

Andre Ye

Dr. Reagan

TS History

29 October 2020

The development of racialized chattel slavery was not a pure instrument of capitalism, as Edmund S. Morgan suggests in *American Slavery American Freedom*. Instead, it was an institution grounded on capitalist principles and premises but built and reinforced by psychological factors – fear and power dynamics. All-encompassing fear – not only from a fear of slaves but from every direction – natives, indentured servants, limitations to legislative action from both from within and outside the gentry – drove the development of racism and racialized chattel slavery. Towards the end of the 1700s and early 1800s, racialized chattel slavery was not driven by economics, but by fear.

The spite between the English poor and the wealthy was fundamentally capitalistic – the wealthy despised the poor for not contributing enough to national income, and for being idle (Morgan). In an effort to generate more profit, a series of thought movements targeted at the oppression of the poor arose; many of the wealthy hypothesized that educating the poor would make them even further idle. Institutions like working houses further sought to extract more labor and income from the poor. These hostilities carried into the Virginian gentry's views of indentured servants and slaves. The Virginian economy was heavily reliant on tobacco, a very labor-intensive plant (lecture). Meanwhile, Parliament's regulations on tobacco, like the Navigation Acts, which mandated all trade with the colonies be done with Britain and hence took profits from selling tobacco to the British, made the price of tobacco plummet. These two factors

– rooted in a capitalist desire to make more profit – deepened an existing divide between the elite and the working-class. The elite came to expect more of the working-class, yet grew hostile towards them because they weren't working quite enough. One Virginian slaveholder lamented that his slaves were always idle (Morgan). British merchants, which continued to push the Atlantic Slave Trade, and white indentured servants provided a constantly increasing labor force to supply the Virginian gentry's consistently increasing demands for labor.

Quickly, however, the numbers became stacked against the Virginian gentry (lecture). The working-class population quickly arose, and as life expectancy increased, indentured servants that outlasted their contracts began demanding compensation. Employers, which often did not expect servants to live that long, often did not or could not payout. The physical power imbalance came to a head with Bacon's Rebellion in the mid-1670s when Nathaniel Bacon marched with angry white indentured servants and black slaves. The rebellion was immensely successful and only was put down several days later with the might of the British military (lecture). This incident demonstrated the extent to which society was divided by class and not by race; white indentured servants were perfectly willing to lay down their lives in protest alongside black slaves in protest of their wealthy oppressors. The Virginian gentry, thus, had two choices: to satisfy the demands brought about by Bacon's Rebellion – to open up land access into indigenous territories – or to devise some method to split apart its constituents to prevent such a rebellion, which threatened the lives of the governor and other elites, from repeating. The gentry, out of fear of provoking the indigenous peoples for a repeat of the Jamestown Massacre, chose the latter. If society was divided not by class and instead by race, the numbers would be stacked more in the gentry's favor. Thus, the colonial elite enacted racist legislation that would divide white indentured servants and black slaves, for instance by forcing land rewarded to black slaves

to be given to white indentured servants. Hence, by appealing slightly to white indentured servants, the gentry was able to split the enslaved population.

For a while, racism worked as a social tool. It re-oriented the numbers in favor of the gentry. However, British merchants continued to push the Atlantic slave trade, and began to take shortcuts – importing slaves directly from Africa (lecture). Furthermore, slaves were already ill-treated on the journey from Africa to the Americas; this, in addition to being brought into a completely different technological and cultural environment, made them predisposed to being defensive and violent (Equiano). In the Stono Rebellion, which occurred around 1740, 60 newly imported slaves revolted, killed dozens of white people, and burned a plantation (lecture). The slaves then marched to the capital, but all were killed or captured and later executed. As the number of slaves increased, even racism as a social tool had its limitations. Social death, which was used to ‘break’ slaves, relied on the premise that a slave had no connections and no relationships within anyone in their environment (Patterson), deteriorated when slaves became the majority. In some counties, slaves made up over 90 percent of the population. Out of fear that another slave rebellion might succeed in killing *them* or capturing land, the Virginian gentry took two measures: making efforts to stop the British slave trade and enforcing outright violence. After the Stono Rebellion, the Virginian gentry banned direct foreign slave imports for 10 years (lecture), and many stopped buying slaves altogether. Younger and less wealthy citizens of the colonies eager to access ‘property’ and to develop their own wealth, however, supported the Atlantic slave trade many of the colonial elite believed the British were cramming down on them (Holton). This, which was a major factor in the colonies’ fight for Independence from Britain, heightened fear and conflict over the issue of slaves. Hence, the Virginian elite used outright violence against slaves. This was not economic – such legislation was passed directly out of fear from multiple directions. One could argue that certain economic benefits arose, but it is at

highest a secondary factor; slaves were the valuable property which provided labor for the labor-hungry Virginian economy, and utilizing brute force that often killed them for no reason is not economically wise.

Thus, building upon conflicts and ideas that stemmed from capitalism in England, the initial hostility between the elite and the working-class – specifically, the elite’s opinions on how to extract more profit from a working-class they saw as idle and lazy – was set up. However, as capitalism drove the numbers against the gentry, demonstrated by Bacon’s Rebellion, the elite chose to develop racism as a social tool out of fear of retaliation from the natives and fear from a working-class riot. When the slave population continued to amass and incidents like the Stono rebellion, the gentry attempted to regulate the slave trade with Britain but was undercut by poorer and younger members who still purchased slaves. With the fear of another slave riot and with the limitation of not being able to completely halt the slave trade, the gentry resorted to outright racial violence, more as an ideology than a coordinated effort to extract economic value from slaves. Furthermore, this transition of conflicts in slavery from being inherently capitalistic to being completely motivated by fear from a variety of sources – the natives, white indentured servants rioting and seizing control, a deadly slave insurrection, among legislative limitations both from within and from Parliament – better explains American racism’s persistence past slavery as economic practice.