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Preface

It is appropriate that the Grace, Kennedy Foundation’s Lecture Committee should have selected as the subject of its Public Lecture in the year 2000, “Factors in the Creation of Contemporary Jamaica”; and Professor Patrick Bryan to deliver it. This Lecture is a tour de force.

He begins by identifying the major influences, which have shaped Jamaica’s history in a range of facets. First, is the long history of association with the Atlantic world, but primarily as a colony under more than three centuries of British rule, the Spanish influence not retained despite the preceding 160 years of ownership.

The next is the Island’s geopolitical position in relation to North and South America and the Caribbean. The third factor is the importation of African slaves. Before the arrival of these three, were the indigenous peoples, the Tainos, who were decimated by the Spanish. (Incidentally, those of us who attended elementary school during the 1920s and early 39s were taught that the original inhabitants of Jamaica were Arawaks.)

Professor Bryan analyses the system of slavery and the ideological foundations of racism; observing along the way, the relations between Europeans and Africans – both sets imported. There is a “continuous and dynamic process of adaptation, creolization, and cultural synthesis as Europe and Africa met in a new land, continuously, over 300 years.”

He takes us to more modern times: the 1938 riots and resulting Moyne Commission, the workers’ movement, a blend of politics and unionism with the emergence of Bustamante and Norman Manley. Next he moves to political independence, the Cold War, Black Power, “the left”; and Edward Seaga and Michael Manley.

Finally, Professor Bryan reflects on the current context – contemporary Jamaica of “continuity and change”.

(Incidentally, there is a reference to two books by Charles W. Mills. The author is not the U.S. specialist in Ethical Theory, Charles Wright, but a Jamaican philosopher, Charles Wade Mills).

Professor the Hon. Gladstone E. Mills, O.J., C.D.
Chairman
Grace, Kennedy Foundation
Professor Patrick Bryan
Professor Patrick Earle Bryan
Grace, Kennedy Lecturer 2000

The Grace, Kennedy Foundation continues to draw heavily upon the talent at UWI as we seek to attract the best and most appropriate presenters in the series of Grace, Kennedy Foundation Lectures.

For this year’s lecture, we have reached for the Professor of History at Mona, Patrick Earle Bryan, BA Hons. History, Spanish, University of the West Indies (UWI), Mona; MA History, UWI, Mona; Ph.D. History, University College, London. He is a Jamaican, born in the year of that great hurricane in 1944. (We are not accusing him of causing it, though in his subsequent labours he may have exhibited some of its characteristics!).

He received his formal education at Wolmer’s Boys’ School, UWI, the University of Texas and University College, London. Dr. Bryan is a distinguished historian with special interest in Latin America. He has had the distinction of Fulbright Fellowships to the University of New Mexico in 1982 and Fulbright Fellowship of John Hopkins University in 1986. He has been teaching for thirty-five years at both high school and university levels, starting at Clarendon College in 1965 through Manchester High School in 1967-1969 and steadily up the ladder at the UWI to become professor in 1997.

Our lecturer is a well-published scholar with books on the Haitian Revolution, Marcus Garvey, Emancipation and Jamaican Society, and numerous articles in learned journals both in Jamaica and abroad. The list is too long to be detailed in this brief introduction. Suffice it to say that through his books, articles and addresses to numerous international conferences, Professor Bryan’s influence as an intellectual of international repute makes him a son of whom Jamaica is very proud.

The Grace, Kennedy Foundation is proud to receive and present Professor Patrick Earle Bryan, M.A., and Ph.D.

The subject he presents to us today is Inside and Outside In – factors in the Creation of Contemporary Jamaica.
C. Samuel Reid
Chairman
Grace, Kennedy Foundation Lecture Committee
Introduction

If I were asked to name three factors that have most shaped Jamaica’s history, I would suggest, firstly, the long history of association with the Atlantic World, and especially the three hundred years of British rule between 1655 and 1962. That association has shaped the Jamaican economy and has vastly contributed to the country’s political, constitutional, economic, technological, legal, and cultural experience.

A second factor I would suggest is geopolitical. Jamaica, an island completely surrounded by the Caribbean Sea, constituted a vital part of what the Dominican historian Juan Bosch has called the Caribbean imperial frontier. The island was the nerve centre of British attack and eventually defence in the Caribbean where British fortifications arched southwards from Jamaica following the broken line of the Caribbean archipelago. The island’s proximity to the North and South American Mainland has placed it in a strategic position vis-à-vis the two American continents. Buccaneering attacks from Port Royal against the Spanish Mainland secured the British Caribbean and, under the principle of ‘No Peace Beyond the Line’, European powers fought in the Caribbean Sea to break and make treaties to consolidate hegemonic power in Europe. The Spanish Caribbean – including Jamaica – was the nucleus from which the British penetrated the Spanish Mainland Empire. For over three hundred years Jamaica has fallen within the commercial and military geo-political space of North America. The island served as a base for the re-export of African slaves to the Spanish Mainland in exchange for Spanish bullion. With the gradual withdrawal of Britain in the twentieth century, Jamaica joined the rest of the Caribbean (including the Spanish Caribbean) as the ‘Fifth Frontier’ of the United States. Jamaica also formed a major part of the nucleus of cheap labour for United States capital in Central America and the Spanish Caribbean. Through this fifth frontier now pass narcotics and toxic waste. Jamaica lies at the centre between North and South America in narcotics trafficking. In the 1920s Jamaica was a major centre for the smuggling of opium between North and South America.

A third major influence on our history was the importation of some 700,000 African slaves out of the 11.7 million (some say 15 million) estimated to have arrived in the
Americas over the long period of the slave trade. Africans provided the labour force for almost every aspect of economic life, introduced cultures that conflicted, and synchronized with, that of the European minority’s culture in the island. For most of the colonial period, ironically, the culture of the majority of the population was regarded as the minority culture. And this is so because when a people are conquered their gods have also been defeated or, at best, have become part of the pantheon of gods of the conquering group. European conquest never left room for other gods in its ideological drive for cultural exclusiveness. But the old gods survived in modified form through a process of cultural synthesis.

The migration of Europeans and Africans to the land of the dead Tainos also meant that no segment of the population enjoyed or could enjoy a primeval attachment to the Jamaican soil. However, the existence of a social, economic and political system based on the enslavement of one race by another implanted two concepts. One concept was the inequality of the races (given intellectual justification by Europeans and accepted by segments of the conquered population) and the other the opposing concepts of freedom and equality. Freedom and equality, in turn, relate not only to larger issues of race, class, and culture, but also to Jamaica’s unequal integration into the international economic system.

These factors largely determined the course of Jamaica’s history, though their manifestation in the historical process of change and continuity has varied at different periods in our history.

As we look back over five hundred years, there is little to remind us of the prior existence of the animistic Tainos on Jamaican soil. The accounts of the conquistadores and Spanish priests, their consciousness moulded by the spiritually and territorially victorious Reconquista, have left only a limited record. The Spaniards and their fellow Europeans brought with them a concept of total war and a passion for the control and domination of all nature. And so, over two continents, the Europeans went in search of El Dorado, the Golden Man. In their quest, they adopted the Taino canoe since, for their own time and space, the Tainos had created technologies appropriate for their existence – the canoe, the stone axe, the cultivation and processing of cassava. Any technology would do to find El Dorado. Surely enough, El Dorado proved to be a myth, but there were silver mines, and
plantation agriculture and commerce converted sugar into gold. A materialistic civilization, modified only by the fear of eternal damnation (and sometimes not even that) ensued in the Caribbean.

Jamaican history has to be analysed at two levels. The first is the one in which the island’s economic history was and probably is little more than an appendage of the Atlantic economy; during which slavery became the major arm of capitalist globalization. The other level is the evolution of internal structures initially implanted by the forces of colonialism and which, developing a logic of their own, cannot be reduced to the country’s external ties to the Atlantic trade and to the British metropolis.

From outside the Caribbean came the demand for sugar from the seventeenth century, coffee from the end of the eighteenth, bananas in the late nineteenth and after the 1950s, bauxite and tourism. Economic ties with the Atlantic World had generated a demand for servile labour from the period of the Spanish occupation of the island (c, 1500 to 1655). The Spaniards effectively eradicated the Taino population, together with their communal existence, and shaped the community according to the individualist, capitalist categories of Europe. African slave labour provided the basis for the new economy.

Jamaica’s pattern of production was, after 1655, tied formally to the British market through mercantilist legislation, and was also closely integrated with the Thirteen Colonies of North America whose economy, complementing Jamaica’s provided commodities such as cotton, salted provisions, livestock, and timber in exchange for rum and molasses. The Island, except for its century and a half of Spanish rule, was always linked with the most technologically advanced centres of the Western World. Yet its technological base was always narrow and remained oriented towards the exploitation of wasting assets for the production of goods in demand overseas. It is probably true, also, that two of the major legacies of colonialism have been an obsession with the acquisition of wealth by any means, and the exploitation of our assets for immediate gain without long-term planning.

The predominant European nation that shaped Jamaica, in terms of language, political, religious institutions and technology has been Britain, superseded only in
the twentieth century by the USA. Britain through the plantation system introduced
the most modern of technology known at the time, to create profitable plantations.
English (and eventually British) colonialism reshaped Jamaican society by
transferring the growing slave plantation system already well developed in the
Eastern Caribbean to Jamaica. African slavery became the backbone of British
Jamaica and the link with the European economy intensified. Since the slave trade
continued through to 107, the cultural and personal links with Africa remained until
that year, and for a short time in the post-Emancipation period there was a revival –
on the basis of indenture – of African migration to Jamaica. There is, then, a
continuous and dynamic process of adaptation, creolization, and cultural synthesis
as Europe and Africa continuously met in a new land over three hundred years.

The links with Great Britain merged easily with North America that has in the
twentieth century exercised an enormous role in the institutional evolution of
Jamaica. The influence from North America is not confined to the impact of white
America. Black American history not only runs parallel to our own history but also
has had, at various points in time, an identifiable influence on Jamaican life. To a
considerable extent Jamaica’s history has always been the history of globalization,
even if it is assumed that the island’s historic role has been on the periphery. It is in
this sense that Jamaica’s history is given its unique features – albeit comparable to
other British Caribbean and Latin American territories. It has always been part of
the Atlantic World in a cultural and geopolitical sense. It is primarily a western
nation in terms of our political, constitutional, and economic orientation. Values
from across the Atlantic and from North America are often imported because of
proximity, migration, and increasingly sophisticated channels of communication.
Yet Jamaica’s culture – in the broadest sense of the meaning of the term culture –
goes beyond a simple African/European dichotomy. African slaves adjusted their
own cultures to fit their new situation in the Caribbean. That African culture
continued to be modified through time. If one sees our history as a continuum in
terms of a ‘black struggle’ there is a world of difference between Tacky, Sam
Sharpe, Theophilus Scholes, Marcus Garvey and the Rastafarian Movement, which
has itself, evolved since its foundations in the 1920s. Even if there was continuity in
the principle of freedom, the world had changed, and the principle had to be
reasserted in terms of the context of the age. Each age invents its weapons of
destruction and its tools of construction. Each age also defines its concept of ‘suffering’.

The Europeans recognizing that change is often central to survival, also had their adjustments to make. In the religious arena alone there is a vast difference between Rev. Bridges on the one and Rev. William Knibb and Archbishop Enos Nuttall on the other. While European culture offered an intensely materialistic and individualistic culture to Jamaican society, it was also responsible – even if not systematically – for essential contributions to the non-material aspects of life, including in the fine arts. And those contributions continue because institutions in Europe and the United States, even after political independence, effectively trained Jamaicans (and other ex-colonials) in their methodologies, offering exposure to their own culture. Regrettably, the possession of European culture was often interpreted as something to demonstrate social distance.

Nationalism, in its mission to create distinct identities as part of the continued resistance to European domination, routinely views metropolitan culture as an imposition. It is true that societies do not change quickly, that attitudes founded in the sanction of habit remain constant over large spans of time. In this ‘universal culture’, Western Europe and the United States have taken pride of place because the progress of human civilization has been marked by the triumph of Europe. Cannons alternating with canons made the triumph of Europe possible in the so-called Third World, including Jamaica. One of these canons has been the belief in white supremacy, thereby forcing the ex-colonial world to consider liberation in terms of racial liberation. Ethnicity has its limits because some ethnic communities view themselves as superior to other ethnic groups while they themselves shun the concept of equality across ethnic groups – or to use one of the latest terms – ‘subaltern’ groups. Centuries of subordination by Jamaican blacks, matched by the same period of super-ordination by whites, have induced many Jamaican blacks to believe in their incapability rather than in their capacity.

I have divided this lecture into seven sections.

The first traverses the long period of slavery in Jamaican history and its companion racism.
The second examines the question of the process of abolition of slavery, which demonstrates the continuing interplay between external and internal forces on the evolution of Jamaican society.

The third and fourth analyse the impact on Jamaica of slave emancipation, and specifically how the forces of inequality and capitalist globalization continued to shape Jamaican society down to 1938.

The fifth discusses the impact of the events of 1938 and examines how Jamaica has sought to refashion its identity in face of the continued structural integration into the Atlantic economy, and the overwhelming influence of metropolitan culture.

The sixth section discusses the political independence and the final section assesses contemporary Jamaica.
Chapter One

Slavery and Racism

I will focus on three things in this section of the lecture. Firstly, I will look at the slave system and the ideological foundations of racism, which were destined to have long term consequences for Jamaica. Secondly, I will examine the ambivalent situation of Europeans in Jamaica who, despite their indubitable loyalty to the British homeland, were caught in the dilemma created by the tendency of the metropolis to subordinate their economic interests to metropolitan interests. Thirdly, I will examine briefly the establishment of constitutional government, which was consistent with the hierarchical structure of the society, vesting awesome powers in the hands of the plantation owners.

The Ideology of the Conquerors

Under Spanish rule, African slaves constituted close to half of the population of Jamaica, the Christian religion (the Roman Catholic denomination) was introduced, a Jewish population existed, and the Maroons were already a visible and well-organized presence. African slavery was the backbone of the Spanish Jamaican pastoral economy, which exported lard and hides and produced small quantities of sugar for local use. Spain had laid the basis of modern Jamaica. The English regime, beginning in 1655, was a continuation of the Spanish one, barring such omissions as the absence of a Catholic Church, replaced by the Anglicans. Even the Spanish Capital, Villa de la Vega, was converted into the English Capital of Spanish Town.

Beginning in the late seventeenth century, but increasingly during the course of the eighteenth century, the British fully adopted the system of African slavery for the promotion of plantation agriculture in Jamaica, a system already tried and tested in Barbados, St. Kitts, and Nevis. Jamaica had more land space than all the other British Caribbean Islands combined. The promotion of both sugar and slavery meant that by the middle of the eighteenth century the ratio of Africans to Europeans in Jamaica was ten to one.
The Iberians, who had enslaved Africans from long before the conquest of the Americas, had developed negative images and stereotypes of the black race – notwithstanding the humanity of the body of legislation created by Alfonso the Wise between 1263 and 1265 and known as the *Siete Partidas*. Racism preceded but was intensified by Caribbean slavery. Not surprisingly, racism made its ideological appearance within fifty years of the Spanish conquest, when Gines de Sepulveda, the Spanish humanist, argued that the Indians were lesser human beings or as he called them ‘homunculi’. Having concluded that the Native Americans were ‘homunculi’, he proceeded to justify their enslavement based on Aristotelian logic, which clearly stated that the ‘unintelligent’ could be justifiably enslaved by the ‘intelligent’. Such views of non-European races were developed later by the British. John Locke, for example, one of Britain’s most revered and illustrious philosophers, took the view that the

…unEnlightened Native Americans are not sufficiently ‘industrious and rational’ to appropriate and add value to the land God has given them, unlike hardworking day laborers in England; so their later expropriation by European settlers is clearly justifiable.¹

Other Europeans, including Kant and Emer de Vattel, were to follow in similar vein.

