

SLAVERY IN EARLY ST HELENA, PART TWO: THE BARBADIAN PLANTATION SYSTEM AND THE EXPANSION OF SLAVERY, 1683-1694

Michael D. Bennett

Research Associate, University of Manchester. Email: michael.bennett-3@manchester.ac.uk

The institution of slavery was central to the development of modern St Helena. However, the early history of slavery in the island remains underexplored by historians. A series of articles, published in *Wirebird* over three years, is concerned with filling this gap in the literature by studying the history of slavery in St Helena from the founding of the English colony in 1659 until the 1730s.

The first article, published in the previous volume of *Wirebird*, explored the system of “black servant” labour in St Helena. Between 1659 and 1682, African and East Indian labourers at St Helena were commonly referred to as “black servants” and were theoretically able to become free planters after conversion to Christianity and a fixed period of service varying from three to seven years. The East India Company (hereafter EIC) was particularly mindful that these black servants were to be treated with respect by their English masters and voluntarily enter into their service. Consequently, they sought to offer protections for the black population on their voyages to the island, encouraged their conversion to Christianity through religious instruction, and curtailed the length of their service. Although the surviving evidence is partial, it is likely there was a significant gap between the labour policies theorised by the company’s directors in London and the actual treatment of black workers in St Helena, and that black servants on the island in this period were actually held in a permanent form of enslavement.¹

This article – part two of three – explores the expansion of slavery in St Helena in the 1680s. The EIC imported greater numbers of enslaved people into the island in these decades and the company’s attitude towards labour also began to change: an increased incidence of slave rebellion and plans to develop a plantation economy in the colony encouraged the EIC to adopt much harsher laws and labour policies in St Helena, modelled explicitly on the rigorous Barbados slave codes. Other historians have observed that the EIC drew upon Barbados as a model for their plans to improve and diversify the economy of St Helena during the 1680s, but the scheme to develop a plantation economy on the island has never been studied in detail in *Wirebird*.² Studying the EIC’s efforts to foster the development of plantation slavery in St Helena in the late seventeenth century helps to underscore the significance of the Caribbean colonies within England’s emerging empire and how social and economic institutions which had

developed in the Caribbean island of Barbados served as a wide-ranging colonial model for the English, even influencing ideas and practices within the EIC and at St Helena.³

THE DEMISE OF THE “BLACK SERVANT” SYSTEM

An intermittent supply of labour and the disruptive actions of English planters and black servants throughout the 1670s hindered the agricultural development of St Helena. There were regular complaints that the EIC’s plantation was not “flourishing” like those owned by free planters, and in an attempt to remedy this situation and maximise production, the St Helena council was instructed to ensure that “all our black servants be constantly employed on our owne plantacion”.⁴ Unfortunately for the EIC, neither the black servants nor the white planters were particularly industrious workers, probably due to their distance from the effective oversight of the company’s directors in London.

In 1676, the EIC began to rethink its approach to colonial labour management following troubling reports that East Indian labourers sent to St Helena from Madras (Chennai, India) were stealing calicos from the company’s warehouse and that the English planter Francis Wrangham had been murdered while on a hunting trip by his enslaved worker, Robin. On 15 July 1676, the St Helena council declared that “if any black shall presume to hold up his hand against his master” or any other white person he “shall have his right hand cut off”.⁵ One week later, Robin was condemned to be “put to death in sight of his masters house” after admitting that he deliberately killed his master. Legal historians such as George William Van Cleeve contend that the fundamental distinction between slavery and other forms of unfree labour is the degree of brutality used in forms of punishment.⁶ The increasingly violent punishments that black workers were subject to in St Helena during the late 1670s and early 1680s, including the threat that they would be “severely whipped” if they broke the laws of St Helena, suggests the labour systems used on the island were beginning to more closely resemble the rigorous modes of enslavement that had become an established feature of the English colonies in the Caribbean and North America, and can be more reliably defined as a form of permanent and hereditary slavery.⁷

