

CHAPTER 3

The tradition of protest in Jamaica

Jamaica has a long history of resistance, stretching from the early years of slavery through the post-emancipation period. During slavery the resistance took a variety of forms, from passive acts of protest such as malingering and sabotage to violent rebellion. The Maroons, run-away slaves who established communities in the interior of the island, also attacked plantations and, in the early eighteenth century, threatened the viability of the colony. It was the rebellions and the slave conspiracies, however, which left a more direct legacy for the rebels at Morant Bay.

Slave rebellions in Jamaica have been far more numerous than elsewhere in the British Caribbean and on a considerably larger scale than those in the United States. In Barbados, for example, there were no major rebellions for over a century from the late seventeenth century to the early nineteenth.¹ The largest outbreak in the United States, the Nat Turner Rebellion in 1831, consisted of only seventy slaves. Many rebellions in Jamaica, on the other hand, involved hundreds of slaves; in the most serious outbreaks, thousands of slaves took part.

There have been a number of explanations for the significant number of rebellions in Jamaica, including the high ratio of slaves to whites. Jamaica had a heavy concentration of slaves compared to the number of whites on the island: in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries slaves outnumbered whites by more than ten to one and by more than thirteen to one in the nineteenth century. This was markedly different from Barbados, where a more stable white population meant that the comparable ratio there was four slaves for every white. In the United States only two states had slave populations which slightly outnumbered the whites; in every other state, whites were in the majority.

Some have also argued that the ratio of creole slaves (those born in the colony) to African slaves was important. In this view, creole slaves had more at stake in the system and were less likely to rebel than African slaves, especially those who had recently been imported to the colony. Again, there was a greater percentage of Africans in the Jamaican slave population than in Barbados or in the United States. While this ratio may be significant for Jamaica in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, it has less bearing in the nineteenth when creole slaves led a major rebellion.

Other factors might also be useful in explaining the slave rebellions in Jamaica. The marked degree of absentee ownership among whites in the island contrasts sharply with the patterns of white resident ownership in Barbados and in the United States. Also, Jamaica's geography, with a mountainous and often inaccessible interior, offered hiding places for rebels. A further element (which was not unique to Jamaica) was the impact of social, religious and political ideas, especially toward the end of the eighteenth and beginning of the nineteenth centuries. The campaigns of the abolitionists, first to abolish the slave trade and then slavery itself, influenced the slaves as did the example of the Haitian revolution.²

Recent refinements to these arguments suggest that slave rebellions were more likely to occur where the forces of control were weakened or distracted and also when slave expectations were frustrated.³ This was particularly the case when slaves believed they were to be freed, but that the planters or local authorities were withholding their freedom. An examination of some of the major rebellions in Jamaica bears out many of these observations.

The first serious slave rebellion which the British encountered in Jamaica occurred in 1673, less than twenty years after they first arrived in the island. It involved 300 slaves, mostly from the Gold Coast (Ghana), who worked on a large plantation in the parish of St Ann. They murdered their master and fled to the interior of the island. There, the slaves resisted attacks against them and, according to a contemporary writer, were 'never dislodged'. Indeed, the slaves

almost destroyed the first parties that pursued them which not only discouraged other parties from going against them but also Encouraged many other negroes to rise, committ barbarities, and then fly to them severall instances of which Soon followed.

These rebels formed the basis of one of the two major Maroon communities on the island.⁴

This was not an isolated outbreak. The last quarter of the seventeenth century witnessed several more rebellions, the largest of which occurred in 1690. In that year more than 500 slaves, almost all from the Gold Coast and belonging to an estate in the parish of Clarendon, broke out in rebellion. Although many of them were captured or killed, others appear to have joined the existing band of Maroons.⁵