One of the peculiarities of the conquest and settlement of Jamaica by the Europeans was that the conquerors (the Europeans) and the conquered (the Africans) were both imported into a land where the aboriginal population had been destroyed by war and disease. Thus, at one level the European settlers in Jamaica represented the metropolis. They were the political agents of empire, the organizers of the plantation system, with the day to day responsibility for the running of a slave-based society. They represented the culture of the metropolis and their relative closeness to the centre of empire endowed them with unprecedented social authority. Racism provided the rationale for institutional development directed towards cultural and legal domination of the coloured population.
On the other hand, insofar as they were subject to imperial sanction, they operated, very often unwillingly, within the parameters laid down by the metropolis. In this sense, their freedom was limited, providing thereby another type of struggle for equality and freedom. Jamaican leaders, who were of course primarily Englishmen living in Jamaica, never for a moment thought of themselves as a backward part of the Empire. On the contrary, they saw themselves as part of the creation, advance and consolidation of the Empire. They were Englishmen, above all, whose liberties Law, the noblest tradition of the British, had sanctioned. The fact that such liberties could not be extended to Africans was not of immediate concern since, for them, the latter constituted, in the European view, a savage version of humanity. They were also entitled, in their view, as Englishmen living in the tropics to all the freedoms of Englishmen living in England. The Magna Carta (which had originally defined those freedoms) was their entailed inheritance. Since their interests often conflicted with those of the British Government, the Jamaican Assembly was notorious for its opposition to British Governors in the defence of a Jamaican as opposed to a metropolitan interest. They helped to consolidate the British hold on Jamaica (and in fact the Caribbean) when there was no British Navy to speak of. Port Royal generated, through trade, capital that was eventually invested in sugar plantations. Buccaneers held Jamaica for the English. Booty found its way into the British economy.

The British Government always made it clear that Jamaican or any other colonial interests would always be subordinate to metropolitan and particularly metropolitan economic interests. The Whites in Jamaica, however, recognized that their physical safety depended fundamentally on the British Armed Forces and Navy, when those had been well consolidated. The Puritans, Quakers and others had sailed to America to create for themselves patterns of life which religious intolerance did not permit them in England. The English came to Jamaica because here, “it was convenient for His Majesty’s subjects to make money.” The fundamental concern was not with the creation of a community of believers, but a community of bounty-seekers.

Yet their consciousness as members of the English establishment overseas introduced into the island the first experience of the practice of constitutional government, although a government obviously very limited in terms of representation, and which demonstrated the philosophical difference between
constitutionalism and democracy. The Jamaica Constitution was designed to reflect planter power exclusively. There was a clear white – European hierarchy of white planter/attorney, overseer, bookkeeper, and artisan. But the divisions between whites based on geographical place of origin and occupation was given less ideological significance in face of the greater concern of whites to defend themselves against enslaved people.

But there is another dimension that is equally important. The white elite identified themselves both according to racial criteria and European cultural criteria, but also with their compatriots in Britain, more so than with the ‘people’ of the island. European culture was the ‘high culture’, African culture the ‘low culture’. That is, European identification was never with the African majority but with the British metropolis, whatever the British metropolis thought of them. The power they wielded over the black population both before and after Emancipation was founded on the concept that black people were a ‘conquered’ (later the term became ‘subject’) people, and the British Army and Navy were the ultimate mechanism to assist the local whites to keep the black and coloured population in order. The fortifications and military bases in Port Royal and elsewhere were intended to drive back not only foreign invasions but also local insurrections of slaves against masters, blacks against whites. In this situation, concepts of equality of citizenship and equality of persons were difficult to universalize. Jamaican planters considered it their right to enjoy all the political and constitutional rights of Englishmen, including the rights to the free enjoyment of their property. The temper of British society was that those privileges, at least before the nineteenth century, belonged to a propertied elite. However, the partnership between planters and the British in the exploitation of slave labour proved an unequal one.

The acquisition and preservation as well as the transmission of property are a fairly sure mechanism to create inequalities even in a society that is ethnically homogeneous. In Jamaica, that ethnic homogeneity did not exist, so that a profound class chasm and an even deeper racial chasm between white rulers and a black enslaved class exaggerated inequality. The class chasm was deepened by the racial chasm.
The slaves faced a different kind of inequality. Whiteness and European culture possessed exclusively by Europeans in Jamaica effectively created social distance between whites and blacks in the island, and the line of division between those who ruled and those who were ruled. For, despite areas of general legislation always necessary to regulate impersonal relations within communities, a large proportion of the laws of Jamaica were dedicated to the control by a small white minority of a large coloured majority. It was not only the content of the law that counted. Equally important was that the framers of the law doubled as the employers of their slave labourers against whom the laws were directed.

The refusal to obey the request of the Bishop of London in 1690 (thirty-five years after the English conquest) to Christianize the African population is one example of the determination to define social distance between the enslaved and those who enslaved. The Bishop’s edict was generally ignored for another one hundred years. However, the reluctance of the Jamaican leadership to bring Africans into the mainstream of Christianity was based on two other concerns: firstly, that to teach slaves (Africans) Christianity would be to “barbarise” the Gospel and secondly, to expose slaves to concepts of equality. From the late seventeenth century, Virginians had begun to make it clear in law that “baptisme doth not alter the condition of the person as to his bondage or ffreedome”. In the same period, the Jamaican Legislature ruled that the “enslaved were ‘reasonable creatures and capable of being taught the principles of our religion’” but protected themselves by declaring that “even conversion was not a passport to freedom.”

Not until the Moravian, Methodist, and Baptist churches entered the Island in the second half of the eighteenth century was any serious effort made to evangelize the slaves. However, by the start of the nineteenth century the establishment, and the Anglican Church, had come to recognize that Christianity wisely used could also be an effective means to inculcate habits of thrift, industry, and obedience. The extended period during which Africans were not exposed systematically to Christianity ensured significant continuities in African culture, including religious culture, in the Island.

African slaves held a range of beliefs in the ancestral spirits who propitiated in worship. Ancestor worship or cult worship “embraced diverse ritual practices which
involved water, forest, air, and earth spirits.” With the reordered religious universe founded in the Caribbean, other forms of expression were associated such as “instrument and artifact making – drums dedicated to the gods, statues, masks, and objects to represent them – the establishment of sacred places, rituals, objects, and a panoply of dance and drama.”

Society among the slaves themselves developed complex features. Firstly, there took place what Kamau Brathwaite has referred to as a creolization process in which Africans developed new modes of communication, necessitated by the dispersed area of the African continent from which they had come and despite the tensions that no doubt had crossed the Atlantic with them. Although there was “an underlying unity to the broad Niger-Congo grouping (especially in its Bantu branch) from which the people in the main originated…. [t]his unity did not prevent the emergence of separate ethnic groups with their separate identities in Africa….”

The value system, the authority-structure on the plantation, the lines of command were vastly different from the African experience where work “took place in small kin-based groups with a domestic slave possibly also involved in the process. The situation in Jamaica was different. The workforce was ethnically mixed, deliberately. But daily associations, common activity, common residences, led gradually to a mixing of ideas and a reduction of cultural distinctiveness, which to a considerable extent created a black ethnicity in confrontation with an already highly developed white ethnicity. As Robotham has noted

Few things can break down stereotypes more thoroughly than being compelled to work together over long periods of time with groups of others with whom one is subject to a common punishment and misery and on whom one is dependent as a matter of everyday life and death. This process eroded traditional ethnicities, and built up new social and kinship relations, and consolidated ties in the labour force on a single estate.”

In her discussion of Maya society, Nancy Farris suggests that there probably emerged a “central core of concepts and principles, serving as a framework within which modifications could be made and providing a distinctive shape to the new patterns that emerged.” Conceivably, also, on the African coast itself there was already a growing creolization process that was deepened on the Island.
In recent times the so-called ‘subaltern school’ has raised again the issue of culture in the process of resistance and accommodation. The issue is important for several reasons no doubt. One important reason is related to the question of whether black slaves responded to their bondage through the continuation of a “certain ongoing cultural authenticity” or whether their response was “ad hoc and incoherent, springing not from their own senses of order, justice, meaning, and the like but only from set of ideas called into being by the situation of domination itself.” There is a growing consensus that culture, or the way, in which slaves identified themselves as a distinct group, was a critical force in determining the extent to which they resisted or accommodated to the system.

The 1760 Tacky Rebellion, which led planters to recognize publicly the danger of slave rebellion, persuaded planters, so argues Turner, to resort to “outright labour bargaining involving slave workers, workplace managers and attorneys on Jamaican sugar estates.” The planters considered it wise to grant slaves customary rights in some but not in all areas. To what extent was the response based on an ‘authentic’ as opposed to a merely reactive culture? The ‘subaltern’ school raises the issue of the internal politics and mutual associations between the subaltern or the dominated culture, and therefore forces a reappraisal of a tendency to what Ortner has called “the [romantic] impulse to sanitize the internal politics of the dominated”.

Black slaves had their own hierarchies, and drew important distinctions between themselves. One of the main divisions was place of birth, whether born in Africa or born in the Caribbean. Secondly, the slaves themselves were divided according to discrete occupational categories, some having higher prestige than others. The common bond of slavery bridged the differences between skilled and unskilled, between field and factory labour, between male and female labour, between household or domestic labour which included liveried janitors, carriage drivers, female domestics (usually coloureds), and between urban and rural slavery. Urban centres were a source for packaging, warehousing, loading and unloading of goods, the centres for distribution of goods.
The system of slavery allowed slaves the usufruct of land, on which they cultivated minor crops and reared small stock. The sale of these products at the Sunday markets, it is thought, allowed slaves some access to cash. It is clear, however, from recent work done by Richard Sheridan, and Barry Higman, that the properties were often an additional imposition on slaves, since Jamaican planters left it almost entirely to the slaves to feed themselves from the production of their small properties on the estates. According to Sheridan, the Sunday Market was sometimes used to purchase edible commodities, which planters had ceased to supply. Furthermore, several of these plots were at a great distance from the plantations – over eight miles in many cases.

The provision grounds, trade networks, and different forms of wages paid for labour all contributed to generating status differences among the slaves. One critical factor in this process was the availability of labour for the provision grounds. The seasoning process itself exposed newcomers (from Africa) to being used by established slaves to work their grounds. The experienced Jamaican attorney, Simon Taylor, warned against established slaves making ‘slaves’ of newcomers. Another observer wrote that competition for a newcomer’s labour could be “violent, and troublesome in the extreme”, because “every negro in his garden, and at his leisure hours [is] earning much more that what is necessary to feed him.” An additional hand would make a larger “surplus for sale, market, and for feeding his stock…. The use of slaves by other slaves for work on provision “grounds was not limited to the use of newcomers. Managers observed the difference between the propertied and the ‘poorer sort’ of slaves, some of whom ‘never work grounds for themselves’.” 12 The view of slave society as constituting a social hierarchy polarized only by race – white versus black – runs the risk of ignoring important sectoral differences in slave society and probably derives the persistence of abolitionist imagery of generally inoffensive and passive slaves faced with brutal slavery.13

Blacks, slave and free, also functioned outside the plantation. There was a visible contingent of free blacks: black buccaneers, black militiamen and, generally in the auxiliary forces, black soldiers, some of whom were slaves. These were a factor in colonial life well before an earthquake sank Port Royal in 1692 and continued for the entire period of slavery. Indeed, the West India Regiment continued to survive...
well after slavery and served a critical auxiliary function. The recruitment of Africans into British Armies was. Some feared, innately subversive of the system, in spite of the fact that the culture of the Navy and Army were substantially different from that of the slave plantation which depended for its survival on an exaggerated repression of slaves. Those whites who hesitated to have free blacks and black slaves become members of the Navy or Armed Forces did so for one main reason: slaves who proved to be good soldiers would prove the whole theory of slavery wrong. “If slaves made good soldiers, then they were surely human, and the better soldiers they were, the more equal to whites they appeared to be. Such an idea was certainly subversive of both slavery and racism.”14 However, the British Authorities wished to co-opt African military tradition into their own armies. They believed that blacks were less susceptible to disease in hot, low-lying, marshy areas, and they preferred to use black labour for fatigue duty in order to reduce white mortality. The black soldiers were also deployed in road-building and the construction of forts.15 By 1815 the free blacks on Jamaica, partly due to their militia contribution, were given various privileges by the Assembly, enough to cause some white inhabitants to protest the action.”16

The British Government’s “freeing of the black soldiers of the West India Regiment, giving these troops an education and religious instructions and putting them on equal footing with white troops” challenged the basic underlying principle of racial inequality intrinsic to West Indian slavery.”17 The groups known, as the ‘Black Shot’ were slaves raised in temporary units and fully armed because of their superior skills fighting in the bush. They were employed during times of war or rebellion.18

Blacks had been used as crewmembers with the buccaneers, and a few blacks or mulattos such as Captain Francis and Diego the Mulatto manned their own privateer ships. Diego el Mulatto was one “of two pirates who flouted an offer of pardon from Governor Lynch of Jamaica who had orders to suppress buccaneering in 1670.” One author describes Diego el Mulatto as an “almost legendary figure” who was “a picturesque ruffian and the virtual prototype of the popular idea of a Caribbean buccaneer.”19 In the West Indies “it was unlawful to impress colonists into the British Navy, so slaves frequently were enlisted as sailors instead.”20 Colonists were unhappy about this practice because it was sometimes thought that
blacks were encouraged to run away to join the navy. Governor Trelawney of
Jamaica in 1743 complained of the potential dangers involved in “manning of
Trading Vessels of America, so much as it is done with Negroes and Indians.” Five
of the ships then in Port Royal, he claimed, “had more black than white crewmen.”
Always “short of sailors, the Royal Navy enlisted Negroes because they were not so
likely to jump ship.”21 The West India Regiment were recruited from the body of
slaves in the West Indies and from slave ships. At first they were more African than
West Indian. “Ironically it was the Africans who mostly fought in and garrisoned
the West Indies…. at first.”

The slaves who worked on plantations were usually named or renamed in a manner
comparable to cattle. They often tended to have the names of Greece and Rome –
Caesar, Venus, Phoebe, Scipio, Cicero, but also Beauty, Carefree, Monkey, Villain,
and Strumper. The West India Regiments on the other hand, received non-classical
surnames and had greater opportunity to provide education for their children. The
soldiers received living quarters superior to those of their slave counterparts. In
some respects, their position was ambivalent. They were slaves but received some
of the privileges of freedmen. Their role was not always for purposes of combat.
Blacks and Miskito Indians were armed to help put down the Maroon Wars of the
eighteenth century.

Among the most salient realities of our history is not only that it was essentially
founded in slavery, but that slavery constituted the enslavement of one race by
another race. The expected social prejudice exercised against the working classes
was exaggerated by the reality that the working class during and after slavery had a
pronouncedly different racial origin from the employer class. Inequality was based
on ethnicity and on whether one worked or did not work with one’s hands.

Thus, since blackness has been associated with the stigma of slavery, the stigma
associated with blackness has affected in a fundamental way relations between
ethnic groups in Jamaica and has conditioned how black people have viewed
themselves. There is a contradiction between the pro-slavery ideology that
encouraged concepts of domination – based on culture and race – and the reality
that the subordinated community may have accepted and bought into their own
domination.
The slave system allowed for the creation of a small free black and coloured population, in particular the children born to planters and slave women, and blacks that had been manumitted. However, physical freedom from slavery came with restraints and constraints. The growth of the coloured population necessitated some legal adjustments to halt the progress of that section of the free population. As early as 1711, the Jamaican Legislature passed a law forbidding ‘Jews, Blacks, Mulattoes, or Indians from officiating in any public office in the island. Whites who employed any of those persons to perform such tasks were fined L100.’22 In 1762 the “Jamaican Legislature demonstrated…. That it could not be blind or inactive to efforts, however well intentioned or innocent, that whites were making to promote economic equality for the races. Apparently legislators and a significant number of local whites had become convinced that white fathers were leaving sizable estates to their free coloured children, the cumulative effect of which was the gradual emergence of a fairly wealthy free coloured group. A legislative inquiry reported in 1762 that such inheritances of real estate and slaves ranged between L200, 000 and L300, 000, and included four sugar estates, seven cattle pens, thirteen houses, and other unspecified lands. With such startling evidence before them, the legislators passed the Inheritance Act of 1762, which placed a L2, 000 limit on the amount of property that a free coloured person could inherit from a white. Any will that exceeded the L2, 000 legacy to a free coloured to a free coloured was to be null and void.”23

It would be an error to assume that all mixed bloods received legacies, since a large number of mixed bloods were part of the depressed urban population. But Jamaica took the lead (which was not, apparently followed generally in the other British Caribbean colonies) in “making legally white individuals who were certain degrees removed from their African ancestry.”24 This practice was much more widespread in the Spanish American Empire. Yet, the growth of a coloured group with wealth and European culture seemed to pose a threat to white hegemony. The consequence was the removal in the 190s of civil rights from the coloureds, except for those of course who had been white in law. The racial chasm applied not only to the relations between white and black but also between white and brown. The approach to the coloured was ambivalent. On the one hand, European fathers often left bequests for their mixed offspring. On the other, conscious of the evolution of these coloured beneficiaries into a slave-holding, privileged group in the slave society,
the Assembly suspended their civil rights in the 1790s. These rights were restored in the 1830s as a planter strategy to receive coloured and Jewish support against the unrelenting pressure of the abolitionist lobby. Slavery was doomed to extinction through metropolitan interference. The last card that the planters could play was to buy politically the support of the coloureds and Jews between 1830 and 831 to beat off the international lobby. In reality, however, down to the end of the nineteenth century, those of mixed blood were systematically viewed as a threat to white hegemony.

