whom such Proof thereof shall be made.

13. It is hereby Ordained and Enacted… That the same Proof or Evidence that is sufficient to prove the reputed Father of a Bastard, by which he is obliged to discharge the Parish whole it shall be, or to keep the same, shall be as authentick to a Jury, to cause the Father of a Bastard to make reparation to the Master or Mistress of such Woman-Servant upon whom the same is begotten; as is before appointed. But if a Servant shall beget a Woman-Servant with Child, 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 Offence committed.

14. … That if any Man-Servant shall marry without his Master or Missesses Consent during the time of his Apprenticeship, he shall serve his Master or Mistress Four Years after his said Time of Apprenticeship is expired.

15. And if any Freeman shall marry the Maid or Woman-Servant of any Person within this Island; such Freeman shall forthwith pay unto the Master or Owner of such Servant, double the Value of what the Maid or Woman Servant is worth, to be recovered by Action of Debt, in the Court of the Precincts, where no Protection, Essoigne or Wager of Law shall be admitted or allowed. But if he be a Servant, then after his Time is expired, he shall serve the Owner of the said Woman Servant double the time she had to serve, at such her time of Marriage.

16. … That when any Difference shall arise between Master and Servant, in and concerning the time of their Servitude, or Term of Years that they are to serve, that all such Differences as shall hereafter arise between Master or Servant, be heard and determined at Common-Law, in the Court of the Precincts wherein such Master or Servant shall then live and abide, as in other Cases of Right between Party and Party.

17. And that all Servants who have occasion or ground to commence Suit, therein, be allowed such reasonable time for the performance thereof by their respective Masters, as to the next Justice of the Peace in that Precinct shall seem requisite and convenient for the same: But not to be allowed more than Two out of a Family, in behalf of themselves and the rest. And whatsoever Servant over and above the number of Two, shall upon pretence of Complaint, absent themselves from their Master's Service, shall by Order of the next Justice of the Peace, receive Thirteen Lashes, and be returned to his Master's Service by a Constable, if the Justice before whom the Complaint is made, shall see cause.

18. And whatsoever Servant or Servants shall willfully and obstinately absent him or her self out of his or Master or Missesses Plantation or Service, either on Saturday, Sunday, or any other Days or Times, not having License or Ticket in Writing under his Master, Mistress or Overseer's Hand for the same; Upon Conviction thereof, by the Oath of one or more Witnesses, or of his own Confession, before some one of his Majesty's Justices of the Peace within this Island, shall for every Two Hours Absence, be adjudged and ordered by the said Justice, to serve his said Master or Mistress one whole Day after his Time by Indenture or Custom is expired. So that the same do not in the whole exceed Three Years; and so in proportion for a longer or lesser time, for such his Absence.
19. Provided always, That the said Justices of the Peace respectively in all such Cases coming before them, do, and have hereby power to hear likewise, and determine any Plea of Complaint, Damage or Prejudice, as well alledged and proved on the part of the Masters, as on the part of the Servants, Labourer and Artificer doing equal right between them.

20. … it is much feared, That some Persons within this Island, have exercised Violence and great Oppression, to, and upon their Servants ; through which, some of them have been Murthered and Destroyed, and the Authors and Causers of such their Destruction, have gone clear, undiscovered and unpunished, by reason of the sudden interring or Servants so destroyed and murthered as aforesaid. For Prevention whereof, and Discovery of all such Murthers and Felonies, as may be hereafter committed,

21. Be it Enacted and Declared… no Master, Mistress, Attorney or chief Overseer of any Family or Plantation within this Island, shall presume to bury or inter any Christian Servant, that shall hereafter happen to dye within their respective Plantations, out of the usual Burying-Place, until the Body of such Servant hath been viewed by the next Justice of the Peace, or a Constable and Two of the Neighbours of the Parish, wherein the Dwelling-House of the said Plantation standeth. Which neighbours, the said Justice or Constable shall make choice of, upon pain of paying Twenty Thousand Pounds of Muscovadoe Sugar for every Servant which shall be so buried, before such View as aforesaid. And if upon such View, it shall appear such Servants came to their Deaths by any Violence, Wounds, or unlawful Means, that then the Viewers of such Servants, do forthwith give notice unto the Coroners, that Proceedings may be had therein according to Law; he receiving for his Fee so much and no more, than by the Laws of England is provided.