The number of rebellions increased significantly in the eighteenth century. Mary Turner, an authority on the slave rebellion of 1831, regards riots and rebellions against slavery in eighteenth-century Jamaica as 'endemic'; moreover, she calculates that such outbreaks occurred on average once every five years. Since Maroons were involved in many of these rebellions, the whites waged a campaign against them between 1725 and 1740. But the

attempt to suppress the Maroons proved to be costly and difficult. Between 1730 and 1734, for example, the whites spent £100,000 in a vain effort to destroy the Maroons. When peace was finally declared in 1739, part of the treaty stipulated that the Maroons should return runaway slaves to the whites. Yet slave rebellions and riots continued to plague the colony.⁶

The most serious rebellion of the eighteenth century broke out in 1760. Known as Tacky's rebellion, after the name of the African rebel chief, it occurred while the British were engaged in the Seven Years' War against Spain and France. This meant that imperial forces were more concerned about external attacks than internal rebellions. Moreover, the war played havoc with the economy: sugar exports were reduced by half and the cost of imported goods was doubled. In assessing the rebellion, Michael Craton concludes that slaves were encouraged to resist because of the weakening of the armed forces.⁷

The rebellion was one of the bloodiest in Jamaica's history. It lasted for six months and resulted in the death of sixty whites and the loss of over 1,000 slaves, 500 of whom were either killed or committed suicide and another 500 transported out of the colony. The Akan-speaking Coromantee slaves from the Gold Coast who were at the heart of the outbreak aimed at 'the entire extirpation of the white inhabitants; the enslaving of all such negroes as might refuse to join them; and the partition of the island into small principalities in the African mode . . .'.⁸ The rebellion was an island-wide conspiracy which shocked the planters and was equal in its impact to the Christmas rebellion of 1831 as well as the Morant Bay rebellion over a century later.⁹

There were fewer outbreaks in the first few decades of the nineteenth century, although several conspiracies were discovered in 1823 and 1824. Yet the most serious slave rebellion in Jamaica's history was yet to come. It broke out two days after Christmas in 1831. Although the rebellion lasted less than two weeks, it did massive damage to property and involved thousands of slaves. One estimate suggests that 20,000 slaves may have been involved in the rebellion, more than 200 of whom were killed during the rebellion and a further 300 executed. Property valued at over £1,000,000 sterling was destroyed.¹⁰ The Christmas rebellion or the 'Baptist war', as it came to be known, was a crucial event in the abolition of slavery. In a variety of ways it also foreshadowed the Morant Bay rebellion.

As with events at Morant Bay more than thirty years later, the Christmas rebellion came at a time of economic and political stress. A severe drought had affected Jamaica and curtailed the production of ground provisions. Food was scarce and expensive, and when heavy rains hit the island, hunger was followed by epidemics of smallpox and dysentery.¹¹

It was not only material conditions which created disaffection. There was also a heightened degree of political consciousness among the slaves stimu-

lated by the resistance of local whites to the British government. In 1831, and under pressure from the Anti-Slavery Society, the British government took steps to ameliorate the condition of the slaves. It sent out a revised Order in Council outlining improvements to be enacted locally on behalf of the slaves. The response in Jamaica was predictable: the whites organized a series of island-wide meetings to denounce the interference of the Home government in its internal affairs. Whites even began to reconsider their allegiance to the Crown; if Britain would not protect the institution of slavery, perhaps the United States could be encouraged to do so.¹²

The whites discussed these developments openly and apparently with little concern about the possible effects on the slaves. The slaves were consequently made aware of the growing anti-slavery agitation in England. As the whites became more vociferous in their denunciation of the British government, many slaves came to the conclusion that they had already been freed, but that the whites were withholding their freedom. Since they believed that they were free, the slaves surmised that they would not meet any resistance from the King's troops in the event of a rebellion; indeed, the soldiers might even come to their aid. Some slaves even asserted that gunpowder unloaded from a naval ship during the rebellion was for them.¹³

This naive belief in the Crown had echoes at Morant Bay in 1865. Many people in Jamaica believed that the Queen could never have written 'The Queen's Advice', a government document which was circulated throughout the island that year. They also maintained that the Queen had sent them clothes and money during the summer of 1865, only to have the goods diverted by the planters to the Indian indentured labourers. At various stages of the rebellion, Paul Bogle made it clear that he was not rebelling against the Queen. There was even a hope that the Queen would replace the current set of white authorities and send others with whom the rebels could negotiate.¹⁴