**The Maroon Wars**

The first slave revolts in the British period began from the 1680s and culminated in the ten-year war between the Maroons and the slaveholders. Finally, in 1739 and 1740, treaties were signed granting the Maroon civil autonomy and land, in exchange for their agreement not to swell their ranks any further with runaway slaves, to recapture runaway slaves and to assist in the suppression of slave revolts. These agreements gave the British a free hand to concentrate on the development of sugar plantations in the west of the island and to reduce the considerable expense entailed in the ‘Maroon Wars’. The agreement has led in some quarters to the ‘demonization’ of the Maroons. That ‘demonization’ rests on one simple factor – the present-day concern about separating those blacks who were involved with the ‘black’ struggle from those who were not. It ought to be clear that the Maroons, despite their colour, were not involved in a ‘black’ struggle against the slave plantation system. The struggle was designed to ensure their own freedom, not black freedom. It was nothing more or less than the effort of some slaves – the colour did not matter to them – to take militant action to be free. The maintenance of that freedom made it necessary for them to make peace and even enter into an alliance with the British in a situation in which, by 1739, both they and the British had become exhausted by the near ten-year conflict. At the time of the Maroon Wars, the ethnic identity of African slaves still retained much of the old African loyalties and tensions. It is, however, easier to explain the Maroons’ policy of returning runaways to the estates (keeping to their treaty of 1739) than to justify the reality that the Maroons themselves kept slaves. Whether this was some kind of eighteenth-century adaptation of living in a slave society or a continuation of an African tradition on Jamaican soil, or a combination of both, can be debated,
The treaties paved the way for the classical period of Jamaican plantation slavery after 1750. Slavery had its intellectual justifications explained; the slave trade was also in its classical epoch; the British Navigation Laws laid down fully their mercantile system that guaranteed Jamaica protection in the British Market. Jamaican planters, wealthy from booming estates, adopted a bizarrely ostentatious life style in Great Houses in Jamaica and made significant contributions to British society in terms of art, architecture, culture and, ironically, charity. And the Thirteen Colonies of the American Mainland provided goods at competitive prices to the tropical colonies of the Caribbean.
Chapter Two

The Anti-Slavery Movement

It is an irony, which demands some explanation, that Jamaican slavery bloomed at the same time that the European Enlightenment of the eighteenth century addressed itself to liberty, equality and fraternity, challenged the divine right of kings and promoted the libertarian ethics of Republicanism.

French rationalism may indeed have provided the intellectual stimulus for the major histories of Jamaica at the end of the eighteenth century – the works of Edward Long and Bryan Edwards – but rationalism was definitely used as a conservative force for the preservation of slave society. Although Edward Long had seen the contradiction between the principle of liberty and the practice of servitude identified by the French philosophes, he found an answer to the contradiction in his perception that the barbarism of African societies had meant that the system of slavery gave Africans vital exposure to concepts of freedom. One hundred years later Archbishop Enos Nuttall expressed the identical viewpoint – that slavery exposed Africans to “free conditions”. In general, the Enlightenment supported the view that property was sacred, and the slave was property. The radicalism of the Enlightenment did not touch the African slave except, as we have seen above, to justify his enslaved status. Slavery, after all, was not only a condition. It was also an idea.

But the French Revolution, itself a child of the Enlightenment, and the American Revolution to a lesser extent, did affect Caribbean slavery. The American Revolution had the effect of reducing supplies from overseas for the feeding and clothing of slaves, and encouraged of Jamaica seceding and joining the Americans. Black American loyalists arrived on Jamaica’s shores. The French Revolution affected Jamaica through the Haitian Revolution which brought a few thousand white French exiles and their slaves to our shores from St. Dominigue. The names of some of these exiles still stand out in Jamaican society – Desnoes, Chevannes, Malabre, Duquesnay, Latibeaudiere, Narcisse, and DuCasse.
The revolutionary period also saw the entry into Jamaica of Spanish Americans in exile during their struggle for independence from Spain – including Simon Bolivar in 1815. The Haitian and Spanish-American Revolutions heralded the reentry into the island of Roman Catholicism, after nearly one hundred and fifty years. Religious toleration in Jamaica had not supported a Catholic (Papist) community.

The revolutions seemed to pose a threat to all-major Jamaican institutions, and especially plantation slavery and monarchy. The French Revolution, as it extended itself into the Caribbean, and including Martinique and Guadeloupe, posed a major threat to the very basis of English economic life in the Caribbean – slavery. The military base at Port Royal was put on alert and mobilized to launch an invasion of St. Dominigue, which took place in 1793. In addition, police measures in Jamaica were strengthened to confine the émigrés to Kingston. The assumption was that ‘French slaves’ in the countryside would provoke rebellion among local slaves. None of those fears materialized. The first and main reason was that slavery constituted a Caribbean-wide system, and the French exiles were not proponents of abolition. On the contrary, they were planters fleeing the effective troops of Toussaint L’Ouverture. Secondly, with their troops doing badly against Toussaint, the British came to an accommodation with the rebel slave leader who agreed, in exchange for commercial concessions, not to spread the revolution to Jamaica. Thus, British diplomacy warded off the threat of slave insurrection inspired from Haiti, while solidly supporting the slave system in Jamaica and the Caribbean as a whole. Thirdly, the French planters who remained in Jamaica (many returned to France) asserted their loyalty and readily passed on their skills in coffee cultivation to Jamaican planters. The slaves who accompanied them seem to have posed no threat of rebellion.

It was language not self-interest that separated the French from the British planter. And, after all, most of the French émigrés fled from St. Domingue to Jamaica for refuge. Most were ardent royalists, not republicans, and as planters they shared the world-view of the British planters. The point was reaffirmed when the British used Jamaica as a base for its invasion of St. Domingue/Haiti, in its effort to restore the slave system officially abolished by the revolutionary government in France.
But there was another revolution in the making – the industrial revolution in England. Slavery produced large quantities of rum, sugar, molasses and coffee for international markets at precisely the time when the British industrial revolution was accelerating production with the aid of new technologies.

The industrial revolution sired economic individualism, undermined the old mercantilist framework of the Atlantic economy, and promoted a new laissez-faire orientation that provided the macro-economic justification for the abolition of slavery. The works of Jeremy Bentham and Adam Smith provided the theoretical justification for the new economic order. Adam Smith, specifically, argued that free labour was more efficient than slave labour. Slavery was an anachronism in a new Atlantic order, which favoured free labour (labour that could be hired at will), free competition, the essential role of market forces as opposed to state intervention, and a commercial order that favoured the importation of goods from the cheapest sources.

Even before Emancipation in 1838, the decline of Jamaica’s plantations weakened the argument of planters for the continued use of slave labour. Some date the decline of the plantations from 1763, others from 1776, yet others from the 1790s. Such was the force of planter propaganda that always identified the island’s economy with the sugar economy, that the decline of sugar became synonymous with the decline of the Jamaican economy. But there was hardly a period in Jamaican history when planters did not complain of crisis and hard times. It is indeed true that there had been a crisis. An earthquake sank Port Royal in 1692, and the island was vulnerable to hurricanes, floods and droughts, slave conspiracy and rebellion. The market was not always predictable.

The birth of Liberalism in Europe dealt a severe blow to Jamaican and West Indian planters. The West Indies, including Jamaica, had clearly become anomalies in the new liberal order. The Jamaican planters were again faced with the reality that metropolitan interests took precedence over theirs and they were on the wrong side of the new philanthropists and of the new economists. The evolution of the Atlantic economy pulled Jamaica and its planters in its wake towards the world of free competition. The planters continued to look to the past and to shape the present and the future in terms of the structure of the past, as they understood it. As the
nineteenth century advanced, the Caribbean became of even less interest to the British who looked increasingly to India and the Far East.

Thus it was less French rationalism than the new capitalism and the eighteenth-century British religious revolution that was to influence Jamaica during the nineteenth century. The Methodist and the Baptist Churches joined the Moravians in Jamaica. The Christianization of the slaves forms a new chapter in the relationship between the culture of Africa, and the culture of Europe. “Evangelicals, with their strong belief in salvation through saving others, were naturally attracted towards a campaign which was pledged to release slaves from bondage and convert them. Much anti-slavery propaganda was emotional, highlighting the callous treatment of slaves and their inner suffering, and this appealed to those under the influence of the Romantic Movement.” 26. Fervent evangelical discourses overlapped with the interests of humanitarians, Benthamites and industrial utilitarians. 27. The mission churches did offer at least “the temporary Elements of Liberty and Independence.” 28. The fundamental contribution of the Nonconformist churches was the teaching of Christianity to the slaves and, in Jamaica, it included the foundation work of two black Americans, George Lisle and Moses Baker. Both men were cautious enough to ensure that sympathy for their black brothers was expressed mainly in Christian conversion rather than in terms of liberation from slavery. Indeed that was the approach of the mission churches despite the fact that their churches back in England tended to support abolition. Thomas Burchell emphasized that missionaries were not to “intermeddle with politics”, not to “teach the principles of an earthly kingdom” and to treat “all in authority…. with a respectful demeanour”. 29.

Specific instructions were issued by the Baptist Missionary Society to the missionaries who were sent to the West Indies: “You are going to a people in a state of slavery and require to beware lest your feelings should lead you to say or do anything inconsistent with Christian duty.” 30.

Though the Nonconformist churches had personal sympathy for the slaves, their instructions were to preach obedience, thrift and hard work. However, slaves, including Sam Sharpe in 1831, found a lesson of freedom from the Gospel. The ideology of liberty was based, in servile Jamaica, not on French rationalism, but on
the Gospel, and a persistent ideology of personal freedom, a value that deepens itself in a society based on its very opposite – slavery.

Meanwhile, the political and constitutional arrangements in Jamaica, while providing some freedom of action for planters and their representatives, simultaneously guaranteed that slave discontent could only be expressed by non-constitutional and extra-legal mechanisms. The tendencies have been well-documented: running away, tardiness, destruction of equipment, lying, stealing, poisoning, suicide, murder, and above all, wide-scale rebellion.

Equally important was the dedication to the sabotage of authority whose legitimacy could not, under the political, economic and constitutional structures, be extended to an enslaved population. Here we have one of the most persistent problems of Jamaican society; the perception that Authority is hostile to the interests of the people and that authority is exercised without legitimacy. The foundation was being laid for the belief that law could countermand justice. Authority came overwhelmingly, though not exclusively, from the use of force rather than consensus. The principal laws known to the slaves were those intended to restrain their freedom of action by consistently punitive measures. Afro-centric cultural activity was allowed in relatively controlled circumstances at Christmas time, but otherwise, attendance at a wake, or ‘play’ could encompass criminality. Whole sections of Jamaican law were first formulated not regulate the relationships between theoretically equal citizens, nor to control aberrant behaviour among an equal citizenship, but to establish distance (of class and race) between those who ruled and those who were ruled. Rebelliousness was clearly facilitated by the continuation of African military traditions.

Tacky’s rebellion in 1760, which led to the execution of some 400 slaves, and massive destruction of property, took place within the context of an African/Akan culture, which made use of African religious ritual, assumed the enslavement of non-Akans and the massacre of all white men.

The Sam Sharpe Rebellion of 1831-32, together with recollections of earlier rebellions in Barbados and Demerara, seemed to suggest the wisdom of abolition. Freedom in Haiti, and awareness of the activities of abolitionist groups in England,
intensified the search for freedom. Various forces and currents in the metropolis, including constitutional change, an idealistic lobby against slavery, the spread of anti-slavery opinion, and changes in the orientation of international economic thought, buttressed the struggle for freedom from slavery. The Abolition Act Law was passed by the British Parliament in 1833.
Chapter Three

Emancipation

Jamaican planters resisted the abolitionist lobby down to the moment of abolition. For them, slave labour was the only way to grow sugar. They did not, however, have the power to resist the British determination to end slavery. Indeed, as we have noted before, the maintenance of the system ultimately depended on the military apparatus of the metropolis. Emancipation, in itself a compromise, was imposed on an unwilling slavocracy. The abolition of slavery threatened a major disruption of an old system.

When full Emancipation slavery arrived in 1838, it is clear that many ex-slaves viewed Emancipation as a means of redistribution of economic resources – mainly land – in Jamaica. The beleaguered planters saw a centuries’ old system disappear almost overnight. For the ex-slaves, freedom meant either freedom to starve or freedom to carve out a space for themselves in the ‘new’ system. Ex-slaves were now purchasing or squatting on land, moving into the interior, establishing themselves in the ‘mountains’. For a planter, and former slaveholder, disorder, licence, and a lack of control had succeeded the old disciplined order. For the ex-slave, Emancipation was to be an opportunity. For the planter, Emancipation demanded a restriction of those opportunities that conflicted with planter interest. Even worse, from the planters’ point of view, Nonconformist missionaries, their own kith and kin, had ‘allied’ with the slaves, to enable them to acquire land, and to form mutual aid societies and cooperatives. Missionaries were educating ex-slaves out of plantation work, and even the Colonial Office seemed to be against the planter interest.

Planters reshaped the law to ensure as much continuity with the slave system as possible. Emancipation introduced more systematically a system of class and race domination in place of a system of control resting primarily on ownership of articles of personal property. When we examine the period after Emancipation, there were major changes and major continuities. For the
planter the change caused him to ‘lose’ his labour, even though he had received his share of L20,000,000 provided as compensation for all Caribbean slave owners. Jamaican prosperity had rested, after all, on possession of land, labour, and capital availability. Now the land was still there but it was no longer as easy to mobilize labour, and capital had taken off to other climes. The planter was also in direct competition with the ex-slaves for control of the land.

The British Government, committed to free trade, imposed the Sugar Duties Act in 1846, marking the end of the mercantilist era that had offered, under the ‘first British Empire’ a guaranteed market for Jamaican sugar in London markets. The Jamaican planter was faced with the new economic reality of the mid-nineteenth century. Planters now faced competition from all producers, with no specific advantage on the London market. The response of planters was to protest against the 1846 Bill. Once again, metropolitan economic interest intervened and no amount of protest on the part of planters could alter the new pressures within the global system.

The adjustments made by the planter elite had severe internal consequences. In fact, they cut their own throats by reducing production – unlike Barbados where production increased – then by reducing wages and importing indentured workers in order to lower wages even further.

Whether slave-produced sugar in Brazil or free-labour sugar produced in the East Indies competed with West Indian sugar, the planters were faced with a grim reality. Slavery had been abolished. A disciplined, readily available labour force could no longer be guaranteed. Capital which would have been needed to modernize factories did not flow into Jamaica. Several parishes such as Portland and St. Mary went out of sugar production. Those who stayed kept wages as low as possible, so driving the labour force away from the estates in increasing numbers.

With the system of slavery abolished in 1838, patterns of subordination and super-ordination by blacks on the one hand and whites (and browns) on the other continued. Ownership of persons was substituted after slavery by the
ascription of inferiority to blacks. What Gordon Lewis has called the pro-slavery ideology survived the abolition of slavery. The anti-slavery ideology, held by some blacks, by some whites, and by some browns, also persisted.

As slaves, blacks were chattel and could not legally vote or be part of the decision-making process. As a free working class after 1838, they became subjects of class discrimination. As blacks, they were subject to racial discrimination. The policy of the ruling elite was also never to raise wages but to suppress them. The elite could get away with such policies since the plantation is directed towards and exporting commodities as cheaply as possible rather than favouring mass consumption. Suppression of wages, designed to maintain the plantation system, had the constitutional consequence of reducing the possibility that the ex-slaves and their children could exercise the franchise based on property and income qualifications. However, ironically, the white planter class in their support for a limited constitution – limited to themselves – planted the first seeds of constitutional government in Jamaica. The constitutional arrangements of Jamaica amply demonstrated and continued to demonstrate that constitutionalism is not coterminous with democracy and that law and justice do not necessarily coincide. However, property qualifications and literacy requirements could only caulk the open-ended nature of representative government. The planters’ difficulty rested on the reality that constitutional government in Jamaica was closely associated with the will of the Colonial Office, the British Parliament and the Crown as well as British economic interests. Colonial freedoms were ultimately predetermined by imperial policy, which in any case conceded more autonomy than had been originally intended. 31 After Emancipation Jamaican politics, as waged in the House of Assembly, continued to have the features of an Opposition to the Colonial Office, which could regulate if not veto Assembly legislation. It was the price that the white members of the Assembly had to pay for British protection against the conquered African people. In terms of their control over internal matters, the planters were very much “judges in their own cause” but their control was never absolute, because their interests often conflicted with British interest. The planters remained dependent on British markets, despite free trade. But they were even
more dependent on the British army and navy to protect them from slave insurrection, or, as it turned out, from insurrections of freed blacks.