22. It is also enacted, Ordained, and Published… that all Servants under the Age of Eighteen Years, which are hereafter brought to be assigned over, or disposed of, as Servants in this Island having made no Contract in England or elsewhere, shall serve for the space of Seven Years and no longer : And such as are above Eighteen, shall serve during the space of Five Years, and no longer; and at the end of the time, shall receive Four Hundred Pounds of Muscovadoe Sugar for their Wages: And where Man and Wife are brought over as Servants in one Ship, they shall be sold and disposed of together, and no severed.

23. … That all such Persons as shall hereafter sue for their Freedom, in respect of their Ages as is before-mentioned, shall be adjudged by the Jury by inspection and proportion of Stature and Confession, when they first arrived at this Island.

24. … That whosoever, either Master of a Family, or Captain or Master of a Ship, or other that shall entertain any Man or Woman above one Night, if he doth not know him or to be free, shall for every Day or Night after the first, forfeit one Hundred Pounds of Sugar. And if he knows him or her to be a Servant to another Man, do notwithstanding wilfully entertain him or her, he shall forfeit Five Hundred Pounds of Sufar for every Day or
Night, the one half of the said Forfeitures to be to the Master or Owner of the said Servant, and other half to the publick use...

25. And if any suspected Person come within any Plantation at unseasonable Hours, or being there, shall stay more than a fitting time; It shall be lawful for the Master, his Overseer or Servants, to apprehend such Person, and keep him in Custody until he may be brought to the next Constable.

26. And if any Overseer, Freeman or Labourer, or Servant, shall entertain or hide any Servant belonging to any other Plantation; such of his Majesty's Justices of the Peace, shall for every such Offence serve the Master or Owner of the Servant or Slave so entertained by him, one whole Year after his time with his own Master of that Plantation is expired, for which he shall receive no Salary or Allowance but ordinary Plantation Cloaths, Shoes, Fish or Flesh for Provision.

27. It is further Enacted and Ordained... That whatsoever Servant by Indenture or Custom, shall be found or apprehended in the Act of running away, upon Board of any Ship, Bark or Boat upon departure from this Island, whereby it may justly be presumed, that the said Servant intended and prepared to escape and run away unlawfully from the Island, and from his or her Master or Mistress's Service, or having first unlawfully absented him or her self from his or her said Master or Mistress's Service, be found by proof or other very substantial and notable Circumstances, endeavouring to get Aboard some Ship, Bark or Boat, to escape and run away unlawfully, as is aforesaid, from this Island, and his Master or Mistress's Service: Such Servant so taken on Board, or so endeavouring to get on Board, shall upon Conviction thereof, before any one of his Majesty's Justices of the Peace for this Island, be condemned Servant to his said Master or Mistress, for the full space and Term of Three Years, to be served and performed after his, or her first Indenture or Service by Custom shall be expired. And the Justice before whom such Conviction is made, is hereby required to make Record thereof: Any other Act, Statute or Ordinance heretofore made, or any other Clause in this Act contained, in any wise notwithstanding, and before the same Justice, the said Servant's Hair to be shaved off, by order of the said Justice.

28. ... divers Servants and Slaves have been carried off this Island to other Plantations and Colonies, to the great Damage and Prejudice of many the Inhabitants thereof, and no Remedy is provided for them...

... [bc of this, ship masters or other vessels required security by himself and two inhabitants of island (free-holders or resident merchants) in form of 2,000 pounds sterling to ensure he won't take an servant or slave off the island belonging to an inhabitant of Barbados without their consent/knowledge; ship search to ensure he doesn't have unapproved laborer, any passengers(?!) paper certifying names of them] ...

29. And all Constables within this Island, are hereby required to apprehend all Run-aways, That they shall know of by credible Information, and them in safe Custody convey from Constable to Constable, until they come to the common Goal, or to his Master or Mistress.

... [constable who doesn't do his job, fined 200lbs of sugar, half to owner and half to publick treasury] ...

30. And to the end that no Person may pretend any ignorance in this Act or Statute, or any Branch or Clause thereof.
198. An ACT to prevent People called Quakers, from bringing Negroes to their Meeting

1. Whereas of late many Negroes have been suffered so remain at the Meeting of Quakers as hearers of their Doctrine, and taught in their Principles; whereby the safety of this Island may be much hazarded; ...