It was decided in 1677 that the EIC would not provide St Helena with any more black servants, but instead left the planters “at libertie to supply themselves as they have opportunitie at their own charge”.⁸ By 1680, reports that there were “about 80 blacks already upon the Island” caused the company’s directors to order resolutely that “noe more blacks be bought” because it was perceived as “dangerous to have too many black servants on the plantations lest they may mutiny and overpower the English”.⁹ The murder of Francis Wrangham in 1676, the attempted murder of another white planter by an enslaved person through stabbing, and fears about an island-wide slave rebellion in 1679 likely prompted the company to make this decision.¹⁰ Growing fears within the EIC’s directorate about the internal threat posed by black servants in St Helena would have been further stoked by the last minute discovery of a conspiracy among enslaved Africans in Barbados to overthrow their English masters and establish their own form

of government in May 1675.¹¹ This attempted rebellion generated a climate of fear throughout the English Caribbean, and was pivotal in shaping the hostile attitude towards the conversion of the enslaved by missionaries in the wider English empire.¹² After this seminal event in the English Caribbean there were no more instructions to manumit baptised slaves at the EIC's territories in the south Atlantic and the Indian Ocean, suggesting that the impact of the failed insurrection in Barbados may have also been felt in St Helena.

The EIC's concerns about the loyalty of the black servants in St Helena were heightened by the disobedient attitude of the English inhabitants of the island, particularly after three mutinous planters were sent home to England in April 1680.¹³ The threat of combined rebellion by both black servants and white planters on St Helena led the EIC to pass a series of laws in 1682 for the "better and more effectual suppressing [of] all mutinies and seditions that may be fomented amongst the inhabitants".¹⁴ By 1684, the company had decided it was necessary to send a copy of the "lawes and customes of Barbadoes" to St Helena, to share information with planters on the island about the 'government, workings, diet, times of labour, and use of their negroes'.¹⁵ The dispatch of Barbadian law books to St Helena – presumably the influential 1661 Barbados slave codes – was part of a wider programme in the mid-1680s to render St Helena profitable through the replication of the Barbadian plantation system.¹⁶ This involved inputs of capital, labour, and expertise and the implementation of more violent and repressive labour management techniques. In the 1680s the EIC began to exclusively use the language of "slavery" rather than "servitude" to describe black labourers in St Helena and licensed a number of slave trading voyages to Madagascar and Southeast Asia to deliver captives to the colony, markedly increasing the island's enslaved population.

THE BARBADIAN PLANTATION MODEL AND THE EXPANSION OF SLAVERY IN ST HELENA

The EIC thought of St Helena as a colony that could develop a thriving plantation economy during the 1680s. This is because the company's directors believed, erroneously, that the island possessed a tropical climate. For instance, in 1683 the EIC extolled the "severall singular and great advantages that that Island hath above any English plantacion we know in any part of the world", and sought to encourage the inhabitants to "make a better improvement of that great opportunity which God almighty by his Providence" had bestowed upon the island.¹⁷ Indeed, reports from 1689 suggest the EIC's policy towards plantation agriculture in St Helena was informed by misguided climatic ideas which prevailed in early modern Europe. These theories suggested that the island would have a tropical climate due to its latitude, and that the mountainous environment of St Helena caused dramatic variations in climate, with the valleys being "as hot as Barbados" and the peaks of the mountains "as cold as the middle parts of France".¹⁸ To exploit the supposedly fertile soil and tropical climate which sustained English settlement in the valleys of St Helena, the EIC instructed planters on the island to cultivate cash crops and alter their labour management techniques. Due to

their distance from the island, the company's directors in London remained unaware for several years that, despite its latitude, St Helena actually had a mild climate, and that their efforts to cultivate tropical cash crops would therefore encounter difficulties from the very beginning. By the time the St Helena planter Orlando Bagley could tell the company's directors in 1684 that "no West India commodities will grow well at St. Helena", the EIC had already devoted considerable resources to the project.¹⁹

