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In 1716 James Lauder disappeared from the streets of Edinburgh. In time his father William learned the fate of his youngest son and brought a suit against four merchants who had spirited away James across the Atlantic to Boston, Massachusetts, as an indentured servant. In one of a series of letters home, James had asked not just to be redeemed and restored but that his plight be made public to, as he put it, “let the world see.” Indeed roughly two years later both his letters and an account of the legal process that followed were published in Edinburgh. Significantly, the authors went beyond the immediate legal issues at hand to condemn the servant trade. In often-sensational language, they described the boy as having been indentured against his will, sold like livestock, and set ashore in a condition and country that rendered redemption all but impossible.

Lauder’s story was representative of the dominant discourse on servitude in the colonial era, one that centered on the servant trade—over and above servants’ lives and labor in American—as immoral and unjust.

Its central themes—dubious recruitment practices, the reduction of men to merchandise, and servants’ lack of recourse—had resonated for over a century in scores of printed narratives. That the reputation of servitude was unfavorable is not itself surprising, but the public’s preoccupation with the commerce in servants over servitude as well as the specific dimensions of the practice that most unsettled contemporaries are newly identified here. Understanding the cultural handling of servitude is important in several respects. Most obviously, this institution was of immense importance to peopling of colonies, bringing roughly half of all European migrants to British America.

Comprehending contemporaries’ views is, then, significant in its own right. Moreover, this discourse—which cast both colonials and Englishmen as barbarians—complicates claims that servitude was for contemporaries, like slavery and Indian wars, emblematic of American savagery alone. Ideas about servitude may also have played a larger role in the rise and fall of colonial labor systems than previously acknowledged. For though the ill repute of servitude never gave rise to an abolitionist movement of much consequence, some observers at the time deemed it potent enough to have made some think twice about signing indentures. More surprising still is the possibility that the more consequential campaign to end the Atlantic slave trade was informed by this earlier narrative tradition.

Thanks to recent scholarship, we can now locate the public perception of servitude in relation to the institution.

Contingent on the most modern of economies, servitude crystallized as seemingly archaic system of migration, labor, and governance. Sanctioned by the state in the name of domestic order and empire, the traffic in servants was largely an
entrepreneurial pursuit, though a minority became servants as prisoners of the state. Regardless of how they came to be bound, all servants faced essentially the same formal terms and juridical status. Servants were "saleable," a status that allowed planters and others to procure their labor through a shipper or other middleman. Performance during their relatively lengthy terms of service was enforced with criminal sanctions, and servants generally had no right to earn wages, get married, enter into contracts, bring suits, serve as jurors, hold office, or vote. Yet indentures and provincial statutes in time sought to guarantee adequate shelter, food and clothing; limit corporal punishment; and see that servants were released with modest freedom dues at the stipulated time. Moreover, servants themselves strove to limit their bondage through myriad actions, from deferential negotiations to rebellion.

The defining legal terms of the institution remained relatively constant across time and space, yet the experience of servants varied widely, in part due to broad shifts in the geographic and demographic contours of servitude in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Drawn largely by tobacco production, servants first arrived in Virginia and soon thereafter in Barbados and Maryland. In the first century of settlement, it is possible to find servants arriving in all of the mainland and Caribbean colonies, but they were concentrated in the Chesapeake and, secondarily, the West Indies. In the following century, the Caribbean was already a small market for servants, while the largest influx centered to the north in the Delaware Valley. The Chesapeake was the only region that continually imported significant numbers throughout the colonial era. Most servants arriving in the 1600’s were English, though there was a large minority of Irish migrants, most of whom arrived in Barbados. But in the 1700’s English servants were outnumbered by an ethnically diverse group, including Irish, Scots, Scots-Irish, and—above all—German-speaking migrants from the Rhine lands. The socio-economic status of servants may have improved slightly with these changes, and with the labor demands of a more diversified and capital-intensive regional economies. Likewise, servants’ tasks in the eighteenth century were probably on the whole more varied than those of their predecessors who overwhelmingly labored in the fields. Living conditions for most servants likely improved with the shift to northern climates, more diversified labor, and more mature settlements where food security and material comforts improved. Servants as a percentage of all European migrants to British America declined slightly in the 1700’s, as did their proportion of the colonial labor force. But the numbers of servants arriving on the mainland actually increased significantly.