The leadership of the Christmas rebellion was also comparable to that at Morant Bay. Sam Sharpe, the rebel leader, was an urban slave, educated and well thought of by his master. He was highly articulate and became a leader in the Baptist church as well as a 'Daddy' or 'Ruler' in the Native Baptist church. Much like Bogle, then, who was a deacon in the Native Baptist church, Sharpe used the organization of the church to organize the rebellion. As Mary Turner has suggested, 'the Baptist war . . . was essentially the Native Baptist war; its leaders shaped mission teaching to their own ends'.¹⁵

Sharpe planned a campaign of passive resistance for the period just after Christmas, 1831: the slaves would simply cease work until their owners paid their wages and thereby conceded that the slaves were free. However, Sharpe also developed an alternative strategy of armed rebellion in case passive resistance failed.¹⁶

Some of Sharpe's methods were quite similar to those employed by Paul Bogle. For example, like Bogle, he made use of oaths to exact loyalty from his confederates. At a meeting before the 1831 rebellion, Sharpe asserted that 'if "Buckra" would pay them, they would work as before; but if any attempt was made to force them to work as slaves, then they would fight for their freedom.'¹⁷ The oath was taken on a Bible:

Sharpe said we must sit down. We are free. Must not work again unless we got half pay. He took a Bible out of his pocket. Made me swear that I would not work again until we got half pay.

One version of the oath included promising 'not [to] trouble anybody or raise any rebellion'.¹⁸ However, another oath taken just before the outbreak of the rebellion was more threatening: those accepting it vowed 'not to flinch till they had succeeded in getting their freedom'.¹⁹

The oaths taken by the slaves in 1831 and by the ex-slaves in 1865 represent a fusion of religion and politics, but one in which political goals were dominant. Both the Baptist war and the Morant Bay rebellion were partly inspired by Baptist and Native Baptist traditions. As Mary Turner has commented on the 1831 rebellion, it demonstrated 'some degree of political maturity among the slaves. They had created a protest movement . . . in which religion had been subordinated to political aims'.²⁰ The same analysis applies to Morant Bay.

There were, of course, significant differences between the two rebellions. The Christmas rebellion was far more widespread than Morant Bay. It engulfed all of the western parishes of the island rather than being restricted to one parish, and it resulted in the destruction of far more property. Perhaps as many as ten times more participants took part in the slave rebellion than at Morant Bay. It is also possible to contrast the aims of those involved in the rebellions. In the Baptist war slaves were seeking their freedom, a freedom they defined as the right to work for wages on the plantations. At Morant Bay the rebels were intent on making their freedom more meaningful; they were therefore concerned about more specific grievances such as the lack of justice, access to land, and low and irregular pay.

Yet the course of each rebellion revealed some striking similarities. In each case, slaves and ex-slaves could be found who were opposed to the rebels or, at the very least, sought to protect the plantations on which they worked. These divisions sometimes reflected class differences within the plantation community. On one cattle pen in St James, for example, the head driver in 1831 sought to safeguard the buildings from being destroyed, only to find the slaves following the lead of a recently-released prisoner who set them on fire. Some slaves mounted guards to defend their estates, others worked normally during the rebellion to harvest the sugar without white

supervision, and still others hid in the woods. Most of these responses were repeated during the Morant Bay rebellion.²¹

The suppression of both rebellions was savage. Soldiers and militiamen seem to have regarded all blacks in the affected areas as enemies and subject to immediate retribution. Running away from the soldiers was regarded as sufficient proof of guilt and alleged ringleaders were often executed without trial. The courts martial were shams; in the Christmas rebellion, out of ninety-nine slaves tried at Montego Bay, eighty-one were executed. Prisoners were sometimes executed for minor offences, such as killing estate stock, and whole slave villages on some of the rebel estates were destroyed.²²

The extent of the 1831 rebellion as well as the brutal manner in which it was put down had widespread reverberations in England. Most importantly, it had the effect of speeding up emancipation: the Act freeing the slaves was passed less than two years after the rebellion had begun. For the ex-slaves, too, the rebellion was not forgotten; it surfaced later during the riots and rebellions of the post-emancipation period.

