THE PROCESS AND CONSEQUENCES OF AFRICA'S TRANSMUTATION

4

In the 500 years that have led directly to our moment, the destinies of African peoples have been profoundly affected by the development of economic structures and political institutions among European peoples. Moreover, it has been the nature of these relationships between Africans and Europeans that both Western civilization and the cultures of African peoples have been increasingly contorted and perverted as the years have accumulated. For the West, the appropriation of the means and forces of African reproduction have had unintended and unacceptable significance. The psychic, intellectual, and cultural consequences of Europe's intrusion into African history have served to accelerate the formulation of the mechanisms of self-destruction inherent in Western civilization, exacerbating its native racisms, compelling further its imperatives for power and totalitarian force, while subverting the possibilities of the rationalization of its states, its diverse cultural particularities, and its classes. Everywhere one turns or cares to look, the signs of a collapsing world are evident; at the center, at its extremities, the systems of Western power are fragmenting. Thus the British Empire at the beginning of the twentieth century, the German Empire in the middle years of this century, and the American empire today are simultaneously forewarnings, witnesses, and the history of this dissolution; and the development of each testified to the characteristic tendency of capitalist societies to amass violence for domination and exploitation and a diminishing return, a dialectic, in its use. "Things fall apart; the centre cannot hold." My subject, however, is not primarily the modern Western world and its contortions. Rather, I intend to focus

here on the centuries of the modern world's adolescence, and on the formation and emergence of African peoples.

The Diminution of the Diaspora

Before the African and New World Black liberation movements of the post–Second World War era, few Western scholars of the African experience had any conception of the existence of an ideologically based or epistemologically coherent historical tradition of Black radicalism. The presence of such a tradition, the possibilities and conditions of its existence were literally and configuratively alien to these observers. Given the presumptions these students of Africa and its diaspora made about the bases of the identities, cultures, ethnicities, and group formations of these various African peoples, neither space nor time, geography nor periodicity, led them to suspect the presence of such a tradition. In its stead, these observers reconstructed social and ideological movements among Blacks to conform to the exigencies of specific locales and of immediate social causes.[1] If in their minds such movements occasionally were allowed some resemblance to one another, this followed from the fact of a general racial order shared by most Blacks, whether as slaves or ex-slaves, rather than the presence of a historical or political consciousness or a social tradition among Blacks. An ideological connective was presumed remote between the African mutineers on the *Amistad* or the captors of the *Diane*; the maroon settlements in Pernambuco, Florida, Virginia, Jamaica, the Guianas, and the Carolinas; the slave revolutionists of the Revolution in Haiti; the slave insurrectionists of the Caribbean and early nineteenth-century America; the Black rebels of the regions of the Great Fish River, the Limpopo and the Zambezi in southern Africa; the Black emigrationists of the American antebellum period; the untolled wars across the African landscape in the 1800s and 1900s; and their twentieth-century successors in Africa and the diaspora.

These events were seen as geographically and historically bounded acts, episodes connected categorically by the similarity of their sociological elements (e.g., slave or colonial societies) but evidently unrelated in the sense of any emerging social movement inspired by historical experience and a social ideology.[2] Such scholarship, of course, was either inspired or at least influenced by the ideological requirement that modern Western thought obliterate the African. As an ideological current, its adherents were not always Europeans. It permeated the intellectual culture and even compromised the work of some of those Africans' descendants. The pioneering work of Black scholars such as C. L. R. James and W. E. B. Du Bois was obviously unacceptable to orthodox Anglo-American scholastic establishment.[3]

The difference was not one of interpretation but comprehension. The makings of an essentially African response, strewn across the physical and temporal terrain of societies conceived in Western civilization, have been too infrequently distinguished. Only over time has the setting for these events been integrated into the tradition. The social cauldron of Black radicalism is Western society. Western society, however, has been its location and its objective condition but not—except in a most perverse

fashion—its specific inspiration. Black radicalism is a negation of Western civilization, but not in the direct sense of a simple dialectical negation. It is certain that the evolving tradition of Black radicalism owes its peculiar moment to the historical interdiction of African life by European agents. In this sense, the African experience of the past five centuries is simply one element in the mesh of European history: some of the objective requirements for Europe's industrial development were met by the physical and mental exploitation of Asian, African, and native American peoples. This experience, though, was merely the condition for Black radicalism—its immediate reason for and object of being—but not the foundation for its nature or character. Black radicalism, consequently, cannot be understood within the particular context of its genesis. It is not a variant of Western radicalism whose proponents happen to be Black. Rather, it is a specifically African response to an oppression emergent from the immediate determinants of European development in the modern era and framed by orders of human exploitation woven into the interstices of European social life from the inception of Western civilization:

> [T]he similarity of African survivals in the New World points not to tribal peculiarities but to the essential oneness of African culture. That culture was the shield which frustrated the efforts of Europeans to dehumanize Africans through servitude. The slave may have appeared in a profit and loss account as an "item," and "thing," a piece of "property," but he faced his new situation as an African, a worker, and a man. At this level of perception, it is quite irrelevant to enquire from which tribe or region a particular African originated.[4]

As we shall see, in slave society such a signification of African culture was accessible for practical and ideological reasons only in a most grotesque form, that is, racism. Racist ideologues observed that all Blacks were identical and supplied the content of that identity. More important, though, few of the proponents of the philosophical, epistemological, or historical traditions of Western culture have found the authentic reality easy to grasp. For longer than the African slave trades to the old or new worlds, the Eurocentric traditions of Western civilization have categorically erred. And though he appeared rather late in this process, Hegel, perhaps somewhat crudely, spoke for these traditions when he declared, "The true theatre of History is therefore the temperate zone"; and further:

> The peculiarly African character is difficult to comprehend, for the very reason that in reference to it, we must quite give up the principle which naturally accompanies all *our* ideas—the category of Universality. . . . Another characteristic fact in reference to the Negroes is Slavery. Negroes are enslaved by Europeans and sold to America. Bad as this may be, their lot in their own land is even worse, since there a slavery quite as absolute exists; for it is the essential principle of slavery, that man has not yet attained a consciousness of his freedom, and consequently sinks down to a mere Thing—an object of no value. . . .
> At this point we leave Africa, not to mention it again. For it is no historical part

of the World; it has no movement or development to exhibit. Historical move-ments in it—that is in its northern part—belong to the Asiatic or European World.[5]

Except, perhaps, in its form of expression, the Eurocentrism that Hegel displays in these passages has proven to be neither anachronistic nor idiosyncratic. He would be echoed by legions of European scholars (and their non-European epigony) in a myriad of ways into the present century.[6] The tradition persisted and permutated.

Such was the character of the world consciousness that dominated thought in Western Europe. Its origins, as we have seen in Part I, were intra-European rather than a reflex of encounters between Europeans and non-Europeans. Indeed, the social base to which this conception was a response assumed its sociological forms more than a millennium before the advent of an extensive European trade in African workers and they were not easily displaced even by the eighteenth century.[7] This cultural tradition of a moral and social order that rested on racial distinctions was nevertheless readily available for the extension to Asian, African, and other non-European peoples when it became appropriate. With respect to the African, that occasion presented itself in the trade that saw its most bountiful fruition in the New World.

The Primary Colors of American Historical Thought

In the summer of 1856, the pro-slavery apologist's argument for the inferiority of African peoples was most eloquently summarized in an article appearing in the fledgling but prestigious American literary magazine, *Putnam's Monthly*:

> The most minute and the most careful researches have, as yet, failed to discover a history or any knowledge of ancient times among the negro races. They have invented no writing; not even the rude picture-writing of the lowest tribes. They have no gods and no heroes; no epic poem and no legend, not even simple tradi-tions. There never existed among them an organized government; there never ruled a hierarchy or an established church. Might alone is right. They have never known the arts; they are ignorant even of agriculture. The cities of Africa are vast accumulations of huts and hovels; clay walls or thorny hedges surround them, and pools of blood and rows of skulls adorn their best houses. The few evidences of splendour or civilization are all borrowed from Europe; where there is a religion or creed, it is that of the foreigners; all knowledge, all custom, all progress has come to them from abroad. The negro has no history—he makes no history.[8]

This anonymous writer's tortuously comprehensive characterization of the history and social integrity of Black peoples had appeared in print midway between two desperate acts in American history: the enactment of the Fugitive Slave Law of 1850 by a Congress panicked into legislating martial law to defend slavery as a property right, and the desperate resoluteness of John Brown's final bloody and radical blow against

slavery in 1859.[9] It was not, however, some sort of mathematical mean between the political sentiments, economic interests, and moral consciousness that inspired these two mutually contradictory but historically complementary public acts (each in its own way, of course, proved to be a necessary condition for the Civil War that followed). The division of opinion among whites and the European immigrant (who perhaps too would be "white" someday) could not be neatly correlated in arrangements of paired and equivalent moral postures: Black inferiority/pro-slavery; Black equality/anti-slavery. On the contrary, this confident declaration from the bleached bowels of mid-nineteenth-century American intelligentsia, wrenching history and historical consciousness from Black peoples, was the dominant ideological rationalization of racial oppression in the United States.[10] Its arrogant and specious historiography, itself the immediate and mangled product of 300 years of systemic African slavery in the New World, was both an absolute imperative as a cornerstone for the rationalization of a slave society[11] and a logical development of an errant civilization served so long by racial orders. By the middle of the nineteenth century, Western civilization, both at the strata of intellectual and scientific thought and that of popular opinion and mythology, had effectively sealed the African past.[12] The undercurrent that gave some recognition to the African's and the Black slave's humanity, and that had been used to nurture much of the earliest anti-slavery sentiment and literature, had been overwhelmed by the more constant and morally profound tradition of racism.[13]

The denial of the African's social order and history was not simply a question of Europe's or colonial America's ignorance of Africa. David Brion Davis, while reconstructing the descent of the African's image in eighteenth-century European thought, has sifted through materials that indicate that at least in this instance knowledge had not been cumulative:[14]

> It was known two centuries ago that Negroes lived in settled, agriculture societies; that they cultivated a variety of crops, raised large herds of cattle, and planted groves of shade trees. It was known that they were highly skilled in the use of iron and copper, in the making of jewelry and pottery, and in the weaving of fine cotton textiles.
>
> ... It was known that Africans lived in neat and spacious villages which allowed privacy to the individual while preserving an intricate system of class and family distinctions. ... Numerous books told of the Negroes' polite manners, their well-established patterns of trade, their knowledge of the planets and constellations.[15]

European travelers and tradesmen, their lives and fortunes so often dependent upon practical knowledge of African peoples, had frequently published such informed accounts, detailing social relations with which they had become familiar. Why such understanding had not persisted in European thought, Davis is at a loss to explain. Having come to the proposition that slavery had always been problematic to Western culture,[16] Davis, like Jordan,[17] resorted to mystery: "For reasons that can perhaps never be fully explained, it was the African's colour of skin that became his defining

characteristic, and aroused the deepest response in Europeans."[18] Davis in conforming to racial convention has inherited its tautology: racial distinctions are the basis of racial sensibilities. He would have been better served by a less presumptuous inquiry into the ideological traditions resident in Western history. Then he might have realized that after some centuries of racial indulgences the substratum of Western thought was unprepared for anything else. Even the shift in eighteenth-century and nineteenth-century Western thought from a basis of a religious and philosophical epistemology to that of modern science had made little difference.[19] In point of fact, it had merely served to extend the terms and rationales for the fantasy of racial inferiority (for the Jews, Irish, Slavs, and Asians as well as for Blacks).[20] Western scientific thought simply took its place as the latest formal grammar for the expression of a racial metaphysics to which its most natural response was acquiescence. Indeed, during much of the nineteenth century, one of the most persistent projects for which Western science was employed was the attempt to demonstrate what was already understood to be the natural order of the races.[21]

In America, the accommodation of Western historical consciousness to racial ideologies created a particular chain of social misperceptions and historical distortions that endured into the present century. Not only was popular thought affected but the very foundations of that American academic thought which first began to mature in the nineteenth century was suffused with racialist presumptions. The emerging American bourgeoisie, in its mercantile, manufacturing, and plantocratic aspects, was purposefully and progressively achieving its first stages of ideological coherence. This intellectual grounding came to absorb the past of those peopling America as well as their present. The result was the construction of the historical legends that obscured the origins and character of the republic and the social relations upon which it rested.[22] The hard edges of class divisions, rooted in the European socioeconomic traditions of English gentry and continental European aristocracies and their lower classes, were softened and obscured by a mythical racial unity. The existence of land-rich elites, the social and political prerogatives of mercantile capital and agrarian property, even the genesis of a southern American aristocracy, all this was inundated by paeans to the political enlightenment that—culling from Europe the "best" of its moral traditions—had presumably conducted the people to independence, constructed near-perfect instruments of governance, and provided to the individual rights guaranteed by formal legal codes.[23] Even the long, vociferous, and sometimes violent opposition of "American Democracy" (the Democratic Party that had dominated federal policy and federal offices in the second quarter of the nineteenth century) to social democracy or "mob rule" (to its opponents)—both symptomatic of the truer character of the social order and one of its last overt manifestations—was faded and forgotten in the wake of an emergent racial consensus.[24] John Brown, closer to the artisanal origins associated with English working-class radicalism a quarter of a century earlier, was a suggestion of a certain strata not entirely mesmerized by the still novel variant of Western hierarchical systems.

One could discern the character and direction of historical distortion much earlier

of course. Some of the realities of colonial America were hardly the stuff from which national legend could be easily formed. By the eighteenth century, American ideologists, already exempted by colonial victory, pacification and an established slave system from the challenges of the non-Western peoples their narratives would abuse, had begun to construct alternative realities. It would be some time before their machinations were no longer tolerable fictions. More recently, while reviewing these beginnings, Edmund Morgan, reconstructing the relations of the earliest Virginian colonists with native peoples, summarized the collective psychic state that he felt must have accompanied the cycle of atrocities that would extend ultimately into the present century:

> If you were a colonist, you knew that your technology was superior to the Indians'. You knew that you were civilized, and they were savages. It was evident in your firearms, your clothing, your housing, your government, your religion. The Indians were supposed to be overcome with admiration and to join you in extracting riches from the country. But your superior technology had proved insufficient to extract anything. The Indians, keeping to themselves, laughed at your superior methods and lived from the land more abundantly and with less labor than you did. They even furnished you with the food that you somehow did not get around to growing enough of yourselves. To be thus condescended to by heathen savages was intolerable. And when your own people started deserting in order to live with them, it was too much. . . . So you killed the Indians, tortured them, burned their villages, burned their cornfields. It proved your superiority.[25]

Yet as early as 1751, Benjamin Franklin, a most deliberate ruling-class colonial intellectual whose ultimate influence on American society would be vast in ideological, financial, and territorial terms, was already immersed in a quite different record of these relationships:

> The Europeans found America as fully settled as it well could be by Hunters; yet these having large Tracks, were easily prevailed on to part with Portions of Territory to the new Comers, who did not much interfere with the Natives in Hunting, and furnish'd them with many Things they wanted.[26]

The violent event of colonial aggression and its corollary of "Indian" slavery had already been transmuted in Franklin's neo-nativistic "American" mind into a relationship of supplication secured by an economic rationale; indeed, the dependence of "new Comers" on natives already reversed. The curtain of supremacist ideology had by now begun its descent on American thought, obscuring from the historically unconscious generations of descendants of colonialists and later immigrants the oppressive violence and exploitation interwoven in the structure of the republic.

The emigrant indentured servant, whose origins were most frequently and casually traced to England, was another of the labor forces upon which the colonial settlements of the seventeenth century depended. They would fare little better than the native American in the traditions being shaped in American historiography by

ruling-class ideologues. Of course, it is now generally presumed that the "white servant" as a class had soon disappeared in the English mainland colonies as a result of the trade in African workers that had begun to reach substantial numbers beginning in the late seventeenth century.[27] This, however, was not the case. Richard Hofstadter tells us: " 'The labor of the colonies,' said Benjamin Franklin in 1759, 'is performed chiefly by indentured servants brought from Great Britain, Ireland, and Germany, because the high price it bears cannot be performed in any other way.' "[28] And as late as the years immediate to the American Revolution, servants still constituted approximately 10 percent of the two and one-half million people occupying the rebellious colonies. Like the slave, legally chattel to be sold at the discretion of a master, often the subject of cruel punishments, and without the rights to property, to marry without the permission of the master, or to drink in a public tavern, the white servant joined the vast excluded majority of the young republic's population:[29]

> Had Lockean dicta been applied to all the human beings in British North America on the eve of the Revolution, and had all been permitted to enjoy the natural and legal rights of freemen, it would have been necessary to alter the status of more than 85 per cent of the population. In law and in fact no more than 15 per cent of the Revolutionary generation was free to enjoy life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness unhampered by any restraints except those to which they had given their consent.
>
> The unfree of Revolutionary America may be conveniently considered in five categories: Negroes, white servants, women, minors, and propertyless adult white males.[30]

The privileges of democracy were illusory for most.[31] White servants themselves were no closer to liberation at the end of the eighteenth century than were their distracted predecessors who had joined with the rankly ambitious Indian-killer Bacon in a desperate attempt to redraw the boundaries of power and wealth of colonial society in the seventeenth century.[32] Nevertheless, the tragic experiences of these generations of working poor were seldom transliterated into heroic saga. Even Abbot E. Smith, whose studies would prove to be so important to the reclamation of this class's historical role, found that an appropriate instrument was difficult to construct. While he fiddled with the calculation that the actual importance of the servant class to those who organized the settlements might be measured by their proportions of the colonial populations (indentured servants amounted to "at least half, and perhaps two-thirds, of all immigrants to the colonies south of New York"),[33] Smith would ultimately insist in bemused concord with his less than objective primary sources that such a measure was finally inflationary:

> [M]odern writers have generally viewed them with generous tolerance, and magnified their virtues either out of patriotic pride or out of a wish to demonstrate how grievously worthy persons were exploited by economic overlords in the bad old

days. But almost with one accord their own contemporaries, who knew them and saw them, denounced them as next to worthless.

... [A]fter making due allowances for middle-class arrogance and the necessities of argument, there cannot remain the slightest doubt that in the eyes of contemporaries, indentured white servants were much more idle, irresponsible, unhealthy and immoral than the generality of good English laborers. Common sense, without evidence, would in fact indicate much the same thing.[34]

Smith would have little of this "tolerance" for the servant class. Nor would Hofstadter. White servitude was a gathering of the inevitable effluence of "casual workers, lumper-proletarians, and criminals" of an England characterized by Hofstadter as a "backward economy . . . moving toward more modern methods in industry and agriculture."[35] Only vaguely understood was the fact that white servants, held to be virtually silent on their experiences by the majority of American historians,[36] were drawn from those redundant sectors of English and continental European societies whose economic and political displacements constituted the basis for the judgment of "overpopulation." Even quite good historians could be smitten by the ideological prerogatives of their class predecessors.