Efforts to develop plantation agriculture in St Helena had begun in the 1660s and 1670s, but a sustained effort to render the colony profitable through the development of Barbadian-style plantations and other economic activities was initiated in 1683. Further discussion in London about the benefits enslaved workers could bring to the island and demographic evidence that "there are in Barbados usually 50,000 blacks for 6,000 whites and yet [they] are kept in subjection without other garrison than the planters themselves" convinced the EIC that the internal threat of slave rebellion could be managed by the white planters, encouraging the company's directors to revitalise plans "for great plantacions to be made" at St Helena.²⁰

On 1 August 1683 the EIC's directors wrote to Fort St George (Madras; now Chennai) to explain how they had thoughts "of making for the Company a large sugar plantacion with mills, sugar houses and still houses" at St Helena, and also a "large great indigoe plantacion".²¹ It was believed that there would be a good market in southern Persia (Iran) for the sugar and indigo produced at St Helena, and as a result, it was forbidden for "any other sugar works or stills to be used or erected upon our said island, resolving to make sugar, rum and molasses the Companies own comodities".²² The EIC was experiencing financial difficulties in the early 1680s, and the effort to establish a plantation economy in St Helena was motivated by a desire to reduce the expense of maintaining St Helena as a strategic refuelling point for company shipping. In April 1684, for instance, the EIC's directors wrote how the "Cattell, butter, cheese and poultry" already produced at St Helena would never make the Company "rich or refund...any considerable of [their] disbursements".²³ It was because the company's directors were seeking a way for St Helena to cover its own maintenance costs that the EIC was "everyday more resolved to prosecute the improvement of St. Helena by sugar works, indigo, cotton, saltpeter and many other wayes".²⁴

Beyond sugar and other cash crops produced in the Caribbean, during the 1680s the EIC also sought to experiment with the production of saltpetre, an important component in the manufacture of gunpowder, and the cultivation of spices in St Helena.²⁵ For example, in June 1683 the EIC wrote to Bengal to inform its employees that because they were beginning an "experiment of making Saltpetre upon our Island of St. Helena" they desired Job Charnock, at this time a senior merchant at Patna, to provide "the best informacon you can of the manner how and the cheapest waies of making that commodity there and [to] transmit the same to our governor and council" of St Helena. If possible, Charnock was to "hire one or two men that speake a little English and know the whole process and way of making saltpetre at Pattana to goe to St. Helena and teach our people the way of it".²⁶ The company's directors also envisioned that the production

of spices such as “nutmeg clove or cinnamon plants” in St Helena would allow them to circumvent the Dutch monopoly over the Banda Islands spice trade. In a March 1684 letter to the governor and council of St Helena, the EIC stated that they saw spices as a commodity with an “inestimable value to this Kingdome” and believed planters would have success in their experiments with its cultivation because of “the nature of cloves trees being to grow upon high land, such as St Helena is, and in much about the same latitude”.²⁷

The effort to diversify the economy of St Helena in the 1680s involved the transportation of seeds, raw material, expert overseers, and enslaved workers across the Atlantic and Indian oceans. The EIC deployed its global networks to supply “useful seeds and plants of India”, bricks from Persia, hard wood from Bengal for use as rollers in the sugar mills, and oxen from the East Indies to drive the machinery at the cane refineries.²⁸ To ensure St Helena planters always had a secure means of “supplying themselves with English servants and all commodities of England and Europe as cheap or cheaper than the planters of Barbados or Jamaica”, the EIC decided to send “one or two ships” to St Helena every year with people and provisions to assist in the development of the colony. The company’s directors hoped that by providing this support, in time, “all things will come to our Island much cheaper than they do to any plantacion in America”, and that therefore the ‘Company may in time gain something for the trade of that place’. Indeed, it was expected that growing cash crops such as sugar and cloves and having “the hands to cultivate their plantations” would ensure that the inhabitants of St Helena would “live and grow rich...as they have in Barbados, Jamaica and other worse places”.²⁹