2. ... And it is hereby Enacted by the Authority aforesaid, That if at any time or times after Publication hereof, any Negro or Negroes be found with the said People called Quakers, at any of their Meetings, and as Hearers of their Preachings, That such Negro or Negroes shall be forfeited, that is to say, on hal to the Party or Parties, that shall seize or sue for such Negro or Negroes, if the Negro or Negroes belong to any of the said People called Quakers, and other Moyety to the pyblick use of the said Island.

3. Provided, That if the said Negro or Negroes be seixed, that Party or Parties so seizing, shall bring an Action within Three Months, grounded upon this Statute against the Owner or supposed Owner of the said Negro or Negroes in any Court of Common Pleas within this Island, at the Choice of the Informer. And in all Suits upon this Statute, the Defendant or Defendants therein having Tend Days Summons shall appear, plead and come to Trial or the Court give Judgment on such Action or Actions... and upon all Judgments on every Action grounded on this Statute, Execution immediately to issue.

4. And it is further Enacted by the Authority aforesaid, That if such Negro or Negroes being at the Meetings aforesaid, and doth not belong to any of the Persons present at the same Meeting, then may any Person or Persons bring an Action grounded upon this Stature against any of the Persons present at the said Meetings at the Election of the Informer, for the Sum of Ten Pounds Sterling for every NEgroand Negroes so present as aforesaid, and shall recover Ten Pounds Sterling for every such Negro and NEgroes, to be divided in the manner before expressed; on which Action or Actions there shall be such Proceedings as is before appointed.

240. An ACT for the setling Six Acres and Thirty Perches of Land and Two Negroes in the Representatives of the Parish of Christ-church, for maintaining Five poor People by the Gift of Mr. Philip Trowel.

1. Whereas Mr. Philip Trowel, of the Parish of Christ-church in this Island, Planter, being well and charitably disposed, did by his Deed indented... settle and convey Six Acres of Land, and Thirty Perches, with its Appurtenances, lying and being in the said Parish of Christ-church, and Island aforesaid; together with one Negro Man, and one Negro Woman therein named, Nathaniel Kingsland and Richard Seawell... and their Successors Representatives of the said Parish for ever, for or towards the Support or Maintenance of Five poor Decayed English Men with full Power and Authority settle and place such Five poor Men with other Powers and Authorities to them and their Successors given relating thereto; as by the said Deed, relation being thereunto had, doth and may appear...

254. An ACT for the more effectual putting in Execution a Statute of England, Instituted An ACT for preventing Danger which may happen from Popish Recusants.

1. ... [England instituted this act, thus] ... That all and every Person or Persons that shall bear any Office or Offices, Civil or Military, or shall receive any Pary, Sallary, Fee or Wages by reason of any Patent or Grant, or shall have Command, or Place or Trust from or under His Majesty, or from any of his Majesty's Predecessors, or by his or their
Authority, or by Authority derived from or them, shall take the Oaths of Supremacy and Allegiance; and likewise make and subscribe a Declaration in the said Act expressed.

2. And whereas the Laws and Statutes of England… do extend to this Place both in Privilege and Penalty, and are and ought to be here in full force…

3. … [you must take this oath in order to serve in public office and if you take office, you take these oaths publicly] …

4. … That all and every Persons aforesaid, that shall neglect or refuse to take the said Oaths, and make the said Declaration as is before provided, shall incur and undergo the same Penalties and Forfeitures which are appointed by the said Statute to be recovered in the Court of Common Pleas where the Offender liveth.

5. … [those pre-mentioned people must be administered oaths by court, courts required to take not of such occurrence] …

329. An Act for the Governing of Negroes

1. Whereas the Plantations and Estates of this Island cannot be fully managed, and brought into Use without the Labour and Service of great Numbers of Negroes and other Slaves: And for as much as the said Negroes and other Slaves brought unto the People of this Island for that purpose are of barbarous, wild and salvage Natures, and such as renders them wholly unqualified, to be governed by the Laws, Customs, and Practices of our Nations. It therefore becoming absolutely necessary, that such other Constitutions, Laws and Orders, should be in this Island framed and Enacted for the good regulating and ordering of them, as may both restrain the Disorders, Rapines and Inhumanities to which they are naturally prone and inclined, with such Encouragements and Allowances as are fit and needful to their Support, that from both this Island through the Blessing of God thereon, may be preserved, His Majesty's Subjects in their Lives and Fortunes secured, and the Negroes and other Slaves be well provided for, and guarded from the Cruelties and Insolences of themselves or other ill-tempered People or Owners.