As might be expected, the white servant class drew to itself the social categories that had long been a basic currency for Western culture. Smith recorded the points of observation of the contemporaries of these "white" servants. He noted the attempts made to characterize the colonial lower class in racial and national terms:[37]

Franklin said the Germans were stupid. . . . Rarely was any criticism levelled against the Scots. . . . Even though they had been rebels or vagabonds at home, they were looked upon as universally ambitious, industrious, and intelligent. . . . Irish were least favored, and some colonies taxed or even forbade their importation. This was partly because of their religion, which was held to be politically dangerous, but mainly because of their tendency to be idle and to run away. [Christopher] Jefferson wrote that many of them were "good for nothing but mischief"; we read that they "straggled" in Bermuda, that they rioted in Barbados, that they would never settle down to an obedient servitude, satisfactory to their masters. Welsh were highly esteemed.[38]

Smith's inventory, however, was far from complete. It was, as well, somewhat deceptive, since neither the Welsh nor the Scots were as numerous as the Irish or Germans among seventeenth- and eighteenth-century immigrants.[39] Not surprisingly, given the history of Ireland since the sixteenth century, the Irish were the primary source of indentured and forced immigrants. In the eighteenth century, for example, perhaps as many as 10,000 men, women, and children were "transported" from Ireland to the New World as convicts.[40] And again between 1745 and 1775, according to the Naval Officer's Returns for the Maryland port of Annapolis, 5,835 servants emigrated from Ireland compared to a total for Great Britain (London, Bristol, and "other ports") of

4,725, some of whom were doubtlessly Irish.[41] As significant as the numbers, is the role that the colonization of Ireland had played in the development of English colonization of the New World:

> The adventurers to Ireland claimed that their primary purpose was to reform the Irish and . . . "to reduce that countrey to civilitie and the maners of England." It is evident, however, that no determined effort was ever made to reform the Irish, but rather that at the least pretext—generally resistance to the English—they were dismissed as a "wicked and faythles peopoll" and put to the sword. This formula was repeated in the treatment of the Indians in the New World. . . . We also find the same indictments being brought against the Indians, and later the blacks, in the New World that had been brought against the Irish. It was argued that the Indians were an unsettled people who did not make proper use of their land and thus could be justly deprived of it by the more enterprising English. Both Indians and blacks, like the Irish, were accused of being idle, lazy, dirty, and licentious, but few serious efforts were made to draw any of them from their supposed state of degeneracy.[42]

The Irish were, then, the prototype for the white servant. And as their own impressive numbers were increased, and the servant class augmented by immigrants from Germany and other refugees from the political upsets of European society and their socioeconomic aftershocks in the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, the vise of intra-European racialism, religious oppression, and class contempts was lifted to embrace most of them.[43] This enveloping racial social order was an ideological accommodation for ignoring or obfuscating the real origins and the more authentic categories of the developing white working class. If they were poor, it was because they had been victims of massive thefts by states and ruling classes; if they were rude and unruly, it was a consequence of the wholesale violations to which they had been subject. Little of this was ideologically convenient when it was comprehended by that infinitesimally small colonial capitalist class that was to use them as laborers, as buffer settlements at the frontiers, or as instruments of discipline for the African populations. It was enough to know that they were "the middling and the poor that emigrated," as Crèvecoeur put it.[44] That, of course, was the barest outline of the tale.

By the eighteenth century, the racial mist of European civilization had settled over the social topography of the English colonies, its blanket scattering the realities of domination and remixing their elements into familiar hues. However, in the lower orders, where the mist was thickest and where received wisdom has taught us to expect Blackness, the contemporary spectrum was more complex: the natives of the New World obtained a savage red, European labor a mottled gray. Above their heads it was a simpler matter: the ruling classes stood in dramatic, white relief. But between ourselves and the specter of that American past are the historical and racial fables that obscure the related exploitations and oppressions of African, European, Asian, and Amerindian peoples during the intervening 200 years. As a means of obliterating these events, the myth of white solidarity arose and came to dominate American

sensibility. It was for the most part a lie but a terribly seductive one. By the end of the nineteenth century it had already substantially displaced the past and mystified the relations of the day. It remains in place.

The Destruction of the African Past

For many reasons, however, it is fair to say that the most significant of the obliterations of the New World's past was that which affected the African. The African became the more enduring "domestic enemy,"[45] and consequently the object around which a more specific, particular, and exclusive conception of humanity was molded. The "Negro," that is the color black, was both a negation of African and a unity of opposition to white. The construct of Negro, unlike the terms "African," "Moor," or "Ethiope" suggested no situatedness in time, that is history, or space, that is ethno- or politico-geography. The Negro had no civilization, no cultures, no religions, no history, no place, and finally no humanity that might command consideration.[46] Like his eastern, central, and western European prototypes, in their time, and the French peasants, the Slavs, the Celtic peoples, and more recently the American "Indians," the Negro constituted a marginally human group, a collection of things of convenience for use and/or eradication. This was, of course, no idle exercise in racial and moral schemata since it directly related to a most sizable quantum of labor disciplined and applied in a most extraordinary way. Slave labor in the New World, as we have seen in the precapitalist societies of Europe, was an inextricable element in the material, commercial, and capital development that took place. Leaving little to the imagination, Marx, in a letter to P. V. Annenkov, had argued:

> Direct slavery is as much the pivot of our industrialism today as machinery, credit, etc. Without slavery no cotton; without cotton no modern industry. Slavery has given value to the colonies; the colonies have created world trade; world trade is the necessary condition of large-scale machine industry. . . . Slavery is therefore an economic category of the highest importance.[47]

Though Marx's declaration was even then a slight over-simplification, it did make the point that has not only endured but to some extent dominated attempts to characterize the relationship of slave labor to industrialization:[48] the creation of the Negro, the fiction of a dumb beast of burden fit only for slavery, was closely associated with the economic, technical, and financial requirements of Western development from the sixteenth century on.[49] Slave labor, the slave trade, and their associated phenomena— markets for cheap commodities; shipbuilding and outfitting; mercantile and military navies; cartography; forestry; banking; insurance; technological improvements in communication, industrial production (e.g., metallurgy)—profoundly altered the economies of those states directly or indirectly involved in colonization and production by slave labor.[50] And nowhere was the trade between Europe, Africa, and the New World more significant than in England:

The triangular trade . . . gave a triple stimulus to British industry. The Negroes were purchased with British manufactures; transported to the plantations, they produced sugar, cotton, indigo, molasses and other tropical products, the processing of which created new industries in England; while the maintenance of the Negroes and their owners on the plantations provided another market for British industry, New England agriculture and the Newfoundland fisheries. By 1750 there was hardly a trading or a manufacturing town in England which was not in some way connected with the triangular or direct colonial trade. The profits obtained provided one of the main streams of that accumulation of capital in England which financed the Industrial Revolution.[51]

Still England was not alone, nor the English unique in having arrived at a point where the appearance of representatives of the "Negro race" was convenient. One simple measure of the importance of African labor that lay behind the construction of this creature is that "before the nineteenth century . . . for 300 years more Africans than Europeans crossed the Atlantic each year."[52] Only the accumulated interests and mercantile activities of the ruling classes and bourgeoisies of Portugal, Spain, France, Belgium, the Netherlands, Italy, and Britain could have accomplished such a massive scale of exploitation.

This "Negro" was a wholly distinct ideological construct from those images of Africans that had preceded it. It differed in function and ultimately in kind. Where previously the Blacks were a fearful phenomenon to Europeans because of their historical association with civilizations superior, dominant, and/or antagonistic to Western societies (the most recent being that of Islam), now the ideograph of Blacks came to signify a difference of species, an exploitable source of energy (labor power) both mindless to the organizational requirements of production and insensitive to the subhuman conditions of work. In the more than 3,000 years between the beginnings of the first conception of the "Ethiopian" and the appearance of the "Negro," the relationship between the African and European had been reversed.

Premodern Relations between Africa and Europe

Because one's sense of the past is so often conceptually distorted by a consciousness whose natural world of things and relationships is the present, it is important to recall that the collisions of the Black and white "races" began long before the events of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries that prefigured modern African slavery.[53] The obliteration of the African past from European consciousness was the culmination of a process a thousand years long and one at the root of European historical identity.

More than a millennium before the beginning of the Christian era, civilizations of the eastern and northern Mediterranean had encountered at least one of the "high civilizations" of Africa.

The Mediterranean:
Egypt, Greece, and Rome

Ancient Egypt was a land primarily of peasants and farmers whose chief preoccupations centered on the Nile's beneficence. It appears quite likely that the state emerged as a direct result of the administrative requirements involved in planning and controlling the waters the Nile brought or did not bring during its periods of inundation. Reservoirs, dikes, canals, and dams became the means of preserving the land during the frequent periods of drought. Once institutionalized, the state became the basis of the first world system, extending Egyptian civilization down the Nile into eastern and northern Mediterranean lands.[54] As early as the Egyptian nineteenth dynasty (1320–1200 B.C.) the Lukku (Lycians), and Teresh (Tarsians) and the Akaiawasha (the Achaeans), as either mercenaries or allies of the Hittites (and most probably the former) had been recorded on the stele of Merneptah (1236–23 B.C.) as among the enemies of Egypt which he had defeated.[55] Greek traditions themselves speak of the founding of Egyptian colonies (Attica, Argolis) in Greece in the fifteenth and fourteenth centuries.[56] Seven hundred years passed before the historical evidence as it is presently preserved reveals another encounter. In the seventh and sixth centuries B.C., Ionian and Carian mercenaries served the Pharaohs Psamtik I (663–609 B.C.) and Psamtik II (594–88 B.C.).[57] Among other duties, they were used to man the garrison at the Pelusian Daphnae (now the western Sinai), and along with Greek merchant traders encouraged to settle at Naucratis near the capital of Sais in the western Nile delta. The settlement of Greeks at Naucratis is interesting, since before this time they had been forbidden residence in Egypt. This dependence on foreign mercenaries to defend its borders was one symptom of the weakness of an Egyptian state that would succumb to the Assyrians less than half a century later.[58] In the fifth century B.C., Herodotus, the first of Europe's historians, traced Egyptian colonial settlements as far as the northern Black Sea region. Herodotus described a Black people, the Colchians ("they are black skinned and have woolly hair")[59] living in what at present is Soviet Georgia. Herodotus believed that the Colchians were descendants of an Egyptian army under "King Sesostris" (believed to be a composite of Sety I, 1313–1301 B.C., and Rameses II, 1301–1234 B.C.).[60] He also noted the participation of Ethiopian soldiers under Xerxes in the Persian wars.[61] Herodotus' references to Black peoples may be taken quite literally since his Egyptian travels (around 440 B.C.) took him up the Nile as far as Elephantine (an island opposite modern Aswan), fully acquainting him with the people whom he called Ethiopians.

From the pre-Christian seventh century on, Egyptian law, science, religion, and philosophy began to have dramatic impacts on the development of Ionian and Greek thought.[62] The Egyptian Mysteries, expelled from Greece 300 or 400 years earlier in the struggle against Egyptian imperialism, once again became the basis of Greek development. Now the spoils of a crumbling state, this time the Mysteries served to advance intellectual and scientific development rather than a technology extended for

purposes of imperialist exploitation.[63] Two centuries later, Plato in his *Timaeus*, while reconstructing the legend of Atlantis (presumably told to Solon by Egyptian priests during the statesman's visit to Egypt), seems to have accepted in his stride the notion of Egyptians as mentors of the Greeks.[64] As Margaret Stefana Drowser has put it "The Greeks felt that their own civilization was new and inexperienced in comparison with the age-old traditions and skills of this ancient land where the past still lived in the present."[65]

As for the origins of Egyptian civilization itself, both Egyptian and non-Egyptian sources of the ancient period agree. Chiekh Anta Diop has observed that:

> Egyptians themselves—who should surely be better qualified than anyone to speak of their origin—recognize without ambiguity that their ancestors came from Nubia and the heart of Africa. The land of the Amam, or land of the ancestors . . . the whole territory of Kush south of Egypt, was called land of the gods by the Egyptians.[66]

Diodorus Siculus (of Sicily), writing in the first century B.C., came to a similar conclusion (a conclusion for the most part only quite recently accepted by Western archaeologists and Egyptologists):

> The civilized Ethiopians . . . according to Diodorus, were the first to honor the gods whose favor their [*sic*] enjoyed, as evidenced by the fact that they had been free from foreign invasion. These Ethiopians were not only pioneers in religion, Diodorus informs us, but also originators of many customs practiced in Egypt, for the Egyptians were colonists of the Ethiopians. From these Ethiopians the Egyptians derived, for example, beliefs concerning their kings, burial practices, shapes of statues, and forms of letters.[67]

As one might anticipate, during the more than 3000 years of Egyptian pre-Christian history, the relationship between Lower and Upper Egypt was never a stable one. First one or the other of the two kingdoms was dominant. During the eighth and seventh centuries, perhaps for the last time, the south (Upper Egypt, Nubia, or Ethiopia) reasserted its dominance, conquering and ruling Lower Egypt until the defeat by the Assyrians in 671–61 B.C.[68] Unquestionably, Western Egyptologists of the eighteenth, nineteenth, and early twentieth centuries found the next 2000 years more palatable to their racial cosmologies and ethnocentrism than Egypt's more ancient past.

The Romans, of course, succeeded the Greeks as the dominant civilization in the northern Mediterranean. As their empire far exceeded the dimensions of Hellenic adventure, their knowledge of Africa was much more extensive. And much like the Greeks, it was those most integral to Rome's imperialist apparatus—its military command, its administrative and colonialist bureaucrats, and its intelligentsia responsible for the training and education of the ruling class's heirs—who achieved the most intimacy with the continent. The Greeks' actual acquaintance with Africa in large measure had been confined to the upper (southern) and lower (northern) Nile regions. The Romans, however, achieved familiarity with peoples along the Nile but

also assumed relations with African peoples of northwestern Africa (that is Libya and west of Libya) and as far south as Cameroon and the Sudan.[69] As the Greeks had in Egypt, the Romans found in north Africa peoples such as the Garamantes who were Black or mixed. (Evidence found in Cyprus of an earlier period, the sixth century B.C. tends to confirm the role of Blacks in even late Egyptian history.)[70] The Romans had as well encountered Black soldiers in the army of Hannibal the Carthaginian, which invaded Europe in 218 B.C. The Romans are also known to have sent military expeditions and to have established military posts and diplomatic relations among peoples south of Egypt. These efforts were in keeping with the attempt to secure the southern boundaries of their Egyptian colony and to preserve trade routes to Meroe, the eastern desert, and central Africa.[71] Peace, however, was elusive, as evidenced by the successive wars fought against the armies of the Ethiopian queen Candace during the last third of the first century B.C. In addition, an Ethiopian people, the Blemmyes, fought continuous wars with Roman armies from 250 A.D. to 545 A.D.[72] West of the Egyptian delta, Roman military expeditions in 86 A.D. and a few years later may have penetrated as far as Lake Chad.[73] The purpose seems to have been primarily the defense of trade routes and caravans, though joint efforts with the Garamantes may have related directly to the state interests of Rome's African allies. Yet despite their less than cordial relations with Africans, the Romans, like their Greek predecessors, did not evolve prejudices of color and race:

> [S]ocial intercourse did not give rise among the Greeks and Romans to the color prejudice of certain later western societies. The Greeks and Romans developed no doctrines of white superiority unsupported by facts or theoretical justifications for a color bar.
>
> The presence of large numbers of Negroes in a white society, according to some modern views, gives rise to anti-Negro feeling. Ethiopians were far from rare sights in the Greco-Roman, particularly the Roman, world. Yet the intense color prejudice of the modern world was lacking. Although it is impossible to estimate the Negro element in the classical world in terms of precise statistics, it is obvious that the Black population in Greece and Italy was larger than has been generally realized.[74]

The Dark Ages: Europe and Africa

After the dissolution of Roman administration, in the fifth century A.D., knowledge of either the ancient African period or of more contemporary periods, began to dissipate dramatically among European peoples. For Europeans beyond the Mediterranean it had never been extensive in any case, restricted largely to those privy to state affairs and those few engaged in the quite sparse literary traditions. In western Europe, its peoples isolated from the centers of civilization by geography, the rigors of transhumance and resettlement, the absence of urban centers, and the lateness of their development, the subsequent dominance of the Mediterranean area by Muslim

peoples proved to be catastrophic for their knowledge of peoples beyond the eastern fringes of the European peninsula. As one example, in the mid-thirteenth century, Bartholomew Anglicus observed with unjustifiable certainty:

> Ethiopia, blue men's land, had first that name of color of men. For the sun is nigh and roasteth and toasteth them. And so the color of men showeth the strength of the star, for there is considerable heat. . . . In this land be many nations with divers faces wonderly and horribly shaper. There be two Ethiopias, one in the East and the other is Mauretania in the West, and that is more near Spain. And then is Numidia and the Province of Carthage. Then is Getula, and at last against the course of the sun is the land that is hight Ethiopia Adusta, burnt, and fables tell that there beyond the Antipodes men that have their feet against our feet.[75]

The ancient civilizations of the Old World, in Asia as well as Africa, became legends, preserved most constantly in the obscure and recondite histories of biblical narrative. As knowledge became more and more a monastic preserve, secular reconstructions assumed a certain rarity due to the church's commitment to the interpretation of history in accord with its perceptions of divine will.[76] Ethnocentrism, legitimated by the authorities of church and ignorance, the two fountains of medieval knowledge, became the basis for world knowledge. Ultimately, with the evolution of Christian ideology into a worldview, it was enough to know that mankind was divisible into two collectivities: the army of Light and the army of Darkness:

> Whether men wrote of an *imperium christianum*, a *regnum Europae*, or later of a *societal christiana*, there was the same impulse to separate the known securities of the "inside" from the dark and threatening forces of paganism, heresy, and schism which lay beyond the perimeter.[77]

Europe was God's world, the focus of divine attention; the rest of mankind belonged for the moment to Satan. For perhaps a thousand years or more, western European world historical consciousness was transformed into theosophy, demonology, and mythology.[78] And, indeed, in a most profound sense European notions of history, both theological and pseudo-theological, negated the possibility of the true existence of earlier civilizations. The perfectability of mankind, the eschatological vision, precluded the possibility of pre-Christian civilization having achieved any remarkable development in moral law, social organization, or natural history (science). For 600 years more, Cassiodorus' sixth-century prescription for putting "the devil and his work to flight" held sway over medieval education and knowledge:

> Let us who sincerely long to enter heaven through intellectual exertions believe that God disposes all things in accordance with his will, and let us . . . reject and condemn the vanities of the present life and carefully investigate the books of the Divine Scriptures in their normal order, so that by referring all things to the glory of the Creator we may profitably assign to the celestial mysteries that which those men have seemed to seek vainly for the sake of mortal praise. And, therefore, as the

blessed Augustine and other very learned Fathers say, secular writings should not be spurned. It is proper, however, as the Scripture states, to "meditate in the (divine) law day and night," for, though a worthy knowledge of some matters is occasionally obtained from secular writings, this law is the source of eternal life.[79]

Islam, Africa, and Europe

Ironically, south of the Pyrenees, encircling the Mediterranean extending beyond the Indus, the scholars among the figurative descendants of the prophet Abraham's first son, Ishmael, were becoming the direct heirs of ancient learning and thought. Lerner and Mahdi argue that this was made possible by the fact that in Islam the absorption of "new and alien sciences" was a juridical rather than a theological question and was thus resolved by the dispute of advocates before a jurist. The issue was whether or not these sciences interfered with beliefs prescribed by Law as defined by jurists. There was too, they note, an absence of ecclesiastical authority in Islam; an authority that might well have paralleled the medieval Christian Church in its preoccupation with competing "heresies."[80] Rodinson believes that perhaps even more significant was the ethos of Arab culture:

> Arab customs accepted and encouraged the adoption, by every clan, of people of all kinds and every nationality, who then became wholly Arab. . . . Persians, Syrians, Egyptians, Berbers, Goths, Greeks and a host of others joined the Arabs, considered themselves as Arabs and really became Arabs. But still greater numbers became Muslims.[81]

While the spiritual and most often the temporal authorities of Christendom shunned much of the learning amassed by pre-Christian civilizations, the Arabic-speaking scholars took to this knowledge as a legitimate booty of the wars won by Muslim armies. Arabic culture now began the absorption of the more developed scientific and philosophic thought of the defeated, just as earlier, the Persian and Syriac cultures had absorbed like elements of Greek culture once it was finally proscribed officially in the Christian Rome of the sixth century, and the Greeks before them took to the intellectual produce of Egyptian and Babylonian cultures.