Post-emancipation riots and rebellions

Recent research suggests that the Morant Bay rebellion was not an isolated phenomenon in the years following emancipation. During the period after 1838 there were numerous riots and conspiracies, several of which had the potential of becoming island-wide revolts. The rebellion at Morant Bay has overshadowed these earlier events, but it is important to place Morant Bay both in the context of slave rebellions and of resistance in the post-emancipation period.²³

As with slave rebellions, the post-emancipation outbreaks had certain elements in common. Rumours of re-enslavement helped to spark the conspiracies and disturbances of 1839 and 1848 as well as Morant Bay itself. The threat of re-enslavement was often associated with the possibility of Jamaica joining the United States as a slave state. Other issues, including disputes over rents and wages as well as problems about land, were also conducive to riots and conspiracies in this period.²⁴

Several of these elements were prominent in a conspiracy which came to light in July, 1839. It arose from a rumour that 'the white and brown people were going to surround the chapel on the 1st of August [the first anniversary of full freedom], and kill the black men, and make the women slaves again'.²⁵ Labourers in several western parishes including Westmoreland, St Elizabeth, St James and Trelawny consequently purchased guns and machetes to protect themselves. They also carried out target practice and

drilling exercises and, quite significantly, adopted the names of the leaders of the 1831 slave rebellion in these drills.

The fear of re-enslavement was one of the driving forces of this conspiracy. Another was the problem of land. As Lorna Simmonds suggests, for the labourers 'acquiring land was the true indicator that freedom had been properly achieved'.²⁶ Ex-slaves were therefore prepared to 'fight' for access to land. As one labourer, Edward Campbell, put it:

the black people were going to fight in August, if the white and brown people did not deliver up the land to them . . . That there must be a fight to get their lands; that if the last fight [the 1831 slave rebellion] did not happen, they would not get their freedom so soon; and that everybody did not join in the last war, but now all were free, and must help in the fight that was coming.²⁷

The Christmas rebellion was the model for these ex-slaves. Moreover, just as in that rebellion and at Morant Bay as well, there were reports that the Queen and her forces would be on their side. There was also a suggestion that the Maroons would come to the aid of the labourers. Although no outbreak occurred, whites reportedly left the affected areas in anticipation of a rebellion.

Nine years later, in 1848, another conspiracy was discovered among the ex-slaves in western Jamaica. This time the conspiracy was accompanied by a series of protests and riots. Again, the ex-slaves regarded 1 August as the day the whites would choose to re-enslave the blacks. The date was particularly significant, as it was the tenth anniversary of full freedom. In addition, the labourers and peasants were concerned about the threat of increased taxation as well as a lowering of wages on the estates.²⁸

The late 1840s was a particularly difficult time for Jamaica. The British government had announced the equalization of sugar duties in 1846, resulting ultimately in the loss of protection for sugar produced in the British colonies. In Jamaica this created an economic crisis for the planters. They therefore sought to depress wages on the estates, often by as much as 25 per cent. However, many ex-slaves regarded this development as a first step toward the reintroduction of slavery.

The peasants and labourers were also disturbed by the planters' public outbursts. As in 1831, the planters held meetings to denounce the actions of the Home government. Again, annexation to the United States was raised as a possibility. This idea was given added credibility by reports in the American press which linked the distressed state of the island with the benefits of annexation. Moreover, the planters were complaining that freedom had been granted too quickly and were speculating on the chances of reimposing slavery.²⁹

Just as the planters came together in their denunciation of the British government, blacks involved in the conspiracy sought to create unity by using colour to appeal for support. A headman on an estate in Hanover reported being approached by several men who said, 'Mr Brown, now you see we are all black, we must stand to our colour.'³⁰ There were also condemnations of brown people for helping the whites to suppress the 1831 rebellion. The 1831 rebellion as well as the Haitian revolution continued to serve as models of protest.