As servitude was crystalizing in America, so too was a coherent public image, one that has been neglected by scholars relative to the attention they have given to other issues—including demographics, legal status, and their place in several regional transitions to slavery. Writers of various stripes—servants, former servants, travelers, chroniclers, promoters, and grub street scribblers—all bore witness to the historical practice of servitude even as they often reworked them in imaginative ways. Printed texts differed in form and included letters, ballads, criminal confessions, novels, and autobiographies. Writers, of course, differed in their circumstances and agendas. Servants, like Lauder, wrote home asking for relief—anything from redemption to food and clothes. Professional writers appealed to a market for diverting fiction. Exiled servants’ petitions often had political overtones, and, even on the eve of execution, transported
convicts hoped to redeem their reputations or save their souls. Writings included some works focused squarely on servitude while others touched on servitude in passing. Despite their variations, writings shared assumptions, vocabularies, themes, and reference points that were relatively constant over time and thus usefully considered as a whole.16

The servant trade was held in poor repute, but it always had vocal supporters. Indeed, the dominant discourse on servitude was at times articulated in response to more sanguine representations. Referencing promotional accounts, a former servant wrote, “You will perhaps be told that you are going to a country flowing with milk and honey.” However, he continued, “you will find that you must wade thro’ an ocean of labour and fatigue.” Some writers, such as promoters, had a material interest in casting servitude as a benign or even profitable venture. The defendants in Lauder’s suit, for example, challenged the libel’s claims and asserted that James had been recruited “in a fair way” and that he lived better as a servant in Boston than he had in Scotland.18 But in this respect they were often no different from those who condemned the practice. The defense of servitude, in fact, reflected the real variety of servants’ circumstances.19 Thus among the many thousands of Europeans who agreed to sign indentures were many who made a reasonable calculation that their lot might be improved, if only once their terms expired. Nevertheless, those who defended servitude had to overcome a tidal wave of bad press.

It was the commerce in servants that loomed largest in the public imagination.20 It is true that contemporaries discussed colonial servitude itself. Thus James complained that his term was lengthy and unprofitable,21 and others condemned hard labor and cruel masters.22 But it was the various dimensions and implications of the servant trade—all grounded in historical practice—that emerged as dominant concerns. Three themes were particularly prominent. First, the various ways of entering into servitude were described as entailing both duplicity and coercion. Second, the buying and selling of servants was commonly described as a morally troubling practice whereby unscrupulous merchants stigmatized men as merchandise and subjected them to the perils of unknown masters. Third, and finally, the Atlantic passage was often understood to sever customary and legal channels of recourse for migrants.

No topic seems to have held more fascination for the public than recruitment. Lauder’s libel spoke of James’s being “enticed” with drink and false promises, held prisoner by avaricious “West Indian Merchants,” and “necessitated to sign an indenture”—and in doing so spoke to broader public concerns.23 Indeed, writers of all kinds dealt with the topic in some depth, with most describing it as entailing coercion, deception, or both. It is particularly striking that despite the various routes into servitude, so many accounts use similar terms and assumptions to cast recruitment as immoral, unjust and, often times, as an infringement of British liberty.

Thousands of men and women from the British Isles were banished by the state to his majesty’s plantations, including religious dissenters, political and military prisoners, and common criminals. The role of the state in precipitating their servitude made them unusual, but once in the colonies, their sale and servitude was generally no different from that of the majority of servants. Accounts of their plight—often written by the victims themselves—lingered on the moment of banishment. Their litany of misfortunes often began with the “dreadful fangs of the law,”24 personified by the “hard-hearted
judges so cruel.” Not surprisingly, they experienced their passage as a loss of personal liberty, as the exiled rebel who once on board was stripped of all possessions and, “clapp’d under hatches, and cast into iron.” Transferred Quakers, Covenanters, Monmouth rebels, and Jacobite prisoners often cast their usage as trespasses upon ancient privileges. Quakers testified to their violent persecution, as they were taken from their homes, stripped of their estates, separated from loved ones, then sentenced by “Judges (so called)” as “bond-slaves” in the plantations. A Jacobite rebel wrote that his servitude marked, “the end of the so much boasted liberty…of British subjects.” For such groups, exile and “slavery” represented another chapter in chronicles of persecution and martyrdom, but even the plight of convicts sometimes cast doubt on the vigor of English liberties. The sensational case of Elizabeth Canning, convicted of libel and sent as a servant to the colonies, was reported in the press and elaborated in broadsides and other fiction. If an English subject, “is to be put in Newgate, pilloried and banished,” she reflected, “upon what ground do we stand?” The transportation of convicts and other prisoners was recognized as meeting colonial demands for labor, but most contemporaries focused instead on the implications for their homeland.