Protected and facilitated by the expansion of Islamic states, Arabic scholars between the seventh and tenth centuries achieved access to the works of their Mediterranean predecessors. The most intensive period of translation into the Arabic from Greek, Sanskrit, Persian, and Syriac took place between 750 and 900 A.D.[82] Translations, however, appear to have been selective, since historical works were generally neglected during the earliest period of absorption. Translators, tending toward a predominance of physicians, demonstrated interests that generally attended to works in the fields of medicine, mathematics, and astronomy.

In the Islamic east, the artistic and intellectual center would gravitate from Damascus and Baghdad to Cairo, as the toll from incursions by Seljuq Turks, Christian Crusaders, Berbers, Arab nomads, and Mongol armies mounted. In the west, the al-

Maghrib, the most glorious centers of Islamic culture were to be found on the Iberian peninsula. It was in Spain and particularly Toledo (reacquired by "Christendom" in 1085 after more than 300 years of Muslim rule) that the work of translation was concentrated. In the twelfth century, following closely the eleventh-century translations, from Arabic to Latin, of Constantine the African (d. 1087) of medical writings, European scholars came face to face with the knowledge of the ancient world's philosophy, physics, mathematics, medicine, alchemy, and astronomy for the first time in almost 1,000 years:

> At the beginning of the twelfth century, Greek knowledge was available in Greek and in Arabic, but more accessible in the latter form. Moreover, many Greek works were lost in the original but available in Arabic translations. When the West became sufficiently mature to feel the need for deeper knowledge, when it wanted to renew its contacts with ancient thought, it turned to Arabic sources.
>
> Thus the main intellectual task of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries was one of translation. Much of the intellectual energy of medieval times was spent not in the creation of new intellectual values but in the transmission of older ones. Knowledge was won not by fresh and independent investigation but by translation, chiefly from Arabic.[83]

By the end of the twelfth century, the universities of Salerno and Bologna in Italy, Paris and Montpellier in France, and Oxford (and in the thirteenth century, Cambridge) in England had been founded on this quite extraordinary event.[84]

Islamic civilization, however, did more than simply function as a belated conduit in the development of Western civilization. Northern Africa as the end point to the gold trade with West Africa was systematically proscribed to European merchants. The purpose, apparently, was to maintain the secret of the sources of the mines and the trans-Saharan routes of trade. In the tenth century, however, the Arab traders began the extraction of a more variable wealth: slaves. Utilizing ports on the Red Sea coast, over the next 900 years, Arab slave traders plundered African societies for perhaps as many as 17 million people.[85]

That, however, is another story, perhaps another history. More to the point is the drawing of the following historical schemata that traduces some of the more consequential effects of Islamic civilization on European peoples, their histories, and their institutions. What is compelling, of course, is that the impact of Islam on Europeans goes far beyond the accepted lore of Muslim civilization as a "treasury for ancient knowledge." This was but an important petard. A much greater force confronted European destiny.

It was not as the descendants of legendary Hebrews or as the vessels of ancient knowledge that Muslims came to be most frequently represented among European peoples. Islam, a faith that embraced a multiracial civilization incorporating peoples from Arabia, Africa, the Near East, the East, and southern Europe, would be known by its armies. And Africans were prominent in its armies from the very beginning. Africans had fought in the pre-Islamic Arabian wars, and within the first century of

the Islamic era (the Christian seventh century), their presence had already been noted in the empires of Europe.[86] Four hundred years later, when Christendom launched a furious counterassault against the enemy whose very being mocked the beliefs of Europe and materially diminished its daily life, Islam, and "blackamoors," was a familiar identity. The Christian encounter with Islam would have then both racial and economic resonances.

On account of their logistical appetites, the Christian Crusades, beginning in the eleventh century against the Saracens in Jerusalem, brought to fruition the mercantile Italian city-states of the Middle Age. These entrepôts dominated southern and western European commerce with the non-European world until the middle of the fourteenth century.[87] By the beginnings of that century, though Papal and regal levies for crusades increased in number and frequency, actual crusades had almost entirely ended. Once the religious enthusiasm and fanaticism that clothed the carnage of the crusades had abated, and the ambitions of Norman and Frankish feudal lords and their clerical allies had been satiated or overwhelmed by the weight of bureaucratic administrations and the seductions of corruption, the sea trade of the Italian coastal states turned from the merchandising of war, the conveyance of armies, and the financing of invasion, to the conventions of commercial trade and of course piracy.[88] Europe—whose population had been stimulated by a higher food productivity associated with new tillage technology, the clearing of cultivable lands for fuel, and as a concomitant to the preparation and transportation of its armies of invasion, and perhaps by benign climatic changes—had expanded.[89] Europe extended itself both horizontally into the establishment of new towns and the resettlement of old ones, and geopolitically—eastward into the lands of the Prussians, Slavs, and Christian Byzantium, westward into England, and south into the calves of the Iberian and Italian peninsulas.[90] The Christian and Jewish merchant lords and bankers of Venice, Florence, and Genoa, already implicated by the opportunities, associations, and investments of the previous period, successfully resisted their abhorrences of the Muslim infidel and his nefarious trades.[91] Following the much more frequent practice among clerics of purchasing dispensations to legitimize their bastard offspring, merchants bought dispensations for their commercial trafficking with the infidels. (Pope John XXII (1316–34) may have also used one if he had not had the fortune of being infallible, for he bought forty pieces of gold cloth from Damascus.) Meanwhile, the gold of Africa, the silks, spices, and sugar of the East and Asia Minor were measured by the Italians and their Islamic correspondents against European slaves (Slav, Turkish, Bulgar, and Circassian) and goods.[92]

Europe and the Eastern Trade

In Europe, however, the feudal system had exceeded its limits, politically, economically, and socially. The European crisis that followed manifested itself in the late thirteenth century and came to full maturity in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. Whatever its root causes—and Wallerstein reminds us of just how subtle the scholars'

debate has become by recalling that Edouard Perroy's thesis was that it was "a satura-
tion of population" and the limits of agrarian technology, while R. H. Hilton believed
that the primary cause was the overbearing expense of feudal superstructures inflated
by war and leached by peasant insurrections and famines[93]—Europe's population
declined, and its markets, trade, towns, villages, and cultivated areas contracted. It
was not, however, a purely internal affair, nor one entirely dependent upon events or
elements encompassed by human society. It remains for one such force to be noted
for the devastating role it played in the crisis of fourteenth-century Europe.

Along with quite a few other historians, Trevor-Roper has added to his list of
suspects behind the collapse of Europe the Mongol Empire and its dissolution in the
mid-fourteenth century. His reasons include the ideological importance that the
Mongol movement immediately assumed in the minds of European Christian rulers.

> Here was a powerful second front against Mamelukes and Turks; here also was a
> huge free-trade area from Budapest to Canton; and both could be exploited. . . .
>
> Thus, when the crusaders' way of imperialist colonization had failed, the alter-
> native way of "pure and friendly correspondence" succeeded, and in the century
> after the failure of the Crusades, Europe was still living, successfully, on the East. . . .
> The great, orderly, tolerant Mongol Empire.[94]

At first, that is in the 1220s, the Franks had mistaken the intent of the Mongols, basing
their expectations on the fragmentary reports on the Mongols by eastern Christians:

> These eastern Christians made a Christian "King David" out of the Mongol con-
> queror, who would have destroyed the Moslem empires, in order to head for the
> Holy Land and liberate Jerusalem.[95]

By the 1240s, after a series of exchanges between Mongol capitals and armies and
Frankish lords and popes, Christendom had been disabused of its error. It learned
that: "The program of the Mongols was wholly and entirely based on a rule given by
Chingis-khan: 'There is only one God in heaven, and on earth there is only one
sovereign, Chingis-khan.' "[96] The Mongol Empire ordered the Pope and the Christian
kings to submit. Still, by the 1260s Mongol and Franks were formally agreeing to joint
crusades against the Muslim Mamelukes, and by the first decades of the fourteenth
century the Italian "merchant republics" and the Mongols had established treaties of
commerce. This meant that whatever other significances Mongol stability, trade, and
technological exchange (e.g., China's gunpowder and printing techniques) would
have for a Europe still compelled by Christian dogma to abhor and shun the southern
infidels, the gold, which was largely brought out of Africa,[97] found its way to central
and eastern Asia only to pave the route to Europe of the Black Death. William McNeill
describes the plague's itinerary in its less nefarious terms:

> Not only did large numbers of persons travel very long distances across cultural and
> epidemiological frontiers; they also traversed a more northerly route than had ever

been intensively traveled before. The ancient Silk Road between China and Syria crossed the deserts of central Asia, passing from oasis to oasis. Now, in addition to this old route, caravans, soldiers and postal riders rode across the open grasslands. They created a territorially vast human web that linked the Mongol headquarters at Karakorum with Kazan and Astrakhan on the Volga, with Caffa in the Crimea, with Khanbaliq in China and with innumerable other caravanserais in between.[98]

Ostensibly, it was the revolt in the eastern end of the Mongol Empire, a revolt that would culminate in the establishment of the Ming Dynasty, which provided the chaotic conditions for the vermin to multiply. The account of the plague left by Ibn al-Ward (who died of plague at Aleppo in 1349) has been generally accepted: it began somewhere in what al-Ward termed "The Land of Darkness" (Yunnan-Burma) before 1331; it then spread to China and northern Asia, and then to central Asia and eastern Europe—all the time following the Mongol trade route between the Mediterranean and China; by the end of 1347, it crossed from Caffa on the Black Sea to the Sicilian port of Messina; within three years, it is estimated, more than 20 million Europeans (one-third to one-half the population of Europe) had joined the more than 60 million Chinese dead.[99]

Islam and the Making of Portugal

Keeping in mind that our interest in the effects of Muslim civilization on Europe is related to the attempt to reconstruct the processes by which the African past was extracted from European consciousness, perhaps the greatest irony of this history concerns the founding of the Portuguese state and the ruling class that ran it. The Portuguese state's expansion into Africa marks, of course, the beginnings of the modern era in European development: the "Age of Discovery." It also marks the beginnings of those encounters between the peoples of the European peninsula and the African continent that would produce the Negro.

The appearance and the development of the Portuguese state were also the results of processes both directly and indirectly related to Muslim civilization. Though Anglo-Saxonist shrouds persist in many English-language treatments of Portuguese history (no doubt in part attributable to Portugal's client relation to Britain since the eighteenth century), these stories bear some relationship to the past. For instance, in the mid-twelfth century, as Trevor-Roper recalls,

a party of English and Flemish crusaders, sailing towards the Mediterranean to join the second crusade, arrived at the mouth of the river Souro. They were easily persuaded that there was no need to sail further. There were infidels in Portugal, and lands as rich as any in Palestine: the crusaders agreed; they stayed. Instead of Edessa they captured Lisbon; and having massacred the Muslim inhabitants and installed themselves on their lands, they forgot about the Christian kingdom of Jerusalem and founded that of Portugal.[100]

As a British historian, Trevor-Roper gives due weight to the English intervention but ignores their Iberian and French allies (e.g., Henry of Burgundy). Nevertheless, it is true that erstwhile crusaders played an important part in the establishment of Portugal during the colonial wars against the Muslims. As Americo Castro declares:

> The fleet engaged in the conquest of Lisbon had weighed anchor in England with 169 ships provided and manned by Englishmen, Germans, Flemings, Frenchmen, and Gascons. The towers raised for the conquest of the city were the work of Flemings, Englishmen, and an engineer from Pisa. All the booty was for the foreigners, who, through a pact with the Moors, took for themselves the gold, the silver, clothing, the horses, and the mules, and gave the city to the king.[101]

Three hundred years later, as the dominant legend goes on, unexercised by the wars and internal conflicts besetting the leading powers of western Europe; geographically proximate to the West African Atlantic coast;[102] with both a direct experience of long distance sea trade and one borrowed from the Italian merchants (who had begun their own commercial colonization of Portugal by the thirteenth century);[103] and with a powerful residue of Christian anti-Islamic adventurism, the Portuguese state launched the first of the great discoveries that would mature into the modern world systems of Europe and European colonies. By the fifteenth century, Portugal and her Italian (and English) partners had transformed sugar production, the plantation system, and, of course, the system of slavery from the islands of the eastern Mediterranean to those of the eastern Atlantic. By the sixteenth century, Spain had inherited the Italian capitalists and all that went with them—and so had the New World.[104]

Still, as Castro had warned: "It is impossible to understand the formation of the immense Portuguese Empire solely in terms of economic or statistical analysis."[105] It might be added that this is particularly the case when such analysis is based on indifferent historical reconstruction. The "peacefulness" of Portugal's fifteenth century, which C. R. Boxer asserts (and Wallerstein repeats)[106] for example, is to be doubted when one learns elsewhere that the century was punctuated by a martial and diplomatic war with Castile, and that the century ended with the homicidal suppression of a dynastic struggle.[107] Castro, himself, came to the conclusion that much more attention had to be paid to Portuguese nationalism:

> Portugal wanted and believed a history of her own, and she did this with such intensity that she was successful little by little incorporating both an imagined history and the practice of imagining it into the process of her authentic existence. The imperial enterprises; the enduring imprint of Portugal in Brazil, in the East Indies, and in Africa; the imposing figures of Vasco da Gama, Affonso de Albuquerque, Ferdinand Magellan, and others; the works of Gil Vicente and Camoems—all this and more have motivated the recreation of the origins of Portugal.[108]

This, however, was not a simple "nationalism": a mass ethos bound to a national destiny. The Portuguese of the twelfth, thirteenth, and fourteenth centuries were an

extraordinary mix of western European and Mediterranean peoples. More impor-
tant, the new nation's ruling classes, the nobility and the bourgeoisie who wove the
ideological tapestry of nationalism and constructed those ideographs that framed
their families and deeds, were drawn from the landed and titled aristocracies of Spain
(Castile, Aragon, and Catalonia), France (Flanders and Burgundy), and England.[109]
The threads of Portuguese nationalist identity were spun from a European source.
Portugal inherited, consequently, not merely its royal houses—and their Italian capi-
talist creditors, but as well the mercantile and scientific migration that was the social
and intellectual efflux of Venice, Genoa, Pisa, Majorca, Florence, Flanders, Catalonia,
and England. With these disparate elements came, too, a certain malaise and the
resolve to construct a state whose character would be distinct from the corrupt,
chaotic, and mean societies from which they had fled or been driven:

> Those Europeans found Europe morally distasteful, with constant internecine wars
> between so-called Christian princes; with heresy rife, and schism a fact for almost
> forty years; with confused relations ever apparent between ecclesiastical and secular
> authority; with charity often non-existent; with marriage made a mockery, and
> adultery widespread; with lying and unvarnished thievery apparent on every side.[110]

It was again, this "nationalism," and particularly the element of Muslim antago-
nism, that played such a critical role in Portuguese expansionism in the fifteenth
century. Robert Silverberg, in chronicling Portugal's and Europe's fascination with
Prester John, has recorded:

> In 1411, when Portugal had arrived at an unaccustomed state of complete peace,
> Joao of Avis adopted a suggestion of his English-born queen, Philippa: to maintain
> the momentum of the national economy, he would send an armed expedition to
> North Africa. Joao and Philippa envisioned a conquest of the Moorish kingdom of
> Fez, thus opening the way for a Portuguese penetration, by land, of Prester John's
> kingdom, somewhere in the heart of Africa. With Prester John's cooperation,
> perhaps, a new spice route could be established, with caravans crossing Africa from
> Morocco to the Red Sea and bringing pepper and cloves to Lisbon.[111]

Dom Henrique (the Navigator), who is credited with marshalling the energies of
Portugal, the resources of the Order of Christ, the skills and instruments of Europe's
most developed seamanship, and the navigational wisdom of Muslim and Italian
mathematicians, cartographers, astronomers, and geographers for the purpose of
exploring Africa and its coastline for a route to the Indies and to Prester John, was of
course the ascetic, celibate, and reclusive son of the newly royal Joao and Philippa.
Following the Portuguese capture of Ceuta in 1415, for more than forty years, Dom
Henrique dedicated himself to the achievement of his parents' dream. Henrique,
however, was not distinctive in this regard. He was in reality simply a more psycho-
logically severe version of his family and the class with whose destiny it was intimately
linked.[112] Francis Rogers quite effectively argued:

The Lusitanian translation of the European dreams concerning the East into action was precipitated, not by Ceuta, but by the simultaneous Council of Constance. It gained further impetus with brother Pedro's travels . . . and final direction by Portuguese relations with Pope Eugenius IV and the Council of Ferrara-Florence-Rome. . . .