One of the complaints of the blacks was directed at 'White Man's' or 'Buckra Law'. The labourers were particularly incensed at their treatment by overseers and bookkeepers on the sugar estates. In addition, as in the 1831 slave rebellion, there were reports that black Baptist leaders were leading the resistance, although the Baptist missionaries denied any involvement in any such plans.³¹

The whites took the threat of revolt seriously. Some moved out of the threatened districts. Although the Governor, Charles Grey, was sceptical about an outbreak, he none the less transferred members of the West India Regiment to strategic points in the affected areas. Grey also sent a warship to Montego Bay and to Savanna-la-Mar to calm the western part of the island. In addition, Grey issued a proclamation designed to dispel rumours of re-enslavement. The proclamation made it clear that there was no intention to revoke emancipation.³²

While there was no general outbreak, there were localised protests in various parts of the island. In July disturbances took place in Black River, St Elizabeth and also in Clarendon. Some of the people involved in these protests were aware of the conspiracy. Later in the year a riot occurred in Brown's Town, St Ann, in which two people were killed and several people seriously wounded. It was followed by a riot on an estate in St Thomas in the Vale that involved over 150 estate workers who resisted police seeking to execute warrants. However, the most serious outbreak during the year broke out in August on Goshen estate in St Mary.³³

The main issue in the Goshen riots was taxation. The people on the estate objected to the high tax assessments made by the collecting constable, Richard Rigg, and to his appropriation of personal property because of unpaid taxes. Since Rigg was told that he would be killed if he came to Goshen, he brought along two policemen when he travelled to the estate. In the course of carrying out his duties, Rigg as well as the policemen were attacked and seriously wounded by a crowd of at least 200 people armed with sticks. When the police returned a week later to issue warrants against twenty-four people involved in the assault, they were confronted by 500 men and women armed with sticks and some weapons. This skirmish appears to have been carefully planned: the mob consisted of people from several other parishes as well as a few Maroons. In the *mêlée* some of the

1598
17075

policemen were seriously wounded and all fled. Another detachment of police met the same fate the following week, and it took the 2nd West India Regiment to restore order.³⁴

The Goshen riots were directed against the tax system, which the people on the estate considered unjust. Governor Grey also regarded the assessments as unfair and was worried about the possibility of a serious escalation in the level of violence. He had good reason to be alarmed: one of the policemen who went with Riggs to Goshen reported hearing the people say they would 'murder Mr Rigg, and the police in particular; and that the St James's war would be nothing to what they would commence.'³⁵ Although seventeen years had passed since the 1831 slave rebellion, it clearly remained an important symbol.

Two other riots – both of which occurred in 1859 – were also significant precursors of Morant Bay. The first, which took place in February, was directed against the toll-gates in several parts of Westmoreland. Residents tore down the toll-gates in at least four different places in the parish, suggesting a concerted campaign against them. Public feeling against the tolls had been vented in a petition sent to the Governor six months earlier, but he had ignored it. When some of the offenders were tried for their part in the assault on the toll-gates, people attacked the police station. Peace was ultimately restored when troops arrived from Port Royal.³⁶

The second major riot in 1859 developed over a property dispute involving Florence Hall estate near the town of Falmouth. The controversy was between a coloured man, Theodore Buie, and his Scottish aunt who sought to evict him from the property. Buie and about sixty others were arrested, but before they could be brought to trial a large crowd attacked the police station and freed them. As the assailants continued to stone the police station, the police fired on them, killing two women and severely wounding eight or nine others, one of whom died a few days later. During the riot, the crowd set fire to the police station and prevented anyone from extinguishing it. They also tried to burn down other parts of the town, and succeeded in destroying the Falmouth wharf. Together, the events at Falmouth and Florence Hall have usually been described as a riot, but there were commentators at the time who believed that the situation was far more serious and that it bordered on rebellion. Moreover, much of it occurred on [1 August,] the twenty-first anniversary of full freedom. Although it may have been coincidental that the trial of Buie and his associates was set for that date, Simmonds maintains that 'it was the perfect time to protest the absence of fair justice for black Jamaicans'³⁷