Themes of an unjust entry into servitude were likewise articulated in stories of kidnapped boys and trepanned heirs. Such cases did occur, but were magnified in the public imagination. Authors lingered on the taking of victims from tippling houses and alleys to waiting ships where, like convicts, they were kept below deck to prevent escape or rescue. The villains of such stories were the agents, factors, or other middlemen who provided merchants with their human cargo. Dubbed crimps, spirits, kidnappers, and, more imaginatively, “pirate at land,” “cannibals,” “Men-stealers,” and “Anthropopola or Man-seller,” they were deemed a class of men whose single-minded pursuit of profit led to the troubling human trade. One ballad condemned the sly kidnapper who “Get your Living by Decoys” and “money make, of little Boys.” An eighteenth-century narrative likewise included a captain who traded in kidnapped servants as having one who would, “do anything for money.” A German former servant similarly recalled being “exposed to the whims and avarice of ships captains.” In Lauder’s libel—its own story of spiriting—agents were cast as having, “no other Thing in their View, but their own Profit.”

When these episodes, real and imagined, resulted in the signing of a contract, the voluntary nature of the agreement remained in doubt. James Lauder, for one, described his circumstances as rendering his signing of an indenture in a phrase that nicely captures the ambiguities and limitations of seemingly voluntary contracts. Held on board the Amity, he was threatened by sailors, which, he wrote, “made me agree, against my will.” In a fictional narrative, a servant was said to have been taken before a ship’s captain who sat at his desk with an indenture and a brace of pistols. Spiritating at least occasionally also raised questions about the vigor of English liberty. Thus one kidnapped servant asked rhetorically, how could it be that “in the land of freedom and justice, he should be seized upon by the cruel grasp of lawless power?” Most striking, here, is the fact that those who entered into servitude seemingly voluntarily—not through conviction or kidnapping—were likewise often described as having been tricked or coerced. The ideal of a symmetrical and voluntary contract was judged as undermined by the incompetency of the recruiters or, more commonly, by “the baseness and knavery” of the recruiters.
fact, the distinction between spiriting in particular and more voluntary recruitment was often blurred, as narratives detailed the, “Various...arts and stratagems made use of to inveigle.”44 Elizabeth Ashbridge was nominally a voluntary recruit, yet her memoir describes herself as signing her contract as a consequence of the recruiters’ deceptions and threats as well as her own, “ignorance of the nature of an indenture.”45 Recruiters were cast as seemingly affable and generous, enticing their prey with pleasant company and intoxicating beverages.46 Thus Defoe’s Colonel Jaques spoke of an agent as a “Subtil Devil,” who in their first encounter, “Entertaine’d us Cheerfully.”47 They were notorious for making false promises—including “a very short Voyage,”48 easy labor,49 profitable service, liberal governance, and even the “pliant loving natures of the women there”50—all intended to get their prey to “swallow their gilded Pills of ruine.”51 The gap between “Golden promises,” on the one hand, and, on the other hand, the harsh reality of servitude was dramatically rendered in both historical and literary accounts through the moment at which the servant discerned his or her true fate. One former servant recalled how, having just begun the Atlantic passage, naively sat at the ship captain’s table for his first meal, only to be taunted by sailors who asked, “do you think you are to be a Mess-mate with the Captain?”52

Other servants were described as signing indentures in desperation. In his writings, John Harrower described his fruitless search for employment in Britain. Alone, penniless, and desperate in the streets of London did he make a choice—of sorts—to become transported to Virginia as an indentured servant.53 Another servant recalled that it was only when he had sold most of his clothes and reduced to “just one poor sixpence in my pocket” that he “was obliged to engage to go to Virginia for four years.”54 For contemporaries, both the “hooks”55 or “bait of promises”56 of unscrupulous recruiters and the compulsion of hunger were perceived as fundamentally compromising the assumption that such contracts were chosen by free will and bound “in a fair way.” Having signed indentures, servants were now decidedly bound by its terms.57

