

DIFFERENT TRAJECTORIES OF FREEDOM IN THE ANGLOPHONE CARIBBEAN
BRIDGET BRERETON, UWI, ST AUGUSTINE

I taken my pen in hand a runaway slave, to inform your excelcy of the evil of slavery. Sir slavery is a bad thing and if any man will make a slave of a man after he is born free, i should think it an outrage becose i was born free of my mother wom and after i was born the monster, in the shape of a man, made a slave of me in your dominion now Sir i ask your excelcy in the name of God and his kingdom is it wright for God created man kind equal and free so i have a writ to my freedom...

His name was William Gilbert, a formerly enslaved man from St Croix who had managed to escape to Boston, and he was writing to the King of Denmark (St Croix was one of the Danish colonies) in 1847, forty years after the abolition of the British transatlantic trade in enslaved Africans, and just before Danish emancipation. [1]

He expressed, in his poorly spelled but eloquent words, the universal passion for freedom among the enslaved. For Caribbean slavery was not a system which totally dehumanised its victims, however much it damaged their bodies and psyches; to equate it with 'social death', with all due respect to Orlando Patterson, is a misleading exaggeration. There were always crucial areas of the enslaved's lives which were largely outside the enslavers' control: the provision ground/marketing complex, a more or less autonomous space; religion and some aspects of expressive culture; and family life. These areas were central to their non-stop struggles for a degree of control over the conditions of their existence, and they constituted the core of their lives after the end of formal slavery.

Historians have come to accept that there were many ways of resisting slavery and that the 'day to day' actions (including so-called petit marronage) were not only more frequent than the violent rebellions, but were in some ways more insidious, more undermining of the system. (This of course is in no way meant to deny the huge impact of the great rebellions, especially the Haitian Revolution, and the British Caribbean risings of 1816, 1823 and 1831). The historiography recognises, too, that attempting to distinguish sharply between 'resistance' and 'accommodation' (or 'collaboration') in the behaviour of the enslaved is to construct a false dichotomy.

I want to apply these generally accepted insights to the period after the end of slavery in the Anglophone Caribbean. There were many trajectories of freedom: many ways of struggling for it, many routes to self-assertion and community building, many modes of resisting efforts to negate the promise of emancipation. We know that the post-emancipation 19th century was marked by endemic protests, risings and some large-scale rebellions. But these actions, which have been extensively studied—riots always generate a paper trail—were not the only nor necessarily the most significant ways in which the formerly enslaved, and others, pursued freedom. I want to talk about some of the other ways in which people sought to defend their freedom and assert their right to autonomy and humanity.

African-Caribbean elation at the time of emancipation was accompanied by a deep feeling of mistrust: was it binding, could it be snatched back? This is why so many

chose to purchase their freedom in the last years of slavery, even when its end was known to be imminent, and why others would choose to buy out their remaining years or months of apprenticeship, even when it was known that it was to terminate two years early, and even when they were urged not to waste their money by well-meaning magistrates and clergymen. In fact the frequency of self-purchase out of apprenticeship seems to have increased as August 1838 drew closer. In the Bahamas people took loans from the brand-new Friendly Societies to do this in the last months of the scheme. They didn't want to be wholly dependent on Queen Victoria's freedom, they wanted a legally executed 'free paper' for themselves and their relatives, if they could manage it.

Rumours of re-enslavement swept the Caribbean from time to time in the decades after 1838, much as rumours of imminent freedom had done in the years before 1834. Many, perhaps most, refused to enter annual hiring contracts with employers (the norm for agricultural labour in Britain), in the belief that this would somehow forfeit their freedom. **'A foolish idea has got into the negroes' head'**, wrote one exasperated Jamaican magistrate in March 1839, **'that, to use his own words, he must not sell "his free".'** To be 'bound down' was not to be free.[2]

Perhaps these deep-seated and, indeed, perfectly rational fears about the permanence of emancipation were especially strong in St Lucia and Dominica, with their memories of an earlier emancipation by the revolutionary French in 1794, which had then been taken away—by the British in St Lucia, by Napoleon in Guadeloupe, so close to Dominica. In Dominica these fears sparked off a major riot in 1844, the 'Guerre Negre', when many

of the formerly enslaved interpreted the attempt to take a census as a prelude to re-enslavement. This is what a freedman called Saint Louis was reported to say (no doubt his patois words translated into Standard English):