But the ex-slave and the ex-slave owner had some mutual interests. The former needed wages and the latter needed labour. The situation worsened in the 1840s as the planters themselves, partly because of shortsighted labour policies, encouraged those slaves who had remained on the estates to leave.

The belief in inequality was a critically important ideology to justify the exploitation of the working class, and that belief was buttressed by quasi-scientific racism emanating from Europe. The attitude of the white elite was based on the assumption that their racial and ethnic identity was ‘the only legitimate one’ in the colony. This racial hegemony extended to a cultural hegemony as well. African slavery and stratification became identified both in terms of race and class. Rodolpho Stavenhagen makes the very pertinent observation that ethnicity and other factors, which he calls “secondary”, do “reinforce stratification” and simultaneously:

“Perform the sociological function of ‘liberating’ the stratification from its ties to the economic base. In other words, they tend to maintain the stratification system even when its economic base may have changed. As a result, stratifications may also be considered as justifications or rationalizations of the established economic system, that is, as ideologies. As with all phenomena of superstructure, stratification systems acquire an inertia of their own which acts to maintain them, although the conditions that gave rise to them have changed.”  

This reality partly underlies the paramount importance of race in social control even after Emancipation had removed chattel slavery in Jamaica. Racism can be regarded as an extreme form of class discrimination, and the consequence is that ethnicity “can become an all-encompassing principle of social perception”. The concept of inequality in Jamaican society was, therefore, rooted in the slave system.
There is no indication that black voters in the post-Emancipation period were prone to licence or that they were unprepared to function as equal citizens within the political system. A study of politics in post-Emancipation Jamaica shows that:

“The extent to which the new class of small freeholders participated in the politics of the island. Although the property qualifications for the franchise excluded the broad mass of Jamaicans from voting, it is important to point out that the growing numbers of black and coloured small settlers and artisans, some of whom were former slaves, influenced the outcome of elections in those areas where emancipation had brought about significant changes in the pattern of landholdings.” 34.

The former slave-owners interpreted the attempt by ex-slaves to utilize the new conditions to their advantage as a resurgence of barbarism, and a threat to the existing legal, social and economic order. There was a fear that freedom would lead to anarchy and licence. The formation of the society was again bedeviled by a belief in inequality and a reluctance to accept the principle of equal citizenship.

Since the authoritarian society of slavery and oligarchic power continued into the Emancipation period, the white response to the reality that an ex-slave could defeat a sugar proprietor at the polls raised alarm among the oligarchy, some of whom called for the raising of the franchise. “Indeed, the franchise reforms and the constitutional changes in the 1850s and 1860s were profoundly influenced by the growing paranoia that a ‘black Parliament’ was imminent unless the ex-slaves and their descendants were disenfranchised.” 35.

Another stereotype that emerged after Emancipation was the notion that blacks were ‘combustible’ and violent. As Alvin Thompson has noted: “The plantocratic view of the African was to a large extent conditioned by economics, social habits and an imagined racism which made it virtually impossible for them to believe that ‘civilized’ life could be maintained in a situation of black freedom.” 36. Others brooded over the thought that if freedom was given to the slaves as a whole “the whites would not long be
suffered to hold quiet possession of their properties; they would soon have no safety but in flight.” 37.

What is remarkable is that, despite the “narrow social and economic base from which to exercise the legal rights of free citizens”, the generations after 1838 were determined to exercise their civil rights.”

The post-Emancipation period, however, is not merely a question of the class struggle between ex-slaves and planters for access to land resources, as of the limited use of the vote. The plantation had declined as the focus of economic and social life. The ex-slaves opened the hinterland of Jamaica, diversified production of goods, and institutionalized the internal marketing system.

Social facilities once provided by the plantation owners were now provided by government, for example, medical services, though the number of doctors in the island declined after Emancipation. Elementary schools, the Mico Training College, and later Bethlehem and Shortwood Colleges were established for the training of male and female teachers. The introduction of colleges for women was a response to the belief of clergymen that gentler standards of discipline were needed in the classroom; and with the provision of education for girls, female role models were necessary. Furthermore, there was evidence, which led to the dismissal of several male teachers, of sexual liaisons between the male teachers and the older female students.

As the century wore on, Jamaica received its first mental asylum, almshouses, and school for intractable juveniles. By the end of the nineteenth century, the Kingston Charity Organization had been established, in imitation of the London Charity Organization Society, to offer assistance to the ‘deserving poor’. The Kingston Charity Organization Society represented the genuine concern of sections of the white population for the spread of poverty in rural and, especially, urban Jamaica. The continuous establishment of hospitals was recognition that the ex-slave population had spread into the countryside, generating a need for institutional health-care. Here again, influences from Victorian Britain served as the models for Jamaicans to follow. Jamaicans were never as enthusiastic about prison reform as were the
British. However, private citizens established homes for distressed sailors. A civil society slowly took shape, marching in time with processes from London. The Theatre Royale was an important centre for entertainment, to be succeeded by the Ward Theatre after the 1907 earthquake. Bicycle riding, tennis, yachting, gambling, cricket, football, the races, and hunting were among elite sports. The ‘ordinary’ people also went to the races, played cricket, inventing their own equipment. The market and the Church were not only economic and spiritual centres (respectively) but also provided opportunities for social intercourse.

Civil society was based on the old hierarchies. Gentlemen’s clubs and interest-group organizations throughout the island continued to demonstrate that the new civil society was hierarchically similar to the pre-abolition society.

The freedom of the former slaves was circumscribed by a new system where, in place of ownership, there was a legal system that contrived to force the ex-slave to become bound by proletarian status. Quasi-scientific racism became a more important force for social control after slavery ended. The planter was concerned above all about securing an efficient and cheap labour force in order to compete globally. The ex-slave, on the other hand, confined his interest in the plantation to securing a cash wage to enable him to pay his rent, medical bills, and his taxes. For the rest, the ex-slave showed a firm interest in establishing himself on his own land, and where possible providing an education for his or her children. There was significant growth in access to land by ex-slaves in the post-Emancipation period.

But the working classes not only made use of the institutions provided for their betterment. They also resorted to direct action in the form of strikes and rioting to correct perceived injustices. Two people were killed in rioting in Brown’s Town in 1848, when workers resisted the police seeking to execute warrants. There were two major riots in 1859. The Second West Indian Regiment and troops from Port Royal helped to quell the riots. 39.

The best-known upheaval is the one at Morant Bay in 1865. Paul Bogle, in his quest for justice, ironically provided Governor John Eyre and the Colonial
Office with the opportunity to establish direct crown control, a step towards which the British had been moving for some time. It is well known that the Morant Bay Rebellion was easily and mercilessly crushed. The massacre is a genuine indication of the white state of mind that feared the wholesale slaughter of whites by blacks.

Up to 1865 the march of history had seemed to suggest that, as coloureds and blacks gradually qualified for the vote, the Jamaican Legislature, heretofore dominated by white planters and their allies, would in the course of time become the constitutional home of coloured and eventually black elected representatives. A few early post-Emancipation governors certainly believed so and indeed had no particular objection to the gradual preparation of ex-slaves for full citizenship. But the beleaguered Assembly thought otherwise. Already the Assembly was feeling the influence of the coloured members who were part of the ‘Town Party’ in opposition to the ‘Country Party’. Coloured Jamaica was well represented by Robert Osborne and George William Gordon, among others.

The relationship between George William Gordon and Paul Bogle could very well have instilled fears of a colored/black alliance, a fear that was clearly enunciated later in the century. Thus, Governor Eyre interpreted an uprising of discontented small farmers in Morant Bay against injustice as an island-wide uprising of blacks against whites, equivalent in scale to the 1857 Indian Mutiny. In fact, "a satirical magazine, Fun, printed a cartoon in which a manic negro, wielding a fire-brand and a machete, cavorts over the corpses of white women and children, an unmistakable reminder of the Indian Mutiny.” Underneath is the caption, ‘Am I a man and a brother?’ a sneering reference to the anti-slavery campaign’s motto ‘Am not I a Man and a Brother?’ The Indian Mutiny had “strengthened British racism.” And the view of ‘natives’ as ‘irreclaimable savages’ gained increasing publicity through the proclamations of Thomas Carlyle, Charles Dickens, and Lord Alfred Tennyson. 40.

The political aftermath of the Morant Bay Massacre was the new Crown Colony Constitution through which the British Crown embarked on direct rule of the colony, abolished the three-hundred year Assembly (with the
Assembly’s approval) and ruled through a nominated council. It was not until 1883-84 that the constitution was modified to restore the electoral principle, and only in 1944, with Universal Adult Suffrage, was the constitution replaced.

In theory, the British Government would act, in the new system, as arbiter between conflicting factions and provide the black population with ‘trusteeship’.
Chapter Four

Social And Economic Change

From 1866 to 1938

British colonial policy assumed imperium ET libertas, empire abroad and freedom at home. Laws framed to reflect the particular reality of Jamaica created the situation where it appeared that special laws ruled the island. “In an effort to protect white settlers from the mass of blacks, Britain offered black dominions ‘benevolent guardianship’ at best, whereas white dominions such as Canada continued to be viewed as constitutional, racial, and economic outposts of the imperial centre.” In the coloured colonies the ruling classes continued to be granted limited autonomy, while the coloured people in coloured colonies received ‘trusteeship’. Crown Colony government in theory appointed itself as trustee of the masses, while defending elite interest that did not compete with metropolitan interest. Crown Colony government was a clear denial of the redistribution of political power sought by the coloured population. The Crown Colony system lasted for another seventy-eight years, partly because the British government agreed to its modification in 1883 and 1884, and partly because contending interests could not agree on an alternative that would be acceptable to them and to the British government.

Histories of the Caribbean (and of Jamaica) place great and justified emphasis on the growth of the ‘peasantry’ after Emancipation, as an offshoot of the Churches to help the ex-slaves find a viable existence. The ‘peasantry’ was not, however, the undifferentiated mass suggested by some of the literature. Rural dwellers were sometimes simply day labourers, sometimes they cultivated their own land; others who owned sufficient land were employers of labour; and yet others mixed farming with other occupations such as shop-keeping, shingle-splitting, carpentry and masonry, tin-smithing and black-smithing, or with sugar-harvesting on the nearby estate – to obtain a cash income. Some were tenants.
The problems of the small-holder have often presented as a consequence of the egotism of the planter. The truth is that planters responded to the crisis of international demand for their exports not only by suppressing wages but also by importing labour (37,000 Indians came to Jamaica between the 1840s and 1917), paying wages in beef and omitting to pay wages at all. Indirectly, therefore, workers were the victims of the international market. The planter in the nineteenth century had no more control over prices of imports and exports than the Jamaican manufacturer has over prices of imports and exports today.

The Churches (or as they preferred to call themselves the Religious Bodies), continued to serve as brokers between the former slaves and their employers. In some respects they were the unconscious agents of Trusteeship. It is easy to see that the Nonconformist churches were generally more sympathetic to the conditions of the servile labour force and to the ex-slaves than was the Anglican Church which, however, resorted to an aggressive policy of missionizing after its disestablishment in 1870. It is also true that the Evangelicals, like the Anglicans, assumed the religious and cultural inferiority of the slaves and made it clear that Christianity was one major reflection of white cultural supremacy. But all religious bodies, including the Anglicans and especially under Enos Nuttall’s leadership, considered it important to pay some attention to the temporal needs of the freed slaves, while removing the world-view created by African religious sensibilities. The Churches defended the black workers as workers, and focused on moral reform. This concern continued a long tradition of Christian responsibility but also mirrored the growing influence of Positivism in the late nineteenth century. Positivism conceived of progress within order, and of a morality that ensured the recognition of duty and of one’s place in society.

The Churches carried forward the views of the abolitionists – to ensure the legal freedom and to further the social and economic interests of the slaves. Barry Chevannes has noted that despite the efforts of the Religious bodies, “the peasant communities throughout rural Jamaica became the focal point for the development of a counterculture to the plantation system.” 41. The counterculture had, in reality, always existed. Isolation from the plantations made more possible the autonomy of rural Jamaicans. The loss of doctors after
Emancipation, for example, intensified the use of African-based medicine among the exslave population.

**Religion and Society**

Christianity brings with it concepts of spiritual freedom and redemption. “Wherever.” Argues Orlando Patterson, Christianity “took root, it garnered converts not only to salvation in Christ but to the ideal of freedom.” By combining their spiritual work with the promotion of education, the Religious Bodies in Jamaica helped to create a core of educated coloureds. Yet, to a considerable extent, the Churches had also developed an internationalist perspective that saw the work of ‘Christianization’ as part of the wider purpose of bringing European civilization to the heathen, wherever they were. Even after Emancipation, in fact, British dissenting churches had had “visions of worldwide conquests for Christianity”. For Enos Nuttall, a Christian education was part of the programme “to uplift subject people”. It was part of the process of strengthening the Pax Britannica, and consolidating Anglo-Saxon civilization throughout the world. Central to Enos Nuttall’s thought was an ecumenical movement in which different strands of Christianity, reflecting the diverse impact of ethnicity, would spread the Gospel. Religious education was an aspect of westernization, but making allowance for ethnic influences to be absorbed so long as they did not violate basic Christian doctrine. The Church had one foundation, different pulpits. Once these different trends did not conflict with the basic tenets of Christianity, they could be used to spread Christianity throughout the Empire. Worldwide evangelization meant the West Indians served in African communities. If planters were concerned primarily with the economic order of the Empire, churchmen showed greater preoccupation with the moral and spiritual order.

In Jamaica itself, the Religious Bodies often cooperated rather than competed with each other. They never did succeed in introducing a universal system of elementary education but they reached a sufficient number to create a growing body of literate black Jamaicans (mainly men). The efforts of the Religious Bodies and the provisions made by the British Government through the
‘Negro Education Grant’ initiated a new era of non-plantation education for the children of ex-slaves.

Views on the education of blacks were not monolithic in white society. The employers of labour complained that children were being educated out of the plantations since an education assumed that the plantation would no longer be attractive to the young educated black person. Another view held by whites was that it could be used as a method of social control. The ultra-conservative Anglican minister, Rev. George William Bridges, who thought that, “Education, in short, tends to abolish the different grades of society, renders the lower classes dissatisfied, sceptical and ripe for revolution,” 44 represented the most conservative view. Others believed that it was better to invest money in education, which would be more effective, in the long term, than investment in police services. Another view, not necessarily incompatible with the first, was that education for the child should end at the age of fourteen or fifteen. Some consideration was given, however, to the growth of a black middle sector, acting as a buffer between whites and the mass of blacks. Such a middle sector did emerge out of the more prosperous segments of the artisan groups, and small landholders.

Within the black middle sector was an intelligentsia who supplemented their elementary education with extensive reading in large personal libraries. For example, John Robertson Scholes, a pillar of the Baptist community in Stewart Town, Trelawny, and a member of the Parochial Board of St. Ann, was described as a man “who loved the race to which he belonged, and it was his strong desire to see them rise materially as well as socially, and always helped them with wise counsels.” His first son, Theophilus, became a medical missionary to Africa, and his second son, George, was an engineer in the USA, John Robertson Scholes died in 1908.

Black intellectuals directed their attention to the concept of equality of citizenship. Others voiced concerns about the injustices of Empire, which Theophilus Scholes described as a “pyramid of exploitation” with the ‘colourless’ race at the top. He regarded British imperialism as a mechanism for sacking the world’s resources for the exclusive benefit of the white
members of the British Empire. His criticism did not refer solely to the Caribbean but to Africa and India as well. Imperialism was, in his view, somewhat like a “sponge applied to a giant pail of water”. Scholes’s writings were also intended to demonstrate the role of non-Europeans in the evolution of world civilization, against the contemporary claims that saw Europe as the originator rather than a participant in world civilization. Civilization was the patrimony of all mankind, not of a specific segment of it. His works denounced racism. Scholes was writing at a time when white Jamaicans were establishing the ‘Jamaica Imperial Association’ in response to Joseph Chamberlain’s policy (one of Scholes’s major targets of criticism) for a united and self-sufficient Empire. Chamberlain’s “Constructive imperialism…. was an alternative strategy to the established economic policy of free trade.”

“With a foundation based upon imperial preference and colonial development, the new imperialists proposed to build a larger political structure than the one in which Little Englanders had been reared.” Chamberlain called for “big capital to come in and develop the regions that were or would be producing primary products and importing British manufactures.” The British Government would be “responsible for providing development aid.”