To help stimulate the development of a plantation economy the EIC drew upon the knowledge of persons with experience in plantation production and the management of large numbers of enslaved Africans, including those who had lived and worked in the Caribbean. As early as 1673, the EIC’s directors emphasised that when it came to establishing plantation agriculture in St Helena, they were giving “due encouragement to all the inhabitants in carrying on the said work of planting by appointing some experienced persons to instruct and advise such as are ignorant in that affair”.³⁰ After the EIC began to devote considerable resources to the development of a plantation economy in 1683, the company’s directors stressed that the project was not to begin until they had found “proper overseers experienced in such affairs to send over”. They even implored the governor and council of St Helena “to be very carefull in the choice of those persons you intrust with the oversight of our plantacions and negroes, and the customs of our working tools and other materials”.³¹

Consequently, the EIC’s directors deployed their global networks of trade and exchange to employ individuals with relevant expertise and experience and bring them to St Helena. For example, those with Caribbean experience, including Thomas Howe, who was skilled in growing indigo and cotton, and Ralph Knight, who was an expert “overseer of such negroes as you shall imploye” on plantations, were vetted as candidates by the company’s directors in 1683 and transported to St Helena.³² Nathaniel Cox, an individual with experience as a slave overseer in Barbados, was reportedly

“well skilled in boyling of sugar and raising a sugar plantation from the planting of the canes to the refining of the sugar”. Lieutenant Robert Holden, the Deputy Governor of St Helena from 1683-89, was another person said to be well acquainted with the “production of indicoes, cotton, ginger and the other usual commodities of the West Indies”. Others who happened to visit St Helena and had useful knowledge of sugar cultivation also contributed their expertise. For example, a Dutch pilot who returned to Europe on the EIC vessel *Herbert* in 1684 showed the planters of St Helena how to improve the productivity of their sugar cane fields by using irrigation techniques. During his brief stay on the island, the unnamed Dutchman showed a joiner named Sherwyn the method of bringing “water from some springs upon your hills by rills through every rowe of your canes, which if you have convenience and skill to effect, there is little doubt but they will growe extraordinary large”.³³

The use of Caribbean expertise and the regular references to the English Caribbean – especially Barbados – in the directives issued by the EIC relating to the economic improvement of St Helena during the 1680s highlights the importance of the Barbadian plantation model to the company’s plans for the colony. It was the integrated plantation – an innovation of the seventeenth-century Barbadian sugar industry which improved the efficiency of sugar production by combining the cultivation of sugar and its processing in a single site – that made Barbados such an attractive model for colonial development. Underpinning the profitability and ‘success’ of the Barbadian plantation system was the importation of tens of thousands of captive Africans into the colony. Hundreds of enslaved people worked on the largest Barbadian estates, and they were controlled using violent and dehumanising labour management techniques. Brutal and severe punishments for misdemeanours, including whipping and the severing of appendages, was used to terrorise an enslaved majority and ensure the profits of sugar production continued to line the pockets of planters, merchants, and investors in both England and the Caribbean. After the Restoration in 1660, Barbadian economic development continued apace. David Eltis has calculated that total annual exports from Barbados in 1665-66 averaged £284.4 thousand sterling (over 90% from sugar exports), far more than any other European colony at this time. By the 1680s, Barbados had reached its peak economic moment, and was a centre of plantation production and a pivot point in Atlantic trade, making it the most important colony in the English empire.³⁴

Members of the EIC were clearly familiar with the Barbadian plantation system, as evidenced by the frequency with which they mentioned Barbados and its social and economic institutions in their correspondence. The EIC’s directorate in London was made up of merchants who had diversified business portfolios, which regularly included investments in the slave trading Royal African Company (hereafter RAC) and in Caribbean plantations as absentee proprietors. This gave them useful knowledge of how the Caribbean plantation system and the transatlantic slave trade worked, which they likely brought to meetings of the EIC and informed their plans for the economic development of St Helena. For instance, Sir Josiah Child – who was elected governor of the EIC in 1681 shortly before the company commenced efforts to develop

Barbadian-style plantation in St Helena – maintained a half-share in a 1330-acre Jamaica plantation and had served on the directorate of the RAC from 1675-76.³⁵