I think that our freedom can be taken away from us, because it was once done in another country near to us; it was the French who gave their people free, and afterwards made them slaves again; my parents told me so when I was quite a child, and I have remembered it ever since; what is done once can be done again, and we all know that liberty is good; I don't know but what the English will do like the French one of these days; it is only for the Queen to send a Gazette, and say "make them slaves again", and they will be all made slaves; if a man pays money, and does not get a receipt, he can be made to pay the money again, so it is with freedom; if we have been made free and have not paper to show for it, we can be made slaves again. [3]

In St Lucia, where the earlier betrayal had also taken place, after the first emancipation was reversed following the British defeat of the 'L'Armee francaise dans les bois' in 1796-97, self-purchases during the last years of slavery and during the apprenticeship were especially numerous. Claire Robertson, reporting on her attempts to tap into oral traditions about the two emancipations (1794 and 1834-38), concludes: 'St Lucians, never trustful due to repeated betrayals of **liberte**, and ever seeking security in a threatening present, choose the freedom their ancestors taught them: legal title to land,

strategic family cooperation, hard work, migration when necessary and, above all, independence'. [4]

Perhaps no single community in the Anglophone Caribbean was as vigilant to guard its freedom, to protect its special position, as the Jamaican Maroons. In his fascinating presentation and discussion of oral traditions told to him by the present-day Maroons of Moore Town and Accompong, anthropologist Ken Bilby (in his recent book **True-Born Maroons**) recounts how these communities sought to defend what they understood to be their rights and immunities, long after the end of slavery in Jamaica (and even longer after the peace treaties of the 1730s). I would love to read you some of the transcripts of these traditional, orally transmitted accounts, but I don't think I have the time (nor can I manage the Jamaican Creole!) Instead I'll just quote some brief reports from archival sources about some of these conflicts in defence of Maroon autonomy. Attempts by the colonial government to send surveyors or land valuers into Maroon territory were invariably resisted as a possible prelude to land seizure, or the imposition of taxes contrary to the 1739 Treaty. In 1946 a land dispute in the Moore Town area led to a serious confrontation when the colonial police entered the community and tried to arrest a man without first consulting the Maroon colonel. This is how Colonel Harris described (in writing) the event several years later (and note how the past, evoked by references to Nanny, the abeng and the drums, frames the account of a recent event):

The sight of so many armed men storming their gates wrought immediate transformation on the now peaceful Maroons—their cohesion and discipline

reached new heights of perfection; the spirit of Nanny lived again. Shattering the morning calm the abeng flung its urgent message across the hills, the drums beat their imperative commands, and the answering echoes brought the kinsmen with uncanny speed to the scene of potential danger...But adopting certain methods which this writer is not free to reveal, the Maroons thwarted every design. And as the evening shadows began to lengthen and the clansmen repaired to their common meeting place, and the subdued roll of the drums became more and more haunting, more and more unnerving, 125 uniformed men--their duty unaccomplished through no fault of theirs—returned to their headquarters.

In 1959 the **Gleaner** reported:

The Maroons of Scots Hall are protesting the entrance upon their property of Government land valuers who have been carrying out the new land valuation on the unimproved value basis. Recently valuers were refused entry into the district when the Colonel gave orders for the abeng to be blown summoning all Maroons in the area to block the entrance of the valuers. They are relying upon the Treaty of 1739, which allowed them hundreds of acres free of taxation, to escape the new rates.

But it wasn't only valuers and surveyors who felt the mistrust and hostility of the Maroons; missionaries and schoolteachers did too, especially around the time of

emancipation. A letter from clergymen of the Church Missionary Society, in 1837, told how

When the Society's Missionaries first came to Moore Town & erected the School-House, the Maroons were very suspicious of their intentions; & would never assemble in the building for Public worship at night without placing Scouts in the skirts of the town to guard against surprise; for they were apprehensive that it was a trick of the white people to get them together in one house, in order that they might surround it, while the Maroons were engaged in prayer, take them prisoners & ship them off the Island: as had been done in the case of the Trelawney Maroons [in 1795], who surrendered on the pledge that they would be allowed to remain in the Island. [5]

Vigilance in defence of freedom, whether through collective action inspired by a living tradition and remembered past of resistance, or by individual choices and strategies, was crucial to the African-Caribbean people. So too were struggles to control their cultural and spiritual lives, and to assert their humanity in the face of crushing racism and oppression.