The riots in 1859 highlighted some of the issues which profoundly affected post-emancipation Jamaica and would prove crucial six years later at Morant Bay. High taxes, whether in the form of assessments or of toll-gates, were a serious problem for the mass of the people, especially as the

Legislature had shifted a heavy proportion of the taxes onto the ex-slaves and away from the plantocracy. The lack of justice, which was an important element in the Buie case, was one of the leading factors in the outbreak at Morant Bay. In both the Florence Hall riots and the Morant Bay rebellion, women were major actors and also major victims of the authorities.

The Morant Bay rebellion, then, was preceded by a long history of slave rebellions as well as a series of riots in the post-emancipation period. Many of the people involved in these riots continued to look to the rebellions as models of resistance, especially the 1831 Christmas rebellion. However, the agenda of the rioters was different in the period after emancipation. It included resisting any attempt at re-enslavement and regarded access to land as a measure of full freedom. Above all, this meant creating the conditions for a meaningful freedom. This would also be the agenda at Morant Bay.

Notes

- 1 Hilary Beckles and Karl Watson, 'Social Protest and Labour Bargaining: The Changing Nature of Slaves' Responses to Plantation Life in Eighteenth-Century Barbados', *Slavery and Abolition*, 8 (December, 1987), pp. 272-93.
- 2 Orlando Patterson, *The Sociology of Slavery: An Analysis of the Origins, Development and Structure of Negro Slave Society in Jamaica* (London: McGibbon & Kee, 1967), pp. 274-9.
- 3 Michael Craton, *Testing the Chains: Resistance to Slavery in the British West Indies* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1982), p. 13.
- 4 Richard Hart, *Slaves Who Abolished Slavery*, 2 vols., (Kingston: Institute of Social and Economic Research, 1985) 2, p. 14; Patterson, *Sociology of Slavery*, p. 267.
- 5 Hart, *Slaves*, 2, pp. 17-18; Patterson, *Sociology of Slavery*, p. 268.
- 6 Mary Reckord (née Turner), 'The Jamaica Slave Rebellion of 1831', *Past and Present*, 40 (July, 1968), p. 108; Patterson, *Sociology of Slavery*, pp. 269-70. On the Maroons, see also Barbara K. Kopytoff, 'The Maroons of Jamaica: An Ethnohistorical Study of Incomplete Politics, 1655-1905', Ph.D. thesis, U. of Pennsylvania, 1973; Richard Price, ed., *Maroon Societies: Rebel Slave Communities in the Americas* (Garden City, N.Y.: Anchor Books, 1973); Hart, *Slaves*; Gad Heuman, ed., *Out of the House of Bondage: Runaways, Resistance and Marronage in Africa and the New World* (London: Frank Cass, 1986) and Mavis C. Campbell, *The Maroons of Jamaica, 1655-1796: A History of Resistance, Collaboration and Betrayal* (Granby, Mass.: Bergin & Garvey, 1988).
- 7 Craton, *Testing the Chains*, pp. 125-7.
- 8 Edward Long, *The History of Jamaica*, 3 vol. (London: T. Lowndes, 1774), 2, p. 447.
- 9 Craton, *Testing the Chains*, p. 138. See also the discussion in Hart, *Slaves*, 2, ch. 6.
- 10 Patterson, *Sociology of Slavery*, p. 273; Thomas C. Holt, *The Problem of Freedom: Race, Labor, and Politics in Jamaica and Britain, 1832-1938* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1992), p. 14; Edward Kamau Brathwaite, 'Rebellion: Anatomy of the Slave Revolt of 1831/32 in Jamaica', *The Jamaican Historical Society Bulletin*, 8 (December, 1981), pp. 80-1. See also Edward Kamau Brathwaite, 'The Slave Rebellion in the Great River Valley of St James - 1831/32', *The Jamaican Historical Review*, 13 (1982), pp. 11-30.