2. Be it Enacted and Ordained… That no Master Mistriss, Commissioner or Overseer, of any Family in this Island, shall give their Negroes or other Slaves leave on Sabbath-Days, Holy-Days or any other time, to go out of their Plantations, except such Negro or other Slave as usually wait upon them at Home or Abroad, and wearing a Livery, And no other Negro or Slave, except with a Ticket under the Master or Mistress Hand, or some other Person by his or her appointment, specifying the time allowed for his or her return, upon pain of forfeiting for every Negro or other Slave so licensed to go Abroad, Two Shillings, and Six Pence Sterling, half of the said Fine to be to the INformer, and the other to the publick Treasury...

3. … And if any Master, Mistress, Commissioner or Overseer of a Plantation shall find any Negro, or other Slave in their Plantation at any time, without a Ticket or Business from his said Master and doth not apprehend them, or endeavour so to do, and having apprehended them, shall not punish with them with a Moderate Whipping, shall forfeit Ten Shillings Sterling, to be disposed of as aforesaid.

4. And for that as it is absolutely necessary to the safety of this Place, That all due care be taken to refrain the Waandrings and Meetings of Negroes and other Slaves at all times, more especially on Saturday Nights, Sundays and other Holy-days, and their using, and carrying of Clubs, Wooden-Swords, or other mischievous and dangerous Weapons, or using or keeping Drums, Horns, or other loud INstruments; which may call together, or
give Sign or Notice to one another of their wicked Designs and Purposes; and that all Masters, Overseers, and others may be encouraged and enjoyned diligently and carefully to prevent the same,

5. Be it Enacted by the Authority aforesaid, That it shall be lawful for all Masters, Overseers, and other Persons whatsoever, to apprehend and take up any Negro, or other slave that shall be found out of the Plantation of his, or their Master or Owner, at any time, especially on Saturday Nights, Sundays or other Holy-days not being on lawful business, and with a Letter from their Master, or a Ticket, or not having a white Man with them (except only such Negroes or other Slaves as usually attend their Masters, and have on a Livery) and the said Negro or other Slave or Slaves, correct by a moderate Whipping; and after Notice given to their Master, Owner or Overseer, him or them detain, until the said Master, Owner or Overseer pay to the said Person that took him up, Two Shillings and Six Pence for every such Negro or other slave; he making Oath before the next Justice of Peace (if thereunto required) by the Owner of such Negro or other Slave, that he found or saw no letter or Ticket with him, as also any Negro or other Slave or Slaves meet or found out of the Plantation of his or their Master or Mistress, though with a Letter or Ticket, If he or they be armed with such Clubs or other Offensive Weapons aforesaid, him or them so disarmed, take up and whip and shall receive the same Reward as aforesaid, from the Master or Owner of such Negro or other Slave or Slaves... - and if beat drums, blow horns, or use loud instruments and will not let "Negro-House" to be serached once a week - ... and whosoever shall suffer and countenance any publick Meeting or Feasting of Strange Negroes or other Slaves in their Plantations, shall forfeit Fifty Shillings Sterling for every such Offence, upon Conviction, or Proof as aforesaid, Provided an Information or other Suit be commenced within One Month after Forfeiture thereof for the same.

6. And be it further Enacted… That every Overseer of a Family in this Island, shall cause all his Negro Houses to be searched diligently and effectually once every Fourteen Days for Fugitive and Run-away Slaves, Clubs, Wooden-Swords, and other mischievous Weapons; and finding any so, to take them away, and cause them to be burned; as also for Cloaths, Goods and any other things and Commodities that are not given them by their Master, Mistress, Commander or Overseer, and honestly borne by; in whole Custody they find any thing of that kind, and suspect or know to be Stolen Goods, the same they shall seize and take into their Custody; and a full and ample Description of the particulars thereof in Writing, within Six Days after the Discovery thereof, to send to the Clerk of the Parish for the time being, who is hereby required to receive the same, and to enter upon it the Day of its Receipt, and the particulars to file and keep to himself; and shall set upon the Posts of the Church Door, a short Brief that such lost Goods are found... [list of items stolen, cross-referenced, and if any ascertained to be stolen, then overseer or clerks 20 shillings sterling for each parcel] …