Many of the collective acts of protest which took place in the decades after emancipation can best be understood as primarily assertions of the right to develop and control autonomous cultural expressions. Jamaicans rioted against attempts to ban Jonkonnu celebrations in Kingston, African-Trinidadians battled the police in defence of

the aspects of Carnival they most cherished, Grenadians came out onto the streets for their right to celebrate (improbable as it may seem) Guy Fawkes' Day (1885). In St Vincent, Christmas, pre-Lenten and cropover carnivals were all important in the post-emancipation years, and attempts by the authorities to ban them in Kingstown led to at least four riots between 1850 and 1879. Masquerading and related 'play' were central to the lives of the Kingstown working class, whose members (like their counterparts all over the region) wanted to control their own cultural expression. Despite the use of police raids, legislation and the militia, a scholar has recently concluded, the St Vincent authorities failed to quell the main forms of popular culture in the 19th century. [6] And Indian immigrants and Indo-Trinidadians collided with the local authorities in defence of their 'pan-Indian' celebration, Hosay or Muharran, in 1884, with fatal results—and this too was part of the 'trajectory of freedom'.

The defence of popular culture might also involve asserting a claim to live by values and standards which were not those imposed by the elites, the churches or the schools. As we all know, the post-emancipation period witnessed an intense campaign to transform the formerly enslaved people and their descendants by wiping out all those cultural forms that could be seen as African-derived, or the legacy of Afro-Creole 'slave culture'. This process, and the responses of the people, have been exhaustively studied for Jamaica in Brian Moore and Michele Johnson's fine book **Neither Led nor Driven (2004)**. They show that the African-Jamaican people appropriated much of the dominant culture—especially Christianity and the Bible—and transformed it by a process of creolisation, while often simply ignoring those aspects of it which seemed

unacceptable, such as the insistence on life-long monogamous marriage and the confinement of women to domesticity. African-Jamaican folk religion, their family and gender patterns, their beliefs and customs ('superstitions'), were not fundamentally transformed by the relentless efforts of the local and imperial elites. Moore and Johnson show that cultural self-determination was an achievement which resulted from the masses exercising their own cultural power, making creolisation 'expansionist, continuous and silently relentless'. One cultural site where the determination of the African-Caribbean people to live by their own values was especially obvious was in the region's cities and towns. Here men and women—but the women were particularly visible—lived very public lives on the streets of towns like Kingston and Kingstown, Port of Spain and St George's, Georgetown and Bridgetown. These 'loose women', women of abandoned character (to use a phrase in the title of an article by Swithin Wilmot on Jamaica), or 'jamettes' to use the Trinidadian Creole term, defied respectable society by living by their own standards of femininity which had little in common with those of Victorian decency. They were out on the streets, they were highly visible, they shocked convention: and all the colonial newspapers, not to mention the travel literature, of the period were full of denunciations.

Of course religious expression was a vital part of popular culture, and many historians have noted that the right to practice religion as they chose was a critical aspect of freedom for the formerly enslaved and their descendants. For most, this involved syncretic Afro-Christian faiths, or neo-African ones, as well as African-derived magical and healing practices, and we are all familiar with the history of these struggles in the

19th, and indeed in the 20th centuries. I want to briefly mention two rather different religious journeys, both taking place (or ending up) in Trinidad.

Between about 1810 and 1840, Trinidad had a remarkable community of Islamic Africans, known locally (as elsewhere) as the Mandingoes. But in the Trinidad case, these people, never numbering more than a few hundred and predominantly male, made themselves into a cohesive community. Under the leadership of a few men literate in Arabic, some of them ex-soldiers of the West India Regiments, and united by religion and ethnic ties, they systematically purchased their co-religionists, and made them work for a time without wages to pay back their purchase price, then freed them. They acquired property both in Port of Spain and in the country, and held on to their Islamic faith. Two scholars who have recently re-examined this community think that the Mandingoes were responsible for perhaps 500 manumissions between 1808 and 1834 (out of a total of around 3000). This was a Muslim 'brotherhood', inspired by the Islamic **tariqua** as it operated in West Africa. In 1840—and this was really at the moment this remarkable community began to fade away—the acknowledged leader was Samba Makumba, a man of Mande origins who had been enslaved during the religious and political turmoil engulfing the Senegambia area in the early 1800s, and brought to Trinidad at the age of 21 in 1800 or 1801. Literate in Arabic, he bore the title of Emir, a spiritual leader; his 'Creole' name was Simon Boissiere. For this group, the struggle—successful for a time—was to hold on to Islam in a colonial society where all the pressures were towards Christian conversion and/or adherence to Afro-Christian syncretic faiths. [7]