Patterns of intercolonial commerce at the edge of empire also brought members of the EIC and St Helena planters into contact with Barbados. By the late seventeenth century, goods such as tanned leather were being manufactured at St Helena and transported to Barbados, while small numbers of enslaved Africans were also sent in the other direction. In 1687, for instance, 15 enslaved Africans were transported from Barbados to St Helena by the Madagascar slave trader Captain Deacon and distributed amongst the planters. This was merely the first step in the EIC's plan to solidify commercial links with the English Caribbean, and it was hoped that captives would soon be supplied to St Helena on every Madagascar vessel returning from Barbados.³⁶ Indeed, the Madagascar slave trade forged some of the most important and lasting links between St Helena and Barbados. Beginning in the 1670s, increasing numbers of interloping slave traders looking to circumvent the RAC's monopoly over the West African slave trade rounded the Cape of Good Hope and exploited Madagascar as a new source of slave supply for the Caribbean plantation economy. St Helena was an important resupply point for these vessels as they made the long journey to the Caribbean. The EIC received reliable information in 1679 "that divers ships that come with negroes doe touch at our Island" for refreshment en route to the English Caribbean.³⁷ Large-scale slave trading ventures were mounted by Madagascar traders to Barbados in this period: on 20 May 1682 the Oxford imported "two hundred Madagascar negroes" to Barbados, while in the following year the Philip from New York delivered 100 captives purchased in Madagascar to the colony.³⁸

As knowledge of the profits created by the Barbadian plantation system circulated within the communication channels of the EIC, it influenced how the company sought to develop a plantation economy in St Helena, particularly with regard to labour. In the 1680s the EIC regularly stated in correspondence with its employees in Asia that they knew from experience that successful English plantations "cannot be effected without slaves".³⁹ They considered it "utterly impossible for any Europe plantacion to thrive between the Tropics...without [the] assistance and labour of negroes". A scarcity of slaves in St Helena was given as the principal reason why "the planters upon that Island [had] not yet found the way to produce any usefull or profitable commodity".⁴⁰ The company's directors therefore remained confident that once St Helena had been well "stockt with Negroes", every acre of arable land on the island would "be worth many more per acre than the best land of England, as it is in Barbados and other places of such like production that are thoroughly settled".⁴¹

Due to the widely held belief that enslaved labour was central to plantation development, after 1683 the EIC began to finance greater numbers of slave trading voyages to supply St Helena with enslaved workers for the plantation economy. The company's directors ordered in summer 1683 that "10 negroes" above 16 years old were to be brought on every ship from Fort St George to St Helena.⁴² These orders were reiterated in the spring of 1684, when the company wrote to its employees at Fort St

George and the Bay of Bengal to send up to ten male and female slaves on every ship to St Helena, along with rice to feed them on their journey. If some of the enslaved men had prior experience in “sugar works and saltpeter works or in planting indigo”, or had been trained as “carpenters, smiths or potters”, then the EIC was prepared to pay double the price for them in India.⁴³ This shows how enslaved workers were valued by the EIC not just for their manual work, but also the additional benefits to colonial life they brought through their agricultural knowledge, capabilities as artificers, and linguistic skills. Reports that the “Madagascar blacks in Barbadoes” were the most “ingenious of any blacks in learning manuell trades such as smiths, carpenters, coopers, masons, bricklayers” led the EIC to license Captain Robert Knox to purchase 250 captives at Madagascar and transport them to St Helena in 1684. In the same year they also signalled their intent to buy “60 or 80 Gold Coast negroes” from the RAC for the use of St Helena planters.⁴⁴

As greater numbers of captives were trafficked to St Helena during the 1680s, the enslaved population of the island increased significantly. To help white planters avert the threat of slave rebellion on the island – which was heightened following the recent deliveries of hundreds of enslaved workers – they ordered the governor and council to adopt more brutal labour management techniques modelled explicitly on Barbados. It has already been mentioned that the EIC sent a copy of the Barbadian slave codes to St Helena in 1684, which the planters were instructed to observe “as near as possible may be” to ensure the continued safety of the island as the enslaved population increased. The EIC instructed the governor and council of St Helena that enslaved workers in the colony were to be managed efficiently under the “rigours of the Barbados discipline” by putting “overseers over them as shall compel each of them to do a full day’s work”. Enslaved labourers in St Helena were to be clothed only in the cheapest clothes available and were to reside in small cabins “according to the manner of the plantacions in Barbados”.⁴⁵