I am convinced that various manifestations of Western Europe's great Oriental dream came to bear on Pedro as he wandered, and that by, let us say, 1433 or 1434 (the beginning of Duarte's reign), the royal brothers, including and most especially Henry, had talked over at length the exciting reports related by Pedro upon his return.[113]

Gomes Eannes de Azurara, his historian contemporary, recorded Dom Henrique's motives:

1. [Henrique] desired to know what lands there were beyond the Canary Islands and a cape called Bojador. . . .
2. If in these territories there should be any population of Christians, or any harbours where men could enter without peril, they could bring back to the realm many merchandises at little cost. . . .
3. It was said that the power of the Moors of this land of Africa was very much greater than was generally thought, and that there were among them neither Christians nor other races. And because every wise man is moved by desire to know the strength of his enemy . . .
4. During one and thirty years of battles with the Moors, the Infante had never found Christian King or Seigneur outside this kingdom, who for the love of Our Lord Jesus Christ was willing to aid him in this war. He desired to know whether in those regions there might be any Christian princes in whom the charity and love of Christ were strong enough to cause them to aid him against these enemies of the faith.
5. . . . [L]ost souls should be saved.
6. [The astrological reason, from which all the others proceed, that as Henrique was born on 4 March 1394, he was under the influence of] the Ram, which is in the House of Mars, with the Sun in the ascendant. . . . [T]his indicated that this prince was bound to engage in great and noble conquests, and above all he was bound to attempt the discovery of things which were hidden from other men, and secret.[114]

Silverberg added, in order to underscore his own interest, that Henrique had "told one of his companions in 1442, he desired to have knowledge not only of Africa and the Indies but 'of the land of Prester John as well, if he could.' "[115] One hundred years later, at the beginning of the sixteenth century, the quest that had so obsessed the House of Avis from its own beginnings (and before it Europe for 300 years) was finally completed. Pero da Covilha, the Portuguese king (1495–1521) Manuel I's emissary to Prester John's kingdom, was discovered by his ambassadorial successors to have become an honored but unwilling captive for life of the court of Ethiopia.[116] Islam

had provided for the emerging Europe a powerful ideological, economic, and political impulse.

There was, however, one element in Islamic civilization that had little or no effect on medieval Europe as the latter was being transformed into the center of a dominant world system. This was the Muslim concept of the slave. Great differences persisted between slavery in Western and Christian societies and slavery in Islam.

The Prophet had said:

> Fear God concerning your slaves. Feed them with what you eat and clothe them with what you wear and do not give them work beyond their capacity. Those whom you like, keep, and those whom you dislike, sell. Do not cause pain to God's creation. He caused you to own them, and had He so wished he would have made them own you.[117]

The Islamic ideal concerning slavery was without parallel in Christian law and dogma. Islamic jurists had codified both the liabilities and the rights of slaves; customs among the Sunni, Shia, and Maliki schools had limited the rights of masters and extended the legal, religious, and social capacities of the slave. The Koran encouraged manumission as an act of piety, in many instances the punishment for criminal acts was less harsh for the slave than the freeman, slaves might purchase their freedom and might assume second-rank offices in state administration and the religious hierarchy. Since Muslim slavery was characteristically associated with unlimited potential for social mobility and much less racialism, it is not surprising to find whole dynasties in Muslim history founded by slaves (e.g., the Egyptian Mamelukes) or the emergence to prominence of Africans as soldiers, poets, philosophers, writers, and statesmen. As early as the eighth century,

> Ibrahim, the son of a Black concubine of the caliph al-Mahdi (775–85) came very close to being caliph in 817–19 when a faction in Baghdad supported his candidature against the nominated successor of the caliph al-Ma'mun. In spite of being "excessively black and shiny" he was preferred by some 'Abbasid loyalists to the 'Alid candidate of Persian descent.[118]

Al-Mustansir, another such son, Hunwick reports, reigned in Egypt between 1036 and 1094. In the seventeenth century, Mulay Isma'il, sharing the same condition, ruled in Morocco. Even Black eunuchs such as Kafur who ruled Egypt for 22 years could achieve enormous power.

That Christendom failed to be impressed by Islamic law and customs on this matter is hardly surprising since the traditions of European slavery were already quite ancient and quite elaborately rationalized by the time of the appearance of Islam in the seventh century. Moreover, it was highly improbable that the Christian establishment of the medieval era would countenance the adaptation of customs from what they considered the ultimate Christian heresy—Islam, many believed, was based on sexual license and forced conversion;[119] and finally, Western xenophobia—so critical to the character of European identity and so fundamental to Christian slave systems—

expressed a revulsion toward Muslim ideals. "A fund of xenophobia was latent in the homogeneous culture of Europe,"[120] is how Norman Daniel has put it. Further:

> [X]enophobia and hysteria were compounded at the inception of the Crusades and it is a mistake to view them as an isolable phenomenon They were just one European activity. Fighting, robbing, killing, trading, making profits, taking rents or tributes, all these were closely linked to philosophical and theological analysis, to the composition of history and propaganda, and even to love of one's neighbor. The Crusades renewed the idea that we need not do as we would be done by. They were also an expression of a much older history of suspicion. . . . The expectation of difference goes back to the cultural intolerance of "barbarians" which is one of the less useful legacies of Greece.[121]

This is not to deny that there were no differences among Christians respecting slavery. There were, in medieval Christendom, as later. Debates between Christian masters, notwithstanding, David Brion Davis observed that "the distinctive characteristic of medieval theology [was] to justify the existing world while providing the means for escaping from it."[122]

In the late Medieval Age, the defenders of slavery, whether the issue was the enslavement of Europeans, infidels, "Indians," or Blacks, frequently turned to the pages of Aristotle to justify slavery as a natural condition of some parts of mankind.[123] In the early sixteenth century, when Fray Bartolome de las Casas converted from colonialist to anticolonialist pamphleteer, it was Aristotle whom he was forced to confront and use for his own purposes:

> He described Aristotle as "a gentile burning in Hell whose doctrine we do not need to follow, except in so far as it conforms with Christian truth." . . .
>
> But . . . Las Casas equally applied the Aristotelian model to "prove" that the Indians were rational beings, not one whit inferior to the Spaniards or any European, ancient or modern for that matter, but in some respects even superior to Europeans.[124]

Las Casas's ploy met, however, with only quite limited success in either his own time or later. His *Very Brief Account of the Destruction of the Indies* was roundly denounced by his contemporaries and their successors. Aristotle's "aristocracy of race" was proved to be much closer to the core of Western civilization than the complaints of Las Casas, his fellow priests Motolinia and de Landa, or such co-sympathizers as governor de Castaneda of Nicaragua and the anonymous bureaucrat who reported on the brutal excesses of Viceroy de Mendoza of New Spain. As Mavis Campbell has suggested with polemical force:

> It should not be too out of place to remind ourselves here that this concept of race has never since been too far from the European psyche, peering out sporadically, with blue eyes and lily white skin, whether through that grotesque Sepulveda [one of Las Casas' most persistent opponents] who spoke of the "Superior" Span-

iards, and applied the very Greek word "barbarian" to the Indians, or through Count Gobineau or Richard Wagner and his son-in-law, Houston Stewart Chamberlain, or Thomas Carlyle who had much influence on New World slavery, culminating in the megalomaniac excesses of Hitler and the racist regimes in Southern Africa.[125]

Aristotle was thus sustained into the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries until a more scientistic rationale could overtake the ideological needs of the New Imperialism. Still, through Aristotle the convergence of moral resolution and practical necessity between Christian societies of the medieval and modern periods and the slave societies of the pre-Christian eras was striking:

> [F]rom the Homeric period onward the passionate adherence of the Greeks to the desire for political and personal liberty made it difficult for them to find a satisfactory explanation of their own slave organization. . . . Plato's reaction took the form of a mild protest that Greeks should not enslave their fellow Greeks while, as a matter of fact, the Hellenes of his day were using their fellow Hellenes as slaves, and without much compunction about it. Aristotle's explanation of the origin of slavery was rationally based upon the then accepted theory of congenital and heritable differences in human capacities, as displayed both individually and in national totalities. . . . His definition of a slave in the *Politics* is not so admirable . . .: a slave is a tool with a soul. Only in the most superficial and materialistic sense is this true. The slave, as a human being, is not a tool; and a tool has not a soul.[126]

In Islamic societies, however, the nature and the thrust of religious authority left little leeway for the use of Aristotle or any other non-Muslim apologists of slavery in this fashion.

Islam and Eurocentrism

The history of Europe for the millennium following the fifth century of the Christian era had not been markedly unilinear. That immense span of time had contained little if any basis for teleological certainty. Indeed, there had been eras such as the eighth century when the very presence of Western high culture had been faint, preserved in scattered outposts whose own fate was made doubly uncertain by barbarian invasion and the pathetic social and material conditions of the pagan societies that surrounded them.

> By the year 700, European learning had fled to the bogs of Ireland or the wild coast of Northumbria. It was in the monasteries of Ireland that fugitive scholars preserved a knowledge of the Latin and even of the Greek classics. It was in a monastery in Northumbria that the greatest scholar of his time, the greatest historian of the whole Middle Ages, the Venerable Bede, lived and wrote. And it was from the monasteries of Ireland and England, in the eighth and ninth centuries, that English and Irish fugitives would return to a devastated Europe.[127]

Christendom slowly recovered. During what would be called the Dark Age, allied with barbarian chiefs and kings, converted or otherwise, the church gradually grew into the most mature base for the feudal organization that characterized the early Middle Ages. It acquired land, and the peasants and slaves who made that land productive and valuable. Without the slightest sense of its moral bankruptcy, moreover, the leaders of the Christian Church unmercifully exploited its human base, legitimating the brutality of the nobility, their secular kin, and sharing the profits from the labor of bound workers and a foreign trade more than eight centuries long that delivered European slaves (among other goods) to Muslim merchants. Feudal Europe, for a time, however, proved to be capable of expansion while rotting from within—but it was only for a time.

By the thirteenth century, that phase of European development was at a close; the system collapsed. The ruling classes of feudal Europe were succeeded by their Mediterranean factors: merchants, traders, and bankers. They in turn spawned or defined the roles for those actors who supplied capital, technical, and scientific expertise, and administrative skills to the states that would lead the emergence of capitalist Europe. By then, however, European culture and consciousness had been profoundly affected. Legend, as we have seen, acquired the authority of history. Moral authority continued to dissipate. The mystifying veil, which the feudal ruling classes had created to hide, or at least soften the crushing oppression that they had put in place, was in tatters. Prester John's first appearance in the European imagination of the twelfth century was consequently understandable.

The legend, if it indeed originated from within the ruling class, accomplished two very disparate ends: for one it presented Europe's intelligentsia with a powerful counterpoint, inspired by Christian idealism, biblical imagery and splendor, Roman law, and Greco-Egyptian civil craftsmanship. Here was the ideal Christian society, secure in its political body and spiritual soul. It was the measure by which the failures and insidious corruptions of actual Christendom could be calibrated in detail. A model Christian Empire, which, when compared to Europe, displayed those faults that had contributed to the inability to defeat Islam either spiritually or militarily. This was the legend's internal function.

Its other significance, however, was even more critical. The legend transmuted the world beyond Europe, "the Indies," into Eurocentric terms.[128] Whatever was the reality of those lands and their peoples, came to be less and less important. For the next 300 years, between the twelfth and the fifteenth centuries, the legend of Prester John provided Europe's scholars and their less learned coreligionists with a structured and obfuse prism through which the authenticity of every datum, every traveler's report, every intelligence of its foreign trade, every fable of its poets, and every phatic foible of its soldiery would be screened and strained. Even direct evidence was not immune, for in the next century, G. K. Hunter tells us, this "frame of reference" was sustained:

The new information which the English voyages of the sixteenth century brought to the national culture had to be fitted, as best it could, into a received image of

what was important. This means that the facts were not received in quite the same way as they would have been in the nineteenth century. Historians of the last century were much taken with the idea of the Elizabethan imagination liberated by the voyagers. But there is little evidence of this outside the unhistorical supposition, "that's how I would have reacted." The voyages certainly did expand the physical horizon, but it is not clear that they expanded the cultural horizon at the same time. . . . The image of man in his theological, political and social aspects could not be much affected by the discovery of empty or primitive lands.[129]

The architects of European consciousness had begun the construction of that world-view that presumed the basic structure of other than European societies was at its foundation a European structure, that the moral, ideological, and spiritual scaffold of these societies was the same bottom structure discernible in European culture, that the measure of mankind was indeed the European. The legend of Prester John and his wondrous realm, the formidability of this purely Christian king who waited in patience for his Christian allies at the other end of the world, all this was the form of the impulse in its appropriate medieval costume. Thus, when the miraculous kingdom could not be located in the deserts and steppes of central Asia or even Cathay, it did not cease its fascination but was transferred to the south beyond the upper Nile. The fantasy and its attendant resolve to bend the very existence and being of other peoples into convenient shapes were important beginnings for the destruction of the African past. While the vitality of Islam had seemed to mock the pathetic feebleness of Christ's chosen, humiliating them in defeat and with the persistent threat of further occupations and invasions, the legend was compelling. And a basic lesson of propaganda was learned: Europe's destiny was incompatible with the autochthonous meaning of the non-European worlds. An increasingly prominent concomitant of the European millennium (roughly from the tenth to the present century) would be the refutation of those terms.

In freeing itself from Muslim colonization, Europe once again had a vigorous bourgeoisie and the state institutions to begin the construction of its own extra-European colonialism. From the fifteenth century on, that colonialism would encompass the lands of Asian, African, and New World peoples and engulf a substantial fraction of those peoples into the European traditions of slave labor and exploitation. Capitalists were, from this point on, no longer dependent upon the material restraints Europe presented for the primitive accumulation of capital. What Genoese, Pisantine, and Jewish capitalists accomplished for Portugal and Spain in the fourteenth, fifteenth, and sixteenth centuries, on their expulsions from Iberia they transferred to northwestern Europe. Soon after, an English bourgeoisie succeeded those of Belgium and the Netherlands in the domination of the now-extensive world system. We have, however, gone far beyond our immediate interests in the Muslim part in Europe's development. Here we must conclude, still somewhat arbitrarily and abruptly, the survey of the significance of Islam in European history. For the moment it will have to be sufficient to remind ourselves that Islam once represented a more powerful civili-

zation, and, again, one closely identified in the European mind with African and Black peoples.

In retrospect the Western potential for creating the Negro had moved closer in a way to its realization. The cultural and ideological inventory was at hand. A native racialism had already displayed its usefulness for rationalizing social order, and with the advent of the Islamic intrusion into European history it had further proved its value by its transformation into an instrument of collective resistance and a negation of an unacceptable past. For the Negro to come into being all what was now required was an immediate cause, a specific purpose. The trade in African slaves, coming as it did as an extension of capitalism and racial arrogance, supplied both a powerful motive and a readily received object.

98. Franz Borkenau, *World Communism*, University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor, 1971 (orig. 1939), p. 94.

99. Lowy, op. cit., pp. 89–91.

100. Ibid., p. 90.

101. Ibid., p. 96; and Haupt, Lowy, Weill, op. cit., pp. 52–61.

102. Joseph Stalin, "Marxism and the National Question," op. cit., p. 307. Lowy erroneously (op. cit.) argues that Lenin had several occasions to refer to Stalin's work but was never terribly excited by it. Lenin's attitude may be illustrated by the remarks found in note 130, Stalin, ibid., pp. 417–18.

103. Ibid., p. 321.

104. Tom Nairn, "The Modern Janus," *New Left Review*, no. 94 (November–December 1975): 21.

105. Ibid., pp. 10, 12, 13.

106. Jean Baudrillard, *The Mirror of Production*, Telos, St. Louis, 1975, p. 33.

107. Alex Callinicos, *Althusser's Marxism*, NLB, London, 1976, p. 87.

108. Theodore Draper, *The Roots of American Communism*, Viking, New York, 1957, chap. 5.

109. Letter to Joseph Bloch, 21/22 September 1890, in Tucker (ed.), *The Marx-Engels Reader*, op. cit., p. 642.

110. Letter to Franz Mehring, 14 July 1893, ibid., p. 650.

111. Nairn, op. cit., p. 25.

112. Ibid., p. 17.

113. Raymond Williams has written: "[T]he reason for the . . . weakness in Marxism is not difficult to find: it lay in the received formula of base and superstructure, which in ordinary hands converted very quickly to an interpretation of superstructure a simple reflection, representation, ideological expression." Williams, "Literature and Sociology," *New Left Review*, no. 67 (May–June 1971): 9.

114. Georg Lukács, op. cit., pp. 110–49.

Chapter Four

1. For example, E. David Cronon remarks as late as 1972: "Garvey appeared fortuitously at a time when the Negro masses were awaiting a black Moses, and he became the instrument through which they could express their longings and deep discontent. The current of black nationalism which he helped to set in motion has not yet run its course, for, as one of his followers once boasted, Marcus Garvey opened windows in the minds of Negroes." ("Afterword: An Enduring Legacy," in E. David Cronon (ed.), *Marcus Garvey*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, 1972, p. 168). Cronon sustains this interpretation of Garvey's as a unique historical entity from his earlier study: *Black Moses: The Story of Marcus Garvey and the Universal Negro Improvement Association*, University of Wisconsin Press, Madison, 1955. By distinguishing Garvey in this way, Cronon constructed a personality and characterized a social ideology cut off from the historical roots suggested by one of his own contributors, George Shepperson ("Garvey as Pan-Africanist," in Cronon (ed.), *Marcus Garvey*, op. cit., pp. 144–47). More significantly, he ignored the broader historical vision articulated by C. L. R. James as early as 1938: "Though often retarded and sometimes diverted, the current of history, observed from an eminence, can be seen to unite strange and diverse tributaries in its own embracing logic. The San Domingo revolutionaries, the black arm in the Civil War, were unconscious but potent levers in two great propulsions forward of modern civilization. . . . This it is which lifts out of bleakness and invests with meaning a record of failure almost unrelieved. The African bruises and breaks himself against his bars in the interest of freedoms wider than his own." C. L. R. James, *A History of Pan-African Revolt*, Drum and Spear, Washington, D.C., 1969 (originally published in 1938), pp. 99–100.