Some descriptions of recruitment were more accurate and informed than others. But they were all, to varying degrees, rooted in the practice of the servant traffic that seemed particularly unjust to observers of the time. Moreover, all such accounts spoke to broader public anxiety about the involuntary nature of labor relations. European workers were no strangers to coerced labor. In England, for example, the lower sorts were subjected to statutes that compelled vagrants to work, and war-time press gangs operated legally throughout the early nineteenth century.58 Moreover, because England experienced the earliest and most thorough transition to wage labor, its people were familiar with the coercive power of the market.59 Servitude was, then, an extreme example of the constraints of law and poverty that limited workers’ control over the circumstances and timing of their entry into labor agreements.60 While most servants’ signing of indentures was nominally voluntary, it was rarely a condition entered into with enthusiasm. In the literature of the day, it seems, becoming a servant often constituted, “barbarous treatment in England.”61

William Lauder’s suit turned on the moment of recruitment, yet it discussed the actual buying and selling of James and others at some length and in often lurid language. As with the recruitment preceding it, the buying and selling of servants troubled those unaccustomed to the practice. Most people entered servitude by signing an
indenture, but these contracts bound servants to the holder “or his assigns.” If a servant did not already understand this fact and its implications, they found out soon enough. Most indentures were quickly sold at least once—often to the shipper and nearly always to the colonial master—with servants having little if any say as to when, where, or to whom they would be sold. Lauder condemned, for example, that James and others would be sold by greedy merchants “as so many Sheep or Horse” and bought by “any that should give the most for them.” Thus the libel addressed the public’s view of servants as reduced to “merchandise,” a status with degrading and dangerous implications.

The moment of exchange most highlighted the degree to which servants were a kind of property. One prominent example here is the frequency with which contemporaries likened the selling of servants to that of horses and livestock. Servants were described, quite accurately, as "bought and sold still from one planter to another, or attached as horses and beasts for the debts of their masters." Whether sold like cattle at public markets or examined like horses for defects, servants were cast not as beasts of burden but as a species of property. Servants seemed like livestock in constituting commercial property, or in the words of the Libel, a “commodity.” As one servant wrote of his master, “he had purchased me for 12 guineas, and... my body was his for four years.” As this particular passage makes clear, the stipulation of a particular term of service did not preclude the sense that persons—and not just labor—were being purchased. So too, for much the same reason, were servants often described as slaves, or slave-like. The frequency with which the expression “sold a slave” appears in servant narratives suggests that the comparison or conflation—real or imagined—was most salient at sale.

Servitude as a status approaching chattel was thus most apparent at the moment of sale.

But criticisms of the servant trade went beyond abstract moral concerns to the concrete perils of an impersonal exchange. In a world in which dependent service was neither uncommon nor necessarily degrading in and of itself, it was the substance of one’s particular place that mattered most. Moreover, bound as they were for long terms to masters with substantial power over them—masters mattered more in determining the fate of servants as much as any other kind of European laborer. At the same time, nearly all servants would only come to know their masters well after they were bound. In language nearly identical to that of the Libel, one account describes a servant sold "like a Nag at Smithfield, and he that gave most for him had him." Former servant Peter Williamson spelled out the implications. “If the devil had come in the shape of a man to purchase us, with money enough in his pockets,” he reasoned, “it would have been as readily accepted as of the honestest and most humane man.” Such concerns of a master’s temperament applied to nearly all servants. Salisbury rebels made much the same point when they noted of the sale of prisoners, "he that hath a good master too day (for some such there are) may have a tyrant too morrow.”

The risks of impersonal sale went beyond that of a cruel master to the broader condition of service. James, for example, was reduced to more menial if not difficult tasks when his master lost his trade. Unlike apprentices, servants could be put to any task. Moreover the uncertainty of sale was based on the geographic location of masters. In narrative, a servant recalls that after his sale, “with my new master I went, not knowing who he was, or where I was to go.” If the “who” raised concerns about a
master’s disposition and perhaps prosperity, the “where” mattered too, for serving in
town or country, in a trade or the fields,
could profoundly shape a servant’s subsequent life and labor. James acknowledged that he lived “well enough,” but he was also threatened with sale to Virginia where he would “draw the plough.” The libel thus noted that it was only by “providence” that James had avoided “the most servile imployments.” If comparisons of servants to livestock were exaggerated, they nevertheless registered the distinctive alienability and condition of servants that made the moment of sale most fateful.