One example of a law implemented in St Helena during the 1680s that was derived from the legal codes of Barbados was that all free planters who owned more than “4 negroes” had to employ one English man as an overseer for the “watching and warding” of the plantation, and that “as the negroes do increase upon the island” there had to also be a corresponding growth in the garrison and soldiers for the security of the inhabitants. From 1683, it was ordered that “all free planters and all persons living within the said island that are able to bear arms (except the blacks) shall be duly quartered as they have been and instantly upon all alarums appear at their respective quarters in arms”.⁴⁶ Such measures were intended to help prevent slave rebellion. Much like in Barbados, beginning in the 1680s the free movement of black inhabitants of St Helena was viewed with increased suspicion and more strictly policed. For example, at a St Helena council meeting in April 1682 concerns were raised about how “many blacks of the sayd Island doe in their travelling to and fro presume to enter into men’s houses”. Legal restrictions were subsequently imposed which stipulated that “noe black man or woman doe presume to enter into any man’s house” without first “calling at some distance from the sayd house unto the owner or occupyer of the same, and obteyning leave to have

admittance”. If no reply was received, then any black inhabitant that “shall dare to adventure to enter into the sayd house or houses” would receive “the penalty of being most severely punish”, and their master would be liable “for any hurt or damage that the owner of the sayd house shall suffer by their sayd blacks”.⁴⁷

If any enslaved people were caught breaking the laws of the island, the EIC ordered for them to be “severely whipped”.⁴⁸ In 1686 the company’s directors grew concerned that the punishments being meted out by colonists were not as brutal as they had ordered, and that this increased the risk of island-wide slave rebellion. For example, when corporal punishment was used to punish a enslaved worker in June 1686, the EIC responded that they “thought very meanly” of the St Helena council for letting those “blacks pass with whipping which an English man would have been condemned to dye by a jury”. The company’s directors found this weakness of judgment to be even more concerning because Nathaniel Cox, who before working for the EIC had been employed as an overseer on Christopher Codrington’s Barbados plantation, should have appreciated more than any other man in St Helena that “the English could not keep the knife from their throats at Barbados if they did not punnish their theevish blacks with farr greater severity”.⁴⁹ Such evidence demonstrates the extent to which the EIC’s attitude towards slave labour in St Helena had undergone a significant shift during the 1680s. The desire to emulate Barbados led to more legal restrictions and brutal punishments being imposed on the black inhabitants of the island when compared to the more lenient “black servant” system the company’s directors had theorised in preceding decades.

CONCLUSION

In the 1680s the EIC sought to make its colony of St Helena more profitable by diversifying its economy, principally through the development of a plantation economy modelled on the success of the Caribbean island of Barbados. These efforts had long-term ramifications for St Helena: the hundreds of captives brought to the island in the 1680s increased the enslaved population of the island and the more rigorous law codes that were implemented in this decade further curtailed the freedoms of island’s black inhabitants.

However, by the early 1690s it had become evident that the EIC’s vision of establishing sprawling sugar plantations in St Helena was not going to be successful. Although the EIC’s directors were clearly well informed about patterns of social and economic development in the Caribbean and devoted significant resources to the development of a plantation economy in St Helena, the EIC’s project failed due to a variety of local climatic, environmental, and geographical factors. A detailed analysis of the reasons underpinning this lack of success and an exploration of the consolidation of slavery in St Helena in the period 1694-1730 will be the subject of my final article in the next issue of *Wirebird*.

AUTHOR'S NOTE

Dr Michael D. Bennett is a Research Associate at The University of Manchester, working on the AHRC-funded “Legacies of the British Slave Trade” project. He is an historian of the English (later British) empire in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Michael developed an interest in St Helena while writing his Masters thesis on the East India Company and slavery at the University of Kent. Parts of this research have recently been published in *Atlantic Studies* and the edited volume *Slavery and Bonded Labor in Asia, 1250–1900*.