2. Though Theodore Draper (*The Rediscovery of Black Nationalism*, Secker and Warburg, London, 1971) was one of the first post-war historians to "discover" a nationalist tradition—he traces the beginnings of Black nationalism to the "migrationism" or "emigrationism" (p. 4) of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries—his work was a bit polemical. Positing the existence of two opposing manifestations of Black nationalism: "emigrationism" and "internal statism," Draper argues that Black nationalism was always of limited significance among Blacks. The care with which his investigation was conducted is perhaps best seen by reviewing his treatment of the nineteenth-century emigration movement. In general, his analysis suffers from a disorganized emphasis on the opinions and actions of Black freemen and rather questionable "samples" of mass opinion: "The great mass of American Negroes preferred to wage an uphill battle to become part of the nationalism where they were born rather than to take the risk of losing what they had without gaining what they were promised" (p. 12). The "great mass" that Draper refers to was of course the almost half million Free Blacks of the antebellum period. His "sampling" seems to have been confined to the limited successes of the American Society for Colonizing the Free People of Color in the United States (approximately 12,000 Black colonists in the first fifty years since its inception in 1817); a smattering of anticolonization declarations; the ambivalence of Martin Delaney (pp. 21–41); and the pragmatic reservations of procolonizationists such as Henry Turner, James T. Holly, and Henry H. Garnet (pp. 42–47). Though Draper acknowledges that at least 10,000 Blacks emigrated to Haiti in the early

nineteenth century and a similar number to Canada (p. 19); that opposition to colonization was sometimes tactical (to maintain pressure against slavery), sometimes based on distorted images of Africa (p. 18) or class-specific interests of an emerging Negro "middle class" (pp. 45–46), somehow a few dozen instances of anti-colonization declarations and a treatment of emigrationist movements that is dominated by a reconstruction of Delany's political activity (20 of 33 pages) are allowed more weight than the tens of thousands who emigrated in the early nineteenth century and the untold numbers who took their leaves of the United States (and sometimes the New World) both earlier (see Immanuel Geiss, *The Pan-African Movement*, Methuen, London, 1974, pp. 52–57; and Floyd Miller, *The Search for a Black Nationality*, University of Illinois Press, Urbana, 1975) and later (William Bittle and Gilbert Geis, *The Longest Way Home*, Wayne State University Press, Detroit, 1964; and Edwin Redkey, *Black Exodus*, Yale University Press, New Haven, 1969). Draper's emphasis on the opposition to the Colonization Society does not account for the proliferation of Black emigration societies and movements, nor the distinction then drawn between African colonization and interests in Haiti, Canada, Latin America, Ohio, and the Western Frontier as sites of future settlement. If Delaney was an ambivalent supporter of emigration, James Forten and Richard Allen were ambivalent opponents (see Miller, op. cit.). Draper relies on Louis Mehlinger's "The Attitudes of the Free Negro toward African Colonization" (*Journal of Negro History* 1, no. 3 [July 1916]: 176–301) for evidence of mass rejection of the Colonization Society. He might have pointed out that Mehlinger's basic source is William Lloyd Garrison's *Thoughts on African Colonization* (Garrison and Knapp, Boston, 1832), and *Thoughts on Colonization*, which recorded protests not entirely uninfluenced by Garrison: "William Lloyd Garrison orchestrated numerous black protest meetings announcing that blacks would not leave the United States" (Miller, op. cit., p. 55). (Garrison, in turn, had been convinced of the society's purportedly racist duplicity by the Black ex-colonizationists Forten and Allen; see William L. Katz, "Earliest Responses of American Negroes and Whites to African Colonization," introduction to Garrison's *Thoughts on African Colonization*, Arno, New York, 1968, pp. i–xi. Even so, Mehlinger cites numerous instances of southern and northern Black support for colonization, though he neglects to mention the (negative) effects of unsuccessful Haitian emigration in the 1820s (ibid., pp. 74–82) or their role in pushing abolitionists from gradualist positions on slavery to "immediatism" (ibid., p. 90; and John L. Thomas, *The Liberator: William Lloyd Garrison*, Little, Brown, Boston, 1963, p. 465, 26n). Draper seems to also have been convinced that the merits of emigration, colonization, and internal statism could be determined by identifying them as originally "white fantasies" (Draper, op. cit., pp. 13, 14, 48, 57). The example of Draper is apparently contagious: see, for example, Raymond Hall, *Black Separatism in the United States*, University Press of New England, Hanover, 1978, pp. 21, 33–37. Like Draper, Hall makes no larger effort to discover the sentiments of those Blacks (slave or freemen) who were beyond the strata of elites who consequently dominate the historical record. Redkey's study of the 1890–1910 period is one attempt to extend this question: "Whether he knew it or not, Garvey was part of a long tradition of black nationalism in the United States. Garvey's followers, moreover, were the same Southern black marginal farmers who had responded to the emigration appeals of Bishop Turner and his followers a generation earlier. . . . In the pattern of earlier African emigration movements, the lower-class blacks responded eagerly when flamboyant *Marcus Garvey* pointed the way. No longer isolated on scattered farms and restrained by southern conditions as Turner's followers had been, the black proletariat, crowded into urban ghettoes and disillusioned with their new homes, spread nationalism far and fast. Garvey himself may have been a foreigner but his millions of supporters manifested an old American response of black nationalism." Redkey, op. cit., p. 294.

3. In an otherwise remarkable work, E. U. Essien-Udom, in his study of the Black American Muslim movement tracing its Black nationalist roots to early nineteenth-century "Negro rationalism" (Paul Cuffe and the emigration movement), distinguished Negro nationalism as an exclusive concern for the welfare of American Blacks, *Black Nationalism*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1962, pp. 17–19. Cuffe himself declared his interest differently: "Having been informed that there was a settlement of people of colour at Sierra Leone under the immediate guardianship of a civilized power, I have for these many years past felt a lively interest in their behalf, wishing that the inhabitants of the colony might become established in the truth, and thereby be instrumental in its promotion amongst our African brethren"; even making an effort during this visit (1810–11) to the colony to dissuade the "Mendingo Tribe" from further involvement in the slave trade: "As they themselves were not willing to submit to the bonds of slavery, I endeavoured to hold this out as a light to convince them of their error. But the prejudice of education had taken too firm hold of their minds to admit of much effect from reason on this subject." Paul Cuffe, "A Brief Account of the Settlement and Present Situation of the Colony of Sierra Leone in Africa," in Adelaide C. Hill and Martin Kilson (eds.), *Apropos of Africa*, Frank Cass, London, 1969, pp. 14, 17–

18. For the neglect of the historical tradition of Black radicalism, see the bibliographic essays of Redkey, op. cit., p. 312; and Miller, op. cit., p. 281.

4. Walter Rodney, "Upper Guinea and the Significance of the Origins of Africans Enslaved in the New World," *Journal of Negro History* 54, no. 4 (October 1969): 345.

5. G. W. F. Hegel, *The Philosophy of History* (ed.) C. J. Friedrich, Dover, New York, 1956, pp. 80, 93, 96, 99. Interestingly enough, Johann Gottfried von Herder, the eighteenth-century German thinker whose work

Hegel knew well (we are told that Hegel never acknowledged Herder's influence), was one of the rare European philosophers who attempted to come to terms with national traditions beyond that of Europe: "[H]ow seldom does an European hear from the native of any country the praise, 'he is a rational man like us!'" And further: "The European has no idea of the boiling passions and imaginations, that glow in the Negro's breast; and the Hindoo has no conception of the restless desires, that chase the European from one end of the World to the other." Herder, *Reflections on the Philosophy of the History of Mankind*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1968 (orig. 1784– 91), pp. 32 and 75 respectively. For Hegel's relationship with Herder, see Frank Manuel's introduction, ibid., p. xvii.

6. Winthrop Jordan reminds us of the antiquity of these notions in his treatment of David Hume's "valuation of color": "Hume was convinced that the peoples near the poles and in the tropics were essentially inferior to those in the temperate zones, a conviction which can be traced historically back through European thought to the Greeks—who also lived in a temperate climate. What Hume did in 1748, though, was to go ancient philosophers one better by hitching superiority to complexion." Jordan then goes on to quote Hume directly: "I am apt to suspect the negroes, and in general all the other species of men (for there are four or five different kinds) to be naturally inferior to the whites. There never was a civilized nation of any other complexion than white, nor even any individual eminent either in action or speculation. No ingenious manufactures amongst them, no arts, no sciences." Jordan, *White Over Black*, Penguin, Baltimore, 1969, p. 253. (Neither M. L. Finley or Frank Snowden would agree with Jordan's interpretation of racial thought among the "ancients." Both argue that the racial awareness of the Greeks and Romans tended to be objective rather than irrational. For Finley, see "Between Slavery and Freedom," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 6, no. 3 (April 1964): 246; and for Snowden, *Blacks in Antiquity*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, 1970, pp. 176–95. (Jordan's view corresponds with that of Friedrich Hertz according to Louis Ruchames: *Racial Thought in America*, Grossett and Dunlap, New York, 1969, pp. 1–2.) Since a complete demonstration of the frequency with which European historians and social analysts have relied upon a Eurocentric worldview for the basis of their work would be tedious because of the very nature of its dimensions, a few instances drawn from the works of eminent scholars should suffice. Moving forward from Hegel and Hume, there is Edward H. Carr's widely praised collection of Cambridge lectures, *What Is History?* (Vintage, New York, 1961). In his final lecture, Carr observed: "It is only within the last two hundred years at most, even in a few advanced countries, that social, political, and historical consciousness has begun to spread to anything like a majority of the population. It is only today that it has become possible for the first time even to imagine a whole world consisting of peoples who have in the fullest sense entered into history and become the concern, no longer of the colonial administrator or of the anthropologist, but of the historian" (p. 199). In 1969, Boniface Obichere, a Nigerian professor of history, recalled that: "The present Regius Professor of Modern History at Oxford, Hugh Trevor-Roper, expressed the opinion that he didn't think Africa and Asia had any history, except that history which began with European enterprise in these places." And further, "that the whole of African history was, in the words of Professors R. Robinson and J. A. Gallagher in *Africa and the Victorians*, 'a gigantic footnote'; to something that Britain was doing in Asia or in England, and so on." Obichere, "African History and Western Civilization," in Armstead Robinson, Craig Foster, and Donald Ogilvie (eds.), *Black Studies in the University*, Bantam, New York, 1969, pp. 87, 88, respectively. An examination of Trevor-Roper's lecture indicates that Obichere's accusation was a bit on the generous side: "Perhaps, in the future, there will be some African history to teach. But at present there is none: there is only the history of the Europeans in Africa. The rest is darkness, like the history of pre-European, pre-Columbian America. And darkness is not a subject of history. Please do not misunderstand me. I do not deny that men existed even in dark countries and dark centuries, nor that they had political life and culture, interesting to sociologists and anthropologists; but history, I believe, is essentially a form of movement, and purposive movement too. It is not a mere phantasmagoria of changing shapes and costumes, of battles and conquests, dynasties and usurpations, social forms and social disintegration. ... [W]e may neglect our own history and amuse ourselves with the unrewarding gyrations of barbarous tribes in picturesque but irrelevant corners of the globe: tribes whose chief function in history, in my opinion, is to show to the present an image of the past from which, by history, it has escaped; or shall I seek to avoid the indignation of the medievalists by saying, from which it has changed?" "The Rise of Christian Europe I: The Great Recovery," in *The Listener*, 28 November 1963, p. 871. For a summary of the development of European thought on non-Western peoples, see Philip Curtin's "Introduction: Imperialism as Intellectual History," in Curtin (ed.), *Imperialism*, Walker, New York, 1971, pp. xiii–xvii. For specific instances in the social sciences, see Bernard Magubanc, "A Critical Look at Indices Used in the Study of Social Change in Colonial Africa," *Current Anthropology* 12, nos. 4–5 (October–December 1971): 419–31.

7. In some sense, even the most careful scholars are still reluctant in their recognition of the European precedents for a slave system of African labor. Edmund Morgan, for example in his study of colonial Virginia, in summarizing the character of "private enterprise" in the colony conjectures: "We may also see Virginians beginning to move toward a system of labor that treated men as things." Though it sounds like Morgan is describing the initial *beginnings* of this system, this is difficult to square with the evidence he

himself has amassed, which led him (one paragraph earlier) to observe: "A servant, by going to Virginia, became for a number of years a thing, a commodity with a price." Further, Morgan had already encountered this system in the mother country: "In England itself, after labor became more valuable, the demand produced a certain amount of buying and selling of industrial apprentices." Edmund Morgan, *American Slavery, American Freedom*, W. W. Norton, New York, 1975, pp. 129 and 128, respectively. The imprimatur of the racial order that had developed for centuries within Europe was decidedly on the mind of Benjamin Franklin when he wrote: "The Number of purely white People in the World is proportionately very small. All Africa is black or tawny. Asia chiefly tawny. America (exclusive of the new Comers) wholly so. And in Europe, the Spaniards, Italians, French, Russians and Swedes, are generally of what we call a swarthy Complexion; as are the Germans also, the Saxons only excepted, who with the English, make the principal Body of White People on the Face of the Earth. I could wish their Numbers were increased." Quoted by Winthrop Jordan, op. cit., p. 254. As Jordan commented, "if Europeans were white, some were whiter than others" (ibid.).

8. "Uncle Tom at Home," anonymous contributor, *Putnam's Monthly* 8, no. 43 (July 1856): 4–5. The article is a classic example of wrong-headed erudition; its author leaning heavily on the accounts of scientific explorers (for example, Heinrich Barth's *Travels and Discoveries in North and Central Africa*, 5 vols, Longmans Green, London, 1857), and military adventurers (Major Denham, Captain Clapperton, and the late Dr. Oudney, *Travels and Discoveries in Northern and Central Africa*, 4 vols., John Murray, London, 1831). In the short career of *Putnam's Monthly* (1853–58 before being absorbed by Emerson's; and a second series, 1958–71 before being purchased by Scribner's), it effectively challenged the cream of literary magazines being produced in New York (its own base of operation) and Boston (see Algernon Tassin, *The Magazine in America*, Dodd, Mead, New York, 1916, pp. 205–31, 315). Ironically, despite its editorial sympathies with Negrophobia, and the frequency with which it published contributions from writers in the "slave states," it did not escape the scorn of southern literati. (See Frank L. Mott, *A History of American Magazines*, 1741–1850, vol. 1, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, 1939, p. 648; "A Special Editorial Note for the People South of Mason and Dixon's Line," *Putnam's Monthly* 3, no. 15 [March 1854]: 343–44; and Tassin, op. cit., p. 186.)

9. For the background and general character of reaction to the Fugitive Slave Act of 1850, see Mary F. Berry, *Black Resistance, White Law*, Appleton-Century-Croft, New York, 1971, pp. 72–77; and John Hope Franklin, *From Slavery to Freedom*, Knopf, New York, 1967, pp. 260–66, 367–70. For another interesting account see William Z. Foster, *The Negro People in American History*, International, New York, 1970, pp. 167–71. Foster particularly emphasizes the violence that accompanied the passage and implementation of the act; violence that was both resistant and compliant in cause. Relying on the first issue of the *New York Times* (18 September 1851), Foster unfortunately confuses the events at Christiana, Pennsylvania, involving William Parker. Foster identified Parker as a "free Negro" when the case was that Parker was a runaway slave from Maryland. Moreover, it was Parker who had helped form a vigilante organization against slave catching in the Christiana area. It was this group that organized the resistance to the Gorsuches' attempts to reclaim their slave properties, killing the Gorsuches (Edward and Dickinson, father and son were killed; a nephew, Joshua, was wounded) in the process. See William Parker's account "Fugitives Resist Kidnapping," in Charles Nichols (ed.), *Black Men in Chains*, Lawrence Hill, New York, 1972, pp. 281–315. For John Brown, see Stephen Oates, *To Purge This Land with Blood*, Harper Torchbooks, New York, 1970.

10. Milton Cantor, in his essay on seventeenth-century America concludes that "The Negro then was permanently bound by biological and anthropological chains. In order to guarantee the viability of his debasement, pro-slavery writers pulled out all stops. Slavery was justified by climate and economic necessity; by reliance upon history, the Bible, the Providential design. It was argued, in the colonial period, that English America could not be developed without the peculiar institution. White men were physiologically unable to labor in hot climates; Negroes alone had this power." Nor were these opinions limited to those sympathetic to slavery: "So widespread was this conviction of inequality that many anti-slavery writers acknowledged it." "The Image of the Negro in Colonial Literature," in Seymour Gross and John Edward Hardy (eds.), *Images of The Negro in American Literature*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1966, pp. 43 and 31, respectively. See also Matthew Mellon, *Early American Views on Negro Slavery*, Bergman, New York, 1969; and Jordan, op. cit., pp. 253–55, 286, 305–7.

11. David Brion Davis, *The Problem of Slavery in Western Culture*, Cornell University Press, Ithaca, 1966, p. 453.

12. "[I]n order to maintain its income without sacrifice or exertion, the South fell back on a doctrine of racial differences which it asserted made higher intelligence and increased efficiency impossible for Negro labour. Wishing such an excuse for lazy indulgence, the planter easily found, invented and proved it. His subservient religious leaders reverted to the 'Curse of Canaan'; his pseudo-scientists gathered and supplemented all available doctrines of race inferiority; his scattered schools and pedantic periodicals repeated these legends, until for the average planter born after 1840 it was impossible not to believe that all valid laws in psychology, economics and politics stopped with the Negro race." W. E. B. Du Bois, *Black Reconstruction in America*, 1860–1880, World Publishing, Cleveland, 1969, pp. 30–39. Benita Parry has discovered that the

Anglo community in India and its British home intelligentsia produced similar "legends" concerning the Indian; see *Delusions and Discoveries*, University of California Press, Berkeley, 1972, pp. 1–70.

13. David Brion Davis, op. cit., pp. 464–82; Cantor, op. cit., p. 53; and Jordan, op. cit., ch. 13.

14. Davis comments that "one of the most comprehensive modern studies of a West African culture presents a picture strikingly similar to that of eighteenth-century accounts." Davis, op. cit., p. 465. Davis is referring, in the former, to the work of Melville and Frances Herskovitts (see ibid., note 47).

15. Ibid.

16. In his preface, Davis stated: "I hope to demonstrate that slavery has always been a source of social and psychological tension, but that in Western culture it was associated with certain religious and philosophical doctrines that gave it the highest sanction. The underlying contradiction of slavery became more manifest when the institution was closely linked with American colonization, which was also seen as affording mankind the opportunity to create a more perfect society." Ibid., p. ix.