Servants, like other dependents and laborers, had multiple means by which they might escape, evade, or ameliorate their service—from delinquency to legal suits. But the Atlantic passage seemed to contemporaries to greatly narrow such traditional avenues of recourse. Like all migrants, servants were often cut off from kith and kin who might aid them in a variety of ways, but a servant’s particular condition made separation especially consequential. Masters had significantly more powers in law and custom to enforce “performance” of their servants than did other employers. When James Lauder threatened to write letters to his home revealing his plight, his captor claimed to not care for “he would deny it.” James’s mail was opened on two occasions, and when news of his case was eventually made public, the implicated ship captain “threatened to cut out James’s Ears.” Ideas about the servant trade often pointed to the complicity of Britain, but the difficulty of gaining redress in the colonies, real and imagined, at times led to more favorable comparisons of Britain with the colonies. In James Lauder’s words, “it is not here as in England, for as soon as you are once here, there is no getting away again.”

Lauder described being prevented from “acquainting his father” even before embarking for America, but in the public imagination the problem of recourse was most associated with the distance from home that bound migrants experience. Williamson noted the kidnapped were carried to the “remost parts of the globe, where they can have no redress for the injuries done them,” but such complaints were not limited to the spirited. One servant was described as far from home, so that “the wild Woods and Fields wherein he worked were the only Witnesses of his Complaints.” More concretely, writers identified the absence of family as consequential. One author claiming to have been a convict wrote in verse that he had been, “Fore’d from your friends and country” and that he then lived “in distant countries void of all relief.” One miserable servant in Virginia spelled out more clearly the implications when he wrote, “I never felt the want of father and mother till now” and goes on to plead for food, clothing, and redemption. Indeed Lauder was far from alone in writing letters home for redemption and aid. Servants and others perceived the possibility that people back home might intervene directly by sending aid or paying off time or indirectly by pursuing legal challenges; however, contacting kith and kin was itself fraught, if only because one’s master might not view it favorably. In the West Indies, one other composed letters to friends in England protesting his treatment and asking for intervention. As a result, he recounted, “our Master perceived that we were uneasy,” and, “grew more and more unkind unto us.”

In the popular imagination, servants were much less likely to receive justice in the colonies, and not just because they lacked advocates. As one noted, “Laws here are not the same as in England.” In an apparent reference to provincial statutes that governed servants, he went on to explain, “they have introduced so many By-
ones…that in some cases destroys the liberty of the subject.” The results of such laws meant that the contractual guarantees spelled out in indentures signed across the Atlantic might not always be strictly enforced. A political prisoner in Barbados claimed that he and his friends had been disappointed in their attempts at redemption, “Having no assurance of performing Articles at such a distance.” Moreover, traditional avenues of seeking justice were now imagined as ineffective. As one wrote, “Now having no redress, remedy, or hope, from Master, Magistrates, nor Ministers.”

Narratives often described this legal difference in terms of a distressing contrast between justice in England and American. Thus, a kidnapped boy was later borne out by his frustrated efforts to obtain a hearing from justices in Maryland. “Wrongly, I supposed I should meet redress as in England.” Not surprising, then, that many longed for home. As a servant woman assured another in the novel The Life of Charlotte Du Pont, that “if I live to see England again, I will see justice done.”

If the poor reputation of the servant trade was rooted in real practice, the reputation may have, in turn, had real effects on the trade. Despite the public interest in kidnapped heirs and transported convicts, most servants were not physically forced into servitude, either by kidnappers or the courts, raising the possibility that the public perception of servitude might have informed potential recruits’ choices of whether or not to enter into indentures. Galenson has suggested potential migrants’ decisions helped determine the inelastic supply of servants, which in turn precipitated transitions to other labor systems, both wage labor and slavery. If he is right, stories about servitude may have shaped colonial development.