Chamberlain’s initiative did not work.

Not surprisingly, Scholes’s works did receive acclaim in Jamaica since he was highly critical of the race-based status quo. His works present the intellectual and philosophical background for Pan-Africanism. It was, in part, a response to the spread of colonialism in Africa by European powers after the 1880s.

Black thinkers had a useful outlet in the *Jamaica Advocate*, a newspaper published by Dr. Robert Love, a Bahamian who took up permanent residence in Jamaica after 1889. Dr. Albert Thorne, also a black Barbadian who resided in Jamaica, devised a scheme for the settlement of blacks from the Caribbean in what was then Nyasaland (now Malawi).

Marcus Garvey, who was born in 1887, carried several of these anti-status quo positions further. He took the position that blacks had to prove themselves capable of exercising the responsibilities of citizenship, which could only be achieved if they surrendered all notions of inferiority and indulged in critical thought. Garvey clearly enunciated the position that citizenship, responsibility
and self-efficiency went together. A strong advocate of black economic enterprise, he founded the Black Star Line and the Negro Factories Corporation. Like other black thinkers of the period, Garvey put Africa and race at the centre of his universe for the obvious reason that the Caribbean was unable to provide a land base for Black Nationalism.

Black Nationalism, in its Pan-Africanist phase, emerged partly out of the ruthless distribution of African lands and peoples among the white imperialists of Europe after 1884. Claude MacKay refers in one of his 1912 poems to the reality that blacks referred to as a “no-land race”. European racism had so internationalized the black question that a black response had of necessity to be international. The black intelligentsia, responding to concepts of racial inferiority, laziness, barbarism, and in Jamaica’s case, ‘combustibility’ resorted to a defensive nationalism to prove that blacks were contributors to world civilization and that slavery had acted as a break upon that major contribution. Europeanized blacks accepted, for the most part, the cultural norms of Europe, but like Scholes, Garvey, and the non-Jamaicans, John Blyden and Sylvester Williams, saw in Pan-Africanism the hope for blacks.

The recovery of political liberties in Africa would, they expected, provide a telluric base with which blacks could identify. For them, it was not a question of adopting African culture as such, since they fully understood the enormous complexity of African culture or cultures. Their view of world civilization was that, in the first place, it was an accretion of contributions from all the races of mankind and, secondly, human civilization had reached its zenith in Europe (and the United States) by the end of the nineteenth century. This civilization, especially in its technological achievements, would contribute to bringing Africa into the mainstream of world civilization once more. Blacks in the diaspora (the analogy was Joseph and his brethren in Egypt) exposed as they were to civilization in its most advanced state would be the agents for the transfer of civilization to Africa.

There was no question in their minds that the development of Africa meant Europeanization of African culture. But Scholes, in a brief passage in
Glimpses of the Ages, also pointed to African religion not as an indication of backwardness but as the Africans’ own animistic methods to establish harmony with one God. African religion was no obstacle to religious progress. There was, ironically, a coincidence between the black intelligentsia’s own wishes and those of European missionaries who hoped to spread European civilization through the Gospel. Whereas such persons as Enos Nuttall saw this as a means of creating the cultural basis of a Pax Britannica, the black intelligentsia saw it as a means of giving Africa the resources to restart itself against European domination. But it never was a reassertion of African culture. The concern with Africa was also shown in what we might for now term the more radical black priests who used as their text Psalm 68, “Princes shall come out of Egypt, Ethiopia shall soon stretch out her hands unto God. The image of a revitalized Africa had another dimension in the approach of the less well educated. Missionary services were crowded because black Jamaicans were anxious to hear news of Africa, still viewed by many as fatherland. They could not return but they wished to identify with their origins, despite the insistence by missionaries that Africans bowed to “wood and stone”.

Intellectual life among the elite in the late nineteenth century saw some awareness of Jamaica’s Taino heritage, a noble savage who had conveniently disappeared. The cosmopolitan works of the black thinkers were vastly different from the antiquarianism of non-black thinkers. But the distance between those who ruled and the Africans who were the ‘subject’ people continued to be as great as ever. Intellectual and material attainments by blacks did not confer equality within a society whose ruling ideology was racial inequality. However, one of the major changes to occur in the later half of the nineteenth century was the intellectual challenge to empire, including its racial-hierarchical structure.

Yet Jamaicans celebrated with some enthusiasm Queen Victoria’s diamond Jubilee in 1897. Official nationalism was imperial in spirit. The black intellectual viewpoint was essentially a minority one, not necessarily shared by the mass of the black working class. Robert Love, however, gave
considerable coverage and support to the strike of dockworkers in 1895. He viewed the strike as heralding a new era of black assertiveness.

Black intellectuals began to look to Africa’s potential as a basis for giving the black diaspora a sense of belonging, and encouraged the establishment of colonies in Africa by blacks. They also viewed themselves, especially through the teaching cadre, as ‘civilizers’ of those blacks who had not fully crossed the line between African culture and European culture. Scholes himself drew a line between ‘civilized’ and ‘uncivilized’ blacks.

In contrast to the intelligentsia, the black working class continued to pursue vigorously its own hermeneutics and exegesis that combined Christian ritual with African ritual and belief. There had been revival movements in 1848-49 and in 1860-6, not long before the Morant Bay Massacre. There was another in 1883. And in the 1890s, Bedward dominated the local religious scene with his island-wide Church and the headquarters in August Town. It is a mark of the social and cultural distance between Bedward and Dr. Robert Love (formerly an Anglican Minister but a powerful advocate of black equality) that the latter would in his *Jamaica Advocate* declare the Bedward was insane and deserved incarceration.

An analysis of the late nineteenth century would not be complete without an examination of ‘white’ society. The diminishing number of whites was dominant but not monolithic. That which united whites as a caste was a common fear of the black ‘subject people’ and an innate suspicion of the loyalties of the mixed population. There was a tremendous gap between a member of the white plantocracy, and his white counterpart who was an artisan, a bookkeeper or even an overseer. (Indeed, bookkeepers were probably the most exploited segment of the white group. A bookkeeper was not allowed to marry, and had to return to the planter two-thirds his salary for room and board. His medical problems were his responsibility, and it was his business to look about his own healing without pay during his period of illness. He paid his own way to Jamaica. His ambition was to become an overseer). The importation of Germans and Scots into the highlands of Jamaica to cut off the access of blacks to ‘the mountains’ introduced a
population of whites, referred to derogatorily by black workers as ‘white labour’. The white elite also had commercial-mercantile orientation, though merchant and planter groups belonged to common organizations such as the Jamaica Society of Agriculture and the Merchants’ Exchange or, in social terms, to the Royal Yacht Club, the Jamaica Club, and a whole array of exclusive white (gentlemen’s) clubs in the rural parishes. It also worth noting that within the white sector the growing links between merchants and planters – as members for example of the Jamaica Society of Agriculture – make it difficult to determine whether planting was an offshoot of merchandising, or merchandising an offshoot of planting.

There were also substantial differences between white colonial bureaucrats and local whites. Colonial “administration provided a highly visible structure of command”, correctly state Stanley and Barbara Stein, and the “colonial bureaucrat was the visible embodiment of imperial domination”. The fact that Jamaica’s Crown Colony administration showed marked preference for bureaucrats imported from Britain was a source of conflict between local and resident expatriate whites. Local whites described them as ‘transients’, ‘opportunists’, ‘without merit’, ‘aristocratic destitutes’. The colonial bureaucrat was considered to be the entity through which Jamaica paid tribute to the British Empire. Their high salaries were the subject of regular critical comment. Invariably, local whites concluded that expatriate salaries were too high. Frank Cundall, himself an expatriate bureaucrat, indicated that the colonial bureaucrat enjoyed a status and prominence which he never enjoyed at home. Local whites drew some distinctions between themselves and the colonial bureaucrats. They felt themselves to be more sensitive to local colour. The evolution of a separate consciousness was expressed through recognition of a folk idiom that could be conveniently appropriated without violating the principle that Jamaica’s culture was British. One result of this kind of thinking was the composition of a “Jamaica Anthem” sung to the tune of “God Save Our Gracious Queen”. Another was the insistence that only locals understood Creole, regarded as a ‘quaint’ Jamaican invention, an indicator of class origin and, to some extent, a source of amusement. Local Whites believed that expatriate magistrates’ lack of knowledge of the vernacular could frustrate the ends of justice. Hence the following story:
**Overheard in Court**

A prisoner was before Justice Little, charged with the theft of a pig.
Judge: What did you do with the pig?
Prisoner: John Cro’ tek ‘im sah.
Judge: Call up Mr. John Crow!

The expatriate writer, Alice Spinner, in her novel *Lucilla* notes the paranoia of local whites:

[His] horror of any row or disturbance was only equaled by his conviction that the only chance of improving the colored population was to preserve strictly one’s own authority… Like most creoles of pure British extraction he had a far more invincible prejudice and dislike to the coloured population than any Englishman could possibly posses; but he kept this in the background… 48.

Yet Spinner concedes that the longer expatriates remained in the island (which they regarded as a kind of purgatory) the closer their attitudes came to resemble those of the local whites.

If some whites were more equal than others, there were ‘browns’ who also suffered at the hands of white supremacy. In the early 1890s, the effort to exclude ‘browns’ from leadership positions in the revived militia demonstrated their ambiguous status in the island. Some members of the white oligarchy confided to the Colonial Office that the browns were the “deadly enemies of the whites”. Referring to retired members of the police force, the planter, Bancroft Espeut, concluded that: “It was better that these black men should go to their plots of land and forget as soon as possible all the training they ever knew. In themselves they are not dangerous, but once teach the ‘coloured’ men to lead them and the community would never be safe.” Officially, race and colour were not questions to be discussed in the country, and the governor’s own commitment to racial equality was symbolically represented at the annual King’s House Ball to which people of all shades were invited.
Jamaica and the American Empire

The Caribbean was always destined to become an American lake. During the second half of the nineteenth century the United States expanded its frontiers from the Atlantic to the Pacific Coast, and absorbed huge chunks of Mexico – including Texas, California, Nevada, New Mexico, and Oregon. Following the Spanish-American War of 1898, the United States added Puerto Rico, Hawaii, the Philippines, and established a Protectorate over Cuba. The United States had joined the club of the New Imperialism. Industrial growth in the United States was founded on the massive use of immigrant labour from Europe. Urban centres grew prodigiously, and United States industrial power challenged that of Britain and Germany. Consumption of goods and services rose as railways streaked across the continent. This material progress was accompanied by a commitment to democratic institutions – at least for the white minority.

The new industrial power was responsible in a fundamental way for the revitalization of the Jamaica plantation system. The new plantations of Jamaica produced bananas, not sugar, and exported them not to the London market but to New York. Before the end of the nineteenth century, the new industrial power absorbed increasing quantities of bananas, citrus and coconuts. Bananas outstripped sugar as Jamaica’s major export, though in the course of the twentieth century sugar was to experience a significant revival. Long before 1930, the United States had become on par with the United Kingdom as Jamaica’s major market. So pessimistic have analyses of Jamaica’s economy tended to be that the late nineteenth century is often described as Jamaica’s Dark Ages. Yet it is abundantly clear that the late nineteenth century saw important changes in the Jamaican economy. It would indeed have been surprising if this were not so, given that the late nineteenth century saw an unprecedented expansion of the Atlantic economy which offered, overall, favourable terms of trade to raw material producers up to the outbreak of World War I in 1918.

The growing importance of the relationship between the US and Jamaica, mainly of a commercial-economic nature, did not impinge upon the
continuing influence of Britain in the island. Obviously, the historical links between Jamaica and the American colonies, the common commitment to liberal institutions, and the Anglo-American concorde would have served to ensure that the island” association with two empires proved complementary, rather than contradictory, to the island’s interests. The US alliance with Britain was definitely associated with a perceived commonality of culture and imperial beliefs. American themselves considered expansion “the extension of civilization”. They believed that “true enlightenment and the Christian spirit” should accompany promoting material interests in other areas of the world. 49.

The United States converted Cuba’s Oriente province into huge sugar estates. The consequent generation of demand for labour encouraged thousands of Jamaicans to harvest sugar in Cuba. United States capital, also directing itself to the construction of railroads, of the Panama Canal (completed by 1914), and the development of banana plantations in Central America, was a magnet for Jamaican labour, not only from the Jamaican proletariat, but also from the “middle walks of life”.

The Jamaican authorities, fearing that the migration of labourers would deplete the island’s labour supply, took measures to restrict emigration by means of the Emigrants Protection Law, later to be revised continuously. One of the ironies of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century is that while praising the glories of the British Empire, Jamaican businessmen counted their money in US dollars, while Jamaican labourers worked for North American capitalists outside Jamaica’s shores for dollar a day. The thankful British focused on India.

While sugar prices fell continuously between 1866 and 1900, and the land under sugar cultivation decreased, the acreage dedicated to bananas and livestock increased. Some areas moved into citrus, cocoa and coconut production on a large scale to meet the demand on the US market. The following tables demonstrate that while Britain provided most of Jamaica’s imports, the US took most of the island’s exports.
Imports & Exports USA & UK Compared (Percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Imports</th>
<th>Imports</th>
<th>Exports</th>
<th>Exports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1899 – 1900</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>63.4</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900 - 1901</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>67.7</td>
<td>63.8</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901 – 1902</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>65.6</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fruits Exports (Percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>US</th>
<th>UK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1923</td>
<td>76.6</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1924</td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925</td>
<td>77.6</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Jamaicans migrated to Panama, Cuba, Nicaragua, Ecuador, Costa Rica and elsewhere. The following table demonstrates the movement of Jamaicans to and from Cuba, Costa Rica and Puerto Barrios (Guatemala).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Cuba Depart</th>
<th>Cuba Arrive</th>
<th>Puerto Limon Depart</th>
<th>Puerto Limon Arrive</th>
<th>Puerto Barrios Depart</th>
<th>Puerto Barrios Arrive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1916</td>
<td>2571</td>
<td>1054</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917</td>
<td>4532</td>
<td>2750</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918</td>
<td>7351</td>
<td>3599</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919</td>
<td>21573</td>
<td>6457</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>19455</td>
<td>22659</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>11792</td>
<td>13317</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922</td>
<td>4419</td>
<td>4210</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Jamaicans became accustomed to seeking opportunities overseas. In each of the peak years 1906-07, 1911-12 and 1912-1913, over 10,580 Jamaicans went to work in Panama. Jamaica’s net population loss between 1891 and 1914 to Panama was some 45,000. Not only was there overseas migration, but there
was internal migration between the banana and sugar-cane districts, and between rural and urban Jamaica – particularly Kingston. The true urbanization of Kingston had started.

There was little doubt after the Spanish-American War of 1898 that the United States had “become sovereign on this continent”. Not only was there a rapidly developing economic tie, but important cultural influences. Jamaica’s revolution in hygiene was generated more from the US than from Britain. The Rockefeller Foundation, for example, underwrote much of Jamaica’s anti-malarial and anti-yaws campaigns. By 1930, Pan American had begun to fly to Jamaica on its Kingston-Barranquilla route, and was delivering mail under licence to the Jamaican government by 1934. It was Pan-American Airways far more than the British airlines that came to dominate Jamaica’s airlanes.

Looking back now at the political growth of Jamaica after 1838, it is easy from the advantage of hindsight to see inevitability in the growth of democratic institutions, of a broad-based constitutional system, and even an easing of racial tensions in Jamaican society. Yet those achievements – to the extent that they have been achieved – were not by any means inevitable, they were not the predictable consequences of the planned march of history. Although the Governor of Jamaica had veto powers, occasionally used, the Jamaican constitution after 1884 continued to make room for a larger membership from the coloured segment of the Jamaican population. The majority of the population remained disenfranchised because the property qualifications for voters remained out of reach of most blacks.

I have suggested that the latter part of the nineteenth century was noted for its social engineering by a paternal imperialism, or imperial paternalism and which, in alliance with the United States, promoted Anglo-Saxon Christianity (essentially Protestantism) throughout the British Empire. That orientation promoted a cultural and religious regeneration aimed at removing the African religious worldview and substituting a European one. Such a policy did not necessarily meet the preferences of all the whites in the island, though it was a far more long-sighted vision than the traditional planter view, which focused on law and order rather than on the limited cultural integration sought by the
paternal imperialists. It was certainly the approach of the Anglican Church, but not necessarily that of planters and merchants who continued to live in fear of black Jamaicans wielding menacing cutlasses. They believed that more sophisticated repression was necessary. Already in 1867, Sir John Peter Grant had created the Jamaica Constabulary Force to keep order in a society considered to be fractured by ethnic conflict. In one view, social control was to be maintained by cultural change: in the other, social control was to be enforced by the law. Both methods assumed the existence of the traditional hierarchy.