7. And for the more effectual detecting and punishing such Persons that trade with any Slaves for Stollen Goods,

   i. … [found trading, will have to put down "sufficient Recognizance"; find that they are unlawfully trading with slave will forfeit that "Recognizance"] …

8. And be it further Enacted and Ordained, That if any Negro or Slave whatsoever, shall offer any Violence to any Christian, by striking or the like, such Negro or other Slave
shall for his or her first Offence by Information given upon Oath to the next Justice, be severely whipped by the Constable, by order of the said Justice. For his Second Offence of that nature, by Order of the Justice of Peace, he shall be severely whipped, his Nose slit, and burned in some part of his Face with a Hot Iron. And for his Third Offence, he shall receive by Order of the Governour and Council, such greater Punishment as they shall think meet to inflict. Provided always, That such Striking or Conflict be not in the Lawful Defence of their Master's, Mistresses or Owners of their Families or of their Goods.

i.  ... [all slaves on island given cloathes 1/yr (drawers and caps for men; petty coats and caps for women); 5 shilling fine for each slave not clothed as described] ... 

9.  And it is further Enacted by the Authority aforesaid, That all Persons who shall hereafter take up any Run-away or Fugitive Negro, or other Slave or Slaves, not knowing the Master or Owner of such Negro or Slave, and shall bring them unto the Provost-Marshall or his Deputy, shall receive Ten Shillings Sterling from the Treasurer for the time being, who is hereby appointed to pay the same: And in case he shall refuse to make the said Payment upon presentment of the said Negro, or other Slave or Slaves, and thereof Oath to be made before any Justice of the Peace... - make sure the person gets paid - ... And the Negroes so brought, shall be kept in the Cage at the Stepping-Stones by the Provost Marshal, and not in Goal; which said Cage is always to be kept in sufficient Repair, at the Publick Charge of this Island.

i.  ... [the provost marshall enacted to] ... to retain and keep in his Custody as aforesaid, the Body of all such Run-aways, until the Owner of them shall pay unto the said Treasurer, Eleven Shillings Sterling; and also unto the said Provost Marshal, Four Pence for every Four and Twenty Hours the said Fugitive Slave hath been in his Custody, and also until he have a Discharge under the Hand of the said Treasurer or his Clerk. And the Turn-Key shall receive Six Pence for every Negro delivered: Provided always, That the said Provost Marshal do furnish the said Negroes and other Slaves, with sufficient Food and Drink, which is to be proved upon Oath, if by the Owner of the Negro or other Slaves it shall be so required to be done.

ii.  ... [if the slave dies because not fed, responsible to owner; if slave escapes before delivered, marshall pays treasurer 11 shillings and make "further Satisfaction to the Owner"; don't put the slaves in the Cage, then 5lbs sterling for each slave to owner] ... [capture runaway slaves and take to St. Michael's Town, to the Treasurer, or to the Cage] ... an Account of his Name and Place of Aboad, with the Time when, and Place where he apprehended such Fugitive Slave or Slaves; And that he knew of no Ticket the Negro had, no the Owner of such Negro or Slave, which the said Treasurer is hereby required to take and enter into a Book; to the intent that all Owners of Slaves may come to the right Knowledge and Understanding when their Slaves were Apprehended, and by whom, and whether they might be wrongfully taken up, or not; and that the Keeper of the Cage at the delivery of any Slaves do take a Receipt of the Person to
whom delivered, and there infer the Mark or Description of the Slave delivered.

iii. … [issue of "Evil and Ill-disposed Persons" have tried to "steal Slaves by specious Pretence of promising them Freedom in another Country" and there are no punishments for such act yet] …

iv. … [people who "tempt or perswade" slaves to leave Master or Mistress, "of an Intent and Design to carry away any of them off this Island, or to conceal or Entertain any of them upon this Island, or howsoever defraud the said Masters or Mistresses" will be convicted on own confession and one witness; person has to pay the Master 25lbs sterling, "to be levied as in the case of Servants Wages: But in case the Party offending shall not be found worth Lands, Goods or Chattels, to the value aforesaid" then "adjudge him Servant for Five Years to the Party injured, and so deliver over to him, and make a Record thereof"... but if person caught actually in process of getting off island, then pay the owner 3x the price of slave(s); no money? then you're working] …