There are reasons to doubt the power of ideas about servitude to shape the behavior. After all, thousands of migrants from the British Isles and Rhinelands continued to enter into indentures. Moreover, if perceptions of the servant trade in many ways resembled those of the slave trade, only the latter helped engender a crusade to ameliorate or abolish an institution. Of course in some cases printed material was produced as fiction and understood as such by those who consumed it. Thus William Lauder’s son Francis most likely gave more credence to the cautionary tale of his brother James than he would to many broadsides that similarly warned young men to beware spirits. Just as importantly, public concern was in part blunted by the assumption that primarily the lesser sort were subjected to it. This is borne out by the ways in which social rank was addressed in many servant accounts, and by fact that the most discussed cases were those in which the lowly servant was well born. Lauder’s libel cast itself as concerned of those “both high and low.” But it also went to great lengths to establish the Lauders’ status as propertied and respectable, thus proving servitude had frustrated his prospects. In fact, condemnations of the servant trade were particularistic in a variety of ways, limiting the degree to which servitude as a whole was imagined as immoral and unjust.

There is, nevertheless, evidence that the literature on the servant trade not only expressed but also heightened public anxieties about the practice and thus perhaps curbed migration. Some writers, in fact, suggested that this was their intention and spelled out the moral of their stories to readers, just as promoters of colonial ventures explicitly sought to entice migrants. James Lauder wrote in letters home that he wished he “had never come away” and cautioned his brother Francis to be more prudent. Many other printed narratives sought to instruct potential
migrants, as the anonymous ballad that concludes bluntly: "Then let Maids beware, all by my ill-fare,/ in the Land of Virginy, O:/ Be sure to stay at home."^99

The power of the servitude’s reputation is likewise revealed in the strong reactions of merchants, promoters and their allies. Letters critical of servitude were derided as false and occasionally suppressed or censored, just as favorable letters were solicited, fabricated, referenced, printed, and circulated. One former servant was thrown in jail, and his books burned, by the merchants and magistrates of Aberdeen whom he had purportedly libeled in his published narrative. John Norris found it necessary to structure his promotional tract as a rebuttal to a series of rather damning imagined queries, such as: "But do not English People, and others, when they come first into the Country, become Slaves there, as it is generally said?"^102

Some contemporaries explicitly addressed the hostile recruiting environment as a direct product of servitude’s reputation. In an early picaresque narrative, Mary Frith suggested that she was nearly kidnapped to Virginia, because at such an early date, "There was then no noyse or talk of Spirits."^103 As such, she attests to the genesis of the public’s reputation of at least one dimension of servitude. By the mid-seventeenth century, John Hammond suggested that though many in England were destitute, "it were dangerous to advise these wretches to better their conditions by travaile, for fear of the cry of, a spirit, a spirit. "^104 That this cry of spirit could indeed result in violence is corroborated elsewhere. As Hammond suggested, the reputation of spirits might curb lawful recruitment. If such public concerns occasionally flared into hysteria, the reputation of servitude probably kept some individuals from voluntarily signing indentures throughout the era. Thus one agent wrote in 1669 from Ireland regarding servants that he, “could not obtayne any...they have beene so terrifed with the ill practice of them.”^106 Letters, petitions, and print were part and parcel of the “noyse” that occasionally spurred crowd actions and more often tended to discouraged potential recruits. If the reputation of servitude did not create a widespread social movement to abolish it, there is evidence that it helped create a hostile climate for those who would recruit at particular times and places.

That the histories of servitude and slavery were intertwined has long been recognized by scholars. At least since the publication of Edmund S. Morgan’s classic account of early Virginia, they have given close attention to the “transition” to slavery. This literature has tended to privilege slavery over servitude, both in the institution of more significance and in identifying a more decisive moment of transition than was the case. Moreover, for those who consider the cultural dimension of this history, most have followed Morgan’s lead in suggesting that white bondage both justified and then gave way to a newly imagined racialized status of slave. The extent to which contemporary ideas about servitude conjoined with the emerging opposition to the slave trade is, however, largely ignored. Right up to the American Revolution, new narratives appeared condemning the servant traffic as an inhuman merchandise that made a mockery of Briton’s self-conceit as the freest of nations. The discourse on servants--present as it was at the birth of the antislavery movement--could not but have informed this monumental development.

From its inception, servitude generated interest and anxiety among the public, only in part based on the novel and exploitative practice itself. American servitude was often regarded as subjecting migrants to a distinctive and barbarous
 планter culture, but contemporaries also pointed to the seemingly unrestrained commerce in men as a breach in British liberties. If the prevalence of such ideas in print is any indication, the traffic in servants may have constituted the Achilles heel of servitude, eliciting widespread interest and censure, and perhaps even curtailing emigration. The extent to which such ideas shaped emerging antislavery thinking has yet to be explored.
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