REFERENCES

- ¹ Michael D. Bennett, ‘Slavery in Early St Helena, Part One: The ‘Black Servant’ System, 1659-1682’, *Wirebird: Journal of the Friends of St Helena*, Vol. 50 (2021), pp. 46-60. See also: Michael D. Bennett, ‘Slaves, Weavers, and the Peopling of East India Company Colonies, 1660-1730’, in Richard B. Allen, ed., *Slavery and Bonded Labor in Asia, 1250-1900* [Studies in Global Slavery, Vol. 10], (Leiden: Brill, 2022), pp. 229-255.
- ² Alexander Schulenberg, “Transient Observations: The Textualizing of St Helena Through Five Hundred Years of Colonial Discourse” (PhD thesis, University of St Andrews, 1999.), pp. 158, 201–202, 223, 326–327; Stephen Royle, *The Company’s Island: St Helena, Company Colonies, and the Colonial Endeavour* (London, 2007), pp. 26–27; Phillip Stern, *The Company-State: Corporate Sovereignty and the Early Modern Foundations of the British Empire in India* (Oxford, 2011), p. 22; Kathleen Wilson, “Rethinking the Colonial State: Family, Gender, and Governmentality in Eighteenth-Century British Frontiers”, *The American Historical Review*, Vol. 116, No. 5 (2011), p. 1307, 1311; John McAleer, “Looking East: St Helena, the South Atlantic and Britain’s Indian Ocean World”, *Atlantic Studies*, Vol. 13, No. 1 (2016), p. 81.
- ³ Some of these ideas are explored in greater detail in: Michael D. Bennett, ‘Caribbean plantation economies as colonial models: The case of the English East India Company and St. Helena in the late seventeenth century’, *Atlantic Studies* (2022).
- ⁴ London to St Helena, 20 May 1681, BL, IOR E/3/89, f. 203.
- ⁵ London to St Helena, 17 October 1676, BL, IOR E/3/88, f. 170; St Helena Consultation, 15 July 1676, BL, IOR G/32/2, ff. 7-10.
- ⁶ George William Van Cleve, *A Slaveholders’ Union: Slavery, Politics, And The Constitution In The Early American Republic* (Chicago, 2010), pp. 70-71.
- ⁷ London to St Helena, 5 April 1684, BL, IOR E/3/90, ff. 175-176.
- ⁸ London to St Helena, 6 April 1677, BL, IOR E/3/88, f. 219.
- ⁹ London to St Helena, 24 March 1679/80, BL, IOR E/3/89, f. 123.
- ¹⁰ Royle, *Company’s Island*, pp. 93-99.
- ¹¹ Hilary Beckles, *Black Rebellion in Barbados: The Struggle Against Slavery, 1627-1838* (Antilles Publications, 1984), p. 37-39.
- ¹² Katharine Gerbner, “The Ultimate Sin: Christianising Slaves in Barbados in the Seventeenth Century”, *Slavery & Abolition*, Vol. 31, No. 1, pp. 57-73.
- ¹³ London to St Helena, 14 April 1680, BL, IOR E/3/89, f. 215.
- ¹⁴ London to St Helena 14 March 1681/2, BL, IOR E/3/89 f. 277.
- ¹⁵ London to St Helena, 5 April 1684, BL, IOR E/3/90, f. 178; London to St Helena, 1 August 1683, BL, IOR E/3/90, f. 95.
- ¹⁶ For the 1661 Barbados slave codes, see: TNA, CO 30/2, 16–26.
- ¹⁷ London to St Helena, 1 August 1683, BL, IOR E/3/90, f. 93.
- ¹⁸ Instructions for Mr Poirior Supervisor of all the Company’s Plantations, Vineyards and Cattle in the Island of St Helena, 22 February 1688/89, BL, IOR E/3/92, f. 19.
- ¹⁹ London to St Helena, 5 April 1684, BL, IOR E/3/90, f. 179.