A very different, but also remarkable, religious journey was that of Maria Jones (c.1780-after 1860). We know about her because the Baptist Mission in Trinidad published in 1851 a short account of her life and conversion. Needless to say this was a typical conversion narrative with all the limitations of that genre, but there is enough to reconstruct the story of a rebellious spirit who appropriated Christianity at least in part as a means of asserting a claim to full humanity. Born in West Africa around 1780, she was kidnapped, enslaved and transported to St Vincent at the age of seven. Even in the stilted language of the missionary we can sense her vibrancy: **'She had a very high spirit, which was not easily subdued; and indeed, was never entirely tamed, till it was humbled by the grace of God. All through her life of slavery she showed much strength & independence of mind, and would often utter sentiments and feelings which proved that she did not willingly submit to the yoke imposed upon her'.**

Maybe because she was an 'unprofitable slave', as the narrative says, but more likely because enslaved persons were worth much more in rapidly developing Trinidad than in St Vincent, she was sold to a Trinidadian, and laboured as a field worker on two estates in different parts of the island. She was attached to an estate near Arima in 1838. When the Mico Charity opened a school there Maria Jones, nearly 60, insisted on going—not only to the evening and Sunday classes designed for adults, but also to the day school with the children. She learned to read, came under the influence of the teacher who was affiliated to the Scottish Presbyterian church which had just been established in Port of

Spain, joined this church, and was married to the man 'with whom for years she had lived as wife, according to the Negro, or rather, slave custom'. That these were empowering events for her is suggested by this passage: **'She soon informed [the Baptist minister] of the change that had recently taken place in her condition, remarking at the same time, with evident pride, that now "she called Mrs Jones, and not Maria, as before time". This she said, purposely, in the hearing of several other females present, turning to them as she spoke, as though anxious to improve the occasion by promoting them to go and do likewise. She seemed to move among them like a queen, as though conscious of some superiority over them in point of character'.**

Falling under the influence of George Cowen, the pioneer English Baptist missionary to Trinidad, she received baptism by total immersion and joined this church. After the ceremony she declared (according to the missionary pamphlet): **'I batize four times now, but only one time right! 'Fore dem tief me in Africa, dem priests dere do somtin for batize; when me come to buckra country, dem catholic priests do what dem call batism; dem put oil on my head, salt in me mout, and make cross on me face; but now me read bible for me own self, me no find dis dere. When me join Cotch church, dem take me 'gain and sprinkle water in me face for batist, but neder dis right, when me come for know better; no more one way, same fashion blessed Saviour he self do'.** This of course marks the triumphant end of the pamphlet, but Maria Jones entered the archival record one more time, when at the age of about 80 she met E.B.Underhill, the noted Baptist leader, during his visit to Trinidad in 1860. That

she was a missionary success story is clear enough; but there is another story, of a rebellious and strong-minded woman who survived enslavement as a child, the Middle Passage, and field labour in St Vincent and Trinidad, lived to a very old age despite the hardships of such a life, and appropriated Christianity in its rival forms as a source of empowerment and strength.[8]

I want to look briefly at two other ways of defending freedom in the aftermath of emancipation, which we might not generally recognise as such. Although the evidence tells us that the enslaved were never truly dehumanised, never thought of themselves as less than fully human, we know that inherent in slavery as a system, and indeed inherent in colonialism also, was an attempt to deny or reduce the personhood of its victims. Seen most starkly in chattel slavery, it was a drive to commodify people, a process of 'thingification'. Of course such an ideological project was not going to lie down and die with the formal end of slavery. So it was crucial to the formerly enslaved and their descendants to assert or reclaim their personhood, not to themselves but in their relations with Others, especially but not only the white masses. Speech acts, verbal encounters, were one mode. Seen merely as annoying 'insolence' by most commentators, or occasionally just as amusing, these verbal conflicts with whites were really about claims to humanity and equality at the interpersonal level.