17. "[T]he historian, rather like the modern student of race-awareness in very young children, must remain tentative and indeed baffled as to whether white men originally responded adversely to the Negro's color because of strictly accidental prior culture valuation of blackness *per se*, instinctual repulsion founded on physiological processes or perhaps fear of the night which may have had adaptive value in human evolution, the association of dirt and darkened complexion with the lower classes in Europe, or association of blackness with Negroes who were inferior in culture or status." Jordan, op. cit., p. 257.

18. Davis, op. cit., p. 447.

19. Ibid., pp. 455–59.

20. Brian Street, in his reconstruction of the history of the relationship between scientific thought and the racial theories that wove through English literature of the Victorian period, concludes: "The link between race and culture, physical and mental qualities, having been established, any subjective feelings with regard to the 'character' of other races can be given scientific backing. If the criteria for distinguishing between races of men depended upon such subjective considerations, Voltaire and Rousseau could claim that Negroes were naturally inferior to Europeans in mental ability, and Hume that 'there never was a civilised nation of any other complexion than white' . . . , with as much justification as Blumenbach could claim that the Caucasian was the most beautiful . . . chauvinism was rendered in 'scientific' terms in the late nineteenth century." *The Savage in Literature*, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1975, pp. 54–55. In 1894, Sir Harry Johnston, the first Commissioner of British Central Africa, broke through a particular barrier of racial theory by posing one solution to the otherwise hopeless future of the inferior races: "On the whole I think the admixture of yellow that the negro requires should come from India, and that Eastern Africa and British Central Africa should become the America of the Hindu. The mixture of the two races would give the Indian the physical development which he lacks, and he in his turn would transmit to his half negro offspring the industry, ambition, and aspiration towards a civilized life which the negro so markedly lacks." Quoted by H. Alan Cairns, *Prelude to Imperialism*, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1965, p. 207.

21. See Michael Banton and Jonathan Harwood, *The Race Concept*, Praeger, New York, 1975, pp. 13–42. Philip Curtin reminds us that "aboriginal mortality" was taken as one proof of the natural racial order by nineteenth-century British scientists: "The exterminated people were all of 'the colored races,' while the exterminators always appeared to be European. It seemed obvious that some natural law of race relations was at work, that the extinction of the non-Europeans was part of the natural evolution of the world." *The Image of Africa*, University of Wisconsin Press, Madison, 1964, p. 374.

22. See Wesley Frank Craven, *The Legend of the Founding Fathers*, New York University Press, New York, 1956, pp. 39–44, 56–85.

23. It is still possible to discover examples or variations of the legend of American foundations in contemporary textbooks. When Milton Cummings and David Wise, under the subtitle "The paradox of colonial democracy," state that "Colonial America was not a very democratic place by contemporary standards," their suggestion is that a defense exists of colonial society in its own terms (not to mention the implication that the more contemporary standards of democracy have been achieved). See Cummings and Wise, *Democracy Under Pressure*, Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, New York, 1977, p. 38. Whatever Cummings and Wise imagine the standards of the seventeenth century to be, they could hardly be described as democratic or the basis for paradox: "Virginians could be so heavily exploited, legally and illegally, partly because they were selected for that purpose: they were brought to the colony in order to be exploited. From the beginning Englishmen had thought of their New World possessions as a place in which to make use of people who were useless at home." Morgan, op. cit., p. 235. "Our first settlers brought with them across the ocean the class distinctions of the Old World. The American wilderness modified and complicated these distinctions, but it did not eliminate them. And the more the population grew—the greater the wealth, the more complex the society—the sharper became the differences between upper and lower classes. The white indentured servant supplied the basic lower-class labor force in the seventeenth century, the Negro slave in the eighteenth century, both supplemented by town laborers of various types." Howard Zinn, *The Politics of History*, Beacon Press, Boston, 1970, p. 60.

24. Roy Nichols tells us that in the 1850s "Thirty-one of these state parties, plus some more or less fluid

groups in the territories, acknowledged the name Democrat, and in national conventions styled themselves the 'American Democracy.' " These were, in spite of their informal pretensions, minority parties, representing specific interests and particular regions. The strains of sectional disputes over the organization of new territories tore through this fabric of compromise in the 1850s. "The opponents of the Democrats were beginning to make this appeal. Pleas were heard for the acceptance of the democratic principle as the means of substituting fair play for the fractious negativism of minorities; there was no more equitable rule than the will of the majority. Such sporting words, however, did not make southerners forget the warning of the census. If the voice of the majority became the will of the Republic, they might well be at the mercy of their free state neighbors. They feared the tyranny of numbers. Plainly the effort by northern spokesmen to make democracy a cohesive formula would have only slightly more chance of success than the labor of their southern antagonists to secure the acceptance of regionalism and the recognition of the right of minority veto." It appears that slight as it was, this "chance" was too large a risk for the southern ruling class. It became one factor that led to the Civil War. Nichols, *The Disruption of American Democracy*, Collier Books, New York, 1962, pp. 20 and 52, respectively.

25. Edmund Morgan, op. cit., p. 90. A little later, Morgan would put these attitudes in more political and racial terms: "The standard justification of slavery in the seventeenth century was that captives taken in war had forfeited their lives and might be enslaved. Yet Englishmen did not think of enslaving prisoners in European wars. . . . There was something different about the Indians. Whatever the particular nation or tribe or group they belonged to, they were not civil, not Christian; perhaps not quite human in the way that white Christian Europeans were. It was no good trying to give them a stake in society—they stood outside society." Ibid., p. 233.

26. Franklin, "Observations concerning the increase of Mankind, Peopling of Countries, &c," in *The Papers of Benjamin Franklin*, Leonard W. Labaree (ed.), Yale University Press, New Haven, 1961, p. 228. Franklin concluded this essay with: "And while we are, as I may call it, Scouring our Planet, by clearing America of Woods, and so making this Side of our Globe reflect a brighter Light to the Eyes of Inhabitants in Mars or Venus, why should we in the Sight of Superior Beings, darken its People? why increase the Sons of Africa, by Planting them in America, where we have so fair an Opportunity, by excluding all Blacks and Tawneys, of increasing the lovely White and Red? But perhaps I am partial to the Complexion of my Country, for such Kind of Partiality is natural to Mankind." Ibid., p. 234.

27. See Morgan, op. cit., pp. 327–37, 305–15. Reviewing the court records of Lancaster County, Virginia, Smith concludes: "In 1757 there were no servant cases, nor in 1764, from which it may be inferred that slaves had practically replaced white servants. . . . These figures are fairly typical, as far as I can discover, of any colonial county in those regions." A. E. Smith, op. cit., p. 278.

28. Hofstadter, *America at 1750*, Alfred Knopf, New York, 1971, p. 34.

29. See A. E. Smith, op. cit., chapters 11 and 12; Hofstadter, op. cit., pp. 49–58. In her attempt to assess the extent to which the ruling class was exclusionist during the heady period of the revolutionary era, Linda Grant De Pauw noted an extraordinary conservatism among her academic predecessors who had studied the period: "The most extreme estimate of unfreedom in colonial America I have found is that of Howard Zinn who estimates that the proportion of the population in 'physical or economic bondage' was 'about one-third of the total,' " Howard Zinn, *The Politics of History*, Beacon Press, Boston, 1970, p. 60. De Pauw, "Land of the Unfree: Legal Limitations on Liberty in Pre-revolutionary America," *Maryland Historical Magazine* 68, no. 4 (Winter 1973): 356, n. 9. As the quote that follows in the text above indicates, De Pauw was much less sanguine.

30. De Pauw, op. cit., p. 356. Ferdinand Lundberg, *Cracks in the Constitution*, Lyle Stuart, New York, 1980, p. 18.

31. "[I]f 'democracy' implies government by consent of the governed or at least by consent of a majority of those governed and not merely of an adult white male elite, then those historians from Bancroft to Brown who have described American society of the mid-eighteenth century as 'democratic' are simply wrong." Ibid., p. 368.

32. See Morgan, op. cit., pp. 250–70.

33. A. E. Smith, op. cit., p. 285; Hofstadter, op. cit., p. 34.

34. Smith, op. cit., pp. 286–88.

35. Hofstadter, op. cit., p. 34.

36. "The vast majority of them worked out their time without suffering excessive cruelty or want, received their freedom dues without suing for them, and left no evidences from which to tell the stories of their careers. These points need to be emphasized, for nearly all accounts of white servitude are principally based on the records of courts of justice." Smith, op. cit., p. 278.

37. Morgan is willing to argue that "In the eyes of unpoor Englishmen the poor bore many of the marks of an alien race." Morgan, op. cit., pp. 325–26. In the next breath, however, he declares: "To be sure, poverty was not genetically hereditary. . . . The poor were not born of another color than the rest of the population, but legislation could offer a substitute for color" (ibid.). He appears to link specifically racial prejudice to differences in color; that is without color, a prejudice may emerge that is only like racism: "The contempt

that lay behind these proposals [the enslavement of the poor] and behind many of the workhouse schemes is not easy to distinguish from the kind of contempt that today we call racism" (ibid., p. 325). The parallels he pursues between English domination of the Irish in the sixteenth century and native Americans from the seventeenth century on, however, would suggest otherwise, see ibid., p. 20. Here again, is an instance where the existence of European racism toward other Europeans is simply denied in both analytical and historical terms.

38. A. E. Smith, op. cit., pp. 288–89.

39. "Beginning in 1728, a vastly increased movement from Ireland began, and by far the greatest number of servants and redemptioners came from that country during the eighteenth century. . . . The German migration, second in volume only to the Irish, began also about 1720, reached its height in the middle of the century, and did not, like the English and Irish, increase during the 1770s." Ibid., p. 336. See also Hofstadter, op. cit., pp. 17–30.

40. Smith, op. cit., p. 134.

41. Ibid., p. 325.

42. Nicholas Canny, "The Ideology of English Colonization: From Ireland to America," *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3d ser., vol. 30, no. 4 (October 1972): 596–97.

43. Hofstadter, op. cit., pp. 19–24.

44. Quoted by Hofstadter, ibid., p. 32.

45. Samuel Krislov has recorded an interesting episode that confirms the growing concern for Black resistance in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries: "In 1802 in a confidential letter to the chairman of a Senate committee, Postmaster General Gideon Granger urged [passage of a Post Office provision which forbade Black employment], suggesting there were objections to Negro mail carriers 'of a nature too delicate to engraft into a report which may become public, yet too important to be omitted or passed over without full consideration.' Such a role as distributing the mail might teach Negroes the pernicious doctrine 'that a man's rights do not depend on his color.' The Postmaster General cautioned against 'everything which tends to increase their knowledge of natural rights, of men and things, or that affords them an opportunity of associating, acquiring and commuting sentiments, and of establishing a chain or line of intelligence.' " Krislov, *The Negro in Federal Employment*, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, 1967, p. 9. The provision was passed and remained in law (if not in practice) until 1865. See also Mary Frances Berry, op. cit., pp. 1–17.

46. Chief Justice Roger Taney of the U.S. Supreme Court, in the majority opinion made public in 1857 that settled *Dred Scott v. Sanford*, established this position as the law of the land until its effective repeal by the Civil War Amendments. Taney, in summarizing "the public history of every European nation," argued that the Constitution of the United States could not have encompassed rights for Blacks: "They had for more than a century before been regarded as beings of an inferior order, and altogether unfit to associate with the white race, either in social or political relations; and so far inferior, that they had no rights which the white man was bound to respect; and that the negro might justly and lawfully be reduced to slavery for his benefit." Further, "if the language, as understood in that day, would embrace them, the conduct of the distinguished men who framed the Declaration of Independence would have been utterly and flagrantly inconsistent with the principles they asserted; and instead of the sympathy of mankind, to which they so confidently appealed, they would have deserved and received universal rebuke and reprobation. Yet the men who framed this declaration were great men—high in literary acquirements—high in their sense of honor, and incapable of asserting principles inconsistent with those on which they were acting. They perfectly understood the meaning of the language they used, and how it would be understood by others; and they knew that it would not in any part of the civilized world be supposed to embrace the negro race, which, by common consent, had been excluded from civilized Governments and the family of nations, and doomed to slavery." Ruchames, op. cit., pp. 398–400. Given his predilection for "public history," had the subject of their social equality come before him, Taney could have come to similar conclusions about the majority of those who were becoming members of the "white race." Prior to the forging of racial consensus, in both Europe and the New World, the "racial" inferiorities of most of these proto-whites was well established by the literati and intelligentsia classes. Indeed, some of Taney's contemporaries did fear that his decision suggested "that there were federal or state constitutional inhibitions on the power of the northern states to preserve their free status, to protect their black and white populations within or outside their domicile." William Wiecek, "Slavery and Abolition Before the United States Supreme Court, 1820–1860," *Journal of American History* 65, no. 1 (June 1978): 55. In a quite informative if sometimes curiously written article on the legal history of slavery in the United States, A. E. Keir Nash reminds his readers that the courts of the nation did not consistently distinguish the rights of whites from those of Black slaves and Black free men. Nash, "Reason of Slavery: Understanding the Judicial Role in the Peculiar Institution," *Vanderbilt Law Review* 32, no. 1 (January 1979): 7–218. As such, it would appear appropriate to assume that the state systems of justice during the first half of the nineteenth century were not exclusively concerned with "white dominance" as one of Nash's critics, Michael Hindus, has suggested. See Hindus, "Black Justice Under White Law: Criminal Prosecutions of Blacks in Antebellum South Carolina," *Journal of American*

History 63, no. 3 (December 1976): 599. Nash, however, while recognizing that there is something to the notion that the history of criminal law in Western societies "reflects" the origins of that law in slave punishments (for presumably enslaved Europeans) and the extension of these penalties "from the lowest classes upwards through the social strata" (op. cit., p. 51, the suggestion originates with J. Thorsten Sellin in his *Slavery and the Penal System*, Elseiver, New York, 1976, p. viii), never quite comes to terms with Hindus' suggestion that another characteristic of the penal codes of the nineteenth century was class domination. See Hindus, op. cit., pp. 575–76, note 30. Nash's avoidance of this interpretative possibility is perhaps most dramatically displayed in one of the curiosities in his essay: the construction of a historically naive empiricist opponent (Nash terms this figure "the ameliorative Whig" and at other times a "silent southerner") for his critics and academic competitors (op. cit., pp. 30–70). Since Nash's alter ego is largely satisfied in confronting Nash's opponents with statistical sets of alternative "proofs," the structural forms and historical processes transferred from the Old World and emergent in the New that provided nineteenth-century America its political economy and the setting of its legal systems are largely ignored. Nash's "Whiggery," for example, in assigning statistical integrity to numbers of convictions, acquittals, indictments, lengths of sentence and the like, fails to take into account the peculiarities of the "crimes of speech"for which slaves and Black free men were held responsible (Hindus, op. cit., pp. 587–89); the fact that slaves were whipped on grounds of improper behavior *after* acquittals from criminal charges against them (ibid., p. 593); that the numbers of executions of slave offenders were probably depressed by the likelihood of claims for compensation from their owners (ibid., p. 596); and that trial evidence might be significantly distorted by restrictions placed on slave testimony (ibid., p. 578).

47. Marx to P. V. Annenkov, Brussels, 28 December 1846, reprinted in Karl Marx, *The Poverty of Philosophy*, International Publishers, New York, 1971, p. 188. A more frequently read treatment of slavery and industrial capitalism can be found in Chapter 31 of *Capital*, where Marx argues: "The discovery of gold and silver in America, the extirpation, enslavement and entombment in mines of the aboriginal population, the beginning of the conquest and looting of the East Indies the turning of Africa into a warren for the commercial hunting of black-skins, signalised the rosy dawn of the era of capitalist production. These idyllic proceedings are the chief momenta of primitive accumulation." Marx, *Capital*, vol. 1, International Publishers, New York, 1977, p. 751. There is much that is true here but also much that is not. A hundred years after Marx described primitive accumulation and set it between the stages of feudalism and capitalism, Oliver C. Cox, the Black theorist, tried to correct Marx's error: "[Marx] begins his analysis of the nature of capitalism almost where he might have ended it; and as is commonly the case in classical economics, he relegates as subsidiary the very things which should have been the center of his study. . . . His 'primitive accumulation' is none other than fundamentally capitalist accumulation; and, to assume that feudal society dissolved before capitalist society began is to over-emphasize the fragility of feudalism and to discount its uses to the development of capitalism." Cox, *Capitalism as a System*, Monthly Review Press, New York, 1964, pp. 213–14. Among many contemporary Marxists, however, there is still a tendency to misconstrue the importance and application of the concept of primitive accumulation. Charles Post, for instance, in a recent article on capitalism in nineteenth-century America seems content to conceptualize slave labor power in terms of primitive accumulation while entirely ignoring its application to "immigrant labour power." See Post, "The American Road to Capitalism," *New Left Review* 133 (May–June 1982): 31–35, 44–45.

48. Eugene Genovese and Elizabeth Fox-Genovese, as two of the more prominent of American historians who identify their work with the analytical categories and relationships associated with Marx, appear highly ambiguous on the relationship between slave production and industrialization. Their remarks consistently distinguish parts of an international or world economic system from other parts according to modes of production. Thus recently they have distinguished between "the slave economies of the New World," and "the free labor economies" of North America and Europe. The logical thrust of their argument transforms these distinctions into oppositions between slavery ("pre-capitalist" or "archaic relations of production") and industrialization within particular "economics" (e.g., the American South). The consequence, in the work of the Genoveses, is an aborted design of the eighteenth- and nineteenth-centuries' world system substantiated by a foreshortened sense of the system's historical development and the forms of its integrations. Compare, for example, the following two statements, which follow closely upon each other in a single essay: "[Modern colonial and plantation economies] have arisen from the world capitalist mode of production and have, from the beginning and virtually by definition, functioned within a world market. But they have simultaneously rested on slave or other dependent labor systems that have deprived them of the best social and ideological as well as economic advantages of a market in labor-power, in contradistinction to that market in labor itself which slavery's capitalization of labor made possible." And: "The colonial expansion of capitalism not only absorbed precapitalist economic systems; it created them. The enserfment of the Russian peasants during and after the sixteenth century, the second serfdom in eastern Europe, the economic exploitation of the highland Indian communities of Mexico and Peru, and the rise of plantation-based slave regimes in the American lowlands may, from this point of view, be seen as varying expressions of colonial capitalist expansion. They represent nothing so much as the power of

commercial capital to adjust unfree labour systems to the rising demand of West European mass markets, which themselves, however paradoxically, arose on free labor—represented a major advance over quasi-seigneurial alternatives, for it permitted greater economic rationalization and a more flexible labor market." "The Slave Economies in Political Perspective," *Journal of American History* 66, no. 1 (June 1979): 22.

Paradox is hardly an analytical term, certainly not for Marxists, and here it is plainly inaccurate. It is also difficult to understand how capitalism might "create" precapitalist forms of labor.