- ²⁰ London to St Helena, 1 August 1683, BL, IOR E/3/90, f. 91; London to Fort St George, June 13 1683, BL, IOR E/3/90, f. 83.
- ²¹ London to St Helena, 1 August 1683, BL, IOR E/3/90, f. 95.
- ²² London to St Helena, 5 April 1684, BL, IOR E/3/90, f. 175.
- ²³ London to Surat, 7 April 1684, BL, IOR E/3/90, f. 177.
- ²⁴ London to Bengal, 5 March 1683/84, BL, IOR E/3/90, f. 159.
- ²⁵ London to St Helena, 1 August 1683, BL, IOR E/3/90, ff. 93-94.
- ²⁶ London to Bengal, 20 June 1683, BL, IOR E/3/90, f. 83; London to Bengal, 5 March 1683/84, BL, IOR E/3/90, f. 159.
- ²⁷ London to Bengal, 5 March 1683/84, BL, IOR E/3/90, f. 159.
- ²⁸ London to St Helena, 1 August 1683, BL, IOR E/3/90, ff. 95-96; London to St Helena, 5 April 1684, BL, IOR E/3/90, f. 174; London to Bengal, 5 March 1683/84, BL, IOR E/3/90, f. 159.
- ²⁹ London to St Helena, 1 August 1683, BL, IOR E/3/90, f. 91.
- ³⁰ Commission and Instructions to the Governor and Council of St Helena, 19 December 1673, BL, IOR E/3/88, f. 43.
- ³¹ London to St Helena, 1 August 1683, BL, IOR E/3/90, f. 95.
- ³² London to St Helena, 1 August 1683, BL, IOR E/3/90, f. 98; London to St Helena, 5 April 1684, BL, IOR E/3/90, ff. 177-178.
- ³³ London to St Helena, 26 November 1684, BL, IOR E/3/90, f. 251; London to St Helena, 5 April 1684, BL, IOR E/3/90, f. 175.
- ³⁴ On the history of early Barbados, see: Michael D. Bennett, "Merchant Capital and the Origins of the Barbados Sugar Boom, 1627-72" (PhD Thesis, University of Sheffield, 2020); David Eltis, *The Rise of African Slavery in the Americas* (Cambridge, 2000), pp. 198-199.
- ³⁵ Bennett, "Caribbean Plantation Economies as Colonial Models", pp. 9-10.
- ³⁶ London to St Helena, 3 August 1687, BL, IOR E/3/91, f. 181, 186.
- ³⁷ London to St Helena, 16 May 1679, BL, IOR E/3/89, f. 69.
- ³⁸ Barbados Shipping Returns 1678-1703, TNA CO 33/13, f. 11 & f. 16.
- ³⁹ London to Bengal, 5 March 1683/84, BL, IOR E/3/90, f. 159.
- ⁴⁰ London to St Helena, 26 November 1684, BL, IOR E/3/90, f. 251.
- ⁴¹ London to St Helena, 15 August 1683, BL, IOR E/3/90, f. 108.
- ⁴² London to Fort St George, 13 June 1683, BL, IOR E/3/90, f. 83; London to St Helena, 1 August 1683, BL, IOR E/3/90, f. 91.
- ⁴³ London to Bengal, 5 March 1683/84, BL, IOR E/3/90, f. 159.
- ⁴⁴ London to St Helena, 5 April 1684, BL, IOR E/3/90, f. 180; Instructions to Captain Robert Knox of the Tonqueen Merchant, 4 April 1684, BL, IOR E/3/90, ff. 182-183; London to St Helena, 26 November 1684, BL, IOR E/3/90, f. 251.
- ⁴⁵ London to St Helena, 5 April 1684, BL, IOR E/3/90, ff. 175-176, 178; London to St Helena, 1 August 1683, BL, IOR E/3/90, f. 95.
- ⁴⁶ London to St Helena, 1 August 1683, BL, IOR E/3/90, ff. 90-91.
- ⁴⁷ St Helena Consultation, 10 April 1682, BL, IOR G/32/2, ff. 13-14.
- ⁴⁸ London to St Helena, 5 April 1684, BL, IOR E/3/90, ff. 175-176, f. 178; London to St Helena, 1 August 1683, BL, IOR E/3/90, f. 95.
- ⁴⁹ London to St Helena, 3 August 1687, BL, IOR G/32/1, f. 49.