10. And whereas many heinous and grievous Crimes, as Murders, Burglaries, Robbing in the High-ways, Rapes, Burning of Houses or Canes, be many times committed by Negroes and other Slaves, and many times maliciously attempted by them to be committed, in which, though by divers Accidents they are prevented, yet are their Crimes nevertheless heinous, and therefore deserve the like Punishment: And also do many times Steal willfully, Kill, Maim or Destroy one or more Horses, Mares, Geldings, Cattel, Sheep or other Quick or Dead thing of the like nature, and of the Value of Twelve Pence or above: And many times by attempting to steal from the Inhabitants of this Island, Stock and other Goods before-mentioned, of above or under the value aforesaid, do put such Inhabitants or some of his Family in Terror, Dread and Jeopardy of their Lives, which several Offenders for danger or Escape, are not long to be imprisoned: And being Brusth Slaves, deserve not, for the Baseness of their Condition, to be tried by the Legal Trial of Twelve Men of their Peers or Neighbourhood, which neither truly can be rightly done as the Subjects of England are, nor is Execution to be delayed towards them, in case of such horrid Crimes committed

11. … That when any such Crime as aforesaid, shall be committed, or attempted to be committed, by any Negroes, Slave or Slaves, and the said Criminals be apprehended and brought before any of His Majesty's Justices of the Peace within this Island, and the Justices before whom the Criminals are brought, shall take Security for their forth coming, or send them to Prison, and with all convenient speed, shall join with him the next Justice of the Peace; And these Two shall by their Warrant or Precept, call to them Three Able, Good and Legal Free-holders of the Place nearest where the said Crimes were committed, and these Five Persons viz. The two Justices and the Three Freeholders, shall hear and examine all Evidences, Proofs and Testimonies, or by violent Circumstances they shall find such Negro or other Slave or Slaves guilty thereof, they shall give the Sentence of Death upon them accordingly…

i. … [if freeholders summoned don't show up, then they have to pay 50 shillings sterling] … And if any Person shall send off his Negro that hath killed another, he shall pay unto the Master of such Negro, the Value of such Negro so killed as aforesaid. And in regard great Mischiefs daily
happen by the Petty Larcenies, committed also by the Negroes and Slaves of this Island … [if steal or devalue anything over 12 pence] … every Negro or other Slave so offending, being brought before some Justice of the Peace of this Island, upon Complaint of the Party injured, and shall be adjudged guilty of Confession, Proof or probably Circumstances, such Negro or Slave so offending (excepting Children, whose Punishment is left wholly to the Discretion of the said Justice, shall be adjudged by such Justice to be publicly and severely whipped, not exceeding Forty Lashes; and the said Justice shall order and cause the Owner of such Negro or other Slave, to make Satisfaction to the Party injured… and if such Negro or other Slave punished as aforesaid, be afterwards found guilty of the like Crimes aforesaid, under the value of Twelve Pence as aforesaid, he or they for such, his or their Second Offence, shall by Order of the Justice of Peace before whom such Complaint and Proof is made, have his or their Noses slit, and be branded in the Forehead with a hot Iron, that the Mark thereof may remain… [and owner of slave must make up to injured party double the value of what was destroyed or stolen] … And if such Negro or other Slave after the Second time aforesaid, be accused of Petty Larceny, or of any of the Offences before mentioned, such Negro or other Slave shall be tried in such manner as Murther, Burglary, etc. are provided for to be Tried; and if such Negro or Slaves as shall be Tried, shall be found guilty a Third time of any of the Offences afore-mentioned, then such Negro or other Slave for that Third Offence, shall be adjudged to suffer Death, in the manner as is appointed in Cases of Murder as aforesaid; or other Punishments as the said Justices shall think fit.

ii. … [should any justice or freeholder neglect or refuse to act on this trial, they each pay 25lbs sterling] …

12. … That if any Negroes or other Slaves, shall make Mutiny or Insurrection, or rise in Rebellion against this Place or People, or make preparation of Arms, Powder, Bullets, or Offensive Weapons, or hold any Council or Conspiracy of, or raising Mutiny or Rebellion against this Island… and proceed by Marshal Law against the Actors, Contrivers, Raisers, Fomenters and Concealers of such Mutiny or Rebellion, and them punish by Death or other Pains as their Crimes shall deserve… Now foras much as the Loss of the Negroes and other Slaves that shall suffer Death by this Act, would prove so heavy for the owner of them only to bear, and that the Owners of Negroes may not be discouraged to detect and discover the Offences of their Negroes; and that thee Loss may be born by the Publick, whole safety by such Punishments is hereby provided forand intended.