The formerly enslaved in Antigua, wrote Frances Lanagan in 1844, 'make it a constant boast, "Me free, me no b'long to you"'. C.W.Day, who lived in some of the islands for a few years around 1850, told the story of Miss Betsy of Barbados, a 60-year-old formerly

enslaved woman who was working for him during his stay there. She refused to go to market one day---‘Me no feel dispose!’—because she hadn’t got her stockings on: ‘You tink, because I wait on you, I not nobody at all!’ What Day saw as amusing yet exasperating behaviour from a person whose only correct response—according to her class and ethnic status—was instant, deferential obedience, was in fact an assertion of worth and equality. Miss Betsy, elderly by mid-19th century standards, a ‘housekeeper’, was a person of status according to Afro-Creole values. Her verbal joust with Day was a claim to equal humanity and a rejection of any relegation to being merely a unit or instrument of labour.

Civility and courtesy were important, symbolised especially by the use of titles of respect. Many post-emancipation observers commented on the use of sir, miss, ma’am, mister, in conversations among Afro-Creoles, often with amusement when it was the ‘lower orders’ doing it. Day complained that in Barbados street vendors would ignore customers unless addressed politely, while addressing each other as sir, miss, lady. Sensitivity to racial terms was part of this too. ‘Negro’—as well as the N-word—equated with ‘slave’, and questioning or rejecting both terms was also to claim respect and equality. Day, again, said Barbadians hated the N-word, which they used toward each other as a vile insult, but also objected to ‘negro’; ‘we is coloured people’, he reported their saying. If this was widespread, it was, perhaps a claim not only to respectability but also to middle-class identity, granted the normal use of ‘coloured’ in the 19th century Caribbean. [9]

In addition to defiant speech acts such as those just discussed, clothing choices might be another (nonverbal) mode of asserting personhood and equality. Nothing so annoyed (occasionally merely amused) upper-class observers as the delight shown by the formerly enslaved—above all the women—in dressing up in European finery quite inappropriate to their class and race status. Of course dress was a key visible marker of class identity in the 19th century, and the respectable in Europe complained when their own lower orders transgressed this line in their attire; but many of the descriptions of dressed-up working class women in the Caribbean suggest that their possession of dark skins and non-Caucasian facial features and bodily types made the transgression far more objectionable than at home. In defying the unwritten but customary ‘rules of dress’ in a deeply stratified post-emancipation society, by dressing in European-style clothes and hats and using expensive fabrics, Afro-Caribbean working-class women were disrupting the customary social equilibrium and even threatening white privilege. It reflected a claim to be somebody, a nonverbal way of ‘saying’ ‘You tink, because I wait on you, I not nobody at all!’, by persons who—by ethnicity and class—were supposed to be invisible nobodies. It was expressive behaviour which destabilised the colonial codes and norms. It was in a way mimicry, which should be flattering; but, as Homi Babha has said, mimicry in the colonial context is also mockery and potentially menacing.

To defy class/race boundaries through clothes was, indeed, menacing because potentially destabilising. The vast social gulf between white and black women, between the elite and the lower orders, was supposed to be made visible in the humble dress of the labourers and peasants. So those who transgressed must be ridiculed and

humiliated. A revealing case was that of 'Duchess' in Barbados, an apprentice who was found guilty in 1836 of stealing cash from her former mistress and spending it on fancy clothes. The magistrate publicly scorned her, not so much for the theft as (so it appeared) for the crime of dressing above her station. **'She had bought wearing apparel fine enough for a Princess. Their colours vied with those of the rainbow, first a flaming bright yellow bonnet, flashy dresses without number, necklaces and earrings without end, rose coloured silk stockings and two pairs of pink satin shoes'**. The magistrate ordered Duchess to try on the shoes: **'This was done before a very crowded court who shouted when the pink satins were placed upon the hoofs of Duchess [note the word]. In truth I never saw anything as unsuitable as the satins to such feet'**.^[10]

In considering these different ways of struggling for freedom and asserting self-worth and humanity—and of course I could have talked about many other ways and cited many more examples—I simply want to suggest that, as students of history, we should seek to understand all these very diverse trajectories of freedom, and not be seduced only or mainly by the 'big events', the major collective protests, the riots and rebellions, important though these undeniably were.