The black middle class and the intelligentsia not only challenged the racist concepts underlying the traditional hierarchy but also sought to find for themselves a place within a politically democratized political and social order. The mass of Jamaicans showed a distinct tendency to distrust and resist ‘Anglicization’ in the religious sphere, a fact demonstrated in the continuation of Revivalism in the 1880s and Bedwardian Revivalism in the 1890s.

**The Rastafarian Movement**

It is in this context that Rastafarianism, emerging in the 1920s, marked a continuum of cultural resistance that had shown itself in British-Jamaican society from the late seventeenth century. No movement, and no group in Jamaican society succeeded more in demonstrating grass-roots to ‘Europeanization’ than the Rastafarian movement, which aggressively described Jamaica as Babylon, presented His Imperial Majesty Haile Selassie as God, demanded repatriation to Ethiopia, and frightened the Jamaican elite with their long woolly dreadlocks.

Rastafarianism emerged from the roots of Jamaican society and was at the forefront of opposition to the late nineteenth-century policy of Anglicization. The black intelligentsia had challenged the racial ordering of society, favoured a democratization of education, promoted political participation by non-whites, but they never challenged the cultural hegemony of Europe in Jamaica. The Rastafarian Movement, in contrast, openly challenged the cultural order that, for them, became a Babylonian captivity. The movement
proved the limited success of the Anglicization policy. Under Leonard Howell’s leadership, tracts were distributed to inform the black masses that a black king would eventually sit on the British throne. The Bible, the Throne, in association with the Prophets – as in other messianic movements – would redeem black men in the secular heaven of Ethiopia.

The Rastafarian Movement never accepted the black middle-class assumptions about Africa. Starting in the 1920s, the Rastafarians were to begin their crusade (if that is an adequate word) for a return to Africa. They based their world view on an interpretation of the Bible, which assumed that the Scripture had been written by black men for black men but had been distorted by white men to give justification for the enslavement and oppression of blacks by whites. The Books of Apocrypha, omitted from the James I Version, became even more attractive precisely because the white man had excluded them from regular Biblical teachings. The Rastafarian order “with its complex eating taboos reflects a belief that body, mind, and nature form an integrated whole.” The order enriched a philosophical tradition among Jamaican blacks that was opposed to the “individualistic, the logical, the analytical, the materialistic view of the world” and opted for the “spiritual, communal, emotional, meditative approach.”

The instinct was to suppress the Rastafarian Movement. But Rastafarianism had deep roots in the old patterns of subaltern culture in Jamaican society, and neither repression nor mockery succeeded in eliminating the Movement. Repression was similarly a reflection of elite views of African-oriented cultures and of fears of black mass insurrection. As Chevannes has noted:

Many Rastafarian beliefs and practices are the idealization of beliefs and practices already present within the culture of the folk but carried to extremes. Such, for instance, is the God-man concept, which derives from folk beliefs in the immanence of God; such also is the sacred ritualization of female subordination, which has precedence in social and cultural life. But in other instances, deliberately and consciously, Rastafarians identified with traditions that were vilified under racist ideology.”
Rastafarian protest was assertive in its determination to give emphasis to the African roots of Jamaican mass culture. Rastafarian music itself mirrors an abrasive rejection of the European cultural order, even while using European instruments to accompany the African drum.

Predictably, the Rastafarian Movement made little impact on ‘accepted’ attitudes to ethnicity. The still predominant white segment continued to view their own racial and ethnic identity as the “only legitimate one in the nation.” Acceptance of equality of citizenship would have challenged traditional class and ethnic relations. There were sectional interests that saw culture as European (and North American white). Others, like the Rastafarians, asserted an association with Africa, while still others sought to identify a specific Jamaican culture, based on the broad process of creolization.

Following the 1930s, Jamaica history moved into a more democratic and egalitarian mode. As CLR James has argued, “assumptions of ‘white supremacy’ were no longer sustainable in West Indian political life as a result of the emergence of a West Indian middle class whose sense of accomplishment had rendered those notions obsolete.”
Chapter Five

Left Incline: 1938 and After

A series of circumstances contrived after the 1930s to force a ‘left incline in Jamaican history. Of the external factors, the Great Depression of the thirties and the ideological debates generated by World War II were probably the most important. Important, too, was British action, though actions of the Colonial Office were not, strictly speaking, ‘external’. Events in Ethiopia continued to reverberate in the diaspora, with Haile Selassie robed as a black leader defending the black race against white Italian fascism. The changes generated after 1938, however, are comprehensible only in terms of the social, political and economic forces that had preceded that historic year.

It has been argued before that the system of liberal (laissez faire) capitalism that predominated in the Atlantic economy and in European economic thought during the nineteenth century, and which underpinned the massive growth of the international economy after the 1870s, went bankrupt with the Great Depression of the 1930s. The late nineteenth century had witnessed not only an expansion of the world economy but also greater proletarianization. The period after about 1880 in Jamaica, for example, saw the expansion of the banana agrarian proletariat and the “reorganization of the sugar industry with a proletariat core.” Some Jamaicans had been proletarianized in the cane-fields and sugar factories of Cuba. Social change could not be easily accommodated in the contemporary political and constitutional arrangements which looked to the past and not to the future.

The Great Depression, commencing with the Wall Street Crash of 1929, had far-reaching consequences for the western industrial nations and, by extension, economies integrated into the Atlantic System. Commodity prices fell and so did the ability to consume foreign goods in an export-import economy such as Jamaica. Unemployment soared, wages fell. What also fell was the belief in free-market liberalism.
In the prevailing crisis, United States enterprises could not persuade Spanish Caribbean and Central American Governments to play host to West Indian labourers in American firms. Cuba, and various Central American Governments, sent home thousands of West Indians. National Governments, asserting national and nationalist needs more vigorously, shifted from a policy of importing cheap labour to providing employment for their unemployed working classes. Liberalism, which had sustained that policy of migration, had been discredited with the Depression. Cuba, under the intensely nationalistic regime of Dr. Ramon Grau San Martin, decreed in 1933 that 50 per cent of employees in agriculture or industry had to be Cuban. Jamaican immigration was definitely banned. The 1933 law aggravated a situation that had been growing worse for the Jamaicans ever since the 1920s when Cuba showed signs of suffering from a crisis of overproduction.

Jamaicans returning home were fully aware of labour organization as a means of defending workers’ interests. Garvey and the UNIA had also been active not only in Jamaica and in the USA but also in those areas such as Cuba and Central America where Jamaicans and other West Indians had settled.

There had been other tensions in Jamaica. World War I veterans had already showed their anger at ‘British ingratitude’ for their war service. The Native Defenders Committee, whose leadership included Jamaicans returning home from the Spanish Caribbean and the USA, had committed itself to the harassment of the Chinese community in Jamaica. The NDC programme was a response to the growing number of Chinese businessmen who had been entering the country since the start of the century. In contrast, opportunities for emigration by black Jamaicans were being constantly reduced. The Lebanese were also targeted for attack.

The Moyne Commission, established in the wake of the 1938 riots, noted the growing level of racial tension in the society. The League of Coloured People called, from London, for universal adult suffrage, a Federation of the West Indies and, essentially, a voice for labour. The International African Service Bureau (IASB) advocated much the same thing but also called for economic reform such as the development of tourism and of industries as well as for
greater support by government for the “diversification of the peasant sector, if necessary through the break up of existing plantations.”  

The policies of exclusion based on race and class had been weakening from the beginning of the century. The challenge of black and coloured intellectuals contributed to the fundamental questioning of the political and social system set up between 1838 and 1866. The assumption of European cultural hegemony was similarly challenged. No longer could the concept of government being equivalent to an extreme dedication to law and order for the protection of the ‘responsible classes’ apply in the context of 1938 and after. The colonial system after 1866 had indeed been a modification of the pre-1838 system, but the prejudices of the pre and post-Emancipation were identical. The Jamaican leadership had not conceived of and, therefore, had not considered a new society after Emancipation.

Political leadership south of the United States asserted four major tendencies. The first was to maintain the old laissez-faire or liberal capitalist system intact. The second was to devise various types of corporatist regimes – in their extreme form fascist regimes of the extreme right. The third was to organize totalitarian leftist regimes, inspired by the successes of the USSR. In either the second or third manifestation, whether of the right or left, political regimes between the 1930s and 1940s “established contact between the political minorities and the common people of their countries.” This development was both an opportunistic response to the political radicalization of the masses and a recognition that social changes taking place after the 1870s had to be accommodated. But there was a fourth response that proved attractive to the British and, by extension, the British Colonies in the Caribbean. This was British or Fabian socialism, which had its roots not in Marxist socialism but in late nineteenth-century positivism and social Darwinism. The British Welfare State was a compromise that reconciled capitalism with state-supervised welfare. In Hobsbawm’s words, it was a “capitalism shorn of its belief in the optimality of free markets and reformed by a sort of unofficial marriage or permanent liaison with the moderate social-democracy of non-communist labour movements.”
This was the broad context in which the nationalist and trade union movement evolved in Jamaica in the late 1930s. The PNP, which was given its ideological orientation by a very articulate left – Frank and Ken Hill, Richard Hart and Arthur Henry (the hour H’s) – demonstrated how indeed Hitler’s malevolent conduct had;

Restored the alliance of nationalism with the left, which had seemed so natural before 1848…. National liberation had become the slogan of the left…. Liberation in what was not yet known as the Third World was now seen every-where as ‘national liberation’ or, among the Marxists, ‘national and social liberation’.” 58.

In Jamaica itself, Governor Arthur Richards persecuted the ‘left’, which he associated with three things: disloyalty to the British Empire and a desire on the part of certain Jamaicans to see Britain lose the War. “It is not so much that they wish to see Germany win, as that they wish to see Britain lose.” Secondly, Secondly, they desired to bring about government by blacks, which Sir Arthur as highly undesirable, or in his words, echoing late nineteenth-century Darwinism, “rule of the unfit”. He referred to the Jamaica Progressive League as “standing essentially for self-government by the unfit.” Sir Arthur declared in 1940. “Jamaicans are constitutionally unteachable. They know it all much better already. It is no use quoting Trinidad. Conditions there must be child’s play to those in Jamaica, the home of poisonous misrepresentation, ignorant prejudice and untaught conceit.” Richards, finally, described JAG Smith, Mr. Campbell, and Dr. Anderson as “in season and out…. Preaching racial hatred. The sterile gospel of Jamaica for the black Jamaicans without any relation to a constructive policy.” Jamaicans had “an incredible ignorance and capacity for being misled.” 59. Sir Arthur Richards was making the last stand for the political domination of the old white oligarchy.

The rising tide of discontent in 1938 not only reflects the dismal social situation in Jamaica, aggravated as it was by the return of unemployed and sometimes destitute Jamaicans from the Spanish Caribbean. It also mirrors ideological aspects of the approaching war (democracy versus fascism), and the evolution of British socialism. It also undermined the old politics of race
and class. While hundreds of Jamaicans volunteered to fight in World War II, sometimes for patriotic reasons, at others to seek opportunities abroad, as usual, some elements of the radicalized coloured middle class condemned the war effort. The social turmoil of the period was contained partly by the application of wartime defense regulations, but turbulence on the labour front continued through most of the war period, 1939-1945. The workers’ movement became a part of the social and political process and played an essential role in providing a mass base for the nationalist movement. The two movements, therefore, were linked in a symbiotic relationship, with the workers’ movement gaining significantly from new legislation and from the protective paternity of the British Trade Union Conference (TUC).

Alexander Bustamante, founder of the Bustamante Industrial Trade Union in 1938, was interned on September 8, 1940, following a speech in which he called for war, revolution, bloodshed, freedom of assembly, land distribution, self-government, and black war against whites. Bustamante made a pointed reference to the colour-class question: “The niggers of this country shall rise. We want revolution in this country and before whites destroy us we will destroy them… The Negro blood has been shedding (sic) for the past 102 years and the time has come when we will shed theirs.” In the view of Governor Richards, Richard Hart was “an extreme and violent revolutionary who has been increasingly engaged since the outbreak of war in subversive activities of a most dangerous character.” Hart, he claimed, was anti-British and anti-government. Hart’s statement on November 10, 1942 did not please Richards: “Capitalism plunges the world into imperialist wars and for such conflicts attempts to provide itself with strategic bases in many parts of the world.”

He found no rest from his anxieties, either, in Frank Hill’s pronouncements against the war:

[T] his is not our war. It is Tory England’s war. It is evident that as time goes on the illusion may be shattered, but the main illusion remains that our imperial masters, having drenched their Empire in blood and filth and oppression all these years, have suddenly seen the error of their
ways. That is the illusion that supposedly intelligent men and women who are fighting for the liberation of their country from British Imperialists are believing. Does it sound like a huge farce? 61.

As Hitler’s victories in Europe mounted, the United States Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, proposed a mandate or trusteeship over the British Caribbean in the event of a British defeat at the hands of Germany.

The Jamaica Progressive League and the West Indies National Emergency Committee both objected to the idea of US control, and appealed to the Pan-American delegates meeting in Havana to support Jamaica’s call for ‘self-determination’. On July 2, 1940, the Jamaica Progressive League pointed out that it was:

… unalterably opposed to any plan that would transfer Jamaica from one sovereignty to another, even though the new sovereignty be Western, or which would place the Island under a trusteeship of any sort, without negotiation with Jamaican leaders and a plebiscite to determine the wishes of the electorate… The status of an independent nation is the only status that would automatically follow the demise of British imperial authority… We shall not be contended, under any new order that may emerge from the present war, to be less than free citizens in our native land. 62.

The Jamaicans received support from the Argentine Foreign Minister, Dr. Melo, and from Fulgencio Batista, President of Cuba, who championed the rights of the Caribbean people to self-government. Batista, in fact, spoke in favour of Caribbean independence and had, within Cuba itself, championed a very liberal and democratic constitution.

While Jamaicans spoke of independence and self-government, the Governor of Jamaica continued to discuss Jamaica in terms of the fear of social disorder. The panic of the white elite (aptly articulated by Governor Richards) rested on the assumption that any movement for change would provoke widespread social disorder, and endanger the hegemony, or worse, the safety of whites.
The Moyne Commission had expressed the view that the Government of Jamaica had a view of government limited to the “conception of government as the guardians of law and order”. In Jamaica, any effort to amend the social order was construed, even in the 1940s, as a threat to the physical safety of whites.

The period after 1938 proved a watershed also because of the ideological success of democracy against totalitarian fascism by 1945, with the assistance of the atomic bomb. Hitler’s Germany, Mussolini’s Italy, and Imperial Japan were not the only losers in the war, however. The war forewarned the collapse of the British Empire. The clamour of the Jamaican middle classes for greater autonomy, self-government or independence was supplemented by the international victory of democracy. Empire, which based itself on the control of subject peoples, was inconsistent with the new concepts of self-determination. In addition, the victory of Gandhi in securing Indian independence had definitely removed the heart of the Empire.

The rise of the two-party system in Jamaica represents the emergence of modern political parties and a clear commitment to modern social organizations such as Trade Unions in a new era in which, for the British Colonies, social reform was not to be regarded as inimical to capitalism. The British Government, more anxious than ever to reform its image as a socially negligent Imperialist, provided not only greater scope for political expression by introducing Universal Adult Suffrage in 1944 but also provided significant funding through Colonial Development and Welfare to finance social development and welfare projects in the British Caribbean. The Colonial Office always made it clear that the funds were not intended to be used for charitable purposes but for projects that would address, in the long-term, the social problems of the Caribbean. Not surprisingly, the two political parties attempted, with varying degrees of success, to contribute to the growth of laissez-faire capitalism while simultaneously seeking to secure mass welfare. Their limited success in reconciling those apparent extremes mirrored the reality that, since the 1940s, both major political parties were in fact coalitions of contending class factions. It was a particularly articulate minority within the party that enunciated the ‘socialist’ orientation of the PNP.
The very cosmopolitan and aristocratic Norman Manley, who was, like so many members of the coloured middle classes of the period, deeply influenced by European culture, consciously encouraged the creation of a synthesis of culture in which the African culture in Jamaica would be acknowledged as an essential aspect of modern Jamaican culture. For Jamaica in 1940, this was a radical approach to culture. It was Manley who commissioned, in 1960, the first major study on Rastafarianism. The political and constitutional changes after the 1940s were matched by a reorientation that viewed a Jamaican national culture, for the first time, as an alternative to European culture. The late nineteenth-century’s focus on ‘Anglicization’ gave way to ‘Creole nationalism’. Intellectually this was the foundation of the concept of a Creole society, which suggests the “origins of a distinctive common culture as a basis for national unity” an ideology specific to a “middle-class intelligentsia that seeks a leading role in an integrated, newly independent society.”