49. See Eric Williams, *Capitalism and Slavery*, Capricorn, New York, 1966, pp. 98–107; and Walter Rodney, *How Europe Underdeveloped Africa*, Bogle-L'Ouverture, London, 1972, pp. 92–101.

50. Cox, op. cit., pp. 165–66.

51. Williams, op. cit., p. 52.

52. Philip Curtin, "The Atlantic Slave Trade, 1600–1800," in J. F. A. Ajayi and Michael Crowder (eds.), *History of West Africa*, Columbia University Press, New York, 1972, 1:240.

53. In this respect it is interesting to recall Count Constantin de Volney's impressions after his journey to Egypt in 1783–85: "But returning to Egypt, the lesson she teaches history contains many reflections for philosophy. What a subject for meditation, to see the present barbarism and ignorance of the Copts, descendants of the alliance between the profound genius of the Egyptians and the brilliant mind of the Greeks! Just think that this race of black men, today our slave and the object of our scorn, is the very race to which we owe our arts, sciences, and even the use of speech! Just imagine, finally, that it is in the midst of peoples who call themselves the greatest friends of liberty and humanity that one has approved the most barbarous slavery and questioned whether black men have the same kind of intelligence as Whites!" Quoted by Cheikh Anta Diop, *The African Origin of Civilization*, Lawrence Hill, New York, 1974, pp. 27–28.

54. Hermann Kees, *Ancient Egypt*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1961, pp. 52–53, 100–101.

55. Margaret S. Drowser, "Egypt: Archaeology and History," in *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1965, 8:37.

56. Diop, op. cit., p. 110.

57. Frank Snowden, *Blacks in Antiquity*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, 1970, pp. 103–4.

58. Ibid.; and Drowser, op. cit., p. 40; George Thomson, *The First Philosophers*, Lawrence and Wishart, London, 1977 (orig. 1955), pp. 191–93.

59. See Snowden, op. cit., pp. 286–87, note 55.

60. "The story of King Sesostris in Europe and of some of his soldiers who settled by the Phasis River has been related to Herodotus's report of black, woolly-haired Colchians and has been interpreted as evidence of a classical tradition that there were Ethiopians among the troops of the Egyptian Sesostris." Snowden, op. cit., p. 121.

61. Ibid., pp. 104–5.

62. See the extraordinary work of George James, *Stolen Legacy*, Philosophical Library, New York, 1954 (republished by Julian Richardson, San Francisco, 1976), chapters 1–111. Since James's work is sometimes difficult to obtain, the reader is advised that the sources (beyond primary works) James normally relies on are Henri Frankfort's *The Ancient Egyptian Religion*, Harper, New York, 1961, and Eva Sandford's *The Mediterranean World in Ancient Times* (publisher unlisted). Yosef ben-Jochannan has in turn relied on James for the treatment of this era in his own work, for example, *Africa: Mother of Civilization, Alkebu-Lan*, New York, 1971, pp. 375–440. See also Diop, op. cit., p. 45. One may also consult Eduard Zeller, *Outlines of the History of Greek Philosophy*, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1948, pp. 8, 23, 26–93; Theodor Gomperz, *Greek Thinkers*, John Murray, London, 1906, 1:5–16, 43; Margaret Murray, *The Splendour That Was Egypt*, Sidgwick and Jackson, London, 1964 (orig. 1949); Henry Olela, 1979, and Lanciany Keita, 1979.

63. "Greek traditions place the installation of Egyptian colonies in Greece at approximately [the middle of the second millennium, B.C.]: Cecrops settled in Attica; Danaus, brother of Aegyptus, in Argolis; he taught the Greeks agriculture as well as metallurgy (iron)." Diop, op. cit., p. 110. See also Plato's *Timaeus* for the suggestion that Greek and African relations were already merely vague memories by the fourth century B.C. George James notes: "One of the military policies adopted by the Greek military authorities at Alexandria was the issue of commands to the leading Egyptian Priests for information concerning the Egyptian history, philosophy and religion. . . . Accordingly, we are told that Ptolemy I Soter, in order to elicit the secrets of Egyptian wisdom or mystery system, ordered Manetho, the High Priest of the temple of Isis at Sebennytus in Lower Egypt, to write the philosophy, and the history of the religion of the Egyptians. Accordingly, Manetho published several volumes concerning these respective fields, and Ptolemy issued an order prohibiting the translation of these books which had to be kept on reserve in the Library, for instruction of the Greeks by the Egyptian Priests." James, op. cit., pp. 49–50. Drowser informs us: "The priest Manetho had perhaps better sources [than Herodotus] when he wrote his *Aegyptiaca* about 240 B.C.; the surviving extracts from this work, ill-copied by later classical writers who quoted it for their own polemic ends, show how valuable a work has been lost. As it is, Manetho's list of the 30 dynasties of kings of pharaonic Egypt, in spite of the garbled forms of the names and miscopying of figures, has triumphantly survived the test of archaeology and is still retained by Egyptologists as the basis of the reconstructed history of Egypt." Drowser, op. cit., p. 31. Recall, Manetho was writing 200 years after Herodotus!

64. A. E. Taylor has disputed the historical character of *Timaeus*, but his interpretation of this section of the dialogue transforms it into purposeless nonsense; see A. E. Taylor, *Plato, The Man and His Work*, World Publishing, Cleveland, 1966, pp. 438–40, and Margaret Murray, op. cit., p. 53.

65. Drowser, op. cit., p. 31.

66. Diop, op. cit., p. 150.

67. Snowden, op. cit., p. 109. See also Snowden, ibid., pp. 289–90; and Diop, op. cit., pp. 85–98; and Boyce Rensberger, "Nubian Monarchy Called Oldest," *New York Times*, 1 March 1979, pp. A1 and A16, which begins: "Evidence of the oldest recognizable monarchy in human history, preceding the rise of the earliest Egyptian kings by several generations, has been discovered in artifacts from ancient Nubia in Africa. . . . The new findings suggest that the ancient Nubians may have reached this stage of political development as long ago as 3300 B.C., several generations before the earliest documented Egyptian kin." For the predominant view—one which presumed the relationship was the reverse, see Charles C. Seligman, *Egypt and Negro Africa*, Routledge and Sons, London, 1933.

68. See Kees, op. cit., pp. 334–35.

69. See Snowden, op. cit., pp. 112, 126; and Keith Irvine, *The Rise of the Colored Races*, W. W. Norton, New York, 1970, pp. 16–17.

70. "The most convincing explanation of Negroid stone figures found in Cyprus is that the sculptures were portraits of Ethiopians in the civil and military service of the Egyptians during Egyptian occupation of the island under Amasis (568–525 B.C.). The sculptures in question were discovered in Ayla Irini and, according to E. Gjerstad, on the basis of style cannot be dated later than 560 B.C." Snowden, op. cit. pp. 122–23.

71. Ibid., pp. 131–32.

72. Ibid., pp. 136–41.

73. Ibid., pp. 141–42.

74. Ibid., p. 183.

75. Irvine, op. cit., pp. 22–23. "In Western Europe, where the majority of the population lived in villages and hamlets and were preoccupied with the problems of survival. . . . In a world in which lived giants such as Gog and Magog, headless men with eyes in their stomachs, and the troglodytes of Libya—single-footed cave-dwellers who shielded themselves from the heat of the sun by lying on their backs and using their huge feet as umbrellas—the fact that some variations in skin color were also reported among foreigners must have appeared as a minor detail." Ibid.

76. See Walter Ullmann, *The Growth of Papal Government in the Middle Ages*, Methuen, London, 1965, p. 88.

77. Sheldon Wolin, *The Politics of Vision*, Little, Brown, Boston, 1960, p. 105.

78. Contemplating the significance for Western Europe of the sixteenth century, Herbert Butterfield wrote: "Until a period not long before the Renaissance, the intellectual leadership of such civilizations as existed in this quarter of the globe had remained with the lands in the eastern half of the Mediterranean or in empires that stretched farther still into what we call the Middle East. While our Anglo-Saxon forefathers were semi-barbarian, Constantinople and Baghdad were fabulously wealthy cities, contemptuous of the backwardness of the Christian West." He went on to write that: "For two thousand years the general appearance of the world and the activities of men had varied astonishingly little [for Western Europeans]—the sky-line for ever the same—so much so that men were not conscious of either progress or process in history, save as one city or state might rise by effort or good fortune while another fell. . . . Now [in the seventeenth century], however, change became so quick as to be perceptible with the naked eye, and the face of time and the activities of men were to alter more in a century than they had previously done in a thousand years." *The Origins of Modern Science*, Free Press, New York, 1957, pp. 187–88, 199. For seventeenth century, especially in England, see Marie Boas Hall, "Scientific Thought," in Allardyce Nicoll (ed.), *Shakespeare in His Own Age*, Shakespeare Survey 17, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1964, pp. 138–51. Even international diplomacy was marked by medieval conceptions, see Franklin L. Baumer, "England, the Turk, and the Common Corps of Christendom," *American Historical Review* 50, no. 1 (October 1944): 26–48. William Carroll Bark, while reluctant to accept the more somber hues of the "Dark Age," admits that a significant "deflect[ion] from science-philosophy to theology-philosophy" took place during the Patristic Age and the following feudal period. See his *The Origins of the Medieval World*, Stanford University Press, Stanford, 1958, p. 72. See also Reginald Poole, *Illustrations of the History of Medieval Thought and Learning*, Dover, New York, 1960, pp. 198–245; and the excellent study by Frances A. Yates, *The Occult Philosophy in the Elizabethan Age*, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1979.

79. Norman Cantor (ed.), *The Medieval World*, 300–1300, Macmillan Company, New York, 1963, p. 111. See also Hugh Trevor-Roper, "The Rise of Christian Europe: The Dark Ages," *The Listener*, 12 December 1963, pp. 975–79. Trevor-Roper, somewhat dramatically asserts: "[T]he old diehards believed that pagan literature was by definition suspect: at least it could only be made safe by prudent excisions: was not an Israelite forbidden to marry a heathen captive, however desirable, unless he first shaved her head and pared her nails? (Deut. xxi, 12). "The Rise of Christian Europe: The Medieval Renaissance," *The Listener*, 26 December 1963, p. 1062.

80. Ralph Lerner and Muhsin Mahdi (eds.), *Medieval Political Philosophy*, Free Press of Glencoe, New York, 1963, p. 13. For the preoccupation with heresy in medieval Europe, see Norman Cohn, *The Pursuit of the Millennium*, Oxford University Press, New York, 1970; and Trevor-Roper, "The Medieval Renaissance," op. cit., pp. 1064–65.

81. Maxime Rodinson, *Mohammed*, Vintage, New York, 1974, p. 297.

82. Eugene A. Myers, *Arabic Thought and the Western World in the Golden Age of Islam*, Frederick Ungar Publishing, New York, 1964, pp. 76–77.

83. Ibid., pp. 132–33. "The discovery that the Arabs, as also the Byzantines, possessed the key to this new learning, soon set Europe buzzing, and to every point of contact the new 'masters' sent out to bring it in." Hugh Trevor-Roper, "The Medieval Renaissance," op. cit., p. 1062.

84. Myers, ibid., p. 96; Trevor-Roper, ibid., pp. 1063–64.

85. Ralph Austen, "The Islamic Slave Trade Out of Africa (Red Sea and Indian Ocean)," in Henry Gemery and Jan Hogendorn (eds.), *The Uncommon Market: Quantitative Studies in the Atlantic Slave Trade*, Academic Press, New York, 1979.

86. Daniel Pipes, "Black Soldiers in Early Muslim Armies," *The International Journal of African Historical Studies* 13, no. 1 (1980): 87–94.

87. Michael Tigar and Madeleine Levy, *Law and the Rise of Capitalism*, Monthly Review Press, New York, 1977, pp. 55, 61; E. R. Chamberlin, *Everyday Life in Renaissance Times*, Capricorn Books, New York, 1967, pp. 64–65; Hugh Trevor-Roper, "The Rise of Christian Europe: The Crusades," *The Listener*, 19 December 1963, p. 1022.

88. See Fernand Braudel, *The Mediterranean and the Mediterranean World in the Age of Philip II*, Harper and Row, New York, 1973, 2:743–44.

89. Marc Bloch, *French Rural History*, University of California Press, Berkeley, 1966, pp. 7–8; Braudel, *The Mediterranean*, op. cit., pp. 142–43; Wallerstein, op. cit., pp. 44–45. William McNeill, following on the work of Emmanuel Le Roy Ladurie and H. H. Lamb, concludes that: "In Europe, a 'Little Ice Age' starting about 1300 climaxed between 1550 and 1850 and has been succeeded by warmer temperatures in the twentieth century." McNeill, *Plagues and People*, Anchor Books, Garden City, 1977, p. 297 n. 23. Wallerstein, referring to the work of Gustaf Utterstrom, makes a similar point: "Utterstrom reminds us that climatic change might have had special bearing on the earlier periods in the transformation of Europe. 'The primitive agriculture of the Middle Ages must have been much more dependent on favorable weather than is modern agriculture with its high technical standards.'" Wallerstein, op. cit., p. 34.

90. Hugh Trevor-Roper has put this most dramatically: "My point is that the Crusades were not just a religious movement. . . . They were not even, by themselves, the cause of the European break-through. They were part of a much larger, much wider process: a process which can be seen all over Europe and on all the frontiers of western Christendom: beyond the Pyrenees, beyond the Elbe, on the Scottish border, in Ireland. This process is essentially a north European process. It is based on a new population-growth and new techniques, agricultural, social, military. . . . Perhaps, as Gibbon wrote, the Crusades were a diversion of this great expansion into the sideline of unprofitable imperialism; perhaps the imperialism was inseparable from the expansion." *The Rise of Christian Europe*, Harcourt, Brace and World, New York, 1965, pp. 127–28.

91. "Merchants regularly paid fines for breaking every law that concerned their business, and went on as before. The wealth of Venice and Genoa was made in trade with the infidels of Syria and Egypt despite papal prohibition. Prior to the 14th century, it has been said, men 'could hardly imagine the merchant's strongbox without picturing the devil squatting on the lid.' Whether the merchant too saw the devil as he counted coins, whether he lived with a sense of guilt, is hard to assess." Barbara Tuchman, *A Distant Mirror*, Ballentine Books, New York, 1977, p. 38. See also Iris Origo, *The Merchant of Prato*, Alfred Knopf, New York, 1957, pp. 80, 123; Tigar and Levy, op. cit., pp. 74–75.

92. "In the early centuries central and eastern Europe was a fruitful source and the trade in these so-called 'Slavs' (*Saqaliba*) was in the hands of Christians and Jews until they were sold into the hands of Muslim merchants on the shores of the Mediterranean or the Caspian Sea. From the eleventh century, when more powerful polities began to emerge in Europe, this source began to dry up, but slaves of European origin were still obtained by raiding and piracy within the Mediterranean and along the Atlantic Coast. European Christian powers of the area had no scruples about paying the Muslims back in their own coin. Another major source of slaves was Central Asia, the home of diverse nomadic tribes speaking Turkic languages." J. O. Hunwick, "Black Africans in the Islamic World: An Understudied Dimension of the Black Diaspora," *Tarikh* 5, no. 4 (1978): 23. For the intra-European trade in slaves, see Iris Origo: "[I]t was the labour shortage after the Black Death of 1348 that suddenly caused a demand for domestic slaves to revive, and brought them to Italy not only from Spain and Africa, but from the Balkans, Constantinople, Cyprus and Crete, and, above all, from the shores of the Black Sea. . . . Many of them mere children of nine or ten, they belonged to a great variety of different races: yellow-skinned, slanting-eyed Tartars, handsome fair Circassians, Greeks, Russians, Georgians, Alans, and Lesghians. Sold by their parents for a crust of bread, or kidnapped by Tartar raiders and Italian sailors, they were brought from the slave-markets of Tana and

Caffa, of Constantinople, Cyprus, and Crete to the Venetian and Genoese quays, where they were bought by dealers and forwarded to customers inland." Origo, *The Merchant of Prato*, op. cit., p. 90. For Pope John XXII, see ibid., p. 8.

93. Wallerstein, op. cit., pp. 21–24. Tuchman prefers to reconcile demographic, climatic, technological, and sociopolitical bases for the crisis, op. cit., pp. 24–48.

94. Trevor-Roper, *Rise of Christian Europe*, op. cit., p. 177.

95. Jean Richard, "The Mongols and the Franks," *Journal of Asian History* 3, no. 1 (1969): 45. Peter Forbath tells us a bit more of the story: "In 1221, with the Fifth Crusade shattered in the defeat at Cairo, Jacques de Vitry, the Bishop of Acre last of the Crusader states to survive, wrote to Pope Honorius III that 'A new and mighty protector of Christianity has arisen. He is King David of India, who has taken the field of battle against the unbelievers at the head of an army of unparalleled size.' This King David, who according to Bishop Jacques was commonly called Prester John, was believed to be the son or grandson of the Prester John who had been awaited at the time of the Second Crusade. . . . This king, it was to turn out, was Genghis Khan." Forbath, *The River Congo*, D. P. Dutton, New York, 1979, p. 28.

96. Jean Richard, ibid., p. 48.

97. See R. S. Lopez, H. A. Miskimin, and Abraham Udovitch, "England to Egypt, 1350–1500: Long-term Trends and Long-distance Trade," in M. A. Cook (ed.), *Studies in the Economic History of the Middle East from the Rise of Islam to the Present Day*, Oxford University Press, London, 1970, as cited by Wallerstein, op. cit., p. 40 n. 85.

98. William McNeill, op. cit., pp. 133–34.

99. Ibid., chap. 4; Tuchman, op. cit., pp. 92–102.

100. Trevor-Roper, *Rise of Christian Europe*, op. cit., pp. 119–20.

101. Americo Castro, *The Structure of Spanish History*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1954, p. 670. For more detail of the English role–based on the Contemporary Accounts of an Englishman and Two Germans (ibid.)—see Violet Shillington, "The Beginnings of the Anglo-Portuguese Alliance," *Translations of the Royal Historical Society* 20 (1906): 109–32; and Edgar Prestage, "The Anglo-Portuguese Alliance," ibid., 4th ser., vol. 17 (1934): 69–100.

102. Wallerstein, op. cit., pp. 49ff.

103. See Charles Verlinden, "The Italian Colony of Lisbon and the Development of Portuguese Metropolitan and Colonial Economy," in Verlinden's collection of essays, *The Beginnings of Modern Colonization*, Cornell University Press, Ithaca, 1970, pp. 98–112. A glimpse of the importance of Italian traders in European and Mediterranean trade and the structures of their commercial houses and banks can be found in Origo's detailed study of Datini (*The Merchant of Prato*, op. cit.), pp. 70–73.