Finally, I want to make a point that I think is important, but which this talk has in fact ignored, a point which resonates especially in Trinidad & Tobago and Guyana, though it's relevant everywhere. When we consider trajectories of and struggles for freedom in the Caribbean, we ought not to leave out the people who entered the region through the

post-1838 immigration schemes. We ought to find ways of integrating the story of their experiences and struggles into the 'mainstream' narrative of the African-Caribbean people. Generally speaking, and I'm as guilty as anyone in this, we tend to separate out the history of the Indians, the Chinese and the others, to put it in a little ghetto of its own. So, for instance, one might find in CXC or CAPE history examination papers questions about the post-emancipation peasantries, say in the period 1838-1900, which are framed so that the Indo-Caribbean people are excluded, despite their major role in peasant development in Trinidad and Guyana at least in the second half of that period. We need to accept, and to write as if we believed it, that all the people who entered the Caribbean after 1838, and all their descendants, were also an integral element in the region's struggles for freedom. I haven't done so in this talk, so let me end by recounting another Jamaican Maroon oral testimony from Bilby's book which does just that, and in my view, very movingly. I'd like to read the actual testimony but I'm still afraid of the Jamaican Creole, so instead this is Bilby's summary:

This text relates a memory of an incident personally experienced by the narrator, Ruth Lindsay of Moore Town, who was born in 1901, early in the 20th century. It is included here because it demonstrates particularly clearly how different layers of Maroon history may be collapsed and interwoven with personal memories that continue to summon up deep emotions in the present. The Maroon elder recalls how, in her younger days, while she was on her way to Port Antonio, she happened upon a group of indentured Indian labourers assigned to Windsor Estate, just to the north of Moore Town. As she watched, a woman who badly

needed to urinate broke away from the work gang and came running over in her direction to get away from the busha. But the white man noticed her absence. Catching her in the act of relieving herself, the busha began to flog the Indian woman with a bull pizzle whip, ignoring her cries for mercy. More than half a century later, with obvious feeling, the Maroon narrator remembers how the scene brought tears to her eyes, not only because of her compassion for this woman, but also because she was able to imagine right then and there the humiliations her own ancestors would have suffered at the hands of the whites if the Maroons hadn't fought for their freedom—the same kind she had just seen the “mad bakra” inflict on this “slave Coolie”.[11]

NOTES

1. Quoted in A.O.Thompson, **Flight to Freedom** (Kingston 2006), 41.
2. Quoted in G.Heuman, **The Caribbean** (London 2006), 102; and B.Brereton, 'Family Strategies, Gender, and the Shift to Wage Labour in the British Caribbean' in B.Brereton & K.Yelvington (eds), **The Colonial Caribbean in Transition** (Kingston 1999), 106.
3. R.Chase, 'Protest in Post-Emancipation Dominica: The 'Guerre Negre' of 1844', **Journal of Caribbean History** 23 (2), 1989, 130.
4. C.Robertson, 'Claiming Freedom: Abolition and Identity in St Lucian History', **Journal of Caribbean History** 34 (1&2), 2000, 89-129; quotation, 118.
5. K.Bilby, **True-Born Maroons** (Kingston 2006), 344, 356, 366.

6. S.Boa, 'Young Ladies and Dissolute Women' in P.Scully & D.Paton (eds),
Gender and Slave Emancipation in the Atlantic World (Durham & London
2005), 247-66.
7. D.Trotman & P.Lovejoy, 'Community of Believers: Trinidad, Muslims and the
Return to Africa, 1810-1850' in P.Lovejoy (ed), **Slavery on the Frontiers of
Islam** (Princeton, 2004).
8. **Maria Jones: Her History in Africa and in the West Indies** (Port of Spain
1851); see also B.Samaroo, 'Maria Jones of Africa, St Vincent and Trinidad',
unpublished paper, 2002.
9. F.Lanagan, **Antigua and the Antiguan**s (London 1844), 17; CW.Day, **Five
Years' Residence in the West Indies** (London 1852), Vol.2, 131; Vol.1, 21-22,
33-34. See also M.Thomas-Bailey, 'Language usage in the cultural politics of the
post-emancipation British West Indies', paper presented to 39th Conference of
Caribbean Historians, Kingston, May 2007.
10. S.Buckridge, **The Language of Dress Resistance and Accommodation in
Jamaica, 1750-1890** (Kingston 2004); H.Babha, 'Of Mimicry and Man: The
Ambivalence of Colonial Discourse' in F.Cooper & A.L.Stoler (eds), **Tensions of
Empire: Colonial Cultures in a Bourgeois World** (Berkeley 1997), 152-60. The
case of Duchess is mentioned both in Boa, 257, and in M.Newton, 'Philanthropy,
Gender, and the Production of Public Life in Barbados, ca.1790-ca.1850' in
Scully & Paton, cited above, 236.
11. Bilby, 90-91; text, 97-98.

UWI, Cave Hill, Barbados, 23 May 2007