Under this new dispensation, “a synthetic national culture was promoted, tending to discourage racial or ethnic thinking that might separate citizens of the nation”. History, nationalism, cultural growth, and self-confidence were very central to the elder Manley’s thought. But within and outside the PNP were areas of thought much attracted to what then seemed the Soviet alternative of economic growth or, at another level, the re-distributive justice inherent in the concept of British Socialism. The PNP’s advocacy of socialism was entirely consistent with the post-World War II ethos, at least up to 1947 when the Cold War reshaped international relations into two rigidly circumscribed spheres of influence.

The victory of ‘democracy’ over ‘fascism’ helped to shape a new world order of anti-colonialism, nationalism, and an institutional voice for the popular masses of people who had consistently been deprived of a ‘voice’. The victory of democracy had also meant the consolidation of the United States as the major world power while Europe slowly recovered from a particularly devastating war. Already the signs were there that Jamaica’s trade relations would become more closely linked to the US market. There appears to have been no dispute within the JLP as to the orientation of Jamaica towards the US
and the West. In 1952 the PNP asserted its ties with the western ‘sphere of influence’ when it expelled the ‘Left’ of the party, distanced itself from the TUC, which was institutionally linked with the radical wing of the party, and formed the National Workers’ Union as an anti-Communist Trade Union.

The embracing of the Puerto Rican model was a logical development in the 1950s. In Puerto Rico itself the ‘model’ developed partly out of the desire of the Puerto Rican leadership to create a new social and economic order, which would reduce pressures for political independence from the United States. The Jamaican government, on the other hand, was attracted mainly by the possibility of large inflows of United States capital to develop its economy and increase employment opportunities. In the post-War period, the United States became the major exporter of capital, and led the great post-war boom that was to end in the early 1970s.

As it was, Jamaica’s economy flew on the wings of a rapidly expanding tourist industry, fuelled by aviation’s new jet engines, and on the wings of a growing bauxite and alumina industry which, in turn, fueled metropolitan industry. The Island’s social problems were eased less by new employment opportunities in capital intensive businesses than by a continuous migration to post-war Britain and North America. Local, meaning Caribbean-wide, enthusiasm for a Federation of the West Indies was buttressed by a British desire for cheaper administration. Caribbean nationalism, within Jamaica, was too undeveloped to provide the ideological support for a Federation. Jamaicans have traditionally dismissed the British South and Eastern Caribbean as the ‘small islands’ – including (incorrectly) continental Guyana. The profound separation of Jamaica from the affairs of the Southern and Eastern Caribbean was manifested in the rejection of the Federation. Within a year of withdrawing from the Federation, Jamaica received its Independence on August 6, 1962.

However, what had been settled before 1962, was the pro-Western stance of both major political parties. The ideological position of the PNP when the Hills, Hart and Henry had been expelled from the party gave the PNP a less radical image under the new reality of the Cold War after 1947. Settled too,
was a two-party system, with each party linked to a major trade union, regarded by one historian as “the particular contribution of the British Labour Party’s active engagement in support of Caribbean democracy.” 65. The failure of Millard Johnson’s Peoples’ Political Party to make an impact on the electorate seemed to signal the triumph over Black Nationalism of integrative Creole nationalism within the two major political parties.
Chapter Six

Political Independence 1962

Despite the rumours that political independence would lead to bloodshed, August 6, 1962 proved a quiet transition. Black Nationalism had no institutional representation, but traditional fears of manic blacks with cutlasses prevailed. The polarizations in the society were partly concealed by an unprecedented economic boom arising from new investments in bauxite-alumina and tourism and by the continuation of migration overseas.

Jamaican political independence was the culmination of a constitutional process that had begun in the late seventeenth century. The assumptions were different, of course. What Professor Froude had regarded in the nineteenth century as an absurd idea – a black Parliament – had actually come into existence. The transitional nature of independence was similarly demonstrated in the economic reality that the country was already a part of the ‘American Mediterranean’. Political independence actually gave to Jamaica what seemed the best of two worlds, the Old World of the Empire (now transformed into a Commonwealth) which continued to extend Commonwealth preferences for bananas and sugar, and the New World of US capital and markets. One of the crucial links between the Old World and this new one was language, i.e. English. A second was the sequential domination of world technology by John Bull and then Uncle Sam. The historical process whose end could hardly have been predicted had granted the vote to the Jamaican masses one hundred years after they had constituted an enslaved labour force. So convinced were the makers of the Constitution that freedom had definitively come that August 1, Emancipation Day, ceased to be celebrated.

Jamaica’s new flag and national anthem earned it in 1962 the title ‘new nation’. In fact, the nation in the sense of a community of people who had developed identifiable traditions and some form of ‘we-group’ feeling was quite old. Modern Jamaica’s evolution started in 1494. Many of Jamaica’s institutions were old. The Island’s culture had been hammered out on the anvil
of confrontation and accommodation between Europe and Africa. But there had been others. Indians, Chinese and Middle-Easterners joined the Jamaican community in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Late in the nineteenth century came Cubans who founded Jamaica’s tobacco industry on lands in the Temple Hall area of St. Andrew.

The Constitutional principle had been implanted. There were educational institutions, at the primary, secondary and tertiary level, two international airports, a civic body dedicated to the empowerment (or relief) of the poor. From 1942 there existed the Council of Voluntary Social Services (CVSS) under whose aegis was an abundance of organizations dedicated to social work. These organizations selected women, children, teen-agers for poverty alleviation, skills training, and leadership education. Later they were joined by US-based service clubs such as Lions, Kiwanis, the Jaycees and more recently the Optimist Club. Religious toleration was the norm. There was an extensive road network and a railroad that traversed the island. A para-military police force created in 1867 carried out its peacekeeping functions armed with wooden batons. The Gleaner, founded in 1834, continued to appear daily.

Theoretically, political independence gave Jamaica the option to exercise an independent foreign policy. Close relations with the United States, increased through the migration of Jamaicans to areas of US capital investment, were strengthened by comparable (but not identical) constitutional traditions. Full internal self-government had been practised since 1958. Jamaica opted to remain within the western alliance and the Island’s diplomatic relations with Cuba were carefully couched in terms of a pragmatic need to respond to the needs of Jamaicans still resident in Cuba, Jamaica’s closest neighbour. When Jamaica joined the Organization of American States it became party to the Rio Treaty of 1947 which had declared, among other things, the commitment of all Latin American nations to defend each other in the event of foreign aggression against any of the Latin American states. Thus Jamaica signed itself into the US sphere of influence in the context of US anxiety about Soviet infiltration of the Western Hemisphere.
Jamaica, like other independent nations of the hemisphere, was eager to have as free access as possible to North American capital. A Cold War Alliance seemed a small price to pay for expanding tourism and bauxite/alumina, for the skyscrapers of New Kingston, multi-storeyed hotels on the North Coast (towering over the Great Houses of the plantation tradition), new highways, an expanding educational system, and a freedom to stimulate a national culture.

There were considerable improvements in health care. Malaria, typhoid fever, as well as tuberculosis were eliminated, poliomyelitis came and went after 1953, infant mortality declined. Jamaica joined the rest of the so-called Third World in a population explosion.

**Further Left Incline: Black Power**

When Jamaica became independent in 1962 the framers of the national motto opted for ‘Out of Many One People’. The motto, it was believed, endorsed multi-racism as the basis for social cohesion. Indeed, it was more. Jamaica intended to prove to the world that all the races could live together in harmony.

The late 1960s and 1970s demonstrated that ‘blackness’ in Jamaica had not run its course. Tangible demonstrations of wealth spawned widespread materialism and emphasised the long-existing polarization of wealth and poverty. Inevitably, in a society where the majority of the population is black and coloured the poorest segment of the population was black and coloured. The 1963 ‘Coral Gardens Uprising’ (probably based on problems of land-holding, squatting and anti-Rastafarian attitudes) directed by the still controversial Rastafarians, led to the deaths of policemen and Rastafarians, and the arrest of 150 Rastafarians. The memory of Claudius Henry’s ‘treason’ in 1959 had not been forgotten. There followed in 1965 an anti-Chinese riot resulting from the decision of three Chinese brothers to beat a black female employee.

The mainspring of Black Power in the United States was largely different from the Jamaican experience. African Americans, in some states, were deliberately discriminated against in law and by law enforcement agencies. It was an all-out struggle against ‘Jim Crow’ legislation. These were not problems replicated in Jamaican society.

Discrimination in Jamaica had its roots not in institutions but in uneven economic opportunities. Rural folk crowded Kingston and St. Andrew in the hope of finding employment in the new industrial estates. To a considerable extent, all this was an internal process which was, however, aggravated by external factors – such as Black Power, the Civil Rights Movement, the activities and the ideas of the Black Panthers, of Stokley Carmichael and Malcolm ‘X’ – that interacted with that internal process. The banning of the writings of the above men and groups expressed beyond a doubt the concern held by the Jamaican Government that racially motivated works written in the United States could fan the flames of race in Jamaica, and especially because Jamaicans often expressed discontent not in terms of class only but of race.

The real contribution of the Black Power and Civil Rights movements was that they initiated a wholesale examination of the history and culture of black people and helped to sensitize Jamaicans to non-European alternatives. ‘Black American’ music in particular, which had already influenced Jamaica in ‘Negro Spirituals’, continued to increase in popularity. Paul Robeson, Marian Anderson, Louis ‘Satchmo’ Armstrong, Nat King Cole, and later Sam Cooke, ‘Fats’ Domino became very popular on the airwaves. Jazz, the Blues, and ‘Rock ‘n’ Roll’ supplemented the popular ‘mento’ form in Jamaica. The new sensitivity to Jamaican Folk was demonstrated by the publication of Tom Murray’s *Folk Songs of Jamaica* in the 1950s. Of course, before radio became widespread it was not unusual for Jamaican ‘Fairs’ especially Emancipation
Day Celebrations (before Independence) to have local bands play mento with flutes, violins, saxophones and drums. Contemporary Gospel Music in Jamaica is much influenced by the African American experience. The United States’ cultural influence on Jamaica was not only from white America.

In Jamaica, the Guyanese Walter Rodney, through his public lectures in African history ‘gave to black people a sense of past achievement and therefore future purpose. They were, to people brainwashed for centuries in a sense of their own worthlessness, an indispensable psychological asset.” 67.

The links between national elite and metropolitan culture, together with ethnicity, had created a society that placed social distance between the elite and the coloured masses. Jamaica’s cultural identity began to emerge from the originally marginalized segments of the population. The search for the Creole or national experience challenged the traditional cultural hegemony and opened the doors for the assertion of equality. Cultural identity became inseparable from mass culture. The Jamaican governments were also proactive in promoting black and coloured Jamaicans to the pantheon of heroes, beginning with Marcus Garvey. It is probable that for some black Jamaicans the new recognition of black and coloured Jamaicans was symbolic only.

There was a continuum between Garvey’s ‘black pride’, Rastafarian Afro-centrism, United States Black Power, and revolutionary Marxism. Precisely because of the dehumanizing aspects blacks, who constituted the majority of the population of the independent nation had to be liberated not only as a working class but as a race, and liberation of the race assumed cultural liberation. Richard Hart’s works on the slave experience in Jamaica in many respects combined at least two of these radical traditions. He was Afro-centrist in the sense that he argued that Africans/slaves had attempted to create their own pattern of freedom during slavery, and that therefore the black working class, their descendants, had the intellectual and moral qualities necessary to mould their own destiny. The second part of the equation was his Marxist orientation that led Governor Arthur Richards to label him a ‘dangerous revolutionary’, committed to the establishment of an economy and society that provided the black working class with maximum opportunities in a Jamaican
version of Bolshevism. Jamaican Marxism never completely separated itself from issues of black equality and progress. In this context, it is important to note the enormous influence of the Russian Revolution on the thinking of dissident intellectuals in the colonial world and in the New World of nation states, which saw a backward capitalist country convert itself into a major world power. That the USSR was a giant with feet of clay became apparent mainly with 

_**glasnost** and _**perestroika**, not before. The moral support given by the Soviets and by the Cubans to national liberation movements in Angola, Mozambique, Namibia, and South Africa during the Breshnev years gave the Cubans and Soviets an indisputable moral authority with respect to the future of blacks.

Jamaica, during the first Michael Manley regime (1972-80), gave unqualified moral support to those liberation movements, partly through conviction but partly because Michael Manley’s revived PNP provided an umbrella for articulate dissenters of anti-systemic tendencies. That support, given that foreign policy is an extension of internal policy, confirmed in the minds of Jamaica’s anti-Communists not only that equality within was being complemented by the search for equality without, but that Jamaica could become trapped in its own socialist rhetoric. It is also becoming more evident that there is an association between black equality and the struggle against a definite philosophy of white supremacy. 68. The dilemma of an Europeanized elite in independent Jamaica was how to create a nation with a clear identity when Europe had always been the yardstick of culture, and cultural originality lay in the marginalized black working class.

However, the Golden Age born after World War II was coming to an end by the early 1970s. In the 1980s there was ‘stagflation’. Secondly, in a country in which social, economic and political problems are often voiced in racial terms, the rising Black Power Movement in the USA had a profound influence on intellectual life. Critical attention was now paid to the question of income distribution in Jamaica where black people, for all practical purposes, continued to be destined to be the segment of the population required to work to keep the economy going without gaining an adequate return for their labour. The age-old pattern of suppressing wages continued. Not entirely
unconnected is the unraveling of the ties between the political parties and their labour union bases, the protests against political unionism, and generally anti-systemic thought.

Thirdly, radical intellectuals not only in the Caribbean but also in other parts of the hemisphere assumed a linear relationship between North American imperialism and the poverty of Third World countries. Fourthly, the decision of OPEC to increase oil prices twice in the 1970s was to have an enormously negative impact on non-oil producers. In Jamaica itself, Michael Manley called for a New International Economic Order, committed himself to support of African liberation movements, stridently condemned Apartheid, and encouraged dialogue with Fidel Castro. In imitation of OPEC, he spearheaded the formation of the International Bauxite Association (IBA). The Association could not, obviously, achieve what POEC had, partly because one commodity was relatively scarce and the other relatively abundant. Simultaneously, partly to ensure oil supplies to Jamaica, Manley developed close relations with Venezuela, an enemy of Castro. Ironically, Venezuela was committed to discouraging more Fidelista movements from developing in the Caribbean and sought democratic allies in its own new commitment to democracy after 1958.

Meanwhile, the United States defeated (or, depending on preference, lacking success) in Vietnam, was faced with a complacent USSR under Breshnev who was scoring high marks in Africa, and among Third World countries. The US, isolated from its allies in its Middle East policy of support for Israel, faced with new apparently radical movements in Central America (Nicaragua and El Salvador), and a socialist regime in Chile, under Salvador Allende, revived the Cold War, especially in the first few years of the Reagan administration. The ‘evil empire” – the words of Mr. Reagan – came under attack as the actor turned President radically reasserted US power in the world. The radical conservatism of Ronald Reagan and Margaret Thatcher was aided by a new policy of neo-liberalism.

As You Were and Right About Turn!
Michael Manley was, in part, a victim of the new Cold War and, in part, of structural adjustment. It can be argued, however, that at the same time there were serious limitations to state power, limitations increased by an alert political opposition. No less important were the influences of long-term economic factors. The new JLP administration, under Edward Seaga, turned its back on Third World radicalism. His regime restored the focus to the western alliance with the expulsion of the Cuban Ambassador to Jamaica. More than a kind of symbolic ‘tit for tat’ response to the expulsion of the US Ambassador, Mr. De Roulet, by Michael Manley in the 1970s, Seaga’s action was an attempt to restore the status quo to what it had been before 1973.

The difficulties and challenges of the contemporary period are not in dispute. Jamaica survives in a highly competitive world. As a small island, it is forced to confront the reality of economies of scale that threaten our competitiveness. As a tourist-dependent economy, it must face the potential fickleness of an industry that can be dried up suddenly through natural catastrophe, boredom and staleness, or reports of violence and political instability. As a bauxite-alumina producing country it faces the challenge that bauxite is probably the most common ore in the world. The expanding world economy after 1945 was able to absorb into the labour force a high percentage of those who came on to the labour market. Liberalism, which had collapsed with the Great Depression, revived after World War II but not in its pristine form. It was now accompanied by the welfare state, or at least states committed to welfare.