104. See Verlinden, "Some Aspects of Slavery in Medieval Italian Colonies," ibid., pp. 79–97.

105. Castro, op. cit., p. 668.

106. See C. R. Boxer, *Four Centuries of Portuguese Expansion, 1415–1825*, Witwatersrand University Press, Johannesburg, 1965, p. 6 (as cited by Wallerstein, op. cit., p. 50 n. 133).

107. See Harold V. Livermore, "Portugal," in *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 1965, 18:276–77; and C. Raymond Beazley, "Prince Henry of Portugal and His Political, Commercial and Colonizing Work," *American Historical Review* 17, no. 2 (January 1923): 253–54. Also of interest is A. J. R. Russell-Wood, *Fidalgos and Philanthropists*, University of California Press, Berkeley, 1968, pp. 6–7.

108. Castro, op. cit., pp. 668–69. Castro here also takes time to acknowledge his differences with Portuguese scholars: "It is obvious . . . that the militant impetus and support for . . . Peninsular vivisection could not arise spontaneously. . . . The initial motivation of that rebellion does not lie in the proto-Portuguese character of that country. . . . That is why two apparently contradictory ways of understanding the origin of Portugal—my own and that of Portuguese historians who opposed it—can both be true." Ibid., p. 669.

109. See Livermore, op. cit., pp. 275–76.

110. Francis M. Rogers, "The Attraction of the East and Early Portuguese Discoveries," *Luso-Brazilian Review* 1, no. 1 (June 1964): 46. Rogers goes on to remind us of the rich utopianism contained in the letter presumably written by Prester John in 1165 and its great popular acceptance for the next 300 years or so. The letter whatever its origins (some scholars have argued that it was written by or on the authority of Frederick Barbarossa; others that its author was an anonymous Levantine Christian monk) described the realm of Prester John in terms that put contemporary Europe to shame, in material as well as social terms. The letter was consequently a critique of Europe, its decay, its chaos, its corruption, and its moral dissolution. See also Vsevolod Slessarev, *Prester John: The Letter and the Legend*, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, 1959; and Robert Silverberg, *The Realm of Prester John*, Doubleday, Garden City, 1972, pp. 40–73.

111. Robert Silverberg, op. cit., p. 194.

112. That the Prince was a man of unusual personality can be surmised from the following lines extracted from his contemporary and court chronicler, Gomes Eannes de Azurara: "Neither luxury nor avarice ever found a home within his breast, for as to the former he was so temperate that all his life was passed in

purest chastity and as a virgin the earth received him at his death again to herself: ... It would be hard to tell how many nights he passed in which his eyes knew no sleep; and his body was so transformed by the use of abstinence that it seemed as if Don Henry had made its nature to be different from that of other men. ... The Infant drank wine only for a very small part of his life, and that in his youth, but afterwards he abstained entirely from it. ... Well-nigh one-half of the year he spent in fasting, and the hands of the poor never went away empty from his presence." G. E. de Azurara, *The Chronicle of the Discovery and Conquest of Guinea*, C. R. Beazley and E. Prestage (eds.), Burt Franklin and E. Prestage (eds.), Burt Franklin Publisher, New York, 1896, vol. 1, chap. 4, pp. 12–15.

113. Francis Rogers, op. cit., p. 50.

114. Gomes Eannes de Azurara, op. cit., chap. 7, pp. 27–30.

115. Robert Silverberg, op. cit., p. 197.

116. Ibid., pp. 200–205. Covilha (Covilhao) was sent by King Joao II (1495–1521) in 1487 on a mission to "discover and learn about Prester John." Covilha and his companion, Alfonso de Paiva, traveled by way of Barcelona, Naples, Rhodes, Alexandria, and Cairo. From there they trekked to Tor, Suakin, and Aden with caravans of Muslims. At Aden they parted, Covilha pushing on east to Calicut, Goa and Ormuz Paiva reportedly to Ethiopia. Upon his return to Cairo, Covilha learned of Paiva's death (either in Cairo or Ethiopia, the reports vary). Disguising himself as a Muslim Covilha proceeded first to Jedda, Mecca, and Medina, and finally reached Abyssinia sometime in 1490 or thereabouts. Thirty years later, in 1590, he related his mission to Rodrigo de Lima and Francisco Alvarez. He remained in Abyssinia upon their departure, still the honored guest of his host, "Presser John." See also Francisco Alvares, *Narrative of the Portuguese Embassy to Abyssinia during the Years 1520–1527*, Lord Stanley of Alderley (ed.), Burt Franklin Publisher, New York, 1970, and Boxer, op. cit., p. 12.

117. J. O. Hunwick, op. cit., p. 22. William McKee Evans has made the unique claim that: "In view of the broad-minded ethnic and social attitudes of the Prophet as well as the noblest of his followers, it is ironic that the lands of Islam became the cradle of modern racial stratification and of many of the ideas that are still used to justify special privileges defined by skin color and other racial characteristics. Muslims aspired to a universal brotherhood of believers. But prominent among their actual achievements was the forging of new links between blackness and debasement. It was under the Muslims that slavery became largely a racial institution." ("From the Land of Canaan to the Land of Guinea: The Strange Odyssey of the 'Sons of Ham,'" *American Historical Review* 85, no. 1 [February 1980]: 28.) The logic of Evans's argument rests on several assumptions: 1. "[T]he rise of Islam eliminated from the Mediterranean slave trade an important source of light-skinned slaves ... [because] ... Islamic law ... held that no freeborn Muslim could be sold into slavery" (ibid.); 2. "During the later Middle Ages a number of European states developed, with sophisticated military organizations that could answer the challenge of Islam blow for blow. ... few European slaves were available for purchase during the later Middle Ages because of the more orderly political conditions in France, England, the German Empire, and other countries ... the supply from Europe was reduced to a minimum, and those came mainly from the Slavic lands." (ibid., pp. 28–29); and 3. "[M]ost black Africans lived in ethnically fragmented, often mutually antagonistic, societies that could offer little resistance to raids from the Sudanese or other Muslim states." (ibid., p. 29). Ultimately, Evans argues, racial myths emerge to justify and rationalize existing power relationships. Just how the myths of racial stratification made their way into Christian European cosmology is not made very clear in Evans' account. The single instance cited by Evans comes from Azurara's recounting of a "noble Moor" successfully bargaining for his own release from his Christian captors in exchange for ten "black Moors." The justification for the exchange, however, is not that of the Moor—whatever it might have been—but of Azurara who referred to the Judeo Christian myth of Noah's sons (Azurara mistakenly identified Ham, the "father of Canaan," as Cain). Nevertheless, Evans is certain that: "As historical events redirected the slave trade, as European slavery entered what the leading authority [Charles Verlinden] on medieval slavery has called its 'Negro' period, Christians began to look at blacks in ways that had been characteristic of racially stratified Muslim countries for some seven centuries" (ibid., pp. 38–39).

Evans acknowledges that his "chief authority on Muslim race relations and racial altitudes" is Gernot Rotter's unpublished dissertation "Die Stellung des Negers in der islamisch-arabischen Geselschaft bis XVI Jahrhundert," 1967. Other important sources are Bernard Lewis, *Race and Color in Islam*, Harper and Row, New York, 1970; and Adam Mez, *The Renaissance of Islam*, Luzac and Co., London, 1937. Rotter's unpublished work made its initial appearance with equal significance in Bernard Lewis's work. See *Race and Color*, p. 2 n. 1. For a treatment of the ideological currents within which Lewis swims, see Edward Said, *Orientalism*, Pantheon, New York, 1978, pp. 315–21; and Maxine Rodinson, "The Western Image and Western Studies of Islam," in Joseph Schacht and C. E. Bosworth (eds.), *The Legacy of Islam*, Oxford University Press, London, 1974, pp. 9–62. Evans's use of his sources is, however, sometimes quite curious. For instance, he uses Iris Origo's work as one confirmation for his contention that Christian Europe and its rulers denied Christian slaves to the Muslim trade. On precisely the same page cited by Evans, Origo says something quite different: "Nevertheless, it is quite plain that many of the Genoese and Venetian traders in the Black Sea paid little heed as to whether the human wares they carried had, or had not, been sanctified

by baptism. The deeds of sale in Caffa and Pera in 1289 show that many of the slaves who were sold there belonged to peoples professing either the Catholic or Orthodox faith, since they included Circassians, Greeks, Russians, Georgians, Alans, and Lesghians . . . this did not prevent their sale" ("The Domestic Enemy," op. cit., p. 328). Evans's citing of Mez is equally cavalier. He uses Mez to confirm: "That slaves were predominantly black in Egypt during the period ca. 950–1250" (Evans, op. cit., p. 26 n. 28); that Islamic racial stratification led to untrained white slaves being valued as high as 1,000 diners, while Black slaves "fetched no more than 25–30 diners" (ibid., p. 29 and n. 41); and that one expression of Muslim contempt for Blacks was the belief that "blacks were 'fickle and careless. Dancing and beating time are engrained in their nature. They say: were the negro to fall from heaven to the earth he would beat time falling' " (ibid., p. 32). What Mez actually wrote is interesting in comparison. Of slaves in Egypt, Mez wrote: "In the 4th/10th century, Egypt, South Arabia, and North Africa, were the *chief markets* for black slaves" (my emphasis). Mez, op. cit., p. 157. Of slave prices, Mez commented: "Like the negro-servant today the black house-slave was chiefly employed as door-keeper. In a society which, above everything else, valued good poetry and fine music, artistically talented and trained boys and girls would inevitably be in great demand . . . and for such girls so trained the price was from 10 to 20,000 marks. . . . As with us, famous singers and female artists had their fancy prices. About 300/912 a female singer was sold in an aristocratic circle for 13,000 diners (130,000 marks), the broker making 1,000 diners" (ibid., pp. 157–58). Mez also put a slightly different interpretation on Black dancing. Adding his own coloring to the remarks of the Christian physician Ibn Botlan (ca. early eleventh century) to whom Evans turns for a characterization of Muslim attitudes toward Blacks and dancing, Mez noted: "The negro must always dance. Like the German when he has shaken off the work-day mood he feels an unconquerable passion to sing" (ibid., p. 161 n. 2). Evans appears to be equally slick with historical reconstruction as he is with his scholarly references. Compare his comment: "Tens of thousands of black Africans, for example, labored on land reclamation projects in Iraq. Blacks were also used in the copper and salt mines of the Sahara. Wherever the work was demanding and the conditions harsh, black slaves were likely to be found" (p. 30). J. O. Hunwick provides a somewhat fuller description. "[I]n a limited number of instances African slave labour was used in large-scale agricultural works, as it was also used, on a lesser scale, in mining and industry. The best known and best documented instance of such 'plantation slavery' is the use made of large numbers of East African slaves—Zanj—in draining the salt marshes at the mouth of the Tigris and Euphrates rivers around Basra. . . . The Zanj enter history only in 868 when they began their fifteen-year revolt which shook the foundations of the 'Abbasid caliphate.' " Hunwick continues: "Once the movement gained success it was joined by some of the Black troops of the caliphal guard sent to fight it, and by some Bedouin and marsh Arabs. . . . The Zanj built their own capital, al-Mukhtara and another fortified town, al-Mani'a. In 870 they captured the flourishing seaport of Ubulla and in 871 they sacked Basra with enormous slaughter. . . . It was not until 880 that the caliph's brother, freed of other pressing military preoccupations, was able to take serious steps against the Zanj. Even then, it took three years of very hard campaigning to crush the movement and seize its towns. . . . The major experiment with 'plantation slavery' in the Islamic world had ended in disaster" (Hunwick, op. cit., pp. 33–34). Hunwick also mentions the enormous variety of occupations of Black slaves in Islamic society: household slaves, revenue officers, poets, musicians, professional soldiers, eunuchs, rulers and colonial administrators, scholars, and concubines, to suggest the range. (See also Ralph Austen, op. cit.)

The final contradiction in Evans's thesis is presented in its entirety in his own words. Sandwiching the discussion of a number of Islamic rulers who were Black and the racial complaints of a number of prominent Muslim poets who were also Black, Evans makes the following remarks: "Despite the general polarization of Muslim society into low-status blacks and high-status whites, no clearly defined color bar emerged" (Evans, op. cit., p. 31). It should also be noted that earlier Evans had written: "In certain contexts, especially when comparing themselves to more northerly peoples, Arabs of this period thought of themselves as 'black' " (p. 24 n. 23). Still, he insists that the terms "Mamluk" and "Abd" came to distinguish respectively European from other slaves while David Ayalon remarks on the variable use of the term "Mamluk" in his "Studies on the Structure of the Mamluk Army," pt. 2, *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 15 (1953): 466; and his "Studies in Al-Jabarti," in *Studies on the Mamluis in Egypt*, Variorum Press, London, 1977, pp. 316–17. And finally, "Muslim attitudes toward blacks were mixed, but amid their ambivalence one can detect here and there most of those notions making up that cluster of ideas were recognized as modern Western racial prejudice" (pp. 31–32). How a racially stratified "pigmentocracy" (Evans's terms) manages to avoid the formation of a color bar is not clarified by Evans. In short, Evans's thesis is analytically flawed, not supported by his own "evidence," and suspiciously convenient at this moment of renewed Western hostility toward Islamic peoples. Moreover, he never seems to get around to explaining why or how the ideologues of a society so ideologically hostile to Islamic beliefs and with a quite ancient and sophisticated racial consciousness of its own would bother or need bother to borrow such an ambivalently held social ideology.

118. Hunwick, op. cit., p. 28.

119. Norman Daniel has argued: "Of the points that I summarised, most had a long life. The 'fraudulent'

or 'hypocritical' character of Muhammad's claim to prophesy, while he was an ambitious schemer, a bandit and a lecher; the emphasis on Islam as a falling short of Christianity, a sum of heresy, particularly in connection with the Trinity; preoccupation with the Qur'anic teaching of Christ; the general lines, if not all the details, of the most unflattering biography of Muhammad, and particularly the weight given to the influence of Sergius and other guides upon him; the enormous Importance given to two moral questions, the public reliance on force and the supposed private laxity in sexual matters; the ridicule and contempt of the Qur'anic Paradise; the suspicion of determinist and predestinarian ethics; the interest in Islamic religious practices, the admission of some Islamic practice as a good example, but the treatment of the cult in general in vain; all these, with some differences in emphasis, but with great continuity in the attitude of intellectual contempt, long dominated Christian and European thought." *Islam and the West*, Edinburgh University Press, Edinburgh, 1960, p. 276. (See also pp. 144–46.)

120. Norman Daniel, *The Arabs and Medieval Europe*, Longman, London, 1979, p. 115.

121. Ibid., pp. 327–28.

122. Davis, *The Problem of Slavery in Western Culture*, op. cit., p. 94.

123. "The Philosophy of Aristotle had such an authority in sixteenth and seventeenth century Spain, that any attack on him 'was regarded as a dangerous heresy,' and the *Politics* enjoyed a *respecto casi supersticioso*." Mavis Campbell, "Aristotle and Black Slavery: A Study in Race Prejudice," *Race* 15, no. 3 (January 1974): 285–86.

124. Ibid., p. 286.

125. Ibid., pp. 290–91.

126. William Westermann, *The Slave Systems of Greek and Roman Antiquity*, American Philosophical Society, Philadelphia, 1955, p. 156.

127. Trevor-Roper, *Rise of Christian Europe*, op. cit., pp. 88–89.

128. Abbas Hamdani has recalled: " 'The word India in the middle Ages,' says Charles Nowell, 'had no exact geographical meaning to Europeans; it was a convenient expression denoting the East beyond the Mohammedan world.' " "Columbus and the Recovery of Jerusalem," *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 99, no. 1 (January–March 1979): 39. Later Hamdani observes, "George Kimble in his *Geography in the Middle Ages* (London, 1938, 128 n.), observes that the term 'Indies' is 'a vague term, for in the Middle Ages there were at least three Indias, viz., India Minor, India Major and India Tertia, i.e. Sind, Hind and Zinj of the Arabs. The first two were located in Asia, the last in Africa (Ethiopia).' " Ibid., p. 46 n. 11.

129. G. K. Hunter, "Elizabethans and Foreigners," in Awardyce Nicoll (ed.), *Shakespeare in His Own Age*, *Shakespeare Survey 17*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1964, p. 40.

Chapter Five

1. Alan Manchester, *British Preeminence in Brazil: Its Rise and Decline*, Octagon Books, New York, 1964, p. 1.

2. Immanuel Wallerstein, *The Modern World-System*, Academic Press, New York, 1974, p. 42; see also Boxer, *Four Centuries*, op. cit., p. 9.

3. Wallerstein, ibid., p. 47.

4. "According to the chroniclers, the idea of carrying on the Reconquest in North Africa was suggested by the need to find useful employment for those who had lived on frontier raids for almost a quarter of a century, and by the desire of John's sons to be armed knights in a real conflict such as the older generation had known." H. V. Livermore, "Portuguese History," in H. V. Livermore (ed.), *Portugal and Brazil*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1963, p. 59. Partially cited in Wallerstein, op. cit., p. 46.

5. See pp. 118ff, chapter 4; and especially Francis Rogers op. cit., pp. 54ff.

6. Livermore states: "With the passing of the old dynasty some of the older nobility had clung to Castile and disappeared from Portugal. Their places had been taken by a new nobility formed of John of Avis's supporters, almost all new men, recently enriched, ambitious, and loyal." Livermore, "Portuguese History," op. cit., p. 60. Wallerstein provides an interesting characterization of the Portuguese bourgeoisie: "The interests of the bourgeoisie for once did not conflict with those of the nobility. Prepared for modern capitalism by a long apprenticeship in long-distance trading and by the experience of living in one of the most highly monetized areas of Europe (because of the economic involvement with the Islamic Mediterranean world), the bourgeoisie too sought to escape the confines of the small Portuguese market." Wallerstein, op. cit., pp. 51–52. His interpretation of the relationship between this bourgeoisie and its Genoese colleagues differs from mine (see text below) and is uncharacteristically lacking in cited scholastic authority.

7. M. Postan, "The Fifteenth Century," *Economic History Review* 9, no. 2 (May 1939): 165. In this short essay, Postan recounts the deterioration of English domestic production—agricultural as well as manufacturing—and foreign trade in the fifteenth century.

8. Livermore, "Portuguese History," op. cit., pp. 58–59. Livermore is most likely referring to the Treaty of Windsor not Westminster. See Manchester, op. cit., p. 2, see also Carus Wilson, "The Overseas Trade of