- 11 Mary Turner, *Slaves and Missionaries: The Disintegration of Jamaican Slave Society, 1787-1834* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1982), p. 149.
- 12 Gad J. Heuman, *Between Black and White: Race, Politics and the Free Coloreds in Jamaica, 1792-1865* (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1981), p. 84. British plans for ameliorating slavery began in 1823 when the first proposals to improve the condition of the slaves were dispatched to the colonies. However, whites in Jamaica resisted these directives, as they would again in 1831.
- 13 Turner, *Slaves and Missionaries*, p. 154.
- 14 JRC: Evidence of Sligo Campbell 140; Evidence of W. Cuthbert 139; Evidence of Raynes Waite Smith 744; Evidence of William Rennie, p. 418. For more information on 'The Queen's Advice', see ch. 4.
- 15 Turner, *Slaves and Missionaries*, p. 153.
- 16 *Ibid.*, pp. 153-4.
- 17 Henry Bleby, *Death Struggles of Slavery: Being a Narrative of Facts and Incidents which Occurred in a British Colony during the Two Years Immediately Preceding Negro Emancipation* (London: Hamilton, Adams and Co., 1853), p. 112.
- 18 CO 137/185, Trial of Samuel Sharpe, 19 April 1832, pp. 308, 309.
- 19 *PP*, 1831/32, (561) XLVII, 35.
- 20 Reckord, 'Jamaica Slave Rebellion of 1831', p. 123.
- 21 Turner, *Slaves and Missionaries*, pp. 158-9.
- 22 *Ibid.*, pp. 160-1.
- 23 Lorna Elaine Simmonds, ' "The Spirit of Disaffection": Civil Disturbances in Jamaica, 1838-1865' (M.A. thesis, University of Waterloo, 1982), p. 147.
- 24 *Ibid.*, p. 15; Michael Craton, 'Continuity Not Change: The Incidence of Unrest Among Ex-Slaves in the British West Indies, 1838-1876', *Slavery and Abolition: A Journal of Comparative Studies*, 9 (September, 1988), p. 145.
- 25 *PP*, 1840, (212) XXXV, McNeel to Smith, 23 July 1839, Evidence of Robert Murray, 40. The discussion of the 1839 conspiracy which follows is based on Lorna Simmonds' treatment of it: see Simmonds, ' "The Spirit of Disaffection" ', pp. 37-39.
- 26 Simmonds, ' "The Spirit of Disaffection" ', p. 38.
- 27 *PP*, 1840, (212) XXXV, 43.
- 28 Simmonds, ' "The Spirit of Disaffection" ', p. 77.
- 29 *Ibid.*, pp. 77, 80-1.
- 30 *PP*, 1847/48, (685) XLIV, 11.
- 31 Robert J. Stewart, *Religion and Society in Post-Emancipation Jamaica* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1992), p. 152.
- 32 Simmonds, 'The Spirit of Disaffection', pp. 83-4.
- 33 *Ibid.*, pp. 84, 88.
- 34 *Ibid.*, pp. 85-6. See also Holt, *The Problem of Freedom*, p. 205.
- 35 *PP*, 1849, (280) XXXVII, 53.
- 36 Douglas Hall, *Free Jamaica, 1838-1865: An Economic History* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1959), p. 248; Simmonds, ' "The Spirit of Disaffection" ', p. 123.
- 37 Anon., *The Florence Hall Controversy and the Falmouth Riots* (Falmouth, Jamaica, n.d.[1859]), pp. 10-13; Holt, *The Problem of Freedom*, pp. 267-8; Simmonds, ' "The Spirit of Disaffection" ', p. 128.