Far-reaching changes, however, were occurring in the international economy, which were no less significant than the introduction of the welfare state idea after World War II, or after systematic free trade was introduced in the middle of the nineteenth century. In the period starting with the 1960s, but accelerating through the 1970s, transnational corporations loosened their ties with nation states. The terms ‘globalization’ and ‘deregulation’, are manifestations of a dispensation in which the old liberalism of the late nineteenth century has been revived. It has been argued that the new liberalism, like the old, is less concerned with national boundaries. Contemporary globalization has tended to mean, more than anything else, the hegemony of the multinational corporations. Fewer companies produce
increasing quantities of the world’s goods. In the motor car industry, for example, the “largest twelve companies now produce between them some four-fifths of the world’s total.” 69. Telecommunications companies are now larger and fewer than ever foreseen.

Contemporary globalization does raise questions regarding the viability of the nation state as the base for development. The new ideology reduces the power of the state. To the extent that globalization encourages cultural uniformity in the ‘global village’ it may, ironically, help to recreate nationalism as its antithesis, a nationalism that focuses even more on the destructiveness of heritage. And as one Caribbean historian has noted: “There seems to be no doubt that the nation-state, as a spatial unit of cultural identification, remains the organizing principle of the globalized order. 70.

The new liberalism, like the old, has meant and will continue to mean greater polarizations of income between rich and poor. It also assumes, internally, a larger role for the national private sector, which had functioned relatively successfully under previous protectionist regimes. The old polarization had stimulated the growth of mutual-aid societies and labour unions that had eased the pressures on the working class. Contemporary management strategies have devised means to emasculate Trade Unions.
Chapter Seven

Continuity and Change

Jamaica is no longer ruled by a supposed ‘cultivated minority’ standing above a culture-starved, amorphous coloured mass. We could say that since 1944 a new order has developed in which groups share equally in the political life of the nation in proportion to their population, and where citizenship encompass (es) different yet compatible ethnic identities together constituting the nation.

Since 1944, all Jamaicans over eighteen years have the vote, all Jamaicans have access to the Press, the mixed culture of the island has given an identity rather distinct from what European leaders had sought to impose as a ‘Jamaican’ culture. Jamaican artists and artistes have recorded, in different ways, for our cultural history the –principles or visions that make us different. Jamaica expresses itself in two languages, the Jamaican Creole and English, with the latter fighting a losing battle. Admittedly the contribution that the Jamaican Creole has made to the enrichment of national expression, has its dark side – a gloomy threat of isolation from the language of international commerce and technology.

Trade Unions have grown and consolidated themselves, thereby providing roughly 20 per cent of the island’s working class with vigorous and needed representation. The Trade Unions have had a significant impact on the legal system, have been a protective bulwark against employers whose standard approach throughout Jamaica’s history has been to depress wages, and to deny workers (slaves, ex-slaves and their descendants) the right to a decent quality of life. The international links of the unions have also served them very well, whether through the British TUC, the United States based AFL-CIO, or the International Labour Organization. Trade Unions have been an essential element in the efforts of the country to establish democratic institutions.

In addition, as we have noted before, there is an array of civic organizations that represent interest groups and disadvantaged groups. Jamaicans attempt,
indeed, to create organizations to keep up with all new definitions of ‘suffering’. Several of these organizations are under-funded, but the spirit of charity has never died in Jamaica, and there are scores of citizens who devote a significant proportion of their spare time to charitable efforts. Jamaica has an active media. Jamaica has performed admirably in sports. The educational system has widened opportunities for Jamaica’s youth. The Churches, though no longer the principal surrogates for the interests of the working classes, have continued active on the social, educational and spiritual front.

Yet there is some concern that the new order is not indisputably better than the old. The old order, it is argued, though jaundiced by racism, had produced some kind of order in a society where everyone knew his or her place. Old value systems have broken down, the old order has gone, and there have been no new values to replace the old. The discarding of old rules has meant no rules at all. The sense of community has been lost both at the national and local level. So it is argued.

We could call into question whether the old order has in fact gone, for two reasons. Firstly, even if we dare to assume for the time being that racism has disappeared, the intolerance and authoritarianism underlying that racism has not. Secondly, despite the absence of a visible white racism against blacks – As far as I can see – there is, as Don Robotham explicitly pointed out in his 1998 lecture, a growing black racism. But black racism is of two kinds. One is directed against non-blacks while the other, just as pernicious, is the racism exercised by blacks against one another, accompanied, contraditorily by a continued servile deference toward whites. As Paulo Freire has noted:

“Self-depreciation is another characteristic of the oppressed, which derives from their internalization of the opinion the oppressors hold of them… So often do they hear that they are good for nothing, know nothing and are incapable of learning anything – that they are sick, lazy and unproductive – that in the end they become convinced of their own unfitness.” 71.
The oppressed have grasped only too readily the instruments of oppression, without understanding that it is the principle of oppression that needs to be removed and replaced by equality of citizenship. The continuing problem of race is also, I think, manifested in the ‘Brownings’ phenomenon, where young females bleach their facial skin to reflect a middling racial category but leave their, bizarrely, in the natural colour.

Imbedded in our consciousness is a dedication to hierarchy which dictates that we seek to ascertain who is better than us and who are worse than us. Or as Dantes Bellegarde explained for Haiti: “Here… we wear two faces, one for those above us, and one for those beneath us.” Interpersonal relationships are authoritarian. Authoritarian interpersonal relationships are inimical to democratic growth, because they challenge the underlying egalitarian principle of democracy.

The dedication to authoritarian attitudes is readily seen in those establishments that have removed pleasant receptionists who gave a smile of welcome to prospective clients and placed, in their stead, surly security guards who make it abundantly clear that people, especially those with dark skins, are not welcome. These attitudes do not generate sensible attitudes towards service. Several black-owned businesses in this city behave as though they are doing customers a favour by selling an article. The old virus of racism has not gone. It has merely, like a virus, muted.

I turn briefly to the perennial complaint about production. All are agreed that Jamaican production needs to be increased and quality improved. It should be understood that if Jamaica were serious about productivity we should continue to have a five-day week, but not a Monday to Friday week. Hours of production time are lost in Jamaica, as citizens have universally to go to the bank, to the Post Office, to the garages, to the Tax Office, to the Mortgage Company, to the lawyer, between Monday to Friday.

The old order was not Utopia, and part of it (not all of it) changed because historical processes inside and outside Jamaica had made some aspects of it
anachronistic. The changes occurring after 1938 did not bring Utopia. Neither did the events accompanying Emancipation one hundred years before.

Yet we must be careful to recognize that values and attitudes in Jamaica are in part a reflection of a revolution in manners and customs in the western world of which Jamaica is a part. Writing with respect to Europe, Eric Hobsbawm insists that the concepts of ‘Rights and duties, mutual obligations, sin and virtue, sacrifice, conscience, rewards and penalties [can] no longer be translated into the new language of desired gratification.” 73. Values built up during the Victorian period have come tumbling down.

The old order was neither integrated nor a source of satisfaction for the whole populace. The same goes for the current order. Social change is not founded only on social engineering or moral preference but upon an amalgam of forces that push human civilization forward or even backward. We cannot deny social change, without denying history.

Many would readily apply to Jamaica the analysis of Brazil by Eduardo Neiva:

> Laws are made but not made or followed. The prevailing individualism has the shape of an “anything goes” practice. [Brazilian] Individualism is Authoritarian. Its social aim is to impose discipline and respect. Justice is never a shared horizon, for empowered individuals will not respect the laws challenging their selfish purposes. Respect is reserved just for the individual or group of individuals that are forceful enough to impose discipline. 74.

But is this pattern of behaviour of all Jamaicans?

Coming under regular attack is the structure of the Jamaican family. The criticism is quite justified. Yet, at the end of the nineteenth century, ‘illegitimacy’ was universally analysed as the cause of the ‘social crisis’ or referred to as the ‘great social evil’. More sensitive observers noted, even then, that concubinage (which did produce illegitimate children) among black
Jamaicans constituted stable unions, a strong sense of family, and a dedication to child welfare. So impressed were they with those patterns of stability that efforts were made to convert those stable unions into Christian marriages. Rev. Webb in 1902 recommended the amendment to the marriage law, “legalising the union of such persons without publication of bans and under well-defined conditions, and legitimatising (sic) their children.” Attempts at mass marriage usually failed because Christian marriages assumed the subordination of women rather than the principle of partnership that underlay the patterns of black concubinage.

They noted too the other pattern of concubinage between European men and ‘coloured’ housekeepers. These liaisons usually ended when white men finally decided to marry white women. Jamaican family life has probably never been ideal. In this twentieth century the structure of marriage in the metropolitan centres perhaps came to resemble our own more closely. High divorce rates in the United States and Europe can hardly make for stable family life. Non-legal marriage is not, of itself, a denial of commitment to family, any more than ‘legal marriage’ creates in itself an ideal situation for the raising of families. In Jamaica’s Victorian epoch, gentlemen were accused of keeping mistresses during Legislative Council Sessions in Spanish Town; other gentlemen were accused of leading lives of open shame or of siring numerous illegitimate progeny.

The structure of violence that makes prisoners of most of us is commented upon as if it were a new phenomenon. The police records early in last century reveal a surprising number of cases of violence against the person, though fatalities were less common than now. What is new is that the gun has replaced old tools of violence and that there is a wave of violence associated with criminal international narcotics trafficking and gunrunning. That traffic is international, and can only be dealt with through systematic and unreserved cooperation with other nations (or sections of nations) who are committed to destroying a trade that is dissipating the energies, and destroying the health, of youth. But equally important is the identification of mechanisms to dissuade youth from orienting their lives in that direction. Such a course of action does not involve a moral education only, but an education in self-interest. The
materialism that pervades the world’s nations has also affected our youth. The older generation cannot take refuge in some ideal past when elders spoke and the young instinctively obeyed. The youth revolution, from the late 1960s, encouraged youth to disregard convention. The challenge to authority has become a value in its own right. Unrestricted freedom of the individual is favoured over old authoritarian systems. Materialism is a greater driving force than a commitment to excellence. But the two things are not irreconcilable. While it is undesirable to build self-esteem on the possession of goods, materialism can be an energizing force for excellence. The report that urban youth in India “are more concerned with their professional ambition than their caste”, and are less concerned with the “ins and outs of politics” is probably counterbalanced by the reality that they “hope to achieve [their] goal [of making money] through enterprise and education.” 72. Indifference to politics is not necessarily unique to Jamaica.

Invariably and inevitably, education (in its widest sense) is viewed as the avenue through which, in the long term, attitudes can be changed. Education, however, does not include only what students learn in school, or in the home. It involves what is learned from the media, now among the most potent forces, for good and ill, in world society. For this reason alone, the youth have to be encouraged in the ways of wisdom – to make sensible choices, and to understand where their self-interest lies. Why are the youth not taking advantage of all the educational possibilities offered them?

It is probable that education may have to be reshaped in conformity with our reality that support systems often do not exist in the homes of many children. It is probable, too, that within our educational system we need to examine very closely the reasons for the unacceptably high failure rates of our children. The reasons are no doubt complex. However, we must start to do more efficiently and professionally what we are doing now or Jamaica will be destined to be a ‘rehabilitation’ society – the high school to rehabilitate the failures of the primary, the tertiary to amend the faults of the secondary, and JAMAL and HEART to catch the others. The problem does not lie solely in resources. It must surely lie, in part, on how effectively we are using the
resources that are currently available. This problem extends beyond the question of education.

For those of us who construe that some of the negative features of our society are entirely new, let us look at a comment made by Mr. J. H. Reid, a black Jamaican, in 1897:

> It is the vindictive and punitive character of the law that recommends it to the admiration of the people... The primary consideration in the various business transactions between individuals seems to be, not what is honest, fair and right, but rather what is legal – that is how far the more astute may go in attempts to overreach, or the powerful in oppressing, his neighbours, without bringing himself under the penalties of the law.

Corruption is not new. A report from Justice Gibbons in the late nineteenth century illustrates the point:

> Since I required the production of the wharf books in a case of logwood stealing at May Pen, when I was informed by an overseer of Denbeigh, that Lord Penthryn had been robbed of 60 tons [L300] during the then season. I have observed that no prosecutions have been instituted. There is no disguising the fact that the Custos, is a large shipper of logwood... I have observed a suspicious connection between larceny of produce, particularly logwood and pimento, and the business of the merchant... in several cases of logwood stealing it has appeared that the stolen logwood was readily purchased at the local wharf belonging in almost every case to a magistrate. These facts which have only casually come to my notice are doubtless well known to the bulk of the people.

Commentators on the structure of our contemporary society note the declining commitment to ‘Community’, which they say had once been strengthened by African concepts of community. The problem is presented as individual interests versus community interest. There is no question that the community has declined, whether through migration or the imbalance between rural and
urban development or, more probably, from a sense that the community has little to offer.

Yet there are new concepts of community quietly evolving. One example is the growth of fundamentalism in Pentecostal and evangelical churches. (Simultaneously, there is a global Islamic and Judaic fundamentalism). Originally, the new fundamentalists had defined their role as creating a refuge for “beleaguered” people “looking for certainty in a rapidly changing world”, a world that had become more atomized, more iconoclastic, more individualistic, and more dedicated to moral relativism. The fundamentalism is global, and in its manifestations sometimes anti-intellectual and sometimes intolerant. It cuts across cultural barriers with ease, concentrating strictly on the truth as understood from the Word of God. The old pattern whereby the established Churches, with their cosmopolitan tendency to accommodate cultural differences, is being steadily replaced by this fundamentalism. As Lehman argues, the “Pentecostals totally reject the contextual/historical approach to scriptural interpretation, while at the same time likening themselves to the early church… Crossing of cultural boundaries are (sic) central features in the growth of fundamentalist and evangelical movements.”

It is a community that is simultaneously authoritarian and concerned with the broad welfare of the community of believers, which strictly divides the world into the believer and the unbeliever. It is at least interesting that over 50 per cent of UWI students are Evangelicals and Pentecostals. But more important is that the relative success of the fundamentalist community demonstrates that people will associate with community once there is some assurance that it is worth their while.

Communities do not have to be geographically defined. Those who advocate policies that focus on the welfare of communities, based on the direct involvement of the communities themselves, have as strong or perhaps a stronger case than those who agitate for constitutional reform as the basis for the future development of Jamaica. The temptation of highly centralized governments is to introduce policies into communities without dialogue with members of the community.
In summary, our history is one of change and continuity. There has also been remarkable creativity, some of it emerging, ironically, from the very depths of social despair. Our reality becomes transformed, but equally important are the changes that occur in our perception of reality. There have been several crises or turning points in our history (even points where history failed to turn), based on the internal dynamism of the country, and on significant external influences.

At the beginning of the twenty-first century there is a perception that our reality represents decay and decline. This is exactly how planters felt in 1838. Whether the past is better or worse than the present amounts to a moral or self-interested judgement, not necessarily a historical judgement. Successful leadership, at all levels of society, does not rest exclusively on the attempt to impose values, or to establish a national criterion of truth. It is to understand the nature of the waves on which the ship will continue its ride into the future.

**Conclusion**

It is clear that Jamaica’s future will rest on the elevation of our standards of production, on the increase of our skill and knowledge to meet the new internal and international challenges, on the education of our youth in the habits of wisdom and excellence, and on the mobilization of a cosmopolitan experience bequeathed to us from the continents of the world.

Jamaican history is not without its achievements. Caught, however, in the webs of self-doubt and lack of truth, we often disparage those achievements, and dissipate our energies in tearing each other apart. Many of us live intensely in the present, feeling the need for immediate gratification.

It is the past that is real, for the present is fleeting. The construction of our future requires an honest appraisal of our heritage, and of the creativity with which we have confronted our problems. There must be a dedication to truth and not, in the political sphere to “one-upmanship”. An examination of our heritage must entail an assessment of where we have failed and where we have succeeded.
If the labourer is worthy of his hire and the employer reward his loyal and dedicated workers rather than concentrate on depressing their wages; if all Jamaicans, in their little sphere of influence, do what is required of them with excellence, we will be on our way to creating a brighter future through a new spirit of collective responsibility. But excellence requires humility, which is not servility, but a recognition of our personal limitations, and therefore the springboard for improvement. We can chastise our youth, but we need not disparage them and assault their dignity. We can chastise our politicians but pay due deference to the offices that they represent. We must cease to confuse the personal with the institutional. New constitutions or new institutions will not help us if we nurture the tendency to treat institutions with scant respect. Those who hold institutional power must at the same time recognize their profound responsibility to ensure that those institutions work with fairness and justice.

Our history is not a stumbling block. It is the track that we and our ancestors have made, marching in the midst of conflict and accommodation towards our destiny at once unique and universal.
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