i. … [should you slave "suffer Death" by the aforesaid act, then the] …

ii. Justices and Freeholders, Colonel and Field Officers, who adjudged such Negro or other Slave to suffer Death, immediately after Sentence thereof given, inquire by the best means they are able, of the Value of such Negro or other Slave, in which Value they shall never exceed the Sum of Five and Twenty Pounds Sterling, for any One Negro or other Slave, and also the Damage of the Party injured, and make Certificate thereof to the Treasurer for the Time being, therein requiring the said Treasurer to pay
out the Value of the said Negro or Negores, the Value of the Damage to the Party injured... and if there be no Party injured, then the whole Value of the Danger or Dangers of the said Negro or other Slave out of the Publick Treasury of this Island...

13. … But in regard there are some Masters and Owners of Negros and other Slaves in this Island, who do not make sufficient Conscience of providing what is necessary for their Negros or ther Slaves, or allowing them time to Plant or Provide for themselves; for which cause such Negros or other Slaves, are necessitated to commit Crimes contrary to the Law; and yet the safety of this Island requiring, that such Negros and other Slaves shall suffer as the Law hath appointed, rather than the poor Inhabitants of this Island be ruined, and driven from hence by their means. That therefore such Masters and Owners of Negros and other Slaves whose neglect of Negros and other Slaves, makes them in some measure guilty of their Crimes, may not be countenanced therein at the Charge of the Publick. … [if slaves sentenced to death based on actions mentioned in act on crimes and rebellion and prove through witnesses that masters did not uphold provisions and necessities, then the] … Treasurer to pay the Damage to the Party injured, out of the Value of the said Negro or other Slave, and nothing to such Master or Owner. And if the Treasurer for the time being (having sufficient Publick Stock in his Hands) shall fail to make Satisfaction and Payment to such Master or Owner of any Negro or other Slave... [the party injured can take action of debt against treasurer] ... And in regard the Planters necessity doth compel them for the Management only of their Lands, to keep so vast a Stock of Negros and other Slaves, whose desperate Lives and great Numbers become dangerous to them, and all other the Inhabitants. That therefore such who are not bound up by that necessity in having Plantations of their own, and hired Land, may not increase the danger to this Island, by keeping Negros or other Slaves to hire out to others...

14. …divers Negros and other Slaves at this present are, and have been long since run away into Woods and other Fastness of this Island, doing continually much Mischief to the Inhabitants of this Island, hiding themselves sometimes in one Place, and sometimes in another, so that are not to be found without much difficulty,

15. … that shall have notice of the Residency or Hidding-place of any Run-away Negros, or other Fugitive Slaves, to Raise and Arm any number of Men, not exceeding Twenty, to apprehend and take them, either Alive or Dead. And for every Negro or other Slave that they shall take alive, having been run away above Six Months from his Master, they shall receive Fifty Shillings Sterling; and for every Negro or other Slave that they shall take alive, having been run away above Twelve Months Five Pound from the Master or Commanders of the said Negro or other Slave; if killed in taking, they shall receive Fifty Shillings Sterling from the Publick; any Act or Statue heretofore to the contrary notwithstanding

16. … That if any Negro or other Slave under Punishment by his Master or his Order for running away, or any other Crimes or Misdemeanors towards his said Master, unfortunately shall suffer in Life or Member, which seldom happens; no Person whatsoever shall be liable to any Fine therefore. But if any Man shall of wantonness, or only of Bloody Mindedness, or Cruel Intent, willfully kill a Negro or other Slave of his own, he shall pay into the Publick Treasury, Fifteen Pounds Sterling: But if he shall
so kill another Man's, he shall pay to the owner of the Negro, double the Value, and into the Publick Treasury, Twenty Five Pounds Sterling...

17. … But if any poor small Freeholder or other Person, kill a Negro or other Slave by Night, out of the Road or Common Path, and Stealing, or attempting to Steal, his Provision, Swine or other Goods, he shall not be accountable for it…